

# Rutgers University

## Spring 2018 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

**Course:** 19: 910: 514: 11HBSE: ADDICTNLIFESPN: 2018SP - HBSE: ADDICTN LIFESPN 19: 910: 514: 11

**Instructor:** Frank L. II Greenagel \*

**Response Rate:** 11/18 (61.11 %)

### 1 - The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner.

Frank L. II Greenagel

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means							
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.64	4.51					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%	█								
Agree	(4)	2	18.18%	█								
Strongly Agree	(5)	8	72.73%	█								
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%									
					0	25	50	100	Instructor	Department		
<b>Response Rate</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>			<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)		4.64	0.67	5.00	2640			4.51	0.89	5.00		

### 2 - The instructor generated interest in the course material.

Frank L. II Greenagel

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means							
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.82	4.45					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%	█								
Agree	(4)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Agree	(5)	10	90.91%	█								
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%									
					0	25	50	100	Instructor	Department		
<b>Response Rate</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>			<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)		4.82	0.60	5.00	2644			4.45	0.93	5.00		

### 3 - The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions.

Frank L. II Greenagel

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means							
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.73	4.42					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%	█								
Agree	(4)	1	9.09%	█								
Strongly Agree	(5)	9	81.82%	█								
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%									
					0	25	50	100	Instructor	Department		
<b>Response Rate</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>			<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)		4.73	0.65	5.00	2634			4.42	0.98	5.00		

### 4 - The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material.

Frank L. II Greenagel

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means							
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.64	4.52					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%	█								
Agree	(4)	2	18.18%	█								
Strongly Agree	(5)	8	72.73%	█								
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%									
					0	25	50	100	Instructor	Department		
<b>Response Rate</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>			<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)		4.64	0.67	5.00	2635			4.52	0.89	5.00		

**Rutgers University**  
**Spring 2018 Student Instructional Rating Surveys**

**Course:** 19: 910: 514: 11HBSE: ADDICTNLIFESPN: 2018SP - HBSE: ADDICTN LIFESPN 19: 910: 514: 11

**Instructor:** Frank L. II Greenagel \*

**Response Rate:** 11/18 (61.11 %)

5 - The instructor assigned grades fairly.									
Frank L. II Greenagel									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.55	4.45		
Disagree	(2)	1	9.09%	█					
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%						
Agree	(4)	2	18.18%	█					
Strongly Agree	(5)	8	72.73%	██████████					
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%						
					Instructor	Department			
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)	4.55	0.93	5.00	2643	4.45	0.91	5.00		

6 - The instructional methods encouraged student learning.									
Frank L. II Greenagel									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.73	4.36		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%						
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%	█					
Agree	(4)	1	9.09%	█					
Strongly Agree	(5)	9	81.82%	██████████					
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%						
					Instructor	Department			
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)	4.73	0.65	5.00	2633	4.36	0.99	5.00		

7 - I learned a great deal in this course.									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			4.73	4.35		
Disagree	(2)	1	9.09%	█					
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%						
Agree	(4)	0	0.00%						
Strongly Agree	(5)	10	90.91%	██████████					
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%						
					Instructor	Department			
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)	4.73	0.90	5.00	2614	4.35	0.96	5.00		

8 - I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course.									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			5.00	4.00		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%						
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%						
Agree	(4)	0	0.00%						
Strongly Agree	(5)	11	100.00%	██████████					
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%						
					Instructor	Department			
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Median</b>		
11/18 (61.11%)	5.00	0.00	5.00	2611	4.00	1.11	4.00		

**Rutgers University**  
**Spring 2018 Student Instructional Rating Surveys**

**Course:** 19: 910: 514: 11HBSE: ADDICTNLIFESPN: 2018SP - HBSE: ADDICTN LIFESPN 19: 910: 514: 11

**Instructor:** Frank L. II Greenagel \*

**Response Rate:** 11/18 (61.11%)

9 - I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as:										
Frank L. II Greenagel										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means					
1 = Poor	(1)	1	9.09%		4.36		4.46			
2	(2)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.46			
3	(3)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.46			
4	(4)	3	27.27%		4.36		4.46			
5 = Excellent	(5)	7	63.64%		4.36		4.46			
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.46			
					0	25	50	100		
Response Rate		Mean	STD	Median	Department		Mean	STD	Median	
11/18 (61.11%)		4.36	1.21	5.00	2635		4.46	0.88	5.00	

