

ENTRE 370 B  
Introduction To Entrepreneurship  
Course type: Online  
Taught by: Sung Park  
**Instructor Evaluated: Sung Park-Predoc TA**

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: Y40  
Responses: 16/25 (64% 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
4.7	4.4
(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:

<b>CEI: 4.8</b>
(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 remote learning course as a whole was:	16	50%	19%	19%	6%	6%		4.5	4.1
The course content was:	16	50%	31%	6%	6%	6%		4.5	4.2
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	16	81%		6%	12%			4.9	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	16	75%	6%	12%		6%		4.8	4.5

### STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
<b>Relative to other college courses you have taken:</b>									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	16		75%	6%	19%				5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	16	6%	25%	38%	25%	6%			5.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	16	6%	38%	38%	19%				5.3
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	16	6%	31%	38%	25%				5.2
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your participation in this course was:	16	19%	31%	38%	12%				5.5
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your success in this course was:	16	19%	38%	19%	25%				5.7

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: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=16)**

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
	6%	25%	38%	12%	6%		6%	6%			

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

**Class median: 5.2 Hours per credit: 1.3 (N=16)**

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
	19%	38%	25%	6%	6%			6%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=16)**

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
25%	75%													

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

**(N=16)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
25%		12%	62%		

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Amount you learned in the course was:	16	31%	38%	12%	19%			4.0	6
Clarity of course objectives was:	16	50%	31%	6%	6%	6%		4.5	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	16	38%	31%	19%	6%		6%	4.1	7
Organization of materials online was:	16	31%	25%	19%	25%			3.8	8
Instructor's effectiveness in using Canvas was:	16	31%	38%	12%	19%			4.0	
Instructor's effectiveness in using Zoom was:	16	62%	12%	19%	6%			4.7	
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	16	56%	19%	12%	6%	6%		4.6	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	16	62%	19%		12%	6%		4.7	1
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	16	56%	25%	19%				4.6	3
The effectiveness of this remote course in facilitating my learning was:	16	44%	31%	6%	12%	6%		4.3	2
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:	16	75%	12%	12%				4.8	
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:	16	69%	19%	12%				4.8	

ENTRE 370 B  
Introduction To Entrepreneurship  
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: Y40  
Responses: 16/25 (64% high)

Taught by: Sung Park

**Instructor Evaluated: Sung Park-Predoc TA**

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

**Please list, in order of importance, 3 key features that should be retained if the course is offered again in a remote format.**

1. The interactivity and the speakers brought into lectures Sung being the professor The meetings/check ins with Sung
2. Breakout rooms, case studies, and NVDP project
3. Group work, presentations from entrepreneurs, breakout rooms
4. 1. Direct connection to the students in the class by getting a good understanding of their motives, experiences, growth, and goals. 2. Only leave room for essential assignments. Focus on projects. 3. Brought in lots of guest speakers.
6. project guest speaker end of lecture competition
7. -recorded lectures -group works -guest lectures
8. - group projects were good - zoom lectures were informative - zoom coffee chat meetups were good
9. case studies, Kahoot, guest speakers
10. Multiple projects - loved the project aspects
11. 1. Breakout Rooms 2. Group Projects 3. Guest Speakers
12. 1. The inclusivity and flexibility of the class. 2. The keynote speakers. 3. Classroom interactions.

**Please list, in order of importance, 3 changes that should be made to improve the course if it is offered again in a remote format.**

1. Maybe less lecturing and encourage more student participation (cameras on as well)
3. not sure
4. I honestly cant see any changes being made to this course.
5. More interactive lectures, slides should be uploaded before the live lecture, allow more questions/don't drone on so much in lectures
7. -more personal assignment -less breakout room -low-stake quizzes
8. - less breakout room stuff - less case study stuff - more NVDP project stuff
9. shorter lectures
11. 1. More student participation 2. idk 3. idk
12. I'm not entirely sure to be honest.

**Please provide specific feedback about the degree to which this instructor utilized teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences.**

1. Always looking to help students and willing to do extended time for the students in their best interests Looking out for us and making sure we are succeeding in the way we need to Challenging the students when needed and inspiring us to think or push more
4. Sung was able to connect with us students very easily by taking his time to get to know us individually and as a whole. This made class scaleable and enjoyable. Sung made it a point to interview us briefly and get a good idea of who we were individually.
7. instructor did his best to encourage us students to be better in this subject
8. Sung was awesome! - very accommodating - very flexible - gave really detailed and awesome feedback - willing to meet outside of class to chat about academics and projects Overall, he is a 10/10 instructor who genuinely cares about the success of his students.
9. N/A
10. Sung was extremely engaging which I enjoyed. Any teacher can be engaging when in class, but online is a different battle and Sung navigated it beautifully
11. I really enjoyed this class
12. I think Sung did an incredible job of adhering to a spectacularly high standard of inclusivity, something I have no doubt he will continue to do going forward.
13. Sung was very helpful and informative. He tried really hard to keep us entertained throughout the quarter. I felt bad there would only be 8 people in class when we would do group exercises, but I think that's just from zoom fatigue. He's a great professor!

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.