

ANNUAL REPORT

University Standing Committee Evaluation of Teaching

Academic Year Covered by Report **2017-18**

Date Report Submitted: **June 4, 2018**

Report Submitted by **Dr. Valerie Wust**

Number of times committee met **6** (January 2018 meeting cancelled due to inclement weather; March 2018 meeting cancelled as Chair Wust was on FMLA for back surgery).

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2018-19 EOT COMMITTEE:

1. Vice Provost Katharine Stewart to forward EoT Committee's proposed changes to Regulations 05.20.10 and 05.20.20 to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for review and/or approval. Once the revisions are approved, EoT Committee should prepare a memo/communication to educate deans, department heads and faculty as to significant changes in these two regulations, particularly as pertains to the policies and procedures for the *Peer Review of Teaching*.
2. Vice Provost Katharine Stewart will pilot the *Comment Selection Tool (CST)* with faculty in the Department of Textile Engineering, Chemistry and Science (Head: Dr. Jeff Joines) and the Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources (Head: Dr. Tom Gower). Use feedback from faculty on the tool to implement changes to the *CST*. Prepare a FAQ sheet for deans, department heads and faculty who may choose to use the tool in RPT dossier preparation and possibly an educational video from Vice Provost Katharine Stewart. Craft boilerplate language that faculty using the *CST* will insert into their dossiers to show that the qualitative comments about their teaching taken from *ClassEval* were randomly generated.
3. Partner with student government organizations at NC State to disseminate information about *ClassEval*. Create an infographic about the nature of *ClassEval* and how the data is used to encourage student participation. This is the second prong of past *ClassEval* education campaigns geared at faculty.
4. Further discuss gender and racial bias in student evaluations of teaching, referencing the extant research and deciding how to best educate students and faculty on this issue. Specific questions to begin discussion: 1. How do other universities approach the issue of bias in faculty evaluation and in student course evaluations?; 2. What are the ways that the campus can reduce bias in student evaluations and in faculty reviews of teaching?; 3. How can the EoT increase awareness of implicit bias in course evaluations (students and peer) and offer practical strategies to the campus for mitigating bias?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS/ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE

Below is a summary of topics the committee discussed and any actions taken. The word (new) denotes any new issues brought to the committee in the 2017-18 academic year.

(new) Incoming EoT Committee Chair: At the April 2018 meeting, Dr. Anna Howard (Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering) was unanimously voted in as the EoT Committee Chair for the 2018-19 academic year.

REG 05.20.10 revisions from 2016-17: The majority of EoT meeting time during the 2016-17 academic year was devoted to revising the EoT regulation, with particular attention being paid to the timing and number of reviews for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty. At the September 2017 EoT Meeting, these changes were approved by the committee (see 3.1; 4.1.1.1; 4.1.2.2; 4.2; 5.1; 7.5; 8.2).

(new) Additional Revisions to the Evaluation of Teaching Regulation (05.20.10) to Reflect the Special Case of the College of Veterinary Medicine: The Provost had verbally given an exemption to the CVM to not use *ClassEval* for student evaluation of teaching at its inception due to rigorous Vet school accreditation standards. This exemption, however, is not currently written into Regulation 05.20.10. The EoT Committee reviewed the CVM's SOP and agreed that their treatment of peer and student evaluation of teaching met and even exceeded the expectations outlined in the EoT regulation. Chair Wust and Vice Provost Stewart revised the EoT regulation to officially exempt the College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) from using *ClassEval* (see new section 3.6) and the EoT approved this addition. It was also decided that a hyperlink to CVM's Academic Support Unit should be added at the top of regulation (www.cvm.ncsu.edu/asu)

(new) Amendments to the Dossier Regulation Pertaining to the 'Summary of Teaching' (05.20.20): 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. To this end, the EoT Committee proposed revisions to Section II, #2a & 2b of the Dossier Regulation, whereby RPT dossiers would contain the following: a brief (1-2 page) summary of Peer Evaluation(s) of Teaching that identifies and/or includes: period of time covered (since initial appointment or most recent RPT review); A list of dates & names of peer reviewers; Selected quotes or evaluative statements from each peer review document that describe the quality of teaching; and An explanation of teaching modifications or improvements made in response to feedback along with evidence of progress. Candidates would also be required to provide copies of the unabridged Peer Evaluation of Teaching documents from the current review period.

(new) Next Steps with the Comment Selection Tool (CST): In 2016-17, the EoT committee had discussed piloting the *CST* on a voluntary basis with faculty going through the RPT process between 2018-2020 and getting feedback to further refine the tool. Vice Provost Stewart suggested instead following the 'departmental pilot model' with focus groups that she used with the online SFR generator to much success. It was decided that the EoT would create a task force to work with two volunteer departments to pilot the *CST* during the 2018-19 academic year: Textile Engineering, Chemistry and Science (Head: Dr. Jeff Joines) and the Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources (Head: Dr. Tom Gower).

(new) Addressing Gender and Racial Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching: For the April 2018 EoT Meeting, members read a recent article from SLATE, suggested by Dr. Zonderman (Head of History) → <https://slate.com/human-interest/2018/03/student-evaluations-are-discriminatory-against-female-professors.html> The article led to a broad initial discussion, with committee members agreeing that bias should be a focus for 2018-19, particularly as relates to gender bias and validity of *ClassEval* and how this information is used by departments and in promotion and tenure decisions. Student members recommended creating an infographic, showing how men/women faculty receive different feedback from their students. It was noted that research papers exist and should be referenced. Vice Provost Stewart posed questions for the EoT to consider in ongoing discussions: 1. How do other universities approach the issue of bias in faculty evaluation and in student course evaluations?; 2. What are the ways that the campus can reduce bias in student evaluations and in faculty reviews of teaching?; 3. How can the EoT increase awareness of implicit bias in course evaluations (students and peer) and offer practical strategies to the campus for mitigating bias?

RECOMMENDATION FOR REVISION OF CHARGE AND/OR MEMBERSHIP CONFIGURATION (if applicable) N/A