

Evaluation of Teaching Committee

Friday, October 23, 2015

11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Office of Faculty Development Conference Room, 4th floor

Clark Hall

Members Present:

Beth Fath (chair), Valerie Wust, Alina Duca, Kimberly Ange-van Heugten, Jason Delborn, James Mickle, Korinn Saker

Members not Present:

Katherine Annett-Hitchcock, Marta Klesath, Lisa Thompson, Desiree Unselt, Chris Becker, Hernan Marchant, Paul Umbach

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Diane Chapman, Erin Robinson, Barbara Kirby

Ex-Officio Members Not Present:

Doug James, Mike Carter, Katharine Stewart

Call to Order- Beth Fath, *Chair*

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:35 am.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Updates:

- a. **Class Eval review schedule-** we have to begin review again next year (must be done every 3 years)
- b. **Spring Schedule 9:30-10:30am, third Friday of the month, changing to only one hour**
- c. **The group will be moving to a Google email group-** should hopefully stop the issue of a reply to all default, Google groups take 7 days to be approved, so look for that soon.
- d. **Extra credit for evaluation completion-** There is a regulation which addresses this exactly: (Regulation <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-10>, 5.2) we obviously need to do some publicity of this fact.
- e. **FAQ concern #5-** Paul and Katharine and Beth have gotten together to discuss how the FAQ could be reworded and they'd hoped to have it ready for today, however, it's not quite done. Look for that next meeting.
- f. **Next meeting ending at 12:30-** Meeting on 11/20 will end at 12:30 because Beth has DE testing that she can't reschedule due to construction.
- g. **New graduate student will be joining the committee-** Next month, Katie Ratteree will be joining the committee to fill an empty student seat. There was

some conversation about getting undergraduate seats filled through a prompt from Donna Johnson.

2. Random sampling of comments from student evals for dossiers

a. Brainstorming in pairs to answer the following questions:

- i. Ideas for consideration:
- ii. Remove or just flag inappropriate comments?
Dangerous to let people remove their own comments—would be sure to have objective and clear criterion to use in order to flag it.
- iii. If flagging comments, how to respond?
Should faculty be asked to comment on all student feedback that they put into their dossier?
- iv. Types of comments that can be flagged/removed?
It is impossible to describe ‘inappropriate’. Instructors should be able to respond to the quotes.
** Ideas for what should be considered inappropriate comments:
appearance, accent in native tongue, all protected class (sexual orientation, race, etc.)
- v. Is there a reviewer for flagged comments? If so, who?
Department Heads already have so much, but this is personnel file information, so it would not be appropriate to ask for an administrative personnel to handle.
- vi. How many times can you run the random generator for comments?
- vii. Other considerations?
 - In addition to the random comments, could the person also have a series of their self-selected comments; possibly as a way of showing growth over time?
 - Could we run this for our committee, so that we could see what this might look like?
 - i. Will look at each class for the last 6 years and pull 5 comments if the class is under 100 students, 10 if over 100
 - ii. There should be no minimum response rate
 - iii. What does this look like for someone who is only teaching one class a semester?
 - How to deal with the varied size of classes, levels of students, etc.?
 - How many comments should be shown on a dossier? Some faculty have limits and some have no limits currently. We should also bear in mind the attention span of reviewers

- Inclusion of all comments? This could be quite cumbersome with faculty who teach many large courses. Possibly one page summary, 4 pages of supporting documents?
- Are we including quotes from all 3 open ended questions? (strengths and weaknesses of instructor, strengths and weaknesses of course and other)—group suggested including all 3.
- What do you do if there is consistency of feedback? For example: Instructor had a heavy accent on 20/30 evaluations might need to be addressed somehow
- What parts of this section of the dossier are being filtered by the candidate, which parts are being generated randomly? Perhaps this should somehow be delineated.
- How do we balance proportion of graduate vs. undergraduate comments/ instructor role (is the course co-taught?)/ Distance Ed classes?
 - i. Perhaps have 5 comments from each course you teach?
 - ii. In large classes (over 100) perhaps that number could be 10.

3. **Recap/introduction of other topics- NOT COVERED DUE TO TIME**

Next topics to address:

- i. NTT Peer review process
- ii. TA review process

Possible new topics:

- i. Better education for DHs regarding use and interpretation of eval #s
- j. Addition of frequency and proportions with evals, panel discussion, Dean presentation

Adjourn- 1:00 pm