

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 12/28 (43% moderate)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
3.5	3.7
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.9
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	12	8%	42%	17%		17%	17%	3.5	3.7
The course content was:	12	17%	33%	17%	8%	17%	8%	3.5	3.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	12	33%	25%	17%			25%	3.8	4.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	12	17%	25%	33%			25%	3.2	3.5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	12		17%	25%	25%	8%	8%	17%	4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	11	55%	27%	9%				9%	6.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	12	42%	42%	17%					6.3
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	12	42%	33%	17%			8%		6.2
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	12	25%	33%	25%	8%			8%	5.8

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 11.0 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=12)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			17%	8%	33%	8%	17%	8%	8%		

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=12)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
8%	25%	17%	17%	17%	8%		8%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.0 (N=12)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
17%	8%	17%	25%	25%			8%							

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=11)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
91%		9%			

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	12	8%	25%	33%	8%		25%	3.0	11
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	12	25%	17%	25%	17%	8%	8%	3.2	12
Explanations by instructor were:	12		50%	25%			25%	3.5	8
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	12	17%	25%	17%	25%		17%	3.0	15
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	12	17%	42%	8%		17%	17%	3.7	4
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	12	17%	8%	33%		17%	25%	2.8	14
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	12	83%	8%				8%	4.9	1
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	12	50%	17%	17%		8%	8%	4.5	2
Clarity of course objectives was:	12	25%	17%	42%			17%	3.3	9
Interest level of class sessions was:	12	8%	8%	42%	8%	8%	25%	2.7	13
Availability of extra help when needed was:	12	25%	25%	25%	17%		8%	3.5	10
Use of class time was:	12	17%	33%	8%	17%		25%	3.5	6
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	12	17%	17%	42%	8%		17%	3.1	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	12	17%	33%	17%	8%	8%	17%	3.5	7
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	12	25%	33%	17%		8%	17%	3.8	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	12	8%		33%	42%	8%	8%	2.3	17
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	12	8%	17%	25%	8%	25%	17%	2.5	18
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	12	25%	33%	17%	8%	8%	8%	3.8	3

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 12/28 (43% moderate)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. It's very interesting and important to learn about how the international monetary system has evolved over time.
2. In my opinion this is a hard class. Models used in this classes especially in the second half are difficult. This course requires a very solid foundation of math and macroeconomics knowledge. A lot of materials for memorization as well. I personally think it might be better to just focus on several time period for efficiency.
3. It definitely stretched my thinking. The course is extremely dense and there is a lot to know and understand.
4. The entirety of the class made little to no sense because the professor does not know how to effectively teach this course. Yes, you are an expert in the material. But no, you are not teaching other experts. We cannot comprehend the material on the same terms as you. Please learn to break it down for us rather than just spew facts left and right and expect us to have a single clue of what you are talking about. What does this mean? Use visuals. Do not just stand there looking at the ground pacing back and forth the classroom giving us a lecture in story format. I learned absolutely nothing from this professor other than that he hates Juventus. All the learning done was on my own time. Why even take the course? I can just read the book and have gained the same amount of intellect.
5. Definitely.
7. Yes it is a really intellectually stimulating class with huge volume of reading, mastering all the knowledges delivered in the class is almost impossible, and too much materials making people feel overwhelmed that I myself felt I have no confidence in my learning. But the course materials are definitely very good

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. office hour is useful. Prof Ghironi is kind enough to re-explain models/class material in office hours. Slides were great.
3. Lectures and the teacher's slides online
4. I can honestly say that I have the same amount of knowledge before and after taking this class. This class taught me absolutely nothing. Not that I am proud either. Every homework was a struggle copying down words on the topic slides and from the book because none of us knew how to answer the questions due to the incompetence of the professor. Well guess what? Copying does not lead to learning. Trust me, I wanted to learn from this class. I cannot be expected to go to office hours after every lecture or before every homework is due just to be able to comprehend the material. That should not be how a class is run. The material on the homework and the midterms should be taught in class and should be taught at a level that is appropriate for undergraduate students who have never experienced a class in international monetary policy. I do not mind being challenged. I welcome the challenge. But the challenge should be in grasping the more sophisticated parts of the material rather than learning it from the bottom up without any help.
5. Having Fabio as an instructor was amazing. His engagement in the material, experience in academia, and history in macro econ was the highlight of the class.
7. Learning models and histories

