

WUSTL Course Evaluations

Introduction to (Statistical) Programming with R

Jonathan Homola

Summer 2015

Part I – Ratings.

Please rate on a scale of 1 \rightarrow 5 (where 1=negative, 5=positive).

Question	Mean	Response Count
Overall <i>instructor</i> rating.	4.9	10
Overall <i>course</i> rating.	4.7	10
Course objectives, expectations, and requirements were clearly defined in the syllabus	4.9	10
Instructor was prepared for each class.	5.0	10
Course material was presented in clear, organized manner.	4.8	10
Instructor was responsive and sensitive to questions in class.	4.9	10
Instructor was available for assistance outside of class.	4.4	10
Assigned readings were valuable.	4.8	10
Written assignments and papers were valuable.	4.6	10
Exams were fair and reflected course material.	4.7	7
Papers and exams were graded fairly.	4.9	10
Comments on written work were sufficient and useful.	4.4	10
Evaluation of my work was clear and timely.	4.9	10
This course allowed for significant interaction with the instructor.	4.4	10
This course provided multiple opportunities to engage with other students.	4.6	10
This was a challenging course.	4.7	10
I learned a great deal in this course.	4.7	10
The workload was appropriate.	4.4	10

Part II – Open Questions.

What did you like most about this course?

- (01) “Gave me the tools needed to get started in R”
- (02) “YES”
- (03) “Using R and learning all of the different things that can be done with it.”
- (05) “I liked the plotting and graphing aspects of this course the most.”
- (06) “The hands on work”
- (07) “The instructor explicitly explains everything and replies on time. The content is interesting, and participation truly contributes to the class.”
- (08) “This is exactly a new subject for me and I have been excited to learn it.”
- (09) “Like the ability to interact with the other students.”
- (10) “The subject matter and seeing how others are using R.”

What did you like least about this course?

- (02) “Assigned readings, written assignments”
- (03) “I wish we had received the answers to all of the homework assignments. It would have been helpful to review my work and see where I could improve.”
- (05) “I am not sure that this can be avoided, but sometimes when I would finish the weekly assignment to reply to another classmate, someone else would have already replied and I had to start all over again.”
- (06) “It would have been nice to receive feedback on our homework”
- (07) “The inconvenience caused by downloading a package.”
- (08) “I just like the course.”
- (09) “Was a little frustrated by some of the homework problems. There were some math/statistics language that I was not really familiar with.”
- (10) “On some of the assignments I felt a bit in the dark and underprepared by the readings and lecture notes to complete the assignment.”

What would you tell another student about this course?

- (01) “YES”
- (02) “It’s good but challenging”
- (03) “That it was very helpful for learning R. Although I would have appreciated an in-person course, the online format was useful/flexible and there was enough support to learn the material and get help.”
- (05) “Yes, I enjoyed this course very much.”
- (07) “I highly recommend this course to people interested in statistics and computer science. It’s a great opportunity for exploration in an efficient way.”
- (08) “It is a course you can learn a lot. You don’t need computer language background before taking the course. But you may have to spend a lot of time to keep up with the whole class.”
- (09) “Class can be a challenge. Description said no statistics or programming were needed to take class but it would really help if student had some background in both of those areas.”
- (10) “It is a worthwhile intro to R.”

What would you like to tell the instructor?

- (01) “Really enjoyable class, now I can build on what I’ve learned”
- (02) “The homework is sometimes quite difficult and there are not too many references to get hints from.”
- (05) “Thank you for teaching me R! It is a very useful skill to know.”
- (06) “Please post homework assignments at beginning of the week. Since its online, many of us were working to juggle our weeks and sometimes only having 5 days to complete the homework wasn’t enough”
- (07) “I really like the class :-)”
- (08) “Thank you. I have a coworker who has ever taken R last year. She told me that the course was just too easy and she just learned how to load packages and do easy things like copy and paste. She felt like she learned nothing at all. Compared to her

experience, I guess my own experience in your class is totally another story. I have to spend tons of hours to study every week before I can complete the homework. Being tired like a dog. But I learned a lot and am feeling like I am becoming smarter than before.”

