

Report of Summary Data for Student Ratings of Instructor Effectiveness: Fall 2015 to Fall 2016

Prepared January 12, 2017 by Thomas Pusateri

Associate Director for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

This report provides summary tables of data from students who completed online student feedback via Digital Measures in 15,783 classes taught at Kennesaw State University during Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Fall 2016 inclusive. The report focuses on one global item common to all feedback forms, “**The instructor was effective in helping me learn.**” Benton and Ryall (2016, p.9)¹ indicate that “Global or summary items provide evaluators a view of how students judged the overall quality of teaching and the course as well as how much they learned.... Global items provide a more valid measure of overall impressions than does averaging several dissimilar items together into a single score.” Students rated their instructors on this item using a scale where 1=*Strongly Disagree*, 2=*Disagree*, 3=*Agree*, and 4=*Strongly Agree*. Students also had the option of selecting *No Response*, but this option represented only 1.5% of all student responses; these responses were not included in the analyses prepared for this report.

Table 1 provides summary data for all 15,783 classes combined (top row), for each College (rows highlighted in grey), and for each department or academic unit within each College (other rows). Each row includes summary data on the:

- Number of classes in which at least one student responded, excluding classes in which no student responded.
- Number of students who received invitations to complete feedback forms, primarily via emails to their KSU accounts.
- Number of students who responded, excluding students who visited the Digital Measures site and declined to respond.
- Response rates, or the percent of students who responded among those who received feedback forms.
- Number of *Strongly Agree*, *Agree*, *Disagree*, and *Strongly Disagree* responses, each reported in separate columns.
- Mean rating, calculated for each row: 1=*Strongly Disagree*, 2=*Disagree*, 3=*Agree*, 4=*Strongly Agree*.
- Percent of *Strongly Agree* responses.
- Combined percent of *Agree* and *Strongly Agree* responses.

Similar to summary reports of data from previous semesters², students rated most KSU instructors highly. The mean rating of all responses combined was 3.49, which is halfway between a rating of *Agree* and *Strongly Agree*. Students selected *Strongly Agree* as their rating 64% of the time, and almost 90% of all responses were either *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*.

Similar to previous summary reports, there is variability in the rating distributions for different colleges, schools, and departments. Please note that these differences **do not** indicate that instructors in certain colleges, schools, or departments are more (or less) effective teachers. Benton and Cashin (2012)³ provide a useful summary of research studies that have identified those factors that do, and do not, correlate with student ratings of instructors, which includes academic discipline: “humanities and arts courses receive higher ratings than social science courses, which in turn receive higher ratings than math and science courses” (p. 8). Benton and Ryall (2016, p. 9) suggest that “differences in [student ratings by] disciplines [may be] attributable to variations in quality of teaching, students background preparation, or subject-matter difficulty.”

Faculty in a specific school or department may consider comparing their own response rates, mean ratings, and percent of *Strongly Agree/Agree* responses to their school or departmental averages as a **rough estimate** of how students perceive their teaching effectiveness compared to other faculty in their unit. However, I caution against using these data for more than a rough comparison because, as Benton and Cashin (2012) discuss, other factors also correlate with student ratings, such as course level, class size, and workload/difficulty of the course (refer to pages 8 and 9). I intend to prepare additional analyses that will compare ratings by course level, course delivery (face-to-face, online, hybrid), and other factors (e.g., course size, courses that are part of learning communities, learning support courses, honors courses, courses in study abroad programs).

Table 2 provides additional data in the form of percentiles that may provide a useful context for faculty to consider as they reflect upon student ratings of instructor effectiveness. As I discussed in a recent blog⁴ on the CETL website, “Unfortunately, we don’t live in Lake Wobegon where all teachers receive above average ratings. Faculty who receive mean ratings below 3.50 are not necessarily perceived by students as ineffective teachers.” The mean rating for all KSU classes included this analysis is 3.49 (see Table 1), but this should not suggest that instructors of half of KSU’s courses are taught by ineffective instructors. As indicated in Table 2f, instructors in 63% of all classes received ratings of either *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* from all students who responded to the instructor effectiveness item, and instructors in 82% of all classes received at least 80% *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* responses. Instructors in only 6% of all courses received ratings of *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* from half of the students in the class.

