



Item	# Students Responding	Mean	StDev
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	23	6.2	1.7
You learned something valuable	23	6.8	1.4
Your interest in subject increased	23	6.1	1.8
You learned & understood the subject materials	22	7.0	1.4
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	23	7.2	1.3
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	23	7.1	1.4
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	23	7.3	1.1
Presentation style held your interest	23	6.3	1.9
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	23	7.0	1.6
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	23	7.2	1.5
Proposed objectives were taught	23	7.3	1.3
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	23	7.2	1.5
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	23	6.7	1.6
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	23	6.9	1.5
Students asked questions, were answered well	23	7.0	1.4
Students encouraged to express own ideas	23	7.1	1.3
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	23	8.1	0.9
Had a genuine interest in students	23	7.9	1.1
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	23	7.9	1.4
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	23	7.9	1.1
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	23	6.7	1.4
Presented background of ideas/concepts	23	6.5	1.8
Presented points of view other than own	23	6.8	1.6
Discussed current developments in field	23	6.9	1.5
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	23	7.1	1.3
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	23	7.5	1.4
Graded material tested content as emphasized	23	7.3	1.7
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	23	7.4	1.2
Assignments contributed to understanding	23	7.5	1.1
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	23	4.7	1.5
Subject workload	23	4.0	1.5
Subject pace	23	4.6	1.3
OVERALL			
Class Rating	20	6.4	1.5
Instructor Rating	20	7.0	1.7

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.



Fordham University

SEEQ Results – Department Summary: Mean Ratings by Item –Fall, 2011

Department: Economics

Item	# Students Responding	Mean	StDev
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	2351	7.1	1.8
You learned something valuable	2353	7.3	1.8
Your interest in subject increased	2351	6.7	2.2
You learned & understood the subject materials	2341	7.0	1.9
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	2353	7.3	1.9
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	2351	7.1	2.1
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	2352	6.8	2.3
Presentation style held your interest	2346	6.5	2.4
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	2351	6.8	2.2
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	2350	7.1	2.0
Proposed objectives were taught	2348	7.3	1.9
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	2343	7.5	1.9
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	2345	6.9	2.0
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	2343	6.9	2.0
Students asked questions, were answered well	2341	7.2	2.0
Students encouraged to express own ideas	2342	7.0	2.0
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	2349	7.7	1.7
Had a genuine interest in students	2351	7.3	1.9
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	2343	7.5	1.9
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	2335	7.5	1.8
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	2346	7.1	1.8
Presented background of ideas/concepts	2348	7.1	1.8
Presented points of view other than own	2335	7.2	1.8
Discussed current developments in field	2326	7.2	1.9
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	2331	6.9	2.1
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	2332	7.2	2.0
Graded material tested content as emphasized	2324	7.2	2.0
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	2336	6.9	2.1
Assignments contributed to understanding	2306	7.1	2.0
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	2323	6.0	1.7
Subject workload	2327	5.1	1.7
Subject pace	2316	5.6	1.3
OVERALL			
Class Rating	2228	6.7	2.1
Instructor Rating	2221	6.9	2.2

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University****SEEQ Results -- Department/Level Summary: Mean Ratings by Item --Fall, 2011****Department: Economics****Level: Undergrad**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	2107	7.1	1.8
You learned something valuable	2108	7.2	1.8
Your interest in subject increased	2106	6.6	2.2
You learned & understood the subject materials	2096	7.0	1.9
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	2108	7.3	1.9
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	2106	7.0	2.1
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	2108	6.7	2.3
Presentation style held your interest	2103	6.4	2.5
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	2106	6.8	2.3
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	2105	7.1	2.1
Proposed objectives were taught	2103	7.2	2.0
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	2099	7.5	1.9
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	2101	6.8	2.0
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	2100	6.8	2.0
Students asked questions, were answered well	2096	7.1	2.0
Students encouraged to express own ideas	2098	6.9	2.0
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	2104	7.6	1.8
Had a genuine interest in students	2106	7.3	2.0
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	2102	7.4	1.9
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	2095	7.4	1.8
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	2102	7.1	1.8
Presented background of ideas/concepts	2104	7.1	1.9
Presented points of view other than own	2094	7.2	1.8
Discussed current developments in field	2085	7.1	1.9
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	2104	6.9	2.1
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	2106	7.2	2.0
Graded material tested content as emphasized	2098	7.2	2.0
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	2096	6.9	2.1
Assignments contributed to understanding	2069	7.1	2.0
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	2088	6.0	1.7
Subject workload	2090	5.0	1.6
Subject pace	2080	5.6	1.3
OVERALL			
Class Rating	2000	6.6	2.1
Instructor Rating	1995	6.8	2.2

