

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 24, 2017: 9:00-10:30 a.m.

Clark Hall OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor

Present: Jason Delborne, Anna Howard, Katharine Stewart, Jim Mickle, Maria Gallardo-Williams, Valerie Wust, Paul Umbach, Greg Young, Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Christopher Adin, Tyler Keel

Ex-officio Present: Grae Desmond, Erin Robinson, Mike Carter

Not Present: Hernan Marchant, Whitney Jones, Stephen McKinney, Justin Travis, Dami Fasina, Amy Clemmons, Diane Chapman

1. Introductions
2. Meeting times for Fall 2017: 9-1030a; Clark Hall OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor
September 21; October 19; November 16
3. Review EoT Committee Charge & Recommendations for 2017-18
 - a. Suggestions for other work items for 2017-2018?
4. Qualtrics Survey for the *Comment Selection Tool*

Adjourn 10:15 am

Next meeting: Thursday September 21, 2017; from 9:00-10:30 a.m. in Clark Hall OFD Conference Room, 4th Floor

Evaluation of Teaching: Committee Charge

1. In consultation with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, advise the Provost on matters of teaching evaluation.
2. On a continuing basis, review the effectiveness of current techniques of faculty teaching evaluation and the selection procedure for the Outstanding Teacher Awards. Recommend changes as needed.
3. Advise the Provost and Chancellor on compliance with university and general administration policies on teaching evaluation.
4. Review the best research on and models of teaching evaluation at our peer and other institutions.
5. Solicit information from colleges and departments regarding their teaching evaluation practices.
6. Suggest improvements in policy and practice.
7. Consult with the Faculty Senate's Academic Policy committee for consideration of policies, procedures and standards

Recommendations for the 2017-18 EoT Committee from the Committee Members

-Partner with student government organizations at NC State to disseminate information about *ClassEvals*. Create an infographic about the nature of *ClassEvals* and how the data is used to encourage student participation. This is the second prong of past *ClassEval* education campaigns geared at faculty.

Recommendations for the 2017-18 EoT Committee from the Chair

1. Forward proposed changes to Regulation 05.20.10 to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for review and/or approval.
 - a. The committee worked very hard on this last year, however, a paragraph needs to be added regarding the CVM's standard operating procedure. Teaching at CVM is reviewed rigorously; however the process is very different from the larger practices of campus.
 - b. We need to craft language within the regulation to make sure that it's clear that CVM standard operating procedure will be within the standards of the EoT regulations. Valerie and Katharine will be working on some language and will bring it to the committee at the September 21 meeting. Would build in the information that says that the SOP would need to be reviewed by EoT committee if they make substantive revisions. (Language within the document would state a date that the SOP was reviewed by EoT committee). There is always CVM representation on the EoT committee, so this seems reasonable. Having the date in there is considered a minor revision.
 - i. In order to be able to put the initial date in the reg, the EoT will need to review the CVM SOP in the committee meeting in September.
 - ii. CVM has a peer review committee that faculty serve on for two years, and then rotate off of the committee (but if you are senior faculty you rotate back on every 5-7 years). Can be tricky to schedule because many faculty only teach a few lessons. As such, coordination can be very tricky.
2. Make *Comment Selection Tool* available to faculty in MyPack and on the 'Build Your Dossier' page of the RPT instructions. Prepare questions for *Qualtrics* survey to elicit feedback from faculty on its utility over 2 RPT cycles (2017-18; 2018-2019). Apply for IRB exemption.

Valerie will be sending an e-mail to new members to get unity IDs to Grae so that everyone can see their teaching evaluation comments. If students would like to see comments, please contact Valerie to see her *ClassEval* comments using the tool.
3. Further educate teaching faculty on *Class Eval* using the *ClassEval* FAQ sheet and 'best practices' infographic.

To be discussed at a future meeting. Top priority: adding language to EoT reg about CVM using different instruments to evaluate teaching.
4. Work with Dr. Kenneth Royal from the College of Veterinary Medicine to develop an online calculator and infographic to help faculty to interpret *ClassEval* results appropriately and responsibility using his revised margin-of-error formula.

Would the committee like to have Dr. Kenneth Royal come and talk with us about his infographic and calculator? Yes, but we'd like to see his materials ahead of time. In particular, we would like to see confidence interval (Paul Umbach).

5. Faculty putting forward documents for promotion/tenure must present a summary of Peer Evaluations (see RTP dossier reg).
 - a. Currently we don't have a requirement that the departments use specific forms for assessment of online and face-to-face instruction. As such, reviews of teaching vary widely.
 - b. We should think the extent to which peer evaluation instruments and procedures are spelled out in the EoT reg. Can we tighten up peer evaluation both to assure that faculty get meaningful feedback and so that faculty evaluators looking at dossiers get useful feedback? Should we look once more at the regulation and the tool in future meetings?
 - c. Is there a way that anyone is keeping track of who is being peer evaluated? Would really like to be able to access this information more easily. In one department, they have to beg to be evaluated.
 - d. Will we re-educate heads on what the requirements are? We have 64 heads and all have a variable amount of familiarity with any regulation. We might need to create an education/communication plan. We may decide to start with less rigid peer evaluation procedures and continue to tighten them up in future versions of the EoT reg.
 - e. The burden on senior faculty in small departments with lots of assistant/associate professors the evaluation burden can be high, but we don't want junior faculty to feel that they're not getting peer feedback.
 - f. Do we want to try this for a few years to see what we get?
 - g. Should we move to a common form? Would we look at our peer institutions? (Much of this has been done by previous EoT committees).
 - h. Should we replace the idea of the summary of peer evaluations-- then we need to look at the dossier format wording-- then if we require the form. We are triangulating from student evaluation, peer evaluations and the candidate statement. Once there is a form that has been 'blessed' then we might be able to require that letters/peer evaluations be included in the dossier.
 - i. We don't want to be in the business of continually updating the reg; we'd like to finalize and then perhaps revisit in a couple of years.
 - j. In September 2017, the group will review the wording proposed by Katharine & Valerie.