#### Nicholls State University

Faculty: Castille/Christopher

Course Enrollment:

10

Spring 2018 Student Instructional Report

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

Evaluations Processed:

	•				1		P	al .				To Const		1	,		M			86-	Jand	Danie and			
Vum 5-1	Var	Effec	4-Effe	dive	3-Mod	Effic	Ra 2-Some		1-Ineff		0-N	<i>(</i> 4	4	No R	//sym	Class	Dent	-	Lluin	Class	<b>VOUCOBGOUP</b>	Deviatio Col	n Univ	%ile	QuestionDescription
			_				2-30me	thell	1-men	ecuve	UFIN	//	4	NOK	esp	Citass	Бері	Cot	GHIV	Cittas	Бері	Cor	Ontv	70He	QuestionDescription
1. Cours							41	100/	41	100/		00/	7-1	I 0	00/	2.20	4.00	4.00	4.41	1.05	0.91	0.93	0.87	3	Expl of Requirements
	2	20%	2	20%	4	40%	0	10%	0	10%	0	0%		0	0% 0%	3.30 4.20	4.28	4.28	4.41	0.79	0.82	0.93	0.83	22	Prep for Class
		40%	4	40%	2	20%		0%																	
	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
	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%	March and the same of the same	0	0%	3.90	4.24	4.20	4.37	0.88	0.95	1.02	0.95	15	Sum Important Pts
							Weig	hted A	verage	for A	A. Cours	e Orga	nization and l	Planning		3.80								i encore	
. Comr	nun	iicatio	1							1 - 15															
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 1	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
							Weig	hted A	verage	for I	3. Comn	nunica	tion			4.38									
. Facul	lty/S	Studen	t Inte	ractio	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%		o	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
		17000	ag sta				Weig	hted A	verage	for (	C. Facul	ty/Stuc	ent Interactio	n		4.60									
. Assig	nm	ent. E	vams a	nd G	rading	y		91054																	
	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
	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
	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
	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
<u>1</u>	-	1078	<u> </u>	3070		2070		SE 100 000		GARAGO IA		CONTRACTOR OF THE	Evens and C		070	3.42	4.10	7,21	4,04	1.04	1.00		0.57		71001grillion (Ticipiu)
C	10		T-v-4		Madi	vode	weig	знеа А	verage	jur 1	), ASSIG	mient	Exams and C	лацид		3.42									
Suppl	iem	*	Instr			11.000000000000000000000000000000000000	- 1	400/		001		001		I 01	001	4.00	4.46	4.46	4.00	0.00	0.04	1.04	0.00	00	Carall Cara Disass
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
	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
	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
							Weig	ted A	verage	for I	E. Suppl	ement	ry Instruction	Method	is	4.00									

### Nicholls State University

#### Spring 2018 Student Instructional Report

Faculty: Castille/Christopher

College:

Course:

BA Department: MNMK

Course Enrollment: Evaluations Processed: 16 10

MNGT 486 2T (11121)

