Seminar Assessment Report

ECO-CO-MICRO1

Title:	Microeconomics 1
Professor(s):	Prof. Laurent MATHEVET
Teaching Assistant(s):	Miguel Blanco

Department:	ECO	**Participants:**	21
Term:	BLOCK 1	**Forms returned:**	21
Year	2021 - 2022	**Return:**	100%

		Answers	%

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

		Answers	%
5	Very much	4	19.05%
4	Considerably	7	33.33%
3	Average	9	42.86%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q2. The seminar was well organised and well prepared.

		Answers	%
5	Very much	4	19.05%
4	Considerably	6	28.57%
3	Average	9	42.86%
2	Not Very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

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

		Answers	%
5	Very much	2	9.52%
4	Considerably	4	19.05%
3	Average	11	52.38%
2	Not very much	4	19.05%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q4. The professor teaches with interest and enthusiasm.

5	Very much	5	23.81%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	7	33.33%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q5. Where appropriate, the professor encourages class participation.

5	Very much	4	19.05%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	6	28.57%
2	Not Very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No Answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	4	19.05%
4	Considerably	10	47.62%
3	Average	1	4.76%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	5	23.81%

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

5	Very much	6	28.57%
4	Considerably	11	52.38%
3	Average	4	19.05%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

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

5	Very much	7	33.33%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	0	0.00%
2	Not very much	3	14.29%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

Title: Microeconomics 1
By: Prof. Laurent MATHEVET

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

5	Very much	3	14.29%
4	Considerably	6	28.57%
3	Average	6	28.57%
2	Not very much	4	19.05%
1	Not at all	2	9.52%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

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

1	Between 80% & 100%	21	100.00%
2	Between 50% & 80%	0	0.00%
3	Less than 50%	0	0.00%
	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	21	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	21	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%

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

5	Very much	1	4.76%
4	Considerably	3	14.29%
3	Average	5	23.81%
2	Not very much	5	23.81%
1	Not at all	7	33.33%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Which courses overlapped with this course/seminar?

Response 1: Mathematics
Response 2: Math
Response 3: hopefully none
Response 4: Micro Sequence
Response 5: Macroeconomics 1
Response 6: None so far.
Response 7: Mathematics

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

Response 1: 30
Response 2: 20+
Response 3: many. A lot. I don't know but sometimes I even work on it in my dreams. Sleeptime was reduced for this.
Response 4: A week: 20 hours
Response 5: 140
Response 6: 30 hours per week
Response 7: 150
Response 8: 100
Response 9: Definitely more than 10 hours per week.
Response 10: 60
Response 11: 120
Response 12: 80hours
Response 13: 10/week (for regular weeks, more beofre the exams)
Response 14: on average maybe around 15 hours a week

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

5	Very much	8	38.10%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	4	19.05%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	3	14.29%

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

5	Very much	3	14.29%
4	Considerably	0	0.00%
3	Average	1	4.76%
2	Not very much	4	19.05%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	13	61.90%

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

Response 1: It would be better if the lectures were better prepared. Professor Mathevet often did not understand his own slides and had to stop and think, which could sometimes take up to 30 minutes of class. Aside from that the explanations were good. However, my issue with the class is that there was a big disparity between the level in class and the problem sets/exam, and the lectures ended up being nearly useless for studying as almost all questions on the problem sets/exams covered different concepts than the ones discussed. I understand that we are supposed to study on our own to learn the concepts deeper, but rather than testing the important concepts the problem sets and the exam felt like they were simply trying to trick us in many cases, by adding new things to the exam problems that we have not encountered before. For example, if non-convex preferences are to show up on the exam (which they did) it would be helpful going into this deeper. (Now we only had one example from the mock exam.) It is hard to study effectively when there is such a big gap between what is taught and what is encountered, and I think there are better ways of creating challenging material.

Response 2: I wish the professor had more time to prepare for his lectures. It sometimes felt like he didn't recognize his own slides. He didn't know the answers to many of our questions, which I found a little bit embarrassing.