¹ Available at: http://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/PaperIDEA_58.pdf

² Summary reports from past semesters are available at: <http://digitalmeasures.kennesaw.edu/course-response/reports.php>

³ Available at: http://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/PaperIDEA_50.pdf

⁴ The blog post is available at: <http://cctl.kennesaw.edu/article/student-feedback-teaching-why-mean-ratings-may-not-tell-full-story>

Table 1. Summary data by College/Department/Unit on student ratings of "The instructor was effective in helping me learn" (Fall 2015 through Fall 2016) 01-12-2017

COLLEGE School/Department/Unit	Number of Classes in which at least One Student Responded	Number of Students who Received Feedback Forms	Number of Students who Responded	Response Rate	Number of Strongly Agree Responses	Number of Agree Responses	Number of Disagree Responses	Number of Strongly Disagree Responses	Mean Rating 1=Strongly Disagree 4=Strongly Agree	Percent of Strongly Agree Responses	Combined Percent of Strongly Agree and Agree Responses
ALL CLASSES COMBINED	15,783	406,022	131,117	32.3%	81,863	32,372	7,899	5,747	3.49	64.0%	89.3%
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	13	82	27	32.9%	18	3	3	1	3.52	72.0%	84.0%
Institute for Leadership, Ethics, and Character	13	82	27	32.9%	18	3	3	1	3.52	72.0%	84.0%
BAGWELL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	1,202	15,735	6,602	42.0%	4,098	1,640	412	297	3.48	63.6%	89.0%
Doctor of Education	76	889	390	43.9%	216	143	20	9	3.46	55.7%	92.5%
Elementary and Early Childhood Education	419	5,593	2,145	38.4%	1,249	514	181	158	3.36	59.4%	83.9%
Educational Leadership	125	1,559	781	50.1%	492	218	35	13	3.57	64.9%	93.7%
Inclusive Education	187	2,367	921	38.9%	568	232	54	27	3.52	64.5%	90.8%
Instructional Technology	172	2,591	1,180	45.5%	851	220	54	28	3.64	73.8%	92.9%
Secondary and Middle Grades Education	223	2,736	1,185	43.3%	722	313	68	62	3.45	62.0%	88.8%
COLES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS	1,493	56,766	20,738	36.5%	13,475	4,595	1,191	940	3.52	66.7%	89.5%
Economics, Finance, and Quantitative Analysis	400	19,102	5,859	30.7%	3,694	1,337	375	320	3.47	64.5%	87.9%
Information Systems	217	7,050	2,475	35.1%	1,419	642	185	174	3.37	58.6%	85.2%
Management and Entrepreneurship	329	9,530	4,710	49.4%	3,177	962	262	197	3.55	69.1%	90.0%
Marketing and Professional Sales	179	5,866	2,214	37.7%	1,426	531	121	92	3.52	65.7%	90.2%
School of Accountancy	254	12,637	4,749	37.6%	3,282	997	228	142	3.60	70.6%	92.0%
Doctor of Business Science	114	2,581	731	28.3%	477	126	20	15	3.67	74.8%	94.5%
COLLEGE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE	723	16,775	5,297	31.6%	2,438	1,622	521	474	3.19	48.2%	80.3%
Computer Science	281	6,917	1,974	28.5%	820	599	220	233	3.07	43.8%	75.8%
Information Technology	232	4,601	1,728	37.6%	924	534	118	93	3.37	55.4%	87.4%
Software Engineering and Game Development	210	5,257	1,595	30.3%	694	489	183	148	3.14	45.8%	78.1%
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND CONSTRUCTION	327	4,439	1,510	34.0%	931	404	81	57	3.50	63.2%	90.6%
Architecture	202	2,437	732	30.0%	393	224	57	37	3.37	55.3%	86.8%
Construction Management	125	2,002	778	38.9%	538	180	24	20	3.62	70.6%	94.2%

