Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Course Evaluations

October 2021

The Ad Hoc Committee on Course Evaluations was formed in Fall 2019. It is composed of representatives from the various NYU schools, in addition to one representative each from the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) and the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC). While the members are predominantly faculty, the committee also includes administrators with experience and expertise in course evaluations. Students and representatives from the Office of Global Inclusion were also invited and participated from time to time. Regular meetings began in November 2019 and continued until June 2021, with a hiatus in mid-2020 during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The creation of our committee was prompted by a C-FSC report, “Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council Recommendations on Student Evaluations,” which was submitted to Provost Fleming in November 2018. With a goal of “ensuring that [course evaluations] are used primarily in the interests of identifying and cultivating good teaching,” the C-FSC’s report raised concerns about the potential for bias within the current NYU-wide course evaluation system. Among the recommendations included within the report was that the University revise or remove the two “global measures” in the set of seven questions common to all schools’ course evaluation forms: “Overall evaluation of the instructor(s)” and “Overall evaluation of the course.” Citing a number of recent studies, the Council argued that course evaluations, in particular these kinds of global measures, “exhibit a range of student biases with respect to gender, ethnicity, and age [of evaluated faculty members]” (p. 3).

In response to the C-FSC’s requests for collaboration, the Provost’s Office consulted with the various school Deans, with C-FSC and T-FSC’s Executive Committees, with the Senate Academic Affairs Committee (SAAC), as well as with the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC), which has historically played an important role in setting course evaluation policies. (See below, p. 2-3.) The idea for our committee emerged from these consultations. Our initial charge was to explore and recommend strategies for (a) reducing bias in student course evaluations, (b) ensuring that the evaluation is helpful to faculty and students, and (c) increasing response rates. From our first meeting, however, it was clear that the multifaceted nature of
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1 This report was prepared by the C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee and subsequently endorsed by the full council.

2 Links to relevant UAAC advisories are provided throughout this report.
course evaluations necessitated a broader approach. Like the C-FSC committee that drafted the 2018 report, we found it necessary to discuss a range of related issues that have proven important to faculty, such as the reporting and use of course evaluation data. We have also gone a step further, in proposing an entirely new set of course evaluation questions.

But for now, since our recommendations relate to the current system of course evaluations at NYU, it is worth revisiting how this system came into being and on the various ways in which the evaluations are used.

**Background**

In May 2012, the Faculty Senators Council (FSC) issued a unanimous resolution urging that evaluation data for all NYU courses be published in a single online location. This was in response to a request from the Student Senators Council to address the varying levels of access to evaluation results across the schools. At the time, however, there was a wide range of practices in place, with schools using different questions and even different numerical scales, not to mention different mechanisms for administering evaluations. Enacting the FSC’s recommendation was therefore no simple matter: for the published data to be coherent and comparable, evaluation practices needed to be aligned across the schools.

To address these concerns, the UAAC took on the topic of student course evaluations for the third time in its history, submitting an advisory to the Provost in Fall 2014. Beyond echoing the FSC’s call to publish results in a single location, the UAAC recommended that the University adopt a common set of evaluation questions for all undergraduate courses, to which schools could add supplemental questions as needed. It also endorsed administering all evaluations online, using the same platform.

Subsequently, in Summer 2015, a small ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators with expertise in survey design was charged with developing the new core evaluation component. Rather than proposing an entirely new set of questions, the group focused its efforts on identifying a few common elements across the existing school evaluation forms. Although a recent survey revision in CAS had eliminated “overall” course and instructor items from that school’s evaluation, most schools’ forms still included them. And since the results of such questions were perceived as being especially important to students in planning for registration, the decision was made to keep them in the common evaluation core.
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3 While a few schools (e.g., CAS) made their evaluation data publicly available at that time, others required sign-on to access their databases (e.g., Stern), and some did not publish their results at all.
These seven core questions were eventually adopted by all undergraduate schools (as well as by a few graduate schools) as they joined the new NYU course evaluation, which uses Albert SIS to collect, store, and publish the survey data, and the University Data Warehouse (UDW+) to analyze these data. The school-by-school rollout began in Fall 2015 and was completed as recently as Summer 2018, only a few months before the C-FSC submitted its report and recommendations on course evaluations to Provost Fleming.

