Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Minutes

<div align="center">

Friday, September 16, 2016
11:30-1:00 pm
Conference Room, Honors, 2nd floor
Clark Hall

</div>

Members present:
Valerie Wust (chair), Whitney Jones, Maria Gillardo-Williams, Hernan Marchant, Jim Mickle, Mahita Nagabhiru, Nolan Watts,

Members not present: Neal Parker, Katherine Annett-Hitchcock, Paul Umbach, Anna Howard, Jason Delborne, Elizabeth Fath, Lisa Thomson

Ex-Officio Members Present:
Barbara Kirby, Erin Robinson, Grae Desmond, Mike Carter

Ex-Officio Members not present: Katharine Stewart, Diane Chapman.

Guests: N/A

Agenda- Call to order, 11:30 am

1. Introductions
2. Doodle Poll Results: Preferred Meeting Times for Fall 2016
   a. Most popular time 10:30-12:00 for October 14
   b. 9:00-10:30 am for November 11 and December 9
3. Updates on Continued Items from EoT Spring 2016
   a. Student government request for Course Detail Sheet and Additional ClassEval Questions—
      i. At UCCC there's a lot of interest, committee was just formed and charged, but has not met yet. What are the options and possibilities? Working with Registration & Records to see where it would be (in Moodle?; My PackPortal?). APC is interested in the desire of faculty to provide additional course information.
      ii. Addition of questions to ClassEval that students want to see the answer to. Barbara doesn't think that there are implications for the UCCC. Unless there are implications for how instructors might grade their courses, or items that impact classroom instruction. The questions from the students focused more on if the course was lecture-based or more oriented towards active learning. Additional questions would be accessed via a link redirecting to a separate

web survey so that those questions were not part of instructors' personnel records. The EoT committee wants to wait until UCCC approves/disapproves the course description sheet which would ultimately include the information requested by students. "Would you recommend this course to someone else" raised concerns—how could the questions be asked and how could students share their concerns within the NC State context? Currently students are sharing this information using outside tolls like https://www.ratemyprofessors.com/

b. Study Abroad: Paper evaluations for remote programs; Program directors vs. Instructor of record listed on ClassEval; Question overlap

   i. Only program still using paper evals—in SACS review it appears that in certain instances that the Program Director was not the Instructor of Record. As such, the wrong individual was being evaluated. Some question overlap? Ongoing—in Spring 2016 Study Abroad had some in ClassEval—Grae and Valerie will meet with Study Abroad again. Several of these courses are special topics—so Instructor of Record is not the same as the person who is leading the trip or teaching a particular course. Grae sends out a list of all of the courses with list of faculty who are Instructor of Record to all scheduling officers for their review, but necessary changes are often not reported before the ClasEval instrument goes live. Can be problematic for RPT - tag the problematic evaluation material (by Dean or Dept. Head). Can't change anything in a closed system; but still want to be able to mark those comments as problematic.

4. Request to Release ClassEval Data to Faculty Member for Research Purposes

   a. Sociology professor who wants aggregated data—sex and race of students and professors. On the OIRP website, it implies that this information can be compiled for faculty—Grae will change it on the website. Because our state ties the personnel record to ClassEval, we can't release the race and gender data legally.

5. Formal Request to Delay ClassEval Question Review?

   a. Currently required every three years (last cycle 2013-2016) Katharine Stewart will ask the Provost for a one-year extension where the EoT committee doesn't have to overhaul the questions again until 2017. Instead focus will be on creating a NTT evaluation policy. 7 out of 7 voting members present at the meeting agreed that we should ask the Provost for an extension. Grae suggests starting the review cycle from the month/year when the revised ClassEval questions are approved by the EoT and

entered into the system. It is currently unclear when the three-year window for revising ClassEval questions starts. Is it every three years? Or just when the questions are approved/revised? Doesn't make sense to change questions before they have been implemented and we've had a chance to look at the data they generate. Former EoT chair Beth suggested every 6 years. Next year we need to discuss how to assess TA teaching.

6. Revisiting Idea of Pilot Test Group for ClassEval Comment Generator
    a. Grae explained the instrument could possibly be used for getting a fair representation of student comments. Addresses faculty 'cherry picking' but also hopefully save faculty time for folks who have a large number of student comments. Working to make things more uniform. Writing a narrative—both the faculty member and possibly a reviewer of the teaching? Still want to do a pilot even if it's not something that we can go ahead with. RPT reports include numeric data that points to instructors who are not providing effective instruction—so incongruous comments should raise red flags for reviewers. Instrument title: "Representative Comment Selection Tool" vs. "Random Comment Generator" → concern for passage within the Faulty Senate. Implementation is problematic because there isn't an incentive. Could we put it out there for instructors to try without an incentive? Response rate is a concern; providing time in the course provides for 80-90% response rate. Setting the parameters for where to select comments will be an important choice. Erin will check to see if there are funds to incentivize faculty to pilot the instrument and collect data from faculty users.

7. Review of Suggestions for 2016-17 EOT Committee
    a. Additional suggestions or items for consideration? (Reviewed the suggestions from the previous years)

8. Initial Discussion: Current Departmental Practices in NTT Peer Teaching Reviews
    a. Chemistry- NTTs reviewed every 3 years; 2 faculty review you (above your rank)—research faculty can evaluate NTTs and NTTs can evaluate T/TT faculty. Chair chooses the peer reviewers; dept. wide review excel spreadsheet available so faculty know when they will be reviewed and who the designated reviewers are. If a faculty member does not like assigner reviewers, s/he can object and ask for different reviewers. Reviewers observe 2 classes; instrument requires review of online materials, syllabus, homework, exam and provide feedback on the whole package. Reviewer writes a narrative describing/evaluating the documents provided (some reviewers do a more thorough job than others). Faculty member being evaluated gets a copy of review from each of the

reviewers—chair does too. Supposed to put it in your promotion packet. *Policy 05.20.34*

b. PE/Music—similar to Chemistry—follows Policy *05.20.34*.

c. Biological Sciences—review every year—faculty has to find someone to do it. Every year 2 different reviewers are used. Department is still developing regulations. Best practice is to have reviewers selected by department head.

d. Each department needs to make its own rule to flesh out the university regulations. Needs to happen widely for NTT faculty. *05.20.10* also could impact this process. Some departments can't allow their faculty to be on a contract longer than a year. Other departments don't have the more explicit progression set up for NTT to be promoted in their track (Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor). Clearly articulated and implemented procedures within departments helps with the professionalization of the NTT faculty. How can we more clearly outline the idea of the importance making NTT regulations align somewhat with T/TT regulations and require departmental compliance?

Adjourn 12:55 pm

Recommendations for the 2016-17 EoT Committee:

1. Review the ClassEval questions (required every three years);
2. Continue the discussion with Student Government regarding their request for additional information regarding courses;
3. Review the NTT Peer review process. In the past few years, the committee clarified the timing and number of peer reviews for tenure track faculty. Last year's final report (2014-15) suggested that similar guidelines for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty should be discussed and policies developed;
4. Pilot the random comment generator and use results to decide if any further action should be taken;
5. Continue the discussion with Study Abroad (SA) regarding both their program evaluations and evaluations of non-NC State instructors teaching SA courses.