

**UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy**  
**Student Course Evaluations**  
**Summary of Results**  
**Fall 2011-Spring 2012**

**Background:** Historically, student course evaluations were not uniformly administered for all courses in the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy Professional and Graduate Programs. In Fall 2011, the Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment (OSPA), along with the School's Assessment Committee, embarked on an effort to develop and implement a uniform and systematic approach to implementation, review, and use of student course evaluations for all required and elective course offering in the School at both the professional and graduate levels. This approach included the development and implementation of:

- A standard course evaluation instrument for use in both the Professional and Graduate Programs;
- A brief survey for course directors (to solicit information on which instructors in their course should be evaluated and whether supplemental, custom questions should be added to the standard evaluation instrument);
- School Policy and Procedures for Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor Effectiveness (*on Website*);
- Review criteria established by the School's Assessment Committee to identify whether any student evaluation results indicate courses or instructors warranting further review or are worthy of outstanding recognition (*Appendix A*);
- A letter template addressed to respective course directors and the course director's Division Chair for any course or instructor "warranting further review," which requests a reflective summary and plan of action from the course director; and,
- A spreadsheet whereby data are maintained each year on courses or instructors warranting further review, so that the OSPA, the Office of Professional Education (curriculum committee), and the Office of Graduate Education (graduate education committee) can follow-up accordingly on an annual basis for purposes of continued quality improvement.

It is important to keep in mind that student course evaluations represent *one* component of an overall course and instructor assessment process. The results do not reflect peer evaluation of instructor teaching effectiveness or a comprehensive, systematic review of a course.

**Results:** The tables in this report summarize, by Program (*Professional or Graduate*) or Course Type (*Electives*):

- The number of courses and instructors evaluated during the 2011-2012 academic year;
- The number and percentage of courses and instructors warranting further review; and,
- The number and percentage of courses and instructors worthy of recognition.

## PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM

## COURSES

	Professional Program Courses Evaluated	Warrant Further Review		Worthy of Recognition	
Semester	#	#	%	#	%
Fall 2011	20	1	5.00%	1	5.00%
Spring 2012	19	2	10.53%	1	5.26%
<i>Combined</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7.69%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>5.13%</i>

Professional Program - Courses: Warrant Further Review							
Semester	Course Number	Course Title	Program Year	Course Director	Response Rate	Criteria Met <sup>1</sup>	Action/Status <sup>2</sup>
Fall 2011	<i>Course X (removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course X (removed for confidentiality)</i>	PY1	<i>Course Director X (removed for confidentiality)</i>	100 out of 164 (60.98%)	Median "overall rating of course" <3 ("Fair" or "Poor")	Letter sent to <i>Course Director X</i> ; reflective summary and plan received.
Spring 2012	<i>Course Y (removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course Y (removed for confidentiality)</i>	PY1	<i>Course Director Y (removed for confidentiality)</i>	111 out of 161 (68.94%)	Median "overall rating of course" <3 ("Fair" or "Poor")	Letter sent to <i>Course Director Y</i> ; reflective summary and plan received.
Spring 2012	<i>Course Z (removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course Z (removed for confidentiality)</i>	PY1	<i>Course Director Z (removed for confidentiality)</i>	113 out of 161 (70.19%)	≥ 25% of respondents selected "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" or "Fair" or "Poor" to 3 questions	Letter sent to <i>Course Director Z</i> ; reflective summary and plan received.

<sup>1</sup> Review Criteria, Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> Information available upon request.

Professional Program - Courses: Worthy of Recognition					
Semester	Course Number	Course Title	Program Year	Course Director	Response Rate
Fall 2011	PHCY 423	Medchem	PY2	Scott Singleton	121 out of 150 (80.67%)
Spring 2012	PHCY 411	Basic Pharmaceutics 2	PY1	Russ Mumper	162 out of 162 (100%)

## PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM

### INSTRUCTORS

	Professional Program Instructors Evaluated <sup>1,2</sup>	Warrant Further Review		Worthy of Recognition <sup>3</sup>	
Semester	#	#	%	#	%
Fall 2011	81	0	0.00%	8	9.88%
Spring 2012	58	0	0.00%	7	12.07%
<i>Combined</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.00%</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10.79%</i>

<sup>1</sup> Course Directors identify instructors to be evaluated by students; there are no requirements on number of contact hours taught in order to be evaluated. Therefore, some instructors may have taught only one class session; whereas, other instructors may have taught numerous times in one or more courses.