Thus, NYU’s current course evaluation system resulted from, and was informed by, the mandate to give students access to complete (i.e., University-wide), consistent, and relevant course evaluation data for use in registration planning. A perceived risk of not doing so was to drive traffic to websites such as RateMyProfessor, which not only published users’ anonymous and often inappropriate comments, but also included instructors’ physical appearance as an evaluation category.

**Current situation**

Evaluations are, of course, used for a variety of other purposes beyond students’ registration planning. First and foremost, they provide individual faculty with a means of gauging the effectiveness of their teaching (or, at the very least, students’ response to it), and of identifying any changes or adjustments that need to be made to their syllabi or instructional practices. They also provide students with a means of giving faculty anonymous feedback, and taken in aggregate, they offer a perspective on the student learning experience. In addition, they are needed by certain schools and programs to comply with accreditation requirements. Finally, they are used by school deans, department chairs, and program directors in making a range of decisions that directly affect faculty, from teaching assignments to teaching awards, hiring, contract renewal, annual merit increases (AMIs), tenure, and promotion.

Although the University has made important strides in standardizing the course evaluation process across the schools, many issues remain. Of particular relevance to concerns about bias is the overreliance on course evaluation data in decisions regarding faculty employment and compensation. These data cannot give a complete picture of a faculty member’s teaching, and should therefore never be used exclusively or in isolation. The potential for bias in
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4 The Provost’s Office has mandated that all undergraduate schools and programs use the Albert-based course evaluation process and common questions. Graduate schools and programs are invited but not required to do so.

5 RateMyProfessor’s “hotness” scale, which notoriously used chili pepper icons, was only discontinued in 2018.

6 The UAAC has made this case on two separate occasions, but it bears repeating here. In its “Report on a University-wide Course Evaluation” (December 2004), the UAAC noted that “[s]tudent course ratings, except at the extreme ends, are of limited use in deciding on faculty merit increases, especially given the small pool of money
student responses makes them even less dependable, and more problematic, as a standalone metric for decision-making.

The seven core questions also leave much to be desired at present. Not only can the “overall” course and instructor questions lend themselves to biased responses (as the C-FSC has observed), but they are too unspecific and thus do not generate the kind of actionable feedback that faculty can use to improve their teaching. The other five core questions are similarly unspecific. (Case in point: “The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.”) While a more limited or “surgical” revision, such as removing the “overall” questions, might address concerns about bias, it would likely not make the core section more useful to faculty hoping to improve their teaching in response to student feedback. For this to happen, a more significant overhaul is needed.

In addition, response rates to the course evaluation are critically low in many NYU schools. There are several possible reasons for this: the move to online course evaluations and the lack (in some instances) of class time devoted to completing them; dissatisfaction with the evaluation instrument; fear of reprisals (resulting from a lack of awareness that course evaluations are anonymous); over-surveying or overcommunication; unfamiliarity with the many important uses of course evaluation data; or even a lack of faith in individual faculty, departments, and schools to implement suggested changes. Whatever the cause(s) may be, one effect of these low response rates is that students with extreme—and even biased—views may be overrepresented in the data.

Finally, members of this committee have expressed concern that many faculty do not routinely review their course evaluations. This may reflect a degree of skepticism about the entire process, from an unhelpful survey instrument to possibly skewed and biased responses. But if the primary goal of course evaluations is to improve teaching and learning, then all faculty must be incentivized to review (and, where necessary, respond to) their evaluations, and they must also be supported in this endeavor.

available for this purpose. They can, however, be one (though only one) component in such decisions, as well as in tenure and promotion decisions and, especially, in the renewal decisions for contract faculty.” (p. 2) Similarly, in Fall 2014, as part of its recommendation that the University adopt a single set of common questions and a single platform for administering evaluations, the UAAC observed that “Evaluations should be one tool among others in assessing promotion, tenure, merit, and contract extensions. They should not be stand-alone tools. Their weight should be properly designated in overall methods of evaluation, and those schools in which teaching and classroom performance are a primary tool for evaluation must be clear about how evaluations are being assessed and used.” (“Advisory #3 on Course Evaluations,” p. 2).
Overview of recommendations

What this last observation reveals is the extent to which the various aspects of course evaluation are interrelated. In consequence, they cannot be addressed in isolation. As noted above, this became very clear from the committee’s first meeting and accounts, at least in part, for our lengthy deliberations. While we have ventured beyond our original charge, we have by no means lost sight of it. Indeed, a number of our recommendations address questions of bias either directly (such as the inclusion of a link to information about bias in the course evaluation instructions) or indirectly (such as adding evaluation questions about inclusive teaching practices).

