

ANNUAL REPORT

University Standing Committee Evaluation of Teaching (EOT)

Academic Year Covered by Report 2014-2015

Date Report Submitted 1 May 2015

Report Submitted by Jeffrey A. Joines

Number of times committee met 9

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee focused on two main issues which were low response rates of ClassEval and peer review of teaching. A little over half of the time was used discussing low response rates and the policy of no incentives. The committee has made four areas of recommendations.

Annual Report..... 12

I. Changes to the Evaluation Instrument.....13

II. Standardizing the RPT Dossier Section on Student and Peer Evaluations15

The EOT committee looked at standardizing the evaluation of teaching portion of the dossier (i.e., <http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-20>), which has also been recommended by the University RPT Committee. Section 2a asks the candidate to provide a Summary of Student Evaluations. This statement is quite vague and leads to many interpretations about what to report in terms of numerical ratings as well as student comments. Should the candidate prepare this section or only provide a two page summary responding to the student and peer evaluations so it is clear what the candidate has done.15

ClassEval Reports:.....15

Suggestions for 2013-2014 EOT Committee.....18

Discussion on Low Response Rates and the Policy of No Incentives **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Created a FAQ on Myths/Concerns and increasing evaluation rates..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Created and approved faculty survey **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Supporting a Pilot in CHASS looking at Synchronous vs. Asynchronous **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Discussion on Peer review of teaching **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

These changes have been discussed with the following groups: Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee (APC) and Personal Policy Committee (PPC), Associate Deans, and Deans. The Department Heads were sent the changes and feedback was requested.

2014-2015 URPTC Annual Report Suggestion on Teaching Portion of the Dossier

“6“There is inconsistency in the presentation of the teaching evaluations across the dossiers. Including the questions for the student evaluations would be useful. Qualitative comments should be included on an all or none basis or in a manner that reflects balance rather than bias. Student evaluation data based on low response rates should not be reported. Finally, dossiers for candidates for Associate Professor should document the required annual peer teaching evaluation.”

I. Changes to the Evaluation Instrument

In [REG05-20-10](#), this committee is charged with evaluating the current course evaluation instrument every three years. The following are recommendations from the Evaluation of Teaching (EOT) Committee annual report:

- **Change Question 1:**
 - **Current:** *“The instructor stated course objectives/outcomes”* Since having the objectives/outcomes is a requirement of the syllabus we should not be checking whether they have done this but did the instructor teach the class along the line of those objectives. It is not clear whether the question means that the instructor stated these once at the beginning of the semester or did it throughout the semester. The committee was not clear what the question was actually trying to accomplish since every course should have a syllabus with the outcomes/objectives stated. Students on the committee and those polled by these students agreed
 - **Proposed:** *“The instructor’s teaching aligned with the course’s learning objectives/outcomes”*

A.
- **Change Question 9:**
 - **Current:** *“The course readings were valuable aids to learning”*
 - The students on the committee agreed that most see readings as books and do not reflect the broader scope of activates in most classrooms today.
 - **Proposed:** *“The course materials (e.g., readings, videos, class notes, course packs, FAQs, websites, course webpage, and blogs) were valuable aids to learning”*

B.
- **Change Question 10:**
 - **Current:** *“The course assignments were valuable aids to learning.”* The word “assignments” could be perceived not to include homework, exams, quizzes, presentations, projects, portfolios, artistic impressions, videos, etc.
 - The committee suggests that a pop up of examples or a list of examples could clarify “assignments”:
 - **Proposed:** *The course assignments (e.g., homework, exams, quizzes, lab reports, papers, presentations, projects, portfolios, artistic impressions, critiques, blogs, and videos) were valuable aids to learning”.*

C.
- **Change of open end questions**
 - Currently there are three open ended questions: *“Comment on strengths and weaknesses of the instructor”*, *“Comment on strengths and weaknesses of the course”*, and *“Other Comments”*. **The last question was very rarely used and propose changing it to something that could potentially help improve the teaching and/or course.**
 - **Proposed:** *Give suggestions on how the course or how the instruction could be improved.*

D.
- **Change the flow of questions to make it clearer to students. Committee recommends having two separate sections:**
 - A section headed **“Questions Related to the Instructor”** followed by current questions 1 to 8 and then question 13 (left unnumbered) for comments on strength/weaknesses of instructor.