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. Not every homework question is given an answer key. Shared office hour time with another class.
3. The topic is just pretty boring
4. The professor. Fabio, you are a great guy. I cannot deny that. Honestly, one of the most passionate professors I have ever had and an absolute expert in your area of study. International monetary policy is such an interesting topic. I really want to recommend this class to other undergraduate students to take in the future. But as the class currently stands, I just simply cannot. Nobody is willing to work this hard to learn this little.
5. I personally found lecture tough to follow in the last few weeks. This was probably my fault though.
7. Too many concepts with a lot of details

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I wish we could have spent less time on the equations of complicated models and instead have more time to cover topics that are more relevant to today's international monetary system. At the end of the quarter, it feels like we're flying. I feel that it's more important to understand the economic history of how the system has evolved from the Gold Standard to Bretton Woods and to today than to understand the derivations of equations in a model.
2. It would be better to assign less homework, to provide answer key to every homework question so that students can prepare better for exams.
3. Making it more clear to students when the midterm and especially final come around as to what specifically we should focus on. There's so much information especially in the 2nd half of the class and the final is only 3 questions, and Fabio doesn't really give much direction he expects you to know every detail of everything, which is pretty unrealistic and tough.

4. 1. Please use more visuals when you teach. Even if that means having the topic slides up when you are talking. That way, students are able to better follow along. Most students are unable to sit for two hours listening to a professor talk without any visuals. 2. Please give out answer keys to the homeworks, even if they are not very detailed. There is little reason not to. Yes, the answers are in the topic slides, but the topic slides are extremely detailed and sophisticated. The answer keys can highlight the important points. 3. Have the homeworks worth a bigger percentage of the grade. Many times this quarter we have submitted homeworks that are 10 pages long (typed). As it stands, each homework is worth about 2-3%. That is simply too much work to do for such little part of grade. 4. Consider having the homeworks graded on completion if you do wish to keep it at 15%. Doing 10 pages of homework only to have two questions graded is simply not fun. Since you use the homework questions on the exams, students will naturally have an incentive to do the homework. 5. While most of the students are proficient in beginner and intermediate macroeconomic topics, some of the terminology used in this class is new. Combine that with the fact that the topic slides are just essentially stating a bunch of facts with terms we've never heard of and you get a bunch of confused and angry students. The topic slides need to be less like reading another textbook and more of a place where you can understand the main points. Not to mention it is essentially impossible to tell which topic slides have been covered in class and which have not.
5. Making expectations on homework clearer. I would write a big paragraph for each question of the assignment which takes quite a while when there are 9 questions and then only get a 5/10 for my response when I thought I covered everything. Clearer expectations would be nice since homework was a lot of time for limited reward.
6. More class discussion like group activities
7. Maybe having more clear agenda, following the syllabus as course progress, give answers to all homework questions, and maybe have a review session during class before the exam

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 11/27 (41% moderate)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
3.8	3.8
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	11	27%	27%	27%	9%		9%	3.7	3.7
The course content was:	11	27%	27%	27%	9%		9%	3.7	3.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	11	36%	36%	9%	9%	9%		4.1	4.2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	11	27%	18%	36%		9%	9%	3.4	3.5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	10	10%	20%	20%	40%		10%		4.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10	40%	30%		20%	10%			6.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10	40%	20%	10%	20%	10%			6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	10	40%	20%	10%	30%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	10	30%	30%	10%	20%	10%			5.8

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=10)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	10%		40%	30%	20%						

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=10)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	10%	40%	30%	20%							

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=10)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
10%	20%	40%	20%	10%										

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=10)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	10	20%	30%	40%	10%			3.5	7
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	10	20%	30%	40%			10%	3.5	11
Explanations by instructor were:	10	20%	20%	40%	10%	10%		3.2	14
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	10	20%	30%	40%		10%		3.5	10
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	10	30%	30%	30%			10%	3.8	5
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	10	40%	30%	20%			10%	4.2	1
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	10	50%	10%	30%	10%			4.5	2
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	10	40%	30%	30%				4.2	4
Clarity of course objectives was:	10	30%	30%	20%	10%	10%		3.8	3
Interest level of class sessions was:	10	20%	20%	50%			10%	3.3	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	10	30%	30%	40%				3.8	6
Use of class time was:	10	30%	10%	50%		10%		3.3	12
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	10	30%	20%	50%				3.5	15
Amount you learned in the course was:	10	20%	20%	50%			10%	3.3	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	10	20%	20%	50%		10%		3.3	18
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	10	20%	30%	50%				3.5	9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	10	20%	20%	50%	10%			3.3	17
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	10	30%	10%	60%				3.3	16