These recommendations are organized into six sections. In the first section, “Course Evaluation Questionnaire,” we propose the testing, piloting, and eventual adoption of a new set of common course evaluation questions (this is included in Appendix #1). The second section, “Student Response Rates,” includes suggested approaches for increasing student participation in the course evaluation. In Section III, “Faculty Review of Course Evaluation Responses,” we identify changes to reporting that could make it easier for faculty to use survey data, in addition to strategies for connecting faculty to teaching support resources. Section IV, “Using and Reporting Course Evaluation Data” addresses both the use of these data in faculty reviews and related reporting needs. In Section V, “Celebrating and Publicizing Excellent Teaching,” the focus shifts from supporting faculty who might need pedagogical support to honoring outstanding teachers, with the understanding that showcasing examples of excellence is part and parcel of an enhanced emphasis on teaching and learning. Finally, in Section VI, “Ongoing Oversight and Research,” we propose a mechanism for continuing to give faculty a voice in all future University-level decisions regarding course evaluations. We also suggest a few possible research areas involving student course evaluations, including but not limited to questions of bias. By offering these final recommendations, we acknowledge that a successful course evaluation system requires constant work and attention, which will necessarily extend beyond the lifespan of this ad hoc committee.
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Committee recommendations

(I) COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The recommendations below stem from the Committee’s belief that a new and better set of common course evaluation questions would not only yield less biased responses but would also generate more actionable feedback that faculty can use to improve their teaching.

1. Replace the existing common evaluation questions. To that end, the Committee has developed a new set of questions (see Appendix #1). The structure of this draft questionnaire was developed following review of recently revised course evaluation forms at a number of other universities, in particular the University of Southern California and the University of Oregon. For example, we have adapted the following question categories from the USC form:
   (a) Course design
   (b) Instructional practices
   (c) Inclusion practices
   (d) Assessment practices
   (e) Course impact
   (f) Student engagement
   (g) Open-ended questions

One deliberate omission from the new form are “overall” evaluation questions for the instructor or for the course. As noted above, such questions not only tend to elicit more biased responses, but they also serve no purpose in helping faculty improve their teaching. In lieu of these “overall” questions, the committee recommends providing the mean and median for responses to all course-related questions and all instructor-related questions on the public course evaluation results page, in addition to the mean and median for each of these questions. (See item #18 below).

2. Test and pilot the new questions during the 2021-22 academic year. This process should involve cognitive response testing, in conjunction with the Learning Analytics Research Network (LEARN), based at Steinhardt. Depending on the findings of the testing process and additional feedback from LEARN, it may be necessary to make a few modifications to the draft questionnaire.
(3) Add a link to information about implicit bias within the survey instructions. The Office of Global Inclusion, Diversity, and Strategic Innovation has been approached about developing such an online resource.

(4) Encourage schools and departments to consider including one or more questions about the use of instructional technology among their own supplemental (or even course-specific) evaluation questions. This will become especially important if online and blended courses continue to be offered in many areas of the curriculum even after the COVID-19 pandemic subsides. The Faculty Committee on Technology-Enhanced Education can provide guidance on developing such questions.

(5) Since concerns about bias and actionable feedback are not limited to undergraduates, either direct or strongly encourage all graduate and professional schools to adopt the new common questions and platform.

(6) Encourage faculty to administer their own early- to mid-semester feedback survey to their students and to make any necessary “course corrections” in response to student input and self-reflection. To facilitate this process, simple survey templates could be pre-loaded into the learning management system for use by instructors. An example of such a survey is the following three-part questionnaire: (1) “What in this course is supporting your learning?”; (2) “What changes would you suggest that would support your learning?”; and (3) “What can you do differently to improve your performance in the class?” Faculty should have the ability to adapt these surveys as needed.

(II) STUDENT RESPONSE RATES

In many schools, response rates to the course evaluation are critically low, and in some cases they are even decreasing. This is problematic for several reasons, not the least of which is that students with extreme—and often biased—views may be overrepresented in the data. The result is a lack of trust, not only in the data, but also in the entire process. The recommendations
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8 It should be noted that there will likely be overlap between the new common questions and the supplemental questions that schools have been using for the past several years. Once the new questions are adopted, schools may need to review their own supplemental evaluation questions, if not for redundancy, then with an eye to the overall length of the survey.

