

There were: 76 possible respondents.

| | Question Text | N | RR | Avg | BUS Avg | BUS F14 | Div Avg | Div F14 | Sch Avg | Sch F14 | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|-----|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Grp | Instructor Questions (GEHL) | | | 5.16 | 5.27 | | 5.23 | 5.44 | 5.29 | 5.18 | | | | | | |
| Grp | Course Questions | | | 4.65 | 5.02 | | 5.03 | 5.26 | 5.15 | 4.74 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Str Disagr | Disagr | Mild Disagr | Mild Agree | Agree | Str Agree |
| 1 | Objectives clearly stated | 51 | 67% | 4.55 | 5.09 | | 5.15 | 5.29 | 5.23 | 5.28 | 8% (4) | 2% (1) | 8% (4) | 16% (8) | 43% (22) | 24% (12) |
| 2 | Objectives met | 51 | 67% | 4.47 | 5.08 | | 5.10 | 5.29 | 5.20 | 5.28 | 8% (4) | 6% (3) | 4% (2) | 16% (8) | 47% (24) | 20% (10) |
| 3 | Content well-organized | 51 | 67% | 4.57 | 5.06 | | 5.05 | 5.26 | 5.12 | 5.26 | 6% (3) | 6% (3) | 4% (2) | 18% (9) | 43% (22) | 24% (12) |
| 4 | Course materials helpful | 51 | 67% | 4.73 | 5.00 | | 4.99 | 5.24 | 5.11 | 5.25 | 2% (1) | 8% (4) | 6% (3) | 14% (7) | 41% (21) | 29% (15) |
| 5 | Assignments & exams covered the course | 50 | 66% | 4.88 | 5.00 | | 5.06 | 5.24 | 5.18 | 5.24 | 2% (1) | 4% (2) | 4% (2) | 14% (7) | 46% (23) | 30% (15) |
| 6 | Learned great deal | 50 | 66% | 4.66 | 4.95 | | 4.97 | 5.25 | 5.10 | 5.24 | 2% (1) | 10% (5) | 6% (3) | 14% (7) | 38% (19) | 30% (15) |
| 7 | Overall effective course | 51 | 67% | 4.67 | 4.94 | | 4.98 | 5.24 | 5.10 | 5.24 | 2% (1) | 8% (4) | 8% (4) | 12% (6) | 45% (23) | 25% (13) |
| 9 | Instructor was organized (GEHL) | 51 | 67% | 4.8 | 5.22 | | 5.18 | 5.41 | 5.22 | 5.40 | 4% (2) | 8% (4) | 6% (3) | 8% (4) | 35% (18) | 39% (20) |
| 10 | Instructor presented effectively (GEHL) | 50 | 66% | 4.92 | 5.14 | | 5.02 | 5.29 | 5.13 | 5.31 | 4% (2) | | 2% (1) | 16% (8) | 50% (25) | 28% (14) |
| 11 | Instructor created respectful environment (GEHL) | 51 | 67% | 5.31 | 5.31 | | 5.31 | 5.45 | 5.35 | 5.47 | | | 4% (2) | 8% (4) | 41% (21) | 47% (24) |
| 12 | Demonstrated thorough knowledge (GEHL) | 50 | 66% | 5.36 | 5.44 | | 5.42 | 5.62 | 5.44 | 5.62 | | | 4% (2) | 6% (3) | 40% (20) | 50% (25) |
| 13 | Instructor encouraged questions/ opinions (GEHL) | 51 | 67% | 5.51 | 5.33 | | 5.32 | 5.50 | 5.34 | 5.51 | | | 4% (2) | 4% (2) | 29% (15) | 63% (32) |
| 14 | Instructor available for student consultation (GEHL) | 51 | 67% | 5.18 | 5.22 | | 5.25 | 5.41 | 5.31 | 5.42 | | | 6% (3) | 10% (5) | 45% (23) | 39% (20) |
| 15 | Overall effective instructor (GEHL) | 51 | 67% | 5.04 | 5.22 | | 5.15 | 5.40 | 5.23 | 5.41 | 2% (1) | 2% (1) | 8% (4) | 6% (3) | 43% (22) | 39% (20) |