Response 3: The material was explained properly, some ideas were further developed in class based on students' questions.

Response 4: Sometimes the professor did not agree with the slides that he made himself or found typos that were never corrected.

Response 5: I feel that Pr. Mathevet made a great effort when teaching this class. Although my above evaluations seem only average, it is much more due to the content than to the Professor. The Micro 1 class feels very "dry" for us students and I believe that it is the same for the professor, and thus this naturally reflects onto the teaching. On the other hand, I found that Pr Mathevet is a great instructor, who makes a lot of effort to provide the intuition behind tough concepts and interacts well with his audience. To summarize I feel that the Micro 1 class is not the most appropriate to allow Pr. Mathevet to make use of his great teaching potential.

Response 6: Overall, I think the amount of time spent explaining different subjects was not perfectly assigned, for example I think we spent a lot of time on discussing the setup of edgeworth boxes which was one of the easiest things in the class for me, while I struggled a lot more on most of the other stuff which we rushed through a bit more.

Q18. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was well organised and prepared?

5	Very much	14	66.67%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	2	9.52%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q19. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was available and approachable outside seminar hours?		
5 Very much	20	95.24%
4 Considerably	1	4.76%
3 Average	0	0.00%
2 Not very much	0	0.00%
1 Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No answer	0	0.00%

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

Response 1: Miguel was a great TA, very helpful and knowledgeable about the material. The participation was initially low in the seminar, but that was not really his fault as it is difficult to create explanations of many of the problem set questions that are not verbose. The remaining seminars with the presentations were not very useful, however, as Miguel can explain the problems better than we can.

Response 2: TA was very friendly and nice and helpful; TA sessions often included regurgitations of proofs/solutions on the board and could be more interactive and engaging in the future.

Response 3: Miguel was our teaching assistant. Miguel is amazing and has saved us all from failing. God bless Miguel (unless you don't believe in god, then Mas-Colell bless Miguel).

Response 4: Miguel is great. He gave us hints, and good suggestions on how to approach the exercises.

Response 5: I think Miguel deserves a huge appreciation and recognition! He was amazing for the fact he taught the course for the very first time. We would be STRICTLY better off if Miguel were giving the lectures instead of Professor Mathevet.

Response 6: Miguel was well prepared (given the difficulty of the class) and available a lot to answer the numerous questions.

Response 7: Miguel Blanco - very good!

Response 8: Very good sessions, nice explanations of problems and strategies to approach them.

Response 9: Miguel was of real help and was always there to answer any of the questions which we could have and this is highly appreciated.

Response 10: I think it would help the the understanding, if we would also repeat some theory in the TA Session, in math this helped a lot.

Response 11: Miguel was always approachable and ready to help. He explained exercises clearly and completely.

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

Response 1: n/a

Response 2: We could have skipped the Mas-Colell part and used Anwar Shaikh's book instead (I know this is wishful thinking).

Response 3: -

Response 4: None

Response 5: More depth in expected lotteries and the last part on the 2WT and AD equilibrium/sequential trade.

Q22. What topics should have been reduced/omitted?

Response 1: n/a
Response 2: The second Fundamental Theorem of Welfare Economics.
Response 3: discrete choice models
Response 4: Consumer and producer theory.
Response 5: I think one of the topics should have been taught with more focus: preferences over lotteries. To compensate I would reduce the amount of lectures spent on General Equilibrium.
Response 6: Discrete choice
Response 7: None
Response 8: Discrete choice models
Response 9: see above

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

Response 1: Uncertainty and risk; general equilibrium; computational problems
Response 2: The necessary assumptions for aggregation of both preferences and production. Unfortunately (and as per usual) the time to go into detail lacked.
Response 3: general equilibrium
Response 4: General Equilibrium was more intuitive and it comes also at hand in macroeconomics modules.
Response 5: General equillibrium.
Response 6: General equilibrium
Response 7: Consumer and Producer Theory
Response 8: General equilibrium
Response 9: Consumer theory, general equilibrium theory, uncertainty.

