UNC | ESHELMAN SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

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

Overview

The School uses the Blue Evaluation System, an online platform by Explorance, to gather student feedback on courses and educators. 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 Educator Effectiveness

The Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE) assumes responsibility for facilitating the evaluation process for all required and elective course offerings and associated educators (e.g., course director, instructor, facilitator) on behalf of the School. Faculty, staff, and students share the responsibility of the evaluation process to ensure its success. The process includes: 1) preparing the online system, 2) conducting the evaluations with established instrument *(see Appendix A)*, 3) disseminating results, 4) reviewing findings, and 5) implementing changes, as needed.

Purpose of Gathering Student Feedback on Courses and Educators

Student evaluation is one component of an overall course and educator assessment process. The evaluations:
- provide *students* an opportunity to share feedback on the course and educators
- provide *educators* 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
- provide the *School's leadership* with information on student perceptions of courses and educators

Student evaluations of course and educator effectiveness serve as one source of teaching effectiveness.

General Policies and Procedures

Before evaluations open

- All required and elective School-based didactic, credit-bearing 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.

- OE will coordinate with University and School units in the management of data sources connected to the Blue Evaluation System.

- Course directors will provide the requested information about educators to be evaluated (e.g., co-course director, instructors, facilitators), and will have an opportunity to request custom items. OE will build and administer the instrument in the Blue Evaluation System.

During evaluations

- Evaluations will be released to students approximately 1 – 2 weeks prior to the last day of classes and will remain open approximately 2 – 3 weeks, closing near the last day of exams, unless otherwise requested.

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

- Course directors are responsible for monitoring response rates in the Blue Evaluation System (https://blueeval.unc.edu/blue/) and by reviewing email updates provided by OE.

- Students can access their evaluations:

  - Via links in emails from OE. An initial email will be sent when evaluations open and multiple reminders before evaluations close.
  - Directly at https://blueeval.unc.edu/Blue/ with onyen login.
  - Via **ConnectCarolina** by clicking "Blue Course Evaluation System" under Student HomePage Links.

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

- Students who serve on School related committees (e.g., Graduate Education Committee, Curriculum and Assessment Committee) and the School's Class Presidents will encourage students to complete evaluations via email, social media posts, and in-person announcements, as needed.

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

After evaluations close

- Student feedback will be kept confidential, and no information linking identity to responses can be accessed by course directors, instructors, facilitators, or teaching assistants. *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.*

- After final grades are submitted to the School Registrar and within 1 week of the evaluation period closing, course directors, instructors, and facilitators will receive an email providing a link to access their results. Educators with PID-based Blue profiles can also access their results directly in the Blue Evaluation System (https://blueeval.unc.edu/blue/).

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

  - Instructors will receive their individual results and the overall course results, but not the results of other educators in the course.

  - Facilitators will receive their individual results and the overall course results, but not the results of other educators in the course.

  - Educator and course reports shared with School administrators (e.g., program deans, division chairs) for the purpose of evaluating the educator's teaching are considered protected human resources (HR) documents.

- OE will archive all evaluation results on the School's server at the end of each evaluation period.

- OE, using established criteria *(see Appendix B)*, will review all evaluation results within 6 weeks of the close of the evaluation period to identify courses or educators who "warrant further review" or are "worthy of recognition."

  - Findings will be presented to the School's Executive Committee, the Executive Vice Dean-Chief Academic Officer, Division Chairs, 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.

ESHELMAN SCHOOL
OF PHARMACY

Policy and Procedures on Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness
Prepared by the Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE)

- Courses and/or educators identified as "warranting further review" will be reviewed by the CAC and GEC Chairs, Division Chairs, Associate Dean for Professional Education, Assistant Dean for Graduate Education, and Executive Vice Dean Chief Academic Officer.

- Course directors and/or educators meeting the School's criteria for "warrant further review" will be asked by the CAC or the GEC to provide a reflective statement on his/her evaluation findings and plans for improvement within 4 weeks of the request. It is important to seek insight and incorporate feedback into plans for improvement from his/her Division Chair and the course director (if applicable) in the reflective process.

- The reflective statement will be shared with appropriate parties (e.g., Program Deans; CAC or GEC; Division Chair; Course Director; Instructor; OE; Executive Vice Dean Chief Academic Officer).

