COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/6 (100% very high)

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
4.6	**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: 5.2
(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:	6	33%	50%	17%				4.2	4.1
The course content was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4.9
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	50%	17%		33%			4.5	4.5

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:	5			20%	60%	20%			4.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	5	60%	40%						6.7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	5	20%		80%					5.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	5	40%		60%					5.3
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	5	40%	20%		40%				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: 10.0 Hours per credit: 3.3 (N=5)

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
		20%		20%	40%	20%					

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

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.8 (N=5)

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
	20%	20%		20%	20%	20%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=5)

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
20%	40%	20%	20%											

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

(N=5)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
80%		20%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

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	33%	33%	33%				4.0	17
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	6	33%	33%	33%				4.0	18
Explanations by instructor were:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	11
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	13
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	67%	17%		17%			4.8	12
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	100%						5.0	3
Clarity of course objectives was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	1
Interest level of class sessions was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	50%	50%					4.5	15
Use of class time was:	6	50%	17%	17%		17%		4.5	9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	33%					4.8	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	50%	50%					4.5	10
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/6 (100% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. this course is very difficult because the materials are very theoretic.

3. Yes, it covers many biblical papers.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. good notes and good reading list.

3. The course is arranged in the logical order of international macro issues.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. the instructor was not very effective in explaining the materials to students. the pace is too fast. as far as I know, many students in this class do not fully understand the materials.

3. The course covers too much, especially in the last half of the quarter.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I had some difficulty keep constantly on top of the readings and the model solutions. Having light homeworks every week / every other week to provide a small extra push to getting through the models would be helpful.

2. I hope the instructor can make some homework for students to practice. also, the instructor talks too fast and often skip the derivations of models and jump directly to the discussion of the conclusions of the papers. I hope he can spend more time explaining the basic stuff especially in the first few weeks.

3. Since the professor has excellent expertise in this field, it would be better to allocate one lecture (either the last day or before the course conference day) to teach ways of thinking and cautions in research of this field. Setting two or three papers aside for the field exam would be good since the course covers too many given the limited time.

4. The teaching speed is relatively fast. It is a little hard to catch up sometimes. The content is interesting, but is not easy to understand

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/8 (88%)

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
4.9	**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: 5.7

(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	71%	29%					4.8	4.5
The course content was:	7	100%						5.0	4.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	100%						5.0	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	4.5

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:	6		33%	67%					5.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	67%	33%						6.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	33%	17%	33%	17%				5.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	33%	33%	33%					6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	50%	17%	33%					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: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 (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
				50%	33%			17%			

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

Class median: 9.0 Hours per credit: 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
				67%	17%			17%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.7 (N=5)

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%	80%													

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
83%		17%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

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	57%	43%					4.6	10
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	4
Explanations by instructor were:	7	71%	29%					4.8	7
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8	11
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	3
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	100%						5.0	6
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	100%						5.0	9
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	1
Interest level of class sessions was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	57%	29%	14%				4.6	15
Use of class time was:	7	57%	14%	14%	14%			4.6	12
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	43%	43%	14%				4.3	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	57%	29%	14%				4.6	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	100%						5.0	2
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	29%	43%	29%				4.0	18
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	29%	57%	14%				4.1	17
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	86%		14%				4.9	5

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/8 (88%)

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 is the best class I've had in the whole PhD program. It's rare to see a professor who goes the extra mile for you. Fabio could do way less and still do a great job. He tried to make us think outside the box in terms not only of timely topics but also of what we can really learn from any study in international macro.

2. This is the best macro course I took so far! Fabio is very knowledgeable and the use of his humor in teaching kept us engaged.

4. Yes

5. This class was unambiguously most interesting yet most challenging among all graduate classes I have taken so far. Frankly speaking, I am not expecting the maximum grade, since the amount of coursework was overwhelming. Still, I have learned a lot, and I also realized that I have to learn a lot before taking my field exam in September. I am already looking forward for this wonderful days and nights I will be spending in the company of Obstfeld & Rogoff, Corsetti & Pesenti, Benigno brothers etc =) in summer months.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The organization was impeccable, we had all the materials since day 1. Also, Fabio was available to answer any inquiry about what turned to be a big amount of work (that at first can seem overwhelming). The presentation conference was also something no other professor has implemented in a course, that is very valuable and taking extra 7 hours from his free time to meet us and discuss papers in the fashion it would be done at real macro conferences is something that we really appreciate and that contributes positively to our learning experience in the phd.

