Summary of Workshop Evaluation
Advanced Course in Household Economics and Natural Resource Management
Waikkal, Colombo, Sri Lanka
June 16 -27, Sri Lanka

Workshop Value and Quality

No. of Participants: 20
Evaluation Forms Filled By: 19

S.N	Questions	Respondents Grades				
		Low			High	
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.	Relevance of this activity to your current work			3	6	10
2.	Extent to which you have acquired information that is new to you		2	1	11	5
3.	Usefulness to you of the information that you have acquired	2		1	9	7
4.	Focus of this activity on what you specifically needed to learn	1		5	9	4
5.	Extent to which the content of this activity matched the announced objectives	1	1		9	8
6.	Overall usefulness of this activity	1	1		9	8
7.	What are the three most significant areas of information, knowledge or skills acquired from this workshop that you could now apply? a. Exposure to HH modeling literature from across the world. b. Analyzing Farm/Peasant household behavior c. Missing markets & Market imperfection d. Linear programming e. Village based SAM f. Household behavior in case of market failure g. Household Modeling (Peasant) h. Techniques to address these problems i. Non separate Peasant HH analysis j. Poverty and environment/ NRM in the context of non –separability			1 3 4 4 6 1 5 1 2 1		

k.	Policy implications for the above two (i. and j.)	1
l.	Household Modeling for NRM	1
m.	Numerical examples	1
n.	Household behavior with full income constraints	1
o.	CGE (Introduction to micro CGE models)	6
p.	Market imperfection and modeling consumer, producer problem in Agriculture sector.	1
q.	Constructing theoretical model that explains real world research questions	1
r.	Constructing empirical model to deal with theoretical model	1
s.	Application of the above model (q. & r.) to deal with natural resource management problems.	1
t.	Introduction to use of Strata	3
u.	Discrete choice model.	1
v.	Modeling Non – separable situations of production and consumption	3
w.	Use of excel to solve linear programming	1
x.	Use of primary data to analyze peasant behavior and externalities.	1
y.	Econometric estimation from limited variables	1
z.	Time preference, resource conservation	1

8 .	Other Comments	a. The course was most relevant since I work on HH modeling in the rural sector.
		b. Too much focus on negative externalities
		c. The course is very useful to understand the peasant household behavior.
		d. Some specific courses in environmental economic and its modeling can be of direct use for me. Especially with respect to its health impacts and how to measure cost of living exposures etc.
		e. Good Quality course but exhausting. Perhaps the course could have benefited from a two – day break. The exercise sessions would have benefited from more assistance/ feedback provided particularly on SAM
		f. Less Lab work than theory.
		g. Devotion of more time to exercises in model formulation would have been more productive.
		h. If some session on collective action problem in natural resource management could be introduced I might have benefited more.
		i. I found workshop very useful as we could learn more on household modeling and application of Strata.

		j. It is very good course to enhance the skills of linkage in Household production function model. k. It is good if we can continue using the knowledge that we acquired. l. Overall qualities of the workshop were very high. The interaction between the participants as well as the faculty as well as among the participants were informal, productive and mutually enriching.

Summary of Workshop Evaluation
Advanced Course in Household Economics and Natural Resource Management
Waikkal, Colombo, Sri Lanka
June 16 -27, Sri Lanka

<u>Course Structure and Content</u>

No. of Participants: 20
Evaluation Form Filled By: 19

S.N	Questionnaire	Yes		No
1.	Were the numbers of sessions each day appropriate? **Comments**: a. Four sessions appropriate. b. The afternoon session was mostly wasted. c. Practices in SAM & CGE were less.	18		1
2.	Was the length of each session appropriate? **Comments:** a. Mostly appropriate. But some session on group works should have been larger. b. Less for CGE	18		1

S.N	Questionnaire	More	Less	Same
3.	If you were to improve on the structure of the program, what would you suggest? **Reading Material** **Discussion Sessions**	 2 5	 3 1	 12 11
	Other Comments: a. More focused and thorough coverage of a fewer topics will be more useful than a shallow coverage of two large a number of topics. b. More time to the <u>discussion</u> on individual/ group presentations of household models would have been useful. Specific suggestions and (in certain case) <u>demonstrations</u> would have made the presentation <u>conclusive</u>. Also, the			

