

Jon (Sean) Jasperson

Courses Taught

The following represents a complete list of the courses I have taught during my career as a teacher. I have included a brief description of each course. The courses are organized in chronological order with the courses that I have taught most recently listed first.

Example syllabi for each course and an example project can be found in my electronic teaching portfolio available at the following URL:

<http://faculty-staff.ou.edu/J/Jon.L.Jasperson-1/TeachingPortfolio.html>

In addition to a description of each course, I have provided a summary of the student evaluations of my performance as an instructor in the course.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COURSES

Accounting Information Systems

In this course, students learn the basics of accounting information systems. Specific course objectives are to assist students in:

- Developing an in-depth awareness of the impact of accounting information systems on managerial decision making as well as organizational competitiveness.
- Understanding the basic principles underlying the design, integrity, and effectiveness of internal controls and accounting information systems.
- Acquiring a conceptual understanding of the internal controls necessary for and the risks associated with key accounting cycles.
- Gaining an appreciation that internal controls and accounting information systems are subject to continuous rethinking caused by economic and technological change.

This course is a required core course in the undergraduate Accounting program at The University of Oklahoma. I taught this course in the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters.

Table 1 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the Price College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 11 items. The first 9 items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). The last two items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent to 1 = bad). In the table, I have listed the mean response for each item.

Seminar in Accounting Information Systems

In this course, we discuss advanced accounting information systems topics and current trends in accounting information systems. Specific course objectives are to assist students in:

- Acquiring a conceptual understanding of the roles of accounting information and information technology in decision making, operational support, and stewardship
- Developing an in-depth awareness of the impact of accounting information systems on managerial decision making as well as organizational competitiveness

- Gaining an appreciation that the functions (and implementations) of accounting information systems continue to be subject to constant rethinking caused by economic and technological change

This course is an elective course offered to MAcc and MBA students at The University of Oklahoma. I taught this course in the Fall 2004 semester.

Table 2 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the Price College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 11 items. The first 9 items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). The last two items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent to 1 = bad). In the table, I have listed the mean response for each item.

Information Systems Infrastructure

In this course students examine information systems infrastructure concepts and technologies within the context of the business enterprise. The content of the course is divided into five sections: 1) overview and introduction, 2) computer organization and architecture, 3) operations and communication, 4) networking, and 5) management issues. Specifically, the course assists students in:

- Understanding the fundamentals of hardware and software
- Identifying basic issues and trends in developing effective enterprise architectures
- Defining and understanding IS infrastructure concepts in the context of the enterprise
- Reading trade literature and utilizing related online resources
- Communicating with technology specialists and business specialists about technology
- Understanding and demonstrating professional business behavior while producing deliverables in accordance with professional-level standards

This course is a core course in the undergraduate MIS program at The University of Oklahoma. I taught this course in the Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 semesters.

Table 3 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the Price College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 11 items. The first 9 items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). The last two items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent to 1 = bad). In the table, I have listed the mean response for each item.

Systems Analysis and Design Theory

This course covers the systems development lifecycle from the birth of a new system to the system's death and replacement. Students learn about various tools, techniques, and methodologies used by systems analysts to develop information systems in organizations. Specifically, the course assists the student in:

- Understanding the systems development lifecycle
- Understanding and explaining the role of information systems in organizations
- Analyzing an existing information system (whether manual or automated)
- Generating alternative solutions to an information systems problem
- Working successfully with a team of peers on a common problem

This course is a core course in the undergraduate MIS program at The University of Oklahoma. I taught this course every Fall and Spring semester between Fall 1998 and Fall 2002.

Table 4 and Table 5 contain a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the Price College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 40 items. Appendix 1 contains a complete listing of the 40 items.

The first 36 items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale (6 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). These items were used to evaluate general performance in the course. The results of these items are aggregated by the college into 12 groups as reported in the tables. I include the mean response for each group in the tables.

The last 4 items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = fair, 2 = not good, 1 = totally inadequate). These 4 items ask the student to compare the instructor and the course to 1) all other business instructors and courses and 2) all other college level instructors and courses. In the tables, I report the mean response for each of the four items.