2. Fabio's detailed explanation and how he related/compared different papers on similar topics

3. Doing presentations

4. The lectures and handouts.

5. The explanations by Fabio were very helpful and handy. Also it was interesting to learn some funny stories about famous economists apart from their papers.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing from the class, it was excellent as mentioned. The only thing is that it seems that there aren't more resources available for students interested in this field. No matter that the class is excellent, it cannot be 50% of all possible courses in the field. We are willing to study on our own as much as needed and more but we need more support from the department. In that sense, it seemed as Fabio had to cover for all learning gaps we could have which multiplied his workload and the time we had to put in some topics beyond what would have been considered efficient.

2. The pace of lectures, especially in the later half of the course.

4. Lack of regular graded assignments

5. The amount of material. It is a lot, indeed. I believe it needs 2-3 months to read all these materials - alone, without taking all other classes and TA duties. I am looking forward to review the content of the course in summer, while i can concentrate solely on international macro and international finance classes.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Great job, continue giving the extra mile, we appreciate it. For improving the class it would be good to provide slightly more concrete of examples of exercises that could be included in the exam. Keep doing your best and Thanks.

2. List the numbers of lectures notes are expected to cover in each week will be helpful. Maybe 2-3 assigned homework will be useful as well.

4. Provide some regular graded assignments

5. If there is an option to make a videos of the course available, so that we can review the explanations by Fabio, that would be great. Other than that, I have no other suggestions. Grazie, Don Fabio! It was an amazing course. Also, almost forgot... Forza Toro!! =)

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2015

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/10 (60%)

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
4.8	**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: 6.7

(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:	6	50%	50%					4.5	4.3
The course content was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	83%		17%				4.9	4.7

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:	6		33%	33%	17%	17%			5.0	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	67%	33%						6.8	
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	100%							7.0	
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: 12.5 Hours per credit: 4.2 (N=5)

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
		20%	20%			20%				20%	20%

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

Class median: 10.5 Hours per credit: 3.5 (N=5)

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
	20%		20%			20%	20%				20%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=5)

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%	40%	40%												

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

(N=5)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
60%	20%	20%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2015

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	33%	67%					4.2	15
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	6	50%	50%					4.5	11
Explanations by instructor were:	6	83%		17%				4.9	1
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	6
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	7
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	12
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	100%						5.0	3
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	9
Clarity of course objectives was:	6	50%	50%					4.5	10
Interest level of class sessions was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	33%		33%	17%	17%		3.0	18
Use of class time was:	6	67%		33%				4.8	2
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	50%		17%	33%			4.0	17
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	33%					4.8	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	50%	17%	17%			17%	4.5	14
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	50%		17%	17%		17%	4.0	16
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	67%	17%		17%			4.8	4

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2015

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 6/10 (60%)

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. Absolutely, Fabio is a boss in his field and being in the same classroom as him is inspiring

2. Yes, I am always having a feeling that many unclear things in the first year macro sequences have been further clarified and understood.

3. Yes, very challenging

4. the class was a hoot and a half!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Sheer knowledge of the instructor

2. This course gives to me a kind of broad and deep understanding of some basic but important stuff in the literature of intl macro, which helps me to further explore questions and read recent papers.

3. Instructor's expertise

4. the humongous knowledge of the professor and his ability in explaining the material as simple as possible, but still very effective

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Fabio can be intimidating sometimes

2. No.

4. the professor sometimes scares student being too abrupt and you always feel like you are going to say something stupid.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Maybe no final exam so we can have more time to write a better paper

2. It's indeed good. Thank you so much, Fabio!

4. overall class is great! maybe professor can learn some good manners with students and hand out more positive feedeback

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2014

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 9/10 (90%)

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
4.8	**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: 6.0
(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:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8	4.6
The course content was:	9	56%	33%		11%			4.6	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	9	78%	22%					4.9	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	9	78%	11%		11%			4.9	4.7

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

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:	8		38%	25%	25%		12%		5.0	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	9	44%	44%	11%					6.4	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	9	22%	44%	11%	11%		11%		5.9	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9	56%	44%						6.6	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	11%	56%		11%	22%			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: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 (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%	17%	17%		17%	17%			

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

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.8 (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%	17%		17%		17%	17%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=5)

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%	60%					20%								

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

(N=6)

In your major	A distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
67%		17%		17%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2014

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	9	78%		11%	11%			4.9	3
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	9	78%		22%				4.9	4
Explanations by instructor were:	9	67%	33%					4.8	11
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	9	78%	22%					4.9	6
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	9	56%	33%	11%				4.6	15
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8	9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	9	89%	11%					4.9	12
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	9	100%						5.0	10
Clarity of course objectives was:	9	89%	11%					4.9	2
Interest level of class sessions was:	9	78%		22%				4.9	1
Availability of extra help when needed was:	9	78%		11%	11%			4.9	7
Use of class time was:	9	78%		22%				4.9	5
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	9	56%	44%					4.6	16
Amount you learned in the course was:	9	56%	11%	22%	11%			4.6	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	9	78%	11%		11%			4.9	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	8	38%	12%	38%		12%		3.5	18
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	9	44%	22%	22%	11%			4.2	17
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	9	56%	11%	22%	11%			4.6	14

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2014

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 9/10 (90%)

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?

