

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 1A/B	<b>Title</b> Microeconomics / Macroeconomics	Date report submitted: 15 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Dr Johan P Larsson	
How many lectures were there?	32 hours of lectures (including a 2 hours revision lecture)	
Who did the lectures?	<b>Michealmas:</b> Dr Johan Larsson <b>Lent:</b> Dr Johan Larsson, Dr Shaun Laurcom	
What number of supervisions were offered? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	8	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	<b>Michealmas:</b> Dr Johan Larsson, Dr Alex Morris, Dr Mo Jia <b>Lent:</b> Dr Scott Wang, Dr Alex Morris	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Approx. 4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	8	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	Students seem to generally have appreciated content and supervisions. Good progress overall.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	The paper should be changed to having the same number of lectures in micro/macro.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 2	<b>Title</b> Public Sector	Date report submitted:  3/12/19
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Howarth	
How many lectures were there?	36	
Who did the lectures?	Howarth and Stott	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	10	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Howarth and Stott	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4 plus revision essays	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	Seemed fine apart from the usual IT problems in Mill Lane.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	No	

<b>University of Cambridge</b> <b>Department of Land Economy</b>		
<b>Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19</b>		
Paper 3 (Year 1, Tripos)	Title: Quantitative and Legal Methods for Land Economists	Date report submitted: 07 June 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Philip Arestis	
How many lectures were there?	Mathematics: 8 two-hour lectures Statistics: 6 two-hour lectures Legal Methods: 4 two-hour lectures	
Who did the lectures?	Mathematics: Philip Arestis Statistics: Helen Bao Legal Methods: Paul McHugh	
What number of supervisions were offered? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Mathematics: 3 sets of 12 supervisions, 36 in total. 1 revision supervisions per student in Easter Term. Statistics: 3 per student in Michaelmas Term and 1 revision supervisions per student in Easter Term. Legal Methods: 4 per student	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Mathematics: Binru Wei Statistics: Helen Bao Legal Methods: Paul McHugh	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Mathematics: 4 students. Statistics: 4 students. Legal Methods: 3-5 students	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Mathematics: a number of exercises per supervision, which varied depending on the theme of the supervision. Statistics: a number of exercises per supervision, which varied depending on the theme of the supervision. Legal Methods: one per supervision including the revision session where they were asked to complete a mock-exam type of question.	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	Mathematics: good progress in both lectures and supervisions. Statistics: good progress in both lectures and supervisions. Legal Methods: The students seemed to engage very well.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	None	
Are there any recommendations you	None	

wish to make for the  
forthcoming year?

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 4	<b>Title</b> Land, Development and Sustainability	<b>Date report submitted:</b>  July 17, 2019
<b>Name of Course Co-ordinator</b>	Professor Laura Diaz Anadon and Professor Ian Hodge	
<b>How many lectures were there?</b>	16 2-hour lectures	
<b>Who did the lectures?</b>	Prof. Diaz Anadon, Prof. Hodge, Prof. Lizieri, Prof. Kontoleon, Prof. Arestis, Dr. Oner and Dr. Larsson plus three revision lectures in the Easter term by Profs. Diaz Anadon, Hodge and Lizieri	
<b>What number of supervisions were offered? (<i>Tripos only</i>)</b>	There were 7 supervisions.  There was an additional task of managing the projects, which included providing feedback on the draft title via Moodle and dealing with student requests.	
<b>Please list the supervisors for this academic year (<i>Tripos only</i>)</b>	Supervision 1: Dr. Victoria Ormond (organized by Prof. Hodge) Supervision 2: Michael Haddad (organized by Prof. Arestis) Supervision 3: Dr. Jing Meng, Ben Probst and Sam Vosper (organized by Prof. Diaz Anadon) Supervision 4: Dr. Cristina Penasco and Ida Sognaes (organized by Prof. Diaz Anadon) Supervision 5: Nicolas Valenzuela (organized by Prof. Hodge) Supervision 6: Prof. Diaz Anadon (this is the Project supervision) Supervision 7: Dr. Victoria Ormond (organized by Prof. Hodge)	
<b>What was the average size of the supervision groups? (<i>Tripos only</i>)</b>	3-4, mostly 4.	
<b>What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? (<i>Tripos only</i>)</b>	6 written essays and a presentation with feedback for the project supervision.	
<b>Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year</b>	Generally the students seemed happy and even though many people lectured and supervised, the organization run smoothly.  The project topics were very varied, many on land, many on affordable housing, many on climate and renewable energy, many on agglomeration economies, indicating that the students were spread across the many topics covered.	
<b>Were there any specific problems that arose?</b>	The biggest problem was regarding the setup and timings of the draft project title, the final project title, and the project supervision.	

