Seminar Assessment Report

ECO-CO-STATS3

Title:	Statistics and Econometrics 3		
Professor(s):	Prof. Jesus BUEREN & Prof. Russell COOPER, Ass. Prof. Jesus Bueren & Prof. Russell Cooper		
Teaching Assistant(s):	Chengzi Yi and Thomas Walsh		
Department:	ECO	**Participants:**	20
Term:	BLOCK 3	**Forms returned:**	20
Year	2021 - 2022	**Return:**	100%

		Answers	%
Q1. In overall terms I am satisfied with the seminar/course			
5	Very much	2	10.00%
4	Considerably	12	60.00%
3	Average	3	15.00%
2	Not very much	3	15.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%
Q2. The seminar was well organised and well prepared.			
5	Very much	1	5.00%
4	Considerably	13	65.00%
3	Average	4	20.00%
2	Not Very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%
Q3. The professor was clear in her/his presentations and explanations.			
5	Very much	3	15.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	7	35.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	1	5.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q4. The professor teaches with interest and enthusiasm.			
5	Very much	7	35.00%
4	Considerably	9	45.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q5. Where appropriate, the professor encourages class participation.			
5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	9	45.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not Very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No Answer	1	5.00%

Q6. The professor was available and approachable outside seminar hours.			
5	Very much	9	45.00%
4	Considerably	7	35.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q7. The overall themes of the course/seminar were developed in a coherent manner.			
5	Very much	2	10.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	6	30.00%
2	Not very much	4	20.00%
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	2	10.00%
4	Considerably	4	20.00%
3	Average	9	45.00%
2	Not very much	4	20.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q9. After taking this course/seminar my interest in the given subject has increased.			
5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	2	10.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q10. Indicate the percentage of sessions you attended for the course/seminar			
1	Between 80% & 100%	18	90.00%
2	Between 50% & 80%	1	5.00%
3	Less than 50%	1	5.00%
	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	20	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	20	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	5.00%
4	Considerably	4	20.00%
3	Average	7	35.00%
2	Not very much	4	20.00%
1	Not at all	4	20.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Which courses overlapped with this course/seminar?

Response: Macroeconomics 2
Response: Macro II
Response: Tiny amounts of Econometrics 1 and 2
Response: Macroeconomics 2
Response: Macro II
Response: Macroeconomics I
Response: Macro II, Econometrics I & II
Response: Macro II, Metrics II
Response: Macroeconomics II
Response: macro 2
Response: Macroeconomics 3

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

Response: 20
Response: 10
Response: 15-20 hours per week
Response: 20h/wk
Response: 160h
Response: 25 hours per week
Response: 80
Response: 20-25 hours a week
Response: 80
Response: 60-70
Response: 20h /week
Response: 150h
Response: The coding problem sets for this course were the most time-consuming tasks of the programme for me, so far. I enjoyed doing them and learned a lot from them. I would spend about 10-12 hours a week on each PS alone. To that I would add a couple of hours studying.

Q15. Practical classes (ECO/SPS) and training seminars have been very useful for the learning and understanding of the subject.			
5	Very much	7	35.00%
4	Considerably	4	20.00%
3	Average	3	15.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	1	5.00%
	NA / No answer	4	20.00%

Q16. If this course was co-taught, do you agree that co-teaching improved the course?			
5	Very much	2	10.00%
4	Considerably	1	5.00%
3	Average	5	25.00%
2	Not very much	3	15.00%
1	Not at all	3	15.00%
	NA / No answer	6	30.00%

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

Response: Both professors were very nice and enthusiastic always ready to help. I can't really appreciate it that much since given the scarcity of time during the whole block I didn't get a chance to come to office hours etc.

Response: Jesus' lectures felt a bit unprepared, and could be improved with more structure. The problem sets were too long and we were not allowed to use the in-built functions which was a major drag on the course. I would either increase the weight of the problem sets to something like 30% of the grade or reduce their scope significantly. Cooper's lectures were good as usual. However, I and I think most people were very confused as to how to study this course. In the previous course we had very detailed class notes and problem sets that were very close to exam questions. In this course we had nothing like that, the problem sets were very long and did not help in preparing for the exam, which was very difficult.

