

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Agenda

Friday, November 11, 2016: 9:00-10:00

Clark Hall Honors Conference Room, Room #205

Members present: Valerie Wust (chair), Nolan Watts, Lisa Thompson, James Mickle, Kate Annette-Hitchcock, Beth Fath, Neal Parker, Whitney Jones.

Members not present: Jason Delbourne, Hernan Merchant, Paul Umbach, Anna Howard, Mahita Ngabhiru, Xiaojing Hou, Maria Gillardo Williams, Andrea DeSantes.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Erin Robinson, Katharine Stewart, Grae Desmond

Ex-Officio Members not present: Doug James, Diane Chapman, Barbara Kirby, Mike Carter.

Agenda:

Call to order: 9:03 am

1. Spring 2017 EoT Meeting Schedule (Doodle poll)

Fridays are the best day, although some committee members teach in the morning. Other faculty members have standing meetings and possibly faculty meetings on Friday afternoon. Doodle poll forthcoming.

2. Update on Student Government Request for Additional ClassEval Questions

Tabled for this meeting. Valerie and Nolan will present request to the Academic Policy Committee on 01-17-2016.

3. ClassEval Comment Generator: Next Steps

a. *Deciding on official name*

Comment selection tool, Random needs to be a part of the name. Representative comment selection tool. Final choice **Comment Selection Tool**. The Comment Selection Tool will be housed in the same location where the RPT report is downloaded at the top of ClassEval in MyPack. It will be accessible from the BUILD YOUR DOSSIER page using the 'generate ClassEval report' link.

b. *Boilerplate language for RPT dossier*

“The Comment Selection Tool is designed to help faculty generate a quick, representative and randomized sample of open-ended student comments from the ClassEval end-of-semester student evaluations of teaching. The open-ended questions are drawn from faculty strengths and weaknesses, course strengths and weaknesses, and other comments.” Use these quotes from the proposal provided by Doug James for the boilerplate language that faculty will cut and paste into their RPT dossiers. Grae will write up the explanation of the delimitations faculty can place on the tool itself.

When do we ask for this feedback using a Qualtrics survey? Immediate after faculty have used the tool and then again after the dossier has gone through committee?

We will need to include the following preamble in RPT dossiers to introduce the comments and the way in which they were selected to the DVF. *“This faculty member has opted to use the Comment Selection Tool. The Comment Selection Tool is designed to help faculty generate a quick, representative and randomized sample of open-ended student comments from the ClassEval end-of-semester student evaluations of teaching. The open-ended questions are drawn from faculty strengths and weaknesses, course strengths, and weaknesses and other comments.”* Would provide the generated comments report in Excel, PDF and MS Word. Boilerplate language will be at the top of the report.

The student comments reports will include a textbox for a RPT candidate response-- would be built into the report generated. Grae will build a box into the report that says “Faculty Response”. Suggestion: RPT candidate flags comments that are completely inappropriate. Department Head would have to allow specific comments to be flagged, and then it wouldn't be a part of the comments that were generated. Concern that most faculty would not do that consistently. Suggestion: Allow faculty to run the tool up to 3 times to assure there are no inappropriate comments that do not relate to the course or instructor.

Would we lock the Comment Selection Tool (only run it X number of times)-- would lock for a week? a month? Partial consensus for running it 3 times. Unlock after 6 months?

c. Questions for Qualtrics survey of users

EoT committee members should try out the Comment Selection Tool again. Play with it until you break it. Come back with comments on how many courses you selected and how many comments per course, any skew you saw, what delimitations you would suggest for roll out to the larger faculty community. **Please take notes about your experience with the tool and bring them to our December meeting for discussion.**

Grae needs Unity IDs to give new EoT committee members access to the system. Any committee members who are not instructors can ask Valerie Wust or Erin Robinson for access to their ClassEval data to play around with the *Comment Selection Tool*.

<https://classeval.ncsu.edu/secure/demo/randomCECommentSelect.cfm>

-Katharine S suggests that we collect feedback on the tool over 2 RPT cycles (2017-2018; 2018-2019) to determine its utility from a faculty perspective.

-We need to create a sub-committee for the Qualtrics survey on the tool. Erin will approach Katharine and Diane as to who should serve on this committee for continuity purposes as the EoT chair and voting members rotate in 3-year cycles. Decide who will contact Nancy Whelchel about this initiative, prepare the Qualtrics survey, request IRB exemption etc.

Notes for the team developing the Qualtrics survey:

We need to be sure to include all types of faculty rank in the demographic section. Katharine Stewart will provide us with a complete list.

Demographic section: Add in pull-down menu with 'Years on faculty at NC State University' with numbers 1-40+. Also at the top of demographic information after 'Dept' add 'Major (optional)' and 'Concentration (optional)' for programs with subsections.

Additional question to be added to body of survey: 'Have you ever reviewed a RPT dossier in the past at NC State University' → Yes or No.

Remove 'Optional Question' asking for a one-page response to the student comments that were selected.

We need to finesse the wording around how satisfied you are with the feedback. We need to ask why—because you got an irrelevant comment, or just negative comment—the two are different.

We need to ask about irrelevant comments in particular.

Why are we asking for demographic data? (For a best practice paper) Need to be able to justify collecting this information.

Would put this Qualtrics link after the tool-- Grae would just have it link to the landing page after you use the tool and redirect to the survey. Suggestion to leave it up for two years and look for a consistent message from the faculty. Need to run it for a few RPT cycles.

Questions: Would we want to see their response to the comments generated? What does that serve? Does not help us to change the generator tool, so perhaps not.

Grae will add the ability to download data in Excel, MS Word and PDF.

4. NTT Peer Teaching Reviews (Reg 05.20.10 Evaluation of Teaching)

Final once over. Document came back from legal in April 2016. Will continue at December 2016 meeting.

Note: At top of regulation add OFD teaching evaluation hyperlinks.

a. Update wording on frequency of review of ClassEval core questions based on clarification from Provost

4.1.2.3-- add upon implementation. *"The review of core ClassEval questions is to be conducted three years after changes to the instrument are implemented. In the case that a decision is made not to modify the core ClassEval questions the review is to begin three years after that decision."* Katharine will take this wording to the faculty senate when we've finished.

Note for future chair: Distance Education courses and labs have slight differences in the questions. (We unanimously decided not to make any changes to those questions, so they will need to be reviewed in November of 2019).

Action Item: Grae will ask Nancy Welchel if faculty using mid semester surveys in their own courses need to get that survey approved.

3.3.2 When possible, peer reviews should be scheduled in the academic years preceding review.

Should match Associate and Full Professor language.

Hyperlink within 3.4 to have the NC State Guide on Peer Review of Teaching. Also put it at the top of the reg in those hyperlinks as faculty are having trouble finding the document.

Will pick up on regulation 4 next time.

Adjourn at 10:23 am

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