Object-Oriented Systems Development

As an advanced systems analysis and design course, this course builds upon the concepts studied in the database course and the systems analysis/design theory course. However, in contrast to the structured development lifecycle studied in these previous courses, this course focuses on the concepts and principles of object-oriented systems development.

A portion of this course is devoted to learning the Unified Modeling Language (UML). Students learn how to apply the UML concepts in modeling information about the static structure and dynamic behavior of a computer-based information system. Specifically, the course assists the student in:

- Understanding the difference between structured systems development and object oriented systems development
- Applying common modeling techniques of the UML to represent the specifications of an information system
- Understanding the impact of object orientation and component-based development on the systems development field

Dr. Traci Carte and I developed this course this course together. It is an elective course in the MIS program at The University of Oklahoma. After the Fall 2000 semester, the course was slash-listed and offered to both undergraduate and graduate students. Traci Carte and I team-taught this course every Fall and Spring semester between Fall 2000 and Spring 2002. I taught this course by myself during the Fall 2002 semester.

Table 6 contains a summary of the student evaluations from the undergraduate students who took this course. Table 7 contains a summary of the student evaluations from the graduate students who took this course. The instrument used by the Price College of Business during the semesters we taught this course contained 40 items. Appendix 1 contains a complete listing of the 40 items.

The first 36 items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale (6 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). These items were used to evaluate general performance in the course. The results of these items are aggregated by the college into 12 groups as reported in the tables. I include the mean response for each group in the tables.

The last 4 items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = fair, 2 = not good, 1 = totally inadequate). These 4 items ask the student to compare the instructor and the course to 1) all other business instructors and courses and 2) all other college level instructors and courses. In the tables, I report the mean response for each of the four items.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY COURSES

Decision Support and Expert Systems Management

The objectives of this course are for students to develop an understanding of the role of computers in direct support of managerial decision making; to reinforce previous understanding of the role of managerial decision making in organizations; and to apply this understanding, as well as prerequisite systems design, database, and programming skills, to the design of typical systems for managerial decision support. Specifically, the course assists each student in:

- Understanding the concepts of decision support and expert systems structure and the principles of their design.
- Analyzing typical decision situations to determine whether it is practical to support them with computer technology and, if so, how.
- Designing and implementing a decision support system.
- Designing and implementing an expert system.
- Understanding decision support, expert, and group decision support system use, development, and evolution.
- Gaining an appreciation of working on systems development projects in a team environment and obtaining experience with project management.

This course is the capstone course in the MIS undergraduate program at Florida State University. Only senior MIS majors are allowed to take this course in the last semester before graduation. I taught this course during Fall 1996, Summer 1997, and Summer 1998 semesters.

Table 8 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 8 items. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor). As per the college evaluation system, I report the median response for each item.

Introduction to COBOL Programming for Business

This course provides a basic introduction to COBOL programming for business applications. Structured programming techniques and common structured programming documentation are emphasized. This course assists students in:

- Understanding the COBOL language
- Understanding structured programming techniques

- Designing and developing small-scale business applications using structured programming techniques and the COBOL language

This course is the second of three programming languages required for undergraduate MIS students at The Florida State University. I taught this course during the Spring 1998 semester.

Table 9 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semester that I taught this course. The instrument used by the College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 8 items. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor). As per the college evaluation system, I report the median response for each item.

Quantitative Methods for Business

The major objectives of this course are for students to develop an understanding of the decision making process and its application to business problems generally, and to appreciate the role of analytical methods and computer technology in finding solutions to business decision problems. Specifically, this course assists the student in:

- Understanding the nature, structure, and characteristics of various formulations of common business decision problems
- Applying various models and techniques to analyze business decision problems and alternative solutions to these decision problems
- Interpreting the results of the analysis and choosing the best solution(s) to these decision problems
- Using computer-based models and techniques to formulate and solve various common business decision problems

In this course, students are instructed in one- and two- sample hypothesis testing, chi-square hypothesis testing, regression, multiple regression, and time-series analysis techniques and how to apply these techniques to common business problems. In addition, various Bayesian and non-Bayesian decision analysis methods are explored, such as, Maximin, Maximax, Minimax Regret, Expected Payoff, and Expected Opportunity Loss.