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.



Item	# Students Responding	Mean	StDev
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	33	6.7	1.4
You learned something valuable	33	7.1	1.5
Your interest in subject increased	33	6.4	1.8
You learned & understood the subject materials	33	6.9	1.7
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	33	7.4	1.4
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	33	7.2	1.6
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	33	7.7	1.3
Presentation style held your interest	33	6.5	2.0
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	33	6.8	1.6
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	33	6.9	1.4
Proposed objectives were taught	33	7.1	1.4
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	33	6.6	1.6
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	33	6.4	1.9
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	33	6.8	1.7
Students asked questions, were answered well	33	7.1	1.4
Students encouraged to express own ideas	33	7.1	1.5
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	33	8.1	1.0
Had a genuine interest in students	33	7.5	1.4
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	33	7.6	1.3
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	33	7.5	1.4
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	33	6.6	1.9
Presented background of ideas/concepts	33	6.3	1.7
Presented points of view other than own	33	6.7	1.7
Discussed current developments in field	33	6.2	1.8
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	33	6.9	1.9
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	33	7.7	1.3
Graded material tested content as emphasized	33	7.5	1.4
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	32	7.2	1.7
Assignments contributed to understanding	33	7.2	1.8
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	33	5.6	1.8
Subject workload	33	5.0	1.5
Subject pace	33	5.2	0.8
OVERALL			
Class Rating	33	6.3	1.7
Instructor Rating	33	6.7	1.7

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University****SEEQ Results -- Department/Level Summary: Mean Ratings by Item --Fall, 2012****Department: Economics****Level: Undergrad**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	1953	7.0	1.8
You learned something valuable	1949	7.2	1.8
Your interest in subject increased	1952	6.6	2.2
You learned & understood the subject materials	1942	7.0	1.9
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	1951	7.4	1.8
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	1948	7.1	2.0
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	1950	6.9	2.1
Presentation style held your interest	1943	6.5	2.2
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	1952	6.8	2.1
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	1949	7.1	2.0
Proposed objectives were taught	1950	7.2	1.9
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	1945	7.5	1.8
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	1950	6.8	2.0
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	1948	6.8	2.0
Students asked questions, were answered well	1949	7.2	1.9
Students encouraged to express own ideas	1949	7.0	1.9
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	1952	7.7	1.6
Had a genuine interest in students	1950	7.3	1.9
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	1947	7.5	1.8
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	1939	7.4	1.7
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	1947	7.0	1.8
Presented background of ideas/concepts	1945	7.0	1.7
Presented points of view other than own	1939	7.1	1.8
Discussed current developments in field	1940	7.1	1.9
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	1947	6.8	2.0
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	1945	7.2	1.9
Graded material tested content as emphasized	1944	7.2	1.9
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	1937	6.9	2.0
Assignments contributed to understanding	1917	7.2	1.8
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	1943	5.9	1.7
Subject workload	1940	4.9	1.7
Subject pace	1935	5.5	1.2
OVERALL			
Class Rating	1899	6.7	2.0
Instructor Rating	1898	6.9	2.1

