Seminar Assessment Report	ECO-CO-MICRO1

Title:	Microeconomics 1
Professor(s):	Prof. Laurent MATHEVET Laurent Mathevet
Teaching Assistant(s):	M. Blanco; G. Dannay

Department:	ECO	**Participants:**	36
Term:	BLOCK 1	**Forms returned:**	36
Year	2022 - 2023	**Return:**	100%

	Answers	**%**	

Q1. In overall terms I am satisfied with the seminar/course

		Answers	%
5	Very much	1	2.78%
4	Considerably	8	22.22%
3	Average	16	44.44%
2	Not very much	5	13.89%
1	Not at all	5	13.89%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q2. The seminar was well organised and well prepared.

		Answers	%
5	Very much	2	5.56%
4	Considerably	5	13.89%
3	Average	20	55.56%
2	Not Very much	6	16.67%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q3. The professor was clear in her/his presentations and explanations.

		Answers	%
5	Very much	2	5.56%
4	Considerably	7	19.44%
3	Average	13	36.11%
2	Not very much	9	25.00%
1	Not at all	3	8.33%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q4. The professor teaches with interest and enthusiasm.

5	Very much	9	25.00%
4	Considerably	16	44.44%
3	Average	7	19.44%
2	Not very much	2	5.56%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q5. Where appropriate, the professor encourages class participation.

5	Very much	7	19.44%
4	Considerably	12	33.33%
3	Average	9	25.00%
2	Not Very much	4	11.11%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No Answer	3	8.33%

Q6. The professor was available and approachable outside seminar hours.

5	Very much	17	47.22%
4	Considerably	10	27.78%
3	Average	3	8.33%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	6	16.67%

Q7. The overall themes of the course/seminar were developed in a coherent manner.

5	Very much	6	16.67%
4	Considerably	9	25.00%
3	Average	12	33.33%
2	Not very much	3	8.33%
1	Not at all	4	11.11%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q8. Recommended lectures, articles and books have been useful and sufficient.

5	Very much	12	33.33%
4	Considerably	9	25.00%
3	Average	9	25.00%
2	Not very much	2	5.56%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	4	11.11%

Q9. After taking this course/seminar my interest in the given subject has increased.

5	Very much	2	5.56%
4	Considerably	4	11.11%
3	Average	13	36.11%
2	Not very much	6	16.67%
1	Not at all	9	25.00%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q10. Indicate the percentage of sessions you attended for the course/seminar

1	Between 80% & 100%	29	80.56%
2	Between 50% & 80%	4	11.11%
3	Less than 50%	3	8.33%
	NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q11. What was the main reason you chose the course/seminar?

5	Personal interest	0	0.00%
4	Thesis related	0	0.00%
3	Supervisor's suggestion	0	0.00%
2	Compulsory	36	100.00%
1	Other	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q11. For question 11, if answer is 'Other', please give a reason

Q12. What were the course/seminar requirements?

5	Oral presentation	0	0.00%
4	Written exam	36	100.00%
3	Essay	0	0.00%
2	Written comments on seminar reading or other writing duties	0	0.00%
1	Participation in discussion or no specific requirements	0	0.00%
	N/A - fulfilled requirements in other seminars	0	0.00%

Title: Microeconomics 1
By: Prof. Laurent MATHEVET Laurent Mathevet

Q13. To what extent does this course/seminar overlap (in terms of content) with others?

5	Very much	2	5.56%
4	Considerably	8	22.22%
3	Average	3	8.33%
2	Not very much	6	16.67%
1	Not at all	14	38.89%
	NA / No answer	3	8.33%

Which courses overlapped with this course/seminar?

Response: Mathematics
Response: I do not know yet
Response: Mathematics
Response: N/A
Response: Some math concepts
Response: Math
Response: Macro 1
Response: Macroeconomics I
Response: Macro 2
Response: Macroeconomics series
Response: Mathematics
Response: Basically any other economics courses
Response: Presumably future micro, future macro based on micro foundations

Q14. How many hours did you spend preparing (reading, assignments, and other work outside class for this course?