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 11/27 (41% moderate)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. To know more about the history of economic, I have really enjoyed the lectures; But frankly, the notes have to quite distracting and long, would like to have a more specific reading instruction on which slide is a important point, which one is not
3. It was a neat overview of the historical development of the international monetary system, good for those who want to know more about the subject.
4. Yes especially understand everyone's position in the world, not just the US
5. I think some of the topics were very interesting but it was very hard to follow the lectures. The continuity and clarity of topics taught were very poor.
6. yes I learned a lot from the materials.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. Fabio is so inspiring and knowledgeable. This has been my favorite course since I have started UW. To have such a wonderful professor who goes out of his way to provide extra office hours, provides information on relevant topics that the students are interested in, and keeps a positive attitude throughout all of this, the Economics department should do whatever they can to keep him for future quarters. Fabio is by far the best professor I have had the pleasure of taking a course with.
3. readings.
4. I think lecture examples helped my learning most
5. Reading the book.
6. slides and lecturing

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. We didn't have any chances to engage in the lecture other than asking questions. Since this course is very lecture heavy (Fabio will speak the entire time other than a 10-minute break), it would have been nice to have small group discussions or worksheets that would keep the students engaged. Two-hour lectures are really tough to sit through and stay involved.
3. none
4. The text heavy slides, at times I felt myself drowning in all the information
5. Going to class. I normally don't like to criticize my professors because I don't like the class or my teacher, and in fact Fabio is a very nice person, but this is without a doubt the worst class I have ever taken. It seemed interesting at first but Fabio is just impossible to understand and would constantly go off on tangents and make no sense at all. Half the time he would just talk on and on about an equation or graph and then say "oh but of course you'd never need to know this for the test" . Maybe I just have senioritis but I've never been in a class this bad. I literally had to resist falling asleep in class everyday and I found it more productive to not go to class and just study on my own.
6. hard reading

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. To have a better class slides
2. I say this for every economics course, but I wish this course was one hour every day instead of two-hour blocks twice a week. The information presented in class is very complicated and takes time to understand. When we go over the information in a two-hour lecture, it is hard for all of the students to stay engaged since this information is heavy. I wish the Econ department would please consider this for future quarters!
3. none
4. I suggest slower examples if possible and more class interaction
5. I don't know.. a better teacher. Better techniques for evaluation of learning. Maybe more engaging slides that aren't just literally bullet points that are essentially from the book.
6. more lecturing

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 13/23 (57% high)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
3.8	3.9
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.1
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	13	23%	31%	15%	15%	15%		3.6	3.7
The course content was:	13	23%	38%	8%	15%	15%		3.8	3.9
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13	38%	31%	15%	15%			4.1	4.2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13	31%	15%	23%	8%	23%		3.3	3.5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	13		8%	31%	54%			8%	4.3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	13	23%	62%	8%	8%				6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	13	15%	23%	31%	31%				5.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	13	15%	31%	23%	31%				5.3
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	13	8%	31%	31%	31%				5.1

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=12)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		17%	33%	17%	17%	8%	8%				

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 6.2 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=12)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
8%	17%	17%	25%	8%	25%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.2 (N=12)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
	17%	42%	17%	8%	17%									

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=12)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	13	23%	38%	8%	23%	8%		3.8	7
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	13	15%	38%	15%	23%	8%		3.6	13
Explanations by instructor were:	13	23%	23%	31%	15%	8%		3.4	16
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	13	15%	46%	8%	23%	8%		3.8	11
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	13	15%	38%	8%	38%			3.6	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	13	23%	46%		15%	8%	8%	3.9	5
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	13	62%	23%	8%		8%		4.7	1
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	13	46%	46%	8%				4.4	4
Clarity of course objectives was:	13	15%	46%	15%		23%		3.8	8
Interest level of class sessions was:	13	8%	38%	23%	15%	15%		3.3	12
Availability of extra help when needed was:	13	46%	23%	15%	15%			4.3	3
Use of class time was:	13	31%	23%	8%	31%	8%		3.7	9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	13	46%	31%	8%		8%	8%	4.4	2
Amount you learned in the course was:	13	31%	23%	23%	8%	8%	8%	3.7	10
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	13	23%	31%	23%	8%	15%		3.6	15
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	13	31%	15%	31%	8%	8%	8%	3.4	17
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	13	31%	15%	23%	15%	15%		3.3	18
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	13	38%	31%	23%		8%		4.1	6

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 13/23 (57% high)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

