eValuate Report - Fall 2018

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: ECON 4223-001

Section Title: Econometric Analysis

Instructor: Tyler Ransom

Total Enrollment: 29

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.96077		14	0.00	7.14	21.43	35.71	35.71	35.71	38.53
	DEPARTMENT	4.19598	4	0.87432		199	1.01	3.52	13.57	38.69	43.22		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.15885	4	0.90433	-0.18	3,582	1.01	3.69	17.11	34.81	43.38		
	COLLEGE	3.98301	4	0.97851	0.02	36,377	1.96	5.21	21.32	35.57	35.93		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.84615	5	0.37553		13	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.38	84.62	92.86	88.07
	DEPARTMENT	4.50000	5	0.77884		198	0.00	2.53	10.10	22.22	65.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.45343	5	0.85423	0.46	3,575	1.06	2.74	9.48	23.22	63.50		
	COLLEGE	4.24509	5	1.00601	0.60	36,338	2.05	5.25	13.31	24.92	54.47		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.71429	5	0.46881		14	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.57	71.43	71.43	84.40
	DEPARTMENT	4.48744	5	0.73071		199	0.00	2.51	6.53	30.65	60.30		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.17235	5	1.02643	0.53	3,580	2.32	4.83	17.12	24.75	50.98		
	COLLEGE	4.01482	4	1.13590	0.62	36,311	4.10	6.93	18.42	24.50	46.05		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.21429	5	0.89258		14	0.00	0.00	28.57	21.43	50.00	42.86	39.91
	DEPARTMENT	4.26633	5	0.97152		199	1.01	4.52	17.59	20.60	56.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.26764	5	0.96453	-0.06	3,572	1.65	4.17	14.28	25.56	54.34		
	COLLEGE	4.09135	4	1.03926	0.12	36,290	2.28	6.08	17.89	27.69	46.05		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.81650		13	0.00	0.00	30.77	38.46	30.77	42.86	38.99
	DEPARTMENT	4.14646	4	1.03921		198	2.53	5.56	15.66	27.27	48.99		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.15828	5	1.08704	-0.15	3,576	3.10	6.40	14.57	23.41	52.52		
	COLLEGE	3.95450	4	1.16707	0.04	36,286	4.61	8.03	18.72	24.58	44.06		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.14286	4	0.94926		14	0.00	7.14	14.29	35.71	42.86	42.86	43.58
	DEPARTMENT	4.20603	5	1.00139		199	1.51	6.53	13.07	27.64	51.26		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.19206	5	1.03234	-0.05	3,577	2.35	5.76	14.15	25.83	51.92		
	COLLEGE	4.00686	4	1.13317	0.12	36,277	4.08	7.34	17.37	26.24	44.97		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	1.00000		13	0.00	7.69	23.08	30.77	38.46	35.71	32.11
	DEPARTMENT	4.33673	5	0.85867		196	1.02	2.04	13.27	29.59	54.08		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.24166	5	0.99968	-0.24	3,567	1.99	4.93	14.05	24.98	54.05		
	COLLEGE	4.07412	4	1.09232	-0.07	36,265	3.33	6.34	17.20	25.82	47.30		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.69231	4	1.25064		13	7.69	7.69	23.08	30.77	30.77	28.57	23.94
	DEPARTMENT	4.10714	4	0.91357		196	1.53	3.06	18.37	37.24	39.80		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.04969	4	0.92125	-0.39	3,522	1.39	3.38	21.58	36.17	37.48		
	COLLEGE	3.85043	4	0.96647	-0.16	34,939	1.93	5.85	26.20	37.31	28.72		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.57143	4	1.01635		14	7.14	0.00	35.71	42.86	14.29	64.29	70.89
	DEPARTMENT	3.50000	3	0.89414		198	1.01	7.07	50.00	24.75	17.17		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.39728	3	0.87216	0.20	3,524	1.02	7.69	57.12	18.87	15.30		
	COLLEGE	3.40390	3	0.86035	0.19	34,957	1.37	7.05	55.20	22.56	13.81		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.69231	4	0.94733		13	0.00	7.69	38.46	30.77	23.08	35.71	28.64
	DEPARTMENT	3.99495	4	0.95852		198	1.01	5.05	24.75	31.82	37.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.93489	4	1.01076	-0.24	3,517	1.91	6.68	23.06	32.73	35.63		
	COLLEGE	3.68633	4	1.04376	0.01	34,890	2.83	9.08	30.84	31.11	26.13		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.92308	4	1.03775		13	0.00	15.38	7.69	46.15	30.77	35.71	35.21
	DEPARTMENT	4.11616	4	1.01343		198	2.53	4.55	17.17	30.30	45.45		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.12898	4	1.01976	-0.20	3,520	2.24	5.40	16.70	28.52	47.13		
	COLLEGE	3.89203	4	1.10659	0.03	34,925	3.62	8.03	21.41	29.42	37.52		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.76923	5	0.59914		13	0.00	0.00	7.69	7.69	84.62	42.86	52.58
	DEPARTMENT	4.74747	5	0.58481		198	0.00	1.52	3.03	14.65	80.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.67539	5	0.65348	0.14	3,515	0.28	1.31	4.75	17.89	75.76		
	COLLEGE	4.56807	5	0.75648	0.27	34,881	0.69	2.16	5.73	22.50	68.92		