All business majors are required to take this course. I taught this course during the Fall 1996, Spring 1997, Summer 1997, Fall 1997, and Spring 1998 semesters.

Table 10 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters that I taught this course. The instrument used by the College of Business during the semesters I taught this course contained 8 items. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor). As per the college evaluation system, I report the median response for each item.

Information Resource Management for Business

This course exposes students to examples of how IT can be used in a business setting. Specifically, this course covers some ways the various functional areas of business, including accounting, marketing, finance, operations, and other areas benefit from the use of IT. Students are exposed to a variety of tools, including spreadsheet analysis and online database reference systems. Information systems concepts and principles used by organizations to help

reduce costs, improve quality, and obtain a competitive advantage in the market place are integrated throughout the course. This course assists the student in:

- Understanding the role of IT in supporting business functions
- Using several systems tools, including Microsoft Windows, Lotus 1-2-3, and others
- Understanding information systems concepts and principles
- Understanding the difference between transaction processing systems, management information systems, decision support systems, and expert systems
- Understanding and applying basic systems development approaches in designing, developing, operating, and maintaining computer-based information systems

All business majors are required to take this course. I taught this course during Summer 1995 and Spring 1996 semesters.

Table 11 contains a summary of the student evaluations I received during the semesters I taught this course. The College of Business changed forms between semesters that I taught this course. A brief description of the scales are provided in the table.

Table 1 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Accounting Information Systems

	1	2	3	4	
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F2004	F2004	S2005	S2005	
New Prep?	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Number enrolled	48	51			
Number responding	43	33			
Question					Mean
1. The course was well organized.	3.58	3.85			3.72
2. The teacher made good use of examples and illustrations.	3.60	3.97			3.79
3. The teacher stimulated class participation.	3.84	4.15			4.00
4. The teacher encouraged questions and answered them effectively.	3.56	4.06			3.81
5. The pace of instruction was consistent with the difficulty of the subject.	3.37	3.91			3.64
6. The teacher was available and helpful.	3.84	4.12			3.98
7. The teacher gave useful and timely feedback on the results of assignments and exams.	3.42	3.94			3.68
8. The teacher was enthusiastic about teaching this course.	4.02	4.21			4.12
9. The teacher maintained a professional attitude and treated each student with respect.	3.67	4.15			3.91
10. How do you rate this instructor overall?	3.42	3.97			3.70
11. How do you rate this course overall?	3.21	3.52			3.37

Scale

Items 1 - 9 (5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 10 - 11 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = bad)

Table 2 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Seminar in Accounting Information Systems

	1
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F2004
New Prep?	Yes
Number enrolled	13
Number responding	13
Question	
1. The course was well organized.	4.46
2. The teacher made good use of examples and illustrations.	4.54
3. The teacher stimulated class participation.	4.70
4. The teacher encouraged questions and answered them effectively.	4.77
5. The pace of instruction was consistent with the difficulty of the subject.	4.69
6. The teacher was available and helpful.	4.77
7. The teacher gave useful and timely feedback on the results of assignments and exams.	4.77
8. The teacher was enthusiastic about teaching this course.	4.77
9. The teacher maintained a professional attitude and treated each student with respect.	4.77
10. How do you rate this instructor overall?	4.70
11. How do you rate this course overall?	4.46

Scale

Items 1 - 9 (5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)
 Items 10 - 11 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = bad)

Table 3 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Information Systems Infrastructure

