**Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, March 17th, 2017: 9:30-11:00 a.m.**

Clark Hall #405 OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor

Members present: Valerie Wust (chair), James Mickle, Maria Gallardo Williams, Whitney Jones, Hernan Merchant, Andrea DeSantis, Nolan Watts  
  
Members not present: Beth Fath, Paul Umbach, Mahita Ngabhiru, Xiaojing Hou, Sarah Coffee, Anna Howard, Neal Parker, Andrea DeSantis, Whitney Jones, Kate Annett- Hitchcock, Jason Delborne, Lisa Thompson

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

Ex-Officio Members not present: Katherine Stewart, Diane Chapman

**Agenda:**

Call to order: 9:36 am

1. **NTT Peer Teaching Reviews (Reg 05.20.10 Evaluation of Teaching)**

1. Sections of particular interest: 4.2 Peer Evaluation Instrument; 6. Procedures for Peer Evaluation; OFD Peer Review of Teaching <https://ofd.ncsu.edu/teaching-learning/peer-review-of-teaching/>

Issue with 3.5- concern with confidentiality, however, you might need that information. Some instructors might take advantage of knowing that they will not be evaluated for small classes and might not put in sufficient effort. Classes with less than 5 students-- could we perhaps just have the Dean and Dept. Head see the results? Would still go in the personnel file? Technically it can be done; legally, can it? Peer institutions also set a limit for privacy reasons-- if you don’t allow for recourse on the part of the instructor. If you have a small department and you see the student multiple times throughout the time they are completing the degree, this could lead to retaliatory measures. How many courses fall into this category? Independent studies, etc.-- those are automatically excluded.

Issue of Studio classes to be forwarded to the College of Design: Studios are often small in the College of Design-- could be really good and you don’t get credit for that either. Student comment: you need to get this feedback because you have so much face time with the students--a very different type of situation than being in a class with 200. Ethical issue: instructors of small classes give a lot of individual attention to each student while other instructors chose to only meet once. Do we provide an alternative for some sort of evaluation (covered in 3.4?) for these small classes? Nothing to prevent the department from conducting a survey of student feedback in cases where a course is exempt from ClassEvals. How useful is the mean compared to the department mean? It doesn’t tell us much. Studio or other structures need to have something that’s more qualitative. Can we adjust the course evaluation rubric that would fit studios better? Instrument could be tailored, but doesn’t address the concern about anonymity. Studios are flagged within the course catalogue-- no longer put within same category as labs. Sometimes department hasn’t changed the format to schedule as a lab vs. studio.

Issue with classes of N < 5 not being included in ClassEvals: As an institution we are trying to protect student’s anonymity; but students want to give feedback-- students should have an option to give feedback. Where do students go to share that information-- Grae tells students that they can go to Dean or Dept. Head when they contact him. Only gets this question once or twice a semester. What’s the difference between 3 and 5 students for anonymity? How many courses are there that if we lower it to 3 it would make a difference? Number is arbitrary. Student comment: I would tell my academic advisor if I had a bad experience with an instructor-- could advisors give feedback to faculty/supervising administrator? Verbiage about if they have low enrollment they should take other action to evaluate those courses? Very specific case-- would it be appropriate to change the reg. for the entire university? Should we change the word anonymity to confidentiality? Half of the questions don’t fit the needs of a studio-- might look like the lab instrument. Specific instrument used in specific cases doesn’t affect the entire university. Colleges who use it (Textiles, Horticulture, Design) should be consulted. Contact R&R to get that information-- how many people are in small courses. Courses need to be set up correctly in SIS-- if you are teaching a course that is a cross listed course, it must be set up correctly, and then students can evaluate the instructor. To put this issue in perspective: ClassEvals are only one data point representing teaching in a faculty member’s portfolio. We might need to develop an instrument for ‘studios’. Will come back to this issue during the 2017-18 academic year and see how many studio courses there are in total, and how many fall below 5 students enrolled. Will be on the agenda in the coming academic year. This might be an education issue for scheduling officers. Will look in SeatMax to see if rooms and instructors overlap? Looking at second half of the clause-- do we need to change the wording? Might not need to change it. Cost benefit analysis to put in the entire system vs. maybe just allow for paper evaluation? Sections of FYI-- Program directors can’t get the course evaluations if the Dept. or Dean doesn’t share.

1. We need to consider how to align the wording 4.2.2 with the categories developed by the EOT committee on OFD. Now there is no consistent way to report peer review observations. Would help with teaching awards and RPT decisions -- just like annual report, some things might not apply to a faculty member, but s/he would need to complete this. Individual reviewer’s capability-- could we require the faculty use the given form? Recommend this instrument-- use as needed; adapt if needed. Could then compare faculty for teaching awards, raises for NTT, promotion and tenure. It helps to have instrument that could be compared. Easy to get to, easy to use, can be modified.
2. We should include some way for faculty to rebut their peer evaluation
3. Review/revise the Overall Evaluation portion of the peer-review-form to make it mandatory and change the descriptors.
4. Could we have a ‘concerns’ box’ for the EoT committee? EoT chair gets random requests on a monthly basis-- how do we review these? We need to make sure that there is a mechanism to address it through appropriate channels. Solution: The Faculty Senate has a process for registering concerns. Faculty should use this venue to report an Issue of Concern for standing committees, such as the EoT committee.

Adjourn 10:56 pm

**Next meeting:** Friday April 21st from 9:30-11 a.m. in Clark Hall OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor