

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD
OF REGENTS OF
NAVAJO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

Approving the Navajo Technical University (NTU) Course Evaluation Policy to Systematically Collect and Use Student Feedback to Support Continuous Improvement in Teaching and Learning, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

WHEREAS:


1. The Board of Regents of the Navajo Technical University is responsible for the administration, operations and the development of policy as stated in Navajo Nation Council Resolution C0-58-16, enacted on November 10, 2016, that amended the University 's enabling legislation, codified at 15 N.N.C. §§1201-1210; and
2. Pursuant to the University 's enabling legislation, Navajo Technical University (NTU) is organized as an institution of higher learning for the primary purpose of providing post-secondary and post- graduate education programs that serve both the academic and vocational/technical needs of the Navajo Nation and its citizens, 15 N.N.C. §1203(A); and
3. Pursuant to the University's enabling legislation, the Board of Regents of Navajo Technical University is authorized to review and approve course curricula, assessment structures, program plans, research and development projects, in accordance with established program priorities and policies of the University, 15 N.N.C. §1 205(F), and to review and approve contracts, 15 N.N.C. §1205(R); and
4. The NTU Course Evaluation Policy provides guidance to systematically collect and use student feedback to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning; and
5. The Course Evaluation Policy establishes clear standards and procedures and helps faculty improve course design; and
6. The Administration of the Navajo Technical University has reviewed the Course Evaluation Policy, and hereby recommends the Board of Regents of Navajo Technical University approve the Course Evaluation Policy to contribute to faculty review and academic program quality assurance, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Board of Regents of the Navajo Technical University hereby approves the Navajo Technical University (NTU) Course Evaluation Policy to Systematically Collect and Use Student Feedback to Support Continuous Improvement in Teaching and Learning, attached hereto as Exhibit A.
2. The President of Navajo Technical University is hereby authorized, directed, and empowered to do all things necessary to effectuate the purpose of this resolution.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby confirm that this resolution was discussed and considered by the Board of Regents of the Navajo Technical University at a duly called meeting held in Crownpoint, New Mexico, at which a quorum was present, and that this resolution was passed by a vote of **5** in favor, **0** opposed, and **0** abstained on the 15th day of May 2026.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Tara Denetsosie-Lovato". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line drawn underneath the name.

Tara Denetsosie-Lovato, Chairperson
NTU Board of Regents



COURSE EVALUATION POLICY

Approved by Student Learning/Academic Excellence Committee: 9/11/2026
Approved by Faculty Congress: 9/25/2026

Table of Contents

<u>Content</u>	<u>Page</u>
History	1
NTU Mission, Vision, Philosophy, and Core Values	1
Policy Statement	3
Policy Purpose and Scope	3
Administration of Evaluations	3
Content and Customization	4
Student Participation and Communication	5
Data Access and Use	5
Quality Control and Review	6
Responsibilities	7
Definitions	7
Related Policies, Procedures, Statutes, and Regulations	7
Evaluation Schedule	7
Appendices	
Appendix A: Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ)	10
Appendix B: Course Evaluation Review Form	13
Appendix C: Interpretation of Likert Scale Ratings (5-Point Scale)	14

History

Navajo Technical University (NTU) has administered course evaluations for several years to collect student feedback regarding course content and instructional effectiveness. Historically, the Office of Institutional Data and Reporting has managed this process, distributing evaluations and compiling the resulting data. While this practice has demonstrably supported enhancements in instruction and student academic progress, the University had not previously adopted a formalized policy to delineate the procedures and prescribed uses of the course evaluation outcomes. Consequently, this policy has been instituted to formalize the process, ensure consistency and transparency, and reinforce NTU's dedication to the continuous advancement of teaching and learning.

NTU Mission

Navajo Technical University honors Diné culture and language while educating for the future.

Vision

Navajo Technical University provides an excellent educational experience in a supportive, culturally diverse environment, enabling all community members to grow intellectually, culturally, and economically.

Philosophy

Through the teachings of Nitsáhákees (thinking), Nahátá (planning), Íina (implementing), and Siihasin (reflection), students acquire quality education in diverse fields, while preserving cultural values and gaining economic opportunities.