| Instructor | Text Responses |
|------------|--|
| | Question: Comments on course effectiveness |
| | I'm not sure why I came to class other than to turn in reading responses that were not even read by the instructor or his TA. Everyone in the class was sure that TA and teacher were randomly assigning grades to papers. Poorly organized and unfairly graded. |
| | -Let students know that the large papers are an extensive exploration of the class ideas using a single company as the focal point. |
| | Very organized. Very fun instructional class. |
| | I didn't feel like I learned much about business with this being a business class. We rarely discussed the business side of topics. |
| | Interesting course. Professor Gehl tried to pick topics that were interesting and relevant. Daily writing assignments seemed more like busy work and didn't add anything. |
| | Class was very organized and I liked the topics |
| | Great discussions, in depth analysis |
| | Lots of reading which were helpful but almost impossible to read all the way through, unless you were a very fast reader |
| | Interesting class, taught us to think outside the box |
| | The writing was helpful for learning as opposed to tests. I enjoyed the lectures. |
| | The lectures were so great but the work and homework were very boring and I think he could incorporate his funny personality into the assignments |
| | I liked having an expert come into class and give a presentation of the subject. I also liked how all of the topics were similar in some regards. |
| | The format of the class was quite confusing. It was purely open discussion so knowing exactly the learning objects were hard. |
| | Our assigned reports relating to the class were the most effective as well as the weekly assigned reading responses. |

| | |
|------|---|
| | waste of business credit, its another English class |
| | I learned a lot about the cyber world and how to write a quick couple word summary of a 11 page article. The papers were a little excessive. I do not think the papers that were written every class had any worth. Felt like a waste of time to have to write one for every class with how brief and broad they were. I would change the course layout so that there were fewer but more developed papers. Also organize the content to be more of a business oriented topic, rather than the teachers hobbies. I feel like this class would be good for someone taking an english major that is interested in cyberspace and gaming, not business or finance. |
| | I found that there were a lot of readings and responses for the class, should maybe consider limiting them. Lecture was the best way for me to learn. |
| | The daily readings provided extensive information of the assigned topics. The open discussion provided students with the opportunity to thoroughly examine specific topics. |
| | The reading responses helped me learn more about the subjects, because a lot of the subjects we talked about I knew very little about. When we had our group days they really helped use that information we knew and put it into a large spectrum. |
| | This class was pointless as it didn't pertain to business like I thought it would |
| | It Would of been nice to have better feedback on assignments and the papers. I feel that it took os long to grade the main papers I couldnt fix my writing to get better grades |
| | Thought the readings were excessively long and boring. Felt like the group work was busy work. I stopped going to class after about 6 weeks. |
| | Question: Comments, suggestions on instructor performance |
| GEHL | The teacher understood the material. I need to take this time to mention that teacher acted with disregard to the student's time. Often he was not present in class but was happy to have his TA lecture for class right before thanksgiving when many people wouldn't be there. I thought this was disrespectful to the TA. |
| GEHL | Very good teacher. Knows a lot about the subject. Very helpful and very good teaching style. |
| GEHL | -Great job on communicating what was going on with future classes. |
| GEHL | The instructor was very encouraging of participation and he respected opinions that were given. |
| GEHL | Professor Gehl is sort of a dry dude and is really interesting to talk to. It sometimes seemed like he didn't want to be there. He was always willing to help and discuss questions. |
| GEHL | Lead good discussions |
| GEHL | Instructor demanded the class to participate in a very professional way. |
| GEHL | Clear, funny, informative |
| GEHL | Always promoted discussions, with an unbiased opinion. Great professor. |
| GEHL | He obviously knew a great deal about the subjects. He made things that were really boring seem mildly amusing and at times, interesting. |
| GEHL | Very charismatic,funny,young and personable! You have lively lectures but the homework and papers are very boring |
| GEHL | The instructor clearly knows the subject very in depth and so that what helpful whenever any questions arose. |
| GEHL | WEAKNESS: Graded business students as if they were humanities students. accepted everyone's opinion. |
| GEHL | Great at relating to us and chose great material. |
| GEHL | great writer but grades unfairly |
| GEHL | He knew a lot about the topics that he is teaching. He was very encouraging for classroom discussion, although they seemed to be very broad and not focused. Most people in a business major are not focused on writing computer code and Bollywood. |
| GEHL | Strong knowledge and history in the topics addressed. Also was a great help toward improving my writing. |
| GEHL | Provided good knowledge of the topics and created a learning environment that included heavy participation from students. |
| GEHL | Laid back yet thorough |
| GEHL | He is very passionate about each topic we talked about. I liked that he brought in speakers for each topic to give us an outside perspective. |
| GEHL | He's a nice guy |
| GEHL | The instructor required a lot from our writing assignments, and I felt that I got good feedback from the TA, Kody. |