- (09) “Enjoyed the class overall. Liked the slides for each week. Feel like the class may have benefited from some sort of video explanation to go along with them.”
- (10) “Thanks for a good class!”

After taking this class, do you feel encouraged and prepared to use R for your own studies/research now?

- (01) “YES”
- (02) “No, have to read more and practice more and then go for really experimental data”
- (03) “I think I would be able to do some pretty basic things, but I would need to learn/become familiar with a lot before it was an efficient tool to use. For example, one week to learn/understand how to build functions just wasn’t enough to really feel comfortable. But I definitely feel very positive about using R and will look for ways that I can use it in my work.”
- (05) “Yes”
- (06) “Ehhh. I at least don’t see it as so foreign but I personally need a lot more work within R to feel remotely comfortable”
- (07) “Yes.”
- (08) “I am not working with data so R has very limited usage for my work right now. But I do feel encouraged and am sure it will be a benefit when I take some statistic courses in the future.”
- (09) “Feel like I have a pretty good understanding of the basics, more advanced knowledge will come with more practice.”
- (10) “I feel better prepared but not completely ready to utilize it for my work. I would like to see a statistics course in the future that exclusively uses R for the homework/etc.”

Is there something important about the course not covered by these questions?

- (01) “It would have been nice to have a full week to complete homework, since I work full time and my business varies, I would have liked to complete the HW early in the week for a few of the weeks when the end of my work week and/or weekend was hectic...”
- (02) “NO”
- (03) “FYI, some of the questions on this eval repeat.”
- (05) “No”
- (07) “No.”
- (08) “No.”

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

Title of Course: Public Policy Analysis: Assessment and Practical Wisdom

Course: L32 4043

Section: 01

Semester: Fall 2014

Instructors: Daniel Butler (Instructor), Jonathan Homola (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 5 of 15 (33%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Discussion Section (Teaching Assistant)

Overall Evaluation (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.00 Give an overall rating for the section

(S) 5.71 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 6.01 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 6.00								

6.00 Give an overall rating of the teaching effectiveness

(S) 5.62 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.84 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 6.00								

Instruction (Jonathan Homola - TA)

0 Material was presented clearly

(S) 5.78 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.91 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

0 Questions were answered clearly and concisely

(S) 5.74 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 Material was presented at an appropriate pace

(S) 5.86 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.07 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 The TA was well prepared for class

(S) 6.05 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.33 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 Class time was used well

(S) 5.77 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.07 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 The TA effectively led the class

(S) 5.74 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S) 5.97 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.21 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S) 5.98 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.20 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

Interaction with students (Jonathan Homola - TA)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

0 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.81 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.04 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

6.00 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.82 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.90 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 6.00								

0 TA was concerned for students

(S) 5.92 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.28 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.04 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.41 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

0 TA maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.07 of 15459	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.41 of 357	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)								

Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

Instructor Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

What did you like <u>most</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

03 We didn't have a subsection with TA, but whenever he spoke in class, it was extremely helpful in clarifying the subject matter.

What did you like <u>least</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?



WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

Title of Course: Introduction to Comparative Politics

Course: L32 102B

Section: 01

Semester: Spring 2015

Instructors: Brian Crisp (Instructor), Jeong Hyun Kim (TA), Jonathan Homola (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 13 of 37 (35%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Discussion Section (Teaching Assistant)

Overall Evaluation (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.38 Give an overall rating for the section

(S) 5.76 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.91 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

6.38 Give an overall rating of the teaching effectiveness

(S) 5.69 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 6.01 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

Instruction (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.14 Material was presented clearly

(S) 5.79 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.12 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	3 (23.08%)
(M) 6.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

6.33 Questions were answered clearly and concisely

(S) 5.79 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.17 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)
(M) 7.00								

6.00 Material was presented at an appropriate pace

(S) 5.86 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.23 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (30.77%)
(M) 7.00								

6.38 The TA was well prepared for class

(S) 6.05 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.24 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

6.33 Class time was used well

(S) 5.83 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.19 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)
(M) 7.00								