Response: Bueren taught the classical time series component clearly.
Cooper may have overestimated the students' familiarity or background relating to GMM and SMM.
Both profs. were approachable and enthusiastic but the co-teaching led to both parts being taught too fast with insufficient time to understand concepts before moving on to new topics.

Response: Course took form of two separate courses, so not appropriate to classify as co-teaching

Response: Both professors taught with substantial enthusiasm. Sometimes the distinction between a macro and an econometrics class were not perfectly clear.

Response: Cooper: Great intuition and super approachable way of teaching complex topics.
Bueren: Broke down pretty dry topics in an easy way.

Response: For both parts, I felt that lectures were taught at a satisfying level and we were always able to talk to professors about the material covered.

Response: The professors were both good but the topics were not particularly close to each other, and in a short amount of time such as 3 weeks learning these two different parts was a bit challenging for me.

Response: The co-teaching feels a bit disconneceted, in the sense that it feels like two different classes with little link between the two.

Response: Course was okay, structure was good, part on SMM and GMM was sometimes confusing and only became really fully clear after we had tried the assignments and the TA pointed out are mistakes. Interesting content, lecture notes on SMM and GMM were slides, I think written notes here would have been appreciated (as least by me).
Response: Jesus Bueren - truly concerned about levelling the playing field for people who had not seen Time Series before and push everyone to the same level. I did all the derivations in lecture and all content and notation was clear. With hindisght, I realise that delivering the lectures sitting and writing on the ipad made the learning experience less engaging as lectures tended to be more monotone. For next year, I really encourage Jesus to use the white board!
Russel Cooper - he gave us some of the best lectures of the PhD so far. His sense of humour, depth of knowledge and articulated way to present complex concepts make him an outstanding lecturer.
Response: It is already co-taught.

Q18. Do you think the teaching assistant (Doctoral Researcher or Post-Doctoral Fellow) was well organised and prepared?			
5	Very much	7	35.00%
4	Considerably	9	45.00%
3	Average	3	15.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
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	13	65.00%
4	Considerably	5	25.00%
3	Average	1	5.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
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: I absolutely loved Chengzi and her approach. She was always ready to help and explain and she was nicely prepared for the TA session. [redacted]

Response: [redacted]

Chengzi was great! She was helpful and her seminars were very good.

Response: TA was prepared.

Response: Chengzi was great -- kind, respectful, accessible, coherent, receptive to feedback

Response: [redacted]

[redacted]

Chengzi on the other hand was great. Given the topic is quite abstract she managed to explain it as intuitively as possible. Also her codes were very readable and understanding and she was available practically all the time.

Response: Chengzi: Great TA that really helped us understand the mechanics behind the intuition.

[redacted]

Response: Especially Chengzi Yi was a really good TA and tried to make the topics as clear as she could do.

Response: [redacted] Chengzi were very good, great feedback, intuition and availability

Response: [redacted] Chengzi Yi - one of the most dedicated TAs we have had. She would relentlessly help students and address our questions, especially on coding bits. She was particularly helpful in office hours in breaking down the SMM codes and explaining intuitively what we had to do. This is particularly important in Cooper's part of the course which, I think, heavily relies on a good TA.

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

Response: None

Response: Although SMM is a method that most people haven't seen, I think for a core time series model it is essential to discuss unit roots and co-integration and their implications in VARs etc. Both topics were not mentioned. This includes the Durbin Watson statistic etc

Response: I missed a lot of topics in time series. I would prefer if we spent more time on Structural VARs, Forecasting error variance decompositions, more time on State space models, Kalman filter and its use in forecasting.

Response: Time series more in depth such as: non-stationary processes, unit roots, cointegration, BVAR and Forecasting

Q22. What topics should have been reduced/omitted?

Response: I think GMM and SMM was a total overkill for the course. I wish we only had time series and got a chance to understand it better. There's so much more we can do in SVAR.

Response: SMM and topics that were examined with no relevant slides or lecture notes.

Response: A slightly larger focus on the time-series aspect in favour of the very in-depth discussion of SMM may be useful. Although interesting, firm choice problems are not strictly econometrics core in my view.

Response: Maximum likelihood - we covered this in each Statistics in Econometrics course, and AR and MA models are in my opinion topics for a masters degree, on this level we could maybe cover it from spectral analysis perspective and not the basics.

