COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 5/6 (83% 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
4.9	**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: 5.0
(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:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6
The course content was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	4.6

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%	20%	20%	40%				5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	5	40%	40%		20%				6.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	5	20%	20%	40%	20%				5.2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	5	20%	20%	20%	40%				5.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	5	20%	40%		40%				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: 10.5 Hours per credit: 3.5 (N=4)

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
				25%	50%	25%					

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=4)

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
			25%		50%	25%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
100%														

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

(N=4)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
50%		50%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2018

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:	5	80%	20%					4.9	5
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	5	100%						5.0	1
Explanations by instructor were:	5	80%		20%				4.9	8
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	16
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	5	60%	40%					4.7	17
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	6
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	5	100%						5.0	12
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	5	100%						5.0	13
Clarity of course objectives was:	5	100%						5.0	2
Interest level of class sessions was:	5	60%	40%					4.7	11
Availability of extra help when needed was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	10
Use of class time was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	15
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	5	60%		40%				4.7	18
Amount you learned in the course was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	14
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	5	80%		20%				4.9	7
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	5	100%						5.0	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	5	100%						5.0	4

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 5/6 (83% very 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?

1. Amazing course. Feel sorry for the prospective PhD students who will not have a chance to take Fabio's courses.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. Many interesting papers I can read and learn about the relevant literature review.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

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 2016

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 5/7 (71%)

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	**4.5**
(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: 6.2
(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:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.5
The course content was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4.6

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%	20%	40%			20%		5.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	5	60%	40%						6.7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	5	20%	60%	20%					6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	5	60%	40%						6.7
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	5	20%	60%	20%					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: 12.5 Hours per credit: 4.2 (N=4)

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
				25%	25%		25%		25%		

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=4)

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
			25%	50%					25%		

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=4)

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
25%	50%	25%												

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

(N=4)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
50%		50%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2016

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	4
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	1
Explanations by instructor were:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	11
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	10
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	5
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	5	100%						5.0	12
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	16
Clarity of course objectives was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	3
Interest level of class sessions was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	5	60%			20%		20%	4.7	17
Use of class time was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	6
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	5	60%		20%		20%		4.7	18
Amount you learned in the course was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	13
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	5	80%		20%				4.9	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	14
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	15
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	7

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 5/7 (71%)

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! The material is extremely interesting and relevant for major discussions in international economics. The ideas he presented and the papers we worked through were just mind blowing. My love for economics has quadrupled this quarter

2. Fabio is not only a remarkable scholar but also a talented teacher. I've learned a great deal from his sequence, more than from any other course on the program, actually. Can't think of anything to complain about, really, it was an excellent and thought-provoking class. Thank you!

3. Yes. Before this course, I thought I am only interested in standard macro or international macro, but after seeing all different kinds of trade elements, I am so into trade now!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The instructor hands down. Fabio cares a lot. He cares about the field, his work and most importantly his students. The most disappointing part of being a grad student here has been that a lot of professors do not connect with the students. Fabio is the exact opposite. He is actively engaged in discussions with us, encourages questions and entertains our idiotic ideas. As much as he would like to seem scary, he is brilliant. It is a sheer pleasure to be in his presence as he teaches. I have been in school for the last 20 years and no teacher, instructor, mentor has had such an impact on me.

3. Fabio did a really job in highlighting the key mechanisms going on in the model, which facilitates my own reading so much! Thanks again, Fabio!

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Absolutely nothing. I just wish this was the only class that I was doing this quarter so I could give more time.

3. No.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I would like to see more of Fabio's recent work and a more detailed discussion of his personal experience in the field. I know Fabio is extremely modest but he is very inspiring and hearing about his work spurs us on to do great things.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

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

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/8 (87%)

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
4.9	**4.5**

(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:	7	71%	29%					4.8	4.4
The course content was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	4.6

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:	6		50%	17%		17%		17%	5.5	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	33%	50%	17%					6.2	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	17%	67%			17%			6.0	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	17%	67%	17%					6.0	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	33%	50%		17%				6.2	

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: 10.2 Hours per credit: 3.4 (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%

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

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%		33%	33%						17%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (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
67%		17%	17%											

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%		33%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 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:	7	29%	57%	14%				4.1	17
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	15
Explanations by instructor were:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8	3
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	4
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	7	57%	29%			14%		4.6	12
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	14
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	9
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	7
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	2
Interest level of class sessions was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	10
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	5
Use of class time was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	1
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	6
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	57%	43%					4.6	11
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	43%	57%					4.4	13
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	29%	57%	14%				4.1	18
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	16

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

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

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 575 A
International Trade And Macroeconomics

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 7/8 (87%)

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. It was an amazing class and very intellectually stimulating just like his first class. I've learnt more in his courses than all other courses combined.

