

Courses taught:

- **ILR 2400 – Economics of Wages & Employment.** A required sophomore/junior level course for the ILR major.
- **ILR 3445/Econ 3770 – Inequality in U.S. Higher Education.** An upper-level economics elective course that is cross-listed in ILR and economics.
- **ILR 7450/Econ 7420 – Seminar in Labor Economics I.** A 2nd-year PhD course in labor economics that attracts students from the PhD programs in economics, the Brooks Policy School, and Applied Economics and Management.

Mean evaluations by course — Scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

Question	Econ. of Wages & Employment			Inequality in US Higher Education				Seminar in Labor Economics I			
	Spr	Spr	Fall	Spr	Spr	Spr	Spr	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall
	2019	2020	2022	2018	2019	2020	2023	2017	2018	2019	2022
Q01. The instructor was well prepared for class.	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Q02. The instructor encouraged students to ask questions.	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9
Q03. The instructor helped me to learn to think more critically.	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Q04. The instructor stated the objectives of the course at the beginning of the semester.	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9
Q05. The instructor provided clear explanations of course materials in lectures.	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
Q06. The instructor was willing to help students in office hours.	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Q07. The instructor presented lectures in an organized fashion.	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Q08. The instructor is an excellent teacher.	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8
Q09. The instructor assigned readings that were clearly related to course objectives.	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0
Q10. The instructor gave examinations on important aspects of course materials.	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9
Q11. The instructor provided adequate feedback on my work in the course.	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9
Q12. The instructor realized when students needed further clarification.	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.9
Q13. The instructor presented contrasting points of view.	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.5	4.9	4.8
Q14. The instructor combined theory and practical applications.	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Q15. This was an excellent course.	4.1	4.7	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9
Responses	12	20	43	18	21	18	16	9	10	11	13
Students enrolled	28	39	59	42	42	44	49	14	14	21	27
Response rate	43%	51%	73%	43%	50%	41%	33%	64%	71%	52%	48%

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 2400 LEC 002 (Economics of Wages&Employment)**

**Principal CID: 11122**

**Fall 2022**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- No recommendations, really liked the way the professor taught the course
- Extremely well organized and understandable.
- The organization of the lectures was very clear and helpful
- Very engaging and interesting
- post slides or notes for students if they have to miss a day because they are sick
- Lectures were well-organized and concise, while still providing time for classroom engagement.
- The organization of the lectures needs to be stronger sometimes students would get confused about certain topics and the explanations weren't strong enough. Also, the handwriting provided complexity to students because sometimes I wouldn't understand what was being written.
- I really enjoyed Professor Riehl
- Interesting to sit through; organized in a way that made note taking easier for me
- The lectures were actually really interesting! I liked that he included real-world examples and that he outlined the agenda of the class on the board before he started teaching. It made things super easy to follow and helped my notes stay organized.
- more organization in the presentation of the lectures. A lot of times I couldn't read the notes that were written on the board. which would put me behind in taking notes.
- I thought that the lectures were very well organized and easy to follow!
- I understand the benefits of writing on the chalkboard to encourage attendance, and it makes it easier to draw graphs, but I also feel it may be easier to read your writing if you did it either on paper and projected it or on a tablet. Then they could be sent to students who have excused absences.
- Organized delivery, the notes were very helpful and clear although I often became lost during lecture.
- The lectures were great. By far, the clearest lecturing on economics I have experienced as an undergrad. Some more participation or interaction with the class could make it more engaging. I can not stress enough how fantastic of a teacher Riehl is and how strong his explanations in-class were throughout this semester.
- The lectures were well-organized and clear.
- No recommendations.
- Although I found the lectures to be very engaging, I would've liked for materials to be posted online to help supplement what was taught in class. Since almost everything was written on the board, if we didn't attend class, we wouldn't have the materials for that day.

- Everything was very nicely organized, lectures were easy to follow.
- Maybe more lectures could use powerpoint/slides instead of being written on the board so if we missed something we could have the slides to look back on
- Great lectures. He explained the material in a way that made it very understandable even when it was difficult topics.
- Perhaps consider having pre-types lectures on smart board to save time physically writing.
- The lectures were really well organized, informative, and at a good speed for students to comprehend the material. It would be slightly more helpful if some version of lecture notes/slides were posted after class or before an exam in case students did not pick up something discussed in lecture that day.
- Posting slides or lecture outlines would be helpful! The lectures themselves were very thorough and helpful, but a portable version of that would have helped my studying beyond the textbook.
- The lectures were great and the content was very organized.
- I really liked it and i like how you ask guiding and prompting questions.
- This isn't a recommendation, I just wanted to say that I really enjoy following along on the chalkboard even though I know that makes things difficult for you sometimes. Because I handwrite my notes, I know I'll be able to follow along because you're also writing the important points down and drawing the graphs together so it feels like I'm better able to follow.
- I think they were good. The only concern is that if you missed a lecture, it was hard to get the information without just getting someone's notes, since the textbook was way more difficult to understand than the lectures and the vast majority of the lecture material was just written on the chalkboard. Incorporating more notes that got posted online could help mitigate that.
- The lectures were very helpful!
- I really like how Prof. Riehl taught as he was very structured in the way he put notes on the board. There is definitely a learning curve for this class as it is a different way of understanding introductory economics in the context of labor and wages, but the professor's delivery got easier to understand as the semester went on.
- I thought the lectures were great. Very well organized, easy to take effective notes from, well lectured, and the class size was just the right size as to enable effective answers and questions during lecture.
- Maybe neater presentation and use of PowerPoint slides rather than blackboard notes. I do like the graphs on the blackboard, however.

## C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Readings were solid and complementary to material learned in class.
- Were relevant and informing
- We had textbook readings, but I didn't find the readings helpful as we emphasized the most important information from the chapters in class.
- The readings were good, but not always necessary to get the fundamental concepts because the lectures were very in depth.
- Textbook Reading was not very interesting, also redundant if lecture was paid attention to.

- I stopped reading the textbook after like the 2nd week because I found it long and difficult to understand, and I felt like I still understood everything relatively well just from the lectures.
- I liked the contemporary documents we read.
- The textbook didn't really help at all.
- Very interesting! I enjoyed the couple of real-world applications that Riehl included as well as how they tied into our class content.
- N/A
- Mainly textbook readings so while they did explain the material we covered very well, they were not the most interesting.
- The readings were less engaging and harder to follow than the lectures
- Readings were helpful if you didn't understand a topic in class.
- I don't think the readings were very necessary for the course. I personally almost never reached for the textbook during the semester
- The readings were made irrelevant because the lectures were so informative and well-taught.
- The readings were clear.
- The textbook was clear.
- n/a
- Fairly helpful, the articles did help for context and actual real life applications
- The textbook is a little dry and feels very dated especially when it discussed traditional roles for men and women, discrimination, and inequality.
- I found the readings to be very interesting and relevant in the real world.
- i found the reading helpful.
- The lectures covered the subjects detailed in the textbook readings well and vice versa. Both lecture notes and textbook chapters were helpful in completing assignments.
- I think some of the readings were a bit redundant, but overall no issues
- Reading where informative and connected to lectures and topics being discussed.
- Readings were often confusing and included information that was not particularly important to what was specifically discussed in class. However, they are still valuable for further understanding these concepts and reinforce topics, and some of the more irrelevant information is still useful for learning about economic applications (even if this material isn't on the exams).
- wasn't sure if we actually had to read the textbook
- Great. I thought Prof Riehl did a good job connecting the concepts to current events.
- Textbook readings were a bit dense, maybe supplement with real-world examples
- NA
- Maybe more readings on real life applications? Found those interesting

### C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- Thankful it is a group paper especially since it is due the last day of class.
- Research paper was fair.
- Appreciate the opportunity to write a paper along with the problem sets and exams. I found the paper to be very straight forward and enjoyable given the fact we could choose our topic.
- I like that the papers could accommodate a wide variety of theories

