



Fall 2019 Course Evaluations

Howard University

At Howard University, The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA) conducted course evaluations for 10 colleges and schools. Evaluations were made available to students on November 13, 2019 and closed December 3, 2019. Faculty received course evaluations on January 10, 2020.

2,043 courses received at least one evaluation
43,112 evaluations were sent
16,413 evaluations were completed (response rate of **38.07%**)

A total of 19 questions (8 course and 11 instructor) were asked across all departments.

In the tables below, both a general mean and a course mean are supplied. The general mean aggregates all student responses (as though the university was one class). This mean is useful when understanding the general student experience across the evaluated courses. The course mean is an “average of averages” and treats each course mean as a data point. The course mean is useful in understanding faculty performance regardless of class size.

This report reflects course evaluation data for the following colleges and schools:

- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Dentistry
- College of Divinity
- College of Engineering & Architecture
- College of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences
- Graduate School
- School of Business
- School of Education
- School of Law
- School of Social Work

For more information, and an interactive data visualization of course evaluation averages, please visit our website (ira.howard.edu/course-evaluations). This data visualization tool provides course means across all departments and colleges/schools.

If you have any questions, please reach out to our email – assessment@howard.edu.

Course Questions	Breakdown of Means	
	General Mean	Course Mean
CQ1: The workload and pace were appropriate for the course level	3.95	4.05
CQ2: This course helped me consider connections between course material and other areas of my personal, academic, or professional life.	3.98	4.09
CQ3: This course challenged me to think critically about the subject.	4.08	4.17
CQ4: This course helped me to communicate clearly about the subject.	3.89	4.00
CQ5: This course provided appropriate knowledge in this subject area.	4.10	4.16
CQ6: The course assignments reflected what was covered in the course.	4.12	4.18
CQ7: The course stimulated my interest in the subject.	3.77	3.91
*CQ8: Overall, this course was..."	3.96	4.07
Key	1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
*Key	1= Very Poor 2= Poor 3=Acceptable 4=Good 5=Very Good	

Instructor	Breakdown of Means	
	General Mean	Course Mean
IQ1: The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.	3.94	4.01
IQ2: The instructor was fair in evaluating student performance.	4.02	4.11
IQ3: The instructor was well prepared for class meetings.	4.19	4.21
IQ4: The instructor made effective use of class time.	4.08	4.13
IQ5: The instructor was accessible during office hours.	4.02	4.12
IQ6: The instructor clearly articulated their expectations for students in the course.	4.09	4.14
IQ7: The instructor provided guidance for understanding course exercises/assignments.	3.97	4.05
IQ8: The instructor provided timely feedback on exams/papers/performance.	3.94	4.02
IQ9: The instructor provided constructive feedback on exams/papers/performance.	3.86	3.99
IQ10: The instructor created a welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.	4.12	4.20
*IQ11: Overall, the instructor was..."	4.07	4.15
Key	1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
*Key	1= Very Poor 2= Poor 3=Acceptable 4=Good 5=Very Good	