The Diné Philosophy of Education (DPE) guides NTU's approach to teaching and learning:

- Nitsáhákees (Thinking): Encourages critical and creative thought in course design and pedagogy.
- Nahátá (Planning): Promotes intentional planning and organization of learning experiences.
- Íina (Living): Embodies active engagement and application of knowledge in real-world contexts.
- Siihasin (Reflection): Fosters self-assessment, continuous improvement, and resilience in teaching and learning.

Core Values: Bitsé Siléí

The NTU core values are in addition to its mission, vision, and philosophy statements, and help guide the university's day-to-day operations. They apply to students, faculty, staff, and the board of regents, and help us achieve our intended goals.

1. **Íhoo'aah: Learning** - We are passionate about knowledge and continue to learn throughout our lives. We pursue new experiences and ways of thinking. We appreciate that much of our learning will occur by interacting with others, inside and outside of the classroom.
2. **Éédééhtį: Innovation** - We encourage and support our faculty, staff, and students in all forms of scholarship, including the discovery of knowledge in teaching and learning, and in developing innovative products and processes.
3. **Alk'izhdiitį: Communication** - We strive to practice honest and open exchanges of ideas in an environment where encouragement serves as the basis for our communication.
4. **Ahilna'anish: Collaboration** - We work together towards the common goals of the university and our larger communities, while valuing teamwork, participation, and a wealth of ideas.
5. **'Adiljidli : Integrity** - We seek to reflect integrity by upholding the highest ethical standards in personal and professional behavior, and in our commitment to transparency and accountability.
6. **Alhidilzin: Respect** - We strive to be a community that appreciates the gifts and unique contributions of each person. We honor the Navajo way of life while also welcoming diverse perspectives.
7. **Na'alkaah: Research** - We create new knowledge that benefits the Navajo people and all human beings through ethical research practices

Policy Statement

The objective of this policy is to establish a consistent and substantive mechanism for all Navajo Technical University (NTU) students to offer feedback regarding their courses and instructors. Furthermore, it assists faculty in gaining insights into students' learning experiences, thereby facilitating the enhancement of instructional efficacy and course structure. This policy promotes transparency for both students and faculty and underpins the ongoing refinement of NTU's academic programs by clearly specifying the procedures for conducting, utilizing, and safeguarding course evaluations. Through this articulated process, NTU affirms its dedication to continuous improvement and transparency in the assessment of teaching.

1. Policy Purpose and Scope

1.1 **Purpose.** NTU's course evaluation system is designed to systematically collect and use student feedback to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning while honoring the Diné Philosophy of Education, which encompasses Nitsáhákees (Thinking), Nahátá (Planning), Íina (Living), and Siihasin (Reflecting). The course evaluation process aims to:

- Support continuous improvement in teaching and learning;
- Provide evidence to inform instructors' reflective practice and course design;
- Contribute to faculty review and academic program quality assurance when combined with other data.

This policy recognizes that student feedback is one of multiple tools for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

1.2 **Scope.** This policy applies to all credit-bearing undergraduate and graduate courses taught at NTU, including lectures, labs, and special topics, except as permitted by the Provost or an equivalent authority.

2. Administration of Evaluations

2.1 **Timing.** Course evaluations shall be administered online through NTU's official evaluation platform during the last two weeks of classes prior to final examinations. The Evaluation team is responsible for notifying students and faculty when evaluations open and close. For courses shorter than a full term, such as summer and/or intersessions, evaluations shall be administered during the final week of the course to ensure meaningful feedback can be collected.

2.2 **Anonymity.** Student responses shall be collected anonymously, precluding any instructor and department chairs from identifying individual respondents or associating responses with specific students. Responses are collected via a secure platform that ensures evaluations are decoupled from student identities. The anonymity of student identities shall be maintained, except in legally mandated or safety-critical situations.

2.3 **Separate Evaluations.** If a course has multiple instructors or teaching assistants, separate evaluations shall be completed for each instructor of record.

3. **Content and Customization**

3.1 **Standard Instrument.** NTU shall maintain a standardized set of core evaluation questions to ensure comparability across courses and disciplines. These standardized questions shall measure aspects of:

- Instructional clarity and engagement
- Promotion of student learning outcomes
- Course organization and assessment alignment
- Learning environment and inclusiveness

The standardized questions shall be periodically reviewed to ensure cultural relevance and inclusivity, reflecting NTU's diverse student population.

In addition, modality-specific questions shall be designed to meet applicable federal, state, and accreditor requirements for online and distance education, including but not limited to:

- U.S. Department of Education (ED) requirements for Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI).
- State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) guidelines.
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC) distance education standards.
- Federal accessibility mandates, including compliance with Section 504 and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as well as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

For online and hybrid courses, evaluation questions shall assess:

- Frequency and quality of regular and substantive interaction between the instructor and students
- Timeliness and meaningfulness of instructor feedback
- Opportunities for instructor-initiated engagement
- Clear communication of course expectations and participation requirements
- Accessibility of course materials and technology platforms
- Availability of academic support resources in the online environment
- Alignment between learning activities, assessments, and stated learning outcomes
- Equitable access to instructional materials and accommodations

These compliance-aligned questions shall be reviewed periodically to reflect updates in federal regulations, state requirements, and accreditor guidance.

3.2 Departmental and Instructor Questions. Departments and instructors may propose a limited number of supplementary, context-specific questions for inclusion in the standard instrument, subject to approval by the Student Learning Committee.

3.3 Constructive Feedback Guidance. Students shall be apprised that their feedback is expected to be professional, civil, respectful, constructive, and oriented toward instruction and the learning environment. Inappropriate or defamatory remarks, including those containing harassment, threats, or discriminatory language, will be withheld. These comments will undergo review by the Evaluation team before the dissemination of evaluation summaries. Students are encouraged to provide specific examples or actionable recommendations to help instructors enhance pedagogical methods and course structure.

4. Student Participation and Communication

4.1 Encouragement of Participation. Faculty and administrators shall encourage students to complete evaluations and emphasize the importance of honest and thoughtful feedback. Participation may be promoted through brief in-class reminders, digital notifications, and anonymous dashboards displaying response rates. Students should also be informed that evaluation results are used to improve courses and enhance the overall learning experience. Reminders about the evaluation period may be communicated via official NTU channels and the Learning Management System.

4.2 Voluntary Participation. Participation in evaluations shall be voluntary, without academic penalty or coercive incentives tied to grades or participation points. Instructors shall not condition academic credit on the completion of evaluations. While participation is voluntary, students are strongly encouraged to complete evaluations to ensure that feedback is representative and meaningful for improving courses and instruction.

5. Data Access and Use

5.1 Instructor Access. Summary evaluation results, including aggregated numerical data and anonymized qualitative comments, will be made available to instructors within two weeks of final grades being submitted to ensure that feedback does not influence grading. Instructors may request consultation with their department chair or assessment staff to help interpret the results and identify areas for improvement.

5.2 Administrative Access. Evaluation summaries shall be accessible to the provost, deans, department chairs, and relevant academic administrators as part of faculty performance reviews, program evaluation, and curriculum development processes. Summative results will be included in the annual student learning report.

The benchmark for course evaluation will be established upon the recommendation of the Student Learning Committee, with final approval by the Faculty Congress. Academic deans and department chairs are responsible for reviewing the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) [see *Appendix A*] results each semester/academic term. This review includes both

individual course/section results and aggregate data for multi-section courses.

The Evaluation team distributes summary tables of CEQ results to academic deans and department chairs, identifying courses with mean CEQ ratings below the established benchmark of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale (*see Appendix C for interpretation*). For any course with a mean rating below the benchmark, the academic dean and department chair meet with the faculty member to review the evaluation results, identify contributing factors, and determine appropriate actions for improvement.

When warranted, the department chair develops an action plan in collaboration with the faculty member. If curricular issues are identified, the academic dean or department chair may refer the course to the Curriculum Committee for formal course revision. The academic dean and department chair document all actions using the NTU Course Evaluation Review Form (*see Appendix B*). Completed forms are maintained in the Office of Assessment and Accreditation.

5.3 Use in Personnel Decisions. Course evaluations shall be considered alongside other evidence (e.g., peer review, student learning outcomes, and professional development activities) in faculty assessments for promotion, tenure, contract renewal, and awards. Evaluation data shall be interpreted in context, taking into account factors such as class size, course type, or delivery mode to avoid misinterpretation. No single evaluation measure shall be the sole basis for high-stakes personnel decisions.

