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The Student Evaluation of the Faculty

In fall of 1987 CAP adopted a uniform questionnaire to be used by all departments for student evaluations of faculty. It also established the policy that all teaching faculty, regardless of rank and full- or part-time status, would be evaluated by students once per year, typically in classes taught during the fall semester. Concerns eventually arose over the utility of the 14-item questionnaire and in the late 1990s a committee was charged to revise the instrument. In fall 2003, a new 56-item evaluation questionnaire was approved by CAP and used in that semester. Faculty, however, objected to the length of the questionnaire, complaining that it took too much time out of the class period, and students voiced concerns that the socio-demographic questions included in the instrument jeopardized the anonymity of their answers. In response the provost charged a new committee to once again revise the questionnaire. That committee, based in part on a statistical analysis of the fall 2003 student responses from over 26,000 completed questionnaires, designed a new 23-item evaluation instrument which was approved by CAP in fall 2004 and used for the first time that semester.

The current instrument, which takes about 5 minutes to complete, measures students’ assessment of three broad areas: the instructor’s classroom performance; particular course features; and how much was gained from the class. Also, the questionnaire includes a global question measuring students’ overall assessment by asking “How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?” All questions are followed by Likert-scale response options.

The results of the questionnaires are reported as the percent of respondents selecting each response option. Each faculty member receives a report that summarizes his/her ratings in each section taught as well as across all sections. In addition, each faculty member is provided with a report that summarizes how students rated faculty in the department in general. This department profile provides a meaningful basis of comparison that allows a faculty member to quickly identify his/her strengths as well as areas in need of improvement.
Through fall 2007, the evaluation questionnaires have been distributed to students in class on scannable paper forms. CAP approved a full-scale online administration trial of the questionnaires during the spring 2008 semester and the questionnaire has been administered online ever fall and spring semester since the trial. There are a number of important benefits to an online survey, including convenience and accessibility, greater accuracy of information, tremendous savings in cost and in class time, and the opportunity to include open-ended responses. Moving the student evaluation process online would also allow us to expedite the aggregation and dissemination of the results, survey students every term (potentially including the two summer sessions), and reduce the college’s carbon footprint.

As part of the new online survey instrument, there are five open-ended questions:

1. Apart from the instructor, what are the strengths of the course?
2. How can the course be improved?
3. Apart from the course, what are the strengths of the instructor?
4. How can the instructor's teaching be improved?
5. What would you like to tell other students about this course?

The results from the first four questions are not published. The comments are shared only with the individual faculty member and his or her department chairperson. These are meant purely as constructive comments for the faculty member. Also, since these results are available to faculty shortly after the grading period, faculty are able to implement student suggestions immediately in their classrooms.

The great challenge in surveying students online is achieving an adequate response rate. The college employs different forms of marketing and communication to encourage students to participate in the evaluation process. Over the last four semesters, the overall response rates have been quite good. With the exception of spring 2010, the response rate has actually better than recent in-class questionnaires; and we have gathered tens of thousands of student comments since moving the questionnaires online.
Table 1: Response Rate and Number of Public Comments for Student Evaluation of the Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Public Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>67.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>58.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>66.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>68.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>73.81%</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>71.03%</td>
<td>18,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>75.86%</td>
<td>22,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>66.26%</td>
<td>16,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>22,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>19,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past Student Evaluation Results and Analysis

Each fall semester all full- and part-time time are evaluated by their students. Immediately below, Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide students’ assessment of, respectively, faculty’s in-class performance, the course itself and what they (students) learned for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007. In 2005 30,044 questionnaires were completed and submitted, in 2006 33,355 and in 2007 35,776 for a total of 99,175 across the three years.

As can be seen from Table 2 the vast majority of students submitting evaluations rate faculty’s in-class performance quite highly and they do so consistently from year to year.

Table 3 indicates that the overwhelming majority of these students find the number of course assignments just right but still challenging and useful. About half find the exams difficult and a majority find them fair. Table 3 also shows that over time students’ ratings have changed a bit. Since 2005 they are slightly more likely to report that the right number of assignments are given and that those assignments are useful. Fewer report, however, that the assignments are challenging. Also a somewhat larger percentage see the exams as fair.

Table 4 indicates that the vast majority of students submitting evaluations report having learned a fair amount to a lot from their courses. Also quite interestingly, overtime slightly increasing
percentages of students feel this way. With regard to each of the five learning objectives listed, a statistically significant increase occurred in the percentage of students responding affirmatively.

