

There were: 43 possible respondents.

| | Question Text | N | RR | Avg | FINAN Avg | FINAN SP19 | Div Avg | Div SP19 | Sch Avg | Sch SP19 | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|-----|------|-----------|------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|--------------|-----------|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | Mid - 300 | 301- 6 Am | 601- 9 Am | 901- Noon | 1201- 3 Pm | 301- 6 Pm | 601- 9 Pm | 901- Mid | |
| Grp | Instructor Questions (SEEGERT) | | | 5.84 | 5.20 | 5.54 | 5.27 | 5.43 | 5.29 | 5.39 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grp | Course Questions | | | 5.79 | 5.03 | 5.36 | 5.07 | 5.22 | 5.15 | 5.25 | | | | | | | | | |
| | What Time Of Day Are You Completing Evaluation | 34 | 79% | | | | | | | | | | | 9% (3) | 6% (2) | 3% (1) | 74% (25) | 9% (3) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | A | B | C | D | F | Other | | | |
| | What was your grade | 34 | 79% | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% (34) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Str Disagree | Disagree | Mild Disagree | Mild Agree | Agree | Str Agree | | | |
| 1 | Objectives clearly stated | 34 | 79% | 5.85 | 5.14 | 5.47 | 5.17 | 5.35 | 5.24 | 5.36 | | | | | 15% (5) | 85% (29) | | | |
| 2 | Objectives met | 34 | 79% | 5.91 | 5.07 | 5.42 | 5.13 | 5.29 | 5.22 | 5.32 | | | | | 9% (3) | 91% (31) | | | |
| 3 | Content well-organized | 34 | 79% | 5.79 | 5.00 | 5.38 | 5.08 | 5.21 | 5.12 | 5.19 | | | | | 21% (7) | 79% (27) | | | |
| 4 | Course materials helpful | 34 | 79% | 5.85 | 4.94 | 5.28 | 5.02 | 5.17 | 5.11 | 5.20 | | | | 3% (1) | 9% (3) | 88% (30) | | | |
| 5 | Assignments & exams covered the course | 34 | 79% | 5.65 | 5.05 | 5.32 | 5.10 | 5.24 | 5.19 | 5.30 | | | | 6% (2) | 24% (8) | 71% (24) | | | |
| 6 | Learned great deal | 34 | 79% | 5.74 | 4.96 | 5.31 | 5.00 | 5.15 | 5.11 | 5.20 | | | | 3% (1) | 21% (7) | 76% (26) | | | |
| 7 | Overall effective course | 34 | 79% | 5.76 | 4.95 | 5.31 | 5.00 | 5.14 | 5.10 | 5.18 | | | 3% (1) | | 15% (5) | 82% (28) | | | |
| 9 | Instructor was organized (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.82 | 5.13 | 5.51 | 5.20 | 5.35 | 5.23 | 5.30 | | | | | 18% (6) | 82% (28) | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|--------|------------|-------------|--|--|
| 10 | Instructor presented effectively (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.79 | 4.95 | 5.33 | 5.06 | 5.23 | 5.14 | 5.23 | | | | | 21% (7) | 79% (27) | | |
| 11 | Instructor created respectful environment (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.79 | 5.30 | 5.62 | 5.35 | 5.53 | 5.35 | 5.48 | | | | 3% (1) | 15% (5) | 82% (28) | | |
| 12 | Demonstrated thorough knowledge (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.88 | 5.43 | 5.72 | 5.44 | 5.58 | 5.44 | 5.53 | | | | | 12% (4) | 88% (30) | | |
| 13 | Instructor encouraged questions/ opinions (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.88 | 5.30 | 5.57 | 5.34 | 5.50 | 5.35 | 5.43 | | | | | 12% (4) | 88% (30) | | |
| 14 | Instructor available for student consultation (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.85 | 5.25 | 5.55 | 5.28 | 5.47 | 5.31 | 5.42 | | | | | 15% (5) | 85% (29) | | |
| 15 | Overall effective instructor (SEEGERT) | 34 | 79% | 5.82 | 5.10 | 5.46 | 5.18 | 5.35 | 5.24 | 5.33 | | | | | 18% (6) | 82% (28) | | |

| Instructor | Text Responses |
|------------|--|
| | Question: Comments on course effectiveness |
| | interesting subject, economics is cool, good format for everything, good mix of examples, learning, reading, etc |
| | I appreciated going over game theory. It was interesting to think about normal day to day situations in this way. It leads to more strategic thinking. |
| | Our class was particularly quiet with some individuals participating in discussions very rarely or not at all. I am left a bit unsure of how grades will reflect this - I'm hoping those that participated get full credit in that area and those that did not also understand why they will not get full credit in that area. Each professor has their own philosophy on cold calling on people in class - in my opinion, our class could have used a reality check with more cold calling. I think the input of classmates that work in all different sectors is vital to class discussions...even if it has to be cold-called out of some people. |
| | more examples in class of problems on the homework |
| | multi take quizzes |
| | Instructor used a variety of sources to make economics interesting and fun . |
| | Who knew I would love my Economics class? I seriously would have never guessed it. I want to shout it from a mountain top. I love Economics! |
| | 1. Step by step instructions in slides. 2. Ability to try practice problems multiple times in homework problems. |
| | Powerpoint presentations are great for class but difficult for note taking. I would find it interesting to start with Game Theory |
| | Entertaining and interesting lectures. I was worried it would be a boring course. |
| | Someone who likes their job alot helped, even though deep down inside he really likes finance more than econ |
| | Nate is great. Great attitude and passion for the topic which helped. |

