# eValuate Report - Spring 2019

*College of Arts and Sciences*

*Course: ECON 5253-001*

*Section Title: Data Science for Economists*

*Instructor: Tyler Ransom*

*Total Enrollment: 13*

*Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up*

*Section Size: X-Small 0-15*

| 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 | 4.71429 | 5 | 0.48795 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 28.57 | 71.43 | 75.00 | 73.26 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.48980 | 5 | 0.73944 | | 49 | 0.00 | 2.04 | 8.16 | 28.57 | 61.22 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.33904 | 5 | 0.87916 | 0.43 | 876 | 1.37 | 2.85 | 10.62 | 30.82 | 54.34 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.97446 | 4 | 0.99984 | 0.74 | 30,691 | 2.26 | 5.32 | 21.79 | 33.99 | 36.65 | | |
| 2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course | INDIVIDUAL | 4.71429 | 5 | 0.48795 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 28.57 | 71.43 | 62.50 | 51.34 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.62500 | 5 | 0.63998 | | 48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.33 | 20.83 | 70.83 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.52638 | 5 | 0.83508 | 0.23 | 872 | 0.80 | 3.78 | 6.19 | 20.41 | 68.81 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.22829 | 5 | 1.01707 | 0.48 | 30,654 | 2.28 | 5.09 | 13.98 | 24.83 | 53.82 | | |
| 3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning | INDIVIDUAL | 4.85714 | 5 | 0.37796 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 85.71 | 62.50 | 70.05 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.72000 | 5 | 0.57286 | | 50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.00 | 16.00 | 78.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.36499 | 5 | 1.02353 | 0.48 | 874 | 3.20 | 3.78 | 10.18 | 18.99 | 63.84 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.06244 | 4 | 1.10514 | 0.72 | 30,639 | 3.31 | 6.76 | 17.99 | 24.24 | 47.69 | | |
| 4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking | INDIVIDUAL | 4.57143 | 5 | 0.53452 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 42.86 | 57.14 | 50.00 | 47.06 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.54000 | 5 | 0.76158 | | 50 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 10.00 | 20.00 | 68.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.45309 | 5 | 0.91979 | 0.13 | 874 | 1.60 | 3.89 | 8.58 | 19.45 | 66.48 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.08251 | 4 | 1.05062 | 0.47 | 30,615 | 2.51 | 6.11 | 18.01 | 27.36 | 46.01 | | |
| 5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter | INDIVIDUAL | 4.42857 | 5 | 0.78680 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 28.57 | 57.14 | 62.50 | 44.92 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.44000 | 5 | 0.86094 | | 50 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 12.00 | 24.00 | 62.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.34138 | 5 | 1.00837 | 0.09 | 870 | 2.53 | 4.83 | 9.89 | 21.49 | 61.26 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.93047 | 4 | 1.17990 | 0.42 | 30,590 | 4.87 | 8.34 | 19.10 | 24.26 | 43.43 | | |
| 6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was | INDIVIDUAL | 4.57143 | 5 | 0.53452 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 42.86 | 57.14 | 62.50 | 56.68 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.50000 | 5 | 0.81441 | | 50 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 8.00 | 22.00 | 66.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.31844 | 5 | 1.02014 | 0.25 | 873 | 2.98 | 4.35 | 10.19 | 22.79 | 59.68 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.00078 | 4 | 1.14173 | 0.50 | 30,608 | 4.32 | 7.18 | 17.69 | 25.74 | 45.08 | | |
| 7. Instructor's management of the course was | INDIVIDUAL | 4.85714 | 5 | 0.37796 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 85.71 | 87.50 | 75.94 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.48000 | 5 | 0.78870 | | 50 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 12.00 | 22.00 | 64.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.27816 | 5 | 1.06015 | 0.55 | 870 | 3.68 | 4.83 | 9.54 | 23.91 | 58.05 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.06855 | 4 | 1.09629 | 0.72 | 30,574 | 3.45 | 6.17 | 17.66 | 25.50 | 47.22 | | |
| 8. Amount you learned in this class | INDIVIDUAL | 4.42857 | 5 | 0.78680 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 28.57 | 57.14 | 75.00 | 55.14 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.32000 | 5 | 0.86756 | | 50 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 14.00 | 32.00 | 52.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.24424 | 4 | 0.88966 | 0.21 | 868 | 1.38 | 2.88 | 13.36 | 34.68 | 47.70 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.85379 | 4 | 0.98178 | 0.59 | 28,869 | 2.09 | 5.97 | 26.14 | 36.09 | 29.72 | | |
| 9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level | INDIVIDUAL | 3.57143 | 4 | 0.78680 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 57.14 | 28.57 | 14.29 | 25.00 | 46.49 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 3.88000 | 4 | 0.79898 | | 50 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 32.00 | 42.00 | 24.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 3.70127 | 4 | 0.88719 | -0.15 | 867 | 0.35 | 4.15 | 44.18 | 27.68 | 23.64 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.43691 | 3 | 0.87334 | 0.15 | 28,873 | 1.27 | 7.00 | 53.50 | 23.22 | 15.01 | | |
| 10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials | INDIVIDUAL | 4.14286 | 5 | 0.89974 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 28.57 | 28.57 | 42.86 | 50.00 | 48.65 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.26531 | 5 | 0.90773 | | 49 | 0.00 | 4.08 | 18.37 | 24.49 | 53.06 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.16301 | 4 | 0.97183 | -0.02 | 865 | 1.62 | 4.97 | 15.72 | 30.87 | 46.82 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.67481 | 4 | 1.06500 | 0.44 | 28,832 | 3.06 | 9.67 | 30.91 | 29.46 | 26.90 | | |
| 11. Overall, this course was | INDIVIDUAL | 4.57143 | 5 | 0.78680 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 14.29 | 71.43 | 75.00 | 60.00 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.44000 | 5 | 0.83690 | | 50 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 10.00 | 24.00 | 62.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.30645 | 5 | 0.95967 | 0.28 | 868 | 1.96 | 4.15 | 11.18 | 26.73 | 55.99 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 3.87572 | 4 | 1.12294 | 0.62 | 28,839 | 3.92 | 8.02 | 22.43 | 27.81 | 37.82 | | |
| 12. This course was graded fairly | INDIVIDUAL | 5.00000 | 5 | 0.00000 | | 7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| | DEPARTMENT | 4.84000 | 5 | 0.42185 | | 50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 12.00 | 86.00 | | |
| | SIMILAR_COL | 4.76279 | 5 | 0.59255 | 0.40 | 860 | 0.35 | 1.16 | 2.91 | 13.02 | 82.56 | | |
| | COLLEGE | 4.55912 | 5 | 0.77649 | 0.57 | 28,815 | 0.85 | 2.29 | 5.87 | 22.09 | 68.90 | | |

