

[MIT Online Subject Evaluation](#) | [Guide to Reports](#)

Change report view: Labuzova, Tatiana

- 15.672 Negotiation Analysis
- 15.673 Negotiation Analysis
- 15.6721 Negotiation Analysis
- 15.6731 Negotiation Analysis

Survey Window: IAP 2022 | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: 15.672 Negotiation Analysis - Lecture L01

15.673 Negotiation Analysis - Lecture L01

15.6721 Negotiation Analysis - Lecture L01

15.6731 Negotiation Analysis - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: 89    Total # of Respondents: 23    Response rate: 26%    Overall rating of subject: 7.0 out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

**INSTRUCTORS**

Quality of Teaching	1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)		1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)	
	Stimulated interest	Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Helped me learn	Overall rating
<a href="#">Curhan, Jared R.</a> , Lecturer (LEC)	7.0 (23)	7.0 (23)	7.0 (22)	7.0 (23)
<a href="#">Labuzova, Tatiana</a> , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.8 (13)	6.8 (10)	7.0 (14)	7.0 (13)

Sloan Faculty Questions	1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Mixed, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree (5 is best)
NAME	Recommend Professor
<a href="#">Curhan, Jared R.</a> , Lecturer (LEC)	5.0 (22)

Labuzova, Tatiana, Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating: 7.0

Quality of Teaching	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)										
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV

<a href="#">Stimulated interest</a>	<b>6.8</b>	13	7.0	0.55
<a href="#">Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material</a>	<b>6.8</b>	10	7.0	0.63
<a href="#">Helped me learn</a>	<b>7.0</b>	14	7.0	0.0

*Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*

	<b>AVG</b>	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
<a href="#">Overall rating</a>	<b>7.0</b>		13	7.0	0.0

### **Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)**

[Student 5486](#) - Very organized & respectful.

[Student 8202](#) - I thought this course was taught extremely well. The material felt relevant to my interests, and the class sessions were engaging. I was initially worried that three days of 8-hour sessions would be challenging, but found the time flew by.

[Student 8208](#) - Very impressive logistics. This is the best zoom learning experience that I have had, it has never been so smooth whereas this was som much more complicated than usual. Thank you!

[Student 8235](#) - Tatiana helped exclusively with course administration. In this she was very effective! It can be hard to judge administrators because of the "you notice when they fail not when they succeed" tendency, so I'll just throw out there it was particularly clear how smoothly the class ran, I'm sure thanks to Tatiana.

[Student 8238](#) - Tatiana was extremely responsive and approachable, especially with any accommodations. The zoom breakout room assignments and releases of information on the iDecisionGames platform were very efficient, maintaining the smooth flow of the class.

[Student 8250](#) - Very responsive, enough to make her the best TA I've met at MIT.

[Student 8264](#) - I feel like although Tatiana was not a lecturer for the course, it would not have run anywhere near as smoothly without her streamlining everything. I've never experienced such smooth transitions etc. in Zoom format. She deserves all the commendation!

[Student 10446](#) - The TA was very thorough in organization and sent out all the instructions in a timely and organized manner, as well as was very responsive to all the questions and concerns. Probably the most organized TA I have met in my studies.

## **SUBJECT**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<i>Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>					<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4 5 6 7</b>			
<a href="#">Subject expectations were clearly defined</a>	<b>6.9</b>					22	7.0	0.35
<a href="#">Subject's learning objectives were met</a>	<b>6.8</b>					22	7.0	0.5
<a href="#">Assignments contributed to my learning</a>	<b>7.0</b>					22	7.0	0.21
<a href="#">Grading thus far has been fair</a>	<b>6.8</b>					17	7.0	0.73

*Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)*

	<b>AVG</b>	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
<a href="#">The pace of the class (content and assignments)</a>	<b>4.1</b>		22	4.0	0.29

[was:](#)

	<b>AVG</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
Average hours you spent per week on this subject in the classroom	<b>21.2</b>	18	22.0	5.58
Average hours you spent per week on this subject outside of the classroom	<b>4.6</b>	18	4.0	1.89

*Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent (7 is best)*

	<b>AVG</b>	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
<a href="#">Overall rating of the subject</a>	<b>7.0</b>		21	7.0	0.22

### **Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)**

[Student 5486](#) - Well run course.