	1	2	3	4	
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F2003	F2003	S2004	S2004	
New Prep?	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Number enrolled	26	9	18	15	
Number responding	19	6	16	14	
Question					Mean
1. The course was well organized.	4.04	4.04	4.62	4.36	4.27
2. The teacher made good use of examples and illustrations.	4.03	4.03	4.50	4.14	4.18
3. The teacher stimulated class participation.	3.86	3.86	4.52	4.07	4.10
4. The teacher encouraged questions and answered them effectively.	3.96	3.96	4.44	4.28	4.16
5. The pace of instruction was consistent with the difficulty of the subject.	3.82	3.82	4.25	4.07	3.99
6. The teacher was available and helpful.	3.99	3.99	4.37	4.14	4.12
7. The teacher gave useful and timely feedback on the results of assignments and exams.	3.98	3.98	4.56	4.21	4.18
8. The teacher was enthusiastic about teaching this course.	4.19	4.19	4.56	4.28	4.31
9. The teacher maintained a professional attitude and treated each student with respect.	4.27	4.27	4.62	4.36	4.68
10. How do you rate this instructor overall?	4.04	4.04	4.69	4.28	4.26
11. How do you rate this course overall?	3.72	3.72	4.37	3.86	3.92

Scale

Items 1 - 9 (5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 10 - 11 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = bad)

Table 4 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Systems Analysis and Design Theory

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F1998	F1998	S1999	S1999	F1999	F1999	S2000	S2000
New Prep?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number enrolled	39	45	16	32	33	37	37	32
Number responding	32	36	13	28	29	29	30	29
Group								
1. Communication ability (3 items)	5.06	5.13	4.41	4.86	5.05	4.68	5.28	5.31
2. Ability to present material (3 items)	4.86	4.94	3.92	4.51	4.55	4.29	5.10	5.36
3. Instructor relationship with students (3 items)	4.92	5.27	4.21	4.92	4.67	4.55	5.04	5.36
4. Instructor acceptance of criticism (2 items)	4.86	5.03	3.5	4.25	4.21	4.36	4.88	5.12
5. Generation of class participation (3 items)	5.02	5.35	4.36	4.90	4.99	4.54	5.18	5.46
6. Ability to motivate students (3 items)	4.86	5.13	4.10	4.60	4.78	4.43	5.18	5.44
7. Clarity of course objectives (2 items)	4.66	4.85	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.48	5.22	5.36
8. Evaluation of exams (3 items)	4.26	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.68	4.94
9. Evaluation of assignments (3 items)	4.77	5.08	3.64	4.51	4.84	4.33	5.16	5.34
10. Evaluation of text and readings (3 items)	4.72	4.67	3.85	4.44	4.49	4.36	4.96	4.71
11. Evaluation of grading (5 items)	4.69	4.82	4.23	4.41	4.39	4.00	4.99	4.93
12. Course organization (3 items)	4.59	4.45	4.59	4.93	5.11	4.77	5.22	5.37
<i>Overall weighted mean (12 groups)</i>	4.77	4.95	4.09	4.60	4.67	4.41	5.07	5.23
Question								
1. Instructor compared to other business instructors	3.75	4.11	3.00	3.50	3.83	3.45	4.20	4.62
2. Instructor compared to all college-level instructors	3.75	4.00	3.00	3.68	3.86	3.38	4.20	4.52
3. Course compared to other business courses	3.88	3.89	3.46	3.86	4.10	3.90	4.33	4.48
4. Course compared to all college-level courses	3.78	3.81	3.38	3.79	4.03	3.62	4.23	4.41

Scale

Groups 1 - 12 (6 = strongly agree; 5 = agree; 4 = mildly agree; 3 = mildly disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 1 - 4 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = fair; 2 = not good; 1 = totally inadequate)

Table 5 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Systems Analysis and Design Theory (cont.)

