

ENTRE 370 A
Introduction To Entrepreneurship
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A93
Responses: 10/36 (28% low)

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

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	4.5
(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: 4.1
(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:	10	60%	30%		10%			4.7	4.4
The course content was:	10	60%	30%		10%			4.7	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	80%	10%	10%				4.9	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	70%	10%	10%	10%			4.8	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	10	20%	30%	20%	30%				5.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10	10%	20%	30%	30%	10%			4.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10	20%		30%	30%	20%			4.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	10	10%		30%	50%	10%			4.3
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	10	10%	10%	40%	40%				4.8

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: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=10)

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
	10%	20%	20%	40%			10%				

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

Class median: 6.8 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=10)

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
	10%	20%	30%	30%			10%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=10)

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
60%	30%	10%												

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

(N=10)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
30%		10%	60%		

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:	10	70%	20%		10%			4.8	
Amount you learned in the course was:	10	60%	20%	10%	10%			4.7	1
Course organization was:	10	50%	40%		10%			4.5	4
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	10	60%	30%	10%				4.7	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	10	60%	30%		10%			4.7	2
Clarity and organization of the Canvas course was:	10	60%	20%		20%			4.7	
Degree to which course activities (discussions, assignments, simulations, etc.) helped you master the learning objectives of the course was:	10	60%	30%	10%				4.7	
Degree to which learning assets (readings, cases, videos, textbook, etc.) helped you master the learning objectives of the course was:	10	60%	20%	10%	10%			4.7	
Balance between instruction and application of skills was:	10	60%	30%		10%			4.7	
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	10	60%	40%					4.7	5
Evaluation and grading techniques (for homework assignments, projects, tests, etc.) were:	10	50%	40%	10%				4.5	
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:	10	80%	20%					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:	10	70%	30%					4.8	

ENTRE 370 A
Introduction To Entrepreneurship
Course type: Hybrid

Taught by: Sung Park

Instructor Evaluated: Sung Park-Predoc TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A93
Responses: 10/36 (28% low)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Case studies with groups helped to learn what decisions had to be made for recommendations
2. I liked the experience of setting up a startup!
3. I think group work and activities helped a lot.
4. lectures, nvdp project
5. Overall, I really liked this class! Some of my friends told me that they didn't like it when they took it with another professor, but I found it to be super useful even though I have a bit of startup experience already. It helped me fill in the gaps and formalize knowledge that I didn't have previously. I also really appreciated that Sung was flexible and offered recorded classes.
6. The NVDP project taught me a lot about what actually goes into creating a company. I know we just touched the surface, but the project felt like a good representation of what I wanted to get out of the class
7. Breakout/ group assignments
8. Realworld and workshop applications
9. Sung was an amazing instructor, where his enthusiasm contributed greatly to my learning. He provided great examples of content, as well as creating fun activities for our groups to complete to get a deeper understanding of course material.

What aspects of this class detracted most from your learning?

1. I feel that listening to final presentations of other groups felt similar to midterms and time could have been spent learning other topics more in depth. Some useful things to know might be how to have a numerical valuation of a company.
2. I don't like group projects.
3. It was very lecture heavy, and I felt as though I had difficulty paying attention a lot of the time. I think in the future, more activities during lecture and student engagement will benefit a lot.
4. none
5. The only thing is the time slot - wish it wasn't from 3:30 - 5:30 PM!
6. long sessions listening to everyone's presentations. They were interesting to an extent but a long time to listen to a pretty repetitive set of presentations
7. None
9. Some of my classmates did not contribute to group assignments, which detracted the most from my learning as I took up more work.

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. It was helpful to have recordings, but a few times the audio didn't work.
2. The lectures were very interactive, great job!
3. He did a very good job, and is a very helpful professor.
4. the exercises during each lecture really made it better to understand the content and memorize it.
5. He helped us form diverse teams without forcing us into instructor-assigned teams, which I thought was nice.
6. Sung provided resources showing female entrepreneurs and people of color as well as social entrepreneurship
7. Very well! He showed a diverse amount of people in his slides showing that representation in the business field matters.
9. Sung had us bring our own interests and experiences to the table when formulating our group's NVDP (new venture development projects), which allowed us to talk to one another in a more personal and understanding manner, rather than just as classmates. This was really great, and Sung was an amazing instructor that should not be looked over!

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.