5.4 Online Learning Department Analysis. The Online Learning Department shall review and analyze evaluation data specific to online courses to identify trends, areas for improvement, and training needs. Findings from this analysis will be used to enhance online teaching practices, support faculty development, and improve the overall quality of online learning experiences at NTU.

6. Quality Control and Review

6.1 Integrity of Process. The Evaluation team shall oversee the administration of evaluations to safeguard data integrity, minimize bias, and ensure compliance with this policy. Periodic audits or validation studies shall be conducted to ensure the reliability and fairness of evaluation instruments. Faculty members may report concerns about evaluation administration or data accuracy to the Evaluation team for review and resolution.

6.2 Policy Review. This Course Evaluation Policy shall be reviewed annually to ensure relevance, effectiveness, and alignment with best practices in higher education. The Office of Assessment and Accreditation and the Student Learning Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, shall be responsible for conducting the annual review and recommending any updates or revisions.

7. Responsibilities

- **Faculty Members:** Promote student awareness and active engagement with

the evaluation process; review feedback constructively.

- **Department Chairs:** Ensure compliance with policy provisions and assist instructors in interpreting evaluation data in context.
- **The Evaluation Team (Office of Institutional Data and Reporting & Office of Assessment and Accreditation):** Manage evaluation instruments; approve additional questions; uphold standards of confidentiality and policy enforcement.

8. Definitions

- **Course Evaluation:** A systematic process of gathering students' perceptions of the quality of instruction and learning experiences.
- **Instructor of Record:** The faculty member or teaching assistant formally responsible for instruction in a given course section.
- **Evaluation Period:** A designated timeframe at the end of a semester/session during which students complete evaluation forms.

9. Related Policies, Procedures, Statutes, and Regulations

A. Academic Integrity Policy:

[Section 3: Academic Regulations](#) (Page 18)

The integrity of an academic program rests on the principle that the grades awarded to students reflect only their own individual efforts and achievement. Students are required to perform the work specified by the instructor and are responsible for the content of work submitted, such as papers, reports, and examinations.

B. Faculty Handbook:

[Section C: University Organization](#) (Page 14)

Department chairs shall review the end-of-semester course evaluation results for each faculty member.

10. Evaluation Schedule

The Evaluation Team shall establish and maintain an annual course evaluation schedule covering the Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters. Course and enrollment data shall be extracted approximately two months before the opening of each evaluation period to allow sufficient time for data verification and cleaning. Academic units and responsible offices shall review and confirm course, instructor, section, modality, and enrollment information before data are uploaded into the course evaluation system. Clean and verified data shall be finalized and uploaded no later than six weeks before the evaluation period opens. The Evaluation team shall coordinate the administration of evaluations, monitor participation, generate reports, and archive evaluation records in accordance with institutional procedures.

Activity	Lead Person(s)/Office	Fall 2026	Spring 2027	Summer 2027
1. Extract course and enrollment data for evaluation preparation	Registrar's Office/ IT/Evaluation Team	Sept. 23, 2026	Feb. 26, 2027	May 5, 2027
2. Review and clean course, faculty, enrollment, and modality data	Registrar's Office/ IT/Evaluation Team	Sept. 24 – Oct. 2, 2026	Feb. 27 – Mar. 5, 2027	May 6 – 14, 2027
4. Finalize and upload clean data/files	Evaluation Team	By Oct. 9, 2026	By Mar. 12, 2027	By May 21, 2027
6. Notify faculty and students about upcoming course evaluations	Evaluation Team / Marketing & Communications	Nov. 9 – 13, 2026	Apr. 12 – 16, 2027	June 21–25, 2027
7. Administer course evaluations	Evaluation Team / Faculty	Nov. 23–Dec. 4, 2026	Apr. 26–May 7, 2027	July 5–16, 2027
8. Send reminders to students and faculty during the evaluation period	Evaluation Team / Faculty	Nov. 25 & Dec. 1, 2026	Apr. 28 & May 4, 2027	July 7 & 13, 2027
9. Close evaluation period and finalize response data	Evaluation Team	Dec. 4, 2026	May 7, 2027	July 16, 2027
10. Generate and review course evaluation reports	Evaluation Team	Dec. 7–15, 2026	May 10–18, 2027	July 19–25, 2027
11. Distribute course evaluation results to faculty	Evaluation Team	December 24, 2026	May 22, 2027	July 30, 2027