Response: Probably, there should be a reshuffle of the entire Econometrics sequence as everything we did was relevant in some sense.

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

Response: IRF computation and SVAR
Response: Stationarity, ergodicity, GMM intution.
Response: The second part I found particularly valuable because it is seldom part of core coursework despite being a fundamental component of the toolbox for all those who want to work with economic models and data.
Response: coding
Response: the basic GMM/SMM distinction was very useful. Reducing it in scope to the end in favour of some more cointegration in the beginning may be useful
Response: Kalman filter, topics on VAR
Response: Part I: SVAR, Part II: SMM
Response: SMM
Response: SMM and GMM
Response: SMM and GMM were really interesting, of course time series is a must and is valuable.
Response: Part 2 - SMM and Indirect Inference. This part of the course really offered a fresh view and a bridge between theory and empirics which I find critical in transitioning from coursework to research.
Response: Times series

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

Response: Dropping the topics. I think Jesus has prepared really good slides and material to grasp the time series topics in a very easy and efficient way. I think Cooper's slides and lecture notes were extremely short. I know we had a book as a reference and I read two chapters but I found the book too chatty and not very helpful for the exam preparation. Obviously having nice lecture notes on the silver plate would have decreased my anxiety about this course and whole block. I know we are grad students and we should be able to find our sources and read references but there's simply no time in the block. I was so lamely prepared for the metrics exam because I didn't know what to study for the part 2. I tried doing two of the problem sets which were just time consuming and in the end I didn't really understand what I was doing at all.
Response: Spend less time of SMM on applications from literature and more on both intuition and straightforward explanations of how it works and what it is and is not.
Response: I think the problem of this course is that it joins time series and GMM/SMM. This puts too much workload on one subject. You don't learn time series as much as you'd want to, and the same goes for GMM/SMM. Also, given how much the problem sets count towards the final grade are just too extensive. A lot of coding for 5 %, which means you deepen your understand in the topic, however on the exam you get completely different exercises. So in my opinion this course needs quite a thorough restruction.
Response: For both classes: The problem sets were considerable in workload but yielded every limited rewards in the grading process. On occasions, Problem Sets somewhat disconnected from lecture.
Response: I think that in general the amount of material covered was too much for 1 course. We had to rush through both parts as lecturers were not given an appropriate amount of time to cover the topics more in-depth.
Response: Maybe the second part of the lecture can be taught as a separate lecture in the fourth block or advanced lecture in the second year.
Response: As mentioned in the macro survey, for me, personally, the way of teaching (for the first part of the course) was not the best one. It was usually hard to understand what was written in the Ipad and sometimes it was critical (for instance if a subscript was t or t-1). Also, I lack a bit of context instead of just jumping into derivations, I would have understood the course better if there were some words in between derivations and if we would have a bigger picture of what was our goal (such as proving that social planner with transfers can lead to decentralized outcome). Following the slides and arguing more about the intuition (leaving derivations for us at home) would have been a better

approach, in my opinion.
Response: I feel that prof Cooper's part of the less could use more structure in terms of material. It is not a trivial subject and following the whole course almost solely from the professor"s explanation (the slides are very minimalist) is quite tricky.
Response: Management of problem set workload - there is a steep learning curve at the beginning, which implies most students end up spending most of their week on these PS. This is one of the reasons why block 3 is so hard on us, I think. There are computational aspects - grid search, VFI, tauchen, on which we could be trained (beyond 1 matlab class) beforehand - so that when we attempt these PSsets we can mostly focus on concepts of the course rather than on debugging basic programming routines.
Response: Prof. Cooper: It would have been helpful to create a more detailed set of notes to better follow the outline of the class (like in macro 2)

Q25. Do you have any further comments about the course/seminar?
Response: I would suggest doing just one Model in part 2 and get more insight into the metrics part of GMM and SMM.
Response: Consider either reducing the material, esp. in part 2, and providing A4 lecture notes on SMM in addition to the slide set.
Response: GMM and SMM were very new and particularly interesting for me and for time series, I finally managed to understand a lot that I didn't before, making this area in general much more approachable for me.