The evaluation questionnaire contains one additional item that provides a measure of students’ overall or global assessment of the instructor. The question asks “How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?” In 2005, 2006 and 2007, 80.6%, 80.7% and 81% of students, respectively, responded that they would “Very likely” or “Somewhat likely” recommend the instructor to a friend. Across all three years combined 80.8% responded this way. As can be seen, then, based on this global measure as well as the more specific measures, students rate Brooklyn Faculty and their teaching quite positively.

Table 2: Student Ratings of Instructors’ Performance: % Responding Excellent/Good by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Three years combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize ideas &amp; class materials</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate interest</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage thinking</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate class discussion</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clearly</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to students’ comments*</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep time/schedule requirements</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability outside of class*</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of information about requirements</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness in returning tests, etc.</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the P<.05 level

Table 3: Student Ratings of the Course: % Responding Affirmatively by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Three years combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right number of assignments, etc.*</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging class assignments, etc.*</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of class assignments, etc.*</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of exams</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of exams*</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the P<.05 level
### Table 4: Student Ratings of How Much They Learned: % Responding A lot/A Fair Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Three years combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge about subject*</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to analyze &amp; solve problems*</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find/use information*</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express ideas verbally*</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express ideas by creative means*</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the $P<.05$ level

Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide the same student evaluation data stratified by part-time versus full-time status of the instructor. As can be seen in Table 5, in 2005 and 2006 students rated adjuncts slightly higher than full-time faculty on instructor performance. As indicated in Table 6, during those years they also reported having learned slightly more in classes taught by adjuncts. Interestingly, Table 7 indicates they were also somewhat more likely to report that adjunct instructors required the right number of assignments, that those assignments were useful and that the tests adjuncts gave were less difficult and fairer.

In 2007, the student ratings of adjuncts and full-time faculty were more similar. The ratings, for instance, regarding faculty performance exhibited fewer statistically significant differences. Also noteworthy is that on some questions (e.g., communicate clearly, knowledge of subject, availability outside of class, promptness in returning tests) full-time faculty were now rated higher. Similarly, in 2007 students indicated they learned as much from classes taught by full-time faculty as they did from adjuncts. And the full-time faculty’s improved ratings occurred even though students continued to perceive their classes as difficult, e.g., students believed full-time faculty gave somewhat more challenging assignments, more difficult and less fair exams.
Table 5: Student Ratings of Instructors’ Performance: % Responding Excellent/Good by Part/Full-time Status and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize ideas &amp; class materials</td>
<td>86.4%*</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>86.1%*</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate interest</td>
<td>79.9%*</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>79.9%*</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage thinking</td>
<td>81.8%*</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>82.3%*</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate class discussion</td>
<td>78.9%*</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>79.3%*</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clearly</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>82.6%*</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to students’ comments</td>
<td>87.5%*</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>88.6%*</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>87.8%*</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>93.0%*</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>92.4%*</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep time/schedule requirements</td>
<td>88.4%*</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>88.4%*</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability outside of class</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>81.6%*</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of information about requirements</td>
<td>84.5%*</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>84.6%*</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness in returning tests, etc.</td>
<td>86.6%*</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>86.3%*</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.1%*</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the P<.05 level

Table 6: Student Ratings of the Course: Percent Responding Affirmatively by Year by Part/Full-time Status and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right number of assignments, etc.</td>
<td>82.9%*</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>84.4%*</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging class assignments, etc.</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>67.9%*</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>66.4%*</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of class assignments, etc.</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>80.6%*</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of exams</td>
<td>46.0%*</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>45.5%*</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>46.1%*</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of exams</td>
<td>86.7%*</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>87.5%*</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>87.0%*</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the P<.05 level
Table 7: Student Ratings of How Much They Learned: Percent Responding A lot/A Fair Amount by Part/Full-time Status and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge about subject</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to analyze &amp; solve problems</td>
<td>77.4%*</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find/use information</td>
<td>80.2%*</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.9%*</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express ideas verbally</td>
<td>76.9%*</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>77.3%*</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express ideas by creative means</td>
<td>77.2%*</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>77.2%*</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the P<.05 level

Students’ responses to the global measure, “How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?” reflect both the convergence and the more favorable rating of the full-time faculty. In 2005 the students indicated that they would recommend 81.8% of the adjuncts but only 79.6% of the full-time faculty, a statistically significant 2.2 percentage point difference. In 2006 a significant 2.7 point difference occurred (82.1% versus 79.4%, respectively). In 2007, though still statistically significant, a difference of only 1.1% occurred (81.6% versus 80.5%, respectively).

