

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Meeting Agenda

Monday, September 10th, 2018: 1:30-3 pm

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

1. Introductions
2. Meeting times for Fall 2018: Mondays at 1:30 on Sept 10, Oct 8, Nov 12, and Dec 10.
3. Acknowledge Previous Work
 - a. Additional revisions to the Evaluation of Teaching Regulation (05.20.10) to reflect the special case of the College of Veterinary Medicine
 - b. Amendments to the Dossier Regulation Pertaining to the 'Summary of Teaching' (05.20.20)
4. Updates on Continued Items from EoT Spring 2018
 - a. Gather feedback re comment selection tool.
 - Follow up with Vice Provost Katherine Stewart re trial in TECS & Forestry
 - Change tool as needed
 - Determine strategy for further roll-out
 - Craft FAQ sheet for deans, dept heads, & faculty. Coordinate further communication.
 - b. Develop student education plan for classeval. Info graphic?
 - c. Develop a way to push info to faculty to increase participation in classeval.
5. New Business: Bias in SETs (student evaluations of teaching)
 - How biased is it?
 - What do we need to do to allow SETs to be used in hiring, PRT, etc?
 - What do other universities do?
 - Are there ways to identify or mitigate bias?
 - How do we have a consistent messaging about the incidence of bias in teaching evaluation both from a student and a DVF point of view.
6. ClassEval questions review will be next year.
 - a. Currently required every three years (last cycle 2013-2016)
7. Additional suggestions or items for consideration?

Adjourn

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?

Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016) "Student Evaluation of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." ScienceOpen
<https://www.scienceopen.com/document/vid/818d8ec0-5908-47d8-86b4-5dc38f04b23e>

Abstract: Student evaluations of teaching (SET) are widely used in academic personnel decisions as a measure of teaching effectiveness. We show:

1. SET are biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant
 2. the bias affects how students rate even putatively objective aspects of teaching, such as how promptly assignments are graded
 3. the bias varies by discipline and by student gender, among other things
 4. it is not possible to adjust for the bias, because it depends on so many factors
 5. SET are more sensitive to students' gender bias and grade expectations than they are to teaching effectiveness
 6. gender biases can be large enough to cause more effective instructors to get lower SET than less effective instructors
- These findings are based on nonparametric statistical tests applied to two datasets: 23,001 SET of 379 instructors by 4,423 students in six mandatory first-year courses in a five-year natural experiment at a French university, and 43 SET for four sections of an online course in a randomized, controlled, blind experiment at a US university.

The authors conclude:

In the US, SET have two primary uses: instructional improvement and personnel decisions, including hiring, firing, and promoting instructors. We recommend caution in the first use, and discontinuing the second use, given the strong student biases that influence SET. Overall, SET disadvantages female instructors. There is no evidence that this is the exception rather than the rule. Hence, the onus should be on universities that rely on SET for employment decisions to provide convincing affirmative evidence that such reliance does not have disparate impact on women, underrepresented minorities, or other protected groups. Absent such specific evidence, SET should not be used for personnel decisions.