- A new section headed “**Questions Related to the Course**” with questions 9 through 12 followed by the course comment.
- From a technical standpoint the numbers of the questions would not change so the reports would be the same.

E.

- **Continue to promote the ClassEval FAQ on Suggestions and Myths**
 - UPA and OFD website in the sections on teaching evaluation
 - Have it sent out to faculty at the beginning of the fall semester

F.

II. Standardizing the RPT Dossier Section on Student and Peer Evaluations

The EOT committee looked at standardizing the evaluation of teaching portion of the dossier (i.e., <http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-20>), which has also been recommended by the University RPT Committee. Section 2a asks the candidate to provide a Summary of Student Evaluations. This statement is quite vague and leads to many interpretations about what to report in terms of numerical ratings as well as student comments. Should the candidate prepare this section or only provide a two page summary responding to the student and peer evaluations so it is clear what the candidate has done.

ClassEval Reports:

- **Require that all faculty utilize the official RPT report tool generated by ClassEval to present the numerical ratings in order to be consistent. The committee recommends the following changes to the report to make it easier to input directly into dossier to make easier to review of the dossier by DVF, CRPTC, and others. (See suggested revised tool in Appendix A.)**
 - **Add *response rates* to the RPT report tool.**
 - **Have only *two classes rather than four classes* presented on a page to make it seamless to paste into a word document rather than having to create a landscape section.**
 - **Include the *survey questions* rather than just the numbers since most faculty cannot remember the content of each question.**
 - **Include the *department mean* on the form as is done in the normal instructor report.**
- The current policy of allowing the candidate to choose which written student comments to include is not good practice; the policy needs to be standardized since many only pick a few good ones while others include every comment. (Needs further review about implementation details)
 - **One suggestion is to create a *comment report generation tool* that could, for example, randomly grab two pages of course and instructor comments from the past five years of teaching to put in the document.**
 - **Develop an ability for inappropriate comments to be flagged by the candidate and for the department head to approve to have these removed from the report.**
 - **The candidate would be given the opportunity to comment on anything that is in the comment section or even to select a small number of additional comments to be included in the section.**
 - Departments could continue to ask that all comments be put in an appendix of the RPT document for review by the DVF but not forwarded to the Provost's office.
 - Again the candidate would have the ability to have a one to two page response.

- This will make it clear what was provided by the candidate versus what was reported.
- G.

Peer Review Process:

Summary of peer reviews included in the RPT dossier should be standardized. The current policy does not recognize that many new faculty do not teach their first year or a department's peer review protocol or size makes it impossible to review each year.

- **In 2012-13, the committee recommended modifying the schedule for peer review as follows:**
 - **For *assistant professors*, it is recommended that they have a minimum of three peer reviews before going up for tenure with one of them occurring before reappointment. It should be stipulated that it is only permissible to have one review per academic year to avoid having three the year they go up for tenure.**
 - **For *associate professors*, the review period should be aligned with post tenure review process of every five years. They should have a minimum of two peer reviews before going up for promotion to full professor. Again, it should be stipulated that it is only permissible to have one review per academic year.**
 - **For *professors*, maintain the current practice that peer reviews be conducted every five years.**

- **The committee recommends that colleges and departments be expected to follow the schedule for peer review of teaching as defined in [REG05.20.10](#). The committee recommends peer review process be documented by department.**
 - Each department should publish their protocol of peer review of teaching process on a central site similar to the RPT (RUL 05.67.XXX) and Post Tenure Review (RUL 05.68.XXX) procedures. This would allow for more consistency and accountability for conducting and reporting peer reviews and for RPT and PTR committees to review them.
 - For most departments this would not be an issue as they already have one. Those departments that currently do not have a protocol for peer review of teaching will be required to develop one. OFD has an example of four very good protocols as well as the new Peer Review Summary Template could be used.
 - The Provost should issue a 3-D memo on compliance with the regulation at the beginning of the academic year.

- **Creating a common Summary Template for the Dossier**
 - Since each department's protocol/instrument may be quite different, the committee has developed a one page *summary template* that departments could use to summarize the report of each peer review. This would be standard across the university and each department could continue to use their own protocol but would be required to summarize the peer review that goes in the dossier. Feedback to the instructor observed can be anything or the summary.