<p>Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?</p>	<p>We need to officially change the process for changing the project title after the final title is submitted (this year it required approval from the Board of Land Economy). Ideally the Chair of the Part I examiners and the paper leader(s) should be enough.</p> <p>We also recommend delay the submission of the draft title until the start of the Lent term. The project presentation around the middle of the Lent term also worked. Shortly after that we suggest they should submit their final title. The students also need to be clear regarding the 'length' of the title. This year we did not give a limit and some were too long.</p>

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 5	<b>Title:</b> Environmental Economics and Law	Date report submitted: 20 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Andreas Kontoleon	
How many lectures were there?	32	
Who did the lectures?	Dr Andreas Kontoleon x 8 hours Dr. Shaun Larcom x 8 hours Dr Julius Weitzdörfer x 8 hours Dr Markus Gehring x 8 hours	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	9 (includes revision supervisions)	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Andreas Kontoleon Sam Vosper Benedict Probst Paul Lohmann Dr. Markus Gehring Pascal Kurt Gotthardt Natalie Jones Julius Weitzdörfer Catherine MacKenzie	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	5	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	<p>The course followed similar content to that used in previous years. Overall in-class observation, supervision reports, and the final exam marks suggest that class performance was highly satisfactory.</p> <p>The exam performance was particularly well impressive suggesting that the students that the students have adjusted well to the modified exam format introduced 3 years ago.</p>	

Were there any specific problems that arose?	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	We will seek feedback on the new exam format and see if there is further scope for improvement.

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 6	<b>Title:</b> Fundamentals of Finance & Investment	Date report submitted: 20 August 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Kanak Patel	
How many lectures were there?	36	
Who did the lectures?	K Patel, C Lizieri	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4 (Michalemas), 4 (Lent), 2 (Easter)	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	K Patel, T Al-Hindawi, C Lizieri	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	3-5	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	numerical exercises + essays	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	<p>The course followed the same content and format used in previous years.</p> <p>Overall in-class observation suggests that class performance was highly satisfactory.</p> <p>The overall exam results suggested that students performed well in the paper.</p>	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	-	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	If students make more effort to keep up with assigned course readings, especially attempt numerical supervision questions, it would help them to build up their confidence in more quantitative parts of the course.	

**University of Cambridge  
Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Examiner(s), Tripos Examinations 2018-19**

<b>Paper No:</b> <b>7</b>	<b>Title: Regional Economics and Policy</b>	Date report submitted: <b>10/06/2019</b>
------------------------------	---	---

<b>Examiner(s) making report:</b>	<b>Professor Pete Tyler Dr Alex Morris</b>
-----------------------------------	--

<b>Distribution of marks:</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
	Over 70%	<b>7</b>	<b>13.7</b>
	60-69%	<b>41</b>	<b>80.4</b>
	50-59%	<b>3</b>	<b>5.9</b>
	40-49%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	32-39%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	Below 32%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

**Summary statistics of each question**

Question	Freq. chosen	Percent	Average Mark
1	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>66.4</b>
2	<b>16</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>60.5</b>
3	<b>13</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>66.1</b>
4	<b>16</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>65.1</b>
5	<b>31</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65.3</b>
6	<b>31</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65.8</b>
7	<b>16</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>65.9</b>
8	<b>23</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>65.1</b>

**Summary statistics of final marks:**

Total number of Students	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<b>51</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>72</b>

1 **Question: Hulten and Schwab (1984) conclude that the results of their growth accounting analysis for the US regions are consistent with Olson’s arguments in *The Rise and Decline of Nations*. Discuss.**

