#### Nicholls State University

Faculty: Castille/Christopher

Course Enrollment: Evaluations Processed: 16 10

Spring 2018 Student Instructional Report

College: BA Department: MNMK
Course: MNGT 486 2T (11121)

Rank											ı	Mean Stand						tandard Deviation							
Num	5-Ver	y Effec	4-Effec	ctive	3-Mod	l Effec		e Ineff	1-Inef	fective	0-N/	<i>a</i> I		No Re	SD	Class	-		Univ	CONTRACTOR OF THE	Depi	MICHARING MANAGEMENT	-	%ile	QuestionDescription
		Organi		_	-			· incl	1 1110]					710 710		-1000	20/20			- 4460/		201			
1	2	20%	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	3.30	4.28	4.28	4.41	1.25	0.91	0.93	0.87	3	Expl of Requirements
2	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.20	4.39	4.36	4.46	0.79	0.82	0.88	0.83	22	Prep for Class
3	5	50%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.10	4.40	4.36	4.49	1.10	0.82	0.90	0.82	16	Command of Subj
4	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	3.50	4.22	4.25	4.42	1.43	1.02	1.02	0.92	7	Use of Class Time
5	2	20%	6	60%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.90	4.24	4.20	4.37	0.88	0.95	1.02	0.95	15	Sum Important Pts
							Wei	ghted A	verage	for A	. Course	e Organ	nization and I	Planning		3.80			•						
B. Co	onmu	nicatio	1																						
6	4	40%	3	30%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.38	1.05	0.93	1.01	0.93	20	Presentations
7	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	5.00	4.46	4.54	4.69	0.00	0.91	0.82	0.67	100	Command of Lang
8	4	40%	5	50%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.45	0.92	0.91	0.97	0.87	25	Use of Examples
9	4	40%	4	40%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	4.00	4.28	4.25	4.37	1.25	0.90	0.95	0.90	22	Challenging Probs
10	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.70	4.43	4.40	4.53	0.48	0.82	0.90	0.82	54	Enthusiasm
							Wei	ghted A	verage	for E	. Comm	unicat	ion			4.38									
C. Fa	culty.	Studen	t Inter	raction	n .																				
11	8	80%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.48	1.27	0.87	0.94	0.88	40	Helpfulness
12	9	90%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.70	4.56	4.52	4.60	0.95	0.77	0.83	0.78	45	Respect for Stds
13	7	70%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.50	4.43	4.36	4.48	0.97	0.82	0.93	0.87	40	Concern-Progress
14	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.60	4.42	4.33	4.42	0.70	0.80	0.93	0.91	56	Avail for Extra Help
15	9	90%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.70	4.52	4.46	4.54	0.95	0.80	0.87	0.83	52	Listen to Std Ideas
							Wei	ghted A	verage	for C	. Facult	y/Stud	ent Interaction	n	74 30	4.60	é et l	-		<b>1</b> . 3	2000				
D. A	ssignn	ient, E	xams a	nd Gr	ading	g							17					277							
16	3	30%	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.70	4.36	4.37	4.45	1.06	0.87	0.91	0.89	7	Inform How Graded
17	0	0%	5	50%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	3.10	4.15	4.15	4.32	1.10	1.02	1.02	0.96	5	Clarity of Exam
18	1	10%	6	60%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.60	4.32	4.31	4.44	0.97	0.91	0.91	0.87	7	Exam Coverage
19	1	10%	6	60%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.70	4.19	4.16	4.33	0.82	0.98	1.03	0.97	11	Comments on Work
20	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	7	70%		0	0%	2.33	4.19	4.15	4.27	1.53	1.02	1.04	1.02	3	Quality of Text
21	1	10%	5	50%	2	20%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%		0	0%	3.30	4.16	4.21	4.34	1.34	1.00	1.01	0.97	4	Assignment Helpful
							Wei	ghted A	verage	for I	). Assigi	nment,	Exams and C	Grading		3.42									
E. St	ıppler	nentary	Instru	uction	Meth	iods	19 m 10 m											Sign Call							
22	4	40%	5	50%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.32	0.92	0.91	1.01	0.92	36	Small Group Discus
23	3	30%	4	40%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%		0	0%	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.24	0.78	1.03	1.07	0.98	32	Term Paper/Project
24	1	10%	2	20%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	5	50%		0	0%	3.80	4.17	4.22	4.39	0.84	1.01	1.02	0.91	17	Lab Exercises
25	1	10%	7	70%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.29	0.57	1.03	1.09	0.98	21	Group Projects
26	3	33%	4	44%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		1	10%	4.11	4.23	4.23	4.36	0.78	1.01	1.01	0.94	32	Case Studies,
27	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	9	90%		0	0%	3.00	4.20	4.21	4.35	0.00	0.99	1.02	0.96	9	Course Journals
28	3	30%	3	30%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.90	4.26	4.29	4.41	0.88	0.88	0.94	0.89	13	Use of Computers
							Wei	ghted A	verage	for E	. Supple	ementa	ry Instruction	Methods	\$	4.00									

