

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 16, 2017: 9:00-10:30am

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

Present: Valerie Wust (Chair); Jason Delborne; Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Jim Mickle, Katharine Stewart; Students: Tyler Keel; Ex-officio Present: (XONV) Mike Carter, Doug James
Not Present: Christopher Adin, Diane Chapman, Brenden Drumm, Anna Howard, Hernan Marchant, Maria Gallardo-Williams, Grae Desmond, Whitney Jones, Paul Umbach, Greg Young; Students: Stephen McKinney, Justin Travis, Dami Fasina, Amy Clemmons, Kristen Stovall, Katie Valker

AGENDA

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

1. Doodle Poll: EoT Meeting Times for Spring 2018
To poll Thur/Fri for Spring given changing teaching and class schedules.
2. Discuss and Approve Possible Amendments from EoT Subcommittee to the Dossier Regulation (05.20.20) → Doug James, Erin Robinson, Srinivasan Krishnamurthy
-Section II, #2a & 2b
-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)
3. Question from Undergraduate Student: Why No Mid-term ClassEval?
4. Qualtrics Survey for the *Comment Selection Tool*

MINUTES

9:05 Chair Wust called the meeting to order

1. Doodle Poll: EOT Meeting Times for Spring 2018
Chair Wust invited recommendations on how to schedule Spring meetings. Members suggested that she send a Doodle poll in early December after course scheduling details are finalized in order to get member responses. Based upon discussion, the poll will focus on time slots available on Thursday and Friday.
2. Discuss and Approve Possible Amendments from EoT Subcommittee to the Dossier Regulation (05.20.20) → Doug James, Erin Robinson, Srinivasan Krishnamurthy
-Section II, #2a & 2b
-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)

Chair Wust reviewed the status from October, and Doug James and Dr. Krishnamurthy shared a working draft of recommended amendments to the RPT Dossier Format Requirement (Regulation 05.20.20) related to Peer Evaluations of Teaching. As currently written, it only notes to include “A summary of peer evaluations of teaching.” No resources, structure, or recommended practices are referenced. Dr. Stewart offered encouragement that most faculty -- regardless of SME percentage of effort devoted to teaching -- care about good teaching and that the current Regulation does not provide any helpful resources, materials, or clarity on how to craft a summary of Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

A Subcommittee led by Doug James, Erin Robinson and Dr. Krishnamurthy will make additional revisions to the working draft. When completed, Chair Wust will email the revised Recommendation to the full Committee in early December for feedback. Discussion focused on giving faculty clarity on how to write a brief summary of Peer Review of Teaching evaluations, and granting faculty the option to include unabridged copies of the Peer Reviews of Teaching. The committee also recommended that the policy should reference the Office of Faculty Development resources, definitions/explanations, and sample templates that can be used to carry out effective peer reviews of teaching. Recommendations for related revisions to Reg. 05.20.10 are forthcoming. Discussion also noted concerns to ensure confidentiality of faculty records, and to remain flexible since faculty have varying levels of teaching responsibilities. Members also noted the importance of maintaining Peer Reviews of Teaching as ‘formative evaluation’ documents, while allowing individual faculty to choose whether or not to include copies of unabridged Peer Reviews of Teaching in their dossiers. Once approved by the full EOT Committee, any recommendation for an Amendment will be forwarded via Dr. Stewart to the Provost and/or appropriate Faculty Senate committee.

3. Question from Undergraduate Student: Why No Mid-term ClassEval?

A question was submitted from a student via ClassEval staff to request information regarding why midterm ClassEval feedback is not standard practice. Members noted that many faculty engage in ongoing Classroom Assessment Techniques, and gather midterm feedback using various informal mechanisms. Chair Wust clarified that the student email was seeking clarity on how to offer feedback to a faculty member about a specific assignment. Various EOT members offered several suggestions on how to respond, and Chair Wust will reply and share several methods or avenues that the student could take to offer feedback to the instructor.

4. Qualtrics Survey for the *Comment Selection Tool*

Given the time remaining, Chair Wust suggested we postponed this discussion until the next meeting. Members agreed.

Chair Wust Adjourned the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

Next meeting: January 2018; Day/time to be determined via Doodle poll; Clark Hall