[Student 6454](#) - Highly recommend this course. The frequent activities and simulations really help with internalizing and applying the concepts covered in the course. I was also very impressed with how well the course was run over Zoom, despite it originally being intended to be run in person. I don't feel at all as if Zoom detracted from the experience, which really speaks to the effort put in by the teaching staff to ensure everything ran smoothly.

[Student 8202](#) - This is more a product of the course structure (3-day workshop), but I felt like I didn't fully grasp some of the concepts that were introduced by the end of our time together. But we covered so much ground, so this is not really a criticism, but more of a feeling of wanting just a little more practice at the end.

[Student 8208](#) - Content is great, teaching is amazing, and practical implementation was super impressive

[Student 8216](#) - The course was amazing. Anyone who has the opportunity should take it! I feel much more confident and positive about negotiation than when I started. The negotiations we practice in class are really fun.

[Student 8235](#) - Gold. Couldn't have been more valuable for me to take it.

[Student 8238](#) - One very useful and well-run class - would highly recommend. One suggestion is to maybe allow people to edit responses on the iDecisionGames platform after submission (for any homework assignments). Other than that, nothing else to add!

[Student 8250](#) - Better break it into 4 days with 5 hrs each day than packed in 3 days

[Student 8264](#) - Very helpful course for both professional negotiations and everyday life! So much applicable information.

[Student 10375](#) - Great case studies! I really enjoyed the course and I think I got some really good practice negotiating.

*Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Mixed, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree (5 is best)*

### **SLOAN SUBJECT QUESTIONS**

	<b>AVG</b>	<b>1 2 3 4 5</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>STDEV</b>
<a href="#">Recommend Subject</a>	<b>5.0</b>		21	5.0	0.0

### **SLOAN FEEDBACK QUESTION**

#### **Feedback**

[Student 5486](#) - This course was extremely well structured, including a balance between lecture, participation, and breaks. I thought I might feel nervous negotiating in class, but the negotiations were designed in such a way that I felt confident the entire time. I believe I have gained useful knowledge and awareness that I can bring into future negotiations.

[Student 8208](#) - Every day we had a new case, that we would play before knowing the concepts that we were practising. That's one way of doing it. Another way would be to give a hint, with one question before the case. e.g. with prisoner dilemma: do you intend to cooperate or not? Why? But that would probably change the purpose of the exercise.

[Student 8210](#) - The timing of the class and schedule were really well done and clear. I found that some negotiations could have benefitted from having more time (Harborco, freelance), and some I found didn't need much time at all (Bepsi, used car). Because this is just my experience, it could be helpful next time to empirically determine the time demand of each negotiation by asking, as a part of the post-negotiation survey, what % of the allotted time was used in the negotiation. That data could be used to inform how to make a decision about to balance the negotiation quality versus time pressure of a given exercise.

[Student 8235](#) - One piece of constructive feedback. It's about when Jared discussed norms and cultures at the end of day 1. I felt this part of the class was the only one with slow pacing. I felt bored. Jared's language become more general and abstract, like "members of negatively stereotyped groups." I would have preferred more stories in this domain. I LOVED stories in other parts of the class and the norms section could really benefit from one. I also felt bored even when Jared described the graphs of me from this norms section, because I felt like we an eternity explaining each graph. This is my only piece of feedback about the course because the rest was so stellar.

[Student 8264](#) - No weaknesses of the course come to mind. It was truly excellent.

## [Show/Hide Comments](#)

[\(top of page\)](#)