- the end-of-semester paper was a lot of work but we had a lot of time to complete it
- The paper is useful for applying course content to policy, and can help students learn about how economic theory informs decisions affecting workers. The paper assignment has been a valuable learning experience so far.
- The paper wasn't bad just need more chances to meet for clarification on certain topics.
- Applicable to the course material
- There was ample time to get the problem sets completed and office hours were always made available, should we have any questions to ask about any of the questions.
- enjoyed the paper
- The final paper was a thought-provoking way to apply the concepts that we learned in class.
- Papers expectations were clear, i appreciated having our outline reviewed and the feedback that was given.
- I appreciated the flexibility in choice of the paper.
- Papers could have been more related to coursework
- The paper helped further elucidate concepts and was an enjoyable assignment.
- The papers were interesting and actually helped me understand the real life applications of the material we were learning, which motivated me to understand the class material more.
- The paper was very open, which I really enjoyed. The group-project option made it much less stressful.
- I would've appreciated more guidance during the semester about the final paper. Although we had an outline due, I felt as though the paper was a bit too vague, and didn't feel like I had a huge sense of direction while writing it.
- The research paper prompt was a bit vague. Would have appreciated a few more check-ins throughout the semester to make sure we were on track.
- The problem sets and the final paper were really good for practical uses of what we learned and being able to make more than a surface level connection to the work
- One paper and it was pretty open ended. Nice way to sum up the course.
- N/A
- Would prefer either a final paper or a final exam, having both seems excessive
- The paper was very fun to work on, especially because of the flexibility we had in our topic and data analysis.
- The paper was pretty stressful and was a lot for a 3 credit class.
- I found this to be a little bit weird because it seemed kinda out of place but nevertheless liked it because it gave us another grade
- I don't know if this would make things worse, but I think a little more guidance on the research paper would be helpful, like maybe having people submit multiple proposals for topics before narrowing in and sending in the outline. I was afraid that we were going in the wrong direction a lot.
- I feel like the paper is good in that we have a lot of time to do it, but I think it's hard to stop students from writing it at the last minute (as my group did).
- I enjoyed the research paper. Nice to apply the theory we learn to be used to understand the economic research.
- I felt the paper assignment was very interesting and a good learning experience!

- We had to write a final research paper and I felt that it was helpful for me to learn how to analyze data (which was also shown in problem set 3). The prompt was a bit vague and hard to understand at first and there was more detailed information for the outline, rather than the final paper, so it would be helpful to have more information for that.
- Was nice to have control over what we wrote about and was pretty engaging to write.
- The paper was a great assignment that allowed students to practice theory and further develop economic theory about wages and employment. However, I believe that there needs to be more equity in the group nature of the papers. I believe groups should either be assigned or not because letting students find their own groups will always leave people without a group even if they wanted one.

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- n/a
- I felt that I had to go to Office Hours to fully understand the class content and problem sets/assignments. I think these assignments as they were sometimes vague and could be better explained in class. Another suggestion is during Office Hours, the professor should look for a larger room to hold them in (which he did a few times) as there were so many students that showed up that we weren't able to all fit in the room. The professor is very available and willing to help his students, and is willing to share his career experiences as well.
- N/A
- I really like not having a discussion because our class is already so discussion based
- The TA didn't know what he was talking about and gave wrong information a majority of the time. He was bad at responding to emails and did not try to engage with students at all.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- n/a
- N/A
- N/A
- No labs / discussion sections, but it was nice being able to go up to the professor right after class for clarifying questions on the lecture. I found the class interesting and having that ability to ask questions after class really helped with some of the more difficult topics.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- n/a
- N/A

- n/a
- NA

#### C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- all good, thought it was challenging but not out of reach if you studied
- Very straightforward and clear. Fair in evaluating the content taught in the course.
- very fair and fairly graded.
- Hard exams, maybe provide chance to go over them as a class after they have been handed back.
- Tough but fair.
- fair
- The exams were overall fair; splitting up some of the questions into smaller questions may be helpful rather than having just a few larger questions. Diversifying question types may also help students who learn in different ways; e.g., on the first two exams (final has not yet been administered), putting more of an equal value on both technical and conceptual questions rather than mostly technical questions.
- Examines did correlate to topics in lectures, quick grade turnaround time, feedback was not as great and sometimes questions answered would be missed.
- I thought that the exams were mostly fair, but did have some qualms with the grading
- Probably only need either a final paper or a final exam, not both. Seems a bit much for a 3 credit course.
- The exams were fair, and involved the topics that were covered in class and problem sets.
- The exams were fair, but at times, it did feel like they were different than the practice prelims. for the first exam i did not expect you to ask why and how certain concepts worked, I instead focused my studying on memorization of formulas you gave to us anyway.
- Very fair and based off what we learned in class.
- Good examinations, fair length, difficulty, and material covered - however the grading was unclear at times
- The exams were fair but a little tough.
- They were ok. The Professor made time to explain in class and in office hours.
- The exams were very fair and covered exactly the material we discussed in class.
- Exams were fair. They covered what we went over in class. Sometimes there were errors between what the TA said and what Prof said, but they were easy-ish to catch.
- Feedback and grading were very fair, the exams just took lots of preparation
- I studied very hard for the exams but still came out with low scores. They were reflective of the material but maybe the difficulty was a bit too much on some of the questions. Grading was done in a timely manner and the professor was always open to going over feedback with me afterwards which I took advantage of and it helped me improve.
- Exams were oftentimes a bit misleading and harder than expected.
- I appreciate that there were three exams and that feedback was given back in a timely manner.
- Exams were fair and covered important class concepts. Grading was strict, but I understand the reason why.

- Fine. TA took off points when he shouldn't have.
- Thought the exams were very reasonable. and I actually liked the regrade policy, while I didn't use it I thought it was very fair.
- I thought they were fair.
- The exams were very fair and tested us on the important concepts of the class
- Every time I took an exam, I felt surprised by the content that was on there because it was very different from the type of question on the practice exams. I would have felt better prepared for the examinations if they were more similar to the practice exams and aligned more heavily with what was emphasized in this class.
- Fair, feedback was a little iffy at times
- Examinations were solid and reflected lecture material

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- The content
- The lectures being so so so much better than intro to micro and intro to macro. The lectures. I also liked the problem sets and study material.
- The teaching was very clear and notes were well structured. There is a good amount of theoretical and practical applications of the information we are learning in this class. The professor is also very helpful during office hours and open to talking to students/scheduling meetings outside of office hours.
- The lectures.
- Lecture
- That the lectures were made engaging, even though the topic is (in my opinion) relatively boring as a whole.
- The lectures and office hours (office hrs were crucial to my success) and the lectures were really organized and I really liked how I knew coming into class what was expected of me
- Lecture was always interesting
- Lecture
- Applying subjects to real life.
- Office hours. Professor had set office hours that I attended every week that were very helpful.
- The final paper because it was very open to allowing us to find a topic we could have a personal connection to.
- Lectures written out on the chalkboard.
- I think this was the first econ course where I felt like I genuinely understood the material that was being taught.
- The teaching made the material incredibly intuitive and easy to understand.
- Prof. Riehl was approachable and kind, especially as someone who struggles with Econ this was the first time I felt like I could go to office hours and feel like I understood the topic more.
- The lectures were extremely strong and clear. I feel like I have come out of this course with a significantly better understanding of economic concepts.
- I like that the notes were written on the chalkboard, as it encouraged me to come to class and participate and take notes



- The third part of the course was most interesting to me
- I found the professor's weekly office hours to be very helpful, and I appreciated how he was available to answer questions and further clarify concepts.
- lectures
- I was honestly a little scared to take this course because I haven't done as well in college econ classes in the past but I feel like he taught everything in a way where it was really clear to understand what was going on. I also liked that he wrote the main points of things on the chalkboard because it meant he was going slow enough that I could write things down in my notes and take time to understand what he was saying vs if he just used a powerpoint.
- just having the course content explained to me in a clear way -- made sure i wasn't super lost in class
- Professor Riehl. Amazing lecturer and instructor.
- The interaction with the professor
- Learning economic theories that relate to real-world topics.
- The lectures featured clear explanations, along with examples that helped clarify concepts. Students were encouraged to participate conversations around the topics.
- office hours and lectures
- Prof Riehl. He is really a great teacher!
- The material learned is very helpful
- Lectures.
- Support offered by the Professor especially in office hours.
- Learning the real life applications

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- Grading discrepancies- really valued the Professor making regrade requests equitable and emphasizing fairness, however the differences between the TA grading and the Professor were a little dramatic at times.
- Research paper
- Exams were tough.
- Probably the tests. I liked learning the material but the tests were pretty stressful.
- not knowing how much you need to participate to get a good grade for participation. It's hard to participate a lot in such a big class and some people are nervous to speak up in front of such a big group. Also the room was always very crowded and sometimes uncomfortable being right next to everyone else
- N/A
- Examines- had examination anxiety so I did not do too well on them
- The grading?
- i don't really have any complaints about this course so idk
- can't think of anything
- the reading
- Nothing comes to mind.
- n/a
- The textbook is very hard to read and not important to the course.

