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

**Thursday October 19, 2017: 9-10:30am**

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

Present: Valerie Wust (Chair); Anna Howard, Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Jim Mickle, Students: Brenden Drumm, Tyler Keel, Kirsten Stovall

Ex-officio Present: (XONV) Katharine Stewart, Doug James, Erin Robinson

Not Present: Christopher Adin, Mike Carter, Diane Chapman, Jason Delborne, Grae Desmond, Maria Gallardo-Williams, Whitney Jones, Hernan Marchant, Paul Umbach, Greg Young
Students: Stephen McKinney, Justin Travis, Dami Fasina, Amy Clemmons, Katie Valker

**AGENDA**

1. EoT Representation for the Board of Governor’s Teaching Award Committee

-Nomination review begins November 17th. Committee meets sometime December 11-13th. Light workload.

1. Faculty Member Concern about Timing of ClassEval Administration
2. Discuss and Approve Possible Amendments to the Dossier Regulation (05.20.20)

-Section II, #2a & 2b. Clarification needed as to whether to produce summaries of peer evaluations of teaching. If so, who produces the summary? Alternatively: require unabridged peer evaluations of teaching.

-Additional document related to Regulation 05.20.20: Peer Teaching Evaluation Summary Guidance: <https://provost.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/PeerTeachingEvaluationSummaryGuidance_updated2.15.16.pdf>

**MINUTES**

9:05 Chair Wust called the meeting to order & had introductions of new members

1. Need EoT Representation for the Board of Governor’s Teaching Award Committee

Nomination review begins November 17th. Committee meets sometime December 11-13th. Light workload. Valerie is not able to serve due to travel conflicts. Dr. James Mickle will serve.

 2. Faculty Member’s Concern about Timing of ClassEval Administration

Chair Wust shared one faculty member’s concern that ClassEvals are completed prior to students completing and receiving grades from their final assignments or final exams. In their view, as a former student they felt it was important to obtain a final grade and feedback from an instructor prior to being able to offer an appropriate evaluation of their teaching. The Committee has had prior discussions about the scheduling and several members offered reasons why ClassEval is administered prior to students completing final exams to include:

1. Research on survey design and NC State’s ClassEval administrators have shown higher response rates and more candid, thoughtful responses when participants are informed early about when they can complete the survey and given time ‘in class’ to complete the online surveys. If delayed until after final exams are completed and students depart campus for holidays or breaks, response rates drop significantly.
2. If students want to offer more feedback (positive or negative) about an instructor after ClassEvals, they are always free to contact the ClassEval Help Desk, faculty member directly, or a Department Chair. The ClassEval administrator has on a few occasions received information from students after ClassEval ended and shared those with faculty or Department Heads as appropriate. For positive feedback, students can also use the Thank-a-Teacher submissions coordinated by the Office of Faculty Development.
3. ClassEval itself offers a combination of closed-end and 3 open-ended questions for students to enter any comments or specific feedback to the instructor.

Given this discussion, EOT Committee supported Chair Wust to offer a response to the faculty member who raised this question.

3. Discuss and Approve Possible Amendments to the Dossier Regulation (05.20.20)

-Section II, #2a & 2b. Clarification needed as to whether to produce summaries of peer evaluations of teaching. If so, who produces the summary? Alternatively: require unabridged peer evaluations of teaching.

-Additional document related to Regulation 05.20.20: Peer Teaching Evaluation Summary Guidance (<https://provost.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/PeerTeachingEvaluationSummaryGuidance_updated2.15.16.pdf>

The Committee discussed Regulation 05.20.20 and noted a lack of guidance or resources for faculty on how to prepare a summary of their teaching. It was noted that Colleges and Departments differ on methods to conduct Peer Reviews of Teaching. Recent EOT Committees have developed a template that is available online and recommended. It was proposed that OFD staff create a new online video tool to support the use of the template and to inform faculty OFD staff can provide consultations. Currently, the unabridged Peer Evaluation of Teaching documents are not required, and generally not included, as part of dossier submissions. The EOT Committee had consensus that the Peer Review of Teaching should remain a ‘formative assessment’ designed to provide constructive, regular feedback to faculty with teaching responsibilities. The Committee does not recommend making it mandatory to include all Peer Reviews of Teaching in the dossier since that would be a dramatic shift to make it a ‘summative assessment.’ Moreover, it was noted that Department Heads generally addresses all aspects of a faculty member’s realms of responsibility (teaching, research, service, etc.) in their summary reports to any Dept. Voting Faculty (DVF) reviews. However, the Committee agreed to form a small subcommittee (Dr. Krishnamurthy, Doug James, Erin Robinson) who will draft a recommendation to enhance the language of Reg. 05.20.20 to ensure proper hyperlinks to supporting material are active. This would also add a link to another document called “Peer Teaching Evaluation Summary Guidance” that is not linked. Finally, the Committee felt it important to clarify that any faculty member would have the option to include Peer Review of Teaching evaluations as part of their dossier package if they felt it would enhance the summary of their teaching.

Adjourn at 10:20 a.m.

**Next meeting:**

Thursday, November 16, 2017;

9-10:30a; Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th Floor