# eValuate Report - Spring 2019

*College of Arts and Sciences*

*Course: ECON 5253-001*

*Section Title: Data Science for Economists*

*Instructor: Tyler Ransom*

*Total Enrollment: 13*

*Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up*

*Section Size: X-Small 0-15*

| 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. Great lectures and well organized course. There is a broad range of material covered, but Dr. Ransom does an exemplary job at framing the concepts in ways that are interconnected. Thus, it doesn't feel like too much. I think it was both well paced and thorough. I also like that the course was taught through Github, and I enjoyed the extra material on his repository. Lastly, the homework assignments were difficult, but Dr. Ransom graded them extremely generously. Thus, completing the assignments was not stressful in the sense that you were worried about getting a bad grade, but rather, they were challenging in a way that was fun and constructive. Easily a top 5 Prof I've had in 5 years at OU. |
| 2. None, other than it being scheduled during champions league |
| 3. None. |
| 4. Awesome course. Learned a ton of stuff that was immediately applicable to other projects. Also, I left a better programmer and a better statistician. Dr. Ransom is the man. |
| 1. The course was well structured, clear, and always moving at a pace that made it feel like we where constantly making progress. |
| 2. The course could have slowed down on a couple major topics like working with large data sets and some of the finer points of how individual machine learning models function. |
| 3. Prof.Ransom is a very good instructor who is very knowledgeable about the subject matter, he keeps everything clear and ensures everyone has a chance to thoroughly understand the material. I dont have any real critiques of his teaching methods. |
| 4. The course is one of the ones that I have taken and I believe that it would be very beneficial for many of the students in the economics department to have access to a course like this. |
| 1. The course is developed with the goal of making students learn. |
| 2. Sometimes the topics are taught a little bit too fast. |
| 3. Slow down in some specific (and more complicated) topics. |
| 4. I think the course was very good and I was able to absorb most of what I was expecting from it. |
| 1. This course gave students a great understanding of why and how to use the content presented. The course was graded fairly, and the final project was a good representation of the learning in the course. |
| 2. This course went through complicated content at a very high level. There were times when, in class, it would be been good to walk through how to create the code being used, rather than copying and pasting. |
| 3. The instructor could look to limit the scope of the statistics addressed in the course and go into much more detail about how to use the statistical models presented. Not only that, it would be very beneficial to spend more time learning about how to create the code and the models yourself, as opposed to using the work of others. |
| 4. This was a great course that was managed effectively. The content was at times overwhelming but ultimately very useful. |
| 1. This was a difficult class, but being able to take time to explain everything and answer questions was important. Great job at dumbing down some of the harder material. |
| 2. We've told in depth with certain topics before we actually learned them on R or another software. Spent a lot of type teaching how it works instead of how we can do it. |
| 3. |
| 4. Great course to touch on a lot of important topics |

# eValuate Report - Spring 2019

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 |