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

Friday, April 21st, 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, Kate Annett-Hitchcock, Jason Delbourne, Lisa Thompson, Hernan Merchant, Nolan Watts, Neal Parker  
  
Members not present: Beth Fath, Paul Umbach, Mahita Ngabhiru, Xiaojing Hou, Sarah Coffee, Anna Howard, Andrea DeSantis, Whitney Jones

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

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

Agenda:

Call to order: 9:35 am

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

-Discuss draft including all suggested revisions made by the EoT Committee during the 2016-17 academic year

Conversation about if we should simply have everyone reviewed every three years and have all who have been tenured or promoted on a five-year rotation.  Good for dossier for EVERYONE to have a 3-year review.  1st three years reviewed every year, then on to a 3 year-- which is the way it is now, except for associate without tenure.  Reviewed yearly-- based on time from entry into role.  Everyone has to be reviewed every three years, that could put a lot of stress on the senior faculty to offer those reviews.  Does everyone get observed in their first year, but then associate professors who are brought in without tenure reviewed every three afterwards?  Add a whole new section that is a catch all for clinical, professor of the practice, lecturers, etc.  Some faculty are hired and don’t have to teach for the first year or two; so should the verbiage be ‘upon beginning teaching’.  Goal is to provide the structure of feedback on teaching for early-career faculty. This provides formative feedback to the faculty member and their department.  Should we allow in person class that is captured by Mediasite; could the instructor be reviewed from home?  If we put it in the reg, then it opens the door for everyone to do it that way, which doesn’t allow for seeing student-faculty interaction, or hearing student questions/seeing the instructor if they are anywhere but in the front.

Looking at 6.1.4, should we make it weaker-- make it a recommendation that faculty meet in person before and after-- that is best practice, but sometimes it is difficult to get materials ahead of time from tenured faculty-- if there is an imbalance of power between the reviewer and the person being observed.

Jim Mickle is going to take a stab at creating a table of the various types of teaching faculty.

URPC meet with Provost; should the candidate make a summary of the peer reviews?  Current requirement in dossier for peer review of teaching is that there must be a summary.  Not clear that the summary should be composed by someone other than the faculty member.  Should we say that those forms used for observation and any faculty response should be included in the dossier.

Should we have something about the fact that people who are in the peer review process should be observed by \*different\* faculty peers.  We must also make explicit that faculty reviews don’t have to be done by multiple reviewers at the same; that over the years of review-- every effort must be made to have different individuals do the observations.  Can’t require because some department have very limited degrees of freedom.

Small numbers of students; can’t do class eval with fewer than 4 students.  Students think that feedback will assure that things change; that may not change things, even if they were in a larger class and the reviews are negative; things don’t always change just because of negative feedback.

Section 4-- allows for review of course eval questions after 3 years to implement them.

Changing ‘teacher’ to instructor to reflect the fact that at the college level instructor of record means the person teaching the course.

Proposal that five and six change places.  Should we split the reg to have student evaluations as one part and faculty evaluations as a different section?  Because it has been tinkered with multiple times, it might be a good idea to have it

3.1- all courses must be evaluated by students but 3.3 peer review of teaching.  Retitling and recombining to reflect things.  Student evaluation of teaching and Peer Review of teaching-- as headers and move things around appropriately.  Section 7 is fine to be left where it is, as are sections 8 & 9.

Discuss how exit interviews and alumni feedback should be included?

All 7,8,9 look good.  4.2.2- spells out what has to be there; and allows for linkage and spell out the categories.  There needed to be an evaluative component in the final peer review; not just documenting, but assessing.  2.3 Peer review- colleagues of any rank mutually agreed upon.  There is no difference between tenure track and teaching track instructors.  Faculty member and department head decide together who should do the review.

Thanks to everyone for their service on the committee.  Congratulations to Nolan on graduating and finding a new job in D.C. working on data for political campaigns.

Adjourn 10:53 pm

**Next meeting:** August 2017, date and time to be determined via Doodle Poll