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F2000	S2001	S2001	F2001	S2002	S2002	F2002	F2002	
New Prep?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Number enrolled	30	25	32	29	13	27	33	35	
Number responding	26	22	25	23	9	23	27	23	
Group									Mean
1. Communication ability (3 items)	5.18	5.20	5.21	5.09	5.30	5.33	5.46	5.26	5.11
2. Ability to present material (3 items)	5.12	5.11	5.13	4.94	5.22	5.20	5.28	5.09	4.91
3. Instructor relationship with students (3 items)	5.35	5.12	5.05	5.15	5.11	5.36	5.25	5.23	5.04
4. Instructor acceptance of criticism (2 items)	5.02	4.70	4.58	4.85	5.11	5.00	5.19	5.00	4.73
5. Generation of class participation (3 items)	5.36	5.27	5.12	5.14	5.26	5.49	5.21	5.06	5.11
6. Ability to motivate students (3 items)	5.03	5.23	5.15	5.09	5.26	5.38	5.17	5.13	5.00
7. Clarity of course objectives (2 items)	5.19	5.14	4.98	5.09	4.78	5.24	5.24	5.07	4.91
8. Evaluation of exams (3 items)	4.63	4.41	4.60	4.39	4.52	4.74	4.91	4.57	4.52
9. Evaluation of assignments (3 items)	5.14	5.09	5.25	5.06	4.89	5.09	5.23	5.06	4.91
10. Evaluation of text and readings (3 items)	4.48	4.49	4.80	4.29	4.75	4.58	5.04	4.78	4.59
11. Evaluation of grading (5 items)	4.85	4.75	4.81	4.78	4.78	4.90	5.17	4.87	4.71
12. Course organization (3 items)	5.09	5.06	5.07	4.90	5.00	5.33	5.40	5.14	5.00
<i>Overall weighted mean (12 groups)</i>	5.04	4.96	4.98	4.90	5.00	5.14	5.21	5.02	4.88
Question									
1. Instructor compared to other business instructors	4.15	4.36	4.16	4.22	4.22	4.43	4.26	4.17	4.03
2. Instructor compared to all college-level instructors	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.00	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.09	3.99
3. Course compared to other business courses	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.87	4.44	4.57	4.11	4.04	4.10
4. Course compared to all college-level courses	3.96	4.32	4.16	3.65	4.33	4.48	4.19	4.09	4.01

Scale

Groups 1 - 12 (6 = strongly agree; 5 = agree; 4 = mildly agree; 3 = mildly disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 1 - 4 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = fair; 2 = not good; 1 = totally inadequate)

Table 6 -- Summary of Undergraduate Student Evaluations for Object-Oriented Systems Development

	1	2	3	4	5	
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	F2000	S2001	F2001	S2002	F2002	
New Prep?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes [†]	
Number enrolled	21	14	5	16	10	
Number responding	13	9	5	12	8	
Group						Mean
1. Communication ability (3 items)	5.33	5.70	5.33	5.39	5.29	5.41
2. Ability to present material (3 items)	5.03	5.52	4.93	5.03	4.54	5.01
3. Instructor relationship with students (3 items)	5.59	5.85	5.20	5.47	5.38	5.50
4. Instructor acceptance of criticism (2 items)	5.38	5.56	4.90	5.13	5.06	5.21
5. Generation of class participation (3 items)	5.62	5.81	5.40	5.61	5.33	5.55
6. Ability to motivate students (3 items)	5.54	5.85	5.27	5.61	4.96	5.45
7. Clarity of course objectives (2 items)	4.54	5.56	5.20	5.21	4.94	5.09
8. Evaluation of exams (3 items)	4.67	5.59	4.87	5.14	4.83	5.02
9. Evaluation of assignments (3 items)	4.59	5.56	5.07	5.26	5.29	5.15
10. Evaluation of text and readings (3 items)	4.23	5.19	5.00	4.92	4.71	4.81
11. Evaluation of grading (5 items)	4.60	5.27	4.96	5.22	5.20	5.05
12. Course organization (3 items)	4.69	5.41	5.13	5.31	5.25	5.16
<i>Overall weighted mean (12 groups)</i>	4.98	5.57	5.11	5.27	5.07	5.20
Question						
1. Instructor compared to other business instructors	4.62	4.89	4.80	4.58	4.00	4.58
2. Instructor compared to all college-level instructors	4.62	4.89	4.60	4.50	3.88	4.50
3. Course compared to other business courses	4.31	4.78	5.0	4.42	3.88	4.48
4. Course compared to all college-level courses	4.23	4.56	4.60	4.42	4.00	4.36

[†]New prep to teach course by myself

Scale

Groups 1 - 12 (6 = strongly agree; 5 = agree; 4 = mildly agree; 3 = mildly disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 1 - 4 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = fair; 2 = not good; 1 = totally inadequate)