5.43 The TA effectively led the class

(S) 5.75 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.95 of 292	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	3 (23.08%)
(M) 6.00								

6.33 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S) 6.00 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.39 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)
(M) 7.00								

6.43 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S) 6.00 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.25 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

Interaction with students (Jonathan Homola - TA)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

5.67 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.85 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.05 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)
(M) 6.00								

6.29 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.86 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.91 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	4 (30.77%)
(M) 7.00								

6.57 TA was concerned for students

(S) 5.95 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.28 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 7.00								

6.43 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.08 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.51 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

6.43 TA maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.03 of 11619	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.47 of 292	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 7.00								

Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

02	n/a
06	No
08	No
10	Fantastic TA who is very approachable and knowledgeable, and also caring for students.

Instructor Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

What did you like <u>most</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

02	they didn't teach
----	-------------------

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

06	He presented the material in relatable ways.
07	Your combined lecture with Jeong was my favorite lecture of the whole class!
10	Confidence in teaching, calmness and ability to answer all student questions.

What did you like least about the teaching of this section by the TA?

02	they didn't teach
06	Nothing
10	N/A

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

Title of Course: Quantitative Political Methodology II

Course: L32 582

Section: 01

Semester: Fall 2015

Instructors: Jefferson Gill (Instructor), Jonathan Homola (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 8 of 12 (67%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Discussion Section (Teaching Assistant)

Overall Evaluation (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.86 Give an overall rating for the section

(S) 5.72 of 15082	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.40 of 1015	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	6 (75.00%)
(M) 7.00								

7.00 Give an overall rating of the teaching effectiveness

(S) 5.62 of 15082	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.31 of 1015	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (75.00%)
(M) 7.00								

Instruction (Jonathan Homola - TA)

7.00 Material was presented clearly

(S) 5.74 of 15077	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.38 of 1010	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (87.50%)
(M) 7.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

7.00 Questions were answered clearly and concisely

(S)	5.72 of 15076	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.51 of 1009	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (87.50%)
(M)	7.00								

7.00 Material was presented at an appropriate pace

(S)	5.89 of 15076	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.65 of 1009	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (87.50%)
(M)	7.00								

6.86 The TA was well prepared for class

(S)	6.05 of 15074	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.03 of 1007	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	6 (75.00%)
(M)	7.00								

7.00 Class time was used well

(S)	5.81 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.61 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (75.00%)
(M)	7.00								

7.00 The TA effectively led the class

(S)	5.72 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.31 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (75.00%)
(M)	7.00								

7.00 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S)	6.03 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.71 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (75.00%)
(M)	7.00								

7.00 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S)	5.96 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.56 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (75.00%)
(M)	7.00								

Interaction with students (Jonathan Homola - TA)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

7.00 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.84 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.70 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100.00%)
(M) 7.00								

7.00 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.82 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.58 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100.00%)
(M) 7.00								

7.00 TA was concerned for students

(S) 5.91 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.44 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100.00%)
(M) 7.00								

7.00 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.01 of 15070	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.84 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.88 TA maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.09 of 15068	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.80 of 1003	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	7 (87.50%)
(M) 7.00								

Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

03

Life changing

Instructor Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

What did you like <u>most</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

01

there was no section for teaching, but TA was always available for consultation on email or outside of class. He was very helpful for the course.

What did you like <u>least</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?



WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

Title of Course: Topics in Politics: Applied Statistical Programming

Course: L32 4625

Section: 01

Semester: Spring 2016

Instructors: Jacob Montgomery (Instructor), David Carlson (TA), Jonathan Homola (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 13 of 15 (87%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Discussion Section (Teaching Assistant)

Overall Evaluation (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.73 Give an overall rating for the section

(S) 5.83 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.72 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	8 (61.54%)
(M) 7.00								

6.55 Give an overall rating of the teaching effectiveness

(S) 5.73 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.48 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (38.46%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 7.00								

Instruction (Jonathan Homola - TA)

6.64 Material was presented clearly

(S) 5.88 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.64 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	2 (15.38%)	8 (61.54%)
(M) 7.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