**Answer:** Hulten and Schwab outline the growth accounting approach – in US sunbelt higher output growth than Snowbelt but not much difference in the growth of TFP. Three general conclusions emerge from this regional source of growth analysis. First, the productivity slowdown in U.S. manufacturing was not a regionally isolated phenomenon, but occurred quite broadly across regions. Second, the pattern of growth over time at the national level (including the slowdown) is largely accounted for by variation in the growth of total factor productivity. Third, interregional differences are largely a result of differences in the growth of capital and labour input. We thus find little evidence to support the hypothesis that the economic decline of the Snow Belt was due to differences in economic efficiency relative to the Sun Belt. *These results are therefore consistent with Olson (1982; 1983b) who argues that special interest groups in the Northeast and Midwest will inhibit growth by encouraging migration of factors of production, but will not necessarily slow the growth of productivity*”. (H&S conclusions)

Discuss Olson’s thesis – long periods of stability lead to the growth-reducing rise of special interest groups. Explain why. Disruption of special interest groups by e.g. war can lead to faster growth. On the other hand, stability leads to greater investment. Very good answer will include discussion of regional test of Olson thesis by Choi using US regional growth rates since statehood. - Sunbelt less red tape than Snowbelt. Less influence of special interest groups in sunbelt? Not clear, that Olson thesis does not lead to lower productivity growth *pace* H&S.

**Comment on Examination Answers.** Answers demonstrated an understanding of some of the main issues.

2 **Question: Critically assess the export-base model as an explanation of disparities in regional economic activity.**

**Answer:** The answer required an outline of the export-base model, (McCann) key role of employment in exports; employment multiplier; difficulty in empirically determining what is the export base; LQ etc.; debate between North and Tiebout – latter; what about construction etc. as a source of growth? Can the world as a whole be export led? North’s rejoinder. Good answer was expected to relate this to the Keynesian reformulation (Armstrong and Taylor) and balanced trade). Rowthorn’s (2010) “Combined and Uneven Development: Reflections on the North–South Divide” as an important extension and empirical use of the model.

**Comment on Examination Answers.** This question produced a diverse range of responses with some students tending to concentrate on the KDT model and not discuss North/ Tiebout. In general not well answered and answers

	lacked clear structure.
3	<p><b>Question:</b> What is the Verdoorn law and how well does it stand up to empirical testing. (65% of the available marks). What is the static-dynamic Verdoorn law paradox and how may it be explained? (35% of the available marks.)</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> Explain the Verdoorn law; how does it estimate the degree of increasing returns, early testing by Kaldor (1966); extensions – inclusion of capital stock; spurious Verdoorn law; problems of endogeneity; spatial autocorrelation (regional productivity spill overs?); citation of some empirical papers. Static-dynamic Verdoorn law paradox. Using the same data set, growth rates give a Verdoorn coefficient of one-half (increasing returns to scale) and log-level specification zero (constant returns to scale). A simple explanation is given in a course handout and concerns spatial aggregation bias. Also discussed in a paper on the reading list.</p> <p><b>Comment on Examination Answers.</b> In general, good responses to this question and answers covered the relevant material well.</p>
4	<p><b>Question:</b> Compare and contrast the role of the growth of relative prices in the regional balance-of-payments constrained growth model and the Kaldor-Dixon-Thirlwall cumulative causation growth model.</p> <p>Outline the KDT model, faster growth of output leads to increasing price competitiveness, leads to faster export growth etc. Model converges or diverges according to parameters of the model. Balance-of-payments constrained growth model, relative prices <i>not</i> important; improved competitiveness via non-price factors that affect the size of the export and import income elasticities. Although the BoP constrained growth model developed out of the shortcomings of the KDT model (under the latter a region can run a trade deficit indefinitely) the assumptions about relative prices are very different.</p> <p><b>Comment on Examination Answers.</b> Answers covered relevant issues well.</p>
5	<p><b>Question:</b> The British Government wants local areas across the United Kingdom to develop Local Industrial Strategies. In England these would be developed by Mayoral Combined Authorities, or Local Enterprise Partnerships, who would ‘promote the coordination of local economic policy and national funding streams and establish new ways of working between national and local government, and the public and private sectors (BEIS, 2018)’. Discuss whether you consider that this new approach will help to reduce the long-standing North-South divide in economic prosperity in Britain.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> The course outlined the long-standing issues that appear to characterise the North-South divide in the United Kingdom. They are aware of the problem from a number of different theoretical viewpoints that have ranged from the standard neoclassical view that regional disparities are the</p>

result of regional wage rigidities to the more cumulative causation approaches of Kaldor emphasising increasing returns. They have considered how policy has changed through time from an emphasis on:

