

Seminar Assessment Report

Title: Macroeconomics

Professor(s): Arpad Abraham

Teaching Assistant(s): Nicolas Aragon / Krzysztof Pytka

Year: 2013-14 **Semester:** 1 **Department:** ECO

Participants: 24 **Forms returned:** 21 **Return:** 87.50%

	Answers	%
--	---------	---

Q1. In overall terms I am satisfied with the professor?

5 - Very much	7	31.82%
4 - Considerably	8	36.36%
3 - Average	6	27.27%
2 - Not Very much	1	4.55%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q2. The professor was well organised and well prepared?

5 - Very much	7	31.82%
4 - Considerably	10	45.45%
3 - Average	2	9.09%
2 - Not Very much	3	13.64%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

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

5 - Very much	5	22.73%
4 - Considerably	6	27.27%
3 - Average	7	31.82%
2 - Not Very much	3	13.64%
1 - Not at all	1	4.55%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Title: Macroeconomics

By: Arpad Abraham

Q4. The professor teaches with interest and enthusiasm?

5 - Very much	16	72.73%
4 - Considerably	5	22.73%
3 - Average	1	4.55%
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	16	76.19%
4 - Considerably	3	14.29%
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%

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

5 - Very much	17	77.27%
4 - Considerably	3	13.64%
3 - Average	1	4.55%
2 - Not Very much	0	0.00%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	1	4.55%

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

5 - Very much	8	36.36%
4 - Considerably	10	45.45%
3 - Average	2	9.09%
2 - Not Very much	2	9.09%
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	5	22.73%
4 - Considerably	9	40.91%
3 - Average	5	22.73%
2 - Not Very much	2	9.09%
1 - Not at all	1	4.55%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

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

5 - Very much	7	31.82%
4 - Considerably	6	27.27%
3 - Average	4	18.18%
2 - Not Very much	5	22.73%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q10. Indicate how often you attended the course/seminar

5 = (9 to 10 sessions)	21	95.45%
4 = (7 to 8 sessions)	1	4.55%
3 = (5 to 6 sessions)	0	0.00%
2 = (3 to 4 sessions)	0	0.00%
1 = (less than 3 sessions)	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

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

5 - Personal Interest	1	4.55%
4 - Thesis Related	0	0.00%
3 - Supervisor's Suggestion	1	4.55%
2 - Compulsory	20	90.91%
1 - Other	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q12. What are the course/seminar requirements?

5 - Oral Presentation	0	0.00%
4 - Written exam	22	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. Was the course mandatory for you and did you take the course for credits?

5 - Mandatory course for departmental teaching credits	20	90.91%
4 - Mandatory course no credits	2	9.09%
3 - Optional / elective course taken for departmental credits	0	0.00%
2 - Optional / elective course taken fully without credits	0	0.00%
1 - Auditing for several sessions only	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q14. To what extent does this course/seminar overlap "in terms of content" with others?

5 - Very much	1	4.55%
4 - Considerably	0	0.00%
3 - Average	4	18.18%
2 - Not Very much	5	22.73%
1 - Not at all	9	40.91%
NA / No Answer	3	13.64%

Which course(s)/seminar(s) overlap with others?

Q15. To what extent did the central themes of this course/seminar match your expectations?

5 - Very much	3	13.64%
4 - Considerably	8	36.36%
3 - Average	7	31.82%
2 - Not Very much	3	13.64%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	1	4.55%

Q16. Practical classes have been very useful for the learning and understanding of the subject?

5 - Very much	8	36.36%
4 - Considerably	8	36.36%
3 - Average	4	18.18%
2 - Not Very much	2	9.09%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q17. If this course was co-taught, Do you agree that co-teaching improved the course?

5 - Very much	1	6.67%
4 - Considerably	0	0.00%
3 - Average	0	0.00%
2 - Not Very much	2	13.33%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	12	80.00%

Q18. Please provide your open comments and feedback in relation to individual professor co-teaching the course.

24507271 Very good TAs.

24507345 Arpad: it would be nice to have a class on the concepts, more basically introduced: type of shocks, intertemp. --, cons. smooth, rent seeking.

