

Elizabeth Stuart  
Teaching Evaluations

This document summarizes my teaching evaluations for nearly all of the Harvard courses for which I have been a teaching fellow. Unfortunately I never received evaluations for the one remaining course, Stat 102 (Introduction to Biostatistics).

These evaluations were done anonymously by all students at the end of each semester, through the Committee for Undergraduate Education. The following is a complete list of comments I received on the above mentioned evaluations, followed by a numerical summary of the evaluations. Original copies also available by request.

**Quantitative Reasoning 33: Causal Inference (Spring 2004). With Professor Donald Rubin.**

“A very good TF. Better at articulating the concepts than Professor Rubin. I hope she eventually goes into teaching as a profession.”

“Liz is incredibly smart and kind—very good with feedback.”

“Perfect TF. Sections were extremely useful, even critical, to clarify Professor Rubin's sometimes wandering lectures.”

“Very friendly and helpful, but too tough of a grader.”

“Friendly, receptive, genuine.”

“Elizabeth was an excellent TF! She was extremely effective at clarifying unclear ideas, and was also very friendly and approachable.”

“Good TF in a bad, bad class. Sections much clearer, more organized than lecture.”

“Excellent. Gave better explanations than Prof. Rubin. Enthusiastic. Encouraging.”

“Elizabeth was great! Sections were extremely important in clarifying lectures and providing examples we worked through together.”

“Liz led great sections—informative and clear. Gave great summarizes of the week's lectures. Sections were very helpful—could always use more handouts, but otherwise great.”

“Liz was good about using examples to show applications.”

“Liz deserves her row of 5's—she just makes herself very available to questions, and is able to clearly present material that Prof. Rubin sometimes makes convoluted.”

**Quantitative Reasoning 33: Causal Inference (Spring 2003). With Professor Donald Rubin.**

“Sections were very helpful in digesting material presented in lectures. Also good for problem sets and understanding course work. Liz was AMAZING-v. good grasp of material; able to teach effectively.”

“Liz was very good. She reviewed the material clearly and addressed relevant issues that were not clear in lecture.”

“Liz was the best TF I’ve ever had. She was a really effective teacher and also answered emails really promptly. Not to mention she was really fun on top of smart!”

“Very helpful and understanding—clearly knew subject very well. Was able to make all students understand. Sections useful to understanding concepts that were unclear in lecture.”

“Liz’s presentations were always clear and helpful. She seemed less hung up on what the course wasn’t and was able to focus on what it was supposed to be. Sections were very useful in clarifying confusing lectures.”

**Quantitative Reasoning 33: Causal Inference (Spring 2002). With Professor Donald Rubin.**

“They [Liz and other TF, Sam Cook] were very attentive. Great at email responses!”

“Thanks for the brownies! Sections are very useful.”

“Excellent at pinpointing and clarifying what we need to know and answering questions. Very open, helpful.”

“Clear sessions were useful supplement to lectures. Sections worked best when going through specific examples in addition to going over homework or tests.”

**Statistics 214: Causal Inference (Fall 2002). With Professor Donald Rubin.**

“Was the best section leader I’ve had in over two years (maybe ever). Sections were very well structured and helped not only with the problem sets but with overall understanding.”

“Boring.”

“Good! Sections were somewhat helpful.”

“Very helpful and dedicated.”

“Very nice balance to the lectures, for example in discussing methods of computation.”

“Helped a lot with the applications of what we learned in lecture. Sections were pertinent to completing problem sets.”

“Very ambitious.”

“Good!”

“Liz was awesome. Sections very useful to understanding material as for help with problem sets. Sections valuable for practical application of material.”

“Excellent. Sections very helpful.”

“Liz was great! And very helpful!”

“Liz was the best TF I’ve had in years. Thank you.”

“Sections were critical to completing assignments.”

“Sections help with assignment. Very important.”

**Statistics 214: Causal Inference (Fall 2001). With Professor Donald Rubin.**

“Liz Stuart is amazing. I could stare at a problem set for 7 hours and not know what the hell was going on. 15 minutes with Liz and I would be completely enlightened.”

“Sections were particularly helpful when structured around upcoming problem sets.”

“Sections were great! Extremely useful and helpful. Great contribution!”

“Excellent TF. Sections extremely helpful, particularly for doing homework.”

“Liz was extremely helpful both in section and in problem solving outside class.”

“She was very helpful outside of class and available for assistance. She was very familiar with the material.”

“A friendly section leader, she helped students through the problem sets.”

**Statistics 101: Intro. To Quantitative Reasoning (Fall 2000). With Professor Steve Wang.**

“I only attended section to pick up homework and leave. Lectures were good enough that section was unnecessary (and I didn’t want to sit through people asking questions I knew). Liz was very nice and helpful and even learned my name despite my non-attendance. She seemed very approachable and good for answering questions.”

“Sections were helpful for practice problems. Liz is a good section leader. Sections very effective when she started doing practice problems.”

“Strengths—went over difficult concepts and gave practice problems. Weakness—sometimes a bit simplistic, esp. at the beginning of the term. Liz was great—very approachable and knew the material well.”

“Sections were helpful in clarifying any confusion on problem sets or mid-terms. She was very helpful in doing practice problems—good leader.”

“Sections weren’t terribly useful, more as a function of lectures being extraordinarily clear than of sections being poorly planned or run. Liz was great. She was approachable, answered questions well, and presented examples and problems well.”

“Sections were most useful if you had specific questions on the material. Otherwise they could be unnecessary. Liz knew the material well and was very good at explaining sample problems. She was a little less effective in the more abstract questions.”

**Statistics 104: Intro. to Quantitative Reasoning (Fall 1999). With Professor Mayumi Morimoto.**

“Since they [sections] weren’t mandatory, I usually didn’t go, so I don’t feel I can really evaluate them. [Liz] seemed friendly and accessible.”

“[Sections] useful, but course too easy to have to make use of them. [Liz] should have taught the course.”

“Liz was very accessible. Both [Liz and Nondas Sourlas] gave excellent pre-exam section prep.”

“Section helpful if needed and a good review of course material. [Liz] very organized and great overall.”

## Numerical Summary

This table summarizes the numerical evaluations. All numbers are out of a 5 point scale, with 1 indicating “Very poor/Very low” and 5 indicating “Outstanding/Very high.”

	QR 33 (2004)	QR 33 (2003)	QR 33 (2002)	Stat 214 (2002)	Stat 214 (2001)	Stat 101 (2000)	Stat 104 (1999)
Was effective overall	4.77	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.79	4.60	4.25
Had good understanding of the subject matter	4.92	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.67	4.80	4.63
Gave clear, well structured presentations	4.69	4.83	4.80	4.42	4.43	5.00	4.43
Used blackboards, visual aids, handouts and problem set keys well	4.69	4.83	4.80	4.35	4.21	4.40	4.57
Assignments and/or problem sets returned promptly	4.92	4.83	5.00	4.40	4.67	N/A	N/A
Was able to guide discussions and keep them moving	4.42	4.80	4.80	4.06	4.46	4.25	4.17
Answered questions well	4.69	4.83	5.00	4.25	4.53	4.60	4.38
Encouraged participation	4.31	5.00	4.80	3.94	4.62	4.50	4.43
Was receptive to answering questions outside of class	4.75	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.64	5.00	4.71