- OE is responsible for archiving criteria review documents (e.g., reflective statement).

- Historical evaluation data are available. Results may be requested by a course director, an instructor within a specified course, or the School's leadership team. OE 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 educators (e.g., feedback that is clear, specific, and respectful).
Course Director	- At the beginning of the semester, complete data request to: 1) Indicate educators to be evaluated in the course (ask if they need to be evaluated by students for upcoming promotion and/or tenure reviews) 2) State the intent to decline or develop custom questions *It is important to balance the total length of the evaluation and potential burden on students with the need for educator evaluations and custom items (e.g., upcoming promotion or tenure review, course improvement needs).* - The course evaluation instrument is 13 items in length when only 1 educator is evaluated (8 course and 5 educator items). Be aware of total item count when indicating the number of educators to be evaluated. - For example, a course with 4 educators (1 course director and 3 instructors) in which the student selects their 1 facilitator will contain: 8 course items (7 scaled, 1 open-ended) 20 instructor items = x 4 individuals x 5 items (4 scaled, 1 open-ended) 5 facilitator items (4 scaled, 1 open-ended) - Overall = 33 items (27 scaled and 6 open-ended) - 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 dedicate in class time for students to complete the course evaluations. *Best practice is to reserve time during the middle of the class session.*
	• 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 CAC and/or GEC to provide a reflective statement within 4 weeks. It is important to seek insight and feedback from your Division Chair and incorporate into your plans for improvement as part of the reflective process.
	• If *an educator 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 educator in your course* meets the School's criteria for "worthy of recognition," you may wish to informally congratulate him/her.
Educator: 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 educators need to be 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 CAC and/or GEC to provide a reflective statement within 4 weeks. It is important to seek insight and feedback from your Division Chair and the course director to incorporate into your plans for improvement as part of the reflective process.
Division Chair	• Ensure faculty in the division are attentive and responsive to feedback provided by students and program leadership and remain effective in their role as educators.
	• Work with course directors and/or educators to address areas "warranting further review."
	• Acknowledge course directors and/or educators 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 evaluations is included, and 2) credit or points are not awarded as an incentive to students for completion of an evaluation.
	• Prior to the semester, provide OE with information required for evaluation setup.
Associate Dean for Professional Education	• After the semester, review evaluation results and summary reports of courses and educators identified as "warrants further review" or "worthy of recognition." Consider evaluation results in course and curricular quality improvement efforts.

ESHELMAN SCHOOL
OF PHARMACY

Policy and Procedures on Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness
Prepared by the Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE)

Assistant Dean of Graduate Education	• Acknowledge course directors and/or educators identified as "worthy of recognition." • Along with the Chair of the CAC and/or GEC, reach consensus on communication plans for courses and/or educators identified as "warrant further review." Coordinate communication efforts with the educator's Division Chair, as needed. • Along with the CAC and/or GEC, review and discuss reflective statement from course directors and/or educators identified as "warrants further review."
Chair, Curriculum and Assessment Committee **Chair, Graduate Education Committee**	• Review evaluation results and summary reports including courses and educators 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 educators identified as "warrants further review." Coordinate communication efforts with the educator's Division Chair, as needed. • Share summary reports of courses and educators identified as "warrant further review" and "worthy of recognition" with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee or Graduate Education Committee. • On behalf of the CAC or GEC, send letters to course directors and/or educators identified as "warrants further review" (draft letters provided by OE), highlighting review criteria met, and asking for a reflective statement on evaluation results. • Along with the CAC or GEC and professional or graduate program leadership, review and discuss reflective statement from course directors and/or educators identified as "warrant further review," as needed. • Acknowledge receipt of reflective statement, and provide recommendations as needed.
Curriculum and Assessment Committee **Graduate Education Committee**	• Review summary reports of courses and educators identified as "warrants further review" and "worthy of recognition" (provided by OE). Consider evaluation results in course and curricular quality improvement efforts. • Review and discuss reflective statement from course directors and/or educators identified as "warrant further review," as needed. • Monitor courses or educators identified as "warrant further review" and ensure that issues are addressed. • Review current evaluation instruments and this policy document, as needed.
Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE)	• Request that course directors indicate: 1) instructors and facilitators to be evaluated and 2) intent to use custom questions. Work with course directors to develop custom questions (when requested). • Prepare necessary course, educator, and student data files and email messages for online evaluation system.