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: ECON 4223-001

Section Title: Econometric Analysis

Instructor: Tyler Ransom

Total Enrollment: 29

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question
1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment
1. Ransom's knowledge of econometrics is awesome, he's well-versed on the subject and the multiple languages involved. Strong points of the class structure are; theres not an overbearing amount of work throughout the semester but enough to keep students busy and learning. Deadlines were well spaced out. Good projects. Good amount of group work as well which helps with other assignments.
2. na
3. The lessons seem to be bit overcomplicated at times and the slides, I think, could better explain the topics and applications. Whatever it may be for the day or current lesson. I would have liked to see more examples in the slides that were similar to problem set questions. The lectures and slides are very heavy on the equation and book side of things while the labs and problems sets seem to be more programming heavy. Found myself lost at time in the R code and intimidated by the coding assignments due to my lack of R.
4. Great. One of my favorite courses I've taken. This is the first course where I've felt like I've learned a useful skill that I could later sell myself on to future employers. Another course, on R or Stata analytical programming, would be awesome.
1. Dr. Ransom worked extremely hard to convey difficult subject matter for students. The labs and slides were good reference points when working on our projects and studying for exams. Sufficient review materials were given for exams.
2. The class focused so much on learning R that I struggled to grasp the underlying concepts. Moreover, these concepts were typically explained just as the book had explained them, glossed over, or explained in terms of linear algebra which was not helpful to many students. Tests were graded exceedingly a harsh way.
3. The in class labs would be more useful as homework where I would have more time to understand what is going on beneath the problems instead of just regurgitating code. It would be helpful if the project had more checkpoints and flowed with the course (i.e. after the heteroskedasticity part of the class tell us to calculate the heteroskedasticity robust standard errors for our projects. This might be a better alternative to the inclass labs which would function better as homework than the problem sets do. The problem sets are extremely tedious and unlike exams and what we talk about in class and what is on exams. Reading quizzes weren't useful. The textbook is very dense and expecting us to come to class understanding the material without a lecture was too much for me. Attempting to read beforehand only confused me heading into class. Regurgitating r script on the exams seemed juvenile.
4. I feel like I learned some basics of the course but did not grasp large portions of the material. Covering less more in depth would've been very useful. Dr. Ransom worked tirelessly for his students and this course seems likely to improve over time, but this semester had flaws.
1. Dr. Ransom was very good at explaining some of the most difficult content of the class. Made learning an enjoyable experience, especially for a difficult subject.
2. I really enjoyed learning about R. It was actually helpful in my job interview process as employers really liked that I was learning it. However I felt that the instruction on using the software could be improved.
3. Maybe provide some more instruction about the basics of R. I wish I had that cheat sheet for R supplied earlier in the class!
4. Overall I really liked the course. I was so happy that I was able to take it before I graduate. The skills and critical thinking skills being developed I feel will be super useful moving forward in my career. I also liked being challenged. I feel like I got my moneys worth.
1. As long as you are eager to learn and set your mind to it, Dr. Ransom will be there to help and explain concepts as many times as you need!
2. The room has a random wall that blocks the powerpoints.
3. Getting a better classroom.
4. Loved the course. Learned a lot and would definitely recommend to another student.
1. The econometrics project and the inclass assignments
2. problem sets were abit hard
3. Nothing, hes pretty good at what he does and the fact that he has made econometrics a worth while course for me shows hes man of means and great work teaching us R
4. EXCELLENT
1. I felt like I was able to learn by trial and error. With the class labs being a completion grade I was not worried about only getting a good grade but could actually focus on learning the information.
2.
3. My one suggestion is to edit the wording on some of the class notes and slides. Sometimes it was so technical that it was hard for me to comprehend. The book should be the resource for technical information and the class slides should be to understand and comprehend.
4. I am so glad I took it and learned so much!
1. Critical thinking.
2. A lot of material to cover in little time. Wish we could have spent more time really understanding each topic.
3. More examples of code result interpretation.
4. Good overall.

eValuate Report - Fall 2018

1. Dr. Ransom was incredibly passionate about helping students learn. A lot of professors are passionate about the material, but aren't as invested in the growth of students. With Dr. Ransom, this is not the case. He is always incredibly helpful and makes sure that each and every class he making a positive impact on students' education.