COLLEGE School/Department/Unit	Number of Classes in which at least One Student Responded	Number of Students who Received Feedback Forms	Number of Students who Responded	Response Rate	Number of Strongly Agree Responses	Number of Agree Responses	Number of Disagree Responses	Number of Strongly Disagree Responses	Mean Rating 1=Strongly Disagree 4=Strongly Agree	Percent of Strongly Agree Responses	Combined Percent of Strongly Agree and Agree Responses
ALL CLASSES COMBINED	15,783	406,022	131,117	32.3%	81,863	32,372	7,899	5,747	3.49	64.0%	89.3%
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES	4,719	132,827	41,965	31.6%	28,748	9,276	1,891	1,135	3.60	70.0%	92.6%
Dean's Office (PhD ICM)	25	151	69	45.7%	45	13	4	4	3.50	68.2%	87.9%
Digital Writing and Media Arts	172	2,915	1,244	42.7%	778	351	47	33	3.55	64.4%	93.4%
English	1,235	28,537	12,095	42.4%	8,663	2,592	394	203	3.66	73.1%	95.0%
Foreign Languages	532	8,657	2,601	30.0%	1,926	454	104	69	3.66	75.4%	93.2%
Geography and Anthropology	227	7,286	1,625	22.3%	1,079	376	84	41	3.58	68.3%	92.1%
History and Philosophy	515	20,284	5,369	26.5%	3,591	1,246	260	154	3.58	68.4%	92.1%
Interdisciplinary Studies	236	5,307	1,483	27.9%	976	316	84	60	3.54	68.0%	90.0%
Political Science and International Affairs	482	15,888	4,155	26.2%	2,810	929	178	126	3.59	69.5%	92.5%
Psychology	377	14,338	4,373	30.5%	2,897	989	262	143	3.55	67.5%	90.6%
School of Communication and Media	528	16,384	5,215	31.8%	3,476	1,164	301	186	3.55	67.8%	90.5%
Sociology and Criminal Justice	390	13,080	3,736	28.6%	2,507	846	173	116	3.58	68.8%	92.1%
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS	2,642	82,735	24,438	29.5%	13,009	7,089	2,094	1,716	3.31	54.4%	84.1%
Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology AND Molecular and Cellular Biology (Department Code: BIOL)	81	1,166	396	34.0%	215	126	23	19	3.40	56.1%	89.0%
Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology (Department Code: DSM)	580	24,103	6,364	26.4%	3,234	2,041	547	373	3.31	52.2%	85.1%
Chemistry and Biochemistry	575	16,836	5,600	33.3%	2,824	1,684	497	467	3.25	51.6%	82.4%
Mathematics	875	28,162	8,679	30.8%	4,767	2,381	751	624	3.32	55.9%	83.9%
Physics	330	6,460	1,675	25.9%	881	457	160	153	3.25	53.4%	81.0%
Statistics and Analytical Sciences	201	6,008	1,724	28.7%	1,088	400	116	80	3.48	64.6%	88.4%
COLLEGE OF THE ARTS	1,063	21,834	5,950	27.3%	3,706	1,533	314	185	3.53	64.6%	91.3%
Dance	88	1,917	611	31.9%	446	113	21	11	3.68	75.5%	94.6%
School of Art and Design	302	6,941	1,939	27.9%	942	673	144	94	3.33	50.8%	87.2%
School of Music	482	8,588	1,983	23.1%	1,381	395	78	46	3.64	72.7%	93.5%
Theatre and Performance Studies	191	4,388	1,417	32.3%	937	352	71	34	3.57	67.2%	92.5%

