UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy
Policy and Procedures on *Student Evaluation* of Course and Instructor Effectiveness

Overview

The School uses an online course evaluation system, eXplorance Blue, to gather student feedback on courses and instructors. This system is contracted and used in collaboration with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Process for Conducting *Student Evaluation* of Course and Instructor Effectiveness

The Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment (OSPA) assumes responsibility, on behalf of the School, for facilitating the course evaluation process for all required and elective course offerings in the School. It is the shared responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to contribute to the course evaluation process to ensure its success. The process includes: 1) preparing the online system, 2) conducting the evaluations, 3) disseminating results, 4) reviewing findings, and 5) implementing changes, as needed.

Purpose of Gathering Student Feedback on Courses and Instructors

Student evaluation is one component of an overall course and instructor assessment process. The evaluations:
- provide *students* an opportunity to share feedback on the course, instructors, and facilitators;
- provide *instructors and facilitators* with feedback regarding student perceptions of the course and their teaching;
- provide the *School* with data to consider in course and curricular quality improvement efforts; and,
- provide the *School's leadership* with information regarding student perceptions of courses and instructors.

General Policies and Procedures

- All required and elective School-based courses (i.e., have a course identifier from the School) offered in the professional program and the graduate program will be evaluated using eXplorance Blue. Student auditors and teaching assistants will not be included in the evaluation.

- Course directors will provide the requested information about instructors and facilitators to be evaluated. Course directors will also have the opportunity to request custom items. *While it is important to consider the potential burden on students of having to evaluate multiple instructors within a course, it is also important to consider the need for instructor evaluations (e.g., promotion and tenure reviews, course improvement needs, etc.). Therefore, course directors are encouraged to be selective, yet thoughtful in their approach to indicating those instructors to be evaluated.*

- Course directors may request to the OSPA that assigned teaching assistants be evaluated via Qualtrics survey.

- Student auditors will be allowed to complete a course evaluation in Qualtrics at the end of the semester. However, these course evaluations will not be included in OSPA's review of course and instructor effectiveness.

- Evaluations, unless otherwise requested, will be released to students approximately two weeks prior to the last day of classes and will remain open for approximately one week after final exams.

- Students will receive emails from the OSPA to encourage evaluation completion. An initial email will be sent when the evaluation period opens, and multiple reminders, as needed, before the evaluation period closes.

- Students who serve on School related committees (e.g., Graduate Education Committee, Curriculum and Assessment Committee) and the School's Class Presidents will encourage student participation via email and in-person announcements, as needed.

- Faculty and staff (e.g., Director and/or Assistant Director of the Office of Curricular and Student Affairs) who work closely with professional and graduate students may encourage student participation via email, as needed.

- Student feedback will be kept confidential, and no information linking identity to responses can be accessed by course directors, instructors, or teaching assistants. *Of note, the School's promise to maintain student confidentiality does*

not apply when the university has a responsibility to act on comments provided, such as reports of violations of the law or university policy, or when comments raise significant safety concerns.

- Course directors should emphasize to students the importance of the evaluations and encourage students to complete the course evaluation. Since response rates are highest when class time is used, the OSPA recommends course directors set aside 15-20 minutes of class time for students to complete the evaluation.

- Course directors should monitor response rates by visiting the eXplorance Blue portal (https://blueeval.unc.edu/blue/) or reviewing the email updates provided by the OSPA.

- Students should not receive points or extra credit for completion of the course evaluations.

- After final grades are submitted to the School Registrar and within 1 week of the course evaluation period closing, course directors and instructors will receive an email providing a link to access their results. Course directors and school-based instructors can also access their results by visiting the eXplorance Blue portal (https://blueeval.unc.edu/blue/).

  o Course directors will have access to reports for the course and all instructors and facilitators.

  o Instructors will receive the overall course evaluation and their individual results, but not the results of other instructors in the course.

  o Facilitators may request the overall course evaluation and their individual facilitator results from the course director.

- The OSPA will download and archive all course evaluation results on the School's server at the end of each evaluation period.