- Textbook
- Although the problem sets were good for practical applications, it was hard having exams, problem sets, and a final paper and having the problem sets weigh so much less.
- The textbook readings.
- Exams
- N/A
- Drew
- the textbook readings
- The textbook.
- Textbook
- I wish the exams reflected the content of the course more clearly and what the practice exams looked like.
- N/A

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- Blackboard notes..
- Sometimes it was a little stressful to ask a question after class or about an exam or something like that.
- Change the exams to reflect the practice exams and the most emphasized content of this course.
- The only real suggestion I have is having more material posted online so that missing a day isn't as much of a setback.
- Maybe make sure that the TA is promoting the same content answers. I felt like when i would go to Drews office hours i would get a completely different answer than when i talked to you.
- Get rid of paper
- None; I enjoyed the class layout, expectations and content.
- Practice exam problems paralleling with actual exam.
- Not much maybe just adding some extra credit assignments or something though to help those who studied for the exams but still scored low.
- Maybe make problem sets weigh more
- More check points for the essay
- posting class notes online
- I see no need for significant changes.
- n/a
- More review of math at the beginning of the course, especially ahead of the first problem set.
- Maybe more feedback on problem sets
- no significant changes recommend
- handwriting during lectures
- n/a
- I don't think a significant change needs to be made
- Find better ways to explain topics to students and make sure there is a unified understanding. More homework/assignments so students can practice content more.

- The professor and the TA seemed to have some miscommunication. While both the TA, Drew, and Professor Riehl were very helpful, accessible, and knowledgeable, sometimes the instructors had diverging opinions on how to deliver a concept which can be confusing if students attend both instructors' office hours.
- the classroom and participation policy
- The TA was not helpful, often giving incorrect answers or explanations that were more confusing. For specific topics, he said that he was not able to help very much because he hadn't worked with them in a long time and was no longer familiar with them. There seemed to be a large disconnect between information coming from Professor Riehl and the TA which frequently led to confusion in course content, expectations, and grading.
- Don't change much. It was a really well run class in my opinion.
- n/a
- NA. Riehl is an amazing professor.
- Wouldn't change much, Professor Riehl did a really great job. Economics is not my forte, but he made this class engaging and interesting and the ability to get a good grade.

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 2400 LEC 004 (Economics of Wages&Employment)**

**Principal CID: 13985**

**Spring 2020**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- Lectures were fantastic. Professor Riehl makes the class engaging. Even the online lectures were effective.
- The lectures are good and engaging.
- The lectures were very informational and very good
- Professor was incredible when it came to clarity!
- Incorporate more data analysis and Excel lessons, as this was relevant information that we were not given that was needed to complete the final problem set.
- N/A
- the lectures really helped me pass all of my tests
- needs to keep writing the notes with students or else goes way too fast. iPad method worked great normally.
- I thought that the lectures were always conducted in a very organized manner and were always interesting as they were supplemented with real life experience. I enjoyed that Professor was always starting class with relevant material.
- Lectures were well-organized and very useful. I really liked how much Professor Riehl would write on the board/draw out diagrams- it made content easy to understand.
- Amazing lectures. Hands down the best Economics teacher I have ever had. I don't even like economics as a subject, but Riehl made the lectures extremely engaging. He challenges us in the perfect way throughout his lectures by asking questions and getting us to think on the why behind everything we were learning. This is something that most teachers don't bother doing among their lectures. Riehl always made sure to explain the logic behind why we were learning something, used real world, engaging examples. Always straight-forward with the content. Explained everything to us super well with ultimate clarity. Best econ teacher ever.
- Amazing professor, lectures were always very comprehensible and effective. Also up to date with current events. Best teacher I've had at this school.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- textbook was monotonous but the reading/ NYT articles the teacher provided were very engaging and enjoyable
- Excellent, always relevant and helps so much to read before lecture to further understand and clarify the content. I never felt like there was any fluff in this class.
- maybe advise students as to which sections in the chapter to place specific emphasis on going forward

- Readings felt really repetitive from the lectures sometimes, maybe pointing out which parts to focus on would make them more useful.
- The textbook readings were a bit dense but I understood that they were a necessary part of the class.
- good
- While the reading was connected to the lecture, I never used my readings to study for a test. I could have easily just passed the class just by going to the lecture and not read anything. I would read just cause I felt guilty if I didn't do it.
- It's possible that Professor Riehl is such an effective lecturer that the value of doing the readings decreases substantially.
- The textbook readings didn't make much sense to me until after lecture
- The readings related very well to the lectures and taught me a lot
- I enjoyed the readings although they were a bit longer.
- Textbook readings reinforced the lecture material.

### C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- N/a
- The papers and assignments were fine but I found that the problems sets were not very clear. There were questions on the problem sets that were very much so unlike those covered during class. There were multiple instances where the TAs and professor seemed to be on different pages about how to approach the problems.
- no papers
- For the problem sets I wish we went over some of the material more during class. I thought they were significantly more difficult than the exam and the content we learned so I always had to go to office hours to understand some of the problems.
- N/A
- NA
- Paper- N/A. Problem sets- good prep for tests
- N/A
- N/A no paper this semester
- At times, some problem set questions didn't have enough grounding in content discussed in lecture -- some questions felt like they dealt with material that we hadn't attempted or seen attempted yet.
- The psets were super helpful in testing my knowledge and going over the correct answers was super helpful as well. They helped to clarify holes in my learning and where I needed to study more on if I didn't quite understand something.
- n/a

### C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- n/a
- N/A
- N/A

- N/A
- N/A
- NA
- N/A
- no sections/labs
- n/a
- This is not applicable to my class.

#### C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- More feedback was needed when it came to exams and problem sets on what students got wrong.
- Exams were fair and reflected the main objectives of course. There should be more feedback on the tests, however.
- The examinations were mostly reasonable but many of the problems were poorly worded and were ambiguous. I attended office hours sessions where the professor told me that parts of my grade could be chalked up to "bad luck" because I had misinterpreted the questions. I wish that there was less room for this and that exam questions were worded more clearly.
- The exams were fair and went over material we had learned. It also made sure we paid attention to small details.
- I liked the format of the tests
- Exams were fair
- I felt that the exams were very fair in scope and difficulty. Adequate feedback was provided both in notes and in class
- they were fair and accurate based on what we had learned.
- really fast grading. would be helpful to post practice problems and answers earlier
- I thought the both exams were very fair and that the instructions were always clear. I appreciate that the exams were close to what we had been exposed to via both class examples and problem sets.
- Exams were fair and feedback was helpful. Grading was very fast (honestly the fastest out of any class I've taken here), which was great. The textbook review problems were not very helpful for preparing for the exam questions, so I wish we could've had a few more practice problems written by the professor.
- I think marking the exams up with the correct answer written down at the end, in addition to the review of the exam in class (which was so helpful) could be useful. The first prelim I got the exam back and just was very confused as to what went wrong. I also think having an optional review session prior to the exam (maybe hosted by the TA) could be a really good idea.
- Clear and interestingly fun to do with the questions being asked. The in-person one that we did have however, I just felt like I didn't have enough time because it takes me longer to think about things but I really enjoyed doing the take home exams. Going over the correct answers with explanations was extremely helpful.
- good feedback, sometimes difficult wording on the question but overall very fair

#### C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Professors Riehls lectures
- Everything was always taught straight to the point, always clarified by removing any potential confusion, explaining the 'why' behind everything we learned, asking us questions to make sure we were understanding the content throughout the lecture.
- the professor! I hate econ and I am only taking this because it is a requirement but because of professor Riehl, who took the time break down concepts and was very accessible, I did not mind waking up at 8:00am to attend lecture
- Lectures + professor's/TA's willingness to help in office hours
- I enjoyed the class overall and was really appreciative of how understanding Professor was of the nature of the class. I was nervous about the class to begin with but Professor was very clear with his material and expectations of the course.
- well-organized intro to labor econ
- Learning about things like wage gap and discrimination but in an economic perspective.
- Professor Riehl's Lectures
- The professor himself
- I learned a lot about how the labor economy works and what drives workers to make certain decisions.
- Interesting content
- The lectures were very engaging and I enjoyed attending class.

