

202007-BMGT230-0201-BUSINESS STATISTICS - Shubham Akshat - Instructor Report - Summer 2020

Project Title: University of Maryland Course Evaluation Summer 2020

Number of Students Invited: 9
Number of Evaluations Submitted: 6

Response Rate: 66.7%

Report Comments

This report presents feedback received from students for the course **BUSINESS STATISTICS** and for the Instructor **Shubham Akshat** in that course. Course means are calculated from all responses by all students in the unit (i.e., course section) on that item and exclude N/A (not applicable) responses. A grade table is included on the next page if available.

Indication is provided below for the Report Group if there is one affiliated with this course section, otherwise it is blank. The Report Group will be the lead section of a grouped course (i.e. multi-section lecture) and/or the primary of cross-listed courses. Subsections are found in the Instructor Subgroup Report.

Semester: Sum II 2020

College: Robert H. Smith School of Business

Department: BMGT-Robert H. Smith School of Business

Course #: BMGT230 Section #: 0201

Course Title: BUSINESS STATISTICS

Report Group:

Instructor: Shubham Akshat

Creation Date: Wednesday, September 02, 2020

Grade Distribution

Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Grade PS	Grade W
6	2	0	0	1	0	0

Grade distribution is current as of September 1, 2020 and includes students receiving a W for the course. Some grades are not included (e.g., Cancel, Incomplete).

Administrator University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes. N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Ougstion	Course
Question	Mean
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.3
I learned a lot from this course.	3.2

By Frequency

1. The course was intellectually ch	allenging			2. I learned a lot from this course.			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%	Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	4	66.7%	Agree	3	5	83.3%
Strongly Agree	4	2	33.3%	Strongly Agree	4	1	16.7%
Statistics			Value	Statistics			Value
Response Count			6	Response Count			6
Mean			3.3	Mean			3.2
Standard Deviation			0.5	Standard Deviation			0.4

How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?

How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
General Education or CORE Requirement	0	0	0.0%
Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	1	5	83.3%
Elective	2	1	16.7%

Additional comments (e.g. about course content/materials, teaching style, etc.):

Comments
I feel like there could have been an extra week or two because there was a lot of material to cover in such a short period of time. But I think the professor did a good job getting through the material while also making sure that the students' needs were met.
Good teacher
It was all great.

Administrator University-Wide Instructor Shubham Akshat Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes. N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Quarties	Course
Question	Mean
The instructor treated students with respect.	3.8
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	3.8
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.7

1. The instructor treated stud	dents with respe	ect.		2. The instructor was well-pre
Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Options
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Disagree
Neutral	2	0	0.0%	Neutral
Agree	3	1	16.7%	Agree
Strongly Agree	4	5	83.3%	Strongly Agree
Statistics			Value	Statistics
Response Count			6	Response Count
Mean			3.8	Mean
Standard Deviation			0.4	Standard Deviation

2. The instructor was well-pre	epared for clas	S.	
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	1	16.7%
Strongly Agree	4	5	83.3%
Statistics			Value
Response Count			6
Mean			3.8
Standard Deviation			0.4

3. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.						
Options	Score	Count	Percentage			
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%			
Disagree	1	0	0.0%			
Neutral	2	0	0.0%			
Agree	3	2	33.3%			
Strongly Agree	4	4	66.7%			
Statistics			Value			
Response Count			6			
Mean			3.7			
Standard Deviation			0.5			

Overall Score

Averaging the following five scaled Administrator items (from above, repeated below) results in the Overall Score.

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Competency	Course
The course was intellectually challenging	3.3
I learned a lot from this course	3.2
The instructor treated students with respect	3.8
The instructor was well-prepared for class	3.8
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher	3.7
Total Score	3.6

The standards the instructor **Shubham Akshat** set for students were...

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course
Question	Mean
The standards the instructor set for students were	1.0

The standards the instructor set for students were			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	6	100.0%
Too High	2	0	0.0%

Student University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students. N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Quartien	Course
Question	Mean
Course guidelines were clearly described in the syllabus.	3.5
The required texts (e.g. books, course packs, online resources) helped me learn course material.	3.0

By Frequency

		2. The required texts (e.g. books resources) helped me learn cou			ne		
Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%	Neutral	2	1	20.0%
Agree	3	3	50.0%	Agree	3	3	60.0%
Strongly Agree	4	3	50.0%	Strongly Agree	4	1	20.0%
Statistics			Value	Statistics			Value
Response Count			6	Response Count			5
Mean			3.5	Mean			3.0
Standard Deviation			0.5	Standard Deviation			0.7

Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course
Question	Mean
Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were	1.0

Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	5	100.0%
Too High	2	0	0.0%

Given the course level and number of credits the workload was

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course
Question	Mean
Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was	1.0

By Frequency

Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	6	100.0%
Too High	2	0	0.0%

How much effort did you put into the course?

By Score

Scale is Little (0) to Considerable (2) with a Moderate mid-point

Question	Course
Question	Mean
How much effort did you put into the course?	1.7

How much effort did you put into the course?			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Little	0	0	0.0%
Moderate	1	2	33.3%
Considerable	2	4	66.7%

Student University-Wide Instructor **Shubham Akshat** Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Ougstion	Course
Question	Mean
The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.	3.7
The instructor was responsive to student concerns.	3.8
The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.	3.2

The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.		2. The instructor was responsiv	e to student	concern	S.		
Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%	Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	33.3%	Agree	3	1	16.7%
Strongly Agree	4	4	66.7%	Strongly Agree	4	5	83.3%
Statistics			Value	Statistics			Value
Response Count			6	Response Count			6
Mean			3.7	Mean			3.8
Standard Deviation			0.5	Standard Deviation			0.4

3. The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.						
Options	Score	Count	Percentage			
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%			
Disagree	1	0	0.0%			
Neutral	2	1	16.7%			
Agree	3	3	50.0%			
Strongly Agree	4	2	33.3%			
Statistics			Value			
Response Count			6			
Mean			3.2			
Standard Deviation			0.8			

College-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors - Robert H. Smith School of Business

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes. N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

Overall this is an excellent course.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course
Question	Mean
Overall this is an excellent course.	2.8

Overall this is an excellent course.			
Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	2	33.3%
Agree	3	3	50.0%
Strongly Agree	4	1	16.7%
Statistics			Value
Response Count			6
Mean			2.8
Standard Deviation			0.8

End of Report