2. Learning a lot of monetary history and monetary theories! I learned about how economics applied in historical events.
3. This class was very intriguing in many ways. The instructors ability to articulate how the financial system was backed by several exchange regime allowed us to think in broader terms how financial central banks use monetary policy to shape economic structures.
4. This class was very interesting. I learned a lot from the class and it was very entertaining. The professor was very good at explaining concepts and relating to the students.
5. yes
7. Yes
9. This was a very tough class with a lot of dense information on the topics.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The professor did a really good job of explaining things and being available after class to clarify.
2. Lecture and reading
3. The instructors ability to bring perspective to topics allowed me to retain the class material much easier.
4. Homework
5. most of the materials
7. Lecture slides
8. The lecture slides were helpful but weren't used enough in lecture.
9. The lecture slides were helpful and Fabio is very knowledgeable about the material he discusses.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. not there
3. Everything was great.
4. N/A
5. none
7. Lectures were extremely hard to follow along, use of slides and explanations of exactly what we were going over and learning that day would have been very helpful
8. I am a very visual learner and had a hard time focusing and staying engaged with the heavy lectures and no visual aids or lectures slides.
9. There were a lot of material on the lecture slides that I felt were not even covered in the class lectures.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

4. N/A
6. Adopt a simple (and clearer) way to explain a topic in slides, avoid using those "fancy" words but actually can be replaced by a much easier vocabulary.
7. more interactive lectures
8. I would have more interaction in the class and try to gauge interest and understanding of the information more. a lot of the time a lot of students were checked out and the lecture would really drag on.
9. The lectures should coordinate more with the lecture slides. I often found myself taking notes on material and that information was not even in that part of the slides. Also, using more visual aids to get the class more involved and see exactly what it is you are teaching (ex: put lecture slides on the big screen more; write out more examples on the whiteboard). Also, provide some more time/guidance on the how to go through/solve the models. I often felt lost trying to work through them.

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/23 (26%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.0	4.3
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	6	33%	17%	33%	17%			3.5	3.9
The course content was:	6	33%	33%	17%	17%			4.0	4.3
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	50%		50%				4.0	4.4

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	6		17%	17%	17%	33%	17%		3.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	33%	50%	17%					6.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	50%	33%	17%					6.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	33%	33%	17%		17%			6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	50%	33%			17%			6.5

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 11.5 Hours per credit: 2.3 (N=6)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	17%				33%	17%	33%				

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 10.2 Hours per credit: 2 (N=6)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	17%			17%	50%		17%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=6)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
17%	33%	17%	33%											

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=6)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	6	17%	50%	33%				3.8	11
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	6	33%	17%	33%		17%		3.5	17
Explanations by instructor were:	6	17%	67%	17%				4.0	10
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	7
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	8
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	1
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	3
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4
Clarity of course objectives was:	6	33%	17%	33%	17%			3.5	14
Interest level of class sessions was:	6	33%		67%				3.2	15
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	67%		17%		17%		4.8	2
Use of class time was:	6	33%	17%	33%	17%			3.5	13
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	5
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	6
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	33%	33%	33%				4.0	12
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	33%	17%	17%		33%		3.5	16
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	17%	33%	33%			17%	3.5	18
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	33%	50%	17%				4.2	9

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/23 (26%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. Yes. The topic cover is very extensive and it covers largely the history of the world economics.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Attending lecture as Fabio spiked my interest and motivate me to learn about the course.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The slides presented are way too long. Apart from that I personally feel that the material covered in this course is too dense to be covered in 10 weeks of class. Fabio is definitely someone that's very knowledgeable in economics and I can see that he wants his students to learn as much as possible. Some of the homework answers are not provided which make it hard for me to learn what I did wrong.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. 1. Provide a more useful slides that can enhance the student understanding. 2. Reduce the material covered in this course. Should take consideration that students have other classes to focus on. 3. Provide answer keys for all homework questions. 4. Limit the required equations and model learned in the course. It demotivate the students and sometimes it feels like I am taking a mathematics class.

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 13/26 (50%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
2.7	3.1
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 4.2
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	13	8%	15%	31%	8%	31%	8%	2.6	3.1
The course content was:	13	8%	31%	23%		31%	8%	3.0	3.3
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13	8%	23%	23%	15%	23%	8%	2.7	3.1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13		23%	23%	15%	15%	23%	2.2	2.7

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	13		8%	8%	23%	54%	8%		3.3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	13	15%	31%	8%	15%	15%	8%	8%	5.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	13		38%	31%	15%	8%		8%	5.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	13		38%	15%	15%	23%		8%	4.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	13		23%	31%	15%	23%		8%	4.6

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 7.8 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=13)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	8%	8%	31%	23%	15%	8%			8%		

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 7.8 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=13)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	8%		38%	31%	8%	8%					8%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 2.9 (N=13)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
	15%	8%	31%	15%	8%	15%						8%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=13)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
92%	8%				