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University****SEEQ Results – Department Summary: Mean Ratings by Item – Fall, 2012****Department: Economics**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	2149	7.0	1.8
You learned something valuable	2145	7.3	1.7
Your interest in subject increased	2148	6.7	2.1
You learned & understood the subject materials	2137	7.0	1.9
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	2147	7.4	1.8
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	2144	7.2	1.9
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	2145	7.0	2.1
Presentation style held your interest	2139	6.6	2.2
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	2148	6.8	2.1
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	2145	7.1	2.0
Proposed objectives were taught	2145	7.2	1.9
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	2141	7.5	1.8
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	2145	6.8	2.0
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	2143	6.8	1.9
Students asked questions, were answered well	2144	7.2	1.8
Students encouraged to express own ideas	2143	7.0	1.9
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	2148	7.8	1.6
Had a genuine interest in students	2146	7.4	1.8
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	2143	7.5	1.8
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	2133	7.4	1.7
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	2143	7.0	1.7
Presented background of ideas/concepts	2140	7.0	1.7
Presented points of view other than own	2132	7.1	1.7
Discussed current developments in field	2133	7.1	1.9
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	2140	6.8	2.0
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	2139	7.2	1.9
Graded material tested content as emphasized	2136	7.2	1.9
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	2128	6.9	2.0
Assignments contributed to understanding	2104	7.2	1.8
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	2136	6.0	1.7
Subject workload	2133	5.0	1.7
Subject pace	2128	5.5	1.3
OVERALL			
Class Rating	2080	6.7	2.0
Instructor Rating	2078	6.9	2.1

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University***Economics***SEEQ Results-- Mean Ratings by Item --****Department/Level/Subdept Course Summary Spring, 2012****Level: Undergrad Course: ECON1200R04 BASIC MICROECONOMICS Instructor: GALLAGHER M**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
<i>Learning/Academic Value</i>			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	28	6.9	1.9
You learned something valuable	28	7.2	1.9
Your interest in subject increased	28	6.6	2.3
You learned & understood the subject materials	28	7.0	2.0
<i>Instructor Enthusiasm</i>			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	28	7.5	1.6
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	28	7.4	1.5
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	28	7.8	1.4
Presentation style held your interest	28	6.4	2.1
<i>Organization/Clarity</i>			
Instructor gave clear explanations	28	6.9	2.0
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	28	6.9	1.7
Proposed objectives were taught	28	7.5	1.4
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	28	7.1	2.0
<i>Group Interaction</i>			
Students encouraged to participate in class	28	6.8	1.9
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	28	6.9	1.8
Students asked questions, were answered well	28	7.4	1.7
Students encouraged to express own ideas	28	7.2	1.7
<i>Individual Rapport</i>			
Friendly towards individual students	28	8.3	1.0
Had a genuine interest in students	28	8.2	1.0
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	28	8.1	1.0
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	28	8.0	1.2
<i>Breadth of Coverage</i>			
Contrasted implications of various theories	28	7.3	1.4
Presented background of ideas/concepts	28	7.3	1.4
Presented points of view other than own	28	7.4	1.4
Discussed current developments in field	28	7.2	1.4
<i>Examinations/Graded Materials</i>			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	28	7.3	1.6
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	28	7.4	1.7
Graded material tested content as emphasized	27	7.5	1.6
<i>Assignments/Readings</i>			
Required readings/texts were valuable	28	7.5	1.5
Assignments contributed to understanding	26	7.2	1.7
<i>Workload/Difficulty</i>			
Subject difficulty	27	5.8	1.7
Subject workload	28	4.6	1.9
Subject pace	28	5.5	0.9
OVERALL			
Class Rating	27	6.6	2.0
Instructor Rating	27	7.1	1.8

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.



