CUNY’s Board of Trustees requires that every college obtain student evaluations on all of the courses it offers but gives no guidance on how practices or processes; each college is on its own. Baruch’s governance charter assigns oversight of the student evaluation of courses and teaching to a Joint Committee consisting of faculty, administrators and students. The Joint Committee has met regularly over the past two years, looking first at the current instrument, which has been in place for over thirty years, and seeking input from a wide range of groups and individuals in the Baruch community.

The Joint Committee determined that the current instrument should be updated to take advantage of advances in the social sciences and psychometrics, as well as to better meet the needs of the entire Baruch community. The student body has been deeply interested in the process and an updated evaluation also figures prominently in Baruch’s assessment efforts with external organizations. The Joint Committee reached out to many different groups and also looked to best practices and processes throughout CUNY and in the nation in the development of a new assessment measure. A new instrument was designed and then revised after an extensive cognitive validation. The revisions were presented to the Faculty Senate and the broader Baruch community, more suggestions and corrections were obtained, and a final set of changes was incorporated.

Delays in layout and typesetting prevent the Joint Committee from providing the proposed forms at this point in time. As soon as the vendor has prepared an instrument it will be posted on the Student Evaluation Blackboard site and widely disseminated. Highlights of the proposed changes include:

- Greatly reduced student demographic data, most of which can be obtained through more efficiently through other means.
- No summary question. Experts in the field caution against relying upon one question to assess faculty or course effectiveness
- A comments section on a separate sheet with separate tracking and processes. Students spoke passionately about the importance of a comment section, which is now common practice throughout CUNY and in higher education. The proposed comments section would be handled separately and in a secure manner, delivered to faculty members after grades are posted in process overseen by the Faculty Senate.

The Joint Committee proposes that the new student evaluation of faculty and courses be adopted for the fall 2005 semester and that the Committee report back to the Faculty Senate, student groups, General Faculty and all other interested groups about the effectiveness of the instrument after two semesters of data are collected. Adjustments and improvements may be needed. The Committee is aware the proposed instrument does not answer all needs or suggestions; two years of discussions with many different groups has made it clear that no student evaluation instrument can meet all needs or wants. Nonetheless, the Joint Committee urges the faculty to approve the new instrument and to work with us to make it more effective.
Draft Instrument – Questions

1. Course Content
   A. The course was well organized.
   B. The instructor communicated course objectives and learning goals.
   C. Assignments contributed to meeting the course objectives and learning goals.
   D. Course requirements were clearly stated and followed.
   E. Required materials and books were helpful.

2. Course Delivery
   A. The instructor came to class well prepared.
   B. The instructor communicated course content clearly.
   C. The instructor taught in a way that helped me learn the subject matter.
   D. The instructor provided helpful feedback.
   E. The instructor returned assignments and exams in a timely manner.
   F. The instructor was available outside of class (office hours, email, etc.)

3. Learning Environment
   A. The instructor established a class environment that fostered learning.
   B. The instructor treated students and their contributions with respect.
   C. The instructor generated enthusiasm for learning the subject matter.
   D. The instructor clearly explained the grading system.

4. Course’s Impact on You
   A. The course improved my oral communication skills. [“not applicable” a choice]
   B. The course improved my written communication skills. [“not applicable” a choice]
   C. The course challenged me intellectually.
Comments

Instructor’s Name:

Course Name, Number and Section:

Only the Instructor has access to the comments written in this part of the evaluation. These comments will be given to the instructor after the final grades are submitted.

Your comments and suggestions are helpful in improving this course.

THANK YOU