Course:

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

Instructor: Mark White *

1 - What is your degree	objective	?									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means	
M.A.			(1)	21	87.5%						
M.I.P.P.			(2)	3	12.5%						
M.I.E.F.			(3)	0	0%						
Ph.D.			(4)	0	0%						
Non-degree			(5)	0	0%						
						0 2	25 50) 75	100		
Return Rate											
24/31 (77.42%)											

2 - If you are a SAIS d	egree stude	ent, does	this cours	e:								
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means	;	
Fulfill a concentration re	equirements		(1)	9	39.13%							
Serve as an elective			(2)	14	60.87%							
						0 2	25 50) 75	100			
Return Rate												
23/31 (74.19%)												

3 - How many classes	have you r	nissed, re	gardless	of the reason	?						
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means	
0			(1)	12	50%						
1			(2)	10	41.67%						
2			(3)	2	8.33%						
3			(4)	0	0%						
4 or more			(5)	0	0%						
						0	25 5	0 75	100		
Return Rate											
24/31 (77.42%)											

4 - Have you participated actively in class? **Response Option** Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means 33.33% Regularly (1) 8 Sometimes (2) 9 37.5% Rarely (3) 7 29.17% Never (4) 0 0% 100 25 50 75 0 Return Rate 24/31 (77.42%)

5 - The size of this cla	ss is:									
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Responses		Means	
Appropriate for the subj	ect matter	(1)	21	87.5%						
Too small		(2)	0	0%						
Too large		(3)	3	12.5%						
					0	25 5	0 75	100		
Return Rate										
24/31 (77.42%)										

Course:

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

Instructor: Mark White *

6 - Approximately hov	v many hou	rs have y	ou spent s	studying or p	reparing for	this class	in a typi	cal week?			
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means	
More than 10			(1)	9	37.5%						
8-10			(2)	11	45.83%						
5-7			(3)	4	16.67%						
2-4			(4)	0	0%						
Fewer than 2			(5)	0	0%						
						0 2	25 50) 75	100		
Return Rate											
24/31 (77.42%)											

7 - Approximately hov	v much of t	he homev	vork, readi	ngs, and ass	ignments h	ave you co	ompleted	for this cou	ırse?		
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means	
All			(1)	16	66.67%						
Most			(2)	8	33.33%						
Some			(3)	0	0%						
Not Very Much			(4)	0	0%						
						0	25 50) 75	100		
Return Rate											
24/31 (77.42%)											

8 - The learning objec	tives and th	ne require	ments of t	he course we	ere clearly s	tated.							
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Respons	ses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	17	70.83%						4.67		
Agree			(4)	6	25%								
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%	1							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%	1							
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.67	0.56	5.00										

9 - The methods used	(lectures, g	group woi	k, discuss	sions, etc.) w	ere effective	e at delive	ring cou	se coi	ntent.					
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Respo	onses			Means		
Strongly Agree			(5)	14	58.33%						4.54			
Agree			(4)	9	37.5%									
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%									
Disagree			(2)	0	0%									
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%									
N/A			(0)	0	0%									
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median											
24/31 (77.42%)	4.54	0.59	5.00											

Course: Instructor:

Mark White *

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

10 - The Blackboard r	esources (i	ncluding	Course Re	adings) were	accessible	and eas	y to use	э.					
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Perce	nt Re	esponses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	17	70.83%						4.67		
Agree			(4)	6	25%								
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%	7							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%	1							
N/A			(0)	0	0%	1							
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.67	0.56	5.00										

11 - The multimedia and classroom technology resources (other than Blackboard) that were used were appropriate for this class.

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	;	
Strongly Agree			(5)	17	70.83%					4.71			
Agree			(4)	7	29.17%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0 2	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.71	0.46	5.00										

12 - The amount of as	signed wor	k (reading	gs, problei	m sets, proje	cts, papers,	quizzes, t	ests and	exams) v	vas	reason	able.		
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	l	Percent F	Response	es			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	14	58.33%						4.42		
Agree			(4)	6	25%								
Neutral			(3)	4	16.67%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0 2	25 5	0 75	5	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.42	0.78	5.00										

13 - The other studen	ts in the co	ourse conti	ributed po	sitively to my	/ learning ex	operienc	e.						
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percen	t Res	ponses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	10	41.67%						4.17		
Agree			(4)	10	41.67%								
Neutral			(3)	3	12.5%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	1	4.17%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.17	0.96	4.00										

Course:

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

. . . .

Instructor: Mark White *

14 - This course enha	nced my un	derstand	ing of the	subject matte	ər.							
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	18	75%					4.71		
Agree			(4)	5	20.83%							
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
24/31 (77.42%)	4.71	0.55	5.00									

15 - Wy overall evaluation	on or the c	course is	positive.									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	20	83.33%					4.79		
Agree			(4)	3	12.5%							
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%	1						
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%	1						
N/A			(0)	0	0%	1						
						0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median							•		
24/31 (77.42%)	4.79	0.51	5.00									

16 - Please add any other comments to explain your ratings or to elaborate further on any aspect of the course.