In discussing Table 4 it was noted that with each year a slightly greater percentage of students responded that they were learning a lot or a fair amount. Table 7 indicates that this pattern holds true for students in classes taught by adjuncts as well as those taught by full-time faculty. But the trend is a little more pronounced for students taught by full-time faculty. For instance, in 2005, 2006 and 2007, respectively, 77.4% to 77.9% to 78.4% of the students in adjuncts classes responded that they gained a lot or fair amount regarding “Your ability to analyze and solve problems.” The respective figures for full-time faculty were 76.2%, 77.1% and 79%. Thus, the enhancements in general in self-reported student learning were a bit more attributable to the courses taught by full-time in comparison to part-time faculty.
1. Did you receive a written syllabus during the first week of class?

Using the scale to the right, how would you rate the instructor on the following dimensions?

2. The instructor's ability to organize ideas and materials for class
3. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in the subject
4. The instructor's ability to encourage independent thinking
5. The instructor's ability to generate effective class discussion
6. The instructor's ability to communicate clearly
7. The instructor's openness to students' comments, questions and viewpoints concerning class topics
8. The instructor's knowledge of the subject matter of the class
9. The instructor's ability to keep to the time and schedule requirements for the class
10. The instructor's availability to students outside of class
11. The clarity of information provided about the course requirements and assignments
12. The promptness with which tests and assignments are graded and returned

Please complete the remaining two sections on the back of this form.
How would you rate each of the following?

13. The number of assignments, projects, creative works in this class
   - Too Many
   - Just Right
   - Too Few
   - Not Applicable

14. How challenging the class assignments, projects, creative works were
   - Very Challenging
   - Challenging
   - Somewhat challenging
   - Not challenging
   - Not Applicable

15. The usefulness of assignments, projects, creative works in this class
   - Very useful
   - Useful
   - Somewhat useful
   - Not useful
   - Not applicable

16. The difficulty of examinations in this class
   - Very difficult
   - Difficult
   - Somewhat difficult
   - Not difficult
   - Not Applicable

17. The fairness of examinations in this class
   - Very fair
   - Fair
   - Somewhat unfair
   - Unfair
   - Not Applicable

18. How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?
   - Very likely
   - Somewhat likely
   - Don't know
   - Somewhat unlikely
   - Very unlikely

Using the rating scale below, how much have you gained from this class in the following

19. Your general knowledge about the subject
   - A lot
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - Hardly anything
   - Not applicable

20. Your ability to analyze and solve problems
   - A lot
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - Hardly anything
   - Not applicable

21. Your ability to find and use information on your own
   - A lot
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - Hardly anything
   - Not applicable

22. Your ability to express your ideas verbally
   - A lot
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - Hardly anything
   - Not applicable

23. Your ability to develop and express your ideas through artistic/creative means
   - A lot
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - Hardly anything
   - Not applicable

Thank You
The next section of the questionnaire presents open-ended items that invite your comments. Please take a moment to provide this invaluable feedback to your instructors and fellow students.

The responses to Question 24 will be posted anonymously in the WebCentral Portal. Please share information you would like your fellow students to know about your experience.

24. What would you like to tell other students about this course?

Your comments in response to Questions 25 through 28 will only be made available, anonymously of course, to your instructor and his/her Chairperson. So please consider these questions as an opportunity for you to provide confidential and constructive feedback regarding your instructor’s teaching and the course.

25. Apart from the instructor, what are the strengths of the course?

26. How can the course be improved?

27. Apart from the course, what are the strengths of the instructor?

28. How can the instructor’s teaching be improved?
Student E-Mail #1  
Sent at the Start – Full-Description (Andrey)  
Tuesday, May 3, 2011

The sender should be Office of the Associate Provost, reply address jeaton@brooklyn.cuny.edu.

Subject: BC Feedback (Student Evaluation of the Faculty)

BC FEEDBACK FOR SPRING 2011 IS ONLINE

You’ve taken the class, you’ve done the work...  
Now tell us what you think!

We want to hear your opinion... In your own words!!

*   *   *   *   *   *   *   *

This semester the BC Feedback period will run from May 3rd through June 1st. Since it’s completely online, you can sit at home with a cup of coffee, jump on a computer at the Library Café, or take a quick break at work to let us know what you think!

By evaluating the professors who taught you this semester, you’ll provide a great service to your fellow students and the College at large.

Plus, only participants completing all of their evaluations receive these great benefits...

+++ Lottery Prizes – A chance to win cash prizes of $250, $100 and $50.

+++ Early notification of course grades via eGrade – in some instances up to 15 days before grades are officially posted!

+++ Early access to your fellow students’ ratings and comments about their professors and courses in time for Fall 2011 semester program changes!

+++ The opportunity to play an important role in enhancing academic excellence at Brooklyn College.

