

Procedures for Gathering Student Evaluations

As spelled out in the *Faculty Handbook* below, student involvement in third-year, PEAR, continuing, and tenure reviews comes through the use of special student evaluation forms. Student input is solicited from a list of students, both current and recently graduated, generated by a sampling procedure administered by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA), and from a second list of students and recent graduates solicited from the faculty member being reviewed. Procedures for sampling students are described below. Examples of the cover letter/email sent to students and graduates along with the evaluation form are also included.

After the provost receives the completed evaluations, the students' names and contact information are then removed in the interest of confidentiality, as the procedures require. However, to provide essential context to the evaluations, each completed individual evaluation will contain the following student information: type (current student or alumni), data source (faculty member's list, sample, or duplicate), major/minor status (major, minor, or none), and a list of every eligible course a student enrolled in during that review period taught by the faculty member (with its corresponding term). These student evaluations, containing the above information (without the students' name and contact information), will be made available to each faculty member under review to read. The faculty member will also be provided with a cover sheet including the percentages in the responding pool of legal sex, type, data source, and major/minor status. The cover sheet will also include tables of the scores for the final¹ question for each of the following categories, as long as at least five respondents belong to that category: male, female, intersex, no sex designated, on the faculty list, not on the faculty list, majors, minors, non-major and non-minor. The provost will then schedule an individual meeting with them to discuss thoroughly the contents of their evaluations. The deidentified versions will also be sent to the members of the faculty member's review committee and the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). The evaluations containing students' names will be seen only by the president and the provost.

¹ Question 8: "Keeping in mind all the faculty you have had at Carleton, please check the phrase below that most closely reflects your rating of this faculty member: among the least effective, ..., among the most effective."

Excerpt from Carleton College *Faculty Handbook*

The College encourages the involvement of students in its faculty and curricular decisions. Students take part in the hiring process within departments and in the review and evaluation of courses, programs and departments through the departmental curriculum committees, the Education and Curriculum Committee, departmental reviews and other departmental and College-wide committees. All instructors have the right, and are encouraged, to secure student evaluations of their own courses.

In formal reviews for tenure or reappointment, student involvement comes through the use of special student evaluation forms distributed and processed by the provost. For this evaluation, a list of twenty to thirty names of current and recently graduated students is solicited from the faculty member concerned. A second list of names is obtained by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment through a random sample, with appropriate mechanisms to make the sample broadly representative of the diversity of students who have taken the faculty members' courses. (Any student who has been the subject of a judicial proceeding involving the faculty member being evaluated will be barred from participating in this review at the latter's request.) After showing the covering letter and the evaluation form to the faculty member being evaluated, the provost and vice president for academic affairs writes to each student whose name appears on the lists, requesting the student's evaluation of the faculty member. Evaluations from current students are normally sought when students are away from the campus.

After the evaluations have been received, the provost prepares a copy of the letters, deleting the student's name and address and other material in the letter that is not appropriate to the review. The concerned faculty member is then given the opportunity to read the edited letters in a manner approved by the provost's office. At a later date, the faculty member meets with the provost to discuss the letters. The edited letters are also made available to the tenured members of the department and to the Faculty Personnel Committee. Only the provost and the president see the full letter from each student.

Student evaluations provide evidence to assist all participants in the process in making their decision. Used with sensitivity, they ought also to provide valuable assistance to the faculty member in evaluating his or her own teaching.

Sample Letter/Email to Student or Graduate

Dear Carleton {Student or Graduate}:

Professor _____ is undergoing a formal review for reappointment to the Carleton College Physical Education, Athletics, and Recreation faculty, and I write to ask you to fill out a questionnaire evaluating their teaching and/or coaching. You have been chosen to participate in this review by a process described in [this excerpt from the Carleton Faculty Handbook](#).

Student evaluations are a very important part of the review process. Along with the appraisal of a candidate's own statement and submitted documents and the observation of a candidate's classroom teaching and coaching by members of their own department, student feedback provides primary evidence upon which the decision is made. **It is particularly important for team members to return questionnaires since the numbers are small and we hope to get an accurate picture of their coaching.**

In answering these questions, please consider the full range of contexts in which you have known this faculty member. Please comment on how they helped you develop various skills (writing, speaking, athletic, etc.) as well as content knowledge.

Survey link to questionnaire inserted here.