24507359

The Prof. is very motivated and interested in teaching us. He gave handouts, which is great. I would prefer if he was clearer in the way he presents things. In particular, if he derived the equations on the board, clearly, it would be much better. Students laugh when they write things down in a logic and sequential manner.

24507345 TAs: it would be nice to have extra hourse with Matlab hints before each problem set. Better use of blackboard would improve classes.

Q19. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was well organised and prepared?

5 - Very much	12	57.14%
4 - Considerably	6	28.57%
3 - Average	2	9.52%
2 - Not Very much	1	4.76%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q20. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was available and approachable outside seminar hours?

5 - Very much	14	66.67%
4 - Considerably	6	28.57%
3 - Average	1	4.76%
2 - Not Very much	0	0.00%
1 - Not at all	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

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

- 24507173 Decision theory. I think that doing both game theory and decision theory in a 5 weeks course was rather ambitious (it did not work out very well).
- 24507201 We needed to work more on theory and go deeper into understanding mathematically the methods we are applying. I would really like that this course can help me doing research because I do not feel equipped for solving problems on my own.
- 24507271 (Time constraints)
- 24507308 I am not sure. In my past, we were analytically solving for models much more, finding closed-form solutions for prices, allocations, also in 'sequential' framework. I am not sure if we should do more practice of that. On the other hand, we spent more time on intuitions/EE, which was very useful.
- 24507340 Global versus local solution methods.
- 24507345 Basic topics and definitions.
- 24507353 All the proofs of the formal analysis of each of the models used during the course.
- 24507359 Matlab teaching was missing. We were asked to program in problem sets but we did not learn how to program. Only those who already know how to program are able to program the PS. As well as those who copy.

Q22. What topics should have been reduced/omitted?

- 24507201 The MatLab part was not very useful. --- Especially, the problem sets on the part oxc. was very interesting and helpful.
- 24507353 The computational part has in my opinion an excessive weight relating to the theoretical part.

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

- 24507304 The relationship to Micro (GE).
- 24507308 EE discussion, effect of different processes of stochastic shocks, iid, persistence.
- 24507324 Matlab exercises. I would have preferred to have many of them/more advanced methods.
- 24507332 Dynamic programming and Matlab related exercises.
- 24507336 Introduction to Matlab.
- 24507340 Matlab chains, stochastic growth model, VFI, recursive comp. equil., Arrow-Debreu comp. equil.
- 24507345 The way of solving problems in recursive way; Matlab implementation.

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

24507201 We should read the original papers.

24507332 They should offer a Matlab camp in August which goes through dynamic programming examples in computational macro.

24507336 This course could focus on less material, but with a higher detail.

24507352 Explaining more the intuition of the equations.

24507353 Dedicating more time to the theoretical analysis of the models and less to practical questions on how to solve them.

24507359 Writing clearly on the board even if it is boring - Teaching programming or giving a 'map' on PS

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

24507268 The backgrounds people in class have varied. Therefore it was somewhat a challenge for people with less background to catch up in a short time (some issues for learning to use Matlab).

24507320 Week is made of 7 days and we have 3 subjects, not just macro.

24507326 I think that if the professor explained the topic slower and wrote the results more clearly, there would have been much less questions and the class would have progressed at the same speed, if not faster.

24507332 Prof. Arpad should talk more with the TAs. Very often they did not know what he precisely asked for in a question and when they thought they did it was not what the professor told us to do in class. Also, they took a more thorough look at the questions a few days before the problem set was due so they could only give general hints and not answer in too much detail. However, both TAs are extremely committed, approachable and well prepared. I loved their handouts to the problem set solutions.

24507340 Problem sets were very long (I don't want to complaint) but a higher weight (say 20%) for grade would be reasonable.

24507345 Overall, I am very satisfied. The course is challenging but well-taught.

24507353 I suggest that the techniques needed to solve these models to be included in a preliminary course, so that one can use the short time available to discuss the theory involved in these models.

24507359 It makes no sense to evaluate students for programming if it is not not taught.