6.80 Questions were answered clearly and concisely

(S)	5.84 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.67 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	8 (61.54%)
(M)	7.00								

6.38 Material was presented at an appropriate pace

(S)	5.93 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.89 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	3 (23.08%)	4 (30.77%)
(M)	6.50								

6.60 The TA was well prepared for class

(S)	6.15 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.29 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (30.77%)	6 (46.15%)
(M)	7.00								

6.38 Class time was used well

(S)	5.90 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.91 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	3 (23.08%)	4 (30.77%)
(M)	6.50								

6.22 The TA effectively led the class

(S)	5.82 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.53 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	1 (7.69%)	5 (38.46%)
(M)	7.00								

6.50 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S)	6.10 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.11 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)
(M)	7.00								

6.67 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S)	6.06 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.81 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	7 (53.85%)
(M)	7.00								

Interaction with students (Jonathan Homola - TA)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

6.67 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.85 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.70 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 7.00								

7.00 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.86 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.94 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (76.92%)
(M) 7.00								

6.78 TA was concerned for students

(S) 5.98 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.68 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	7 (53.85%)
(M) 7.00								

6.90 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.08 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.27 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	9 (69.23%)
(M) 7.00								

6.90 TA maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.14 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.11 of 393	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	9 (69.23%)
(M) 7.00								

Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

05

No

Instructor Short Answers (Jonathan Homola - TA)

What did you like <u>most</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

01

Lecture topic was useful and he made the material very clear (with lots of examples)

02

Jonathan is very helpful with questions and spent a lot of time outside of class helping us with our concerns and questions.

03

He was very nice when helping students through problems, and could answer most questions.

04

The pace

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/9/2017

-
- | | |
|----|--|
| 05 | Jonathan was always incredibly helpful and understanding whenever I came to him with a question |
| 10 | Jonathan gave clear explanations, was patient with me and was incredibly responsive. He responded to emails, worked patiently with me and my group, and was able to explain things in a thorough manner. |

What did you like <u>least</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

- | | |
|----|---|
| 03 | Once I emailed him with a question and he did not respond for a couple days, though he did apologize, and another student helped me clear up the problem. |
| 05 | N/A |
| 10 | Jonathan was very helpful and there is nothing I could say that was negative about his teaching. |



Instructor Report for Jonathan Homola, FL2016.L.L32.582.01 - Quantitative Political Methodology II

A&S Fall 2016 Course Evaluations

Project Audience 7

Responses Received 5

Response Ratio 71.43%

Report Comments

Welcome to your Instructor Report for WashU Course Evaluations. Below you will find response data from your specified Fall 2016 course section. Responses to personalized questions appear at the bottom of the report.

The intention of this report is to provide feedback, and also to prompt improvement in areas that may be lacking. This report is accessible to appropriate department level and school level users, as determined by your school. We appreciate your dedication to our learning community at Washington University.

If you have questions or concerns about your report, please contact evals@wustl.edu

Please Note: In order to protect student anonymity, fall and spring reports are not generated for sections with fewer than 4 respondents.


Creation Date Mon, Jan 16, 2017



TA Evaluation


Instruction (Jonathan Homola)

1. Material was presented clearly




Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A

2. Questions were answered clearly and concisely




Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.00

3. Material was presented at an appropriate pace




Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A

4. The TA was well prepared for section




Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A

5. The TA used time well



Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A


6. The TA effectively led the section



Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A


Instruction (Jonathan Homola) (continued)

7. Topics were effectively related to the course lectures



Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	N/A


8. Communicated at a level appropriate for the class




Statistics	Value
Mean	5.00
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.00

Instruction - Comparison Detail


1. Material was presented clearly




2. Questions were answered clearly and concisely




3. Material was presented at an appropriate pace




4. The TA was well prepared for section




5. The TA used time well




6. The TA effectively led the section



7. Topics were effectively related to the course lectures




8. Communicated at a level appropriate for the class




Interaction with Students (Jonathan Homola)

1. Expectations were clearly explained



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.80
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.45


2. Grading procedures were fair



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.80
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.45


3. TA was concerned for students

4. TA was available for consultation outside of




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.80
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.45

section



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.80
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.45


5. TA maintained positive environment in section




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.75
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.50

Interaction with Students - Comparison Detail


1. Expectations were clearly explained




2. Grading procedures were fair




3. TA was concerned for students



4. TA was available for consultation outside of section



5. TA maintained positive environment in section



Please provide any additional feedback on **Jonathan Homola** that was not covered by the previous questions.

