IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Management & Organization
Term: Winter 2024

MGMT 430 E
Strategic Management
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sung Park
Instructor Evaluated: Sung Park-Predoc Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A93
Responses: 26/50 (52% 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	**4.9**
(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: 5.5
(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:	26	77%	23%					4.8	4.9
The course content was:	26	69%	27%	4%				4.8	4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	26	85%	12%	4%				4.9	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	26	81%	19%					4.9	4.9

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:	26	12%	38%	23%	27%				5.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	26	15%	50%	23%	12%				5.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	26	23%	50%	15%	12%				6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	26	27%	38%	23%	12%				5.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	26	35%	54%		12%				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: 8.2 Hours per credit: 2.1 (N=25)

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
4%	20%	16%	28%	16%	8%	8%					

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

Class median: 6.4 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=25)

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
	12%	20%	40%	12%	4%	12%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.7 (N=25)

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
24%	64%	12%												

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

(N=25)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
48%	52%				

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Management & Organization
Term: Winter 2024

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
Clarity of learning objectives was:	26	65%	31%	4%				4.7	
Amount you learned in the course was:	26	54%	38%	8%				4.6	5
Course organization was:	26	77%	23%					4.8	1
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	26	73%	23%	4%				4.8	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	26	65%	27%	8%				4.7	4
Clarity and organization of the Canvas course was:	26	69%	31%					4.8	
Degree to which course activities (discussions, assignments, simulations, etc.) helped you master the learning objectives of the course was:	26	81%	19%					4.9	
Degree to which learning assets (readings, cases, videos, textbook, etc.) helped you master the learning objectives of the course was:	26	77%	15%	8%				4.8	
Balance between instruction and application of skills was:	26	77%	23%					4.8	
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	26	85%	12%	4%				4.9	2
Evaluation and grading techniques (for homework assignments, projects, tests, etc.) were:	26	81%	15%	4%				4.9	
The instructor's facilitation of an inclusive teaching environment where all types of students (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, socio-economic status, belief systems, age, etc.) felt they belonged and were encouraged to engage was:	26	81%	15%	4%				4.9	
Extent to which instructor's course materials and content reflected a diversity of identities and/or acknowledged issues of equity when relevant to the course topic was:	26	81%	19%					4.9	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Management & Organization
Term: Winter 2024

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

MGMT 430 E
Strategic Management
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sung Park
Instructor Evaluated: Sung Park-Predoc Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A93
Responses: 26/50 (52% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Sung explained some very complex subjects in a way that was easy to understand. The explanations of concepts alongside the cases made it easy to see how the topics being learned had real life applications.

2. Sung ho Park was an amazing professor and made the course a lot easier to handle. Initially, I was terrified coming into a capstone class where I had heard the content and work load was a lot of work. However, Park was able to guide us through the content in an understandable way and clarify any learning and assignment objectives along the way. There is a reason both winning teams came from his course and why our average ranking was 2.3!

3. Sung was a phenomenal instructor, breaking down concepts extremely effectively and utilizing class time in a very efficient manner.

4. 1. the nuances that the professor added to the cases presented in lectures 2. the interactive, participative nature of class

5. Well-organized PPT and convey really helpful information.

6. Sung is a very engaging instructor. Class discussions and peer discussions were best for learning the content.

7. I enjoyed the structure of the class -- reading a new case prior to every class and talking about it every class. The setup of the way we discussed the case was enjoyable as it was a guided lecture that was highly engaging and encouraged participation through group discussion. I also enjoyed the capstone project. Although it was both challenging and time consuming, I felt that it was one of the most applicable classes I've taken at Foster that mimics real world projects in a career. For someone who is interested in Marketing and Consulting, it was a unique experience being able to work with Pokemon.

8. I really had major takeaways in the development of teamwork and collaboration skills.

9. The discussions and lectures that Sung engaged the class in

10. Sung, he was absolutely fantastic

11. the in-class discussions, the quizzes that were open ended helped me think through

12. Definitely the professor! Sung was such a fun and engaging professor who made sure we understood the concepts before moving on and made the classroom very open to conversation. He was very encouraging and created an environment where I could comfortably ask questions and ask for help if needed to clarify topics or assignments. Having a presentation-based project before the actual capstone project also gave us an opportunity to practice and prepare for the final capstone competition.

13. Sung was an incredible professor! His teaching style and willingness to go above and beyond for his students was by far the most impactful aspect of the class!

14. Reading the cases, presentations helped with public speaking skills, and the teacher - who was amazing and highly encouraged participation

15. Sung took the time to meet with students individually at the beginning of the quarter, which made him a lot more approachable to talk to and ask questions. Additionally, he was always very prepared with lectures and he spent time to give valuable feedback to his students. Sung is the best professor I ever had in college and also is so extremely knowledgeable. A fantastic professor and a fantastic person.

16. in class discussions and collaboration with teammates real life case examples that we analyzed

17. Sung was very helpful in providing us with ideas and concepts that could be applied to our work.

18. He was an extremely good teacher using a case based learning method! I usually learn better with this method just for the sole fact that it isn't boring and thus I can pay attention and thus learn. Because he was such an interesting speaker, it really helped with my quality of life while attending this class, and in fact even sometimes made me look forward to attending.