- taking work to the workers through incentives to attract investment into slow growing regions;
- the Thatcher policies of the 1980s with the emphasis on encouraging enterprise and reducing wage rigidities;
- the New Labour era and the focus on endogenous growth, the drivers approach to competitiveness and the New Labour changes to the delivery of policy as manifested in the Regional Development Agencies;
- The new localism agenda in 2010/11 that saw the removal of the Regional development Agencies and the move to Local Enterprise Partnerships and the arguments for business-led local economic regeneration;
- The move to focus on Powerhouse Concepts and the agglomeration boosterism through enhanced transport infrastructure in the UK.

They have had a thorough grounding in the debate about the merits of a place-based approach to local economic development relative to the arguments put by some economists on rather enhancing the skill base of people in the place.

They are also aware of the arguments for spatially blind policies that suggest that ‘trickle-down’ can help backward areas and are aware of the limitations of this approach particularly against the arguments that local economic development requires local stakeholders to coordinate endeavour to overcome market and state based failures. A locally placed approach should be considered in the light of these discussions.

**Comment on Examination Answers.** A wide variety of answers. Some very good answers and the discriminating factor in securing the higher marks was how well structured the discussion was around understanding of the nature of the problem, what economic theory had to contribute to understanding its causes and the scope for policy intervention including some discussion of the role of place based policy compared to spatially blind.

6

**Question:** EU regional policy has been successful in achieving its core objectives. Discuss.

**Answer:** The course has discussed the rationale behind an EU wide approach to regional policy as adopted through Cohesion Policy. The shape and form of EU Cohesion policy was examined and in particular, its emphasis on a place based approach to economic development building on the core principles of concentration (more resources to the weaker regions), partnership local based delivery over programming period to help build sustainable outcomes. A focus on achieving additional outcomes and leveraging in additional resources was emphasised and the extensive reform of the Cohesion programme through

the Barca Review were discussed.

In assessing whether the policy achieved its core objectives the answers should reflect on the nature and scale of the problem and how success should be measured. The course emphasised that a simple focus on convergence, as adopted in the standard Barro growth model approach, was only part of a way forward since there was a need to measure institutional reform. Progress in this respect has been slow but one should recognise the challenges involved and the emphasis of policy in building sustainable institutional reform and capacity building over a period. The course mentioned the EU emphasis on using evaluation to assess progress in delivering core outcomes recognising the importance of understanding the theory of change behind the intervention and a focus on assessing impacts on the outcomes that mattered.

**Comment on Examination Answers.** Many good answers here and answers demonstrated a good understanding what cohesion policy had been seeking to do, how its impact could and should be assessed and the importance of going beyond simple convergence.

7

**Question:** The economic regeneration of many parts of British cities has required the extensive use of area place-based policy initiatives. Discuss what is known about their strengths and weaknesses.

**Answer:** The course has shown that in Britain there has been divergent city growth with many, predominately southern cities, growing more quickly than their northern counterparts who have found it difficult to adjust to industrial decline. The course discussed the evolution and development of various policies designed to overcome market failures, particularly in the property market and thus the role of Urban Development Corporations, The strengths and weaknesses of these initiatives had been assessed. The course emphasised the progressive move by British urban policy makers to adopt partnership approaches to regeneration that addressed the multi-faced nature of the problems and the importance of stakeholders addressing both market *and* state failure if they are to deliver sustainable and improved outcomes.

The debate about the merits of regenerating places rather than simply concentrating on the people in the place was outlined. Area Based Initiatives have been criticised because progress has often appeared to be relatively slow, people come and go from areas and the benefits provided leak away, perhaps from those most in need. Displacement and leakage effects argued to be problematic and there is population churn that influence what happens to those who benefits from policies delivered in a particular area.

However, Area Based Initiatives build institutional capacity and enabled areas to attract resources and seek to integrate deprived areas with the economy of the areas around them.

**Comment on Examination Answers.** Answers tended to show an understanding of the standard market failure arguments for place based intervention but recognised the importance of seeking inclusive, community orientated response.

