INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated my interest in the subject</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me learn</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

I am not sure I have ever met a TA like Jon. He exhibited a truly incredible knowledge of the literature and clearly was very devoted to making recitations as helpful as possible. Sometimes I think he tried to tackled too much at once in the recitations, leaving me feeling a little overwhelmed and not sure what the bottom line was. He really wanted to help us understand which was great.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject expectations were clearly defined</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's learning objectives were met</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments contributed to my learning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading thus far has been fair</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Overall rating of the subject               | 7     |

Student: 18963
Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

This is one of my favorite courses ever. The subject material was fascinating and left me excited to pursue the many ideas that the course material sparked. I thought the problem sets were useful but a little long and it was sometimes easy to get stuck on the empirical parts. A little more guidance step by step might be nice. As I noted, I was really glad that theoretical concepts were emphasized in lecture. The cold calling was a little awkward; is there a better/faster program than Siri that can call on names?
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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 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.): 5
- 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)

Great class. The randomizer doesn't seem to randomize very well, need new randomizing technology.

Student: 23843
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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 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)

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.) 12

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 F12 in E51-361

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)
Jon is clearly very enthusiastic about the topics and eager to share his knowledge with us. I appreciated that he went over more confusing parts of the class with us, for example going over complicated papers. I like the idea of cold calling in principle, but I think he could try to formulate his questions a little bit better so they aren't so open ended and difficult to see what he's getting at.

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.) 5
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 8
Overall rating of the subject: 7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement):
I really liked the local public finance component that was included this year! The papers I had the hardest time understanding were Cohen and Einav (2007) and basically any Nathaniel Hendren paper, so if understanding those is a priority, spending a little more time on those next time could be helpful.
INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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

Subject's learning objectives were met

Assignments contributed to my learning

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)

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

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)

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

Overall rating of the subject

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)
INSTRUCTORS

Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated my interest in the subject</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me learn</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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)

You really care! One suggestion on the post-recitation emails is to have a "tl;dr" one-paragraph summary at the top, then some dashed lines, then the full body of the long email afterwards.

SUBJECT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject expectations were clearly defined</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's learning objectives were met</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments contributed to my learning</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading thus far has been fair</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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)                         | 5      |
| was:                                                                    |        |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Overall rating of the subject                                           | 7      |

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Student: 38982
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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 5

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

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: 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.) 10

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 F12 in E51-361

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)
He did a great job teaching- while he sometimes crammed in more substance to his section slides than I could absorb while he was going, the slides were thorough enough that I could go back later and learn what I'd missed.

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: 7
Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I loved the balance of assignments: the reading responses were really useful for helping me dedicate time and think about the papers.
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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)
I really dislike the cold calling in recitation. To me, the stress of that supplants the material as the focus of recitation. No other TAs do that, and I don't see why it's necessary. But otherwise I thought recitations 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 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:

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 7
Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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)

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)
INSTRUCTORS
Cohen, Jonathan Palm, Recitation Instructor
Teaching in Recitation R01 meets F12 in E51-361

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated my interest in the subject</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me learn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject expectations were clearly defined</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's learning objectives were met</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments contributed to my learning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading thus far has been fair</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The pace of the class (content and assignments)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 F12 in E51-361

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)

Very enthusiastic and willing to answer students’ questions! Clearly cared a lot about teaching and put in time and effort above and beyond.

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:

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

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.) 5
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)
QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Overall rating of teaching 6

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT

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

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

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 F12 in E51-361

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 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)
Same issue as lecture: so much material that it was hard to really master any particular bit. Take a bit out so what is there can be understood.

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 N/A

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.) 5
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)