19. In-class discussions contributed most to the learning. Most of the time when professors grade participation through contributions to in-class discussion, the inputs from students feel forced. But for myself and what it seemed like all other students, participation was voluntary, honest, and insightful. These academic discussions were so integral to my learning.

20. Sung was an AMAZING professor! He deeply cared about everyone's learning experience and took the time to get to know students. At the beginning of the quarter, he offered one-on-one meetings and it really helped to get to know him and him getting to know us. This was the first time I've had a professor offer this and it was one of my favorite things. He also took the time to learn everyone's names and made the class very fun. MGMT 430 was definitely one of my favorite classes I've taken at Foster and I'm surprised it was Sung's first time teaching the course because he taught it exceptionally well. I learned so much this quarter from this class and am very grateful I had Sung as my professor.

21. Sung is an amazing teacher and make the content much easier to learn

What aspects of this class detracted most from your learning?

1. N/A

3. The class was excellent due to Sung's excellent teaching!

6. The timing of assignments. It was difficult to learn the material and then immediately apply concepts to the assignments because of the condensed nature of this course. Moving more assignments to the beginning of the course would alleviate the timing issues.

7. Having the Case 2 Analysis due right after the capstone project and presentation day was a bit difficult. However, I understand why it is given to to assess other assignments besides our capstone project. Overall the course load was pretty manageable alongside our major capstone project.

8. none

9. Some of the cases were filled with too much unnecessary detail

10. I think the easy grading made it hard to differentiate at times. Friends that spent half the time and submitted a average assignment ended up getting in the high 90's

12. Nothing

13. None!

14. Not sure

15. N/A

16. honestly the case competition crept up on me very fast- i wish we would have had like 10-15 min of class time every other class to check in on case comp details and information.

17. I think that having the slides on hand as the professor discusses them would be more helpful. Then I can annotate as we move along.

18. None

19. N/A

20. Nothing about the content of the class, but the course materials were very expensive. It was $70 for the course pack and we only used it to read the cases. If the cases could all be provided (like some that were), that would be great for future quarters.

How well did the instructor utilize teaching strategies that encourage the learning and growth of students from all backgrounds and life experiences? Please provide specific examples or feedback.

1. Sung made the class very accessible and was very focused on encouraging participating without being too forceful. He was clearly very knowledgeable on the topics he was teaching and made learning the topics a fun experience.

3. Sung was very receptive to feedback throughout the course. Additionally, he was a very supportive teacher, always taking time to speak with students and connect with them personally. He was a very effective speaker, clearly explaining concepts and always keeping the class engaged. I would take a class again with Sung simply to have him as an instructor.

5. Excellent in teaching style. He made this class so much fun through different cases studies. All of the cases are thoughtful and useful in depth. Overall such a great quarter to having him as my instructor. Definitely counts one of my favourite class in Foster!

6. It was good

7. Sung was very attentive and engaging. I would say he was the best professor I had at UW. He encouraged lots of class discussion and also was very responsive and willing to talk with all students, whether it be during class or outside of class time. He was extremely supportive of us leading up to the capstone presentations as well. It was great being able to utilize all that we learned in the course (including many of the analysis such as Porter's, Alternative Matrix, and VRIO) in our capstone project.

8. Sung did very well in encouraging and promoting class discussions and idea sharing. He was always really open to everyone's ideas and provided insightful feedbacks.

9. Great job

10. He is fantastic

12. The instructor taught in a way that was very welcoming and open to feedback and conversations from all the students in the class, making the class atmosphere very comfortable and enjoyable to have discussions in.

13. The professor did a great job of facilitating a open, warm, and inclusive class environment!

14. Amazingly, he encouraged particiaption and presented a diverse set of use cases that people of all backgrounds could understand and learn with

15. As mentioned before, Sung took the time to talk to students and also encouraged us whenever we had any issues. He really boosted everyones confidence and told us that we had all the tools to succeed in and outside of the course. He also was super quick to answer emails and questions. Lastly, he gave students that may be a bit quieter the opportunity to talk by walking around the classroom during discussions if they did not want to speak in front of the class.

16. he did a great job including everyone in discussions and was very friendly and welcoming. our class had a strong community and was super fun to be a part of!

17. He was very helpful in getting students to participate. When students proposed ideas or possible answers, he listened and explained how it may apply or not.

18. He was very good at including students and asking for their perspectives and points of views on variety of topics. And despite including us so much in our class discussions, even if he didn't agree with our answers we never felt put off by it, and the environment that he created in his classroom fostered being okay with speaking up and answering questions even if it might not be correct.

19. When certain students spoke more during in-class discussions, Professor Sung made sure to include other (more shy) students by politely prompting for their insights or talking to them more privately before the entire class came together.

20. Sung did a great job making the class an inclusive space. Sung made sure to call on all students who raised their hands and welcomed all ideas. He also encouraged students to think deeper and from different perspectives.

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.