9 The Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee has recommended mid-semester surveys on two occasions: once in May 2006 (“Report on Student Course Ratings”) and again in Fall 2016 (“Advisory on Midterm Feedback”).
below aim to increase response rates to ensure that NYU can have a viable student course evaluation process.

(7) In addition to email reminders, send students texts to encourage them to complete pending course evaluations.  

(8) Address students’ concerns about confidentiality by clarifying that when they complete course evaluations, their identity is never shared with their professor, and that faculty are unable to see the anonymized results for a given course until after they have posted final grades. Such a message could be conveyed on the Course Evaluations website, in a pop-up message on the online evaluation form, on announcements and reminders from the Registrar’s Office and schools, and/or in University-level communications about course evaluations. Additional strategies might include enlisting the Student Government Association to help reassure students and creating a video that would both clarify the process and emphasize the value of course evaluations in improving teaching and learning.

(9) Regularly convene focus groups of students (both undergraduate and graduate), faculty, and administrators to explore what other factors might be contributing to low response rates and to identify appropriate strategies for promoting or incentivizing participation.

(10) Promote among faculty the following practices, which may increase student response rates:

(a) soliciting and responding to student feedback either at or, preferably, before the midpoint of the semester (see item 6 above);

(b) letting students know their input is important in the “collaborative venture of teaching and learning” and sharing with them examples of specific changes that they have made to their courses in response to student feedback; and

(c) reserving synchronous class time for students to complete course evaluations on their laptops or smartphones; reminding students at that time that course evaluations are confidential (see #8 above); and ensuring that students feel secure

This approach has been successfully used by the Office of Student Success in its Student Voice Series surveys.

In Fall 2020, members of the Student Government Association relayed to Vice Provost Gigi Dopico concerns they had heard from fellow students that faculty might retaliate against their course evaluation responses by lowering their final grades. It was suggested that this might account for low participation rates.

in their anonymity (e.g., by stepping out of the room while students complete the evaluations or by sitting out of view of their laptops).

(11) Set the following growth targets for each school over a three-year period:
(a) Year 1: 10 percent above the current average of the past three years (2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021)
(b) Year 2: 15 percent above the current average of the past three years (2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021)
(c) Year 3: 20 percent above the current average of the past three years (2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021)

During this time, the Provost’s Office and schools should prioritize:
(a) student outreach and promotion of course evaluations,
(b) reasonable incentives to students for completing evaluations, and
(c) instructional practices like those described above.

By the end of Year 3, no school should have a response rate of less than 66 percent. If a school’s current three-year average is significantly below 66 percent, the growth targets for Years 1-3 may need to be adjusted to ensure that the school can meet the required response rate by the end of Year 3.

Finally, to ensure that the increase in response rates is spread evenly, schools should also monitor—and take concrete steps to minimize—the number of individual course sections with rates that fall below the school’s target for a given year.

(12) If, at the end of Year 3, there is still a University-wide response rate of below 66 percent, implement enhancements to Albert to delay the release of students’ grades until they complete the course evaluation.\textsuperscript{13} It will be necessary to determine what restrictions may apply, such as a time limit for delaying grade release.

(III) FACULTY REVIEW OF COURSE EVALUATION RESPONSES

Committee members have expressed concern that many NYU faculty do not routinely review their course evaluation responses. There may be several reasons for this, such as a sense that the questionnaire does not generate useful feedback (see Section I above) or that the response rates are so low that the data are skewed and do not reflect students’ actual experience

\textsuperscript{13} This is currently the practice at Stern Graduate.
of the course (see Section II above). But if the primary goal of the course evaluation is to improve teaching and learning, then faculty must be incentivized to review their responses, and must also be supported in this endeavor.

(13) Enhance course evaluation data reporting for faculty by providing the following:
(a) standard deviations and distribution of responses (for quantitative questions);
(b) comparative quantitative data across departments and across schools;
(c) text analysis capabilities (for qualitative questions);
(d) completion rates for qualitative questions, if these questions remain optional;
(e) total responses vs. total enrollment, to clarify response rates; and
(f) response rates by ethnicity and gender (taking appropriate measures to ensure that students are not identifiable).

If these enhancements are not achievable within the Albert Faculty Center, then the University should consider licensing relevant software, such as Blue by Explorance.