COLLEGE School/Department/Unit	Number of Classes in which at least One Student Responded	Number of Students who Received Feedback Forms	Number of Students who Responded	Response Rate	Number of Strongly Agree Responses	Number of Agree Responses	Number of Disagree Responses	Number of Strongly Disagree Responses	Mean Rating 1=Strongly Disagree 4=Strongly Agree	Percent of Strongly Agree Responses	Combined Percent of Strongly Agree and Agree Responses
ALL CLASSES COMBINED	15,783	406,022	131,117	32.3%	81,863	32,372	7,899	5,747	3.49	64.0%	89.3%
SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	1,301	23,222	8,203	35.3%	4,804	2,401	533	341	3.44	59.5%	89.2%
Civil and Construction Engineering	273	5,701	1,829	32.1%	1,144	527	92	44	3.53	63.3%	92.5%
Electrical & Computer Engineering Technology	159	2,060	683	33.2%	369	217	52	31	3.38	55.2%	87.6%
Electrical Engineering	170	3,793	1,247	32.9%	701	381	76	61	3.41	57.5%	88.8%
Mechanical Engineering	215	4,446	2,106	47.4%	1,212	612	160	97	3.41	58.2%	87.7%
Mechanical Engineering Technology	155	2,516	915	36.4%	522	256	74	55	3.37	57.6%	85.8%
Mechatronics Engineering	47	682	228	33.4%	145	65	13	4	3.55	63.9%	92.5%
Systems and Industrial Engineering	282	4,024	1,195	29.7%	711	343	66	49	3.47	60.8%	90.2%
GRADUATE COLLEGE	3	14	5	35.7%	5	0	0	0	4.00	100.0%	100.0%
Graduate Teacher Training	3	14	5	35.7%	5	0	0	0	4.00	100.0%	100.0%
HONORS COLLEGE	63	728	263	36.1%	161	65	13	10	3.51	64.7%	90.8%
Undergraduate Honors (Dept Code: UNST)	63	728	263	36.1%	161	65	13	10	3.51	64.7%	90.8%
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	807	18,054	7,552	41.8%	4,966	1,743	419	273	3.54	67.1%	90.6%
Leven School of Culinary Sustainability & Hospitality	207	4,305	1,456	33.8%	927	331	102	72	3.48	64.7%	87.8%
First-Year and Transition Studies	457	10,047	4,800	47.8%	3,101	1,137	275	173	3.53	66.2%	90.4%
Interdisciplinary Studies	14	337	171	50.7%	140	28	1	1	3.81	82.4%	98.8%
Leadership and Integrative Studies	14	510	107	21.0%	64	30	7	2	3.51	62.1%	91.3%
University Studies (Dept Code: UNST)	115	2,855	1,018	35.7%	734	217	34	25	3.64	72.7%	94.2%
WELLSTAR COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	1,427	32,811	8,567	26.1%	5,504	2,001	427	318	3.54	66.7%	91.0%
Exercise Science and Sport Management	209	6,604	1,383	20.9%	960	271	53	39	3.63	72.6%	93.0%
Health Promotion and Physical Education	478	14,752	3,657	24.8%	2,423	826	178	141	3.55	67.9%	91.1%
Social Work and Human Services	192	4,098	1,265	30.9%	772	328	68	53	3.49	63.2%	90.1%
WellStar School of Nursing	548	7,357	2,262	30.7%	1,349	576	128	85	3.49	63.1%	90.0%

Table 2: Percentiles for student ratings of "The instructor was effective in helping me learn."

Percentiles are based on data from 15,783 classes taught from Fall 2015 through Fall 2016.

Data tables were prepared by Tom Pusateri (CETL Associate Director) on 01-12-2017.