2. Excellent course. Prof. Fabio Ghironi is a true scholar. He knows every little detail of what he is talking about: concepts, techniques, intuition, history of macro thought and of the monetary system. In the process of transmitting this knowledge to his students, he is friendly and fun, but always professional and respectful. On top of the strict syllabus, he transmits passion for this important and relevant field. He is an inspiration for many of us. The combination of final exam + course conference + paper is a great idea. We are very lucky to have Prof. Ghironi at UW!

3. I really enjoyed the course content and I learnt something new in every lecture. The discussions also stretched my thinking. This was the perfect course both in terms of learning new techniques and in terms of making us think like researchers.

4. Yes, the instructor asked as a lot of interesting questions

5. Yes. Yes.

6. Yes, the course provided a clear understanding of the effects of subtle assumptions. Seeing familiar models in an open economy setting also provided an appreciation for the material. Very interesting course!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The best economics classes I have taken have always been those that present models in the context of economic thought at the time they were published. Fabio, you've done a fantastic job of highlighting the key contributions of each paper and showing how they advanced literature as a whole. I VERY much enjoyed this aspect of the course.

3. The lectures were brilliant- I didn't get to know when one hour twenty minutes would pass. And the diversions (stories) within the lectures were also very inspiring.

4. Preparing for final exam and course conference

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The course covered a lot of material. Maybe too much for a 10 week class? Towards the end of term, I struggled to keep up, but I will have time over the summer to review more carefully.

3. Nothing. But I do feel like a quarter is too short to fully grasp the course content and do justice to all the derivations

4. Too much material...

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

4. it would be great if we can have weekly assignment. This will help us to digest the materials better.

5. Maybe some practice problem sets with some solutions or hints. I think this would compliment working through the papers.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2013

IASystem *The Course Evaluation Standard*

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 3/3 (100%)

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
5.0	**4.8**

(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: 5.2
(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:	3	100%						5.0	4.8
The course content was:	3	100%						5.0	4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	3	100%						5.0	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	3	100%						5.0	4.8

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

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:	3			33%	67%				4.2	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	3	33%	33%		33%				6.0	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	3	33%		33%	33%				5.0	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	3	33%		33%	33%				5.0	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	3			33%	67%				4.2	

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: 14.5 Hours per credit: 4.8 (N=3)**

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
				33%			33%			33%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 14.5 Hours per credit: 4.8 (N=3)**

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
				33%			33%			33%	

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.8 (N=3)**

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
33%	33%											33%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=3)**

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

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2013

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	3	100%						5.0	2
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	3	100%						5.0	3
Explanations by instructor were:	3	100%						5.0	8
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	3	100%						5.0	10
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	3	100%						5.0	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	3	100%						5.0	6
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	3	100%						5.0	17
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	3	100%						5.0	16
Clarity of course objectives was:	3	100%						5.0	7
Interest level of class sessions was:	3	100%						5.0	1
Availability of extra help when needed was:	3	100%						5.0	12
Use of class time was:	3	100%						5.0	4
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	3	100%						5.0	15
Amount you learned in the course was:	3	100%						5.0	5
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	3	100%						5.0	13
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	3	33%	33%	33%				4.0	18
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	3	100%						5.0	9
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	3	100%						5.0	11

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2013

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 574 A
International Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 3/3 (100%)

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. This class is absolutely amazing. This is the best class I have ever had in my life, and I wish I had the opportunity to take it earlier. Intellectual contribution is invaluable.

2. Yes, due to Proffessor Ghironi's way of presenting the course material, this class was very intellectually stimulating.

3. A good introduction to current topics in international macro. Some great papers!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Instructor is one of the leaders of this field. He serves as a role model in every aspect in addition to the intellectual contribution.

2. I would say that: 1) reading the seminal papers in our reading list 2)Thinking through the lecture notes and 3) Attending the lectures and listening to the Professor explain the key ideas contributed the most to my learning.

3. Practice problems/exercises.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. I wouldn't be able to say that any aspect of this class detracted me from learning.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. I think that this class is exactly what a graduate course in international macro economics should be like. The provided reading list consists of great papers, the lecture notes are excellent and listening to the Professor explain the key ideas is really helpful. I would like to use this opportunity to thank our Professor for the best course I have taken at UW so far. It was a priviledge and an honor to have the opportunity to learn international macro from him.

3. Give out the practice exam at the start of the quarter - it helps us smooth our study time allocation. It seemed odd to write that we could not collaborate on the discussion preparations - it was my first time discussing and some peer feedback could have been helpful in avoiding errors.