Table 7 -- Summary of Graduate Student Evaluations for Object-Oriented Systems Development

	1	2	3	4	
Semester (F = Fall and S = Spring)	S2001	F2001	S2002	F2002	
New Prep?	Yes	No	No	Yes [†]	
Number enrolled	4	8	7	13	
Number responding	4	8	7	6	
Question					Mean
1. Communication ability (3 items)	5.42	5.38	5.43	5.50	5.43
2. Ability to present material (3 items)	5.25	5.25	5.16	5.39	5.26
3. Instructor relationship with students (3 items)	5.58	5.33	5.62	5.72	5.56
4. Instructor acceptance of criticism (2 items)	4.88	5.00	5.43	5.58	5.22
5. Generation of class participation (3 items)	5.50	5.38	5.57	5.61	5.52
6. Ability to motivate students (3 items)	5.50	5.29	5.35	5.56	5.43
7. Clarity of course objectives (2 items)	5.25	5.31	5.29	5.33	5.30
8. Evaluation of exams (3 items)	5.03	4.88	4.86	5.22	5.00
9. Evaluation of assignments (3 items)	5.58	5.04	5.19	5.39	5.30
10. Evaluation of text and readings (3 items)	4.67	5.00	5.19	5.28	5.04
11. Evaluation of grading (5 items)	4.55	4.90	5.11	5.30	4.97
12. Course organization (3 items)	4.75	5.04	5.19	5.39	5.09
<i>Overall weighted mean (12 groups)</i>	5.16	5.15	5.28	5.44	5.26
Question					
1. Instructor compared to other business instructors	4.25	4.25	4.43	4.67	4.40
2. Instructor compared to all college-level instructors	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.67	4.34
3. Course compared to other business courses	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.17	4.17
4. Course compared to all college-level courses	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.17	4.17

[†]New prep to teach course by myself

Scale

Groups 1 - 12 (6 = strongly agree; 5 = agree; 4 = mildly agree; 3 = mildly disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree)

Items 1 - 4 (5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = fair; 2 = not good; 1 = totally inadequate)

Table 8 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Decision Support and Expert Systems Management

	1	2	3	
Semester (F = Fall; S = Spring; and Su = Summer)	F1996	Su1997	Su1998	
New Prep?	Yes	Yes [†]	No	
Number enrolled	24	48	53	
Number responding	16	20	42	
Question				Mean
Description of course objectives and assignments.	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Communication of ideas.	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.5
Expression of expectations for performance in this class.	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.5
Availability to assist students in or out of class.	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.3
Respect and concern for students.	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.3
Stimulation of interest in the course.	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8
Facilitation of learning.	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.5
Overall assessment of instructor.	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.3

[†]New prep for different textbook

Scale

5 = excellent; 4 = very good; 3 = good; 2 = fair; 1 = poor

Table 9 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for COBOL Programming

	1
Semester (F = Fall; S = Spring; and Su = Summer)	S1998
New Prep?	Yes
Number enrolled	39
Number responding	28
Question	
Description of course objectives and assignments.	4.0
Communication of ideas.	4.0
Expression of expectations for performance in this class.	4.0
Availability to assist students in or out of class.	4.0
Respect and concern for students.	4.0
Stimulation of interest in the course.	4.0
Facilitation of learning.	4.0
Overall assessment of instructor.	4.0

Scale

5 = excellent; 4 = very good; 3 = good; 2 = fair; 1 = poor

Table 10 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Quantitative Methods for Business

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Semester (F = Fall; S = Spring; and Su = Summer)	F1996	S1997	S1997	Su1997	F1997	F1997	S1998	
New Prep?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Number enrolled	41	60	57	42	40	42	41	
Number responding	28	43	32	32	33	34	32	
Question								Mean
Description of course objectives and assignments.	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.3
Communication of ideas.	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.9
Expression of expectations for performance in this class.	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.1
Availability to assist students in or out of class.	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.4
Respect and concern for students.	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
Stimulation of interest in the course.	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.9
Facilitation of learning.	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.9
Overall assessment of instructor.	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.1