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- The problem sets.
- n/a
- N/A
- NA
- readings dry and long
- N/A
- N/A
- The exams as in lecture I'd understand everything perfectly, I'd go to office hours for the problem sets but yet, something was not clicking for me with those exams.
- N/A
- the textbook readings

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- nothing.
- To help other economic teachers teach econ courses in the same/similar way. I just wish all my economic classes were taught as well as this one.
- I think it would be great if we could have more office hours, especially later in the week.
- N/A

- a lot of times after the problem sets were assigned, the professor would realize that those examples might not have been the best problems given to prepare for the prelim..so just changing that.

- N/A

- n/a

- Provide feedback on the problem sets and tests.

- to make the exam and problem sets questions clearer.



**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 2400 LEC 004 (Economics of Wages&Employment)**

**Principal CID: 13948**

**Spring 2019**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- Maybe end each class with a test like question on the material covered that day
- lectures were organized and straightforward
- Lectures were incredibly helpful and supplemented the textbook perfectly. Professor Riehl was clear and concise.
- I think lectures could be presented in more efficient fashion, such as through power point instead of using the chalkboard.
- less nervous
- Be more clear on what he will test about; Organization is very good, not clear on what students should know
- Professor Riehl is a good lecturer, however the material was dry at times. Most importantly, however, the lecturers covered a lot of material and it was difficult to know what we would be expected to know for the exams and problem sets. The first problem set especially was surprisingly difficult and I felt unprepared for it from going to lecture and doing the readings.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- I don't know if there is a better text book for labor economics, but I thought the textbook was very poorly written. I often felt more confused about the topic after reading about it in the textbook than before.
- Be more clear on what students should read
- good
- No comment
- oftentimes more of a chore, made understanding concepts difficult

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- good
- very fair and office hours were very helpful for the problem sets
- No comment
- alright
- More clarity on what the paper will be about
- The problem sets at the beginning did not reflect the level of difficulty we learned the material in class. The project using Excel, however, was interesting and gave me valuable Excel skills.

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- n/a
- n/a
- N/A
- n/a

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- more materials to prep for the exams would've been helpful, especially for prelim 1
- very fair
- No comment
- alright
- Very random
- The first exam was at a level much higher than what we learned in the course. It was also hard to tell what we would be expected to know.
- The examinations did not always align well with the material covered in class and highlighted in the book. I believe that the professor should better understand the skills and capabilities of the students rather than remaining adamant about how the course ought to be taught. If the majority of the class is not doing well, especially in comparison to all the other ILR Labor Economics, then he/she should reconsider whether the degree of difficulty is appropriate.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- The Excel project
- Office Hours
- lectures
- A better overview of labor economics and the labor market as a whole
- lectures

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- studying for the prelims
- Not sure
- readings
- Exams and Problems Sets
- The readings.

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- Try to make lectures more interactive and engaging in some way.
- Exams
- timing of day
- Use powerpoint to present lectures!

- provide practice tests with actual answers banks like in other econ courses

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 3445 LEC 001 (Inequality in US Higher Ed)**

**Principal CID: 18027**

**Spring 2023**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- Slides were sometimes very long. Overall, very interesting and Prof. Riehl is a clear expert on the subject matter. I learned a lot
- I appreciate that you made time for students to talk about their perspectives and opinions and you did a good job of handling when students gave incorrect answers because you made me want to keep participating even if I made a mistake
- In most classes we did not finish the slides and had to finish them the next class. It would be easier to absorb the material if some of the "fluff" was cut out and we could finish a topic in one class.
- I enjoyed the lectures and found them to be engaging and interesting.
- More variety would be nice -- perhaps some videos or guest lectures
- I really liked the structure of the lectures. The only thing I would change is it would be great to have more open discussion time, especially since some of the material on the slides is repetitive if you did the reading for that class.
- loved how the readings were summarized, very clear and easy to follow, and participation was invited and always felt comfortable asking questions

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Related to the class lectures. I actually read them all and found them interesting.
- some were super dense but you broke them down well in lecture and highlighted the main takeaways
- The papers were interesting but often long
- a lot of reading
- readings were very long and dense but summarized well in class
- Readings can be a little dense, but the main points were always clarified in lecture and the discussion questions helped steer me in the right direction when I was completing the readings.
- I found the readings interesting and helpful for understanding the course objectives.
- I really liked covering the Harvard and UNC cases, the Chetty paper on mobility, and Michelman reading on networking. I was most interested in the content on admissions and college outcomes and less interested in the readings on effects of being in college.
- Some of them were very long but when it was confusing they were summarized well

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- Paper is interesting. I like how we choose our own topic and design our own experiment. Makes it much more interesting.
- Your feedback on the outline was super helpful. Also I was super scared about the Psets and figuring out how to use R but the way you wrote the assignment and gave clear directions made it much simpler than I thought it would be and helped me walk away feeling like I actually learned something.
- Very good experience and interesting to research something of interest to me
- final paper and final exam unnecessary. Make a paper at a different time in the semester maybe the course is not so backloaded with work.
- The final paper was a great way to reinforce the main theme of the course and get my creative juices flowing. I think that in addition to feedback on an outline, it'd be nice to add another milestone to the paper where we submit and receive feedback on a rough draft, before submitting the final draft.
- I really enjoyed doing the paper - it was a manageable amount of work and it was easy to design an experiment using the methods we had talked about in class so it felt like a good way to apply the material
- Enjoying writing the final paper, very fair assignment

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- NA
- n/a
- N/A
- N/A

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- The sample questions were super helpful in preparing for exams.
- I appreciated that we went question by question after the prelim and you explained where points were taken off/why. It was also nice to have our physical exams back for future studying
- Very relevant to the class and no surprises
- The content and sample answers for the practice midterm were very short, only asking for the main points. However, the grading rubric for the actual midterm seemed to be very detailed and points were deducted for very specific things. It'd be nice to have more practice that reflects the difficulty of the actual exam. A full-length practice exam would be nice. Due to the length of the written responses, I think being able to take the exam in class but type our responses would be nicer than having to handwrite them.
- I thought the exams were fair and I knew how to prepare for them. The feedback was useful as well.
- I thought the exams were fair to the material
- More practice exams

- I think the grading was a little harsh because even getting a question partially wrong took you down almost an entire +/- sign but I think the content of the test was good and we were prepared.
- Good feedback, felt fair

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Discussion - I liked hearing other students' experiences (about their own high schools, hometowns, etc.)
- the conversations and learning how to actually read research reports
- Learning about aspects of higher education I had not previously considered
- Riehl is an awesome professor. Super accessible and helpful outside of class. Incredibly smart. Also this course content is just so interesting. Loved the class.
- Learning empirical strategies/analyses, how to read heavier research papers, and getting a little bit of practical experience with R
- I really enjoyed the class content and the variety of readings. Also, Professor Riehl is a great professor. He is super approachable, engaging, and genuinely one of the nicest professors I have ever had.
- The readings and discussions in lectures were the best part of the course for me
- Fascinating material, engaging and informative
- Honestly this class was amazing! It is definitely one of the best classes I have ever taken and it made me think about working with policy related to US higher education. Professor Riehl made lectures amazing and engaging and made sure to create discussions so students could get involved. I actually really enjoyed the Problem sets and appreciated how they introduced me to R. I can't say enough good things about this class or Professor Riehl and am very happy I got to take this class!
- discussion of students thoughts and perspectives

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- N/A
- NA
- problem sets

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- Not sure I would change anything. Overall, Prof. Riehl is a great professor. I learned a lot and really enjoyed this course. Super interesting content!
- Not a super big deal but it felt much more like a statistics course rather than econ (which I actually really liked). I still got a lot of value out of it and would take the course again but I enrolled under the assumption there would be more focus on things like supply and demand graphs, finding the equilibrium, and all the other stuff talked about in Labor econ but this was definitely more of a deep dive in research and research analysis which again I just wasn't

expecting in an ECON course so it might be helpful to make that stick out in the course description.