#### Nicholls State University

#### Spring 2018 Student Instructional Report

Castille/Christopher Faculty:

College:

Course:

Department: MNMK ΒA

Course Enrollment: Evaluations Processed: 16 10

(11121) MNGT 486 2T

Rank													Mea				dard D								
Num	5-Much	More	4-More	T	3-San	1e	2-L	ess	1-Much	Less	0-N//	1		No Re	2SP	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col U	Iniv	%ile	QuestionDescription
	F. Course Outcomes																								
29	6	60%		0%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.10	3.59	3.60	3.84	1.20	0.98	1.05	1.03	66	Learning Increased
30	2	20%	4 4	0%	1	10%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.50	3.59	3.62	3.84	1.18	0.92	0.99	1.00	23	Achieved Objectives
31	4	40%	1 1	0%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	3.60	3.53	3.50	3.77	1.43	1.06	1.14	1.12	36	Interest in Subject
32	4	40%	4 4	0%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	4.00	3.67	3.63	3.88	1.25	1.01	1.06	1.04	57	Think Independently
33	4	40%	5 5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	4.10	3.67	3.66	3.90	1.20	1.03	1.08	1.05	57	Actively Involved
- 7007							Wei	ghted A	verage j	for F	. Course	Outco	omes			3.86									
								eries.											10						E O I.
34	5	50%	4 4	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	4.40	3.69	3.73	3.88	0.70	0.88	0.94	0.99	89	Effort Put In Prepared for Class
35	2	20%	4 4	10%	2	20%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.60	3.56	3.63	3.81	1.07	0.89	0.91	0.96	33 86	Challenged by Crs
36	7	70%	2 2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	4.40	3.63	3.73	3.85	1.26	0.96	0.99	1.03		
Num	5-Ver	v Diff	4-Some I	Diff	3-About	Right	2-Som	e Elem	1-Very	Elem				No R	esp		Dept	711		Class	17.017		Univ	%ile	OuestionDescription
37	7	70%	3 3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%				0	0%	4.70	3.34	3.41	3.40	0.48	0.64	0.71	0.73		Level of Difficulty
Num	5-Muc	h Heav	4-Heavi	er	3-About	Same	2-Li	ehter	1-Much	i Light				No R	esp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class			Univ	%ile	QuestionDescription
38	8	80%	_	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%				0	0%	4.80	3.24	3.19	3.24	0.42	0.74	0.76	0.83		Work Load
Num	5. Ver	v Fast	4-Some I	ast	3-About	Right	2-Son	e Slow	1-Very	Slow		100000		No R	esp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class			Univ	%ile	OuestionDescription
39	2	20%	1	50%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%		Nacc 201		0	0%	3.90	3.16	3.27	3.25	0.74	0.59	0.65	0.64		Pace of Course
Num	5-Ver	vm	4-Effect		3-Mod	Kffee	2-Son	ne Ineff	1-Inefi	fective .	0-N	/A	*	No K	Resp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	%ile	OuestionDescription
40	1	10%	T. Company of the last of the	60%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%		0	0%	3.50	3.92	3.90	4.09	1.18	0.92	0.98	0.93	12	Quality of Instruct
A.T.	1 , , ,	i/Minor	2-College	Pag	3-Elec	ctive	4.0	Other						No k	Resp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	%ile	Ouestion Description
Num 41	1	10%		10%	7	70%	1	10%						0	0%	2.80	1.31	1.27	1.37	0.79	0.68	0.62	0.69		Description of Crs
			1221		3-Ju		15	enior	5.Gr	iduate	6-01	her		No F	Resp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	%ile	<b>QuestionDescription</b>
Num 42	0 I-1:re	shman 0%	2-Sophon	0%	4	40%	6	CHICAGO CONTRACTOR	0	0%	0	0%		0	0%	3.60	3.74	3.16	2.61	0.52	0.69	1.07	1.22		Class Level
		Name of the last	E TRANSPORTE									748350		No.1	Resp	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	%ile	<b>OuestionDescription</b>
<i>Num</i> 43	1-Bett	er Engl	2-Better (	0%	3-Fa	10%	1							0	0%	1.20					1	0.37	0.31		Comm in English
					1	1070			12000					No I	Røen	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dent	Col	Univ	%ile	<b>OuestionDescription</b>
Num	<i>1-F</i>	emale 60%	2-Ma	40%										0		-	1				-	0.50	0.48		Gender
44		00%		70 /0								C.	7-Below C	No I	Pavn	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	Class	Dept	Col	Univ	%ile	QuestionDescription
Num	-	I-A	2-A-	100/	3-1	30%	-	1-B 20%		-B- 0%	6-	40%	-	0% 0	0%		_	1			1.56				Grade Expected
45	0	0%	1	10%	3	30%	1 2	20%	· I ·	0 /0	11	707	1			A services		V22130 521	1000000	SERVICE CONT	12517270	SSE V. 18	(833)-325	3222	