<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
<i>Learning/Academic Value</i>			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	25	6.2	1.5
You learned something valuable	25	6.6	1.3
Your interest in subject increased	25	5.7	1.8
You learned & understood the subject materials	25	6.1	1.6
<i>Instructor Enthusiasm</i>			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	25	6.6	1.5
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	25	6.4	2.0
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	25	6.8	1.9
Presentation style held your interest	25	5.8	2.2
<i>Organization/Clarity</i>			
Instructor gave clear explanations	25	6.3	1.9
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	25	6.3	2.0
Proposed objectives were taught	24	7.1	1.6
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	24	6.8	2.2
<i>Group Interaction</i>			
Students encouraged to participate in class	25	6.1	1.8
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	25	6.4	1.3
Students asked questions, were answered well	25	6.7	1.7
Students encouraged to express own ideas	25	6.3	1.6
<i>Individual Rapport</i>			
Friendly towards individual students	25	7.3	1.5
Had a genuine interest in students	25	6.4	1.9
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	25	7.3	1.4
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	25	6.8	1.5
<i>Breadth of Coverage</i>			
Contrasted implications of various theories	25	6.0	1.8
Presented background of ideas/concepts	25	5.7	1.6
Presented points of view other than own	25	6.0	1.9
Discussed current developments in field	25	5.7	1.8
<i>Examinations/Graded Materials</i>			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	25	6.2	1.6
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	25	6.5	1.8
Graded material tested content as emphasized	25	6.6	1.6
<i>Assignments/Readings</i>			
Required readings/texts were valuable	25	6.7	1.5
Assignments contributed to understanding	25	6.5	1.6
<i>Workload/Difficulty</i>			
Subject difficulty	25	5.8	1.4
Subject workload	25	4.7	1.6
Subject pace	25	5.8	1.4
OVERALL			
Class Rating	24	5.9	1.2
Instructor Rating	24	6.1	1.8

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University****SEEQ Results -- Department/Level Summary: Mean Ratings by Item --Spring, 2012****Department: Economics****Level: Undergrad**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
Learning/Academic Value			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	1600	7.2	1.6
You learned something valuable	1597	7.4	1.6
Your interest in subject increased	1595	6.9	1.9
You learned & understood the subject materials	1594	7.2	1.7
Instructor Enthusiasm			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	1600	7.5	1.7
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	1597	7.3	1.9
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	1597	7.1	2.1
Presentation style held your interest	1593	6.8	2.2
Organization/Clarity			
Instructor gave clear explanations	1598	7.1	2.0
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	1595	7.3	1.9
Proposed objectives were taught	1594	7.4	1.8
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	1593	7.5	1.9
Group Interaction			
Students encouraged to participate in class	1599	7.0	1.9
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	1596	7.0	1.9
Students asked questions, were answered well	1596	7.2	1.9
Students encouraged to express own ideas	1592	7.1	1.9
Individual Rapport			
Friendly towards individual students	1599	7.7	1.6
Had a genuine interest in students	1598	7.4	1.8
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	1596	7.6	1.7
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	1592	7.5	1.7
Breadth of Coverage			
Contrasted implications of various theories	1596	7.3	1.6
Presented background of ideas/concepts	1592	7.3	1.7
Presented points of view other than own	1590	7.3	1.6
Discussed current developments in field	1587	7.4	1.7
Examinations/Graded Materials			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	1599	7.1	1.9
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	1595	7.4	1.8
Graded material tested content as emphasized	1591	7.4	1.8
Assignments/Readings			
Required readings/texts were valuable	1592	7.0	2.0
Assignments contributed to understanding	1566	7.2	1.9
Workload/Difficulty			
Subject difficulty	1578	5.8	1.6
Subject workload	1580	5.0	1.6
Subject pace	1576	5.5	1.2
OVERALL			
Class Rating	1520	6.9	1.9
Instructor Rating	1516	7.1	2.0

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

**Fordham University****SEEQ Results -- Department Summary: Mean Ratings by Item --Spring, 2012****Department: Economics**