2. Yes, I always find Fabio's class challenging in terms of intellectual learning and yet very interesting (thus challenging in a good way). I can see that I am learning something new from every class, and following the readings becomes much easier after going over them in class.

3. Yes. I learned intuition and technique. I learned important concepts and cutting-egde research. The class is extremely well designed. Fabio puts a lot of effort and we are lucky to have him here. He cares for all of the students and is very friendly too.

4. Very much so - introduced an intersection I had never studied before

6. Yes, the course conference was a lot of fun1

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. His way of teaching, his material, everything. Moreover he is one of the very few professors who genuinely cares about students and is very very helpful. He is the best Professor I've ever taken a class from.

2. Fabio's excellent summary of each paper we went through. It was very helpful to have some sort of an overview of the paper (e.g. aim of the paper, how it contributes to the literature, its main conclusions) before going deeply into the mechanics. Looking at the big picture saved me from being lost in the technical aspects of the papers.

3. Classes, office hours, course conference, deriving equations of papers, thinking of intuition, and thinking of topics for term paper. Also, related to this class: I learned form amazing seminar speakers all over the quarter, and better understood seminars thanks to this class.

4. The reading

5. Discussion of a working paper

6. Reading and deriving the papers.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing at all.. I can't think of a thing I'd change.

2. Skipping some parts of the paper/slides altogether. While I do understand it is due to the time constraint (10 weeks is just too short), I was surprised to find out that even skimming over the models in class (although we do not actually solve them out) was helpful when going over the paper by myself later on. I cannot say this is necessarily Fabio's fault nor he can do much to improve on this aspect though...

3. The few but time-intensive log-linearizations?

4. None

6. Nope

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. The only minor suggestion I have is that maybe the term paper should be due earlier so that we can focus all our time on the field exam during the summer. But It's for our own good I guess. Everything else is perfect.

2. Nothing much that I can think of - I enjoyed the class a lot!

3. A solid International Trade class during winter to better prepare us to digest all of the content of this class...

4. More case studies or examples might be nice, if there are any applicable ones.

5. A couple of assignments to stay on top of things?

6. It's a fantastic class! Fabio is great!

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

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

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 575 A
International Trade And 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
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: 4.3

(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	67%	33%					4.8	4.6
The course content was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	4.6

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				100%				4.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	3	33%	33%	33%					6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	3			33%	67%				4.2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	3			33%	67%				4.2
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: 8.5   Hours per credit: 2.8   (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: 8.5   Hours per credit: 2.8   (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: 3.7   (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%	67%													

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
67%		33%			

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

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

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

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

ECON 575 A
International Trade And 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. The class is invaluable for those who would like to do research in international economics. It does not only provide you ideas for just couple of papers, but it also enables you to build your whole research agenda for the rest of your life with what you learned in this class.

2. Good material survey - fairly smooth continuation of earlier courses. Brought some new ideas to my attention that were pretty cool.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Fabio's devotion and wisdom make this class an invaluable experience. I think even if Fabio were teaching quantum mechanics, he could convince me to do research on that as well.

2. The discussion and paper assignment. The lectures are strong, but ultimately the greatest factors in determining what I learn are the assignments.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. Hope I don't say the wrong thing about the wrong sports team :) Kidding...

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. It was a good course. Not a lot of room for improvement. Some final exam anxiety. As always, it would be nice to get an example problem set to help prepare for the final, even if only one, early in the quarter. The suggestion to derive important results can sometimes lead to hours of trivial mathematics without a little more structured guidance on when to move along and when to stay hunkered down.