

Course evaluation summer term 2018

Name of session	Advanced Macroeconomics	
Type of class	exercise	
Lecturer	Benjamin Lahn	
registered participants	32	
count of participants	14	
rate of participation	43,8%	

Did you take the course in previous semesters?	count	percentage
never before	0	0,0%
already once	1	7,1%
already twice	3	21,4%
more than twice	10	71,4%
sum	14	

kind of module	count	percentage
obligatory module	1	7,1%
obligatory module by choice	0	0,0%
module by choice	13	92,9%
sum	14	

Content and structure of the session

questions	count	answers					no answer	median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = totally agree	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree				
1. Content, structure and objective of the session were explained comprehensible.	14 (100%)	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,3	0,45
2. At the beginning of the session, the content was interesting for me.	14 (100%)	8 (57%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,6	0,89
3. My interest for the content of this session has increased.	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	8 (57%)	0 (0%)	5	4,5	0,63
4. The structure of this session is logical.	14 (100%)	9 (64%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,6	0,82
5. The amount of content is too large.	14 (100%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	8 (57%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3	2,6	0,72
6. The session is well geared to the other session(s) of this module.	14 (100%)	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,8	0,67
7. The workload to get the credit-points is too low.	14 (100%)	1 (7%)	11 (79%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	2	2,2	0,86
8. The importance of the topics of the session is obvious and relevant to my study.	14 (100%)	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	2,4	0,81
9. The session is well placed in the curriculum of my study program.	14 (100%)	8 (57%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,6	0,89

Organization of the session

questions	count	answers					no answer	median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = totally agree	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree				
10. The provided materials are helpful.	14 (100%)	4 (29%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	2,0	0,85
11. The literature references are conducive to me.	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,9	0,96
12. The session starts and ends on time.	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	2	1,9	1,06
13. The media use (projector, board etc.) takes place in a sensible way.	14 (100%)	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,4	0,49
14. I think the exercises are appropriate.	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	4	3,5	1,24
15. The room conditions (size, acoustics, furnishing etc.) are good.	14 (100%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	2,3	1,10
16. Disturbances, talking or disorders (of other participants) affect me.	14 (100%)	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,4	0,49
17. Criticism/suggestions of the students was/were answered.	14 (100%)	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,4	0,62
18. There is enough time and space for questions and discussions in the session.	14 (100%)	10 (71%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,4	0,73
19. The offered consultation-hour/round of questions was/were helpful for me.	14 (100%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	2,3	1,03
20. The used methods in this course enable my cooperation.	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,9	0,83

Teaching competence/performance of the lecturer

questions	count	answers					no answer	median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = totally agree	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree				
21. The lecturer seemed to be well-prepared.	14 (100%)	9 (64%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,4	0,48
22. The lecturer arranged the sessions attractive.	14 (100%)	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,9	0,74
23. The lecturer depicted the content comprehensible and descriptive.	14 (100%)	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,5	0,82
24. The speaking tempo is too slow.	14 (100%)	8 (57%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,6	0,81
25. The discussion in the session was conducted productive.	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	4	4,1	0,74
26. The lecturer went sufficiently into issues of the students.	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,6	0,61
27. The lecturer has motivated me to cooperation.	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,9	0,83
28. The lecturer has taught the syllabus under a current state of research.	14 (100%)	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	1,1	0,26

Presentations and papers

questions	count	answers						median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = totally agree	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree	no answer			
29. I get enough help and support for my presentations and papers.	14 (100%)	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	2	1,6	0,50
30. I learn a lot from the presentations of the other participants.	14 (100%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	3	2,7	1,15
31. The lecturer complemented the referent (student) in a useful way.	14 (100%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	3	2,6	0,83
32. In my opinion, presentations and papers are sensible complement to the session.	14 (100%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	3	2,4	1,26
33. The remarks concerning my presentation/paper are helpful for me.	14 (100%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	3	3,2	1,23
34. The exercises were assessed sufficiently.	14 (100%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	3	2,6	1,26

Own participation

questions	count	answers						median	mean	standard deviation
		At no time	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	>8 times			
35. I missed my classes.	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (57%)	6 (43%)			

questions	count	reasons							
		other class at the same time	work/job	medical condition	personal reason	no interest in course	childcare	other reasons	no comment
36. Main reason of missing classes:	10 (100%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

questions	count	answers						median	mean	standard deviation
		up to 1 hour	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	5-6 hours	7-8 hours	>8 hours			
37. My usual weekly workload (without attendance time) for this module is:	13 (100%)	4 (31%)	4 (31%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)			

Competences - Does the judging session is appropriate to reach the competence aims associated with the module?

questions	count	answers						median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = totally agree	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree	no answer			
38. dissemination of knowledge	10 (100%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	2	2,0	0,94
39. deepening of knowledge	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	5	5,0	0,00
40. methodological competence	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	2	2,3	0,47
41. problem-solving skills	10 (100%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2	1,8	0,69
42. information procurement and processing	10 (100%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	2	1,9	0,99
43. power of judgement	10 (100%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1	1,6	0,68
44. capacity for teamwork	10 (100%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1	1,2	0,42
45. presentation skills	10 (100%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1	1,2	0,42
46. independence	10 (100%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1	1,6	0,73

Overall evaluation of the session

questions	count	answers						median	mean	standard deviation
		1 = very good	2	3	4	5 = totally disagree	no answer			
47. My overall evaluation for the attended session is	14 (100%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	1,7	0,70

What do you like most about the session?

Benjamin is presenting the topic very well and one gets a better understanding of the topic and the methodology

Very motivated lecturer. The lecturer took some time after the classes to deal with questions in greater depth. Very sympatic guy

The lecturer was always well prepared and truely interested in our learning progress. Additionally, he was always available for questions again trying to answer them as good and extensive as possible.

The exercises were explained really well, definitely helped to understand the content of the lecture by deepening it in the exercises as well. Also helpful summaries of the model the exercise was about in the beginning of the class! Very good presentation skills, clear answers to questions.

I really liked the competence of the contributor and different ways of explaining a topic.

The way Benjamin presented the topics and exercises. He is a very good lecturer, that presents the topics in an interesting fashion.

What do you dislike? Are there any problems?

The problems occur from the extent of the main lecture, to many topics and models pressed into the lecture for the first 1,5 month until the midterm, which is not sufficiently manageable in that time with that amount of credits and foreknowledge of Bachelor Macroeconomics at Leipzig University
wealth of material, imparting of methods and relevance for the exam did not have complied

The workload of the module is too large. However, this is not in the area of responsibility of Benjamin Larin.

There was way to less time for the lessons. Therefore, the speaking pace was too high to fully understand and write at the same time.

What suggestions for improvement do you have?

better distribution of the lecture and density. The course amounts for 20 credits at least, spread the course, do the most important parts in Advanced Macro and offer the second part with more depth to student who want to go on with Macroeconomics after their studies. The intention of giving us the best insight is laudable, but it doesn't fit with the workload and a 2 year master, as you can see with the average study time for the master economics. Or prepare a 2.5/3 year master.

Exercise the IRF in the computer tools with octave

More exercise lessons or less content.