

[MIT Online Subject Evaluation](#) | [Guide to Reports](#)

Change report view: Vives, Jaume

14.385 Nonlinear Econometric Analysis

Survey Window: Fall 2022 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: 14.385 Nonlinear Econometric Analysis - Lecture L01, Recitation R01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: 19 **Total # of Respondents:** 13 **Response rate:** 68% **Overall rating of subject:** 6.1 out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

Quality of Teaching	<i>1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>			<i>1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>	
	Stimulated interest	Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Helped me learn	Overall rating	
Kasy, Maximilian , Instructor (LEC)	5.7 (12)	6.7 (12)	6.0 (12)	5.9 (12)	
Newey, Whitney K. , Instructor (LEC)	5.9 (12)	6.6 (12)	6.0 (12)	6.2 (12)	
Vives, Jaume , Recitation Instructor (REC)	6.5 (6)	7.0 (6)	6.8 (6)	6.7 (6)	

Vives, Jaume, Recitation Instructor in Recitation R01 - Overall rating: 6.7

Quality of Teaching

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Stimulated interest	6.5								6	7.0	0.84
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7.0								6	7.0	0.0
Helped me learn	6.8								6	7.0	0.41

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating	6.7								6	7.0	0.52

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 3687](#) - Enjoyed candidness in recitations :) Would be nice to post more code examples (I can do the psets in R but they look ugly :(and I would like to have nicer code)

[Student 47726](#) - We haven't had feedback on any of our problem sets all term! It always makes me anxious when I have no idea whether I'm passing.

[Student 54208](#) - Great!

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

SUBJECT	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Subject expectations were clearly defined	6.6								12	7.0	0.67
Subject's learning objectives were met	6.1								12	6.0	1.0
Assignments contributed to my learning	6.1								11	6.0	0.94
Grading thus far has been fair	6.1								7	7.0	1.21

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4.5								12	4.0	1.0

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Average hours you spent per week on this subject in the classroom	3.6	11	3.0	1.12
Average hours you spent per week on this subject outside of the classroom	5.5	11	4.0	2.62

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

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating of the subject	6.1								11	7.0	1.14

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 3687](#) - The class was too fast on some lectures (the new content) and then too slow on others (content that we had largely covered already in previous classes). It would be nice to rebalance the material. Also more motivating examples for applied folks would be helpful.

[Student 36443](#) - I think the empirical components of problem sets were helpful, although I would've definitely enjoyed them more if there were less start-up cost to each (and some of the data was a little bit more formatted, etc.) Of course, this is a part of data work, but less logistical troubles might've made the econometric focus clearer.

[Student 47726](#) - I found the entire econometrics sequence very unsatisfying and I feel like I know less econometrics than when I started this PhD.

Show/Hide Comments

[\(top of page\)](#)