<i>Item</i>	<i># Students Responding</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>StDev</i>
<i>Learning/Academic Value</i>			
Class intellectually challenging/stimulating	1795	7.3	1.6
You learned something valuable	1792	7.5	1.6
Your interest in subject increased	1790	7.0	1.9
You learned & understood the subject materials	1789	7.3	1.7
<i>Instructor Enthusiasm</i>			
Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	1795	7.6	1.7
Instructor was dynamic and energetic	1792	7.4	1.8
Instructor enhanced presentations with humor	1792	7.1	2.0
Presentation style held your interest	1788	6.8	2.2
<i>Organization/Clarity</i>			
Instructor gave clear explanations	1793	7.1	2.0
Class materials were carefully/well prepared	1789	7.3	1.9
Proposed objectives were taught	1788	7.4	1.8
Instructor presentations facilitated taking notes	1787	7.5	1.9
<i>Group Interaction</i>			
Students encouraged to participate in class	1794	7.1	1.9
Students invited to share ideas & knowledge	1791	7.0	1.9
Students asked questions, were answered well	1791	7.3	1.9
Students encouraged to express own ideas	1787	7.1	1.9
<i>Individual Rapport</i>			
Friendly towards individual students	1794	7.8	1.6
Had a genuine interest in students	1793	7.5	1.8
Welcomed students seeking help/advice	1790	7.6	1.7
Accessible during office hrs &/or after class	1786	7.6	1.7
<i>Breadth of Coverage</i>			
Contrasted implications of various theories	1790	7.4	1.6
Presented background of ideas/concepts	1786	7.3	1.6
Presented points of view other than own	1784	7.4	1.6
Discussed current developments in field	1781	7.4	1.6
<i>Examinations/Graded Materials</i>			
Feedback on exams/graded materials valuable	1792	7.1	1.9
Evaluation methods were fair/appropriate	1788	7.4	1.8
Graded material tested content as emphasized	1785	7.5	1.8
<i>Assignments/Readings</i>			
Required readings/texts were valuable	1784	7.1	1.9
Assignments contributed to understanding	1755	7.3	1.8
<i>Workload/Difficulty</i>			
Subject difficulty	1771	5.9	1.6
Subject workload	1774	5.2	1.7
Subject pace	1770	5.6	1.2
OVERALL			
Class Rating	1702	6.9	1.9
Instructor Rating	1696	7.2	2.0

The results in this summary represent the average (Mean) and standard deviation (StDev) of the ratings of students for the course indicated above. The item descriptions have been paraphrased. Please see the SEEQ instrument for the actual wording. NOTE: The standard deviation tells how the data is distributed (spread out) with respect to the average. In other words, the smaller the StDev, the closer your score is to the average or mean value of the student responses.

Learning/Academic Value

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
You found the class intellectually challenging and stimulating	6.9	3.0	9.0	28	1.5
You learned something that you considered valuable	7.1	5.0	9.0	28	1.4
Your interest in this subject has increased as a consequence of this class	6.6	3.0	9.0	28	1.7
You have learned and understood the subject materials in this class	7.4	5.0	9.0	28	1.3

Instructor Enthusiasm

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the class	7.6	5.0	9.0	28	1.2
Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the class	7.5	4.0	9.0	28	1.4
Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor	7.6	5.0	9.0	28	1.4
Instructor's style of presentation held your interest during class	6.5	1.0	9.0	28	2.0

Organization/Clarity

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor's explanations were clear	7.2	3.0	9.0	28	1.7
Class materials were well prepared and carefully explained	6.8	3.0	9.0	28	1.6
Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught, so you knew where the class was going	7.0	3.0	9.0	28	1.6
Instructor gave presentations that facilitated taking notes	7.3	5.0	9.0	28	1.3

Group Interaction

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions	7.1	3.0	9.0	28	1.5
Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge	7.0	3.0	9.0	28	1.6
Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers	7.1	3.0	9.0	28	1.7
Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor	7.0	3.0	9.0	28	1.8

Individual Rapport

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor was friendly towards individual students	7.8	5.0	9.0	28	1.3
Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students	7.4	3.0	9.0	28	1.7
Instructors made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class	7.8	4.0	9.0	28	1.4
Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class	7.7	4.0	9.0	28	1.4

Breadth of Coverage

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories	7.1	5.0	9.0	27	1.5
Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	7.0	5.0	9.0	27	1.4
Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate	7.1	5.0	9.0	25	1.3
Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field	7.0	4.0	9.0	27	1.6

Examinations/Graded Materials/Assignments

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	6.8	4.0	9.0	28	1.5
Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate	7.5	4.0	9.0	28	1.4
Examinations/graded materials tested class content as emphasized by the instructor	7.0	1.0	9.0	28	1.9
Required readings/texts were valuable	6.9	4.0	9.0	27	1.6
Readings, homework, etc. contributed to appreciation and understanding of the subject	6.7	3.0	9.0	28	1.5