Under the guidelines adopted by the faculty and the Board of Trustees, student evaluations will be read by the candidate under review **after your name and contact information have been removed**. However, to provide essential context to the evaluation, your completed individual evaluation, excluding your name and address, will be linked to the following personal information: student type (current student or alumni), data source (personal list, sample, or duplicate), major/minor status (major, minor, or none), and a list of every eligible course you were enrolled in during the review period taught by the faculty member, along with the corresponding term. As such, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. They are then made available to the senior colleagues in the candidate's department and to the members of the Faculty Personnel Committee, a faculty group that deliberates with the President and the Provost, to assist them in making their recommendations. **Only the Provost and President see your name attached to your response.**

The thoroughness of our reviews is vitally important to the future health of the College and the effectiveness of the teaching here. For this reason, we depend upon you to respond fully and candidly to the questionnaire. Please rely for your answers on your own experience of the faculty member, and not on hearsay from other students. Because different students find different faculty or teaching and coaching techniques to be effective, we value every opinion; we need your response to ensure as fair and accurate a judgment as possible.

To be certain that it will be included in our evaluation procedure, your response must be received no later than DATE.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Becky Krogh [by email](#) or at (507) 222-4311.

Thank you on behalf of the College and Professor _____, for taking the time to respond thoughtfully to this request.

Sincerely,

Michelle Mattson & Chair of Department

Sample Student Evaluation

This form is sent when we don't have a student's email address. It looks slightly different from the online form, but both evaluations contain the same questions.

STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please use a pen to complete and sign the form.

Evaluation of _____
(Faculty Member's Name)

1. Which courses and/or labs did you have with this faculty member? What other interactions did you have, e.g. as advisor, comps advisor, or work supervisor? Please complete the following:

Course or Other Interaction		Academic		Are/were you a major in this person's department?
No.	Title	Year	Term(s)	
This information is pre populated for those completing the form online. They have the option to add additional information or note any corrections to the pre populated information.				

2. Please briefly describe the criteria you use to judge the effectiveness of a faculty member at Carleton.

3. Which qualities of a faculty member are most helpful to your learning?

4. Based on the criteria you use to evaluate faculty members, what are this faculty member's strengths?
How and how well did they help you to learn?

5. Does this faculty member have any weaknesses that affected your learning? If so, please describe their weaknesses and how they affected your learning.

6. Are there any aspects of this faculty member's scholarly or creative work, or breadth of intellectual interest, that enhance their teaching effectiveness? If so, please explain.

7. Please list up to seven of the most effective faculty you have had at Carleton (including this faculty member, if appropriate).

8. Keeping in mind all the faculty you have had at Carleton, please check the phrase below that most closely reflects your rating of this faculty member:

among the least effective <input type="checkbox"/>	considerably less effective than average <input type="checkbox"/>	less effective than average <input type="checkbox"/>	of average effectiveness among Carleton faculty <input type="checkbox"/>	more effective than average <input type="checkbox"/>	considerably more effective than average <input type="checkbox"/>	among the most effective <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	---	--	--

INFORMATION BELOW MUST BE INCLUDED IN ORDER FOR THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE REVIEW. IT WILL BE DELETED WHEN VIEWED BY FACULTY MEMBERS.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Signature: _____

If you have any questions please contact Becky Krogh, at 507-222- 4311 or bkrogh@carleton.edu.

T-10/20

Carleton College

Faculty Review - Provost & Committee Report (Individual)

FACULTY NAME

Review Type: **THIRD-YEAR/TENURE/CONTINUING/PEAR**

(Total respondents: **XX**)

Overall Results

	N	%
Among the most effective		
Considerably more effective...		
More effective than average		
Of average effectiveness		
Less effective than average		
Considerably less effective...		
Among the least effective		

Results by Major Status*

	Major		Minor		Non-Major/Non-Minor	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Among the most effective						
Considerably more effective...						
More effective than average						
Of average effectiveness						
Less effective than average						
Considerably less effective...						
Among the least effective						

*not provided on PEAR reviews

Results by Legal Sex**

	Male		Female		Intersex		Not Declared	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Among the most effective								
Considerably more effective...								
More effective than average								
Of average effectiveness								
Less effective than average								
Considerably less effective...								
Among the least effective								

**cell counts of less than 5 are redacted to protect students' identities

Results by Data Source

	Personal List		Sampled	
	N	%	N	%
Among the most effective				
Considerably more effective...				
More effective than average				
Of average effectiveness				
Less effective than average				
Considerably less effective...				
Among the least effective				

Results by Graduate Status

	Alumni		Student	
	N	%	N	%
Among the most effective				
Considerably more effective...				
More effective than average				
Of average effectiveness				
Less effective than average				
Considerably less effective...				
Among the least effective				