The template includes categories for comments, which would be limited to two to five sentences. See the Appendix B for a description of the categories developed and the actual template.

- .

Suggestions for 2015-2016 EOT Committee

- The peer review template that was created needs to be vetted with the NCSU community. It needs to be put on the OFD website and shared with department heads, Deans, and Associate Deans.
- EOT should manage all the suggestions and make sure they are followed through.
- FAQ on Classeval should be sent out to the committee, deans, department heads, etc. to get it circulated with the faculty.
- EOT Committee should look at question 12 again as three different student groups has sent inquiries about changing the liker scales. Eventhough EOT has addressed this several times.
 - Question 12: *Overall, this course was excellent.* One perception of the question the answer should be yes the course excellent or no it was not. The Likert scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, etc. to some doesn't make sense. However, in practice students think about the course being Excellent, Very Good, Good, Poor, Very Poor. This questions is a remnant of the old paper system where it was difficult to change the scale. Changing the Likert scale is tricky as Good should not be in the middle and it needs to remain a 5 point scale as this will cause issues.
- The EOT committee over the past few years addressed the timing and number of peer reviews for tenure track faculty. Similar guidelines for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty should be discussed and policies developed.

Appendix A

Modified ClassEval RPT Report

The items in green would be new and each page would include only two classes at a time to make it easier to paste into the RPT dossier.

Term	Fall				Fall				
Year	2013				2013				
Course	XX 440 001				XX 110 001				
Courses	XX 440 001, XX 540 001				XX 110 001				
Title	XXX				XXX				
Responses	7				17				
Enrolled	8				33				
Response Rate	87.5%				51.5%				
#	Question	Mean	SEM	N	Dept Mean	Mean	SEM	N	Dept Mean
1	The instructor stated course objectives/outcomes	4.7	0.18	7	4.4	4.8	0.1	17	4.4
2	The instructor was receptive to students outside the classroom	5	0	7	4.2	5	0	17	4.2
3	The instructor explained material well.	5	0	7	4.1	4.8	0.11	17	4.1
4	The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course	5	0	7	4.4	5	0	17	4.4
5	The instructor was prepared for class	4.9	0.14	7	4.4	5	0	17	4.4
6	The instructor gave useful feedback.	4.9	0.14	7	4.1	4.8	0.1	17	4.1
7	The instructor consistently treated students with respect	5	0	7	4.4	5	0	17	4.4
8	Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher	5	0	7	4.2	4.9	0.06	17	4.2
9	The course readings were valuable aids to learning	4.8	0.17	6	4	4.7	0.12	17	4
10	The course assignments were valuable aids to learning	4.9	0.14	7	4.2	4.9	0.08	17	4.2
11	This course improved my knowledge of the subject	4.9	0.14	7	4.3	4.9	0.06	17	4.3
12	Overall, this course was excellent	5	0	7	4.1	4.8	0.14	17	4.1

Example 2: Current RPT Report

As you can see the current RPT report doesn't paste easily into a portrait document and has to be put into landscape mode owing to the four classes across.

ClassEval Results for Rank, Promotion or Tenure Fall 2011 or Later

Instr: XXXXXXXX

Emplid: YYYYYYYYYYYYYYYY

Term	Fall			Fall			Sprg			Sprg	
Year	2013			2013			2013			2013	
Course	XX 440 001			XX 110 001			TE 424 001			TE 404 001	
Courses	XX 440 001, XX 540 001			XX 110 001			XX 424 001			XX 404 001	
Title	XXXXXXX			XXXXXXX			XXXXXX			XXXXXX	
Responses	7			17			13			15	
Enrolled	8			33			31			30	
Q	Mean	SEM	N	Mean	SEM	N	Mean	SEM	N	Mean	SEM
1	4.7	0.18	7	4.8	0.1	17	4.4	0.14	13	4.5	0.13
2	5	0	7	5	0	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.6	0.13
3	5	0	7	4.8	0.11	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.5	0.13
4	5	0	7	5	0	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.5	0.13
5	4.9	0.14	7	5	0	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.5	0.13
6	4.9	0.14	7	4.8	0.1	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.5	0.13
7	5	0	7	5	0	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.6	0.13
8	5	0	7	4.9	0.06	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.6	0.13
9	4.8	0.17	6	4.7	0.12	17	4.4	0.18	13	4.2	0.22
10	4.9	0.14	7	4.9	0.08	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.3	0.16
11	4.9	0.14	7	4.9	0.06	17	4.5	0.14	13	4.4	0.13
12	5	0	7	4.8	0.14	17	4.4	0.14	13	4.3	0.12