OVERALL RATINGS

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Subject difficulty, relative to other subjects was	5.5	1.0	9.0	28	1.6
Subject workload, relative to other subjects was	4.6	1.0	9.0	28	1.9
Subject pace was	5.5	2.0	9.0	28	1.3
Overall, how does this class compare with other classes at Fordham University?	6.9	4.0	9.0	28	1.6
Overall, how does this instructor compare with other instructors at Fordham University?	7.1	4.0	9.0	28	1.4

What are the strengths and weaknesses of this course?

Comment

strength- like economics
weakness- hate mankiw

Good teacher but too fast moving

Strengths: well outlined, straight forward lecture
Weaknesses: can be a little boring but that economics

The strength of this course is its ability to provide a solid foundation to understanding economics. I feel there is no weakness to this course the way the professor taught it.

The instructor was well-versed in the subject, and was interesting to listen to in class. He made the subject interesting, and provided plenty of opportunities to get a better grade in the course. There were not any visible weaknesses in the course

strengths: learned a lot of valuable information
Weakness: Slightly difficult to take good notes

Covers a good breadth of information in the field of microeconomics

strengths were the intersecting topics and activities to get students involved. weakness was the continuous wordy phrases that confused students

This class was excellent. I like how we went over examples in class, but the tests were difficult.

a lot of information

Strengths: relevant, straight-forward
Weaknesses: boring

It felt like a high school course. Pace could have been faster.

I found micro to be a very interesting course that helped explain many economic issues in today's economy. I really enjoyed this class.

MicroEconomics is a stimulating, fun course. I was a big fan of the textbook used, Mankiw's 6th Edition MicroEconomics

Informative

Fairly easy to keep up

teacher could have been better

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Instructor?

Comment

strength- funny
weakness- rambles

Great teacher

Strengths: genuine interests in all students

Professor Gallagher is one of the most amazing professors I have encountered at Fordham and one of the nicest people I have ever met. He is easily approachable and extremely helpful. One of my favorite things about Professor Gallagher is that he genuinely cares about his students, which I particularly find really encouraging. He has a great sense of humor and knows his subject well, I wish I could take him for all my future economics class because he gave me the confidence to major economics.

He was interesting and funny, and made the subject more interesting to listen to. He was also friendly and readily available for aid after class. Feedback on tests was a little vague and unclear, but it was well-explained in class.

Strength: Very receptive to students

Weakness: Notes are sometimes a little confusing

Lectures were difficult to understand. It would have been more helpful to go through the chapter with students from different examples besides the book. For example, making a personal powerpoint instead of putting what the textbook says on the board.

He did a good job of explaining material, but it would have helped to have PowerPoint slides. It's difficult to take notes entirely by ear. But overall, he was very kind, and I enjoyed his class

strengths were his positive attitude and understudying of specific students needs. weakness is speed of classroom

He was excellent!

he's a nice guy

he should stop teaching based solely on the textbook and have a more original lesson plan

Strengths: friendly, fair, hardworking

Weaknesses: boring way of teaching, sometimes gets lost or confused

It's hard to judge because this class was so basic, but an overall good professor.

I really liked Professor Gallagher. He was a very fair teacher and grader. Sometimes his lectures got a little boring, but overall I'd recommend him to anyone taking economics. He simplified many complex ideas and made them easy to understand.

Prof. Gallagher is an enthusiastic, funny, knowledgeable professor. I have learned at least three times as much about the subject of Economics than I did in last semester's MacroEcon. He is always helpful, jovial, and gives lots of helpful tips and acronyms to study with. I can understand why he has such an excellent reputation among students at Fordham.