Rank			Mean	ACCOUNT OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	Deviation	
	ich Less 0-N/A	No Resp	Class Dept Col U	Iniv Class Dept	Col Univ %il	e QuestionDescription
F. Course Outcomes	24年1月1日 - 1000					
29 6 60% 0 0% 3 30% 1 10% 0	0% 0 0%	0 0%	4.10 3.59 3.60	3.84 1.20 0.98		6 Learning Increased
30 2 20% 4 40% 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 2	Achieved Objectives
31 4 40% 1 10% 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 3	6 Interest in Subject
32 4 40% 4 40% 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 5	7 Think Independently
33 4 40% 5 50% 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 5	Actively Involved
55	e for F. Course Outcomes		3.86			
· · · · ·						
34 5 50% 4 40% 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	Effort Put In
35 2 20% 4 40% 2 20% 2 20% 0	0% 0 0%	0 0%	3.60 3.56 3.63	3.81 1.07 0.8	0.91 0.96	Prepared for Class
36 7 70% 2 20% 0 0% 0 0% 1	10% 0 0%	0 0%	4.40 3.63 3.73	3.85 1.26 0.9	6 0.99 1.03	36 Challenged by Crs
3	ery Elem	No Resp	Class Dent Col	Univ Class Deni	Col Univ %i	le QuestionDescription
Num         5-Verv Diff         4-Some Diff         3-About Right         2-Some Elem         1-Ve           37         7         70%         3         30%         0         0%         0         0%         0		0 0%	4.70 3.34 3.41	3.40 0.48 0.6	4 0.71 0.73	Level of Difficulty
37 7 7070 0 0070	100	No Resp	Class Dept Col	Univ Class Depi	Col Univ %i	le QuestionDescription
TVIIII S-WACH HEAV 4-HEAVIES S-WOOM CAME	uch Light	0 0%		3.24 0.42 0.7		Work Load
38 8 80 80 70 2 20 70 0 0 0 0 0		)/ D	Class Dept Col	Univ Class Dep	Col Univ %	le QuestionDescription
IVIIII J-Very Past 4-State Past J-Amateur 2 Jan	ery Slow	0 0%		3.25 0.74 0.5		Pace of Course
39 2 20% 5 50% 3 30% 0 0% 0				Univ Class Dep	t Col Univ %	ile OuestionDescription
(VIGINE 3-Very Eneces 4-Engenves 3-magazines 2-unitarine	neffective 0-N/A	No Resp		4.09 1.18 0.9		12 Quality of Instruct
40 1 10% 6 60% 1 10% 1 10% 1	1 10% 0 0%					ile QuestionDescription
Num 1-Mai/Minor 2-College Rea 3-Elective 4-Other		No Resp 0 0%	Class Dept Col 6 2.80 1.31 1.27	Univ Class Dep 1,37 0.79 0.6		Description of Crs
41 1 10% 1 10% 7 70% 1 10%		0 078				
Num 1-Freshman 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-C	Graduate 6-Other	No Resp	Class Dept Col	Univ Class Dep 2.61 0.52 0.6		ile QuestionDescription  Class Level
42 0 0% 0 0% 4 40% 6 60%	0 0% 0 0%	0 0%	6 3.60 3.74 3.16	2.61 0.52 0.6	1.07	Olass Level
	0 0% 0 0%					
Num 1-Better Engl 2-Better Other 3-Eaual	0 0% 0 07	No Resp		Univ Class Dep		
Num 1-Beuer Engl 2-Beuer Othe; 3-Eaual 43 9 90% 0 0% 1 10%	0 0% 0 07			Univ Class Dep 1.06 0.63 0.4	0.37 0.31	Comm in English
43 9 90% 0 0% 1 10%	0 0% 0 04	No Resp	6 1.20 1.10 1.09  Class Dept Col	1.06 0.63 0.4  Univ   Class   Dep	0.37 0.31 t Col Univ %	Comm in English  ile OuestionDescription
1 201 1 1001	0 0% 0 04	No Resp 0 0%	6 1.20 1.10 1.09  Class Dept Col	1.06 0.63 0.4	0.37 0.31 t Col Univ %	Comm in English
43 9 90% 0 0% 1 10%  Num 1-Female 2-Male	5-B- 6-C 7-Below C	No Resp 0 0% No Resp	6 1.20 1.10 1.09    Class   Dept   Col	1.06 0.63 0.4  Univ   Class   Dep	0 0.37 0.31 t Col Univ % 0.50 0.48	Comm in English  ile OuestionDescription

#### 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 chichonts;

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

Don't in about the gungger. Then are

3) I WOULD LIKE MY PROFESSOR TO KNOW THAT:

Course but please explain

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 Should work more with Tableau in class with students, space out

imulation deusions evenly

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 recolings 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, insightful course. 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: 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 decent ful 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 treuly 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.