(14) Provide support to faculty in reviewing their course evaluation results and in using them to improve their teaching. Possible sources of support include the Center for Faculty Advancement, school-based teaching centers, and school- or department-based faculty mentoring structures. Special attention should be paid to part-time faculty for whom these evaluations may play a larger role in reappointment decisions than for full-time faculty, but who also may have less access to resources like those listed above.

(15) Require faculty to submit, on a regular basis, a reflective statement on their course evaluation responses and response rates. Schools should work with their faculty council (or the equivalent) to develop an appropriate process. Possible opportunities include submission of the teaching preference form for each semester or year, the AMI process, or the reappointment or promotion process. The format of this statement can vary by school. Faculty should be made aware of the target student response rate for their school when they complete the reflection.

(IV) USING AND REPORTING COURSE EVALUATION DATA

The use of quantitative course evaluation data in making decisions about faculty hiring, contract renewal, and tenure and promotion makes it important to ensure that our course evaluation tool yields accurate responses (see section I above). Nevertheless, these quantitative course evaluation data—even from a significantly improved tool—cannot give a complete or accurate sense of a faculty member’s teaching, and should therefore not be used exclusively or in
isolation. The UAAC has made this case on two separate occasions, but it bears repeating here.\(^\text{14}\) The recommendations below address not only how course evaluation results are used but also how they are made available to administrators and students.

(16) Ensure that the quantitative component of student course evaluations is not the sole source of evidence used in assessing teaching for the purposes of hiring, contract renewal, AMI, tenure, or promotion. Rather, they should be one among many types of evidence considered. Other sources could include:
(a) qualitative data from the evaluation,
(b) peer observations,
(c) faculty responses to previous student course evaluations,
(d) teaching philosophy or effectiveness statements,
(e) teaching practices inventories,\(^\text{15}\)
(f) engagement with learning analytics services offered by NYU IT’s Teaching and Learning with Technology team (Active & Reflective Teaching Tools), and
(g) participation in professional development opportunities.

(17) Develop clear and standard protocols within each school for connecting faculty experiencing difficulty teaching with appropriate and effective pedagogical support. The primary goal of these protocols should be to improve teaching and learning within the school, not to create a probationary system for faculty. Schools can determine what types of evidence they will use to identify faculty in need of support, perhaps drawing on the examples cited above, but not relying exclusively on quantitative evaluation data. Whatever practices schools adopt, however, must be followed for all faculty; neither individual nor categories of faculty should be exempted. The sources of support can be school- or University-based (e.g., the Center for Faculty Advancement), or a combination of the two.

In addition to these protocols, it may also be helpful simply to add links to teaching support resources to the Albert Faculty Center, since this is where faculty view their

\(^{14}\)In its “Report on a University-wide Course Evaluation” (December 2004), the UAAC noted that “[s]tudent course ratings, except at the extreme ends, are of limited use in deciding on faculty merit increases, especially given the small pool of money available for this purpose. They can, however, be one (though only one) component in such decisions, as well as in tenure and promotion decisions and, especially, in the renewal decisions for contract faculty.” (p. 2) Similarly, in Fall 2014, as part of its recommendation that the University adopt a single set of common questions and a single platform for administering evaluations, the UAAC observed that “Evaluations should be one tool among others in assessing promotion, tenure, merit, and contract extensions. They should not be stand-alone tools. Their weight should be properly designated in overall methods of evaluation, and those schools in which teaching and classroom performance are a primary tool for evaluation must be clear about how evaluations are being assessed and used.” (“Advisory #3 on Course Evaluations,” p. 2).

course evaluation responses. Even more helpful would be for links to specific workshops and resources to appear whenever faculty receive “low” average scores on particular questions. This would, however, likely require both significant technical development, not to mention regularly scheduled workshops, etc., that are specifically designed to address particular aspects of teaching evaluated in the survey.

(18) On the public results page, provide the mean and median for responses to (a) all course-related questions and (b) all instructor-related questions—in addition to the mean and median for each of these questions. (The current averages for the “overall” course and instructor question responses can be easily misinterpreted as averages for all responses to questions in those categories.)

(19) On whichever platform administrators (and possibly also faculty) view course evaluation results, allow for the disaggregation of responses by students’ home school and program of study. Such disaggregated data are required by some accrediting agencies, in particular ABET.

(V) CELEBRATING AND PUBLICIZING EXCELLENT TEACHING

(20) Encourage school Deans to send a congratulatory note to all faculty who receive stellar evaluations, or who other pieces of evidence suggest are especially effective teachers.