Comment

Jonathan answered correspondence quickly and made sure to completely address every question asked.



A&S Spring 2017 Instructor Report for SP2017.L32.Pol Sci.555.01 - Longitudinal and Event History Models for the Social and Political Sciences (Jonathan Homola)

A&S Spring 2017 Course Evaluations

Project Audience 5

Responses Received 3

Response Ratio 60.0%

Report Comments

Welcome to your Instructor Report for WashU Course Evaluations. Below you will find response data from your specified course section. Responses to personalized questions appear at the bottom of the report.

The intention of this report is to provide feedback, and also to prompt improvement in areas that may be lacking. This report is accessible to appropriate department level and school level users, as determined by your school. We appreciate your dedication to our learning community at Washington University.

If you have questions or concerns about your report, please contact evals@wustl.edu

Reports will not be generated for course sections with no responses.

Creation Date Fri, Jun 02, 2017



Subsection Evaluation

Past research shows that the students' answers to any one question can be noisy, more prone to biases, and provide less useful data for evaluating courses and instructors. Since interpreting individual questions, including their relative highs and lows, can easily lead to inaccurate conclusions due to low reliability, individual question responses are not available in any standard report.

However, combining students' responses to several questions aimed at measuring the same underlying attribute can improve the quality of the measures. Therefore, the statistics displayed for each attribute (mean, median, mode, and standard deviation) are calculated from the grouped responses to all the questions in each topical block.

The varied rating scale responses are statistically reliable as individual questions.


TA Evaluation

Instruction


Question	Score			
	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Material was presented clearly	5.00	5.00	2	0.00
Questions were answered clearly and concisely	5.00	5.00	2	0.00
Material was presented at an appropriate pace	4.50	4.50	2	0.71
The TA was well prepared for section	5.00	5.00	2	0.00
The TA used time well	4.50	4.50	2	0.71
The TA effectively led the section	5.00	5.00	2	0.00
Topics were effectively related to the course lectures	5.00	5.00	2	0.00
Communicated at a level appropriate for the class	5.00	5.00	2	0.00

Instruction - Breakdown by Frequency


1. Material was presented clearly




2. Questions were answered clearly and concisely




3. Material was presented at an appropriate pace




4. The TA was well prepared for section




5. The TA used time well




6. The TA effectively led the section



7. Topics were effectively related to the course lectures




8. Communicated at a level appropriate for the class




Instruction - Comparison Detail


1. Material was presented clearly




2. Questions were answered clearly and concisely




3. Material was presented at an appropriate pace




4. The TA was well prepared for section




5. The TA used time well




6. The TA effectively led the section



7. Topics were effectively related to the course lectures



8. Communicated at a level appropriate for the class




Interaction with Students


Question	Score			
	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Expectations were clearly explained	4.33	4.00	3	0.58
Grading procedures were fair	5.00	5.00	3	0.00
TA was concerned for students	5.00	5.00	3	0.00
TA was available for consultation outside of section	5.00	5.00	3	0.00
TA maintained positive environment in section	5.00	5.00	2	0.00

Interaction with Students - Breakdown by Frequency


1. Expectations were clearly explained




2. Grading procedures were fair




3. TA was concerned for students



4. TA was available for consultation outside of section




5. TA maintained positive environment in section




Interaction with Students - Comparison Detail


1. Expectations were clearly explained




2. Grading procedures were fair




3. TA was concerned for students



4. TA was available for consultation outside of section



5. TA maintained positive environment in section



Please provide any additional feedback on **Jonathan Homola** that was not covered by the previous questions.

Comments

Jonathan is a great TA. He was always willing to help talk through and brainstorm solutions for issues with our individual research projects, even if that required him doing some research and getting back to us.