- Add more practice exams
- Since the problem sets and prelims are graded by a TA that does not otherwise appear in lecture, sometimes the expectations of written answers don't always match up to what Professor Riehl mentions in class.
- Having more office hours would be really helpful if possible!
- Content towards the end of the semester lacked relevancy to students, and accordingly, students participated less
- IT would be helpful to go over basic R in class so the problem sets felt more applicable. In the help R section, the TA could not answer many of our questions. The instructions in the pset for how to load the working directory were not complete, and it took the TA like 15 minutes to figure out how to do it in the help section. Since your OH were not during a time I was available, and the TA did not feel helpful, the problem sets were probably more overwhelming than they should have been

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 3445 LEC 001 (Inequality in US Higher Ed)**

**Principal CID: 14259**

**Spring 2020**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- great lecturer
- good overall. I actually enjoyed the online lectures more than in-person because of breakout rooms, there was more opportunity for discussion.
- In the beginning sometimes the comments from students seemed to go into tangents that took up more class time than necessary.
- I think it would be interesting to invite some of the economists, if possible, to guest lecture. For example, during the Harvard affirmative action topics, hearing the differing economists' points of view would have allowed me to better conceptualize the readings. This could even be done through a short online video of them speaking about their contributions to the case.
- Increased utilization of videos and visuals.
- I wish we thought more practically at times and a bit removed from the content of the Econ papers themselves, although the professor did try to do this quite often.
- N/A - this course was a rare combination of a great professor and engaging material.
- I think that the lectures were very informative and engaging. Multiple viewpoints were always expressed (when applicable) and students were encouraged to state their personal point of view and use mathematical/textual evidence to back up their claims.
- I have no recommendations about the lectures -- they were organized very well and Professor Riehl delivered them very effectively.
- Great course! Not many recommendations.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- interesting readings. a great mix of technical/academic articles from reputable journals as well as op eds and news articles that were less technical but still got the point across. i wish more classes in ILR were like this one where we go over the influential papers and authors in academia so that we at least get introduced to some real academics, not just some second tier bullshit.

great work on this!

- good.
- N/A - the readings were very relevant to the subject matter and interesting.
- Can shorten the readings
- I wish the readings, specifically the Econ papers were more condensed. I did enjoy reading them though but they took a significant amount of time.



- The readings were very interesting and applicable to class.
- If anything at all, it could be helpful for the professor to upload clippings of the readings with only the sections we're responsible for getting through on our own -- maybe he could still throw up full versions for those who're interested?
- Readings were long and time consuming, but going over them in class helped.
- The readings were often quite interesting, but I will say that at times the economics-heavy ones were maybe a tad too long.

#### C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- great teacher and learning experience.
- N/A
- The problem sets and prelim papers allowed me to better apply and comprehend the effects of changing variables on college inequality.
- Papers employed a nice format and enjoyable to write.
- I thought the problem sets in R were very valuable - I had thought that coding experience would be a good thing to get under my belt and thought the applicability of the problem sets to real life made them far easier to get through.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A

#### C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- The class was very discussion oriented and hearing my classmates' thoughts was valuable to my increased understanding of topics.
- Discussions were nice to hear other's perspectives, would definitely keep this aspect.
- N/A
- N/A (but Shiyi's office hours were great!)
- Had discussions as a class.
- N/A

#### C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- exams were reasonable, although they didn't require much critical thinking.
- The Problem sets had nothing to do with course readings and course lectures. I personally found it to be more statistical and CS than Econ related. It would have been much more useful to substitute problem sets for case studies and submit 2-3 page write ups.
- The exam paper was fair and Professor Riehl provided adequate feedback to help me improve on the next exam.
- Exams are specific and can be somewhat challenging but they are not impossible or greatly unfair.

- (It's worth noting that both happened after the switch to online) I thought the exams being more short-answer and long-form response was well suited to the course's material and thought the grading was consistent and fair.
- I felt that the content of the midterm examination was fair and that the questions were in line with expectations. However, I know multiple people who had serious problems with how the exam was graded. Personally, I noticed that I didn't receive credit for correct answers whenever I didn't touch on the wording that was in the answer key in the first sentence of my answer. This lends me to believe that some of the questions (particularly those graded by the TA) only had the first sentence or two read and were graded entirely based off of that.
- The exams were very fair, and I think Professor Riehl adapted the tests to fit the reality of online learning quite well.
- Our exams happened after spring break, so they were tricky, but worked well. Feedback wasn't great but it was because they returned them so quickly.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Became more self-aware of my present environment at Cornell
- the micro econometric explanation
- The professor! Would definitely take another class with him. He is a super helpful and understanding person. I felt like my opinion was valued and when I needed clarification I got it.
- Discussing questions in small groups via breakout rooms. It was great to collaborate with my peers and apply readings to our own experiences selecting colleges.
- The interesting statistics and information I learned throughout the course.
- Seeing different opinions on the value provided by a college education. It was neat to hear the professor break down these very in depth and often statistically complex papers for us.
- The professor did a great job delivering the content and fostering in-class discussion. The material is very interesting and pertaining to college students.
- The discussions that took place in lecture were a wonderful learning and reflecting opportunity. I also enjoyed the Breakout Rooms in the Zoom lectures.
- Lectures -- Professor Riehl is one of my favorite lecturers I've had in my four years. He seems well connected to the students and their mindsets and tailors his lectures to best fit them
- Readings
- Professor Riehl's accessibility -- I always felt comfortable going to his office hours to chat and ask any questions that I had, and he was always open to talk and share his insights.

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- Problem sets
- The homework was very different than the rest of the course, and would catch me off guard.
- N/A
- The long amount of reading.
- N/A
- Again, the grading of the test seemed a bit arbitrary/inaccurate. Other than that, I really enjoyed the class and got a lot out of it.

- Problem sets
- For me, there was none. It's a very interesting class and I can truly say that I learned a lot.
- N/A

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- problem sets to Case study
- N/A
- Utilizing more videos in the lecture.
- I think that the tests ought to be graded a bit more thoroughly, ensuring that credit is given for an entire answer rather than what the first sentence of a response may imply.
- It could be cool to spread the final term paper more through the semester. I know we didn't actually complete the paper this semester but was in another course that spread out its term paper and allowed for far more professor feedback on my writing, something I thought the Econ major had been missing.
- Maybe more problem sets
- Perhaps just simplifying some of the more economics-heavy papers that could be a little bit challenging to fully grasp.
- It would be helpful to teach the class how to use R

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 3445 LEC 001 (Inequality in US Higher Ed)**

**Principal CID: 14264**

**Spring 2019**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- Very interesting content. Really excited me about the topic. Think sometimes when class is not being responsive in discussion, have people break out into groups and talk then come back together and answer.
- I think there were some topics that the professor did not know about but would have been very interesting to discuss.
- It would have been nice to have some variety in lectures in terms of class engagement -- the class is a long period, so the lectures can sometimes feel long and a little dry. However, the content presented was very interesting.
- Content was great and well organized. Often had to keep us on track.
- None--they were a nice combination of lecturing and discussion, and the material was presented in an interesting manner.
- Overall good.
- Great course that made me think critically about how education in the US actually functions.
- I thought the lectures were delivered in a very organized manner that combined both clear explanations and the opportunity for active participation.
- Perhaps bring in a guest lecturer to create interesting discussion. For ex. bring in a lecturer with one argument and we learn someone else's counterargument beforehand, and then he discusses his findings.
- I enjoyed the lectures and thought they were interesting as they gathered all significant information from readings and invited discussion, however though attendance is required and opportunities for anyone to speak are abundant some chose not to participate. This leads to a couple people dominating discussions despite Professor Riehl seeking out others' opinions.
- Loved them, thought the emphasis on discussion was a highlight and wouldn't change them.
- Slides went by too quickly to get some of the main points (but since they were made available to students, this is not too big of an issue). Did a good job about playing devil's advocate at times, which provided a different point of view.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Did not always do the readings but the professor made it really easy to keep up with the topics and understand even when I was really busy.
- Readings were relevant to the class material; however, some of them were very long -- it would have been nice to have some guidance on the longer economic papers.