Easy to understand

Great person

none that were good or bad

Learning/Academic Value

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
You found the class intellectually challenging and stimulating	6.9	3.0	9.0	30	1.7
You learned something that you considered valuable	7.1	4.0	9.0	30	1.6
Your interest in this subject has increased as a consequence of this class	6.5	3.0	9.0	30	1.9
You have learned and understood the subject materials in this class	7.1	4.0	9.0	30	1.5

Instructor Enthusiasm

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the class	7.2	5.0	9.0	30	1.1
Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the class	6.9	5.0	9.0	30	1.4
Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor	7.4	5.0	9.0	30	1.4
Instructor's style of presentation held your interest during class	6.5	3.0	9.0	30	1.7

Organization/Clarity

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor's explanations were clear	7.3	3.0	9.0	30	1.4
Class materials were well prepared and carefully explained	7.1	4.0	9.0	30	1.4
Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught, so you knew where the class was going	7.3	4.0	9.0	30	1.4
Instructor gave presentations that facilitated taking notes	7.3	3.0	9.0	30	1.5

Group Interaction

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions	6.6	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge	7.0	3.0	9.0	30	1.3
Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers	7.0	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor	7.1	3.0	9.0	30	1.3

Individual Rapport

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor was friendly towards individual students	7.9	5.0	9.0	30	1.4
Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students	7.6	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Instructors made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class	7.5	5.0	9.0	30	1.4
Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class	7.6	5.0	9.0	28	1.3

Breadth of Coverage

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories	7.4	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	7.3	5.0	9.0	30	1.3
Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate	7.4	4.0	9.0	30	1.3
Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field	7.0	3.0	9.0	30	1.7

Examinations/Graded Materials/Assignments

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	7.1	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate	7.6	5.0	9.0	30	1.3
Examinations/graded materials tested class content as emphasized by the instructor	7.4	4.0	9.0	30	1.4
Required readings/texts were valuable	7.2	4.0	9.0	30	1.5
Readings, homework, etc. contributed to appreciation and understanding of the subject	7.0	2.0	9.0	30	1.7

OVERALL RATINGS

Question	Mean	Min	Max	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Subject difficulty, relative to other subjects was	6.0	3.0	9.0	30	1.5
Subject workload, relative to other subjects was	5.0	1.0	8.0	30	1.5
Subject pace was	5.5	3.0	9.0	30	1.2
Overall, how does this class compare with other classes at Fordham University?	6.9	3.0	9.0	30	1.6
Overall, how does this instructor compare with other instructors at Fordham University?	7.3	5.0	9.0	30	1.2

What are the strengths and weaknesses of this course?

Comment

Covers microeconomics theory decently, but insults the intelligence a bit. Needs more math.

Strengths- fair grading / good extra credit

Weaknesses- sometimes it is dragged out

The material itself is not very exciting, but the professor makes it as delightful as he can.

The textbook is very dense so it is hard to go over all the material in the semester.

The class went according to the syllabus and we were never thrown any curve balls. The only weakness I can think of is that the subject is a bit dry and maybe use a few more methods, like the snickers and the drawing, in more of the classes to liven it up a little.

strengths - good pace, approachable instructor

This course was interesting however there was an immense amount of information that needed to be learned in a very short duration of time.

The weakness of this class is that the first half of it was exactly the same as macroeconomics and for those who have taken it already, it was a waste of time.

Slightly boring, material sometimes confusing but has real-life applications. Fair for an intro course

Done in line with the book is a strength. Weakness= class itself was not too vocal. Not necessarily a teaching problem

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Instructor?

Comment

Nice guy, experience in finance. Seems a bit bored with subject sometimes. However, this is more due to general apathy of class than to personal disinterest.

He cares about the class, yet sometimes he forgets what he's talking about.

Very humorous and has a genuine care about his students.

Funny good teacher

He goes over the material very fast and sometimes moves too quickly. I wish we spent longer on some material and less on less important stuff. Overall though, Prof Gallagher is a funny teacher and quite engaging during class.

strengths - very nice and supportive teacher, always willing to help students who do not understand a topic explained in class

The instructor taught what he was supposed to, but was not very engaging.

Extremely nice, cares about students

sometimes boring, needs to give better powerpoints

Good at explaining things

Courses Taught:

Introductory Microeconomics

Introductory Macroeconomics