Response: Many hours
Response: A lot
Response: 2 hour a day
Response: around 8 hours a week
Response: 15
Response: 10 hours weakly on average
Response: 12 hours
Response: 2 hours per hour of class
Response: 30 hrs a week
Response: 6/7 per week
Response: Too much...
Response: min 20h per week
Response: 4-5 hours per day
Response: 15 per week
Response: 10-12 hours per week
Response: 8-10 hours per week
Response: 100
Response: 80
Response: 60

Response: 12 hours per week
Response: 20 h per week
Response: 50
Response: 15
Response: Ten hours per problem set
Response: 150

Q15. Practical classes (ECO/SPS) and training seminars have been very useful for the learning and understanding of the subject.

5	Very much	7	19.44%
4	Considerably	5	13.89%
3	Average	7	19.44%
2	Not very much	4	11.11%
1	Not at all	3	8.33%
	NA / No answer	10	27.78%

Q16. If this course was co-taught, do you agree that co-teaching improved the course?

5	Very much	0	0.00%
4	Considerably	1	2.78%
3	Average	3	8.33%
2	Not very much	3	8.33%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	28	77.78%

Q17. Please provide your open comments and feedback in relation to individual professor co-teaching the course.

Response: I appreciated the effort in trying to provide the intuitions

Response: Prof. Mathevet overall did a very bad job in teaching microeconomics I. He is very inexperienced in teaching PhD-level microeconomics and did not fully understand the essence of microeconomics theory. Apparently, the slides he used came from previous professors. The slides were organized in a different way from the textbook but prof. mathevet did not understand the logic of such reorganization. He is unable to explain why topics were organized in this way and relationships between these topics.

He did not prepare well for the class. What he did was just to read out the slides. Anyone with a beating heart can do that. It is often the case that he had difficulty explaining concepts and proof in class that he had to skip or come up with something that does not make sense. He should practice more before coming to class. His performance in class makes people feel he just spent 10 minutes before each class reading the slides.

I hope he could understand that teaching is not just throwing a bunch of materials to students and told them to have fun. That confuses students and makes them disappointed. The textbook is already complicated and confusing. Prof. Mathevet NEITHER illustrated the connections of different topics NOR provided any intuition for decomposing complicated concepts. He lacks a comprehensive and profound understanding about micro theory. He did not know what is important and the underlying connections between different theories and concepts. He could not even clearly explain the strategies that proof in textbook used. Her made learning micro

super super burdensome, hard, and dry. I sincerely advise the economics department to change the instructor of micro I for future cohorts.

Response: Microeconomics is very hard to teach because it is a lot of theory but Laurent Mathevet teached it very well trying to make the theory clearer with graphs and coming again at every session to the questions we had after the previous one. It was hard to understand sometimes but I think it is because theory is like this, hard to fully get at the first time

Response: Prof. Mathevet - while I found the core material highly interesting, a few suggestions come to mind to improve the course in future years.

1) The classes would benefit from being more interactive (e.g., creating more space for students to voice questions / comments)

2) Clearer reference should be made in the lecture slides to the textbooks (e.g., which lectures correspond to which chapters/sub-chapters in MWG) to facilitate review at home.

3) Short, illustrative examples would help students gain more intuition for the material and stay engaged during lecture.

4) As the course is theory-heavy, problem sets could be made shorter without losing much of the insight they are meant to deliver. This would free up more time to delve into the textbooks and grapple with the concepts being learned.

5) The modality of calling students to the board during the TA sessions and having the rest of the class watch the student re-do a problem on the board is not useful. The time would be much better spent talking through the problem set at a higher level and focusing on the areas that students are having difficulty understanding.

Response:

Response: If I canchange one thing about the course, it would be to take a break. I really thinkit is impossible to follow a course during 90 mins, especially if the professorfollows slides instead of using board. I believe that people start tolose their interests after some point, so I prefer a small break like Ichinodid. In addition, I prefer using the board more frequently, especially for proofsand mathematical explanations. For example, when we were doing proofs forwelfare theorems, it was very hard to follow, it would be much better if you use theboard to go over it. Also in my opinion, we covered the last twolectures (10 and 11) too fast, it would be much better if we could have spent more timewith uncertainty and time. For next year, maybe you can consider this intoconsideration. Lastly, it would be great if the professor could summarize what we did last time in the beginning of each lecture and give an introduction. I understand the professors feel pressure to cover all things they need to cover but when we lose something in the beginning of the lecture then it gets useless for us to stay in the class since we are not able to follow. To summarize, I prefer a course structure like 50 minutes class 10 minutes break and 50 minutes class again, so the professors can have more time to cover all things and to give a brief summary at the beginning of the lectures. One last thing I want to add is about the problem sets, I think for us it is very inefficient that students go to the board to solve questions. Everyone does that to get the point, but no one can explain things as good as teaching assistants. Therefore, no one wants to attend the problem set sessions since it is not very helpful, I prefer that TA's correct all solutions and then solve in the class like all other classes.