- The OSPA, using established criteria *(see Table 2)* will review all course evaluation results within 6 weeks of the close of the evaluation period to identify courses or instructors who "warrant further review" or are "worthy of recognition".

  o Findings will be presented to the School's Executive Committee, the Associate Dean for Professional Education, Assistant Dean for Professional Curriculum, Assistant Dean for Graduate Education, Chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC), and Chair of the Graduate Education Committee (GEC) for review and discussion.

  o Course directors and/or instructors meeting the School's criteria for "warrant further review" will be asked by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee or the Graduate Education Committee to provide a reflective statement on his/her evaluation findings and plans for improvement. It is important to seek insight and feedback into plans for improvement from his/her Division Chair in the reflective process.

  o The reflective statement will be shared with appropriate parties (e.g., Program Deans; Professional Program Curriculum and Assessment Committee or Graduate Education Committee; Division Chair; Course Director; Instructor; Divisional Director of Graduate Studies; OSPA).

- Historical course evaluation data are available, dating back to 2003. Results may be requested by a course director, an instructor within a specified course, or the School's leadership team. The OSPA will respond to such requests within 1 week.

Table 1: Shared Responsibilities

Student	- Complete evaluations for each course in which you are enrolled. Provide thoughtful and constructive feedback regarding courses and instructors.

Course Director	• At the beginning of the semester, complete data request to: 1) indicate the instructors and facilitators to be evaluated in the course*; 2) state the intent to decline or develop custom questions; and, 3) identify any student auditors or teaching assistants. *(*Ask instructors teaching in your course if they need to be evaluated by students for upcoming promotion and/or tenure reviews.)*
	• During the semester, emphasize the importance of student completion of the evaluations and use of data for continued quality improvement.
	• At the end of the semester, encourage evaluation completion and set aside 15-20 minutes in class, if possible, in an effort to increase response rates.
	• After the semester, thoughtfully consider student feedback in an effort to continually enhance course offerings and teaching effectiveness.
	• If your *course* meets the School's criteria for "warrant further review", respond to requests from the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and/or Graduate Education Committee to provide a reflective statement. It is important to seek insight and feedback into plans for improvement with your Division Chair in the reflective process.
	• If *an instructor in your course* meets the School's criteria for "warrant further review", schedule a time to meet with him/her to discuss evaluation findings and plans for improvement.
	• If *an instructor in your course* meets the School's criteria for "worthy of recognition", you may wish to informally congratulate him/her.
Faculty / Instructor / Facilitator	• At the beginning of the semester, inform course director(s) if you need to be evaluated for upcoming promotion and/or review. (*Not all instructors are evaluated by students.*)
	• After the semester, thoughtfully consider student feedback in an effort to continually enhance course offerings and teaching effectiveness.
	• If *your teaching* meets the School's criteria for "warranting further review", respond to requests from the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and/or Graduate Education Committee to provide a reflective statement. It is important to seek insight and feedback into plans for improvement with your Division Chair prior in the reflective process.
Division Chair	• Ensure faculty in division are attentive and responsive to feedback provided by students and program leadership, and that faculty remain effective in their role as educators.
	• Work with course directors and/or instructors to address areas "warranting further review".
	• Acknowledge course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "worthy of recognition". Formal recognition will come from the Associate Dean for Professional Education or the Assistant Dean for Graduate Education.
Registrar	• Prior to the semester, review course syllabi to ensure: 1) required statement on course evaluations is included, and 2) credit or points are not awarded as an incentive to students for completion of a course evaluation.
	• Prior to the semester, provide the OSPA with information required for evaluation setup.

UNC | ESHELMAN SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

Policy and Procedures on Student Evaluations of Course and Teaching Effectiveness
Prepared by the Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment (OSPA)

Associate Dean for Professional Education **Assistant Dean of Graduate Education**	• After the semester, review evaluation results and summary reports of courses and instructors identified as "warrants further review" or "worthy of recognition". Consider evaluation results in course and curricular quality improvement efforts. • Acknowledge course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "worthy of recognition". • Along with the Chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and/or Graduate Education Committee, reach consensus on communication plans for courses and/or instructors identified as "warrant further review". • Along with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and/or Graduate Education Committee, review and discuss reflective statement from course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "warrants further review".
Chair, Curriculum and Assessment Committee **Chair, Graduate Education Committee**	• Review evaluation results and summary reports including courses and instructors identified as "warrant further review" or "worthy of recognition". Consider evaluation results in course and curricular quality improvement efforts. • Along with the Associate Dean for Professional Education or the Assistant Dean for Graduate Education, reach consensus on communication plans for courses and/or instructors identified as "warrants further review". • Share summary reports of courses and instructors identified as "warrant further review" and "worthy of recognition" with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee or Graduate Education Committee. • On behalf of the Curriculum and Assessment or Graduate Education Committee, send letters to course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "warrants further review" (draft letters provided by the OSPA), highlighting review criteria met, and asking for a reflective statement on evaluation results. • Along with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee or Graduate Education Committee and professional or graduate program leadership, review and discuss reflective statement from course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "warrant further review," as needed. • Acknowledge receipt of reflective statement, providing recommendations as needed.
Curriculum and Assessment Committee **Graduate Education Committee**	• Review summary reports of courses and instructors identified as "warrants further review" and "worthy of recognition" (provided by the OSPA). Consider course evaluation results in course and curricular quality improvement efforts. • Review and discuss reflective statement from course director(s) and/or instructor(s) identified as "warrant further review," as needed. • Monitor courses or instructors identified as "warrant further review" and ensure that issues are addressed. • Review course evaluation instruments and this policy document, as needed.

Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment (OSPA)	- Request that course directors indicate: 1) instructors and facilitators to be evaluated, 2) intent to use custom questions, and 3) student auditors or teaching assistants. Work with course directors to develop custom questions (when requested). - Prepare and provide necessary course, instructor, and student data files and email messages for online course evaluation system. - Download and archive all course evaluation results on the School's computer server. - Review all course evaluation results using established criteria at the end of each semester. - Email course evaluation results to the Associate Dean for Professional Education and the Assistant Dean for Graduate Education, and the Chairs of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Education Committee. - Create a summary report each semester and annually. Share reports with the School's Executive Committee, the Associate Dean for Professional Education, Assistant Dean for Professional Curriculum, the Assistant Dean for Graduate Education, and the Chairs of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Education Committee. Post de-identified summary reports on the OSPA website. - Provide the Chairs of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Education Committee with draft letters for Instructor(s) or Course Director(s) identified as "warrant further review", as requested. - Provide the Associate Dean for Professional Education and the Assistant Dean for Graduate Education with draft letters for Instructor(s) or Course Director(s) identified as "worthy of recognition", as requested. - Review course evaluation instruments and revise this policy document, as needed.

Endorsed by the Assessment Committee, 03-21-2012; Revised, 01-07-2014

Table 2: Course Evaluation Review Criteria

The Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment reviews all professional and graduate course evaluation results (including electives) using the below criteria:

Course
  A. Courses Warranting Further Review
    1. Median rating of <3 on 3 or more questions; **OR**,
    2. Median rating of <3 for "overall rating of course" question
  B. Courses Worthy of Recognition
    1. Median rating ≥ 4.5 on 4 or more questions; **AND**,
    2. Median rating ≥ 4.5 for "overall rating of course" question

Instructor
  C. Instructors Warranting Further Review
    1. Median rating of <3 for " Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher." question
  D. Instructors Worthy of Recognition
    1. Median rating ≥ 4.5 for " Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher." question

Custom Questions: Custom questions will not be included in OSPA's review of course evaluation results.

Graduate Program:
- In order for graduate courses/instructors to be identified as "warranting further review" or "worthy of recognition", student response rates on course evaluations must be approximately 80% for courses with 10 or fewer students, and approximately 60% for courses with 11 or more students.

Appendix A: Current School-based Course Evaluation Instrument

Note: all instruments will be updated as needed with input and endorsement of the School's curriculum and assessment committees.

Course Characteristics

	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Sometimes	4: Usually	5: Always	Not Applicable
The course was well organized.						
The in-class activities/exercises contributed to my learning.						
The assessments were clearly connected to the course outcomes.						
This course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter.						
Communication and feedback from the course instructor(s) were timely.						

	1: Poor	2: Fair	3: Good	4: Very Good	5: Excellent
Please indicate your overall rating of this course.					

Please comment on the strengths of the course.	
In this course, what helped you learn? was motivational? was valued/useful?	
Please comment on what would have made the course a better learning experience for you.	
In this course, what hindered your learning? was demotivating? was not valued/useful?	

Instructor Characteristics for [Name of Instructor]

	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree / Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	Comments
The instructor actively engages me in learning in the classroom.							
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.							

Small-Group Facilitator Characteristics for [Name of Facilitator]

	1: Very Ineffective	2: Ineffective	3: Somewhat effective	4: Effective	5: Very Effective	I did not work with this facilitator.
The facilitator challenged the team's thinking in helpful, productive ways						
The facilitator helped the team improve our team's creative thinking skills						
The facilitator helped improve our team's clinical decision making process						
The facilitator helped me improve my own clinical decision making process						
The facilitator helped me become a more effective, efficient self-directed learner						