Course content

Q26. Was the sequence and structure of the course clear?			
5	Very much	4	20.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	6	30.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q27. How much overlap was there between this seminar/course and a previous one you took in your previous MA programme?			
5	Almost identical	0	0.00%
4	Considerably	7	35.00%
3	Not very much	9	45.00%
2	Not at all	4	20.00%
1	I do not have an MA degree prior to EUI	0	0.00%
	NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q28. Course content: additional comments:
Response: Part 1 overlapped with MSc time series courses. Part 2 was 100% new.
Response: Mostly the part regarding univariate and multivariate time series.
Response: There was a huge overlap with my previous courses in Time series, but zero in GMM/SMM.
Response: Overlap with: Applied Time Series class
Response: Time series bit was fairly standard; it majorly overlapped my undergrad time series course (except Kalman filter), so in all honesty I was expecting a more ambitious syllabus; and I think the cohort had the ability to go further, honestly. But that is an entirely personal note,

Written Notes and References

Q29. Were slide/lecture notes provided to you?		
Yes	20	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q30. Were the slide/lecture notes clear?			
5	Very much	3	15.00%
4	Considerably	4	20.00%
3	Average	11	55.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q31. Were the slides/lecture notes sufficient to understand the topics covered in class?			
5	Very much	2	10.00%
4	Considerably	2	10.00%
3	Average	9	45.00%
2	Not very much	6	30.00%
1	Not at all	1	5.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q32. Were the slides/lecture notes well connected with the actual lecture?			
5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	7	35.00%
3	Average	6	30.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

Q33. Did the professor provide references to other sources for deepening your understanding (e.g. textbooks, related articles, supplemental material)?		
Yes	19	95.00%
No	1	5.00%
NA / No Answer	0	0.00%

Q34. Were the slides/lecture notes well connected to these complementary sources?			
5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	6	30.00%
3	Average	6	30.00%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	2	10.00%

Q35. Written notes and references: additional comments:

Response: Too time consuming. I was too tired by the second half of the block that I gave up doing the problem sets …

Response: Part 1 slides were self-contained and PS could be answered using critical thinking and material provided. Part 2 slides and A4 notes were insufficient to be able to understand all examinable material, particularly as it was more high-level in the slides than the level required of students.

Response: For the SMM part of the course I think the study material could be widened by giving the students a set of more comprehensive notes. Another thing I think the students would benefit a lot from, is having a notes' set containing some different examples to see the estimation procedure of a model in action in different scenarios. In such way they can try themselves to sketch estimation procedures, make mistakes and learn from that. This creates chances for students to fail and learn in the process and really master the techniques.

Response: The slides for the second part of the course (Cooper) were not helpful. It would have been much more helpful to have the same type of notes we had during the 2nd block for Macro I.

Response: The slides for Prof Bueren's part were satisfactory and contained the necessary content to follow properly the class.

On the other hand the material for Prof Cooper's part is in my opinion too light to follow such a technical topic

Problem Sets

Q36. Did the problem sets help you deepen your understanding of the basic concepts covered in class?			
5	Very much	8	40.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

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

5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	11	55.00%
3	Average	0	0.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	1	5.00%
	NA / No answer	0	0.00%

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

5	Very much	2	10%
4	Considerably	8	40%
3	Average	6	30%
2	Not very much	3	15%
1	Not at all	1	5%
	NA / No answer	0	0%

Q39. The level of difficulty of the problem sets were:

5	Too easy	0	0%
4	Easy	0	0%
3	Neither easy nor hard	5	25%
2	Hard	11	55%
1	Too hard	4	20%
	NA / No answer	0	0%

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

1	Not very time consuming	0	0%
2	About average	2	10%
3	Too time consuming	17	85%
	NA / No answer	1	5%

Q41. Problem sets: additional comments:

Response: Part 2 problem sets were too advanced for many students to understand within 3-9 hours of lectures on GMM, SMM, etc.

Response: Jesus' problem sets by steps was very nice and conducive to learning. Cooper's problem sets often very time-consuming to set up just to get to the point of solving and learning from them. As TAs required HTML output, in the future it would be useful to have a brief crash course on how to do this prior to problem set due dates.

Response: The problem sets, especially the coding part, was amazing to actually internalise the subjects taught - maybe even essential. However, the workload together with macro AND micro was too intense

Response: I spent most of my time working on problem sets. They are just too extensive for the points you receive in the end.