· Great class, but sometimes too many handouts?

• This course is great for anybody who likes a good challenge and wants to get a better grasp of risk modelling and excel through learning by doing. Since the coursework is mostly based on the students' own model, how much you benefit from the class really depends on how much you put into it.

• This is a very useful course, especially if you are in an interview and you are asked about the proudest work. At first, I had no idea what to do, but gradually with the help of professor White and the two TAs, I could develop my own model. It is rewarding at the end to see your final product.

• The sample problems were great, and, given the number of weeks without assignments, I think additional, shorter, examples testing different concepts could have included (probably not more than 2 more, however). They might test different model structures, distributions, etc.

• This is without a doubt the hardest class I've taken at SAIS, but also the most rewarding. The learning curve was very steep but I made it to the end of the semester with a model I was very proud of. I liked the way the class is set up - with sample models to help students figure out what each step of the modeling process is supposed to look like before they apply it to their own models, but it does make for a very heavy workload. As everyone will tell you, the quality of your model at the end of the semester will be directly related to how much time you have to spend on it and I know I wish I had taken on Risk when I had a less busy schedule. That said, I cannot recommend this course enough - just make sure you know how to use Excel before you come into the class, and that you otherwise have a manageable work load because this class is a ton of work.

• Excellent course, my only suggestion would be that the Monte Carlo test model could have focused more on random walks instead of sampling.

• If you want to score well, you have to go to talk with the professor and TA a lot, asking for guidance. You have to wait in line for a long time and get a 10mins guidance. It is not fair for students who cannot make it.

• This is a very challenging class, but rewarding class. At the end, it depends on the amount of effort you put into it. You will work on the same model throughout the semester - I thought the most challenging part was starting it. The lectures were good, but you won't really understand the material until you have to apply it to your own model. You won't realize how much you understand until the course is done. I highly recommend going to the TA's office hours and Professor White's office hours for help. They were the reason I made it through the course and understood what I needed to do on my model.

• This course is very interesting and really helped me get a better handle on building a model, becoming very comfortable with excel formulas I used to think were difficult, and thinking about risk in a holistic manner. The course is a lot of work, but worth the effort. You can get a lot out of it if you devote the time to it. The skills I learned I hope to apply to a job in the future.

• One of the most challenging and rewarding classes at SAIS. It really helped me better understand how professionals would approach model development and the steps needed to create a functional, versatile model. Wouldn't recommend taking while working. A possible way to make the course even stronger would be to make the monte carlo portion be submitted in stages. I don't think I fully understood the utility of the different distributions and how to correctly incorporate them into the model, having students submit their distributions and reasoning for why they chose particular ones would be beneficial in strengthening our knowledge of the scenarios in which one distribution is used versus another.

Course: Instructor: SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling Mark White *

17 - The instructor wa	s consister	ntly well p	repared fo	or class.										
Mark White														
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percen	t Res	ponses			Means	;	
Strongly Agree			(5)	19	79.17%						4.79			
Agree			(4)	5	20.83%									
Neutral			(3)	0	0%									
Disagree			(2)	0	0%									
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%									
N/A			(0)	0	0%									
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median											
24/31 (77.42%)	4.79	0.41	5.00											

18 - The instructor est	tablished hi	gh stand	ards, chall	lenged me, ar	d encourag	ed me to	do my be	st work					
Mark White													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent I	Respons	ses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	21	87.5%						4.79		
Agree			(4)	2	8.33%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree			(2)	1	4.17%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25 5	0	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.79	0.66	5.00										

19 - When appropriate	e, the instru	uctor en	couraged ac	ctive participa	tion in clas	s.						
Mark White												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Responses	;		Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	18	75%					4.71		
Agree			(4)	5	20.83%							
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25	50 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
24/31 (77.42%)	4.71	0.55	5.00									