- Very interesting! I have saved most of them and sent them to friends and family interested in the same topics.
- Very thought-provoking and relevant with the subject matter of the course.
- Mostly good. I actually did the readings in this class because they were pretty interesting and allowed me to participate in class, whereas doing readings in other classes can be pretty useless. I have to say I didn't like the Goldin and Katz readings. I think they spend a lot of time talking about numbers and not really explaining what the numbers mean.
- Built on course material addressed in lectures.
- Overall the readings were good, but some were quite dry and dense.
- I thought the readings were very interesting and informative.
- I enjoyed the articles especially as they mixed more opinionated news articles with typical economic journal articles and mostly all related to the course.
- Really enjoyed the readings, very varied content with both economic papers and op-Eds.
- Readings were fine, related to what the course objectives were.
- The articles were delightful to read and fascinating- thought they were high quality and well-written.

#### C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- The final paper is doable and he prepared us well with the outline.
- Final paper was a great assignment -- gave us enough independence to explore the topics we were most interested in.
- Very clear objectives
- Built on course material addressed in lectures.
- I thought the paper was an interesting opportunity, but I don't know if it was particularly valuable in the learning experience.
- The papers were well varied and discussed both sides. Particularly enjoyed we read both sides of the Harvard case.
- The papers/homework were all very fair and related to completing basic economic research focusing on higher education and provided a good basic background in R for those without prior experience.
- Dry, but necessary- I get how they add the empirical understanding/dimension, but they're noticeably less enjoyable to read.
- Only one paper, which is fine, I guess. Making it due by the final lecture can be a bit stressful, however.

#### C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- None
- N/A
- NA
- N/A
- N/A

- Very interesting for me to think differently and many different avenues to explore.
- N/A
- N/A

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- The content relayed well into the exams and the grading was done quickly and coherently.
- Exams were fairly graded and relevant to the class -- I didn't feel like they were too hard or too easy.
- Thorough and fair
- Very fair, I was not surprised by the content whatsoever
- Very clear format, properly tested what we learned in class.
- Prelim was probably easier than it had to be
- I thought the exam was very fair and combined both relevant course material and deeper level thought
- Fine, about as expected, maybe make a little harder.
- Thought they were fair, thought grading was fair as well. Liked the written response style, suits the discussion nature of the course.
- In-class prelim was fine and covered the content that we did up to that point well.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Most valued part of this course was the application of theories to real world issues.
- The professor
- Engaging lectures and class discussions. This was made possible because of the small class size, which benefited the material. Professor Riehl was a great lecturer who is very knowledgeable and interested in the topic, which made it a great class.
- Class discussions
- The thought-provoking conversations as well as the problem sets which exposed students to R.
- Prof. Riehl, hands down. We at Cornell are really lucky to have him
- Lectures and final paper.
- All of it is great.
- The in-class discussions.
- Explanations of the readings in class and problem sets.
- Having open ended discussion about the topics.
- Exams were fair and related directly to course readings and lectures
- How smart and knowledgeable Evan was.
- Different perspectives on a number of issues, such as affirmative action and the value-added to a university degree.
- The content matter, easily the standout. So much to discuss!

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- awkward silence when he asked a question
- Long lectures.
- Some of my peer's comment in the discussion
- I can't think of anything because it was generally all pretty valuable
- The readings.
- Nothing
- None.
- Paper
- As we discussed, I feel that there was a little too much anecdotal stories that led to not much
- The problem sets, which I really liked since they helped me shake the rust off my R and Latex, but I do think they were tangential to what the course was interested in.
- Discussion on roommate effects was a bit boring, but I understand how it was a part of the course

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- More variety in lectures. I think the range of topics covered was a good mix of introductory/historical/and modern topics. However, I would've liked to see more relevant papers/examples towards the end (i.e. the Harvard case, which was one of the most interesting topics we covered).
  - Force students to rely on statistical versus anecdotal
  - None
  - None. The readings, lectures, problem sets, papers, and exams all made me think critically and helped me learn the material.
  - None
  - I would make the paper either a larger part of the course or adjust it a bit because it is a big part of our grade but doesn't have a ton of build up.
  - Make the problem sets harder because I thought there was too much hand holding for it.
- Other than that, and increasing the difficulty of the midterm, this was about as well designed of a course as possible.
- Turnaround on reading an empirical paper was sometimes too short (i.e. from Monday lecture to Wednesday lecture) and slight restructuring of the syllabus might be useful, unless the paper is less than 20 pages in length.
  - Maybe just make regression work a prereq for the course or cut down on the revision- I didn't mind it, but I think that lecture could be used for more interesting topics, like really looking into financial aid.

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 3445 LEC 001 (Inequality in US Higher Ed)**

**Principal CID: 17777**

**Spring 2018**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- The lectures were always greatly interesting and well organized.

One change I think I would have liked would be to have spent somewhat more time in lecture getting an overview-level explanation of the topics that we looked at. At some points, I felt as if the results and conclusions of the many individual papers that we read weren't adding up to more than the sum of their parts, when I read and understood the papers but still didn't feel much more comfortable with my broader understanding of the topic.

I understand that many of topics that we looked at are ongoing debates, and that the best insight into them is to read the best papers on the topics, but I think I would enjoy learning the material more and understand it more fully if there were more time spent on explaining the contexts that the papers fit into and what the general consensuses are among academics, or if there is no consensus, where the weight of the evidence lies among the broader literature.

- I think the delivery was good, but could be better in the sense that it did feel monotonous at times. I think including certain strategic breaks to regain attention (professor already did this by stopping to ask reflective questions) or activities/simulations could really help improve the absorption of the material.

- When explaining graphs or charts make sure you provide enough time let students take careful notes on your descriptions since you do not type them on the slides and therefore we cannot follow up with them later.

- Given Professor Riehls first year of teaching, I was very very impressed by the quality and effort he put into his lectures, choosing of readings, and discussions. I enjoyed every lecture and thought they were engaging.

- No recommendations. One of the most well organized classes I've taken. Presented both sides of all debates in the field and assigned related readings that were very thought provoking.

- The lectures were thoroughly engaging and legitimately interesting for both students and professor (I hope). Everyone was encouraged to present their point of view, and the professor facilitated a fantastic environment for stimulating discussion and dialogue.

- The lectures were very well organized, and I personally enjoy it when there is sufficient content on uploaded slides so that was very welcome!

- The lectures were organized and informative.

- There's a lot of content in the slides, but it felt like the professor was reading off of them, which is a little redundant. However, the content and organization was great!

- You did a great job, can't think of anything



- Lecture was fantastic and intellectually stimulating, really good balance of lecture and discussion.
- Slides could be improved by adding text boxes that explain graph takeaways, but delivery should stay the same. Far exceeded other ECON electives I have taken
- Delivery could improve, content was great and slides were all very organized
- None

#### C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Readings were great - I particularly enjoyed the newspaper articles as they were easy to understand and was written in a more 'regular' format. The academic papers were more rigorous as this was the first class we read academic papers in such depth - however, I felt like they were essential and a strong point of the course. Perhaps reading fewer papers and breaking them down into two separate readings would incentivize people to read and understand them better.
- I really enjoyed the readings and the fact that we had a variety of different types of readings- they weren't all long academic articles.
- High value readings that clearly connected to the overall themes in the course.
- A good mix of both academic papers and more accessible readings, some of the more academic readings were definitely drier than others, but these academic papers definitely brought important analytical tools to our discussions of inequality.
- The readings were very interesting (love that op-ed articles were included), and the initial lectures prepared us well for reading economics/research articles.
- The readings were informative and provided a nice balance between in-depth economic concepts and article commentaries. I really enjoyed the news article readings we had as they were an interesting source for a variety of opinions that experts had on the topics we were discussing in class.
- Readings were all very interesting and relevant.
- perfect amount, good mix of papers and op-eds
- None
- I liked how the readings were varied - some were research papers and some were op-ed pieces
- Maybe shorter readings or specific pages assigned

#### C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- The paper assignment was great and really made us think about the ideation process of studies and added a personal connection to the material since we had to choose topics we felt were important/interesting.
- The paper was challenging but a good experience in critical thinking.
- The papers were enjoyable to write, made me think critically.
- One aspect of the paper assignment I did appreciate was that we were allowed to pick a topic that genuinely interested us as students and citizens. No complaints regarding the paper in general.