Scale

5 = excellent; 4 = very good; 3 = good; 2 = fair; 1 = poor

Table 11 -- Summary of Student Evaluations for Information Systems Resource Management

<p>Summer 1995</p> <p>Responses are on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. Thirty-two students responded to this evaluation.</p> <p>Responses to four questions regarding the instructor's involvement with and concern for students had a mean of 4.31 with a standard deviation of 0.70. Responses to four questions concerning the instructor's interaction with the students had a mean of 4.46 with a standard deviation of 0.53.</p> <p>81 percent of the students generally agreed that as an instructor, I was thoroughly competent in my area and 78 percent of the students generally agreed that as an instructor I was an effective teacher.</p>
<p>Spring 1996</p> <p>The same 8 items reported in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10 were used by the college during this semester; however, only percentage of students responding in each of the 5 scale categories are reported. Student responses are on a five-point Likert scale with categories of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Thirty of the 40 enrolled students responded to this student evaluation.</p> <p>At least 70 percent of the responding students placed me in the excellent or very good categories in response to each of the 8 items on the scale except item number 3, where only 66 percent of the respondents indicated that I was in these two categories.</p>

Appendix 1

This appendix contains the complete set of items used on the student evaluations for the Price College of Business for all courses I taught between the Fall 1998 semester and the Fall 2002 semester. Items are presented with their respective group.

The following items were rated using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = mildly agree; 4 = mildly disagree; 5 = disagree; 6 = strongly disagree).

Group 1 -- Questions to assess communication ability

1. The instructor speaks clearly when presenting material.
2. The instructor holds the attention of the class.
3. The instructor presents material at an appropriate pace.

Group 2 -- Questions to assess ability to present material

1. The instructor is able to simplify what is taught.
2. The instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
3. The instructor carefully answers questions.

Group 3 -- Questions to assess instructor's relationship with students

1. I have access to the instructor or his/her assistants during office hours or immediately after class.
2. The instructor establishes rapport with the class.
3. The instructor is helpful when students have problems.

Group 4 -- Questions to assess instructor's acceptance of criticism

1. The instructor invites criticism of his/her ideas.
2. The instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

Group 5 -- Questions to assess generation of class participation

1. I feel involved with this course.
2. I feel free to ask questions in class.
3. There is a lot of classroom discussion in this course.

Group 6 -- Questions to assess ability to motivate students

1. The instructor is enthusiastic about teaching.
2. I was stimulated to think in this class.
3. I find learning enjoyable in this class.

Group 7 -- Questions to assess course objectives

1. The objectives of this course are clearly communicated.
2. I understand what is expected of me in this course.

Group 8 -- Questions to evaluate exams

1. Exams are free from ambiguity.
2. Exams assess what I have learned in this course.
3. Exams are coordinated with major course objectives.

Group 9 -- Questions to evaluate assignments

1. Directions for course assignments are clear and specific.
2. Assignments are related to goals of this course.
3. Assignments are of definite educational value.

Group 10 -- Questions to assess textbooks and readings

1. I am generally pleased with the text(s) required for this course.
2. The assigned reading is well integrated into this course.
3. The assigned reading is generally interesting and holds my attention.

Group 11 -- Questions to evaluate grades

1. Grades are an accurate assessment of my knowledge in this course.
2. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
3. Grades are returned in a timely fashion.
4. The grading system was clearly explained.
5. The number of graded assignments and tests is acceptable.

Group 12 -- Questions to assess course objectives

1. The course was well organized.
2. A syllabus clearly laid out the course requirements and objectives, instructor's office hours, how grades would be determined, etc.
3. The course was well structured.

The following items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Excellent; 2 = Good; 3 = Fair; 4 = Not Good; 5 = Totally Inadequate).

1. How does this instructor compare to other business instructors?
2. How does this instructor compare to all instructors you have had at the college level?
3. How does the amount of knowledge you gained in this course compare to the amount of knowledge gained in other business courses?
4. How does the amount of knowledge you gained in this course compare to the amount of knowledge gained in all college courses you have taken?