<sup>2</sup> If an instructor was **evaluated** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

<sup>3</sup> If an instructor **met criteria** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

Professional Program - Instructors: Worthy of Recognition					
Semester	Instructor <sup>4</sup>	Course Number	Course Title	Program Year	Response Rate
Fall 2011	Adam Persky	PHCY 203	Physiology	PY1	133 out of 165 (80.61%)
Fall 2011	Adam Persky	PHCY 413	Kinetics	PY2	137 out of 151 (90.73%)
Fall 2011	Bob Dupuis	PHCY 449	Immunology/ ID	PY3	67 out of 154 (43.51%)
Fall 2011	Christine Walko	PHCY 447	Hem/Onc	PY3	114 out of 154 (74.03%)
Fall 2011	Macary Marciniak	PHCY 441	Immunization Certification	PY3	65 out of 153 (42.48%)
Fall 2011	Phil Rodgers	PHCY 443	Derm/Endo	PY2	101 out of 150 (67.33%)
Fall 2011	Ralph Raasch	PHCY 449	Immunology/ ID	PY3	67 out of 154 (43.51%)
Fall 2011	Robert Shrewsbury	PHCY 401L	Pharmaceutical Skills Lab	PY1	153 out of 164 (93.29%)
Fall 2011	Robert Shrewsbury	PHCY 403L	Pharmaceutical Skills Lab	PY2	148 out of 151 (98.01%)
Fall 2011	Robert Shrewsbury	PHCY 405L	Pharmaceutical Skills Lab	PY3	145 out of 153 (94.77%)
Fall 2011	Scott Singleton	PHCY 423	Medchem	PY2	121 out of 150 (80.67%)
Spring 2012	Debra Kemp	PHCY 444	Pharmacotherapy 4 - Cardiology/Nephrology	PY2	65 out of 149 (43.62%)
Spring 2012	Jay Campbell	PHCY 432	Pharmacy Law & Ethics	PY3	152 out of 153 (99.35%)
Spring 2012	Lindsey Kennedy	PHCY 446	Pharmacotherapy 5 - Neurology/Psychiatry	PY2	59 out of 146 (40.41%)
Spring 2012	Lisa Dinkins	PHCY 404L	Pharmaceutical Care Lab 4	PY2	76 out of 150 (50.67%)
Spring 2012	Macary Marciniak	PHCY 434-C	Pharmacy Practice Management - Community	PY3	39 out of 63 (61.90%)
Spring 2012	Robert Shrewsbury	PHCY 402L	Pharmaceutical Care Lab 2	PY1	128 out of 161 (79.50%)
Spring 2012	Robert Shrewsbury	PHCY 404L	Pharmaceutical Care Lab 4	PY2	76 out of 150 (50.67%)
Spring 2012	Russ Mumper	PHCY 411	Basic Pharmaceutics 2	PY1	162 out of 162 (100.00%)

<sup>4</sup> There are 13 unique instructors who received a "worthy of recognition". Two instructors received a "worthy of recognition" each semester, thus the combined total of 15 in summary table.

## GRADUATE PROGRAM

## COURSES

	Graduate Program Courses Evaluated	Warrant Further Review		Worthy of Recognition	
Semester	#	#	%	#	%
Fall 2011	9	1	11.11%	3	3.33%
Spring 2012	6	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
<i>Combined</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6.67%</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>26.67%</i>

Graduate Program - Courses: Warrant Further Review						
Semester	Course Number	Course Title	Course Director	Response Rate	Criteria Met <sup>1</sup>	Action/Status <sup>2</sup>
Fall 2011	<i>Course A (removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course A (removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course Director A (removed for confidentiality)</i>	8 out of 14 (57%)	Median "overall rating of course" <3 ("Fair" or "Poor")	Letter sent to <i>Course Director A (removed for confidentiality)</i> ; reflective summary and plan received.