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	13		15%	31%	31%	15%	8%	2.4	9
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	13		23%	31%	15%	23%	8%	2.6	12
Explanations by instructor were:	13		23%	23%	15%	23%	15%	2.2	14
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	13		31%	23%		38%	8%	2.7	5
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	13		15%	38%	8%	31%	8%	2.6	10
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	13		23%	23%	15%	31%	8%	2.2	8
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	13	15%	23%	8%	23%	15%	15%	2.3	18
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	13	15%	31%	23%	15%	15%		3.3	3
Clarity of course objectives was:	13		23%	23%	15%	23%	15%	2.2	15
Interest level of class sessions was:	13		38%	15%	8%	15%	23%	2.8	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	13	8%	23%	15%	23%	15%	15%	2.3	17
Use of class time was:	13	8%	23%	23%	8%	23%	15%	2.7	4
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	13	8%	31%	8%	23%	23%	8%	2.3	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	13		46%	15%		23%	15%	3.2	1
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	13		38%	15%	8%	23%	15%	2.8	7
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	13		15%	31%	15%	23%	15%	2.2	13
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	13		15%	38%	23%	8%	15%	2.6	11
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	13		15%	46%	8%	15%	15%	2.8	6

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 13/26 (50%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. too hard we are not learning about history
2. Yes, the concepts could be challenging to understand and required review to ensure that I had grasped them fully. The aspects that focused more on history were easier for me.
3. yes
4. Yes, very interesting subject

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. nothing
2. Learning about various financial crises and times between the world wars.
3. A lot of stuff will be useful in the future

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Reading and the pdf is the same thing, pdf is unorganized
2. Lectures often lacked direction. I didn't know where we were going with the day and often the material didn't match the slides or the slides weren't used.
3. Clarity of instructor's explanation

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. nothing can help
2. It would be helpful to have a greater use of the slides during class or give an outline of the day's lecture at the beginning of the lecture.
3. Refine the information provided in class. Too much data are irrelevant and complicated
4. Homework was very vague, after seeing solutions I felt discouraged because I would always know the answer, but I wouldn't know that the answer was what you were looking for -- (or for clarification- questions were too vague, and I didn't know what you were asking most of the time).

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 1/3 (33%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
5.0	4.6
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	1	100%						5.0	4.6
The course content was:	1	100%						5.0	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	1	100%						5.0	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	1	100%						5.0	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:								
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	1		100%					5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	1		100%					6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	1		100%					6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	1		100%					6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	1		100%					6.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
				100%							

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.3 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
				100%							

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=1)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
														100%

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=1)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	1	100%						5.0	4
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	1	100%						5.0	1
Explanations by instructor were:	1	100%						5.0	13
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	1	100%						5.0	15
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	1	100%						5.0	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	1	100%						5.0	8
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	1	100%						5.0	17
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	1	100%						5.0	18
Clarity of course objectives was:	1	100%						5.0	2
Interest level of class sessions was:	1	100%						5.0	3
Availability of extra help when needed was:	1	100%						5.0	12
Use of class time was:	1	100%						5.0	6
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	1	100%						5.0	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	1	100%						5.0	5
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	1	100%						5.0	11
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	1	100%						5.0	9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	1	100%						5.0	7
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	1	100%						5.0	10

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 1/3 (33%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi

Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi-Professor

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. This class was probably the most intellectually stimulating class I've taken at the UW. It connects so many dots within macroeconomics to elucidate the complex and sometimes scary world of monetary economics. I feel like I now have a relatively firm grasp of how trade, money, and monetary policy operates in the world.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The small class size and the ready availability of help from both Fabio and Rory.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing!

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I would suggest breaking up the slides into 3-4 sections. 300+ slides in one document is a little unwieldy.

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/18 (38%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Median	Adj. Median
4.0	3.8
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	7	14%	57%	29%				3.9	3.6
The course content was:	7	14%	29%	43%	14%			3.3	3.1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	4.5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2	4.1

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	7	14%	29%	29%	14%	14%			5.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	43%	43%	14%					6.3
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	43%	14%	29%		14%			6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%				6.2
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	29%	29%		43%				5.8

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 9.0 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		14%	14%	29%	14%	14%		14%			

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 8.0 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			43%	29%	14%			14%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (N=7)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
14%	29%	43%	14%											

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=7)