| | |
|---------|---|
| | Topics discussed in class were far more simple than topics on weekly quizzes. I guess by design this forces studying which he often mentions is his goal. Organization of syllabus a little scattered. |
| | I would have liked to have an actual econ textbook to go with the course material. I feel like the lecture slides did not contain enough information for study and review. I also think the group work in class was more stressful than it was helpful. I don't think we had enough information to always complete the group assignments with the time we had at the end of lectures. |
| | He did a great job with using examples and explaining what he taught in class. |
| | Game theory activities and the group workouts |
| | Great outside application; made economics relate to my everyday life |
| | I like the articles and extra reading. I feel they connected what we were learning in the classroom to the real world. |
| | Nate was very well versed in the subject matter and showed genuine enthusiasm. |
| | I love how canvas was organized. Breaking it out in weekly segments was very beneficial for me. However, I do believe this should be a 5 week course. Some of the material I felt was irrelevant. I don't really know how game theory will every apply in a professional setting for me. There was plenty of material that could have been cut out. |
| | I enjoyed the topics. The content was well organized and structured. |
| | The objectives were clearly stated and were met. I felt what we learned is applicable, and I think I retained several key points that were ingrained throughout the class. I thought the assigned readings, both in the books and the articles. It was much more enjoyable than reading through a text book each week. |
| | The readings were very interesting and helpful. Both the slides and the other study materials were very helpful in conveying the subject matter both the conceptually and mathematically. The charts provided a great way of bridging the cap between the conceptual and mathematical. |
| | (1) Very helpful and relevant readings, (2) Excellent mix of lecture and in-class exercises that kept me engaged in the class. |
| | Overall I really enjoyed the content. I feel as though there was more than once where we would start to take the exams and had no idea how the concepts played into the material. I asked various other students and they felt the same way so maybe if more time was spent on some of the practical examples (for earlier units; later units were perfect) |
| | I loved the breaks with groups and live group work we did, helped the 4 hours not seem so long and strangely enough, our supply and demand activity helped solidify the content. |
| | Question: Instructor Comments |
| SEEGERT | Nate was great at teaching and really had the knowledge of the material. I mostly liked learning about how taxes effect the economy and how they can be a useful tool. |
| SEEGERT | Maybe call on people more when people don't volunteer to speak? I don't know, I enjoyed the class a lot, just trying to think how to get better participation? |
| SEEGERT | Incredible instructor. Nate should always be paired with Davidson's course! The two of them make this difficult material more enjoyable and engaging as their friendly competition evolves with each day in class. I would be very interested in taking further courses that Nate teaches. |
| SEEGERT | concise |
| SEEGERT | TA seemed confused and uncertain. |
| SEEGERT | Nathan Seegert may be the best professor I've had during my entire PMBA experience. He cares about the students, he loves the content, he is a great teacher. he is funny, relatable, and down to earth. I seriously cannot say enough good things about him. Stay elastic Professor Seegert! |

| | |
|---------|--|
| SEEGERT | Nate is an outstanding professor and really knows how to bring anyone that is struggling up to where they need to be. I suggest that an analysis of speed be done as I found it difficult sometimes to take good notes and keep up with the lectures. |
| SEEGERT | Strong knowledge of all material and material outside the course. Would like to tie the concepts back into our work lives more often. |
| SEEGERT | (1) Professor Seegert made conscious time for class discussion around the topics, and when students asked questions, he made time in the lectures to discuss without sacrificing schedule, (2) The articles were an effective method in helping me think through the class topic before class |
| SEEGERT | My favorite instructor in the program thus far! Professor Seegert clearly loves the subject matter and does a great job of demonstrating how interesting and practical economics is. I heard so many people talk about how they thought economics would be boring and abstract, and were amazed at how it can be applied to everything we do. Professor Seegert went above and beyond to make sure we were comfortable with the material. |
| SEEGERT | I really enjoyed being in Nate's class. He was challenging, but did a great job explaining the material to be people with no economic background. I really appreciate his humor and the way he structures his classes. Even though I found this class tough, I would definitely take another economics class if he was teaching it. |
| SEEGERT | He made the class fun. He challenged and encouraged participation. |
| SEEGERT | Nate was very good at explaining during the course of the lecture. My only recommendation would be to have more information on the slides themselves |
| SEEGERT | I never had an issue falling asleep in class. Nate kept things interesting and energetic. He also encouraged class participation without forcing anyone to speak. |
| SEEGERT | I really appreciate the use of real life examples and the level enthusiasm the instructor has for the topic. |
| SEEGERT | He was very energetic and brought the energy to the class |
| SEEGERT | Very effective professor. He is intellectual, engaging, funny, and aware of his class. He did a good job teaching and always made class enjoyable. I had a good time and would definitely recommend. |
| SEEGERT | I would teach more of what is covered in the assignments. But great job with including all of the material that we needed to understand the materials. Also, no one is upset if we get out a little bit early. |
| SEEGERT | Level 7 goofball which keeps you very interested, never a dull class. obviously very knowledgeable. |
| SEEGERT | He broke complex topics down into easy to understand bits. His enthusiasm for the topic was contagious. |
| SEEGERT | Areas for improvement: I would have liked to have seen a better selection of colors for the dry erase markers. |
| SEEGERT | As mentioned above, his love for economics made this class great. He has a great way to bring us along. The only thing I would mention is to eliminate saying, you all have to say one smart thing not because of the challenge, but I wonder how many people did not want to respond because they didn't know what smart meant or they just ruled their comment out altogether. I understand what Nathan was trying to do, but wonder if he would have received more class participation this way. Then again, it could just be our cohort. |