<sup>1</sup> Review Criteria, Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> Information available upon request.

Graduate Program - Courses: Worthy of Recognition				
Semester	Course Number	Course Title	Course Director	Response Rate
Fall 2011	DPET 833	Experimental Design Clinical Research	Heyward Hull	6 out of 11 (55%)
Fall 2011	MEDC 807	Foundations of Chemical Biology: Org	David Lawrence	3 out of 4 (75%)
Fall 2011	MEDC 833	Molecular Target-based Drug Delivery	Michael Jarstfer	5 out of 6 (83%)
Spring 2012	DPOP 872	Proposal Writing in DPOP	Betsy Sleath	4 out of 4 (100%)

## GRADUATE PROGRAM

## INSTRUCTORS

Semester	Graduate Program Instructors Evaluated <sup>1,2</sup>	Warrant Further Review		Worthy of Recognition <sup>3</sup>	
	#	#	%	#	%
Fall 2011	44	1	2.27%	5	11.36%
Spring 2012	26	1	3.85%	6	23.08%
<i>Combined</i>	70	2	2.86%	11	15.71%

<sup>1</sup> Course Directors identify instructors to be evaluated by students; there are no requirements on number of contact hours taught in order to be evaluated.

Therefore, some instructors may have taught only one class session; whereas, other instructors may have taught numerous times in one or more courses.

<sup>2</sup> If an instructor was **evaluated** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

<sup>3</sup> If an instructor **met criteria** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

Graduate Program - Instructors: Warrant Further Review						
Semester	Instructor	Course Number	Course Title	Response Rate	Criteria Met <sup>1</sup>	Action/Status <sup>2</sup>
Fall 2011	<i>Instructor 1 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course 1 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course 1 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	8 out of 14 (57%)	≥ 25% of respondents selected "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" or "Fair" or "Poor" to 3 questions.	Letter sent to <i>Course Director 1</i> regarding student evaluation of <i>Instructor 1</i> ; reflective summary and plan received.
Spring 2012	<i>Instructor 2 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course 2 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	<i>Course 2 (name removed for confidentiality)</i>	7 out of 7 (100%)	Median rating of <3 on 4 questions; 25% of respondents selected "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" or "Fair" or "Poor" to 6 questions; Median "overall effective teacher" rating of <3 ("Fair" or "Poor")	Letter sent to <i>Course Director 2</i> regarding student evaluation of <i>Instructor 2</i> . Division Chair provided input to DGS and the OSPA and reflective summary and plan received from <i>Course Director 2</i> .

<sup>1</sup> Review Criteria, Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> Information available upon request.

Graduate Program - Instructors: Worthy of Recognition				
Semester	Instructor	Course Number	Course Title	Response Rate
Fall 2011	Heyward Hull	DPET 833	Experimental Design Clinical Research	6 out of 11 (55%)
Fall 2011	Stephen Frye	MEDC 807	Foundations of Chemical Biology: Org	3 out of 4 (75%)
Fall 2011	David Lawrence	MEDC 807	Foundations of Chemical Biology: Org	3 out of 4 (75%)
Fall 2011	Mike Jarstfer	MEDC 833	Molecular Target-based Drug Delivery	5 out of 6 (83%)
Fall 2011	Jian Liu	MEDC 833	Molecular Target-based Drug Delivery	5 out of 6 (83%)
Spring 2012	Betsy Sleath	DPOP 872	Proposal Writing in DPOP	4 out of 4 (100%)
Spring 2012	Susan Blalock	DPOP 872	Proposal Writing in DPOP	4 out of 4 (100%)
Spring 2012	Delesha Carpenter	DPOP 872	Proposal Writing in DPOP	4 out of 4 (100%)
Spring 2012	Mary Roth McClurg	DPOP 872	Proposal Writing in DPOP	4 out of 4 (100%)
Spring 2012	William Janzen	MEDC 804	Drug Discovery Targets	7 out of 7 (100%)
Spring 2012	Jian Jin	MEDC 804	Drug Discovery Targets	7 out of 7 (100%)

