

Evaluation of Teaching Policy College of Pharmacy

This policy describes the expected process for evaluation of teaching in the College of Pharmacy.

1. Student Evaluation of Teaching

The student evaluation system has three components:

- Student course and instructor surveys
- Perspective surveys from graduating P4 students and/or recent graduates
- Dean's student focus groups

A. Student Course and Instructor Surveys

1. Student evaluation is mandatory for all courses in the undergraduate, professional, and graduate programs with a student enrollment of >5 students. Exceptions must be granted by the Department Head.
2. Students will evaluate courses and teachers in separate surveys, even when a course has one instructor.
3. At the beginning of each semester, the Department Head will inform the course coordinator which instructors from their department should undergo an instructor evaluation in that course.
4. Students should be allowed a reasonable period (approximately 5 days) to complete surveys, which should generally be completed before final exams.
5. The results of instructor (as opposed to course) evaluations will be accessible only to the instructor and the Department Head.
6. The results of course evaluation data will be accessible to the course instructor(s), the Department Head, and to the Dean's office.
7. The results of surveys will be released only after final grades for courses have been filed.
8. Instructor and course evaluation data are required for inclusion in promotion documents and annual review reports. The statistical measures of variability should be reported along with results of evaluations.
9. Each survey will contain some Pharmacy-wide questions (see Appendix 1). Departments may also add department-wide questions.

B. Perspectives of Recent Graduates

The Dean's office will utilize the AACP graduating student survey to gather student views on the curriculum and how well it has prepared them for practice.

C. Student Focus Groups

The Dean and Senior Associate Dean will meet with focus groups from each year of the professional program to solicit input on the courses for each professional year. While protecting the anonymities of participating students, information gathered from these

focus groups will be shared with the Department Heads, Curriculum Committee, Assessment Committee, and Executive Committee, as appropriate.

2. Peer Review of Teaching

Peer review of teaching is designed to provide formative information for faculty development and to provide an assessment of teaching for promotion and tenure decisions. The process of peer review may be initiated by a request from any faculty member who wishes such a review or at the discretion of the Department Head. A peer review team will be appointed by the Department Head or their designee to conduct the review and the process is outlined below.

Faculty appointed as Assistant Professor (tenure or clinical track) in Fall 2011 or later are required to have completed at least two reviews of teaching by peers by the time of their promotional review to provide an opportunity for assessment of trends in their teaching. A summary of the peer review information must be included in the promotion document and the faculty member should indicate what improvements/modifications in their teaching arose as a result of the peer review.

A. Peer Review Team Process

1. In consultation with the faculty member to be reviewed, the Department Head will name a peer review team of 2–3 faculty members to conduct the review. Faculty may be included from other academic units.
2. The peer review team will have a preliminary meeting with the faculty member to be reviewed, at which he/she will discuss teaching philosophy, course goals and objectives, innovations, and problems he/she is trying to address (if any). Sample examinations and homework assignments, as well as any electronic resources (e.g., the course web site), will be reviewed.
3. The peer review team will make at least two class visitations (with different members visiting at different times), checking first with the subject faculty member as to satisfactory times. Appendix 2 provides a guide for possible points to consider.
4. The review team will meet following the visitations to discuss their findings, which should include strengths as well as items for improvement.
5. The peer review team will then meet with the evaluated faculty member to discuss the findings and make suggestions.
6. The peer review team should provide the Department Head requesting the review a summary of the strengths observed and potential areas for improvement.

APPENDIX 1

College-Required Questions on the Student Course and Instructor Surveys

A. College-Wide Course Evaluation Questions

- Rate this course by giving it an overall grade (A through F).
- I understand the importance of this course for the profession of pharmacy.
- The grading system was clearly stated.
- Learning objectives for this course are clearly stated.
- Successful performance in this course required that I understand the material.
- I get adequate feedback on examinations so that I can understand the questions I missed.
- The different topics in this course were well integrated.
- This course requires me to engage in independent learning of material not explicitly covered in class.
- How could this course be improved? (Open-ended; please put instructor-specific feedback on the instructor evaluation.)
- What aspects of this course (either content or course-presentation style) were particularly helpful? (Open-ended; please put instructor-specific responses on the instructor evaluation.)
- Appropriate questions for assessment of course outcomes should be included.

B. College-Wide Instructor Evaluation Questions

- Rate this instructor by giving him/her an overall grade (A through F).
- This instructor appears to be well prepared for class.
- This instructor speaks audibly and clearly.
- This instructor has an effective style of presentation.
- This instructor is good at explaining things.
- With this instructor I feel free to ask questions in class.
- This instructor treats all students with respect.
- This instructor makes good use of analogies, illustrations, and/or case studies.
- The instructor emphasizes the connections of course material to the profession and to everyday life.
- This instructor is available to help me outside of class.
- I believe that this instructor wants me to succeed in this course.
- This instructor challenges me to think about the material that he/she teaches.
- This instructor stimulates my interest in this material.
- I learned a lot from this instructor.
- Offer constructive advice on how could this instructor's teaching might be improved. (Open-ended)
- What aspects of this instructor's teaching (either content or course-presentation style) were particularly helpful? (Open-ended)

APPENDIX 2

A Guide for Peer-Review Class Visitations

Note: These points are merely a guide to aid the class visitation part of peer review. Reviewers may add other criteria and may find some of the criteria below not applicable or useful.

Organization
Appropriateness of content
Gives outline or objectives
Smooth topic transitions
Summarizes
Clarity
Gives examples
Defines unfamiliar terms
Stresses important points
Interaction and engagement
Makes eye contact
Student reaction - engaged, paying attention, not engaged
Calls students by name
Encourages questions
Asks questions
Challenges the class
Crosses the "semi-permeable membrane" between class and instructor
Enthusiasm and style
Speaks expressively
Speaks at appropriate pace
Visual aids clear
Illustrates with anecdotes or analogies
Demonstrates interest in the topic
Innovations
Interesting techniques and their effect on the class
Use of class time
Starts and finishes on time
Covers relevant material
Amount of material covered