Carleton College

Faculty Review – Student Response Data “Name Redacted” Version

Faculty Name:

Review Type: [Continuing, Third-Year, PEAR, or Tenure]

Student Type: [Current Student or Alumni]

Data Source: [Random, Duplicate, or Personal]

Respondent Code:

Respondent Information:

Student Type

[Current Student or Alumni]

Major/Minor Status

[Major, Minor, or None]

Course Data:

Course 1

Course prefix, number, name, and term

Course 2

(No course listed)

Course 3

(No course listed)

Course 4

(No course listed)

Course 5

(No course listed)

Course 6

(No course listed)

Course 7

(No course listed)

Course 8

(No course listed)

Course 9

(No course listed)

Course 10

(No course listed)

Evaluation:

Did you have any other interactions with this Professor, e.g. as advisor, comps advisor, or work supervisor?

Please describe these interactions and how they affected you.

Please briefly describe the criteria you use to judge the effectiveness of a faculty member at Carleton.

Which qualities of a faculty member are most helpful to your learning?

Based on the criteria you use to evaluate faculty members, what are this Professor's strengths? How and how well did they help you to learn?

Does this Professor have any weaknesses that affected your learning?

Please describe their weaknesses and how they affected your learning.

Are there any aspects of this Professor's scholarly or creative work, or breadth of intellectual interest, that enhance their teaching effectiveness?

Please explain:

Please list up to seven of the most effective faculty you have had at Carleton (including this Professor, if appropriate).

Keeping in mind all of the faculty you have had at Carleton, please select the phrase below that most closely reflects your rating of this Professor. [Among the most effective, Considerably more effective than average, More effective than average, Of average effectiveness, Less effective than average, Considerably less effective than average, or Among the least effective]

Sampling Procedure for Faculty Reviews

Which students are eligible for selection?

To be eligible for the population of students from which a sample will be drawn and whose evaluations are then requested as part of a faculty member's review, a student must:

- be a Carleton graduate or a currently-enrolled degree-seeking Carleton undergraduate,
- have taken at least one course taught by the faculty member who is being evaluated, and
- have received a "valid grade" in the course as recorded on the student's transcript as of the date the sample is drawn. Grades that are not valid include DRP (drop), CI (continuing integrative exercise), L (non-credit labs), and N (PE activity course not completed).

To be eligible, graduates must have formally completed all requirements for graduation and received a Carleton degree. Eligible undergraduates must be enrolled full-time, attending an approved off-campus study program, fulfilling a required leave, or on a waiver of senior residency (an early graduate). To be eligible to be polled, students must meet all of the criteria as of the point in time in which the sample is drawn. Students who have withdrawn, are currently taking a personal leave, or who have completed 12 terms but left without graduating are not eligible for sampling. However, please see the note below regarding these students' eligibility on a faculty member's personal list.

How is the sample obtained?

The sample is drawn from the approved list of students taught by the faculty member. In order to ensure a sufficient number of student responses, the target sample size is 150 students. If there are 150 or fewer unique students on the approved list, all students will be sampled. The sampling will be weighted by the number of courses that a student has taken with the professor. For example, a student who took three courses with a faculty member will be three times as likely to be sampled as a student who took only one course. It is worth noting here that credit-bearing lab courses are only assigned a course weight of 1/3, whereas all other courses in which a valid grade is given are assigned a course weight of 1. This results in a sample that is perfectly representative of the gender identity grouping distribution of unique students taught by the faculty member and that represents students in proportion to the number of courses taken.

Otherwise, 150 unique students will be randomly selected. Four *post hoc* guardrails are in place to ensure that the sample drawn above is representative of the population of students who took courses with the faculty member. These ensure that a) the sample is well-balanced with respect to legal sex, b) the sample is well balanced between majors and non-majors; c) students from large classes do not unduly dominate the sample; and-d) the sample includes students from all or almost all sections taught in the period under review.