Student evaluations are a key component of the college’s review of faculty performance. Your feedback will help faculty and departments provide the best possible instruction. All responses are completely anonymous and your identity will not be associated with your evaluations.

It’s easy and only takes a few minutes! Just log on to the WebCentral Portal (http://portal.brooklyn.cuny.edu). Look for the BC Feedback tab for the evaluation links and status page.
Subject: Student Evaluations of the Faculty (BC Feedback)

On behalf of Associate Provost Mirotznik --

As you may know the response rate for the Student Evaluation of the Faculty (BC Feedback) last semester was 77% -- our best result yet, in-class or online! We’re hoping for a repeat performance this semester!

This semester the BC Feedback period will run from May 3 through June 1. While we will be sending reminder e-mail messages to students, your involvement in this process is invaluable for ensuring a robust response rate. Please take a moment to encourage your students to complete the online questionnaire via WebCentral (http://portal.brooklyn.cuny.edu).

To enhance the student response rate, we’re using the following strategies and incentives for students that submit all of their evaluations:

+++ Lottery Prizes – A chance to win cash prizes of $250, $100 and $50.
+++ Early notification of course grades via eGrade — in some instances up to 15 days before grades are posted!
+++ Early access to fellow students’ ratings and comments about their professors and courses in time for Fall 2011 semester program changes!
+++ The opportunity to play an important role in enhancing academic excellence at Brooklyn College.

Please note that you can monitor the percentage of students in each of your classes who submit an online evaluation by clicking on “BC Feedback – My Section Status” on the Home tab of the WebCentral portal.

Thank you so much for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Jerry Mirotznik
Associate Provost
Important notes and submission deadlines:

» The deadline to submit Webgrade rosters for WINTER INTERSESSION 2008 semester was 02-04-2008.
Welcome to the Brooklyn College Student Evaluation of the Faculty Reports Page

Brooklyn College distributes Student Evaluation of the Faculty questionnaires to most class sections at least once each year, primarily at the close of the fall semester. Evaluation results will typically be posted online by the middle of the following term.

This inquiry tool allows you to view the evaluation results from Fall 2005 semester to the present in various formats.

**Tip:** Use “Instructor Summary for Each Term” to view a term-by-term summary of a specific instructor’s evaluation, starting with the most recent term. Use “Course Summary for Each Instructor” to see a summary of all responses for a specific course, across all instructors teaching that course that term.

Select Option

- Instructor Summary for Each Term
- Department Summary for Each Term

Spring 2010  Earlier Reports

- Instructor for Each Section
- Course Summary for Each Instructor
- Course Summary for All Sections Combined
- Section Report
- Department Summary for Each Instructor
- Department Summary for Each Course
- Department Report for Each Section
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October 5, 2011

To:    All Department Chairs
From:   Jerry Mirotznik, Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
Subject : New Student Evaluation of the Faculty Reports

Enclosed you will find a CD containing the new reports we have developed to make interpreting the Student Evaluations of the Faculty easier and, hopefully, to make the evaluation results more useful. In the future, these reports will be made available online via the WebCentral portal.

There are three new reports:

1. An updated version of the traditional report of the faculty member’s semester average. What is new is the addition of the department average included on the same report. There is no longer a need to flip between the two separate reports to see the comparison.

2. A graphical representation of the evaluation results for all of the faculty teaching in your department for a single semester. These five measures are an aggregation (and simplification) of responses to the 23 fixed-response questions. The question groupings are included on the next page. The bar graphs show the percentage point difference from the department average. For example, if Prof. X has an aggregate score of 75 percent and the department has an average score of 68 percent, the bar graph for Prof. X will read +7 points.

3. A graphical representation of the evaluation results for each faculty member teaching in your department over the last ten semesters. If a faculty member was not evaluated in a particular term, that semester will be blank on the report. These reports use the same methodology as the single semester reports.

Important Notes:
Spring 2011 is the most recent term. However, we have also provided the reports for the two previous semesters. If a faculty member was not evaluated during Spring 2011, reports will not have been generated for that individual. Simply go to a previous semester when he or she was evaluated to find the reports.

Also, you will see that the graphs may be slightly different from those distributed in May. The “Not Applicable” responses have been excluded from the calculations.