8	<p><b>Question:</b> The majority of neighbourhoods that are the most deprived according to the 2015 Index of Multiple Deprivation were also the most deprived according to the 2010 Index. Many of these areas have been amongst the most neighbourhoods in England for decades. Discuss what you consider the reasons for this persistence.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> The course introduced the long-standing nature of the neighbourhood based deprivation problem in many countries, but particularly the UK. The breadth and depth of social exclusion, including the increased focus away from simple income poverty, was discussed. The problem reflects many factors coming together in a complex way and that it is difficult to establish cause and effect. The economic dimension is of great importance and housing concentrates problems in specific places. A key issue was that the deprived neighbourhood looks to be relatively isolated from surrounding areas and the broader local economy of which it is a part. Isolation is a problem. The factors that lead to mainstream delivery failure and market failure in overcoming the problems had been outlined. There was extensive discussion of whether ‘neighbourhood effects’ (like people living together) compound the problem or whether it is mainly down to the characteristics of the people in the place.</p> <p><b>Comment on Examination Answers.</b> Answers demonstrated good understanding of the relevant issues.</p>

<p>Was a project part of the assessed examination?</p> <p><i>If so, please comment on the quality of projects submitted</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>General observations</p>	<p>None</p>

**University of Cambridge  
Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b>	<b>Title</b>	Date report submitted:
8	Law of Real Property	16 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Prof. Martin Dixon	
How many lectures were there?	42	
Who did the lectures?	Prof Dixon and Law Faculty members	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	10 including revision supervision	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Prof Dixon (MT only) Dr Lees (MT only) Laura Lintott (LT and ET) Lauren Quinn (LT and ET)	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	3/4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Varied. Minimum 4	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	<p>The course has 24 hours of lectures in MT to ensure a broad basic knowledge. The lectures are essential and provide the basic foundation without which the subject is undoable.</p> <p>There were no issues.</p>	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	None	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	None	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 10	<b>Title</b> The Built Environment	Date report submitted: 15/07/2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Professor Franz Fuerst	
How many lectures were there?	32 (plus 1 revision lecture)	
Who did the lectures?	Nicky did 16 lectures – covering section A of exam Franz did 16 lectures– covering section B of exam	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	5 supervisions for Section A (3 in Michaelmas, 1 in Lent, 1 in Easter) 5 supervisions for Section B (3 in Lent, 2 in Easter, including 1 revision supervision)	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Danuta Jachniak (5 supervisions for Section A) Ramandeep Singh (2 supervisions for Section B) Camilo Calderon (3 supervisions for Section B)	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	9	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	The course ran smoothly this year. Nicky covered the Michaelmas term and Franz the Lent term. Students seemed happy with the structure and progress and we did not receive any complaints. Exam revision was facilitated with specimen exam questions that were discussed in supervisions and a separate revision lecture. The only slight challenge was Nicky's departure during the academic year but the lecturer and supervisor team, particularly Danuta, ensured continuity throughout the exam preparation period.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	This paper is likely to be repositioned with a stronger focus on urban planning from 2019/20 onwards.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 11	<b>Title</b> Land and Urban Economics	Date report submitted: 15 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Dr Özge Öner	
How many lectures were there?	32 hours of lectures (including a 2 hours revision lecture)	
Who did the lectures?	<b>Michealmas:</b> Dr Nicky Morrison, Prof Bernard Fingleton <b>Lent:</b> Dr Özge Öner, Dr Johan Larsson	
What number of supervisions were offered? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	8	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	<b>Michealmas:</b> Danuta Jachniak <b>Lent:</b> Yiwen Qiu, Christina Li, Pradeep Debata	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Approx. 4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Approx. 8	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	Students maintained their interest throughout the year and progressed well. The students seemed to enjoy the course.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	None, other than ensuring the provision of high quality lecture and supervision venues.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 12	<b>Title</b> Law and Economics	Date report submitted: 15 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Dr Shaun Larcom	
How many lectures were there?	33 hours of lectures (including revision lecture)	
Who did the lectures?	Dr Shaun Larcom, Professor David Howarth and Professor Simon Deakin	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	9	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Dr Shaun Larcom, Professor David Howarth and Professor Simon Deakin	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Approx. 4	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Approx. 5	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	Students maintained their interest throughout the year and progressed well. The students seemed to enjoy the course.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	None, other than ensuring the provision of high quality lecture and supervision venues.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b>	<b>Title</b>	Date report submitted:
<b>13</b>	Law of Landlord and Tenant	16 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Prof. Martin Dixon	
How many lectures were there?	36	
Who did the lectures?	Prof Dixon and Dr Lees	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	10 including revision supervision	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Prof Dixon (LT and ET) Dr Lees (MT)	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	3	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Varied. Minimum 4	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	The small numbers taking the paper mean that the lectures can be interactive. Apart from poor quality lecture rooms, with failing or non-existent equipment, there were no issues.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	Very poor quality IT equipment in lecture rooms	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	At least basic IT provision in lecture rooms.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No 15</b>	<b>Title</b> Advanced techniques in finance and investment for real estate	Date report submitted: 20 August 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Kanak Patel	
How many lectures were there?	36	
Who did the lectures?	Kanak Patel, Thies Lindthal and Nick Mansley	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4 (Michaelmas), 4 (Lent), 2 (Easter)	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Kanak Patel (Michaelmas & Easter), T Al-Hindawi, Thies Lindthal	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	3-5	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Numerical exercises + essays	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	<p>The course followed the same content used in previous years.</p> <p>Attendance in lectures was generally good but some students did not keep up with the required course reading and as a consequence were not sufficiently well prepared for supervisions.</p> <p>Overall in-class observation, and the final exam marks suggest that class performance was highly satisfactory.</p>	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	-	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	If students make more effort to keep up with assigned course readings, especially attempt numerical supervision questions, it would help them to build up their confidence in more quantitative parts of the course.	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> <b>14</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>Planning Policy and Practice</b>	Date report submitted: 31 <sup>st</sup> January 2020
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Kelvin MacDonald	
How many lectures were there?	32	
Who did the lectures?	Dr Sónia Alves Kelvin MacDonald Dr. José Reis Sarah Whitney	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Seven	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Dr Sónia Alves Kelvin MacDonald Sophia Peacock Dr. José Reis Sarah Whitney	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4.5	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	An average of 30 essays per Supervision and 38 Exam scripts	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	The paper was refreshed to include new material on planning theory and on sustainable development and joint lecturing in the form of contrasting presentations from two lecturers was trialled on two occasions.  The course seemed to be well received.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	None	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	No	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 16	<b>Title</b> Land, Food and Ecosystem Services	Date report submitted: 19 July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Ian Hodge	
How many lectures were there?	32 + one revision session	
Who did the lectures?	Ian Hodge, Michael Carroll, Mark Reader	
What number of supervisions were offered? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	There were 8 supervisions.	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	Supervision 1: Oliver Taherzadeh Supervision 2: Mark Reader Supervision 3: Oliver Taherzadeh Supervision 4: Michael Carroll Supervision 5: Ian Hodge Supervision 6: Mark Reader Supervision 7: Oliver Taherzadeh Supervision 8: Michael Carroll	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	All supervisions requested written submissions.	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? ( <i>Tripos only</i> )	8 .	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	The course went well with encouraging results in the examination.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	No	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	No	

