INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	5
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	5

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Strengths:
Was always super enthusiastic in his efforts to try and get us interested in the material!
Recitation notes were very helpful.

Area for improvement:
In his effort to make us understand the deeper nuances of a topic, his explanations became a bit confusing. I am sure the point that was being made was interesting, but may not be the most helpful point for people still grasping the fundamentals of a topic.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	3
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	4

Overall rating of the subject   6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Course Content was great! The readings, the topics were very very interesting. Super excited to do more economics courses.

However, "Public Policy" in the title is pretty misleading- not many connections between the content and this was made and this was a bit disappointing.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	1
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	4
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	4

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	2
Subject's learning objectives were met	3
Assignments contributed to my learning	2
Grading thus far has been fair	

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	15

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

Overall rating of the subject	2

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Unfortunately, I had very little interest in the topics covered in this course.

I recommend that all incoming students have some prior experience in economics before taking this course.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Put in a lot of effort which I appreciated. Also, didn't give away the answers instead inviting the students to figure it out themselves. This is generally good, but when I'm not even close to the answer it's not a super helpful technique.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	4
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

I felt that the recitation sections were very useful in helping me understand the material and appreciated the format of the Recitation notes and going through examples in class.

My main complaint was that I was frustrated by how often office hours were changed (they seemed to change almost weekly, and at times we weren't given notice until the day of). I stopped going to office hours because of this. I schedule research meetings around the hours posted in syllabus - when HH change all the time it makes it incredibly difficult to plan and I frequently had other conflicts.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	20

Overall rating of the subject   6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	5

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Cared about students and excited to be there at the beginning, made an effort to collect feedback. Focused too much on answers, rather than process -- 99% of learning happens before and after the answer, so arriving at the right answer should not be such a huge focus. Overall, a good TA.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	4
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	5

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	10

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

Overall rating of the subject	3

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	4
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	4

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

While very enthusiastic and receptive to criticism, it was difficult to get help from office hours since he would change the times very last minute at least once a week. I would have gone to office hours but was never able to when times were switched. I understand if unexpected circumstances come up but I find it difficult to believe it happens this often.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	4
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	15

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Better coordination between TAs and professor would be appreciated in the future.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	4
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	5
Helped me learn	4

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

Overall rating of teaching	4

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Jonathan knows his stuff, but was unable to make up for the other learning deficiencies of the course.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	4
Subject's learning objectives were met	2
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	5

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	1

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Rather than make me more interested in a deeper look at economics, this subject made me feel like the field consists of oversimplified models dependent on untenable assumptions. The course may be overambitious in the amount of material it presents. Professor really cares about the class and wants everyone to learn, but I feel like the lack of clarity of the slides and the tendency for teaching to get caught in technical explanations made it especially difficult to benefit from this course.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Areas for improvement: Jons explanations were not always helpful in making the material more intuitive for me. Unfortunately that might simply be because we do not reason the same way, and I dont know what he can do about that !

Strengths: Jon obviously cares a lot. He went above and beyond in providing lengthy written answers (complete with mini litterature reviews) to student inquiries, even when they were not directly relevant to the content of the class. This goes a long way in getting people enthusiastic about the subject matter. It also acted as a band-aid solution to my main frustration with this class, which is that the timeline forced us to speed through content, and so we rarely had the time to really wrangle with the implications of the models. I liked the conceptual/intuitive bent of his problem sets, and found them more stimulating than the previous ones. I also appreciated the tone of the assignments, although I never want to hear about chicken and rice again. Thanks for everything !

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	8

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

Overall rating of the subject	7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Strengths: Office hours were helpful. Grading was fair. Plickers were fun. Lecture notes were a godsend in class that sweeps through so much theory with a dose of econometrics in one semester. The modules on free trade, externalities, risk, and information asymmetry were particularly interesting !

Areas for improvement: The public policy part of the course title felt like a slight misnomer. Class was as fascinating as it was frustrating because the pace kept us at surface-level discussions. As soon as we had the tools to start unpacking the conceptual implications of the models, and perhaps how that would translate into public policy, it was time to move on to the next topic. The result was that every time class ended, I was left with a hundred questions which I did not feel comfortable asking because 1) how to prioritize ? 2) Id be cutting into class time which could perhaps be better spent clarifying technicalities. Basically this class left me on my hunger, and maybe that was the point ?