If any of these guardrails is crossed, a new sample will be drawn. Specifically,

- For each of the sex designations available to us in Workday (male, female, intersex, not declared), if the percent of sampled students with that sex identification is less than the percent in the population taught by 3 percentage points or more than the percentage taught by 10 percentage points, then a new sample will be drawn.
- If the percent of majors in the sample is less than the percent of majors in the population taught by 3 percentage points or more than the percent of majors in the population taught by 10 percentage points, then a new sample will be drawn. Minors are not considered in this guardrail. Additionally, this guardrail does not apply to PEAR faculty reviews.
- If the ratio of students in the largest sections to students in the smallest sections is greater than 1.25, then a new sample will be drawn. For the purpose of this calculation, the smallest and largest sections will be determined using a partition based on equal enrollments. Eligible sections taught by a faculty member are sorted by enrollment and then partitioned into three chunks with equal student enrollments in each chunk. For example, if a faculty member has taught 270 students, starting with the smallest sections, add sections until a collective enrollment of 90 is reached, and those will be the “small sections.” Then starting with the largest sections, add sections until a collective enrollment of 90 is reached, and those will be the “large sections.” The percentage of students in each chunk who are included in the sample is computed. Then, the percentage of students from the largest sections is divided by the percentage of students from the smallest sections. Students who enroll in multiple courses with an instructor for a given review period can appear in multiple chunks.
- If the sample does not include students from at least 90% of the eligible sections taught by the faculty member, then a new sample will be drawn.

Once a successful sample is drawn, the 20 to 30 names selected by the candidate will be added in, if they do not already appear in the sample.

Please note that students with no contact orders from the College, missing contact information, or who are slated to receive more than three faculty evaluations in a given review cycle will be dropped from the final list of students, and, if available, replaced by another student who was not originally sampled to receive an evaluation. However, students on a faculty member’s personal list WILL be sent an evaluation regardless of the total number of evaluations in which they are included in a given review cycle unless those students have a no contact order with the College or missing contact information.

How does the process begin?

IRA will send the professor under review a list of all courses they have taught during the years appropriate for the review. The list will reflect each of the courses taught during this period, according to the College’s computerized transcript system. The faculty member is then asked to verify this list of courses against their own list of courses as being both complete and accurate. Occasionally, the official records are incomplete or inaccurate for courses taught cooperatively by two or more faculty, due to switching of course sections without having notified the Registrar of such change(s), the listing of instructors as “Staff,” assumption or

dropping of responsibility for a course due to illness or other emergency, or for independent studies when they are handled administratively by a department chair. Confirmation, or emendation, of this list is all that is required to get the selection process underway. This should be done promptly so that the sampling and other work can continue and the necessary deadlines can be met. Once the set of courses taught is confirmed, candidates under review will be sent their class rosters for approval. These class rosters are also based on data contained in the College's computerized student records system. From these rosters, the faculty member may begin to create personal and exclusion lists.

Student Names Submitted by the Review Candidate

Personal List

A faculty member under review will be asked to submit a list of 20 to 30 students whom they would like to have us contact for an evaluation. Evaluation forms will be sent to these students. Overlap between the personal list and the one selected randomly will almost always exist, but the only effect of this outcome is to create a joint category of evaluation responses. Students not registered in any of the courses may be on the personal list with the approval of the provost. Faculty are asked to indicate these students on their personal list that they submit to the Provost's Office for approval by providing a justification for their inclusion. In creating the personal list, faculty are encouraged to review the sample student questionnaire to determine which students the faculty member has had substantive interactions with who could best respond to the questionnaire.

Exclusion List

On occasion, there are valid reasons for a student, who meets the eligibility criteria detailed above, to be removed from consideration from the student evaluation process. As such, at the same time the faculty member completes their personal list, they are also permitted to compile a list of these students to submit to the Provost's Office, along with a valid justification for their removal. These are handled on a case-by-case basis and approved by the provost.

Frequently Asked Question

Q. Which terms are included in the reviews? When are the students polled?

A. For the third-year review, students are drawn from all courses taught by the faculty member since their arrival at Carleton. Students taught through spring term of the second year are included; the evaluations will be sent out during the following winter break. (The intervening fall term will be included at the time of tenure review.)

To be eligible for sampling at the time of tenure review, students must have taken a course from the faculty member since spring term of the faculty member's second year, beginning with courses taught during the fall term of the third-year review. This tenure review sampling also includes students taught through spring term of the tenure review year; the evaluations are sent out during the summer break.

Schedules for continuing (non-PEAR) and PEAR reviews are determined individually.

For samples drawn during the summer, seniors receiving their degrees in June are included in the population, and undergraduates are included or excluded based on their enrollment status at the end of spring term.

It is conceivable that the same student could be drawn for more than one review for a given faculty member provided that the student took at least one course in each of the time periods.

In summary,

Number of classes taken: a student's likelihood of being included in the sample is directly proportional to the number of classes they have taken with the faculty member under review. A student who has taken two classes is twice as likely to be included, a student who has taken three classes is three times as likely to be included, etc.

To be certain that a student will be surveyed: include the student in the personal list. If that student meets the status criteria, and can be reached via email or paper mail, the student will receive an evaluation.

November 4, 2025