

Educational Quality Survey Report – Fall Semester 2015

The following report is based upon the survey that was handed out to students taking classes in the master’s program. The survey consisted of 8 questions, which can be found at the end of this document. The questions were split into the following categories: information (2), administration (2), studies (3) and conclusion (1).

Students were also given the opportunity to leave written comments. A summary of survey responses and comments will be presented for each class individually.

**First Year Courses:**

**Analytical Methods**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,6 | 4,5 | 4,4 | 3,6 | 4,1 | 4,2 | 4,7 | 4,0 |

Students were not completely satisfied by the overall organization of the course, but overall rated it as above average.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: Students expressed positive opinions about both lecturer and the TA. They also felt confident about the exam as a good method to be graded in the course and gave positive emphasis on the coursework (and textbook) that was covered in this class.

Suggestions for improvement: It seems that there could be improvement regarding the balance between game theory and math: game theory was harder, but math more time consuming. Clearly, the switching of teachers was problematic in game theory, especially since it lead the lectures and problem sessions to be out of sync.

**Microeconomic Theory**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,8 | 4,8 | 4,6 | 4,3 | 3,9 | 3,9 | 4,4 | 4,2 |

Strong positive responses show satisfaction for the course information that was provided and administration of the course. The slightly lower responses for Q5 and Q6 reflect that students did not think the course was too difficult or overwhelming.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: The material given to improve overview of the class (eg the production theory chart) made everyone very happy. The importance and usefulness of problem solving sessions was also emphasized.

Suggestions for improvement: Students find the synchronization between the micro and math classes is an area that needs improvement; the micro course required knowledge from the math class, which had not been taught yet (in particular the Lagrange method). In addition to this, it was suggested that both teachers could prepare the lecture/problem solving session better, some found the content hard to follow. The class was confusing for some, even though they found the exam was easy.

**Macroeconomic Theory**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 5,0 | 4,8 | 5,5 | 5,2 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 4,8 | 5,1 |

Overall, students were very satisfied with this class. It appears to be slightly difficult for most, but did not let this influence their opinion of the class overall.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: Many students expressed appreciation for the way Teodora structured, organized and taught the course.

Suggestions for improvement: Problem solving sessions would be a great addition to the course, especially since many felt lost and overwhelmed about the material covered. Some students suggested more extensive information on content, for example in the lecture notes or more specific details on the content covered in each chapter.

**Topics in Microeconomics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 2,7 | 3,0 | 3,5 | 2,7 | 4,4 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,0 |

Responses show that most students found the workload for topics to be above average, despite the difficulty level of the content itself scoring lower for the majority. They also show low scores for the overall administration of the course and information.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: Switching to studying empirical research and reading papers was a positive criteria for many students. Positive comments were in particular for the immigration portion of the class.

Suggestions for improvement: In the health portion of the course, it was clear that the lectures were originally designed for a different class, and in particular that they were not designed for a written exam. Alternative assignments could be a useful addition, since the exam turned into mostly memorizing research to answer very specific questions. Overall, needed better structure and organization.

**Second Year Courses:**

**Financial Theory**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,9 | 5,0 | 4,9 | 4,0 | 3,2 | 3,1 | 4,1 | 3,2 |

Students taking this course did not seem to find it too demanding or difficult, the majority also gave constantly strong responses to the information and administration portions of the survey.

**Comments**

Exchange students desired more information regarding the course, and found in particular that the lectures have room for improvement.

**Labour Economics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,8 | 4,6 | 5,0 | 4,3 | 4,3 | 3,9 | 4,3 | 4,4 |

A decent level of workload and difficulty, however the teachers seem to have structured the course well and overall ratings were high.

**Comments**

An improvement to the course could be the addition of hand-in assignments. Students could benefit from better communication between teachers, they found one to be less organized than the other and that their focus on what was important in the course was too different.

**Public Economics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,7 | 4,7 | 5,6 | 4,8 | 4,9 | 4,4 | 4,9 | 4,8 |

Responses were consistently high for all survey questions, especially regarding the communication with teachers. Quality of the course as well as difficulty level.

**Comments**

The course was perhaps too demanding, in particular the hand-in assignments. The hand-ins could also be improved with clearer instruction sand grading criteria.

**Health Economics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,3 | 5,2 | 4,6 | 4,3 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,2 | 4,1 |

The course did not score high for relevance to the student’s future studies, and it was not too demanding. However, they rated the administration and the course information high.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: Posting exercises all at once allowed students to manage their time, and there was good course structure.

Suggestions for improvement: There is a desire for better connection between theory and empirics parts of the course. The course could also benefit from better structure, because some students expressed that they lost overview of the content.

**Political Economics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,6 | 5,2 | 5,5 | 5,6 | 3,9 | 3,8 | 4,2 | 5,0 |

Strong positive responses to the administration of the course. Overall, education quality was rated strong and difficulty level has rated very consistently fair.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: There was good organization of the course.

Suggestions for improvement: Broadening the geographical scope of the studies could be an improvement to the class. More information on structure and grading, specifically for the presentation and participation in seminars, would be beneficial.

**Applied Macroeconomics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 |
| Average | 4,2 | 5,4 | 5,6 | 5,0 | 3,4 | 3,8 | 4,6 | 4,0 |

Students were very happy with the organization of the course, but the opinions on difficulty levels were very scattered.

**Comments**

Positive Feedback: Students commented on how interesting the course was and how it was presented to them in the structure of the class and evaluation methods.

Suggestions for improvement: Perhaps better communication between the teachers of the two different sections of the course could be of improvement.

**Survey Questions**

**Q1. Was the general information regarding the course prior to this semester clear (contents, exam procedure, etc.)?** (1: not at all – 6: very clear)

**Q2. Was the information regarding the grading criteria clear?** (1: not at all – 6: very clear)

**Q3. Has the communication with the teachers been satisfactory?** (1: not at all – 6: very satisfactory)

**Q4. What is your opinion on the overall organization of each course**? (1: very poor – 6: very good)

**Q5. How do you consider the workload of each course?** (1: too low – 6: too high)

**Q6. How would you rate the difficulty level of each course?** (1: too easy – 6: too difficult)

**Q7. Did the content of the courses seem relevant to your future studies/working life?** (1: not at all – 6: very much)

**Q8. Are you satisfied with the overall educational quality of each course?** (1: not at all – 6: very satisfied)