Response: Prof. Laurent MATHEVET. He was enthusiastic about the course but it was unfortunate that he had to explain many concepts. SO at some points the lecture was hard to focus. However I do not think there is an alternative to this.

Response: In the theory class, I would have loved Laurent to have been more specific in each idea and point he was making. Sometimes I got lost and could not catch up with the explanation. I think that the correct use of the backboard would have helped a lot, but it was not a frequent resource or it was used not in a structured and ordered way. Also, I have to point out that we are a lot of people in the class and I would like teachers (in general) to make the handwriting bigger, large and more legible on the blackboard. In the back of the class, sometimes, it is hard to listen well and to see the handwriting.

Response: Laurent's teaching is helpful and insightful; he provides additional intuition on concepts in class and tries to explain things beyond what is written on the slides. The slides, however, should be improved! In my opinion they are often too packed with information, and many times key concepts are not necessarily highlighted on a slide which may lead one to believe that things are important which in fact are not and vice versa... This also has a negative impact in the sense that sometimes it becomes difficult to follow the main story of the lecture, even though Laurent himself is doing a good job at trying to convey this main story. All in all, I am certain that Laurent could give a very good lecture if his slides were more coherent and concise.

Response:

Response: I think that the professor was very prepared but sometimes it was very hard to follow him. I understand that the concepts are hard but I really struggled though out the course. I would suggest to rely less on slides and focus more on the intuitions (maybe though graphs/example). I think that it was done by the end of the course.

Response:

Response: Prof. Mathevet did a poor job teaching this course. At times he was unprepared and seemed flustered by rather simple extensions of the material taught in class. His general approach to teaching Microeconomics I was much less about intuition and applicability of theory taught but leaned heavily towards explaining Mathematical features of models taught. This is not only time-wasting but also disheartening. To provide an example, spending more than one lesson on a proof of a theorem neither enhances understanding nor does it help in the applicability of taught content. My feedback would be to create appendices in each of the lecture slide decks such that students can read up on the derivation of a particular theorem/proof etc. and spend the extra time on intuition and perhaps examples. This would also improve the quality of slides.

Moving forward, I believe it is quite frankly insulting to create an exam where 35% relate to a concept that was never explained in class, which also bring me to his lack of interpersonal skills. When asked about why he would write such an exam, his response was a snippy "Why not?". Yet another example of his, quite frankly, arrogant manner is his response to a request of mine to have 5 minutes of break during lectures. If he spends yet another 90 minutes on simply reading mathematical derivations off his slides, I would believe that a short break is in everyone's best interest. In particular, I don't think "Well, it's grad school. It's hard." is an appropriate response to give to such a request.

I would suggest a drastic rethinking of how Prof. Mathevet wants to teach this course. With his current setup, he may leave future students taking this course disgruntled.

Response: At the beginning I felt that he wasn't as open to class participation as I would have liked but throughout the block he improved in this aspect. I found his slides to be a bit confusing and could have followed the course if he spent more time explaining on the board rather than following the slides. Also

Title: Microeconomics 1
By: Prof. Laurent MATHEVET Laurent Mathevet

sometimes I feel like especially in the proofs, we got so lost in the details and even though the specific parts were clear sometimes I had difficulties with connecting different points. I learnt most of what I needed from the problem sets and the book.

Response: Since the course is very rich and theoretical, I think it is very difficult to teach, especially since many people had never studied the textbook on which the course is based. Nevertheless, the professor was very attentive, always taking care to give detailed answers and insights when asked.

Response: Prof. Mathevet seems to be really open and friendly, however, the lecture very often lacked coherence. Even though micro is not new to me (obviously), quite frequently I didn't know what we are doing at the lecture and why. I guess more examples being solved or intuitions given would help. Similarly, if some time in the beginning of each lecture would be spent on saying what's exactly going to be discussed and what are the links between those topics, theorem, etc., that would be also helpful.