In your major	A distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	7	14%	43%	29%	14%			3.7	17
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	8
Explanations by instructor were:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	10
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	57%	14%	14%	14%			4.6	3
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6	5
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2	7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	100%						5.0	2
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	6
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	29%	57%		14%			4.1	12
Interest level of class sessions was:	7	57%	14%	14%	14%			4.6	1
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	57%	14%	14%	14%			4.6	4
Use of class time was:	7	29%	29%	43%				3.8	16
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	9
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	29%	57%			14%		4.1	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	29%	57%		14%			4.1	14
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	14%	57%	14%		14%		3.9	15
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	14%	29%	29%		29%		3.2	18
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2	11

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/18 (38%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. Yes, yes, did not not much on subject matter previous to class and was very interesting to work through the problems economists have historically faced.
2. Yes because this class takes a much richer look at the topic at hand relative to other economics courses. Instructor presented material in a rigorous and perfectly understandable manner which allowed me to connect ideas and be intrigued to understand at unprecedented levels.
3. Yes
4. Yes the topics were very advanced and especially pushed your quantitative skills.
5. This is the best class I've taken at the UW. Fabio is a great teacher, who taught a very challenging course, but as the quarter ends, I feel like I understand the history of macroeconomics.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Professor's lectures on material, working through problems or ideas.
2. Without a doubt, lectures were very effective for obtaining necessary knowledge. Despite this the textbook was not at all bad, however it felt a little less detailed than lecture and at times not exactly connected to the current topic.
3. Lectures, board work
4. Fabio was very good in teaching the subject matter. It also helped that we covered the readings pretty thoroughly in class.
5. Fabio's lectures were very helpful, they were a bit hard to follow at first, but once I got used to his lecture style, I could tell he really was interested in, and cared about the topic, and that it was easy to understand.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. The lectures presented were exactly what I would expect from a university course, unlike many other courses I've taken the material is spoon fed to you in a way that makes it incredibly uninteresting. However, while rigorous the material is also quite dense so sometimes it felt dragging.
3. Soccor tangents. Although they were very entertaining and made the class way more fun to attend
5. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Just as Fabio already realized, spring quarter is shorter and so not all of the material can be covered in the same manner as other quarters.
2. Anything to mitigate the density of material might make it better, perhaps through more graphical information or imagery or color just to mix things up a little bit.
3. NA
5. N/A

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 21/35 (60%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Median	Adj. Median
2.9	3.2
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.2
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	21	10%	19%	33%	19%	5%	14%	2.9	3.1
The course content was:	21	10%	14%	38%	29%	5%	5%	2.8	3.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	21	19%	38%	24%	10%	10%		3.7	3.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	10%	19%	10%	38%	19%	5%	2.2	2.5

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	20			10%	45%	25%		20%	3.6
The intellectual challenge presented was:	20	40%	20%	15%	20%	5%			6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	20	25%	25%	30%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	20	40%	25%	15%	10%	10%			6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	20	15%	25%	20%	30%	5%	5%		5.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 9.1 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=19)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	5%		16%	37%	26%		11%		5%		

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=19)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
5%	16%	26%	11%	21%	16%			5%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.1 (N=19)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
	21%	21%	37%	11%			5%					5%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=20)

In your major	A distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
95%					5%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	20	5%	25%	30%	20%	10%	10%	2.8	14
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	20	15%	20%	40%	10%	5%	10%	3.1	6
Explanations by instructor were:	20	15%	10%	30%	15%	10%	20%	2.7	18
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	20	15%	25%	25%	10%	10%	15%	3.1	8
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	20	15%	25%	20%	20%	15%	5%	3.0	17
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	19	11%	26%	21%	5%	21%	16%	2.9	9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	20	30%	50%	10%	5%	5%		4.1	1
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	20	35%	30%	20%	10%	5%		4.0	2
Clarity of course objectives was:	20	10%	20%	35%	10%	10%	15%	2.9	11
Interest level of class sessions was:	20	15%	10%	30%	10%	5%	30%	2.7	12
Availability of extra help when needed was:	20	20%	30%	30%	15%	5%		3.5	3
Use of class time was:	19	21%	16%	32%	16%	16%		3.1	7
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	20	25%	25%	5%	15%	30%		3.5	4
Amount you learned in the course was:	20	15%	10%	35%	20%	5%	15%	2.8	15
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	20	15%	20%	40%	10%	10%	5%	3.1	10
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	20	25%	10%	35%	15%	5%	10%	3.1	5
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	20	10%	20%	30%	15%	10%	15%	2.8	16
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	20	10%	20%	35%	25%	5%	5%	2.9	13