Course: Instructor: SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling Mark White *

nner of de	elivery cle	early was e	effective at de	livering cou	urse conte	ent.						
		Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponse	s		Means		
		(5)	17	70.83%					4.71			
		(4)	7	29.17%								
		(3)	0	0%								
		(2)	0	0%								
		(1)	0	0%								
		(0)	0	0%								
					0	25 50	75	100	Instructor			
Mean	STD	Median										
4.71	0.46	5.00										
	Mean 4.71	Mean STD 4.71 0.46	Weight (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0) Mean STD Median 4.71 0.46 5.00	Weight Frequency (5) 17 (4) 7 (3) 0 (2) 0 (1) 0 (0) 0 Mean STD 4.71 0.46	Weight Frequency Percent (5) 17 70.83% (4) 7 29.17% (3) 0 0% (2) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (4) 7 29.17% (3) 0 0% (2) 0 0% (2) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (4) 5.00 U	Weight Frequency Percent (5) 17 70.83% (4) 7 29.17% (3) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (2) 0 0% (1) 0 0% The second	Weight Frequency Percent Percent R (5) 17 70.83%	Weight Frequency Percent Percent Response (5) 17 70.83%	weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses (5) 17 70.83% (4) 7 29.17% (3) 0 0% (2) 0 0% (1) 0 0% (0) 0 0% The second sec	weight Frequency Percent Responses (5) 17 70.83% 4.71 (4) 7 29.17% 4.71 (3) 0 0% 4.71 (1) 0 0% 50 75 100 Instructor Mean STD Median	Nner of delivery clearly was effective at delivering course content. Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means (5) 17 70.83% 4.71 4.71 (4) 7 29.17% 4.71 4.71 4.71 (3) 0 0% 4.71 4.71 4.71 (1) 0 0% 4.71 4.71 4.71 (1) 0 0% 4.75 100 Instructor (1) 0 0% 100 100 100 100 0.0 0% 0 0% 100 Instructor 100 Mean STD Median Image: State	Nmer of delivery clearly was effective at delivering course content. Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means (5) 17 70.83% 4.71 4.71 (4) 7 29.17% 4.71 4.71 (3) 0 0% 6 6 (2) 0 0% 6 6 (1) 0 0% 6 6 Mean STD Median C 25 50 75 100 Instructor 1 4.71 0.46 5.00 - - - 1 0 0

21 - The grading syste	em was clea	arly state	d and fairly	y applied (cor	sider assig	nments,	papers, c	quizze	s, tests	, and ex	ams).		
Mark White													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Resp	onses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	15	62.5%						4.38		
Agree			(4)	6	25%								
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%								
Disagree			(2)	1	4.17%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	1	4.17%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	4.38	1.06	5.00										

22 - The instructor provided timely and constructive feedback on assignments. Mark White Means **Response Option** Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Strongly Agree (5) 19 79.17% 4.71 Agree (4) 4 16.67% Neutral 0 0% (3) Disagree (2) 1 4.17% Strongly Disagree 0 0% (1) N/A (0) 0 0% 0 25 50 75 100 Instructor STD Return Rate Mean Median 24/31 (77.42%) 4.71 0.69 5.00

Course:

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

Instructor: Mark White *

23 - The instructor ob	served the	scheduled	d class tim	ies.									
Mark White													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percen	t Resp	oonses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	19	82.61%						4.78		
Agree			(4)	3	13.04%								
Neutral			(3)	1	4.35%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
				-		0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
23/31 (74.19%)	4.78	0.52	5.00										

24 - The instructor wa	s available	and prov	ided the a	ssistance I ne	eded to su	cceed in t	he course	.				
Mark White												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent I	Responses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	20	83.33%					4.75		
Agree			(4)	2	8.33%							
Neutral			(3)	2	8.33%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%	1						
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
24/31 (77.42%)	4.75	0.61	5.00									

25 - My overall evalua	tion of the	instructor	' is positiv	e.								
Mark White												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	21	87.5%					4.83		
Agree			(4)	2	8.33%							
Neutral			(3)	1	4.17%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 50) 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
24/31 (77.42%)	4.83	0.48	5.00									

Course:

Instructor: Mark White *

SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling

26 - Please provide any additional comments that would be helpful regarding your instructor.

Mark White

• Professor White is extremely helpful and spent a lot of time advising us on our modelling strategies. His feedback encouraged me to try new approaches to my model and really push myself. While this led to some stressful days (and nights) prior to deadlines, I am very proud of the final result.

• Prof. White's Risk Analysis class is the best class and the most rewarding experience I have had at SAIS up until now. By far the most supportive professor I have ever experienced. The only criticism I have is that instead of hearing the students out sometimes he just cuts them off before the whole issue has been stated and starts answering questions that were not necessarily asked or going to be asked. Anyhow, he is second to none!

· Professor White is very well organized, and his feedback is very constructive and clear

• Dr. White is great. Clear he loves the subject matter.

• Professor White is the best quantitative professor at SAIS, in my experience. He explains concepts very well in class, and especially in Risk, is always excited about things and concepts that can otherwise seem dry. Prof. White is always available and very approachable for office hours, and his grading is tough, but fair.

• In the early stage of the class the blog assignments felt a bit forced. This felt like busy work and could be dropped or made more substantial.

• Professor White is amazing. I highly recommend taking a class with him. He really cares about all of his students and wants us to succeed. He has so many office hours (although they are constantly packed). He is so knowledgeable about the subject and it is amazing how he can advise people working on models across a broad range of subjects. I really enjoyed having him as a professor and would recommend taking this class with him.