Response: Laurent Mathevet's slides order was the most confusing to me. I wanted to supplement the course material with the text book that was recommended. However navigating thorough the text book via slides were quite challenging.

Response: Laurent Mathevet did a good job considering the excessive amount of material he was expected to cover in an extremely short time frame. He did his best to answer in a considered way to students' questions and to encourage participation and explain things clearly but he did not have enough time. The course was too overloaded to allow for interesting discussion of how results would change under different assumptions, no room for critical thinking.

Q18. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was well organised and prepared?		
5 Very much	16	44.44%
4 Considerably	11	30.56%
3 Average	6	16.67%
2 Not very much	0	0.00%
1 Not at all	1	2.78%
NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q19. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was available and approachable outside seminar hours?		
5 Very much	25	69.44%
4 Considerably	7	19.44%
3 Average	0	0.00%
2 Not very much	0	0.00%
1 Not at all	1	2.78%
NA / No answer	3	8.33%

Q20. Please provide your open comments and feedback in relation to individual teaching assistants (please specify the teaching assistant):

Response: Useless to have to go trough all the problems if they are not explained deeply

Response: Both were well prepared

Response: Calling students to write on board is just a waste of time. Please do not do that again.

Response: Both Greg and Miguel were very available and helpful to answer any of our questions.

Response: Unanswered emails

Response: I think both of the TAs are very helpful and available for us all time. I like their teaching styles and their assistance during the office hours. As I mentioned before, I really believe that the problem set sessions are inefficient but this is not related to the TAs, it is about the fact that students come to the board and try to solve the questions without explaining. It takes more time and it is not helpful for us.

Response: Both were very helpful and explained everyting I had on mind in a very clear manner.

Response: I think that the class system was not very good, since our classmates were the ones that were out on the blackboard a lot of times, and they have not been warned previously about which exercise they have to do. I would rather ask the teacher about the exercises, and not ask a classmate and maybe embarrass him/her. Also, the class was too slow because of this system. I strongly prefer that the TA would have done a brief summary of the necessary theoretical material to be understood to do the PS at the beginning of the class (like in maths) instead of going out to the blackboard.

Response: The TA sessions were incredibly helpful in getting a better understanding of the course

Response: Both of them did a great job explaining difficult concepts and helped us throughout the block.

Response: The TAs were great. However, I think many people did not like the part about going up to the board. Not because we don't want to do that but because in general people stopped focusing once classmates were up at the board.

Response: Greg is very brilliant. He was always approachable and clear in his explanations. I understood the concept only because of him. Miguel is also very good and approachable. The only issue with the TA sessions was the format. Calling students at the white board is very old-fashion and decreases the overall attention. Thus, the TAs corrected only half of the problem sets, and the rest was done by us at the whiteboard but of course no one was paying attention. If the idea was to increase class participation, I think it had the opposite effect. During the last class we were only 10.

Response: Gregory's teaching performance was superb. He knew how to answer every question without hesitation and came adequately prepared to all classes. Miguel did an adequate job.

Response: I think that the TA sessions would be much more productive if the TAs explained the solutions to problem sets instead of us solving the questions on the board. While I appreciate that we could get a chance to improve our presentations skills, I think that 5 minutes on the board is not enough to make any difference but we could've gotten a lot more out of it if we were able to follow the solutions of the TAs instead. Also it did sometimes reduced our interest in attending the sessions since we were either too anxious of being called to the board on a question we couldn't do our because we knew we wouldn't get a great explanation anyways.

Response: The two teaching assistants were always available to answer our questions and were extremely benevolent. It helped me a lot to approach the course and the exam more serenely!

Response: Miguel was incredibly helpful during TA sessions. He has a strong understanding of the material and is able to effectively communicate concepts to students.

Gregory is an incredible instructor. He was always available even outside of the scheduled office hours. He was very good at explaining the material in a way that is concrete and understandable. When people were having trouble, he found alternative ways to explain contents. I benefited immensely from his help and guidance throughout the course.

Response: TA classes were really helpful, I wouldn't change anything (except for the lengthiness of problem sets)

Response: Greg and Miguel did a great job teaching a huge volume of material in the time available. They were reassuring, approachable and knowledgeable.

Q21. In your opinion, what topics were omitted that should have been included?