- Really appreciated professor's flexibility in terms of paper content (e.g. we can talk about consideration of kindness/ethical engagement in college admissions -- which isn't your typical topic of interest in labor economics, evaluating post-school earnings, etc).
- The papers were a good learning experience for conducting our own experiments.
- I really appreciated the comments from the paper we had to write.
- useful, the problem sets were a good intro to R and helped me better understand the material
- n/a
- The final paper was the perfect length and I liked how we got to pick our own topics
- None

#### C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- -
- N/A
- No labs or discussion sections.
- Not applicable.
- N/A
- n/a
- N/A
- None
- N/A
- n/a

#### C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- I thought the examinations were very fair and examined the most important parts of the course in a straightforward manner.
- Exams were good, I liked how there were MCQs to reward those who did readings. I think there could be a bit more clarity in grading criteria but overall, the experience was good.
- The exams were well represented by the study guides.
- Exams were fair, but graded too picky. I expected to do better than I actually did.
- Straight-forwarded and certainly tested the material taught in class.
- Overall, the exams were representative of the material learned in class. However, I did feel that the statistical components of the class could have been better explained. Much of the empirical knowledge we dealt with was complex, and prior classes had not yet covered the technical material.
- Comprehensive exam that wasn't very difficult, but tested my knowledge on mostly everything we covered in course. Very fair.
- pretty standard, you had to go to class to do well
- Relevant, reasonable style, structured in an engaging way. Valuable feedback
- Examinations were a fair representation of course material, but were graded rather harshly
- None

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- The problem sets. I was grateful for the opportunity to expand my understanding of Excel and have an introduction to R. I felt like I learned much of the material best when I was able to manipulate the data myself.
- The most valued part of the course was the ability to make personal connections, as students, to important issues in education that touches all of us.
- Professor Riehl clearly did not intend to trick students or catch them on tiny details. The readings were dense but he clearly articulated what main points to look for and then presented them thoroughly in lecture.
- The content! This class, being an econ class, is very different than anything I've taken in ILR. The course content made me feel very informed and was often very surprising. I can definitely say I walked away with a breadth of knowledge in this course.
- The professor! Professor Riehl was great at engaging discussion, at conveying complex concepts and models clearly and concisely, and an inspiring lecturer all around. I honestly could not tell that this was his first teaching experience, and would easily recommend the course to friends or classmates.
- Everything! The professor did an excellent job of preparing, organizing, and leading the course. The course material was highly interesting, lectures were engaging, readings were manageable, and late submissions were accepted with penalty (some professors don't accept them at all and given my heavy courseload, this was greatly appreciated). Most of all, the professor had a great, down-to-earth personality -- very kind (e.g. gave us an encouraging spiel during the period when there were several Greek life related hate crimes and assaults on campus) and relatable (e.g. "German guy" haha).
- I enjoyed the open discussions we had in class. It was a great way to learn from other students' background and experiences, and provided an open floor for different perspectives.
- Participation of other students. We are all products of different, yet similar education systems and it's really cool listening to other students' experiences and perspectives on different issues, such as affirmative action or different styles of college.
- the discussion. Professor Riehl really knows how to ask thought provoking questions and stimulate interest
- Learning R was useful
- Discussion in class
- lectures
- The ability to speak intelligently about issues of my concern

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- I felt like some of the earlier problem sets had quantitative aspects that were a bit too advanced without much guidance. This created a situation where students spent unnecessary time trying to google very basic things instead of thinking about the problems.
- Excel Problem Set. It felt like the complications/ lack of familiarity took away from the actual content.
- N/A

- Not applicable.
- Redundancy of what was taught in lecture and what was in the slides.
- Some of the readings, but you kept the topics interesting so good job!
- probably the math parts
- n/a
- I liked all of it
- None

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- Finding better ways to incentivize more listening in class - perhaps asking people who use laptops to move back in the class? It is very easy to get distracted in the current format (as is the case for most classes) and I feel that the biggest change to make is to add more incentive structures in place for people to listen more.
- N/A
- Can't think of anything. Sorry, I know I didn't really have any constructive criticism, only praise... I'll let you know if I do. Thanks for the phenomenal semester and sorry for some of the late submissions!
- Talk more confidently, you're a great professor and this class was amazing!
- honestly not much, probably the best class that I've taken at Cornell. I can't think of any useful criticism except that the slides weren't particularly useful. Thank you Professor Riehl!
- None
- a few of the lectures could have been made a little less dry
- shorter readings

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 7450 SEM 101 (Seminar in Labor Economics I)**

**Principal CID: 17634**

**Fall 2022**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- I really appreciated the course and learned so much from it.
- No recommendations. Lectures were extremely helpful and engaging.
- No changes needed. The lectures were great for discussing the readings and wrapping your head around the more complicated concepts.
- The course covers a range of different topics in labor economics and is a great intro to the field. I am wondering if there are some inner connections between the topics that can be made as a roadmap or something like that? The topics feel disconnected sometimes, and I would appreciate if you can show more the connection between different topics or historical progression of ideas.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- The readings were great and I like how they were organized.
- Most of the readings were quite advanced/sometimes difficult but I always felt like I had a good grasp on them following the lectures and feel I benefitted from struggling through them first. I also appreciated the limited required readings and corresponding presentations by other students. This allowed me to devote the necessary time to the seminal papers each week while still benefitting from recent research through presentations.
- No changes needed. The choice of readings was terrific given the content of the course, and some of them are helping me think of new questions to explore.
- Overall, I liked the readings. They included methods I was unfamiliar with and would not have read if not for this course. I wonder if a paper or two could be added which are more "applied" flavor and less structural, though.

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- I appreciate the structure of the course with the main "examination" being the paper proposal. I received great feedback halfway through the course (which also served as an incentive to begin thinking about research) and appreciated the focus being on something that could be useful to me outside of the scope of this class.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Evan is a great prof. and he explains the content very well. I like the structure of the course a lot. It allows us to delve deeply into seminal papers and also learn about what is the frontier research.

- This was a great course that I would recommend to every applied micro student - not just those interested in labor! Dr. Riehl is a phenomenal professor!

- The readings we went through, especially through the focus on how to develop underlying models that can be tested, and the econometric approaches to different questions.

- I was very grateful to not have psets in this course.

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- It is probably a good idea to cover Angrist and Pischke early in the class like we did, but just be aware that a lot of professors assign those readings to second year students as well, which might mean that some students are not getting that much new material. Definitely not a big concern though.

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- The only thing I found confusing is the schedule of what to read on what day.

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 7450 SEM 101 (Seminar in Labor Economics I)**

**Principal CID: 14594**

**Fall 2019**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- This class is the best class I have been taking this semester, I enjoyed a lot! Thanks a lot Evan!
- I really enjoyed the course. Only thought perhaps is that the course is a bit too education heavy and focused only the US.
- Lectures were clear and well presented. The presentation slides are a great resource.
- Classes were very well structured all the time. Evan is a great speaker, sometime maybe a bit fast.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Interesting and relevant
- I enjoyed the readings and thought that they all spoke to the material covered in class that day. While some of them were challenging to understand at first, the discussion in class helped a lot. I also appreciated that we were given 1 reading per topic to focus our attentions.
- I liked the way each week was covering a different topic and how we tried to briefly cover the literature on all of them.
- I really appreciate that Professor Riehl kept the readings manageable. Focusing on one reading in depth - and really understanding it - is much preferred to skimming several. The readings were well chosen, not overly technical, and Professor Riehl often told us what to focus on.

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- Paper discussions in class were useful

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- I appreciated being able to email about problem set questions.
- I appreciated the opportunity to fully think through a research idea and draft a formal proposal. Professor Riehl gave helpful feedback along the way.
- Very painful problem sets, but useful

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- Presentations
- Prof. Riehl did a great job on explaining everything, he is so patient and kind!
- The paper proposal. It can be intimidating to start this process, but I think it was very fruitful to force myself to put something together. It was also useful to receive feedback on a first draft.
- Exposure to a large literature
- Lectures. Professor Riehl does a great job at presenting complex topics and making things intuitive.

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- NA
- Individual presentations.
- Not enough time to assimilate all

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- NA
- Nothing!
- This was one of my favorite courses. Thanks for great semester.