	- Download and archive all evaluation results on the School's server. - Review all evaluation results using established criteria at the end of each semester. - Email summary of 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 semesterly and annually. Share reports with the School's Executive Committee, the Executive Vice Dean – Chief Academic Officer, 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 OE website. - Provide the Chairs of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Education Committee with draft letters for Educator(s) or Course(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 Educator(s) or Course(s) identified as "worthy of recognition," as requested. - Review current evaluation instrument and revise this policy document, as needed.

![UNC ESHELMAN SCHOOL OF PHARMACY]

Policy and Procedures on Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness
Prepared by the Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE)

Appendix A: Instrument for Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness[1]

A. Course Characteristics

	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
The course was organized.						
The activities/exercises contributed to my learning.						
The assessments were connected to the course outcomes.						
This course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter.						
Communication and feedback helped me gauge my performance in the course.						
The course content related to cultural diversity enhanced my learning experience.[2]						

Overall, this course was excellent.	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Please discuss the reasons for your overall rating of this course.						

B. Instructor Characteristics for [Name of Instructor][3]

	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
The instructor used teaching methods that helped me better understand the subject matter.						
The instructor's communication strategies were effective.						
I was treated with respect.[2]						

Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Please discuss the reasons for your overall rating of instructor: [Name of Instructor]						

C. Small-Group Facilitator Characteristics for [Name of Facilitator][4]

	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
The facilitator guided our group discussion to facilitate learning.						
The facilitator's communication strategies were effective.						
I was treated with respect.[2]						

Overall, the facilitator was an effective teacher.	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neither Disagree/Agree	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Please discuss the reasons for your overall rating of facilitator: [Name of Facilitator]						

D. Course-specific custom questions curated by the Course Director (if applicable)

---

[1] Instrument updated as needed with input and endorsement of the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy's curriculum and assessment committees.

[2] Diversity and Inclusion questions added Spring 2021.

[3] Instructor questions repeat for each person listed by the course director.

[4] Student selects their facilitator(s), and questions repeat for each selected. Questions appear only for courses with facilitators, who are listed by the course director.

ESHELMAN SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

Policy and Procedures on Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness
Prepared by the Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment (OE)

Endorsed by the School's curriculum and assessment committees 03-21-2012; Revised 01-07-2014, 12-16-2022

Appendix B: Assessment Criteria for Student Evaluation of Course and Educator Effectiveness

The Office of Organizational Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment evaluates results from student evaluation of course and educator effectiveness using the following criteria:

Course
   A. Courses Warranting Further Review
   1. Median rating of <3 on ≥3 course characteristics items, **OR**
   2. Median rating of <3 on "Overall, this course was excellent."
   B. Courses Worthy of Recognition
   1. Median rating ≥4.5 on ≥4 course characteristics items, **AND**
   2. Median rating ≥4.5 on "Overall, this course was excellent."

Instructor
   C. Instructors Warranting Further Review
   1. Median rating of <3 on ≥1 instructor characteristics items, **OR**
   2. Median rating of <3 on "Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher."
   D. Instructors Worthy of Recognition
   1. Median rating of ≥4.5 on ≥2 instructor characteristics items, **AND**
   2. Median rating ≥4.5 on "Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher."

Facilitator
   E. Facilitators Warranting Further Review
   3. Median rating of <3 on ≥ 1 facilitator characteristics items, **OR**
   4. Median rating of <3 on "Overall, the facilitator was an effective teacher."
   F. Facilitators Worthy of Recognition
   3. Median rating of ≥4.5 on ≥2 facilitator characteristics items, **AND**
   4. Median rating ≥4.5 on "Overall, the facilitator was an effective teacher."

Custom Questions: Custom questions will not be included in OE's evaluation of results.

Response Rate Thresholds
- Graduate Program: For graduate courses and educators to be identified as "worthy of recognition,"
   - courses with ≤10 students must have response rates ≥60%
   - courses with ≥11 students must have response rates ≥50%