Appendix B

Peer Review Summary Template Categories and Descriptions

Category	Required	Description	Examples
Class Description	Required	Describe the class observed including title, academic level, number of students, whether it is required or not, GEP, in person/DE, type of course, time period, and date of observation(s).	Top portion of the form
Teaching Methods	Required	Describe the teaching methods and comment on their appropriateness to achieve the class learning outcomes/goals. Note any discipline-specific or general types of teaching methods.	See below
Teaching Effectiveness	Required	Comment on the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter (e.g., currency and depth of knowledge) as well as his or her ability to explain things well and respond to questions at an appropriate level.	
Student-Teacher Interaction	Required	Describe the instructor's interaction with the class, including rapport with all students, instructor's ability to promote creative and critical thinking, opportunities for student engagement, and opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of the lesson objectives.	
Teaching Materials	Required	Comment on overall course design (e.g., syllabus, handouts, class notes, course-packs, and other teaching materials). Describe the types of assessments (e.g., class activities, homework, exams, papers, videos, presentations, projects, portfolios), addressing their rigor and appropriateness.	
Areas of Strength	Required	Describe areas of strength the instructor has demonstrated.	
Opportunities for Improvement	Required	Describe at least one area for improving student learning or the instructor's teaching effectiveness; if applicable, comment on instructor's actions in response to previous peer reviews.	
<i>Innovative/Interesting Teaching Idea(s)</i>	Optional	Describe any innovative techniques, materials, or assignments that could benefit other faculty.	
<i>Technology Utilized</i>	Optional	Describe technologies used by the professor and students as well as comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the technology (e.g., class management systems; social media platforms; cad/cam software; blogs; clickers, student computing, web assign, message boards, videos, simulations, and blackboard).	
<i>Classroom Behavior</i>	Optional	Comment on the instructor's oral and written delivery and presentation effectiveness including tone, voice level, eye contact, mannerism, movement, delivery, and pace.	
<i>General Student Feedback</i>	Optional	Comment on any student feedback provided to the peer reviewers.	
<i>Overall Evaluation</i>	Optional	Comment on any other information that will be helpful.	

Teaching Methods

Describe the teaching methods utilized during the observation. Comment on appropriateness of the teaching methods to achieve the class learning outcomes/goals. Note any signature pedagogies of the discipline and/or general types of teaching strategies.

Examples: Teaching methods (check as appropriate if used)

- Traditional lecture (large or small class)
- Interactive lecture
- Discussion (Think/Pair/Share, debate)
- Cooperative or Collaborative Learning
- Group work or teamwork
- Role play / drama /skits
- Lab teaching
- Clinical teaching
- Experiential learning and field work
- Projects (indiv. or group)
- Interdisciplinary discussion
- Service-learning
- Case-based
- Inquiry-based / problem-solving
- Problem sets
- Presentations / microteaching
- Flipped course
- Research

Resource:

List of 150 Teaching Methods, UNC-Charlotte Center for Teaching & Learning

<http://teaching.uncc.edu/learning-resources/articles-books/best-practice/instructional-methods/150-teaching-methods>

Peer Review Summary

Instructor Observed:

Date(s) of Observations:

Enter Date.

Enter Date.

Class Observed:
Class Time Period:
Required Class

Yes No

Peer Reviewer(s):

Pre Discussion Date(s):

Enter Date.

Post Discussion Date(s):

Enter Date.

Number of Students:

Type of Class:

Choose a type.

Course Delivery:

Choose Method.

Teaching Methods —

Teaching Effectiveness —

Student Teacher Interaction —

Teaching Materials —

Areas of Strength —

Opportunities for Improvement —

Innovative/Interesting Teaching Idea(s) —

Technology Utilized —

Classroom Behavior —

General Student Feedback —

Overall Evaluation —