**ELECTIVE COURSES – PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS*****COURSES***

	<b>Elective Courses Evaluated</b>	<b>Warrant Further Review</b>		<b>Worthy of Recognition</b>	
<b>Semester</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Fall 2011	10	0	0.00%	5	50.00%
Spring 2012	11	0	0.00%	3	27.27%
<i>Combined</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.00%</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>38.10%</i>

<b>Elective Courses: Worthy of Recognition</b>				
<b>Semester</b>	<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Course Director(s)</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
Fall 2011	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	Roy L. Hawke; Howard McLeod	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	DPPE 803	Ambulatory Care	Phil Rodgers; Debra Kemp	28 out of 40 (70.00%)
Fall 2011	DPPE 820	Managing the Practice of Pharmacy	Fred M. Eckel	16 out of 36 (44.44%)
Fall 2011	DPPE 830	The Leadership Challenge	Wendy Cox; Mary Roth McClurg	17 out of 18 (94.44%)
Fall 2011	MOPH 801	Nuclear Pharmacy	Richard Kowalsky	7 out of 17 (41.18%)
Spring 2012	DPET 810	HIV	Amanda Corbett	7 out of 10 (70.00%)
Spring 2012	DPPE 804	Teaching and Learning Concepts and Pharmacy Practice	Jennifer Robertson	6 out of 9 (66.67%)
Spring 2012	DPPE 811	Infectious Diseases	Ralph Raasch	18 out of 30 (60.00%)

## ELECTIVE COURSES – PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

## INSTRUCTORS

Semester	Elective <i>Instructors</i> Evaluated <sup>1,2</sup>	Warrant Further Review		Worthy of Recognition <sup>3</sup>	
		#	%	#	%
Fall 2011	53	0	0.00%	17	32.08%
Spring 2012	27	0	0.00%	8	29.63%
<i>Combined</i>	80	0	0.00%	25	31.25%

<sup>1</sup> Course Directors identify instructors to be evaluated by students; there are no requirements on number of contact hours taught in order to be evaluated. Therefore, some instructors may have taught only one class session; whereas, other instructors may have taught numerous times in one or more courses.

<sup>2</sup> If an instructor was **evaluated** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

<sup>3</sup> If an instructor **met criteria** in more than one course (per semester), the instructor is only counted once (per semester).

