

# SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II

## Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 18963

### 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	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)*

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 tackle 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)*

Subject expectations were clearly defined	5
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:	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
-------------------------------	---

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?

## **SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for 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 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: 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



## **SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 24944**

#### **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)*



## **SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 26625**

#### **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**

#### **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

*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 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.



**SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**  
**Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 33014**

**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 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: 4

*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 6

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



## SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II

### Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for 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 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)*

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

#### 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.) 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)*

Student: 38982



**SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**  
**Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 39940**

**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**

**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)*



## **SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 40085**

#### **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) 4

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)***

I loved the balance of assignments: the reading responses were really useful for helping me dedicate time and think about the papers.



## SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II

### Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 40340

#### 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) 4

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)*

**SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**  
**Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 43156**

**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)*



**SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**  
**Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 43614**

**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	4

*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	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.)	3
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)*



## **SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 49599**

#### **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) 4

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)**

Student: 49599





**SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II**  
**Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 52173**

**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	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	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.)	7

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

Overall rating of the subject	7
-------------------------------	---

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



## SUBJECT: 14.472 Public Economics II

### Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 64428

#### 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: 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.) 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)*

Student: 64428