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	5

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I think the content is really interesting and taught well. The lecture notes are very detailed, which is really helpful.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

He explains most of the materials clearly during recitations. His graphs really helped me understand concepts. Sometimes, his recitation could be a little more engaging.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	3

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I feel like I didn't learn that much new material from this class (beyond what I learned in 14.01 and 14.74). I didn't read the assigned papers sometimes. If students may be randomly called to answer questions about an assigned reading, I think I would have read more of the papers.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	4

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Made several helpful and interesting clarifications/comments during class. I didn't attend many of his recitations, but the ones I went to were good.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	5

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

In psets, especially in the first half of the class, it was not clear what the goal of the questions were, and they seemed to focus on aspects not the focus of the class. One test was poorly structured. I wish there was more discussion or examples of actual policies and how they work.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	4
Grading thus far has been fair	5

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	3
Subject's learning objectives were met	4
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	3

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

Overall rating of the subject	2

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Very enthusiastic about the subject. But you're just so burnt out my man just take it easy a bit.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	5

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Just general improvements needed in pace and organization. Otherwise its pretty good.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	3

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	8

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I expected the class to involve more discussions about typical public policy topics. I was excited

during the first class when we were polled on minimum wage views, but then we never did

anything like that afterward.

I did not like the way Tobias was explaining "efficient insurance". He basically said that if we convince everyone to get insurance, then we get the maximum people benefiting from risk pooling. I did not like this because no one who didn't want insurance is getting "convinced" to buy it; they are being FORCED against their will to buy something that makes them worse off in order to subsidize agents that are really risky to the insurance company. I don't think efficiency is a valid reason to infringe on people's individual liberties.

General complaint about MIT ECON: The econ department clearly has a left wing bias. This was most clear to me in 14.02, but the bias is clear in all the courses I've taken. Please hire professors that believe in free markets, austrian economics, and are critical of the benefits of federal reserve.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	4

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Good at encouraging engagement and soliciting feedback; I felt like if I ever had a problem he would help me figure it out. Even though I really appreciated the effort, sometimes the explanations were hard to follow.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

The quizzes are not fun and I don't feel like they've done much for my learning, tests could be better structured, I like that the class covers a lot of material and introduces lots of parts of the field of economics

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

You're great at making the subject material less abstract, and clarifying confusion.

I would suggest working more concrete examples about typical student confusions just to be even more helpful

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	7

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I would recommend the subject spend more time dedicated to introducing the econometrics tool and why they work the way they do in a dedicated lecture before applying it to what we are learning in the semester. Then, a quick review during the relevant lectures would be helpful.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	3

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	3

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

Overall rating of the subject	7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I would absolutely recommend (and have recommended) this class to friends.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	4

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

The quiz system is ineffective. Psets are a better test of concept understanding. The quizzes just
make you paranoid and make you constantly look back at the random theorems. There is already

an attendance/participation grade so the quizzes accomplish nothing but a gotcha and make you anxious when you're running a bit late. In my opinion they should not be a part of future classes.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	0
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	2
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	6

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	6
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I thought the class was run well. Some of the readings were (in my opinion) absurdly long. When

I open a 52 page PDF I'm much less likely to read any of it than if there was a 10 page summary

or shorter reading, for example. The posted detailed lecture notes were incredibly useful. Readings deviated from the schedule a lot. In the future, it would be helpful to update the schedule ANY time there's a change (and not say something like "we are a week ahead") or email out 24 hours before class with a reminder on what reading is due.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	6
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

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

Overall rating of teaching	7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Very clear explanations and very very helpful! Great examples. My enjoyment and understanding of the class increased dramatically when he started.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
Subject's learning objectives were met	5
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	3

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	2

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

Overall rating of the subject	5

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

The pop quizzes should be open note - I understand the incentive to come to class on time and pay attention, but you shouldn't expect that we have memorized given material by some random day we are not aware of.

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	5
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	5

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

Overall rating of teaching	6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	4

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor

Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F9 in 4-163

QUALITY OF TEACHING

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Stimulated my interest in the subject	
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	
Helped me learn	

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

Overall rating of teaching	

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	6
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	7

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

Overall rating of the subject	6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)