**University of Cambridge**  
**Department of Land Economy**

**Report of Course Co-ordinator, Tripos 2018-19**

<b>Paper No</b> 17	<b>Title</b> Land Policy and Development Economics	Date report submitted: July 2019
Name of Course Co-ordinator	Dr. Shailaja Fennell	
How many lectures were there?	32 lectures	
Who did the lectures?	Dr. Nicholas Valenzuela-Levi, Dr. Flavio Comim, Dr. Shailaja Fennell	
What number of supervisions were offered? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	8 supervisions (one supervision for each set of four lectures delivered)	
Please list the supervisors for this academic year <i>(Tripos only)</i>	Dr. Nicholas Valenzuela-Levi, Dr. Shailaja Fennell, Dr. Jane Lichtenstein, Dr. Flavio Comim, Dr. Sarada Chatterjee	
What was the average size of the supervision groups? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	4-5	
What were the numbers of pieces of work submitted? <i>(Tripos only)</i>	8	
Please comment generally on the course, and progress throughout the year	The course is very popular, with over 90 percent of the final year cohort taking the paper. The course is divided internally into three sections, and each lecturer having responsibility for a third of the course.	
Were there any specific problems that arose?	There were not specific problems that arose on the course.	
Are there any recommendations you wish to make for the forthcoming year?	The students appreciated the case studies as they provide good illustrations of strengths and weaknesses of development models, and we will be incorporating more case studies in the coming year.	