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

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

Clark Hall #405 OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor

Members present: Valerie Wust (chair), James Mickle, Maria Gillardo Williams, Lisa Thompson, Hernan Merchant, Andrea DeSantis

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, Nolan Watts

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

Ex-Officio Members not present: Diane Chapman

Guest: Nancy Floyd, Li Marcus

Agenda:

Call to order: 9:36 am

1. **Courses Being Taught Together but Listed Separately in R&R (Guest: Nancy Floyd)**

a. Students not being able to complete ClassEvals because of ‘low enrollments’.

 Graduate student contacted ClassEval because s/he wanted to evaluate a course,
 with 9-19 students, however, it was actually two sections listed
 together-- not cross-listed. Two classes in the same room, one coded as DE, and

 one as F2F. CHASS has a lot of dual listed courses,
 graduate and undergraduate (so the graduate students might not be prompted to
 evaluate their course). Are there other situations that they should be aware of
 where it does make sense to have two classes in the same room at the same time?
 Multi-level (grad/undergraduate) where there are additional assignments for
 graduate students. Doctoral and master’s students-- out of class
 expectations/projects, might have very different experiences. Sometimes we
 crosslist because of discipline requirement-- not because the content is different.
 Share instructors-- triple crosslist; multiple departments share instructors. Can
 combine sections. Are scheduling officers doing the same thing, or are they all
 treating this issue differently? Scheduling officers should catch these errors.

 Students who cannot officially evaluate a course can e-mail department head/dean

 with comments, however, it’s hard to preserve anonymity. Do we need to further

 educate scheduling officers, or change Part 4 of the EoT reg? Are there things that

 ClassEval (Grae) can do procedurally to avoid these sorts of issues? Many

different situations could fall into this category; so perhaps one size does not fit

 all. If this is a commonly used procedure, arbitrary assignment into small sections

would disenfranchise specific groups. There may be compelling reasons to have

two sections together in the same room. We don’t want students to be vulnerable

to being able to be identified. Also theoretically denies faculty the ability to get feedback for RPT from those students. Is there a recommendation or clarification to UCCC? Beginning of UCCC meeting they have discussion-- so that faculty can take issues back to their departments; be aware that this could be a problem. Use as a teaching case for scheduling officers to be better educated? Perhaps doing more education to make sure scheduling officers/faculty are aware of what can happen with combined courses. Trying to do away with further incentives for
faculty not to combine these classes. May need to do some faculty-level evaluations. Need to craft those messages for sharing within the graduate school.
Only current recourse for students when a course is not part of ClassEvals is to encourage them to share concerns with department head or dean. Next step-- subgroup to craft a communication to share with the scheduling officers, impacted parties. How big of a problem is this, and how do we solve it in ways that don’t hurt students or faculty? Have subcommittee (Barbara Floyd/Li Marcus) come together and then close the loop with Valerie. Barbara has seen an increasing number of dual listed courses from various colleges-- are we doing this for the right reason? Grae will run a data request to look at how many classes fall into this category. Li will touch base with Grae and Nancy.

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

a. 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/>

Made it through section 3—revisions made for the purpose of clarity. Beth Fath had a concern as an NTT that it needs to be clear to the reviewer of the NTT faculty member that they be aware of the SME for that NTT faculty member, not evaluating them based on TT expectations. Don’t have gradations for NTT faculty like we did for TT in 3? Does the committee believe that NTT faculty at different ranks should have a varied schedule for those folks like TT faculty. Current reg requires that anyone on NTT would be reviewed every 3 years-- would change if NTT who are Associate NTT faculty, should they only be reviewed every 5 years? 3.3.4 is not clear enough. Clinical faculty in the Vet school do a great deal of teaching, but the variety of NTT need to be spoken to. Set out a schedule for NTT faculty, but must remember that we have NTT faculty at all ranks (Lecturer, Sr. Lecturer; Professor of Practice, Extension, Research, Clinical, Teaching). Also be aware of college and departmental rules/standards for senior rank; don’t usurp college and departmental rules. We should have more detailed guidelines-- large and diverse group. About ⅓ of faculty fall into one of these (NTT) faculty-- maybe including folks within less than .75 FTE. Not an insignificant population. In some departments, maybe more in CHASS and CVM Clinical-- do more teaching in terms of credit hour production than the TT faculty, so we must be supporting them. NTT stay in rank for different times than TT faculty; this might be because standards for success aren’t defined, or could be a career pathway choice to stay in that pathway; so makes this tricky. Captures diversity of paths as well as diversity of timelines. Research faculty have zero teaching responsibilities, so this reg applies to them, but for example USDA will not allow them to teach. Some teaching faculty have gone for as long as 10 years without being observed. Should we put something in the reg that says NTT faculty “with teaching responsibilities”. Perhaps once you’ve reached full professor rank at the university you might not have to be reviewed every 5 years. Write this in a way that doesn’t hamstring any departments. Must either be super comprehensive, or have a small group of people who feel a bit left out, or leave it very vague. 3.3 has explicitly said faculty with teaching responsibilities. Is it problematic to put it again? Put these things upfront in 3.3; revise 3.3.4 specifically can address all other faculty ranks (lecturer, instructor, etc.). Parallel tracks should have similar expectations-- standardize things. Brings some clarity to the awards process too. Looking at 3.3.4-- do we need to re-wordsmith to get it where we want it? 3.3.1 Assistant Professors (tenure-track and non-tenure track) should receive…3.3.2..Associate Professors (tenure-track and non-tenure track) should receive, 3.3.3 Professors (tenure-track and non-tenure track) should receive… . 3.3.4 Peer review of faculty at other ranks. Remove .75 from everything below because it’s been made explicit in 3.3. Must go to the executive committee, must also go to Faculty senate. Will go from there to the Provost, might need to go to Dean’s council. The goes to general council, then it goes to EON (executive officers meeting0; once approved, then it becomes regulation. Should we also make it through 4, 5 and 6 before we send it up? (Resounding YES). After Dean’s Council looks at it/Faculty Senate sees it, might should send it to Associate Deans just so that they have some background knowledge to inform their college? Don’t need to sign off on it, just have an awareness?

In the last 15 minutes, we should look at 4? Should 4.1.1.2 need to be revised; because it’s after a certain window of time has been allowed for the reg to be implemented. Needs to be revised in 4.1.1.3. There are 3 different questionnaires, (lab questions, DE questions-- specific questions). Last review, we did not review specific questions (only on DE or lab questions). So there was an oversight in the last review and should we immediately rectify that, or should we note it and come back to it? Table the conversation of if we must look at the specific questions. Need to get the reg moving up, so we will discuss it later. (If we reviewed right now, would that mean that they are on different 3 year schedules?). Optional questions are only reviewed by Nancy, because of the timetable. Will pick up on regulation 4.2 at our March meeting.

Adjourn 10:53 am

**Next meeting:** Friday March 17th from 9:30-11 a.m. in Clark Hall OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor

*(Mark your Calendars for Final Meeting: April 21st,2017)*