Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 16, 2018: 10:30-12:00am

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

Present: Valerie Wust (Chair); Christopher Adin; Jason Delborne; Grae Desmond; Hernan Marchant, Maria Gallardo-Williams, Anna Howard, Jim Mickle, Katharine Stewart;
Students: Tyler Keel, Kirsten Stovall

Ex-officio Present: (XONV) Doug James

Not Present: Mike Carter, Diane Chapman, Brenden Drumm, Whitney Jones, Srinivasan Krishnamurthy; Paul Umbach, Greg Young
Students: Stephen McKinney, Justin Travis, Dami Fasina, Katie Valker

AGENDA

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

Chair Wust opened the meeting at 10:33am

1.Review of Minutes (11/16/17): Motion made to approve by Jim Mickle; Second by Anna Howard; Unanimous approval

2. Suggestions for Other Agenda Items for Spring 2018 meetings

- Doug James suggested educating faculty and department heads about the *Peer Review of Teaching* template that is available

3. Qualtrics Survey for the Comment Selection Tool (CST)

Chair Wust offered a summary of the development of the CST and how faculty might use it to improve their selection of Student Evaluation of Teachings for RPT.

Grae Desmond developed the CST with options for faculty to choose a number of years, courses, and comments per course as it generates randomly-generated student evaluation comments. The goal is to release the CST to faculty going through promotion or tenure as an optional tool to facilitate faculty creation of the summary needed for their RPT dossier or annual review materials. Katharine. Stewart wants to make this tool available to NC State faculty outside of the EoT Committee. The EOT Committee, per Chair Wust, wants to gather feedback on faculty use of the tool via a Qualtrics Survey.

Grae Desmond will need to clarify how many times a faculty member can run the CST to generate comments. Chair Wust tried to clarify if you could choose undergrad vs. grad classes. Maria Gallardo-Williams asked if you could simply choose specific courses. Katharine Stewart

identified a challenge that arises when certain faculty are up for promotion (particularly NTTs) who may have been teaching for a large number of years and taught many courses during the time since their last appointment. Grae Desmond might need to clarify various filters. One EOT member proposed a 'word cloud' as a useful tool, which raised concerns about what gets included in a dossier.

Anna Howard asked if the EoT regulation clarifies what type of comments should be included in a RPT dossier? Katharine Stewart clarified that the instructions are the same regardless of rank. It was reiterated that the CVM is exempted from ClassEval and uses their own instruments to allow students to evaluate courses and instructors.

Jason Delborne proposed the following CST parameters: all courses over all time, or filter w/ courses you choose (allowing multiple). Anyone pulling by class is trying to provide random data about each specific course.

Grae Desmond clarified that up to nine 'Classroom Instructors' can be added for a single course.

Jason Delborne recommends CST settings of either 1) random across all courses; or 2) choose courses.

Grae Desmond should add check box to include at least one comment from each course when CST is run.

Katharine Stewart has concerns about rolling out the CST to the general NC State population. She asked whether there a way to refine tool. The EOT Committee understands deeply what we're trying to achieve and why. Faculty won't experience the CST in that way when trying to compose RPT materials. High stress time for faculty and Dept. Heads when developing dossier. Katharine Stewart refers to a SFR Task Force she created transition the SME to a SFR, which will be generated with an online tool. The new online SFR generator is being piloted with volunteer departments.

Grae Desmond reminds the EoT that we developed the CST as 'optional tool'. If we find some departments willing to pilot it, that would give us feedback to refine tool. He also pointed out the need to clarify messaging for faculty / departments going forward. Then we can say "Faculty in X, Y, Z departments have used the CST and found it beneficial."

Katharine Stewart identified many concerns about messaging – and wants to avoid putting any faculty under review in a difficult situation vis-à-vis the DVF or Dept Heads about why they are using the CST.

Jason Delborne asked if we can we pilot the tool for Faculty Activity Reports.

SME to SFR Task Force talked w/ DH in their College and decided to be pilot departments.

Boilerplate language will be helpful and important, but we must decide on several steps for communication and rolling out a new online tool.

Doug James and Katharine Stewart discussed a possibility of forming a Task Force / subcommittee to work with a small number of pilot departments to 'beta' the CST.

Comment – When faculty lose freedom of control in how they present themselves, and use tool rather than their own comments, or add language that they can add other student comments and/or feedback on comments chosen in report. But, what if some faculty do use the CST and some don't in same department?

Katharine Stewart- EOT Committee is committed to idea of fairness in the evaluation of teaching for all faculty. Central challenge is when you put evaluations in a RPT document; data is 'summative' not 'formative' as a process to improve your teaching. Not all faculty view this data as 'formative', unfortunately.

Katharine Stewart – ask departments of former EOT Comm. Chair departments on board to participate in CST pilot: Jeff Joines; Beth Fath

To Do:

__Grae Desmond to add 'filter by course' option to the Comment Selection Tool (CST)

__Piloting the CST with 3 departments in 2018-19: Jason Delborne to check w/ DH; Valerie Wust to contact Jeff Joines & Beth Fath (former EOT Comm. Chairs, now DHs) via email to request participation

__Katharine Stewart/ Grae Desmond need to meet and discuss how to pilot CST w/ departments.

__ Assessment /Feedback on – Meet w/ Dept. prior; show how to use it; test for 1-2 months

- Schedule Mtg. #2, maybe lunch/dessert, as focus group (debrief: what faculty liked, what was confusing, etc.)
- Seek feedback on CST use, and type of instructions needed
- Qualtrics survey – immediate feedback

Chair Wust adjourned the meeting at 11:43 a.m.