Enclosed you will find details about how the questions were combined for the bar graphs, samples of the three different reports, and a guide to help you navigate the enclosed CD.
# Individual vs. Department Scores for Each Questionnaire Item

**Department:** Aerospace  
**Semester:** Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you receive a syllabus during the first week?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor's ability to organize ideas and materials for class</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
<td>53.36%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in the subject</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>47.99%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>29.77%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor's ability to encourage independent thinking</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>52.24%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>30.01%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor's ability to generate effective class discussion</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>49.19%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>14.21%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor's ability to communicate clearly</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>29.22%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor's openness to comments, questions and viewpoints</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>61.75%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>25.45%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructor's knowledge of the subject matter of the class</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>66.62%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor's ability to keep to the time and schedule requirements</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>9.41%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor's availability to students outside of class</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>50.13%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>30.06%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>11.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The clarity of info provided about the course requirements and assignments</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>56.75%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>28.22%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>10.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The promptness with which tests and assignments are graded and returned</td>
<td>Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>54.18%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>30.73%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>11.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The number of assignments/projects/creative works in this class</td>
<td>Too many/Just right/Too few/Not applicable</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>86.47%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How challenging the class assignments/projects/creative works were</td>
<td>Very Challenging/Challenging/Somewhat challenging/Not challenging/Not applicable</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>15.59%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29.65%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The usefulness of assignments/projects/creative works in this class</td>
<td>Very useful/Useful/Somewhat useful/Not useful/Not applicable</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>33.15%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>42.78%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The difficulty of examinations in this class</td>
<td>Very fair/Fair/Somewhat unfair/Unfair/Not applicable</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>33.69%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>42.21%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>11.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The fairness of examinations in this class</td>
<td>Very likely/Somewhat likely/Don't know/Somewhat unlikely/Very unlikely/Not applicable</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>41.02%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>44.97%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?</td>
<td>A lot/A fair amount/Some/A little/Hardly anything/Not applicable</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>56.04%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>26.06%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor ratings combine the student evaluations for all sections taught by a particular instructor.  
The department ratings combine all the student evaluations submitted for the department across instructor, course and section.
## Categorical Groupings

| 1. Did you receive a written syllabus during the first week of class? | Not Included |

### Instructor’s Performance

- 2. Ability to organize ideas and materials for class
- 3. Ability to stimulate interest in the subject
- 4. Ability to encourage independent thinking
- 5. Ability to generate effective class discussion
- 6. Ability to communicate clearly
- 7. Openness to students’ comments, questions and viewpoints concerning class topics
- 8. Knowledge of the subject matter of the class
- 9. Ability to keep to the time and schedule requirements for the class
- 10. Availability to students outside of class
- 11. The clarity of information provided about the course requirements and assignments
- 12. The promptness with which tests and assignments are graded and returned

| Excellent or Good |

### Course Difficulty

- 13. The number of assignments/projects/creative works in this class
- 14. How challenging the class assignments/projects/creative works were
- 16. The difficulty of examinations in this class

| Too Many |
| Very Challenging or Challenging |
| Very Difficult or Difficult |

### Usefulness and Fairness of the Course

- 15. The usefulness of assignments/projects/creative works in this class
- 17. The fairness of examinations in this class

| Very Useful or Useful |
| Very Fair or Fair |

### How much have you gained…

- 19. General knowledge about the subject
- 20. Ability to analyze and solve problems
- 21. Ability to find and use information on your own
- 22. Ability to express your ideas verbally
- 23. Ability to develop and express your ideas through artistic/creative means

| A Lot or A Fair Amount |

### Recommend Instructor

- 18. How likely are you to recommend this instructor to a friend?

| Very Likely or Somewhat Likely |
Student Evaluations of the Faculty

Individual vs. Department Scores*

Multiple Semesters

Kiefer, Sarah

Aerospace

Each bar represents the number of percentage points above (+) or below (-) the department average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course Difficulty</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-10.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-7.22</td>
<td>-6.31</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Usefulness/Fairness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning Attained</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>-11.15</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recommend Instructor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>-5.97</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>-11.48</td>
<td>-5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each bar represents the number of percentage points above (+) or below (-) the department average.
Student Evaluations of the Faculty

Individual vs. Department Scores*

Department: Aerospace  Semester: Fall 2010

Kiefer, Sarah

- Instructor Performance: 5
- Course Difficulty: 20
- Course Usefulness/Fairness: 0
- Learning Attained: 10
- Recommend Instructor: 5

Mitchell, Robert

- Instructor Performance: 20
- Course Difficulty: 0
- Course Usefulness/Fairness: 10
- Learning Attained: 20
- Recommend Instructor: 10

Torres, Aaron

- Instructor Performance: 25
- Course Difficulty: 15
- Course Usefulness/Fairness: 20
- Learning Attained: 25
- Recommend Instructor: 25

Olszewski, Gabrjel

- Instructor Performance: 10
- Course Difficulty: 5
- Course Usefulness/Fairness: 15
- Learning Attained: 20
- Recommend Instructor: 20

* Each bar represents the number of percentage points above (+) or below (-) the department average.