# Evaluation ECON4165 2026

**Course responsible: Jonas Erraia**

The course evaluation was conducted with 14 respondents, up from 8 in 2024. Nine respondents attend the five-year master in economics and four the two-year master. All respondents attended the lectures and followed the seminars, so the numbers below reflect students who actually saw the teaching. Overall satisfaction is high: 57 percent rated their satisfaction with the course 5/5, 36 percent rated it 4/5, and one student rated it 3/5. Most students found the course interesting, with 79 percent giving the top score.

The lectures score well. 64 percent of the students rated the quality of the lectures 5/5 and the rest 4/5, while 86 percent rated my ability to convey the material 5/5. The assessment of learning outcome split evenly between 4/5 and 5/5. The written comments give a consistent picture of what drives these numbers: the switching between slides, drawing and live coding, the practical examples, and the close link between the lectures and the term project. Several students also write that the course fills a gap in the catalogue now that ECON4160 is discontinued, and argue that it should continue.

Three improvement themes stand out in the comments. The first is predictability. Some lectures were cancelled or postponed and the order of topics changed during the semester. Some students appreciated the flexibility, since they could influence what we covered, but others found it confusing, and one also mentioned late course messages. The second is the term project. Several students found the project description unclear early in the semester, and the open exam format made it hard to judge what a good paper looks like. The feedback on the papers received mixed ratings from the few students who rated it, and one student suggested a compulsory midterm draft to force an earlier start and create room for formal feedback. The third theme is material outside the lectures. Important points, such as common mistakes to avoid in the project, were said in the lectures but not written on the slides, and the lectures are not recorded. Some students also wanted the code walkthroughs to go a bit slower and asked for a few structured tasks per model in addition to the R files. One student suggested listing Math 2 as recommended prior knowledge.

For next year I plan to set the lecture plan before the semester starts and keep changes to a minimum. This might mean to rather include fewer lectures. I will also attempt to write the recurring lecture points, in particular the common mistakes in the project, into the slides or a short note on Canvas, add a few short structured assignments per model, and raise with the administration whether Math 2 should be listed as recommended prior knowledge.