Q24. How could the teaching format and learning results for this course be improved?

Response 1: More connection between theory and computation/application could be made. MWG isn't the most helpful in applying concepts to problems -- additional resources on this would be useful.
Response 2: It is extremely hindering to update slides after a lecture has been finished as many students take their notes in the current set of slides so things just tend to not be registered when slides are updated constantly. I understand this was a first time taught, which explains this but it is still a nuissance.
Response 3: drop discrete choice models and spend time on general equilibrium
Response 4: Preamble: I think these comments are more aimed at what the department wants to do with this module. The course was given over six weeks I think it would give a bit more breadth to the students if delivered over seven weeks also given that it's a course and in other programs in Europe is given over 10 weeks. This would allow the students to dive deeper in the material. Overall I think the professor was given a really hard job and eventually he managed fairly well.
Response 5: Professor used the slides from the previous professor, which is OK if he'd know what actually is on the slides. It happened quite often that he was a bit confused about the notation and slides content. If he is confused, I'm even more confused.
Response 6: I am thankful for the extra points we could gain by solving the question on board BUT it wasn't very helpful. Instead of random selection, I'd suggest students should prepare one question in more detail and be prepared to solve it on board by providing a real learning experience to their peers. I wish we hadn't spent so much time with us solving the questions on board. Miguel is a great TA and it would have be super helpful if

he could have had a chance and time to explain the tricky problems to us.

Response 7: The professor used slides for going through sometimes complicated mathematical derivations. Unfortunately, with this approach it is almost impossible for students to follow the course. Thus, it would be better if the professor relied less on the slides.

Response 8: Slightly better preparation of slides by the professor. Usually the slides were updated after the lectures, hence taking notes on slides during the lecture was less effective (changes to the final version of presentations required additional revisions of notes and were a bit confusing at times).

Response 9: During the TA sessions, correct only some of the exercises in the problem sets (provided that the solutions are afterwards uploaded) and use the rest of the time to do other problems that we have not seen or to review the most important content seen in class (as done in mathematics).

Response 10: By rethinking the random cold calling in practical classes. At least, inform at the beginning of each class who will solve which question. Students often ended up being more concerned on 'am I going to be called next?' rather than on the question itself.

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

Response 1: Really kind and enthusiastic TA and professor, especially given a rather dry subject.Response 2: Mas-Colell. Traumatising students since 1995. But honestly, I think a more critical approach to Micro could be valuable for new generations of econ resarchers. Response 3: I think the exam weights on the two parts should have been made clear before in such a way that students can strategize the preparation in the optimal way. This bit of information was missing since the weights of the two parts were changed considerably with respect to the mock exam provided. Overall I am happy with the module and I think I learned a lot.Response 4: The exam was a bit harsh. We spent sooo much time solving super nice problems in class but we weren't ready for the tricky questions. It's hard to say if the exam was unfair - I guess it was OK but again to make it even fairer I'd appreciate solving more tricky questions in class with a TA then thinking about those problems under time pressure in the exam.

Course content

Q26. Was the sequence and structure of the course clear?

5	Very much	9	42.86%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	6	28.57%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

Q27. How much overlap was there between this seminar/course and a previous one you took in your previous MA programme?

5	Almost identical	1	4.76%
4	Considerably	13	61.90%
3	Not very much	4	19.05%
2	Not at all	2	9.52%
1	I do not have an MA degree prior to EUI	0	0.00%
	NA / No Answer	1	4.76%

Q28. Course content: additional comments:

Response 1: I have never taken Microeconomics I at graduate level.

Written Notes and References

Q29. Were slide/lecture notes provided to you?

Yes	20	95.24%
No	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	1	4.76%

Q30. Were the slide/lecture notes clear?

