

FGBUS 250 AF
Foundations of Global Business
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Sung H Park
Instructor Evaluated: Sung H Park-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: C
Responses: 11/33 (33% moderate)

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 4.7 (0=lowest; 5=highest)	College Decile 8 (0=lowest; 9=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	DECILE RANK	
									Inst	College
The course as a whole was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	8	8
The course content was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	8	8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	7	7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	7	7

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK	
										Inst	College
Relative to other college courses you have taken:											
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	11	55%		45%					6.6	9	9
The intellectual challenge presented was:	11	55%	27%	18%					6.6	9	9
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	11	55%	18%	18%	9%				6.6	9	9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	11	55%	9%	36%					6.6	9	9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	11	55%	9%	27%	9%				6.6	8	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: 15.0 (N=11)

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
	18%	9%		9%			18%		9%	9%	27%

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

Class median: 10.5 (N=11)

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
	9%	18%		9%	27%		9%		9%		18%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.8 (N=11)

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
45%	36%	9%												9%

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

(N=11)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
9%	27%	18%	9%	36%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK	
									Inst	College
Course organization was:	11	64%	18%	18%				4.7	9	9
Instructor's preparation for class was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	7	7
Instructor as a discussion leader was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	8	8
Instructor's contribution to discussion was:	11	55%	45%					4.6	7	7
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	11	64%	18%	18%				4.7	9	9
Quality of questions or problems raised was:	11	73%	9%	18%				4.8	9	9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	7	7
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	9	9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	8	8
Instructor's openness to student views was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	8	8
Interest level of class sessions was:	11	64%	27%	9%				4.7	8	8
Use of class time was:	11	73%	18%	9%				4.8	9	9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	11	73%		27%				4.8	9	9
Amount you learned in the course was:	11	73%	9%	18%				4.8	9	9
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	11	64%	18%	18%				4.7	8	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	11	64%	18%	18%				4.7	8	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	11	64%	18%	18%				4.7	8	8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	11	55%	27%	18%				4.6	7	7

FGBUS 250 AF
Foundations of Global Business
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: C
Responses: 11/33 (33% moderate)

Taught by: Sung H Park
Instructor Evaluated: Sung H Park-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. yes came to know about different accepts like 5 potter, viro , integration etc if r entering in to new busines came to know what all accepts we have to think
2. Yes
3. lerning the basis of business strategy, and summilating the business project
4. The overall class content, materials and discussion activities were very good. I find it intellectually stimulating as we cover through the case studies different industries considering medium size and large size companies.
5. The best teacher I've ever seen. I love how the professor creates the class to participate together.
6. Yes, He always try to bring all students at the same line, understand core things. which was great.
7. I could frequently collaborate with other team members to pursue the best outcomes

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. 5 potter, viro , integration etc if r entering in to new busines came to know what all accepts we have to think
2. The group exercises
3. analyzing the real cases like robinhood because that allowed me to understand the details of business strategies
5. The case study that I've never known before.
6. Professor gave us a lot of cases in order to make us understand smoothly. which was amazing.
7. learning so practical business strategy to utilize in a variety of situations

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. Nothing
3. none
4. Covering different themes very fast and not in depth.
5. -
6. Not class content. As usual, the annoying sounds from sound speaker happened a lot.
7. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. we want more time for this class n want to learn more
2. I think it was perfect
3. It was too short to understand this class content soundly. So, we need more time to deepen our understanding in this subject.
4. It was pending a wrap-up and feedback from the side of the professor after the final presentations by students on the final day. Each team had their own criteria to analyse the different sections and I saw a lack of agreement on what are the key elements that we should consider in each part and some misunderstandings in some items of the project. It would be useful that the professor provides some examples of good practices and cases based on the different presentations to know finally what we did good and what not.
5. -
7. The level of class is still so high

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.