#### Footnotes

<sup>1.</sup> Percentile specifies the percentage of means that were less than or equal to your mean. For example, if you have a percentile of 45 for question 3, then 45 percent of the other courses evaluated had a class mean less than or equal to your class mean for question 3.

<sup>2.</sup> Standard Deviation is a measure of the dispersion of the students' responses. Lower standard deviation indicates more agreement among responses, and higher standard deviation indicates less agreement among responses.

<sup>3.</sup> N/A and missing responses were not included in the computation of means or percentiles.

486

1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

Droup talk were very helpful to help understand everything

2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE
SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

Should apply more chichents;

Explain what to do to prepare
Be transparent on how to pass.

Don't in about the gungges. Then are

3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

Leally enjoyed the

that it may be difficult.

## 1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

Tableau & learning new things that I would've never learned in any other classes.

## 2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS. THE PROFESSOR.

SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR: Should work more with Tobleau in Class with Students, space out

3) I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:
This class has a big work load and I struggled, but I'm happy
I did it.

# 1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

The simulation and class discussion.

# 2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

Make which recdings and assignments are due and when more clearly posted in Moodle. The grade values seem unbalanced for homework and classwork. Some are worth 2 rints and others are worth 100.

#### 3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

More chachauncy please.

# 1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

Not the reading.

The sim pulled everything we learned together. Tableau was also good but wish we could go further into it.

# 2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

The leadings were very difficult

ett was irritating when you would not

ckeck our homework that was REQUERED.

Made it difficult to continue doing work thanowing that you wouldn't check it.

#### 3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

·Overall, it was a helpful course but way too much work.

. I wish we had more time on sim + tableau.

1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

- Discussions. Some were kind of pointless because the whole class already agreed but explaining ideas to other people helps to solidify the concepts.

2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

- Make it more obvious what the actual homework is.

I got all of them but it seemed to be a common issue.

- More focus on the simulation and strategic ideas. Less focus on technical details.

3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

-This class had a much higher workload than other classes in Nicholls but I think that's a good thing. Other classes at Nicholls need to increase workload.

1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS **COURSE WAS:** 

Being introduced to Tablea and getting and insight on year world practice

2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE

SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

Should put more emphasis on quites that they are more like tests.

Do more in class work on Tableau to get a patter understanding.

3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

I think this course would make more Sense as a core course rather than an elective

# 1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

Learning tableau

# 2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

Become more organized and do in-class practice with simulation/quing material/ Tableau to help understanding before working on own own. The class is organized, but assignments were unclear at times.

#### 3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

I enjoyed the challenge this course gave, but I wish we haid time to practice on more of the equations / tableau/ going material to get a better understanding.

Other than that, this was a great, insignified corse. I enjoyed the "chachauncies" this course taught me!

#### 1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS **COURSE WAS:**

The tableau assignments and the simulation.

#### 2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

Should be more up front with students when Anying to recruit them for this class and clarity what exactly is expected of them as well as be a little more understanding when students need a little extra help since this is new material for most.

#### 3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS:

2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

3)I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

1) I BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE PART OF THIS COURSE WAS: Nothing. We are not graduate Students. You are teaching the class on both levels the same. You also came in an presented this class to use in a VERY decentful way. No test ... 4 TEST. one of which took is Hours plus to complete

2) TO IMPROVE THIS COURSE IN FUTURE SEMESTERS, THE PROFESSOR:

way too much for 1 class. Tahleau should be on its own. If you are going to teach something you should know the program backward in forwards. You should actually teach Not tell us to go home watchvideos or Read. We Pay you to teach us not for us to 3)1 WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

It truly feels as if you think your class is the only one we have. The amount of time spent forzyour class preparation is at least four times more than other classes. The sad part is I learned way less from the hours wasted on your work. I have professors who TEACH with No books that I have learned way more from.