12. Faculty review evaluation results, identify areas for improvement, and incorporate findings into program/course improvement plans	Faculty / Department Chairs / Deans	Dec. 2026 – Jan. 2027	June 2027	August 2027
14. Archive evaluation data, reports, and documentation	Evaluation Team	Dec., 2026 – Jan., 2027	May–June 2027	July–August 2027
15. Review the evaluation process and identify improvements for the next cycle	All stakeholders	January 2027	June 2027	August 2027

Equity and Inclusion

NTU is committed to minimizing bias in student evaluations and ensuring fairness for all faculty members. Evaluation practices shall consider potential influences of gender, ethnicity, teaching style, or other factors, and safeguards shall be implemented to reduce the impact of such biases.

Transparency

NTU may publish aggregate evaluation summaries, without identifying individual instructors, to demonstrate institutional accountability, promote transparency, and support continuous improvement in teaching and learning.

Training and Support

Faculty shall have access to workshops, guides, and other resources to help interpret evaluation data and use the results effectively for professional development, curriculum enhancement, and instructional improvement.

Appendix A: Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ)

Face-to-Face

Section 1: The Course

Please rate your agreement with the following statements

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree

Q1. I was treated with respect in this course.

Q2. The course syllabus clearly explained course goals, requirements, and expectations, especially on academic honesty and plagiarism.

Q3. Course assignments and learning activities supported my understanding of course content.

Q4. I understood how to access academic and technical support services (e.g., tutoring, library, advising).

Q5. Class time was used effectively to support my learning.

Q6. The physical classroom environment (space, seating, lighting, and technology) supported my learning.

Q7. Instructional technology used in the classroom (e.g., projector, smartboard, and audio) functioned effectively.

Q8. I was informed about how to file a complaint or grievance if I experienced unresolved concerns.

Q9. This course contributed positively to my overall learning and academic development.

Q10. What did you find most effective or valuable about this course?

Q11. What suggestions do you have for improving this course or your learning experience?

Section 2: The Instructor

Please rate your agreement with the following statements

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree

Q12. The instructor presented course material clearly and effectively.

Q13. The instructor encouraged participation, questions, and expression of ideas.

Q14. The instructor provided timely and meaningful feedback on assignments, discussions, or assessments that supported my learning.

Q15. The instructor integrated the use of the Diné Philosophy of Education principles, methods, and/or applications.

Q16. The instructor was accommodating to different learning styles, abilities, and special needs.

Q17. I had sufficient opportunities to ask questions and receive immediate clarification during class.

Q18. The instructor met the class on time and typically held the class for the entire period, except when sick or attending previously announced professional meetings.

Q19. The classroom environment encouraged respectful dialogue and peer collaboration.

Q20. The instructor's teaching methods were effective.

Online/Hybrid

Section 1: The Course

Please rate your agreement with the following statements

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree

Q1. I was treated with respect in this course.

Q2. The course syllabus clearly explained course goals, requirements, and expectations, especially on academic honesty and plagiarism.

Q3. Course assignments and learning activities supported my understanding of course content.

Q4. I understood how to access academic and technical support services (e.g., tutoring, library, advising).

Q5. Course materials (videos, documents, online content) were accessible and usable with my available technology.

Q6. I was informed about how to request disability-related accommodation or accessibility support.

Q7. Blackboard was easy to navigate and supported my learning.

Q8. I had access to the necessary hardware, software, and internet connection to complete course requirements.

Q9. I was informed about how to file a complaint or appeal related to the course or instructor.

Q10. This course contributed positively to my overall learning and academic development.

Q11. What did you enjoy most about this online course?

Q12. If you could change one thing about this course or your online learning experience, what would it be and why?

Section 2: The Instructor

Please rate your agreement with the following statements

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree

Q13. The instructor presented course material clearly and effectively.

Q14. The instructor encouraged participation, questions, and expression of ideas.

Q15. The instructor provided timely and meaningful feedback on assignments, discussions, or assessments that supported my learning.