Response: The amount of programming involved was too much, especially that all problem sets amounted to 5% of the

final grade. With such low gratification for the effort, very time consuming and involving problem sets tend to be frustrating later in the semester.
Hence, I would suggest either reducing the workload, or increase the weight of PS towards the final grade (with the latter being a better solution in my opinion, since problem sets help to understand the topics more in-depth).
Response: The problem sets involved too much programming for an average economics student. While it is definitely a nice thing to learn about how to program everything from scratch, it is too time consuming and combined with the other courses of the 3rd block, it increases the overall stress incredibly.
Response: The problem sets were too time consuming for the 1st part as they were the only ones compulsory. Yet I think compulsory problem sets help to deepen the understanding, so having the ones of the second part being compulsory as well will be helpful for the learning experience (conditional on reshuffling the content of the blocks)
Response: We were encouraged to use Julia yet the pre course in coding was in matlab. Using Julia seems tdefinitely the path to follow but then the coding classes previously need to be aligned with that. Having had Julia classes before hand would have been very useful since it felt like a bit chunk of the time spent on problem sets was on understanding the language.
Response: Part 2 - I honestly feel that this part of the course lacks a technical note with a generic "SMM recipe". In the end I backward-engineered one from all the coding, but some generic step-by-step guides would have saved me hours. In general, during lectures the SMM procedure seems straightforward (which conceptually sort of is), yet computationally there are more cumbersome aspects which could be addressed in lecture (order of loops, dimensionality of data vs simulated objects, etc).

T.A. Sessions

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

5	Very much	1	5.00%
4	Considerably	8	40.00%
3	Average	9	45.00%
2	Not very much	1	5.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	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: Already explained that in the previous page.
Response: Both of them did a great job.

Q44. Did the T.A. explain harder/trickier parts of the problem set well?			
5	Very much	5	25.00%
4	Considerably	11	55.00%
3	Average	3	15.00%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

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

Q46. Did the T.A. respond to the problems and difficulties raised by the class?			
5	Very much	6	30.00%
4	Considerably	12	60.00%
3	Average	1	5.00%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

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

Q48. Did you feel that the T.A. sessions were more useful than simply reading written solutions?			
5	Very much	8	40.00%
4	Considerably	7	35.00%
3	Average	2	10.00%
2	Not very much	2	10.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

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

Response: Especially Chengzi took a lot of time to talk with me about my code for the problem sets in office hours and beyond, this extremely helped me to understand the methods we learned in class.

Q50. Did you feel that the T.A. understood the material sufficiently better than the students?			
5	Very much	11	55.00%
4	Considerably	7	35.00%
3	Average	1	5.00%
2	Not very much	0	0.00%
1	Not at all	0	0.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

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

---

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%	6	30.00%
Between 40% and 60%	12	60.00%
Between 60% and 80%	1	5.00%
Between 80% and 100%	0	0.00%
NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q53. What percentage of this time spent on this course was spent on problem sets?		
Between 0% and 20%	1	5.00%
Between 20% and 40%	1	5.00%
Between 40% and 60%	3	15.00%
Between 60% and 80%	6	30.00%
Between 80% and 100%	8	40.00%
NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q54. What percentage of the time spent on this course was spent on general background studying and reading?		
Between 0% and 20%	11	55.00%
Between 20% and 40%	6	30.00%
Between 40% and 60%	2	10.00%
Between 60% and 80%	0	0.00%
Between 80% and 100%	0	0.00%
NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q55. What percentage of the time spent on this course was spent on other things?		
I spend between 0% and 20% other things	16	80.00%
I spend between 20% and 40% other things	3	15.00%
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	5.00%

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

Response: Reading further resources on SMM, etc..
Response: I would have loved to read a paper applying the methods

Q57. How much of the course material was familiar to you before the course?			
5	Most	0	0.00%
4	A lot	1	5.00%
3	A moderate amount	10	50.00%
2	A little	6	30.00%
1	None at all	2	10.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q58. Of the material that was familiar did you manage to deepen your understanding?			
5	Very much	4	20.00%
4	Considerably	4	20.00%
3	Average	5	25.00%
2	Not very much	5	25.00%
1	Not at all	1	5.00%
	NA / No answer	1	5.00%

Q59. Additional Comments:

Q60. Any other remarks: