Evaluation of Teaching Committee Minutes

Friday, October 14, 2016

10:30-12:00

Honors Conference Room, 205

Clark Hall

Members present:

Valerie Wust (chair), Jason Delbourne, Hernan Merchant, Nolan Watts, Lisa Thompson, Andrea DeSantes, James Mickle, Maria Gillardo Williams

Members not present: Kate Annette-Hitchcock, Lisa Thompson, Neal Parker, Paul Umbach, Anna Howard, Beth Fath, Whitney Jones, Mahita Ngabhiru, Xiaojing Hou.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Doug James, Erin Robinson, Katharine Stewart, Mike Carter

Ex-Officio Members not present: Grae Desmond, Diane Chapman, Barbara Kirby

Guests: Susanne Jennings (Adobe Education), Jamie Palmer (Student Body President)

Agenda- Call to order, 10:30 am

**Best practices in Teaching Digital Literacy & 21st Century Skills in Higher Education**

1. How Adobe is partnering with other universities for digital literacies.
   1. Adobe in Education digital literacy-- skills around communication in more visual ways. Prepare students to enter the workforce with productive critical thinking skills, instead of just a consumer, but a content creator. Creative Suite is most known-- Photoshop, Lightroom, InDesign, video editing tools. How do you pull some of the tools into the classroom to be able to make the curriculum more up to date? Creative cloud: turn in a paper and a video; represent biology research in a visual way. Cross curricular.
   2. Any initiatives on campus that Adobe could support? Students asked to have work done in non-traditional formats? Markus Wust- Digital Humanities Lab; partners with faculty interested in doing digital literacy knowledge. Using the Digital Humanities lab to represent assignments in cutting edge ways. Cluster of Visual Narratives faculty members might be interested. David Rieder-- rhetoric, digital rhetoric -- CRDM graduate program.
   3. Clemson started in rhetoric to present things within their research, but now are spreading across the curriculum. UNC just came on board this semester-- digital literacy; ENG 105, students turn in digital work. All schools represented are excited about digital literacy. Nursing students were really excited about this-- communicate concepts to their patients. Use for e-portfolios, CoAT program? UNC digital center of excellence-- give grants to teachers who incorporate this into class and build learning modules. Next level of grant, incorporate into entire syllabus-- create a roadmap for faculty members.
   4. What does a partnership entail? Discounted pricing for students (especially schools with 100%), and a gift back-- build a physical space, grants, jointly build curriculum. Bring together schools two or three times a year to talk about how they integrate things into the classroom. Nov. 1st- San Diego 115 people from 30 schools coming to talk about how they are using the technology-- lots more interest than expected, but will try to get a few passes. Students present the work that they’re doing.
   5. Faculty don’t often teach software, but how to create the content, how to build the narrative. Courses in general education that teach how to use the tools? Schools rely on libraries to do the training for the software. More about learning how to do the process-- Clemson digital studio (like Apple Genius Bar)-- green screen, room to record audio. Can ask libraries How do I do this? Often it’s student workers who are explaining the software. Collaboration building capabilities, good skill for employers.
   6. Other partners to connect to: IDIG, DELTA, Libraries (Hunt specifically) visualization studio, etc. Friday Institute with College of Education could also be a good connection.
2. **Update on Continued Items from EoT September 2016**
   1. Provost response to request for clarification on ClassEval Question Review Cycle--
      1. Agreed to delay the window-- reviews conducted 3 years after the changes to the instrument happen-- also if there were no changes, set a 3-year review cycle. Need a few years of data to decide if the changes were effective.
3. **Alternatives to Compensated Pilot Test Group for ClassEval Comment Generator**

**(CoGenT)**

* 1. No funding available to pilot so we need to move forward with other options.
  2. Do we want to make it available to faculty who are putting together a RPT portfolio? Feedback from faculty who are deciding to use the tool and those who decide not to use it. Every dossier building season Katharine gets questions about it.
  3. RPT workshop on how to build dossier: add this tool to the website and workshop presentation.
  4. Questions that we might ask the users to reflect on? If we gather that data, do we want it to be anonymous? Use Qualtrics? Boilerplate language to explain how it works. Trying to survey people at two points-- right after generation of report; perhaps after dossier has gone to committees for review by DVF?
  5. Subcommittee-- some prompts in Qualtrics, create the boilerplate language to be included within the dossier as preamble to randomly generated comments.
  6. Give people a heads up that this is available—RPT info sessions in early Spring 2017 for Fall 2017 submissions. Would want to make sure that what is said at the RPT sessions reflect what the committee wants to say.

1. **Student Government Request for Additional ClassEval Questions**
   1. See initial questions from April 2016 vs. current questions October 2016 (Guest: Student Senate President Jamie Plummer)
   2. UCCC is reviewing the idea of using the DELTA course sheet.
   3. To incentivize doing the extra questions would have to complete the original 12 questions. NC State could control the extra data that students want. *www.ratemyprofessor.com* tends to provide extreme views of courses/professors. Students are looking for more of a middle-view of what is required for the course. Add in studio as a class format option to question #2.
   4. Add-on questions need an introductory note to explain their origin/intent and let students know that the responses will be made publically available and not in faculty members’ personnel records
   5. Survey design expertise: Doug James & Paul Umbach to delve into what the students are trying to get at/ask in each question.
   6. How should or would these questions be used in tenure and promotion decisions? Concerns from faculty senate: once this data exists could DVF use the information in a tenure decision?
   7. If the EOT committee feels that this is of value; go to the Academic Policy Committee meeting of Faculty Senate with the student government reps and find out what concerns are out there. Delay revising add-on questions until it is clear whether there is faculty buy in.
   8. Student taking 5 courses-- for some students this means as many as 13 evaluations; would this decrease response rates? Concern that students might not complete the evaluations. Survey fatigue for students?
   9. Open question-- if there is a way to convince students that it’s in their best interest to respond to these questions?
   10. #4, Course syllabus regulation-- implies that faculty are assigning books that they aren’t using. Possible red flag. Could be a survey design issue -- perhaps it’s how often did you use the assigned textbook?
   11. Instructor performance-- having a novice evaluate usefulness of text and performance of instructor is problematic.
   12. I recommend that all students who take this class purchase the book ahead of time, I recommend that all students wait until after having attended the class to purchase the text.
   13. Question #1- Credit hour reg. for one hour of direct instruction, should have 2 hours. Could run afoul of accreditation standards.
   14. How do we do this in a way that students get actionable data that is also supportive of faculty needs and concerns. Don’t want to create landmines.
   15. Housing this data? Wolftech gradient-- Trackster; assures that only those with unity ID could see it. Longitudinal data?
   16. Graduate course applicability? Not appropriate for graduate courses. The students wouldn’t care about this data. Plan of Work wouldn’t allow for people to change their courses easily.
   17. Question 1-- different distribution-- lowest # is less than 3. Self-reporting own experience, so the question is fair.
   18. Students getting overwhelmed by extra survey; Student gov’t polled 400 students who reported they would be 50% more likely to complete their ClassEvals if they would get some data about questions that are meaningful to their student experience.
   19. #5 ask about percentage of assignments or work done-- give ranges
   20. #6 needs an N/A category-- judge a faculty’s performance. Not really appropriate for these questions; Do students care about knowing this?
   21. Will have to go to faculty senate, they could stop ClassEval add-ons pretty effectively, so it’s better to have their support/partnership. Will still need to wordsmith afterwards.
   22. Student gov’t to prepare a one pager to make an argument for why additional ClassEval questions are a good idea. Present argument in writing and face-to-face with Faculty Senate.
2. **Revisiting Reg 05.20.10 based on 04-08-2016 review by General Counsel** 
   1. See attached document: *Proposed Revision to REG 05.20.10 Evaluation of Teaching*
   2. We need to review the proposed changes and decide what’s acceptable. Then it will head up to Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
   3. All review and then possibly add additional language on how #2 comes about.
   4. Who are we excluding when we say faculty with .75 FTE? Within HR those folks are full-time faculty and have to be evaluated in this manner.
   5. Apply only to faculty in our teaching track? Do we want to anchor the schedule to the rank of faculty members? Or do we want to anchor the schedule to the contract? Need to assure flexibility for departments to deal with clinical and research faculty who teach.
   6. 4.2.2- Nature of peer evaluation instrument. Do these categories match up with the EOT document? Need to make sure that we link it into the reg, or find a way to add that to the additional references section at the top of reg page.
   7. 4.2.3- Directs people to the resources at the reg-- make sure the instrument is on that list.
   8. 6- Required or recommended procedures? 6.1 needs to reflect that. 6.1.2 & 6.1.3 have wording “must”-- a little strong; should or may? Perhaps to confining? Possibly include 6.1.2 not and but instead or.
   9. Perhaps we should go through the entire reg for must/should/may? At least section 6.
   10. Giving more versatility, faculty have a lot of demands on them, so flexibility is essential. Allows for a quality review. Need a consistent standard across all colleges; needs to address what was covered in the class.
   11. Add to 6.1.2- deviation from these standards needs explanation. Under certain circumstances, other options will be applied.
   12. Table to next meeting-- will continue to discuss.

Next meeting: Friday November 11, 2016 from 9-10:30 a.m. in Clark Hall Honors Conference Room (#205)

Adjourn- 11:59 am