Response: Link between Core and Competitive Equilibrium
Response: Not omitted but I think the lectures 10 and 11 could have been explained more detailed.
Response: N/A
Response: Monopoly
Response: Even though it is a course on Micro theory I would have loved to learn more about how we use data to approach the theory. How is it done in practice given that the topic in general seems abstract?

Q22. What topics should have been reduced/omitted?

Response: There were some slides on comparative statics that were too algebraic and notation intense. I suggest to cut that part off
Response: aggregation
Response: hard to know
Response: Lotteries
Response: Maybe not topic but the course in general relies a lot on proofs, maybe some more intuition at one or the other place would have saved time in preparing the course
Response: Definitely the mathematical proofs in all their extensiveness
Response: I had the impression that the part on General Equilibrium was dense, and that we would need more time on it.
Response: Students asked to solve questions on the board. I think that part is unnecessary since students lack the power of explanation and the time constraints are small for us to solve maximum amount of questions.

Q23. What topics covered in the course/seminar did you find particularly valuable?

Response: Welfare measures, duality, substitution and income effect
Response: nothing valuable
Response: General equilibria and utility maximisation problems
Response: General equilibrium
Response: GE part and discussion
Response: Choice under uncertainty, general equilibrium with uncertainty and Radner equilibrium
Response: In general I think everything we learn in micro 1 is very valuable, however since most of us do not want to be theorist maybe less emphasis could be put on proofs and more time spent on the intuition behind

everything.
Response: General equilibrium

Response: No student solving of problems at the board.

Response: 1. change the instructor. 2. the problem sets are long and tedious. people should spend time understanding and digesting concepts not just completing assignment. Besides, we get almost all the answers of assignments as they are highly similar to previous ones used by previous cohorts. What's the point of writing them again?

Response: Just one suggestion about the TA session: May be it should be better not having to correct exercices on the board, it is a good idea because it would allow the TA to see if we really understand the things, but I think that at the end when we go to the board, we just copy the solutions we had. And it is harder to understand for other people than when it is the TA that corrects the exercise. But otherwise, the sessions are well-organised and the office hours sessions are very useful !

Response: I think the professor should do more practical examples in class, and actually derive the proofs that he considers important and not only read them from the slides. Furthermore the TAs should not call students to the blackboard to solve exercises, because nobody of the other students is following their colleagues deriving proofs. The best would be for the TAs to do a recap of the theory learner in class to make it more understandable and then go in depth over the mechanisms of the most difficult exercises.

Response: See suggestions above.

Response: I think that the exercises done in class do not represent what we have done in the exam. I would rather that these exercises cover further and better the exam contents. If there are going to be theoretical exercises in the exam, please, make a close list of the questions that might be asked. Though it might be large, I would have an idea about where to start to study for the theoretical questions.

Response: See comments above.

Response: To me, I would prefer more real world examples as well as some parallels to empirical research or how it is applied in current research. Maybe the incorporation of latest papers or articles could help

Response: Less workload, especially for the Problem sets.

Response: See my comments above. Reduce focus on proofs (include them nonetheless and refer to them in an appendix section) and shift focus towards intuition, understanding and applicability

Response: I think that the lectures should rely much less on slides, and much more on writing on the board. I understand that there was not much time compared to the amount of material to be taught. Nonetheless, I think that slides should be replaced by self-contained lecture notes, and that lectures should be based on writing on the board and commenting more formally the concepts. Even at the cost of reducing the material covered in the course (or even better increasing the hours of lecture).

Response: The teaching is very bad. Grad school is hard, of course. But I believe a teacher should be able to have at least a marginal capacity to make the material more approachable. It is exactly the opposite with Professor Mathevet: things I already knew from previous courses, he managed to explain in such obscuring ways, that I was left with more doubts and more confusion than before I took his course. His classes were simply sessions on demolition of my sense of self-worth, until I found out I could actually understand from the

Mas-Colell book what in class seemed extremely hard. Then I stopped attending the classes and studied the book instead.

Response: It would have been useful to explain the strategy behind presenting some topics in a sequence that differed from the one adopted by the textbook (Mas-Colell, Whinston & Green 1995) – I refer especially to chapters 2 and 3

Response: More intuitions and more organized and clearer power point may help.

Response: The problem sets hardly included any excercisesthat were more "applied". This made it hard to understand difficult concepts studied in class. Problem sets were so long that it was sometimes infeasible to understand every proof (exercise) fully. Some more easier and applied question would help, i.e. questions similar to the ones we were given in the final exam.

