



UNIVERSITY of MARYLAND SCHOOL OF NURSING

Policy on Course and Faculty Evaluations

Responsible Administrator: Academic Deans, Department Chairs, and Director of Evaluation

Sponsoring Unit: Office of the Dean

Effective Date: 05/16/2017

Last Reviewed: 04/29/2022

Next Scheduled Review: 01/2024

POLICY STATEMENT

Curriculum and teaching-learning practices are evaluated every semester to foster ongoing program improvement and to facilitate the achievement of student and program outcomes. We have an established benchmark to “flag” a course for thorough review.

RATIONALE

The University of Maryland School of Nursing (UMSON) is devoted to excellence in teaching-learning practices and committed to evaluating its educational program and using evaluation data to foster ongoing improvement. Course evaluation questionnaires and faculty evaluation questionnaires completed by students each semester for each course are a crucial component in this process. The results of these and other assessment tools may result in recommendations to change or adjust the educational program. Student evaluation of academic course experiences is an integral part of the UMSON student learning assessment system and of faculty members’ annual performance evaluations. The course evaluation review process aims to improve course content and instructional methods to enhance student learning experiences and implement adjustments as necessary.

SCOPE

This policy applies to all courses.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, STATUTES, AND REGULATIONS

School of Nursing Policies and Procedures

- [Bylaws of Faculty Organization](#)

USM, UMB, or Other External Policies, Statutes, and Regulations

- [II-1.20 University System of Maryland Policy on Evaluation of Performance of Faculty](#)
- [Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education \(CCNE\) Standards for Accreditation of Baccalaureate and Graduate Nursing Programs](#)

CONTACTS

Office of Evaluation
Office of the Academic Deans
Department Chairs

RESPONSIBILITIES

The benchmark for course review is recommended by the Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) with final approval residing with the Governance Council.

The academic deans and department chairs are responsible for reviewing the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) (see Appendix A) results every semester. Individual course/section data and aggregate data for multi-section courses are reviewed.

The Office of Evaluation sends the summary table of course evaluation results to the academic deans and department chairs, highlighting courses with CEQ mean ratings of less than 4.00/5.00 (benchmark). When a course has a mean rating less than 4.00, the academic dean meets and discusses the evaluation results with the department chair to determine issues and actions. If appropriate, the department chair will develop an action plan with the appropriate faculty member. If appropriate, the academic dean will send the course to the curriculum chair for a course revision review. The academic dean and department chair will use the UMSON Course Evaluation Review Form (see Appendix B) to document the action plan, which will be housed in the Office of Evaluation. At least annually, a summary report, in aggregate, is presented to ASAC by the director of evaluations.

The department chairs are responsible for reviewing the Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire (FEQ) (see Questions 9 - 16 in the UMSON Course Evaluation Questionnaire, Appendix A) results every semester. Individual faculty data and aggregate data for all sections/courses are reviewed.

The Office of Evaluation sends the summary table of faculty evaluation results to the department chairs, highlighting courses with FEQ mean ratings of less than 4.00/5.00 (benchmark). When a course has an FEQ mean rating less than benchmark, the department chair meets and discusses the faculty evaluation results with the individual faculty member to determine issues and actions. If appropriate, the department chair will develop an action plan with the appropriate faculty member. The department chair and faculty will use the UMSON Faculty Evaluation Review Form to document the action plan, which will be housed in the department.

PROCEDURES

The course evaluation results are available two weeks after the semester is finished. All courses will be reviewed every semester. Academic deans and/or department chairs will meet with the

responsible faculty member for any courses with a mean rating for course evaluation less than benchmark within eight weeks of having received the results.

The faculty evaluation results are available two weeks after the semester is finished. Department chairs will meet with the responsible faculty member for any courses with a mean rating less than benchmark within eight weeks of having received the results.

APPENDICES

Appendix A UMSON Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix B UMSON Course Evaluation Review Form

DATE AND SIGNATURE

Date: May 2, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jane Marie Kuselby". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

Approved by the Dean:

Appendix A UMSON Course Evaluation Questionnaire

As a reminder, students should follow the UMB code of conduct when completing this evaluation, including being professional, civil, respectful, and courteous. Remember to provide feedback in a manner in which you would like to receive it.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Course Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Course content flowed logically from course objectives.						
2. Readings were consistent with course content.						
3. Learning activities were consistent with course content.						
4. Graded assessments (e.g., paper, exams) were consistent with course content.						
5. Blackboard navigation was easily executed.						
6. The amount of work for credit earned was about right.						
7. The assigned textbooks and other course materials were valuable to my learning.						
8. I learned relevant information.						
The Instructor						
9. Was well prepared.						
10. Was knowledgeable about course content.						
11. Used effective teaching strategies.						
12. Provided constructive feedback on tests, assignments, and performance.						
13. Provided timely feedback on tests, assignments, and performance.						
14. Applied consistent standards in evaluation.						
15. Was readily available to students.						
16. Treated students with respect.						

Open-ended questions:

1. What aspects of the course contributed the most to your learning?
2. What aspects of the course contributed the least to your learning?
3. What recommendation(s) do you have to improve the course?
4. Do you have additional comments?



UNIVERSITY of MARYLAND
SCHOOL OF NURSING

Appendix B
UMSON Course Evaluation Review Form - CEQ

Program	Semester	Course Number and Title	CEQ	
			N	Mean
<p><i>Associate dean and department chair responses to the data and action steps for improvements, if any:</i></p>				

Academic Dean: _____

Date: _____

Department Chair: _____

Date: _____

Return to **Office of Evaluation** by mm/dd/yyyy

UMB'S CORE VALUES

RESPECT *and* INTEGRITY

WELL-BEING *and* SUSTAINABILITY

EQUITY *and* JUSTICE

INNOVATION *and* DISCOVERY



UNIVERSITY of MARYLAND
SCHOOL OF NURSING

UMSON Course Evaluation Review Form - FEQ

Program	Semester	Course Number and Title	FEQ	
			N	Mean
<p><i>Department chair and faculty responses to the data and action steps for improvements, if any. Please list specific factor(s) that contributed to the results. Examples: instructor's workload, course size, course evaluation, course semester, first time assigned teaching, and/or personal issue.</i></p>				

Faculty: _____

Date: _____

Department Chair: _____

Date: _____

Return to **Department Chair** by mm/dd/yyyy

UMB'S CORE VALUES

RESPECT *and* INTEGRITY

WELL-BEING *and* SUSTAINABILITY

EQUITY *and* JUSTICE

INNOVATION *and* DISCOVERY