**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 7450 SEM 101 (Seminar in Labor Economics I)**

**Principal CID: 14695**

**Fall 2018**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- This has been the best class I've taken at Cornell both content and organization/goals of the course. Evan is excellent and approachable.
- Lectures were great and always well-organized.
- This was a great class. The instructor is clearly very knowledgeable and cares about the students' learning.
- Maybe a little more clarity on the instructions of the problem set would be nice. I had to spend a quite amount of time in figuring out what I am supposed to do with the questions, confused by the direction.
- I enjoyed them. No additional changes needed.
- Content was good. Not sure I appreciated the machine learning section, feels like something better suited for a methods course. I'm also not sure that the introduction to methods at the beginning of the course was necessary. I think everyone there is getting/has gotten exposure to all the Mostly Harmless stuff elsewhere, and it actually didn't come up that much in the papers we read throughout the semester. Though that problem set (PS1) was extremely helpful. I think I would have preferred to spend another week on human capital. I guess I would have appreciated more discussion, but I get that there isn't a lot of time for that.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- Readings were great. I wish I had time to do more of the non-required ones, but I guess there's winter break for that.
- These were generally good.
- Very good reading lists. I liked that the presentations were intertwined with the course materials.
- I enjoyed being able to take a deep dive on 1-2 papers per week. I felt like I was better able to internalize the models and empirical strategies this way.

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- N/A
- Do readings and papers differ?
- N/A
- I think there was an excessive focus on Educational Economics (human capital, teacher quality, school quality, peer effects, information on schooling).

Perhaps, there could be more balance and cover other topics such as: robotization in the labor market, the effect of trade on local labor markets, the effects of unions, earnings inequality, labor market institutions.

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- We didn't have laboratories or discussion sections
- N/A

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- I don't know why there is an in-class final exam. If he wants us to answer the questions then we should just answer them at home. There isn't much value to the students or to him in having us show up and regurgitate answers.
- I felt that the homework assignments didn't add too much to my understanding of the material. This applies especially to the HW involving the Chetty paper and to Question 3 of the machine learning paper. Both of these involved various trade-offs between different decisions. The design of the homework does not really get at how to weigh the different options and how to make trade-off decisions in practice.
- Haven't seen it yet.
- I think the final exam was unnecessary, especially I don't think there is much value in having a face-to-face examination if we already know the questions beforehand, in my mind that only encourages the memorization of the questions.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- The classes and the problem sets were great.
- Most of the topics were great. Lecture slides were great. Student presentations were a mixed bag.
- The lectures
- This is one of the best courses I've taken so far in the PhD program
- Exposure to key papers in a variety of literatures and a thorough discussion of the assumptions of the models and how they fit into the broader labor literature. The size of the class was also very conducive to a more conversational discussion of the papers.
- I liked that we only covered one topic a week, and that Evan provided us with open questions/other research done in the area in case we are interested in that particular topic down the road. I also found the homeworks to be useful (and definitely will come in handy in the future).

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- In-class final exam.

- Parts of the homework assignments were very tedious, and sometimes too little information provided. The Chetty HW would have been much more manageable with slightly more guidance and instruction.
- Methods/machine learning sections.

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- Nothing I haven't mentioned above. Thanks for a great course!
- Provide slightly more guidance in the homework assignments.
- Drop the in-class final exam!

**Instructor: Evan Riehl**

**Course: ILRLE 7450 SEM 101 (Seminar in Labor Economics I)**

**Principal CID: 17363**

**Fall 2017**

Note: If this is a cross-listed course, comments for both halves of the course are included.

C01. Recommendations about the lectures (e.g. content, organization, delivery, guest lectures):

- Lecture format/discussion questions were very good at motivating me to read and understand the papers we studied beforehand.
- The lectures were very helpful and clear. The reading questions helped guide me through the material and gain a deeper understanding of the content.
- The organization is nice and I learn a lot of different topics and I think the in class presentations.
- There were a few lectures in which the content seemed to go over everyone's head, but it was enough to pique my interest into looking deeper into the concepts. It's hard to balance depth of discussion and understanding with the wide breadth of the course. Having the slides printed and prepared really helped me focus in on the content rather than trying to keep up with note-taking. I got a lot more out of it because of the level of preparation for each lecture.
- About half of the student presentations were poor and difficult to get something from. Many focused on material too technical for the 30 minute slots. Many students also had too much material prepared for 30 minutes. I think these were two common mistakes and could be mentioned to the next cohort so that they avoid them.

C02. Readings? (e.g. content, scope, interest value)

- The readings were all very helpful and clear. The only suggestion I have is to briefly preface the following week's content in the last lecture of the previous week. This would help guide our reading, as certain concepts, such as machine learning and value added were new concepts to me.
- I thought that the papers we discussed were very relevant and also generally quite recent (which I very much appreciate). Most were interesting to me.
- The majority of the readings were very interesting.

However, it would be interesting if we covered an economic "debate" in readings. For example, in Macro Labor we read several papers on a specific model that presented different perspectives on it. In Labor, we can perhaps do the same for the Chetty VA paper and the debate around it. Or some other popular debate.

- I thought all the readings were valuable and interesting.

C03. The papers? (e.g. content, learning experience)

- Same comments as for the readings.
- The paper proposal was useful and Evan provided clear guidance in multiple meetings for every student.
- The paper proposal, which focused on how to present a research paper in a concise, clear way, was a very helpful exercise.

C04. Laboratories? Discussion sections? (e.g. content, value to your education)

- N/A
- N/A

C05. The examinations? (e.g. content, style, grading, feedback)

- N/A
- We haven't taken any examinations yet.
- Personally think it is very important to have the final exams to test the models! It is really handy when I start to write my own papers.
- I think I would have liked a little more feedback in terms of performance on problem sets. That's difficult to do with a big class.
- I would prefer a larger research proposal over a test for a seminar course.

C06. The most valued part of this course was:

- A strong conceptual foundation of various topics in labor and the machine learning discussion. Prior to the machine learning lectures, I was completely unaware of this technique. Also, the problem sets were helpful for all of us, regardless of our programming expertise.

Evan was the most effective professor I have had at Cornell to this point. He went out of his way to help the students with clear lectures, useful problem sets, and paper guidance. Also, his empirical strategies lecture very helpful for other classes.

- Evan's explanations of different literatures and how they related to each other (new contributions, most important ideas) were very useful! The problem sets were quite useful as well.
- I like the different topics and paper reading and it gives me many research ideas. Also the paper proposal pushes me to think about my research.
- The homeworks were very helpful in both teaching econometric methods and how to code them.
- Different empirical methods. Evan's comments on the papers. Problem Set 3 was very cool. Made me want to take ML next semester.
- I really like that the professor points out open questions and areas worth researching for each topic. This is really helpful for knowing where we are in the literature and developing ideas.

C07. The least valued part of this course was:

- I still don't understand the teacher value-added paper very well.
- The student presentations provided valuable practice, but many of the students clearly had not adequately prepared for the presentation. This concern also arose in many of my other classes and has very little to do with the course itself.
- Although the cookies were very good, the second desert was not as tasty :(

However, you should definitely still bring sweets (I still had two pieces of the second desert). Also, I will now bake for my section students too to seem cool.

C08. The most significant change to make is:

- I'm not sure how feasible this would be, but it may be helpful to set up a recording device to record the student presentations. Following the presentation, you could send the video files to the presenters, so they can evaluate their own performance. I remember you mentioned early in the semester that presentations were a concern for many students in the program, so this may be a useful way for students to analyze their own performance in the context of lecture 3 on presentations.
- Keep the papers that are read current each year (the ones we read this year were great).
- I really like to comment on the homework. I know you put a lot of effort in that but sometimes I get lose in what is the question is really asking. The thing is that I can do it based on the hints but I don't know why I need to do this, which always confuses me. It might because I am bad in interpreting empirical results, though.
- I would remove the second VA problem set. Its too specific of a topic. It could be replaced with more readings. Alternatively, we can be assigned two or three short peer reviews on papers. Then the class discussions could be less structured.
- I would have liked to have done the Python exercises we talked about in class at the beginning of the semester. Data scraping is one of the things I feel would be very valuable to know, and a structured environment like a problem set is a great way to learn something like that.