Response: I think this course needs to give students a lot of insight, and perhaps more examples as well, even though the course is already extremely dense. The problem sets could also be composed of more practical exercises.

Response: Although the teaching assistants are incredibly kind and encouraging, I believe TA sessions would greatly benefit from not calling students to the board. This would reduce unnecessary stress for students and leave more time for instructors to go trough the material.

Response: See above

Response: As with all courses in Block 1, there was too much to cover in too little time. This made it extremely hard to engage meaningfully with the course. However, Even More so than other modules, I felt there was a huge gap between the material the lecturer (had time to) convey and what we were expecting to master. The problem sets again were at a level to challenge even the more well prepared students in class, and not to facilitate the learning of students who had not seen material this Advanced before. A more graduated approach would have been helpful. For example, instead of having lots of questions on non convex preferences, I would have benefited from questions with more standard set ups, before moving to the corner solution cases. The jump was too much for me, meaning I found it hard to concentrate on core concepts. As the problem sets counted to the grades it was hard to say I'll forgoe points on a question on lexicography preferences to instead make sure I fully understand duality for example. I also found the format of students being asked to the board to be stressful and for me it had the effect of stereotype threat. I belief that students are keen to learn and should not be forced to do this to prove. Actually attendance worsened. Students are not teachers so it was hard to learn from classmates writing on the board.

Q25. Do you have any further comments about the course/seminar?

Response: The course should be taught in a much better and clearer way

Response: I feel like students could benefit from some practical training before facing a (relatively complicated) problem set, which in the end counts for the final grade.

Response: In general the preparation of the PS are very time-intensive. To me that they only count 20% of the grade does not really reflect the effort..

Response: One of the worst courses I have ever suffered in my life.

Response: The slides are not reader-friendly or useful to study.

Course content

Q26. Was the sequence and structure of the course clear?		
5	Very much	10	27.78%
4	Considerably	9	25.00%
3	Average	10	27.78%
2	Not very much	3	8.33%
1	Not at all	2	5.56%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q27. How much overlap was there between this seminar/course and a previous one you took in your previous MA programme?		
5	Almost identical	7	19.44%
4	Considerably	15	41.67%
3	Not very much	11	30.56%
2	Not at all	1	2.78%
1	I do not have an MA degree prior to EUI	1	2.78%
	NA / No Answer	1	2.78%

Q28. Course content: additional comments:

Response: Not in economics

Response: This course was at a far higher level. I do not feel I had the prerequisite skills, or the time to fill the gaps. I also believe that the people who managed had actually already covered this exact material previously. This makes me question the pedagogical value that these courses add, if the only people who can manage them are those who have seen it all before....

Written Notes and References

Q29. Were slide/lecture notes provided to you?		
Yes	35	97.22%
No	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	1	2.78%

Q30. Were the slide/lecture notes clear?		
5	Very much	5	13.89%
4	Considerably	8	22.22%
3	Average	11	30.56%
2	Not very much	10	27.78%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q31. Were the slides/lecture notes sufficient to understand the topics covered in class?

5	Very much	3	8.33%
4	Considerably	5	13.89%
3	Average	12	33.33%
2	Not very much	11	30.56%
1	Not at all	4	11.11%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q32. Were the slides/lecture notes well connected with the actual lecture?

5	Very much	17	47.22%
4	Considerably	9	25.00%
3	Average	6	16.67%
2	Not very much	2	5.56%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q33. Did the professor provide references to other sources for deepening your understanding (e.g. textbooks, related articles, supplemental material)?

Yes	34	94.44%
No	1	2.78%
NA / No Answer	1	2.78%

Q34. Were the slides/lecture notes well connected to these complementary sources?

5	Very much	11	30.56%
4	Considerably	15	41.67%
3	Average	6	16.67%
2	Not very much	2	5.56%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q35. Written notes and references: additional comments:

Response: It could have been better to have the slide sets in advance so that one could have read and attended the lecture.

Response: without the book Mas-Collel, Whinston, Green - Microeconomic Theory the course would have been impossible to follow

Problem Sets

Q36. Did the problem sets help you deepen your understanding of the basic concepts covered in class?

5	Very much	14	38.89%
4	Considerably	9	25.00%
3	Average	4	11.11%
2	Not very much	8	22.22%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q37. Did the problem sets provide insights that went beyond the basics covered in class?