For Table 2d: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4= Strongly Agree

Table 2a. Percentiles for the number of students who received feedback forms in each class		Table 2b. Percentiles for the number of students who responded in each class		Table 2c. Percentiles for the student response rate in each class		Table 2d. Percentiles for the mean ratings in each class		Table 2e. Percentiles of the percentages of Strongly Agree responses in each class		Table 2f. Percentiles of the combined percentages of Strongly Agree and Agree responses in each class	
99%ile	341	99%ile	126	99%ile	100.0%	99%ile	4.00	99%ile	100.0%	99%ile	100.0%
90%ile	47	90%ile	17	90%ile	66.7%	90%ile	4.00	90%ile	100.0%	90%ile	100.0%
80%ile	35	80%ile	12	80%ile	50.0%	80%ile	4.00	80%ile	100.0%	80%ile	100.0%
75%ile	32	75%ile	11	75%ile	45.8%	75%ile	3.94	75%ile	91.7%	75%ile	100.0%
70%ile	28	70%ile	9	70%ile	41.7%	70%ile	3.86	70%ile	85.7%	70%ile	100.0%
60%ile	24	60%ile	8	60%ile	35.3%	60%ile	3.75	60%ile	76.5%	60%ile	100.0%
50%ile	21	50%ile	6	50%ile	30.8%	50%ile	3.67	50%ile	66.7%	50%ile	100.0%
40%ile	18	40%ile	5	40%ile	26.7%	40%ile	3.50	40%ile	60.0%	40%ile	100.0%
30%ile	15	30%ile	4	30%ile	23.1%	30%ile	3.38	30%ile	50.0%	30%ile	90.0%
25%ile	13	25%ile	3	25%ile	21.1%	25%ile	3.27	25%ile	43.5%	25%ile	85.7%
20%ile	10	20%ile	3	20%ile	19.4%	20%ile	3.14	20%ile	33.3%	20%ile	80.8%
10%ile	6	10%ile	1	10%ile	14.3%	10%ile	2.83	10%ile	16.7%	10%ile	66.7%
1%ile	1	1%ile	0	1%ile	0.0%	1%ile	1.00	1%ile	0.0%	1%ile	0.0%

The tables above contain percentiles for summary data of student ratings obtained in 15,783 classes taught at KSU from Fall 2015 through Fall 2016. The tables exclude classes in which no student visited the Digital Measures website to provide feedback.

Table 2a displays percentiles for the number of students in each class who received invitations to complete the online student feedback forms. The maximum (99%ile) number of students in any class was 341. The median (50%ile) number of students in all classes was 21. The minimum (1%ile) number of students in any class was 1.

Table 2b displays percentiles for the number of students who responded in each class. The median (50%ile) number of students who responded in any class was 6. Students in 98 classes (0.6% of the 15,783 classes) visited the Digital Measures Website but declined to provide feedback, as indicated by the minimum value of 0.0% (1%ile).

Table 2c displays percentiles for the response rate for each class, which is the percent of students in each class who provided feedback. The maximum (99%ile) response rate was 100% and the median (50%ile) was 30.8%. [Medians are calculated differently from means, which is why the median of 30.8% differs from the mean response rate of 32.3% reported in Table 1.]

Table 2d displays percentiles for the mean ratings obtained by instructors for each class. The 50%ile of 3.67 indicates half of all classes received a rating of 3.67 or higher on a scale where 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, and 4=Strongly Agree.

24.4% of all classes obtained a mean rating of 4.0	0.3% of all classes obtained a mean of 1.0
64.5% of all classes obtained a mean rating of 3.5 or better	2.5% of all classes obtained a mean of 2.0 or lower
87.4% of all classes obtained a mean rating of 3.0 or better	6.1% of all classes obtained a mean of 2.5 or lower

Table 2e displays percentiles for the percentages of students in each class who indicated "Strongly Agree" on the item, "The instructor is effective in helping me learn." The median (50%ile) is 66.7%, which indicates that in half (actually 54.6%) of all classes, at least 66.7% of students in the class indicated "Strongly Agree" on the item.

Table 2f displays percentiles for the combined percentages of students in each class who indicated either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to "The instructor is effective in helping me learn."

In 62.8% of all classes, the combined percentage of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses was 100%.

In 70.3% of all classes, the combined percentage of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses was 90% or higher.

In 81.8% of all classes, the combined percentage of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses was 80% or higher.

In 6.3% of all classes, the combined percentage of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses was 50% or lower.