5	Very much	1	4.76%
4	Considerably	6	28.57%
3	Average	11	52.38%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	1	4.76%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	8	38.10%
2	Not very much	5	23.81%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	9	42.86%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	1	4.76%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Yes	16	76.19%
No	4	19.05%
NA / No Answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	6	28.57%
4	Considerably	7	33.33%
3	Average	2	9.52%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	5	23.81%

Q35. Written notes and references: additional comments:

Response 1: Only MWG was provided as an additional resource -- more resources would be great. In the future it would be appreciated if only final versions of slides were uploaded -- and if later re-uploaded, if they were clearly flagged.
Response 2: Mas-Colell only

Problem Sets

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

5	Very much	7	33.33%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	6	28.57%
2	Not very much	2	9.52%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	8	38.10%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	1	4.76%
2	Not very much	2	9.52%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	0	0%
4	Considerably	11	52%
3	Average	5	24%
2	Not very much	1	5%
1	Not at all	2	10%
	NA / No answer	2	10%

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	14%
2	Hard	12	57%
1	Too hard	5	24%
	NA / No answer	1	5%

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

1	Not very time consuming	0	0%
2	About average	3	14%
3	Too time consuming	17	81%
	NA / No answer	1	5%

Q41. Problem sets: additional comments:

Response 1: These problem set were literally my life.
Response 2: Individual problem sets are too time consuming. I would much rather prepare problem sets in groups.
Response 3: all these proofs dont help me unterstand the concept. especially the exam is so different to the problem set...

T.A. Sessions

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

5	Very much	1	4.76%
4	Considerably	5	23.81%
3	Average	6	28.57%
2	Not very much	7	33.33%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	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 1: Miguel saved us all (see comment above)

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

5	Very much	7	33.33%
4	Considerably	11	52.38%
3	Average	2	9.52%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Response 1: supra

Response 2: Miguel did a great job at TAing this class. He was always very approchable to answer our questions and was great at providing nice intuition behind the concepts. You can see that he has a deep understanding of the topic

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

5	Very much	16	76.19%
4	Considerably	3	14.29%
3	Average	1	4.76%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Response 1: and quickly.

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

5	Very much	7	33.33%
4	Considerably	8	38.10%
3	Average	3	14.29%
2	Not very much	2	9.52%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Response 1: Without Miguel we would have been doomed.

Response 2: Yes and surely the solutions provided by the TA were quite comprehensive and clear.

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

5	Very much	16	76.19%
4	Considerably	4	19.05%
3	Average	0	0.00%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Response 1: ...doomed.

General

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

Between 0% and 20%	0	0.00%
Between 20% and 40%	3	14.29%
Between 40% and 60%	9	42.86%
Between 60% and 80%	6	28.57%
Between 80% and 100%	1	4.76%
NA / No answer	2	9.52%

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%	2	9.52%
Between 40% and 60%	5	23.81%
Between 60% and 80%	8	38.10%
Between 80% and 100%	5	23.81%
NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

Between 0% and 20%	7	33.33%
Between 20% and 40%	9	42.86%
Between 40% and 60%	3	14.29%
Between 60% and 80%	1	4.76%
Between 80% and 100%	0	0.00%
NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

I spend between 0% and 20% other things	19	90.48%
I spend between 20% and 40% other things	1	4.76%
I spend between 40% and 60% other things	0	0.00%
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	1	4.76%

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

Response 1: Doing problems and reading MWG
Response 2: there is no time for other things
Response 3: Reading MGW

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

5	Most	2	9.52%
4	A lot	7	33.33%
3	A moderate amount	8	38.10%
2	A little	1	4.76%
1	None at all	2	9.52%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

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

5	Very much	7	33.33%
4	Considerably	9	42.86%
3	Average	2	9.52%
2	Not very much	1	4.76%
1	Not at all	1	4.76%
	NA / No answer	1	4.76%

Q59. Additional Comments:

Response 1: but not in a way that helps me critically reflect on much of it.Response 2: Please drop presentation of students in exercise class. Takes too much time and doesn't help to get additional understanding

Q60. Any other remarks:

Response 1: Too little time to discuss some of the assumptions that we are making, which is important because this lies at the heart of everything we do.
Response 2: The fact that we had to correct exercises in class did not help to understand the problems if you did not understand them while doing them.