Q16. The instructor integrated the use of the Diné Philosophy of Education principles, methods, and/or applications.

Q17. The instructor was accommodating to different learning styles, abilities, and special needs.

Q18. The instructor initiated regular communication to guide my learning throughout the course.

Q19. I had opportunities to ask questions and receive timely responses from the instructor.

Q20. The instructor's teaching methods were effective.

Section 3: Department Questions (optional) — Up to 5 questions

NB: If your courses/programs include Lab Assistants or Teaching Assistants (TAs), departments can add a few targeted questions to evaluate their effectiveness and better support student learning.

Sample Questions

- I would recommend this course to other students.
- The lab assistant/teaching assistant was knowledgeable about the course material.
- The lab assistant/teaching assistant explained concepts clearly during lab sessions and discussion sessions.
- What did the lab assistant/teaching assistant do that most helped your learning?
- How well does this course fit within the overall program curriculum?
- The course prepared me with skills relevant to industry or employment.
- The course included experiences that reflect real workplace practices.
- The course contributed to my preparation for professional work.

Appendix B: Course Evaluation Review Form

School	Semester	Course Number & Title	CEQ Average	
			N	Mean
<i>Department chair and faculty reflections on the data and any planned action steps for improvement. Please identify specific factors that may have contributed to the results, such as instructional workload, class size, course evaluation patterns, course modality, or semester offered, first-time course teaching, and/or other contextual or personal considerations relevant to NTU.</i>				

Faculty:.....

Date:.....

Department Chair:.....

Date:.....

Reviewed by Academic Dean/Provost:.....

Date:.....

Appendix C: Interpretation of Likert Scale Ratings (5-Point Scale)

5 – Strongly Agree

Indicates a very high level of student satisfaction and strong evidence that the course or instructional practice is meeting or exceeding expectations. Scores at this level reflect consistent effectiveness and represent exemplary performance.

4 – Agree

Indicates overall positive student perceptions and strong performance. A mean score of 4.0 or higher exceeds the institutional benchmark. It suggests that the course or instructional practice is functioning very effectively, with no or limited immediate need for corrective action.

3 – Neutral (*Benchmark*)

Indicates acceptable student perceptions and meets the established institutional benchmark. A mean score of 3.0 suggests that the course or instructional practice is performing at a minimally satisfactory level. While results at this level are not necessarily problematic, they may warrant review to identify opportunities for improvement or to strengthen student experiences.

2 – Disagree

Indicates student dissatisfaction and concerns regarding the course or instructional practice. Mean scores below the 3.0 benchmark, and those closer to this level, suggest potential issues that require discussion, reflection, and targeted improvement strategies.

1 – Strongly Disagree

Indicates significant student dissatisfaction and clear evidence that expectations are not being met. Scores at this level signal serious concerns and the need for immediate review and corrective action.

Interpreting Mean Scores and Standard Deviation

In addition to reviewing individual Likert-scale responses, faculty should consider both the mean score and the standard deviation when interpreting course evaluation results. The mean reflects the overall level of student agreement with a given item and is used to determine whether the established institutional benchmark of 3.0 has been met. The standard deviation indicates the degree of consistency in student responses. A lower standard deviation suggests greater agreement among students, while a higher standard deviation reflects more varied experiences or perceptions. Faculty are encouraged to use the mean and standard deviation together to identify areas of strength, recognize consistent instructional practices, and pinpoint items that may benefit from further reflection or targeted improvement.

For example: Question: *I was treated with respect in this class.*

Total Responses: 15

- **Mean (Average): 4.75**

A mean of 4.75 indicates that students generally agreed or strongly agreed that they were treated with respect in the class. This suggests that respectful interactions were a consistent part of the course environment.

- **Median (Middle Value): 5**

The median of 5 shows that at least half of the respondents selected *Strongly Agree*, indicating that many students experienced a high level of respect in their interactions within the class.

- **Standard Deviation: 0.66**

The relatively low standard deviation indicates limited variation in student responses. Most students reported similar perceptions, suggesting that experiences of respect were fairly consistent across the class.

Taken together, these results suggest that students generally felt respected in the class, with minimal differences in individual experiences. While no course is experienced identically by all students, the data indicate a broadly positive and consistent classroom climate regarding student treatment.