• Professor White is a fantastic professor. He puts a lot of time into the class and holds a lot of office hours. I would not have been able to get through the course without the feedback he provides in office hours. He puts a lot of thought and and provides a lot of direction for everyone's models, which are all very different. He challenges students to make their models more sophisticated, and gives students the tools to get it done.

• Professor White was endlessly helpful and I cannot thank him enough for his patience and assistance in the project. He makes time for everyone in the run-up to model submissions and is willing to not only help you debug the model but also help explain the underlying motivation for using one formula or technique over others. I do wish there was more clarity in terms of the final grade distribution, I never felt like I really knew where I stood in the class on a letter-grade scale

27 - TA SectionWas th	ere one or	more TA	for this co	urse?									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Perc	ent R	esponses			Means	
Yes			(1)	23	95.83%								
No			(2)	1	4.17%						1.04		
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
24/31 (77.42%)	1.04	0.20	1.00										

28 - The TA review se	ssions were	ere helpful.										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Responses			Means	
Strongly Agree			(5)	15	65.22%					4.61		
Agree			(4)	7	30.43%							
Neutral			(3)	1	4.35%							
Disagree			(2)	0	0%							
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%							
						0	25	50 75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
23/31 (74.19%)	4.61	0.58	5.00									

29 - The TA was available for office hours

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Means	eans				
Strongly Agree			(5)	17	77.27%					4.73			
Agree			(4)	4	18.18%								
Neutral			(3)	1	4.55%								
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median										
22/31 (70.97%)	4.73	0.55	5.00										

Course: Instructor: SA.340.713.01.FA17: Risk Analysis and Modeling Mark White *

30 - The TA attended class sessions and/or was aware of what materials had been covered in lectures.														
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent I	Response	5		Means			
Strongly Agree				(5)	19	82.61%					4.78			
Agree				(4)	3	13.04%								
Neutral				(3)	1	4.35%								
Disagree				(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree				(1)	0	0%								
							0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	ean S	rd	Median										
23/31 (74.19%)	4.78	.78 0	52	5.00										

31 - The TA clearly and constructively explained concepts.															
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Re	sponses						
Strongly Agree			(5)	15	68.18%						4.64				
Agree			(4)	6	27.27%										
Neutral			(3)	1	4.55%										
Disagree			(2)	0	0%										
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%										
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor				
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median												
22/31 (70.97%)	4.64	0.58	5.00												

32 - My overall evaluation of the TA is positive.															
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Response	s						
Strongly Agree			(5)	17	77.27%						4.73				
Agree			(4)	4	18.18%										
Neutral			(3)	1	4.55%										
Disagree			(2)	0	0%										
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%										
						0	25	50 75		100	Instructor				
Return Rate	Mean	n STD	Median												
22/31 (70.97%)	4.73	0.55	5.00												

33 - Please add any other comments regarding your TA(s). If this course has more than one TA, please list the name of the TA for whom you wish to provide specific feedback.

• The TA sessions were a very helpful introduction to the basics of excel and risk models. More importantly, the TAs took a lot of time to help us build our individual models, especially in the last week before the final models were due. They helped me debug my functions and I could not have built a successful model without them.

• Both the TAs for this class were crucial to succeeding at the class. I cannot thank them enough for all of the help that they provided, during office hours, TA sessions and even outside of these hours. Any student having TAs like this can consider him- or herself lucky!

• TA's were consistently available. I just did not avail myself of their assistance.

• I would not have made it through this course to the end of my model without the TAs. Jim in particular was able to help me through every math/formula problem I ran into in excel, and the TA sessions taught me every excel skill I now have, as I basically only knew how to add a column before taking this class (not recommended). The TAs held tons of extra office hours for each model phase deadline, especially the final monte carlo model, which we all desperately needed (as evidenced by the 5-10 people at every office hour session). Huge thank you to these fantastic TAs.

• There tends to be a clump of people during TA office hours, which makes it difficult for everyone to get exposure. Perhaps consider giving students an allotted amount of time before they have to step aside at let others have a chance to interact with the TA. This might make your time less monopolized by an aggressive few.

• I have not been in a class where the TAs took so much extra time to help students with their projects. These TAs truly went above and beyond their duties this semester. Getting through the course would have been much different without them.

• Jim and Courtney were amazing! I would not have gotten through this class without their help. They were very available and remained positive throughout this entire experience. They were very effective in helping a class-full of stressed students on their models. Overall, I am very thankful for their help and for making the experience more enjoyable.

• The TAs for this course were both fantastic. They were available for so many extra hours to help the students finish their project deliverables, I can't believe how much time and effort they put into this course. I truly would not have been able to do the projects without them.