Elective Instructors: Worthy of Recognition				
Semester	Instructor <sup>4</sup>	Course Number	Course Title	Response Rate
Fall 2011	Amanda Corbett	DPET 816	Integrative Meds	10 out of 20 (50.00%)
Fall 2011	Bob Blouin	DPPE 830	The Leadership Challenge	17 out of 18 (94.44%)
Fall 2011	Chris Walko	DPET 816	Integrative Meds	10 out of 20 (50.00%)
Fall 2011	Chris Walko	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	Craig Lee	DPET 813	Cardio	22 out of 40 (55.00%)
Fall 2011	Craig Lee	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	Debra Kemp	DPPE 803	Ambulatory Care	28 out of 40 (70.00%)
Fall 2011	Fred Eckel	DPPE 820	Managing the Practice of Pharmacy	16 out of 36 (44.44%)
Fall 2011	Howard McLeod	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	John Valgus	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	Lynn Dressler	DPET 832	Pharmacogenomics	8 out of 15 (53.33%)
Fall 2011	Macary Marciniak	DPPE 831	Self Care	14 out of 15 (93.33%)
Fall 2011	Mary Roth McClurg	DPPE 830	The Leadership Challenge	17 out of 18 (94.44%)
Fall 2011	Pam Joyner	DPPE 830	The Leadership Challenge	17 out of 18 (94.44%)
Fall 2011	Phil Rodgers	DPPE 803	Ambulatory Care	28 out of 40 (70.00%)
Fall 2011	Richard Kowalsky	MOPH 801	Nuclear Pharmacy	7 out of 17 (41.18%)
Fall 2011	Shanna O'Connor	DPPE 831	Self Care	14 out of 15 (93.33%)
Fall 2011	Stefanie Ferreri	DPPE 831	Self Care	14 out of 15 (93.33%)
Fall 2011	Stephen Caiola	DPPE 820	Managing the Practice of Pharmacy	16 out of 36 (44.44%)
Spring 2012	Amanda Corbett	DPET 810	HIV	7 out of 10 (70.00%)
Spring 2012	Chris Walko	DPET 812	Advanced Hem/Onc Pharmacotherapy	18 out of 28 (64.29%)
Spring 2012	Christopher Hurt	DPET 810	HIV	7 out of 10 (70.00%)
Spring 2012	David Wohl	DPET 810	HIV	7 out of 10 (70.00%)
Spring 2012	Jena Ivey Burkhart	DPPE 800	Geriatric Pharmacy Practice	9 out of 12 (75.00%)
Spring 2012	Jennifer Robertson	DPPE 804	Teaching and Learning Concepts and Pharmacy Practice	6 out of 9 (66.67%)
Spring 2012	Ralph Raasch	DPPE 811	Infectious Diseases	18 out of 30 (60.00%)
Spring 2012	Susan Peck	DPPE 804	Teaching and Learning Concepts and Pharmacy Practice	6 out of 9 (66.67%)

<sup>4</sup> There are 23 unique instructors who received a "worthy of recognition". Three instructors received more than one "worthy of recognition". Two instructors received a "worthy of recognition" each semester, thus the combined total of 25 in summary table.

## Appendix A: 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:

### A. Courses/instructors warranting further review

1.  $\geq 25\%$  of respondents selected "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" or "Fair" or "Poor" to 3 or more questions; **OR**,
2. Median of  $< 3$  on 3 or more questions; **OR**,
3. Median rating of  $< 3$  for "overall effective teacher" or "overall rating of course"

### B. Courses/instructors worthy of recognition

1.  $\geq 75\%$  of respondents selected "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" or "Very Good" or "Excellent" to 4 or more questions; **AND**,
2. Median of  $\geq 4.5$  on 4 or more questions; **AND**,
3. Median overall course rating of  $\geq 4.5$ ; **OR**,
4. Median rating of  $\geq 4.5$  for "the instructor was an effective teacher", or instructor is "fully deserving of a teaching award"

### Evaluation Instrument Details:

- *Likert scale*: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
- *Number of Likert Scale Questions*: 7 Course-Level Questions and 7 Instructor-Level Questions.

**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.

**Professional Program:** Review criteria were adjusted for PHCY 411 and PHCY 450 which had unique evaluation instruments.

- PHCY 411:
  - Course and Instructor Questions with a 4-pt Likert scale:
    - For Criteria A2 & A3, a median of 2.4 was used instead of 3.
    - For Criteria B2 & B3, a median of 3.6 was used instead of 4.5.
  - Course Questions:
    - For Criteria A1 and A2: instead of 3 of 7 questions, 6 of 13 questions.
    - For Criteria B1 and B2: instead of 4 of 7 questions, 8 of 13 questions.
  - Instructor Questions:
    - For Criteria A1 and A2: instead of 3 of 7 questions, 5 of 11 questions.
    - For Criteria B1 and B2: instead of 4 of 7 questions, 6 of 11 questions.
- PHCY 450:
  - Course Questions with a 4-pt Likert scale (instead of 5-pt):
    - For Criteria A2 & A3, a median of 2.4 was used instead of 3.
    - For Criteria B2 & B3, a median of 3.6 was used instead of 4.5.
    - Same number of questions as standard instrument.
  - Facilitator Questions:
    - Cannot be assessed. Due to evaluation set-up, student responses were merged by Digital Measures; results are separated by course section.