(21) Recommend that all schools create awards for excellence in teaching, if they do not already have them. Showcase excellent teaching through the Center for Faculty Advancement and the Teach Talks programs.

(22) Create a mechanism for recognizing outstanding teaching among faculty from across the schools who are not yet eligible for the University Distinguished Teaching Award.17

(VI) ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND RESEARCH

(23) Establish a faculty steering committee on course evaluations, or charge an existing body or committee (such as the Center for Faculty Advancement or the Senate Academic

16 In Albert SIS, these correspond to “program” and “plan.”

17 Only full-time faculty members with at least ten years of service at NYU are eligible for the University Distinguished Teaching Award.
Affairs Committee) with providing periodic guidance on this topic to the Provost’s Office. The following responsibilities, among others, would be assigned to this committee:

(a) overseeing ongoing research into the possible presence of bias in student course evaluation responses, in collaboration with OGI, the Office of Institutional Research and Data Integrity (OIRDI), and/or LEARN. Research should take into account both quantitative and qualitative data and could include the following areas:
   (i) the impact of bias statements,
   (ii) results for in-person vs. online courses,
   (iii) possible correlations between higher grades and higher course evaluation responses,
   (iv) course and instructor ratings based on respondents’ or instructors’ ethnicity and gender,
(b) formulating and proposing additional research projects involving course evaluation data to improve teaching and learning;
(c) identifying and promoting best practices in increasing student response rates and in using course evaluations to improve teaching and learning; and
(d) being a visible group to which colleagues can turn for course evaluation concerns, etc.
Appendix #1: PROPOSED NEW COMMON COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The draft course evaluation questions below may need to be modified in response to the findings of the testing process and feedback from LEARN.

(1) On average, I spent the following amount of time per week outside of class on course-related work (e.g., completing readings and other assignments, reviewing notes, rehearsing, or attending my instructor’s office hours). [SLIDING SCALE: 0-20 HOURS PER WEEK]

(2) I put in the necessary effort to learn from this course. [LIKERT]

(3) The course was structured in a way that helped me understand the concepts covered. [LIKERT]

(4) The required readings and/or assignments served the goals of this course. [LIKERT]

(5) I learned perspectives, principles, or practices from this course that I expect to apply in future settings. [LIKERT]

(6) The instructor communicated clearly what was expected of students in this class. [LIKERT]

(7) The instructor effectively explained challenging concepts and methods. [LIKERT]

(8) The instructor fostered a sense of belonging in the class. [LIKERT]

(9) I received helpful feedback on my work. [LIKERT]

(10) Which elements below contributed the most to your learning in this course? (Select 1-3 options.)

   (a) Level of challenge
   (b) Course materials
   (c) Inclusion of diverse voices and perspectives in the syllabus
   (d) Use of a variety of teaching methods
   (e) Instructor’s receptiveness to diverse student viewpoints
   (f) Instructor’s sensitivity to students of all backgrounds and life experiences
   (g) Instructor’s availability to students
   (h) Clarity of instructions for assignments
   (i) Helpfulness of feedback on my work
   (j) Timeliness of feedback on my work

18 The Likert scale used here could be a standard 5/4/3/2/1 scale (where 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree). Alternatively, a 2/1/0/-1/-2 scale (where 2 = strongly agree, 1 = agree, etc.) could be used, and might even be preferable.
(k) Student group work or peer-to-peer learning
(l) Hands-on experiences (e.g., labs, field trips, field work, community-engaged learning)
(m) Other ____________

(11) Which elements below could use some improvement? (Select 1-3 options.)

(a) Level of challenge
(b) Course materials
(c) Inclusion of diverse voices and perspectives in the syllabus
(d) Use of a variety of teaching methods
(e) Instructor’s receptiveness to diverse student viewpoints
(f) Instructor’s sensitivity to students of all backgrounds and life experiences
(g) Instructor’s availability to students
(h) Clarity of instructions for assignments
(i) Helpfulness of feedback on my work
(j) Timeliness of feedback on my work
(k) Student group work or peer-to-peer learning
(l) Hands-on experiences (e.g., labs, field trips, field work, community-engaged learning)
(m) Other ____________

(12) Is there anything else you would like to share about your learning experience? If you prefer, you may elaborate on one or more of your responses above. [OPEN-ENDED QUESTION]