	discussions on the exercises were half-hearted leading to loss of interest in that particular activity. c. Make it livelier and more group works. d. More time and lecture is required to learn Strata. e. More training is required to interpret the Strata's result whether theoretical predictions correlated with empirical estimation. f. In the exercise sessions (assignment) it should have been more interactive with the resource person. It was obvious that most participants were not familiar with most techniques and so left a gap between actual learning and optimal learning. g. In order to improver the structure of the program, I suggest to increase the number of instructors with varying specialization. h. Complete exercise regarding LP, Logit and Probit models should be allocated more time. It also should be conducted in very systematic way. I personally think that these activities did not provide a good insight to the candidates who were learning this for the first time. i. Given the time constraints, the structure of the course was appropriate – it covered the areas from where one can start further study and research. j. Make sure that lectures are in accordance with the given exercise. Also make sure that at least one example same to the exercise has been handled in the class. k. Rather than reading all materials provided better to ask participants to study the materials most relevant to their research interest and presentation of those materials.			
	COURSE CONTENT			
4.	Has the amount of information or feedback you have received been appropriate? **Comments:** a. However, feedback/assistance in the exercise session was not sufficient. b. Maybe a follow up course on the empirics (such as design of questionnaire and related issues; statistical and econometric analysis of data; sampling issues etc.) of the theoretical issues would complement fully the information gathered from this particular course.	**Yes** 18		**No** 1

5.	Please identify the sessions that were MOST useful to you	a. All b. Farm household behavior, Market imperfection and Missing Markets. c. Those conducted by Stein himself. d. LP sessions e. Market Failures, Poverty and Environment sessions. f. Linear Programming g. Session on household models h. Discussion of externality lecture of village CGE modeling exercise. i. Poverty and forest management. j. Group discussion on externalities/ after summarizing the articles given by the group. k. The sessions which discussed different ways of HH modeling were the most useful. Prof. Stein as a resource person was an excellent choice. l. Theory of Household production function model, econometric implication. m. Presentation of group project; working in a group for reading materials. n. Role of time preference and degradation, HH models. o. The session numbers correspond to the ones given the time schedule of the course.
6.	Please Identify sessions that were LEAST useful to you.	a. SAM (too little discussion) b. The exercise could have been more interactive. Help was required in those & was not adequately provided by the helper. c. CGE d. Most afternoon sessions. The teaching assistant never came with preparation and he did not take the job seriously. e. Heckman's model f. Assignment sessions were not as useful as expected. g. Session when Jeetendra was explaining SAM. h. SAM, LP, CGE models.

7.	Any other comments you would like to make.	a. The discussions for the afternoon exercise could be improved.
		b. Overall, the course I would have benefited more if all participants has uniformly high interest level.
		c. This course should be 3weeks program.
		d. The arrangement was excellent, absolutely nothing to complain, in fact it could not be better. Professor Stein was a very good choice, in fact, excellent choice. Teaching assistant was a bad choice just because he didn't take it seriously.
		e. Courses relevant to environmental valuation and application of optimum control theory to resource management maybe very useful.
		f. It would have been useful to work on one assignment which would eliminate the end of a course into a test (with some given data) SAM –CGE. The assignments currently done were a little disjointed.
		g. Econometric exercises have to be strengthened. Theoretical prediction of household production function model has to be linked with more empirical work in the practical session.
		h. I look forward to this kind of useful course in future.
		i. The sessions of first two day are very good but because of difficulty in following mathematical equation symbol, I could not get much then.
		j. This is not because of the course content; rather, it is because I am not conversant with theoretical basis of bio-economic models and CGE models. The course did give some basic information on the applied part but little theory.
		k. More in-depth coverage of inter-household interactions (using Game Theory model) and incorporation of risk in household models; deriving reduced form equations from structural model and econometric problems; issues should be covered.

8.	Are there any additional preparatory or follow up actions/ information/ materials that it would have been helpful for SANDEE to provide?	a. No
		b. Another course on Game Theory and CGE would be very useful.
		c. More in Environment Conservation issues.
		d. The teaching assistant was not very helpful. At times he was more detached than helpful.
		e. More introductory activities on the subject (as access to book was limited). More on strata operation.
		f. To construct an effective interactions between resource persons and participants who would like to develop theoretical or empirical work based on the household economics and natural resource management.
		g. A workshop with game theoretic approach is suggested.
		h. The teaching assistant should have played a larger role in terms of communication with the participants before the course began in terms of systematically preparing the participants on the preliminaries.
		i. The solution set of all the assignments with the data set and notes/ should be mailed to participants so that they can follow upon the exercises again.
		j. Solutions to all the exercise have to be sent as an attachment to all the participants. It will be helpful to practice ourselves.
		k. If SANDEE can provide recent articles in the future then it will help to undertake research work in current issues.
		l. The panel data set and the solutions of the different exercises should be sent as an attachment to all participants.
		m. Arrangements may be made to supply the participants with data sets used for constructing CGE and SAM.