5	Very much	11	30.56%
4	Considerably	10	27.78%
3	Average	7	19.44%
2	Not very much	6	16.67%
1	Not at all	1	2.78%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q38. Was the material/references provided by the lecturer sufficient to solve the problem sets?

5	Very much	4	11%
4	Considerably	7	19%
3	Average	13	36%
2	Not very much	7	19%
1	Not at all	4	11%
	NA / No answer	1	3%

Q39. The level of difficulty of the problem sets were:

5	Too easy	0	0%
4	Easy	0	0%
3	Neither easy nor hard	3	8%
2	Hard	24	67%
1	Too hard	8	22%
	NA / No answer	1	3%

Q40. In terms of workload, the problem sets were:

1	Not very time consuming	1	3%
2	About average	6	17%
3	Too time consuming	28	78%
	NA / No answer	1	3%

Q41. Problem sets: additional comments:

Response: Too long problem setsa

Response: Some problem sets were only proofs, not very much connected to the exam content

Response: Please, change the problem sets in order to represent better what we are going to face in the exam (I think that Econometrics 1 is a good example of this practice).

Response: The problemsets for Microeconomics were by far the most time consuming. I'm a bit torn between about average and too time consuming because it heavily depended on the questions. Some individual questions took nearly a day to finish

Response: Some proofs in the problem sets were ridiculously hard, which at some point was just incredibly time consuming while at the same time providing no further insights into the core concepts of the class.

Response: I think that I spent more time on problem sets than studying or going to class

Response: PSs were very time consuming 2-3 day per week, if one wanted to understand concepts.

Response: I think the designing of the Problem Sets can improve. Sometimes I felt we were assigned just a random exercise from mas colell whose purpose I couldn't understand very clear.

Response: I know proofs are important, but sometimes doing tens of them in one problem set was a bit too much.

Response: I spent far more time on this causing me to neglect the others.

T.A. Sessions

Q42. Was there sufficient time to discuss the problem set in the T.A class?

5	Very much	5	13.89%
4	Considerably	5	13.89%
3	Average	11	30.56%
2	Not very much	9	25.00%
1	Not at all	5	13.89%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q43. If the course had more than one teaching assistant, please provide open comments and feedback about the individual teaching assistants here

Response: Both was nice.

Response: Both TA's were equally competent in what they were doing

Response: Both are very nice and approachable.

Q44. Did the T.A. explain harder/trickier parts of the problem set well?

5	Very much	11	30.56%
4	Considerably	11	30.56%
3	Average	8	22.22%
2	Not very much	4	11.11%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q45. If the course had more than one teaching assistant, please provide open comments and feedback about the individual teaching assistants here

Response: Both TA's were equally competent in what they were doing

Q46. Did the T.A. respond to the problems and difficulties raised by the class?

5	Very much	16	44.44%
4	Considerably	11	30.56%
3	Average	5	13.89%
2	Not very much	2	5.56%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q47. If the course had more than one teaching assistant, please provide open comments and feedback about the individual teaching assistants here

Response: Both TA's were equally competent in what they were doing

Response: They did as well as possible given time constraints.

Q48. Did you feel that the T.A. sessions were more useful than simply reading written solutions?

5	Very much	6	16.67%
4	Considerably	14	38.89%
3	Average	4	11.11%
2	Not very much	7	19.44%
1	Not at all	3	8.33%
	NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q49. If the course had more than one teaching assistant, please provide open comments and feedback about the individual teaching assistants here

Response: The two teaching assistants were always available to answer our questions and were extremely benevolent. It helped me a lot to approach the course and the exam more serenely!

Response: See previous comments on format of classes.

Q50. Did you feel that the T.A. understood the material sufficiently better than the students?

Title: Microeconomics 1
By: Prof. Laurent MATHEVET Laurent Mathevet

5	Very much	15	41.67%
4	Considerably	13	36.11%
3	Average	6	16.67%
2	Not very much	1	2.78%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q51. If the course had more than one teaching assistant, please provide open comments and feedback about the individual teaching assistants here

Response: The TA sessions were not helpful in understanding concepts. First, a little summary of the core concepts covered in class should be made (like in Math). Reading the solutions was as helpful as the TA sessions. This is more of a problem of the problem sets themselves than Miguel's/Greg' s fault. The little presentation we had to do in class was useless as people just wrote their solutions on the board, which implied even less explanation than from the TAs.

Response: The TAs, both Miguel and Greg, were great. They were very helpful and available. They worked hard to help us understand the material. I didn't like two things regarding the exercises classes: First, I don't see the point of students solving exercises compulsory and at random in the board. I think it does not help us to better understand the material, and we loose to much time. Second, I don't like that only one or two exercise of the problem sets are corrected. I would like to receive feedback from all of them, even if they are not graded.

Response: The two teaching assistants were always available to answer our questions and were extremely benevolent. It helped me a lot to approach the course and the exam more serenely!

General

Q52. What percentage was this of the total average time you spent on courses per week?

Between 0% and 20%	3	8.33%
Between 20% and 40%	7	19.44%
Between 40% and 60%	12	33.33%
Between 60% and 80%	11	30.56%
Between 80% and 100%	1	2.78%
NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q53. What percentage of this time spent on this course was spent on problem sets?

Between 0% and 20%	0	0.00%
Between 20% and 40%	3	8.33%
Between 40% and 60%	7	19.44%
Between 60% and 80%	13	36.11%
Between 80% and 100%	12	33.33%
NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q54. What percentage of the time spent on this course was spent on general background studying and reading?

Between 0% and 20%	16	44.44%
Between 20% and 40%	14	38.89%
Between 40% and 60%	3	8.33%
Between 60% and 80%	0	0.00%
Between 80% and 100%	1	2.78%
NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q55. What percentage of the time spent on this course was spent on other things?

I spend between 0% and 20% other things	31	86.11%
I spend between 20% and 40% other things	2	5.56%
I spend between 40% and 60% other things	1	2.78%
I spend between 60% and 80% other things	0	0.00%
I spend between 80% and 100% other things	0	0.00%
NA / No answer	2	5.56%

Q56. Based on your response from the previous question what do you spend this percentage of time doing?

Response: watching other online lectures

Response: reading the book

Response: Right before the exam I wrote revision notes but that was about it

Response: I only did problem sets.

Response: Watching YouTube videos on micro.

Q57. How much of the course material was familiar to you before the course?

5	Most	4	11.11%
4	A lot	10	27.78%
3	A moderate amount	14	38.89%
2	A little	7	19.44%
1	None at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q58. Of the material that was familiar did you manage to deepen your understanding?

5	Very much	5	13.89%
4	Considerably	15	41.67%
3	Average	7	19.44%
2	Not very much	5	13.89%
1	Not at all	3	8.33%
	NA / No answer	1	2.78%

Q59. Additional Comments:

Response: Exam disproportionately computational and long.

Response: Writing the texts of the problem sets a bit more precisely would be helpful, specifying for example the set in which parameters live, and a more detailed description of the general framework for some exercises. Same for the exam

Response: I think the TA sessions and problem sets should really be changed. The professor and TAs seemed very motivated to teach us concepts well. Therefore, I think this course could be very interesting if it was coordinated better. I think, the exam questions are a good example of how future problem sets could look like. Moreover, including a true / false section in the PSs (like in metrics) could maybe help to understand concepts.

Q60. Any other remarks:

Response: As there is no survey on the block as a whole, I will add some general comments here. First, the volume of content is too much to absorb meaningfully in this time frame, even if you attend every lecture, every office hour and ask TAs, classmates, etc for extra help, as I have done, with the background I entered into the course with. I am willing and able to work hard, but this was excessive. I took maximum one day off a week and often only Sunday afternoon. It has taken a huge toll on my physical and mental health (weight gain, physical pain, anxiety, loss of self comfidence). But I have tried my best and will see how the results are, and am proud of my efforts. By means of constructive criticism, I feel that there was too big a gap between what I knew and the problem sets. Maybe there could be some worked solutions solving easier problems e.g. non convex preferences would help bridge the gap. I also felt the TAs had too many people looking for their time at the end especially. I also would have appreciated one week at the start with no assignments. This would have helped immensely. Note that it is not possible to move into PAB flats or EUI agency sourced housing more than 3 days before the course begins. There is no buffer for settling in which is hugely challenging. A calm start is important.

I also think if you admit people who have not covered all of this material before at this Advanced a level there should be some kind of preparatory element or engagement of some kind. Group problem sets are also very stressful, especially in the first week.