2. I wish their was more of a focus on coding, especially challenging students to learn coding skills instead of just using the handouts.

3. Maybe include some sort of inc-class quizzes that require students to have retained knowledge of coding instead of just copying it down from the in-class lab.

4. Overall, this course was great and I'm really thankful that I took it with Dr. Ransom. The introduction to coding will be very useful in my career.

1. Dr. Ransom did an excellent job explaining the material and provided references (labs, cheat sheets, etc.)

2. I would have liked to see more math, especially the matrix algebra, in the course. Unfortunately, most of the students in the class did not have the proper math background to make this material accessible. Maybe putting stronger math prerequisites on the course would allow it to be taught more thoroughly.

3. Get reference sheets out earlier in the semester.

4. I enjoyed it. It's an important subject in economics and it was taught very well.

1. Grading was VERY lenient. Going into the course I was sure it would be the class I struggled with most this semester. I was wrong. It was an easy A with just attending class and paying attention. This is also a bit of a weak point though â€" I would've liked to be challenged a bit more.

The quizzes worked well.

Problem sets were fair.

Exams were a good level of difficulty.

Dr. Ransom was really great and taking feedback and adjusting accordingly (I'm specifically thinking of the length of the problem sets, but there were other instances of this).

Labs were pretty well-designed.

2. The textbook was mediocre. Wasn't very intuitive and was quite dense most of the time. Dr. Ransom did a good job of dumbing the material down/ translating it into english during lectures.

In general, the course required a fair amount of self-discipline, in the sense that it would be REALLY easy to get an A without fully earning it. You could get full credit on labs, problem sets, etc without actually doing the work (chegg, BSing, etc) since they were graded so leniently.

3. Dr. Ransom improved a lot as a lecturer throughout the semester. The first week or two I SERIOUSLY contemplated dropping the course due to concern about his lecturing abilities combined with my lack of statistical knowledge (I took AP stats like 3 years ago). As the semester went by, though, Dr. Ransom got really good at explaining complex concepts clearly and concisely. He also did a good job at approaching concepts from different angles when his original explanation wasn't getting through to us.

4. Very good! Really improved throughout the semester. The material is fairly rigorous and challenging, but it ended up being an easy A. It was really great (almost required, I'd say) to have a solid group of friends in the course. It made studying much more enjoyable and productive. Dr. Ransom is a quirky dude but is incredibly kind, smart, and helpful. I would definitely recommend this to class to every economics major.

1. I think the course itself is essential to any Economics major. Therefore, the subject matter was incredibly relevant. Moreover, the final project was a great practical application of what we had learned in class both in material and R.

2. I think that the book used was really dense and hard to understand. There weren't enough graphic illustrations of the course materials. For me, I learn best visually, so the PPT slides were very "wordy". For example, perhaps a graph could supplement the definition of heteroskedacticity, etc.

3. The project is great, the RQ don't do much to encourage learning, makes PPT slides more graphic.

4. Awesome professor, very accessible, kept the course light--would definitely recommend in the future. This was the first iteration of the course for Dr. Ransom, moreover, I took AP Stats in high school, so a lot of the material was hard to "refresh". All in all, he's a great guy and liked the course.

1. The use of econometric model on everyday data is very useful because it helps us predict the future.

2. The software used was very complicated to use. The teacher would go very fast with the slides. The in-class labs were becoming complicated and we had to use critical thinking to do the labs but sometimes it would just be very hard.

3. I would do the labs with the students during class and made it mandatory to stay in class for that. I would write on the board more than using the projector. I would suggest to spend more time in figuring out r, at least for some students who aren't good with computers. The language was very hard to refer to, the class had both theory and practice which is nice but it made it very hard to study for exams.

4. I liked it. I think it was a very different from what I expected the class to be. I would not take this class again because the instructors might use the projector more than the board. It is easier to take notes when teacher writes in board because you are following what he is doing rather than speeding up to be able to copy everything from the slides.

1. Discussions.

2. In class lab takes time.

3. Explaining more examples.

4. It's an interesting ang practical course.

eValuate Report - Fall 2018

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always