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 21/35 (60%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. The class was incredibly difficult and thought provoking. Combining historical context with macroeconomic tools inspired me to extend the many models that I have learned over the years to whatever material I am tackling.
2. I really like the class material. So i choose it. Moreover, Fabio is one very interesting person.
3. Yes
6. Feels like memorizing all the stuff
7. Yes. Wasn't a typical econ class, presented all of the needed historical background to understand the models and progressions. I really enjoyed this class and learned a lot. I think the department could benefit from more classes like this, especially in the lower level classes.
8. The models were challenging but fairly presented and improved my thinking about international macroeconomy
9. yes, this is a very hard class. The topics presented in the class are very intricate and requires a lot studying to understand completely
11. Yes, this class was much more difficult than I anticipated. There was a lot more material to digest throughout the course than I thought there would be.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Fabio's lectures were fantastic. He has a really great way of outlining the main points, highlighting reoccurring features, and presenting very complex ideas in simple steps.
2. Lots of examples related to the class material
3. the lecture and the real life examples
7. Enjoyed lectures when you wrote on the board and gave us things to take notes with - it helped keep me engaged.
8. The understanding of the mechanisms and intuitions of the models presented and how they relate to the historical events covered in the class.
9. reading the lecture slides and doing the homework
10. Fabio's enthusiasm in the subject is unparalleled. His genuine care in each of his students (remembers all our names!!) makes you want to work hard in his class. I felt like I learned a lot when he asked us questions and engaged in discussions. I was able to understand the material better when he wrote notes on the board and drew diagrams for us.
11. Practice tests.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. the class slides are so long and it should simplify
3. there is too much information than I can handle
4. Homework was too difficult.
5. The instructor is very enthusiastic about economics and I'm sure he has a lot of knowledge about the profession. But the content was very very hard and his explanation is very unclear. Homework assignments are extremely hard.
6. Too much reading 800 slides to go through for entire quarter.
7. Sometimes lecture could get dry and it would be hard to focus and keep my attention on the class which was disappointing because the materials covered were really interesting.
8. There were too many informations about historical events which made it hard to concentrate on the in my opinion important part of the course. Understanding the underlying mechanisms of the international monetary system.
9. the long hours and sometimes a little too much math
10. This is probably due to my short attention span, but I often zoned out during lecture if he was just talking for an extended period of time. I realized I learned a lot better when I asked questions during office hours, which he encouraged a lot during class, so I do blame myself for not speaking up more in class.
11. Not going to class all the time.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Make it into a series or extend it longer. Great class.
3. be more focused on several specific topics

4. instructor's explanation should have been more clarified. Home work was too tough.
5. Change an instructor.
6. Too much slides to go through. Don't have to spend so much time on the instructor's own theory. Put more emphasis on current monetary system. Essay assignments are too long.
7. Follow along with the slides a little more (click through them as you go) so we can see written versions of what you're talking about. Maybe have discussions on some of the topics to keep the class engaged - sometimes it is hard to ask questions in lecture based classes but discussions allow for those questions to be addressed in a more relaxed environment
8. Compared to the effort one has to put in the homework, it is underrepresented in the overall grade. Further the amount of slides (above 900 with guest lecture) is in my opinion too much, especially because the information is sometimes only covered in a short-time in class.
9. shorter lectures slides to focus on the important things we need to know
10. More student engagement and discussions in class.
11. Homework solutions for every problem, not just the ones that were graded (would help for studying to know how each problem would be graded)

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 15/21 (71%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Median	Adj. Median
3.4	3.3
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.6
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	15	20%	27%	27%	20%	7%		3.4	3.3
The course content was:	15	20%	27%	27%	13%	13%		3.4	3.2
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	15	27%	27%	27%	20%			3.6	3.5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	15	20%	27%	27%	20%	7%		3.4	3.3

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	Average (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	15		40%	20%	20%		13%	7%	5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	20%	53%	13%	7%			7%	5.9
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	20%	33%	13%	27%	7%			5.6
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	27%	60%	13%					6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	27%	27%	33%	13%				5.6

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work? **Class median: 9.8 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=15)**

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	7%	7%	13%	20%	27%	7%	13%			7%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 7.2 Hours per credit: 1.4 (N=15)**

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
13%	13%	7%	20%	20%	13%	7%		7%			

