1. Please comment on the individual instructors with regard to effectiveness and attitude toward students:

**Strengths**

- Ran has a great attitude towards students: it is clear that he cares, he learned all of our names, he makes himself accessible, and offers constructive feedback.
- Instructor really cares about helping students to develop research and presentation skills—preparing all of us for higher-level Ph.D. work
- Excellent and effective communicator. Did a great job giving us a broad picture of various topics in economic history. Enjoyed the interactive format. Compared to other courses, I think Ran did an excellent job of fostering a collaborative, highly discussion-based environment where people felt comfortable volunteering their ideas and comments.
- Ran obviously cared a lot about this class and I think that really made a difference. You could tell he wasn’t teaching this out of obligation but was rather very excited about the material and whether the students were engaged with it. Particularly for a history class that many take as a requirement, this was great. Ran’s attitude made this my favorite class I’ve had as a PhD student. I also really appreciate how willing he is to listen to research ideas. If I have an idea now, even if it’s not about history, he would be one of the first people I’d check with. Also, he was very encouraging. Some of us are developing research proposals for the first time and when things don’t look as easy as expected, we may be likely to get discouraged. Ran did a great job in motivating us to keep going and think of ways around problems.
- Very good lecturer. Prepared interesting material, and tried very hard to engage the students.

**Suggestions for Improvement**

- Could be more explicit about connecting topics throughout the course or giving an overall picture of the course content. (Or perhaps just reminding us of it at various points throughout the course)

2. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses, if any, of the textbook(s) and reading(s). What materials were most and least valuable? Why?

**Strengths**

- By having us read one paper/class (rather then multiples) allows us to really focus and get the most out of that particular paper.
- I enjoyed the selection of readings.
- I thought the readings were very well-chosen and diverse. There were readings to appeal to the micro and macro people.

**Suggestions for Improvement**

- I didn’t get anything out of doing readings and then seeing the same papers presented by students; I found it frustrating that we couldn’t arrange the time so we could learn more.
- None

3. Please comment on assignments and exams (difficulty, length, frequency, usefulness, and their success at testing conceptual understanding rather than recall):

**Strengths**

- Felt that creating slides for every paper was very useful for making sure we had read and thought about each paper. Research proposal and paper presentation were also helpful.
- I think that the 3 slides per paper were very effective in making sure everyone read the paper carefully. While at the time they may seem annoying, I was usually grateful that I had done the slides because I got a lot more out of the papers as a result.
- I liked the format of the proposals (presentations only)
Suggestions for Improvement

- None
- After the mid-quarter evaluations Ran mentioned that he might make the presentations more discussion-based since everyone had already read the paper before class. I think this is a good idea.

4. Do you have any additional comments on the course over-all?

Strengths

- Very well taught. The course structure is very organized. We learn to develop many important skills such as participating in discussion and taking a role of the presenter. I really appreciate all of these aspects and would like the instructor to retain the current format of the course.
- I thought the course was very well structured and covered a lot of interesting topics.

Suggestions for Improvement

- This isn't really a suggestion for improvement, but I wanted to mention one thing. This year we had a lot of third years in the class which actually really helped at the beginning because we second years could learn from them about identifying key issues in a paper (something we didn't have much experience with). But I felt like at the end of the class when we had paper proposals, the third years were often presenting whatever they had just presented in the third-year seminar (I could be wrong) and so half the class had already seen the presentation. I'm not sure if this detracted from discussion, but at times it felt a little odd. I'm not sure how to change this though. I think it's really nice that Ran encourages everyone to present something they're interested in and there's no point in coming up with a proposal just to fulfill a requirement.