10 - I rate the overall quality of the course as:										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means					
1 = Poor	(1)	1	9.09%		4.36		4.36			
2	(2)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.36			
3	(3)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.36			
4	(4)	3	27.27%		4.36		4.36			
5 = Excellent	(5)	7	63.64%		4.36		4.36			
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		4.36		4.36			
					0	25	50	100		
Response Rate		Mean	STD	Median	Department		Mean	STD	Median	
11/18 (61.11%)		4.36	1.21	5.00	2600		4.36	0.90	5.00	

11 - What do you like best about this course?	
Response Rate	7/18 (38.89%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I really enjoyed learning about different issues that exist at this time as they relate to substance use, from Suboxone use to multi-family therapy, to the debate about legalization of marijuana and possible negative consequences associated with such legalization.</li> <li>This was a great starter course for the ACT program. I learned a lot about addiction and Greenagel knows the material very well.</li> <li>I like that the professor is helpful and has generated deeper interest into the subject.</li> <li>The teacher wanted the students to do well and had a passion and great amount of knowledge in the subject</li> <li>I think I learned the most from this class compared to most classes I've taken.</li> <li>I like that Frank is incredibly knowledgeable and his passion for the topic is contagious. I am glad he listened to student concerns and mid-semester evaluations and stopped cursing like he was going for the world record. I like the all day format and think more courses should be offered like that.</li> <li>The subject matter drawn directly from the DSM was helpful.</li> </ul>	

# Rutgers University

## Spring 2018 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

**Course:** 19: 910: 514: 11HBSE: ADDICTNLIFESPN: 2018SP - HBSE: ADDICTN LIFESPN 19: 910: 514: 11

**Instructor:** Frank L. II Greenagel \*

**Response Rate:** 11/18 (61.11 %)

### 12 - If you were teaching this course, what would you do differently?

<b>Response Rate</b>	7/18 (38.89%)
----------------------	---------------

- Nothing really.
- I am not a fan of the hybrid class format. I would have benefited from increased in-class lectures, as well as being able to interact with classmates through discussion. I would have preferred the class quizzes presented differently, ie. prepared and handed out on paper, instead of slide presentation.
- I suggest that the school adds more days to meet in person. There is not enough time to get in depth with the subject over the course of 4 meetings. It would benefit the professor and the students if we could meet either weekly or twice a month.
- not a hybrid course
- N/A
- We had about 26 hours of classroom time, whereas traditional classes had 40 hours this semester. I think this class would benefit from 5 sessions instead of 4, giving us at least 32 hours.
- Dress in something other than ratty jeans. I would not drop so many f-bombs in a 6-hour class. I would not dismiss the department-assigned reading list in favor of a dozen "articles" I myself had written and posted online somewhere.

### 13 - In what ways, if any, has this course or the instructor encouraged your intellectual growth and progress?

<b>Response Rate</b>	6/18 (33.33%)
----------------------	---------------

- The course definitely encouraged me to look at addiction in an enhanced way and further understand that everyone's treatment is unique.
- Professor Greenagel is experienced and knowledgeable in the field of addiction. He is passionate about improving the treatment of alcohol and drug abuse from the ground to international level and demonstrates this in his lectures. He is able to engage and relay relevant information in his class presentations, as well as keep us awake for 7.5 hours. He supplemented course readings with articles that were relevant to the field and offered further insight as to what is occurring on the direct practice, community, state, and national level. He also offered opportunities outside the classroom to learn about what is occurring in local communities, as well as professionally.
- I was already interested in learning more about addictions, but the professor has challenged all of us to think outside of the box, which has encouraged me to pick up readings outside of what is offered in this course and continue to grow my interest in this subject.
- The instructor is passionate about what he's teaching and truly wants everyone to gain as much knowledge from the course as possible.
- He challenges us in a safe environment. That is a hard balance to find.
- None.

### 14 - Other comments or suggestions:

<b>Response Rate</b>	4/18 (22.22%)
----------------------	---------------

- I really enjoyed the class and the various topics we learned about. I learned a lot of new information about substance use and the treatment of individuals who are experiencing issues related to substance use.
- Professor is really smart, intelligent and knowledgeable, but has a bad habit with the f and s bombs. One or two are not a problem, but it's way more than that. Recommendation to all professors: ban the words "like" and "basically" from students when they answer in class or when doing presentations. It's for their benefit.
- N/A
- Frank Greenagel is typical of the worst adjunct professors I have endured at Rutgers. He is self-aggrandizing, opinionated, and unprofessional.