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.4 (N=15)**

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
20%	27%	20%	7%	13%	13%									

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=15)**

In your major	A distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
93%				7%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	15	33%	20%	13%	13%	20%		3.7	10
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	15	40%	20%	7%	33%			4.0	4
Explanations by instructor were:	15	13%	47%		33%	7%		3.7	12
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	15	20%	47%		33%			3.9	5
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	27%	33%		40%			3.8	13
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	15	13%	47%	7%	20%	7%	7%	3.7	7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	15	53%	27%	7%	13%			4.6	2
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	15	47%	33%	7%	7%	7%		4.4	3
Clarity of course objectives was:	15	27%	33%	7%	20%	13%		3.8	6
Interest level of class sessions was:	15	13%	33%	13%	7%	20%	13%	3.2	14
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	53%	27%	13%	7%			4.6	1
Use of class time was:	14	29%	14%	29%	14%	14%		3.2	18
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	15	33%	27%	33%	7%			3.9	9
Amount you learned in the course was:	15	20%	27%	27%	13%	7%	7%	3.4	15
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	15	27%	33%	13%	13%	7%	7%	3.8	11
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	15	20%	33%	20%	7%	13%	7%	3.6	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	15	20%	27%	27%	7%	13%	7%	3.4	16
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	27%	20%	27%	20%	7%		3.4	17

ECON 425 A
Topics In Monetary Economics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 15/21 (71%)

Taught by: Fabio Ghironi
Instructor Evaluated: Fabio Ghironi

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. Yes; it forced me to think deeply about the historical forces that shaped today's international monetary system and continue to shape it today. The mathematical modeling work was difficult yet rewarding.
2. Yes. This class helps a lot in understanding the transitions from the old gold standard era until the contemporary era. There is a lot of perspective that is presented in this class and without reading ahead one would be loss in the class. But
3. I would not have taken this class if I had known it was going to be a history class. The material was incredibly boring. I got some knowledge out of the class but not as much compared to other classes
4. This class was not stimulating because there was nothing required other than attending lectures and listening to the lectures. Homework questions could be answered by reading the slides and doing the readings. Attending class did not seem beneficial in helping to understand the material
5. Yes, it gave me a whole new perspective of the monetary systems that we have used.
6. Yes, the course requires a lot of intellectual thinking and understanding.
7. Not necessarily, very information based and felt like it was more memorizing history.
8. Yeah, definitely because I spent most of the time learning through study the slides. However, it takes me quite a long time to understand the material.
9. Yes, the content is VERY rich, forces you to think sideways, upways, downways

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The slides were very well put together and coincided well with the readings.
2. The perspective presented by the teacher is interesting. The class slide is great as it summarizes everything in- and outside of the reading materials Guidance through the calculus homework is really helpful.
3. Honestly there was not a moment in class that contributed to my learning.
4. Office hours with the teacher were very helpful. I often times felt that this was the only place that I learned.
5. Slides
6. The reading resources provided by the professor was very helpful.
7. homework assignments
8. Homework question.
9. the rich and interesting content

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. It would have been helpful if the turnaround time on homework assignments was faster. It was difficult to gauge how well I understood the material in the roughly one and a half week interim before assignments were returned.
2. None
3. You would move too fast through slides. And class was incredibly boring. Your grader graded hw too hard. After putting in 5 hours on the hw I would find myself getting only an average grade.
4. The slides had too much information on them and it was very overwhelming to feel like I fully understand all of the material. There was just way too much to read and we were required to understand almost all of it.
5. Too many questions in one homework. Not having enough time to properly complete the exam. At times, the grader takes off points without saying why. Also, I received full marks for a question on the homework, but when I used the same answer during exam, I got 2 points deducted.
6. None.
7. Slides were difficult to follow along
8. no, or maybe I don't feel like reading the slides because there are just too many fact to be understand/ memorize. Sometime, even if I read the slide I don't really get what it said. Luckily after some explanation by you & friends, then I learned.
9. the presentation of intuition was lacking, most of it were facts. I always walk away from class, not getting a clear picture of the main points.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. The checklist nature inherent with graders did not lend itself well to this material. It necessitated regurgitating the notes in homework assignments rather than demonstrating comprehension.

2. Everything presented in this class is great
3. Writing legibly. Give longer than 3 minute breaks. Not writing paragraphs on your slides
4. The lectures need to be more interactive and help students understand and learn the material. At times the professor would go on a tangent on things that weren't relevant to the class. Over all I felt overwhelmed by this class that it made me feel like it was impossible to succeed.
5. Try to use the slides more, less questions in exam (questions aren't tough, but the time constraint makes it tough). Try not to walk around while talking, it distracts students. Overall, you did a good job!
6. The instructor should interact more with the students by asking more questions and class interaction is lacking.
7. The slides contained a lot of information making it difficult to condense and pull out the really important points that you were hoping to emphasize in the course. The slides felt like a play by play of world history making it really hard to stay interested and find motivation to come to class.
8. make the class more interesting, really, need to be more interesting. Interesting in the way that people can actually pay attention in your class and learn from the class without the need of a lot of effort to read the slide again to understand the material. But you are a great professor!
9. explain key points and takeaways in a more simple manner