Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes

Monday, January 14, 2019: 11:30-1pm

Clark Hall Conference Room, 4th floor

1. Approve Minutes from November 12, 2018, Notes from December 10, 2018
2. Updates on Continued Items from EoT Spring 2018
3. Need more volunteers for Teaching Committees
4. What to tackle this semester?
5. Communication around ClassEval – Faculty
6. Communication around ClassEval – Students
7. Other items for consideration?
8. Adjourn

Present:
Anna Howard, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Diane Chapman, Director of Office of Faculty Development
Grae Desmond, Institutional Planning & Research (Classeval contact)
James Bartlett, ELPHD, College of Education
Jason Osborne, Statistics
Jennifer Stanigar, Office of Faculty Development
Katherine Stewart, Provost Office Liaison
Matthew Warren, 3rd year Ph.D.
Mi Kim, History
Mike Carter, Graduate School, Dean's Office & Staff
Paul Williams, Accounting, College of Management
Rebekah Davis, Doctoral Student in the College of Education
Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Business Management
Whitney Jones, Dept of Biological Sciences
Invited guest: Jade Berry-James, Public & International Affairs

Not Present:
Shweta Trivedi, Animal Science
Penny Jeffrey, Sci, Tech, Engr & Math (STEM) Education, College of Education
Samuel Flynn, Student in the College of Sciences
Maria Gallardo-Williams, Chemistry
Kelia Ray, MS student in Technical Communications, College of Humanities & Social Sciences
Prakhar Kumar, Masters Student in ECE, College of Engineering

Begin meeting 11:30am

1. Minutes from November 12, 2018, Notes from December 10, 2018. Agenda item skipped. Minutes are not yet approved.

2. Updates on Continued Items from EoT Spring 2018
- Comment Selection Tool Trial: Katharine will follow up with TECs and Forestry
- The EOT reg is under review with academic policy committee first, then the executive committee of faculty senate will review this Thursday. They can send to a committee within the Faculty Senate for a deeper review or other outcome. Katherine will update by next EOT meeting.

3. Volunteers for Teaching Committees
- Jason & Matthew - Feb 1st - Outstanding Teacher Award
- Paul & Rebekah - Feb 8th - Alumni Distinguished UG Professor

Jennifer's notes following the main points of discussion:

- Katharine wants this committee to have conversations about what is happening and what the concerns are. The EOT committee has questioned the validity of SET for RPT decisions. Research suggests there is bias. If instrument is more likely to be helpful for formative/developmental insight for teaching faculty - not so much for evaluation of teaching effectiveness - what recommendations are likely? There are other forms for evaluating teaching: observations by peers or subject matter experts to provide insight into what is happening in classroom, review of course syllabus, etc.
- Katharine noted that the existing policy and practice is that SET are not the only point used for RPT decisions, however it is used along with other data points. The question was asked, how to provide helpful context for DVF on the limited use of SET for decisions? How do we catch the attention of DVFs and DHs? Ideally, Provide proper mentoring and information. You need to capture the attention of a few people that can speak up - the sheet (FAQ?) that was sent out had both good/bad, maybe add some lit review or links to a page with more info - we don't need to be so negative about ClassEvals.
- SET are an administrative and management tool. Faculty need to hear how they are doing and we want to hear from students. It may be perceived by faculty that SET is overused/overemphasized in some contexts and in some departments when the review is focused on "a number" but it is a detailed dataset - if there is nothing else constructive to say, DHs might look for evidence in the SET for something to improve. Is there a better way to display the SET data, not just the mean/avg, maybe histograms? Some non-overall questions may be higher, and some of the question wording may skew the result.
- "When you have seen one department at NC State, you have seen one department at NC State" -Katharine Stewart.
- How can we educate faculty about SETs and potential biases, and the reality of how important they are in RPT decisions, not to create incentives to change the class/manipulate to improve SETs?

- The Hornstein article points out that SETs have become commodified - what is the purpose of SET? To both improve/innovate instruction and for HR decisions. (Any time you use a single thing for multiple objectives, its usefulness decreases.)
- There is space for faculty to explain context around low SET, the arc of development, a story of scholarship or teaching, or about how it has changed and improved over time. What is the dept's culture? Can we educate faculty on the use of it, that it is not just a one shot in time?
- Can the OFD help spread this context around SETs during NFO - here is what you can do - give tools/info over next 5 years as they prepare dossier. Katharine Stewart does information sessions but not all faculty attend these or the NFO (only 50% of new faculty attend). We need multiple pathways, multiple venues, multiple voices (from DHs, DVFs, senior faculty, etc.) - maybe have DHs do a breakout session at NFO?
- Is there another way to show SET data - for example % satisfied? Are there differences between the format of the "standard ClassEval" report used for RPT vs. what faculty receive at the end of semester? The question was raised about whether we should eliminate the individual average, but keep the department mean. Histograms and frequencies may be more useful to see the distribution for individual questions.
- Can student comments be matched with responses to see what is driving dissatisfaction? We don't check for straightlining. There is value in having departmental data available and transparent.
- What department data would be appropriate? (e.g., did you fall within a confidence interval of all people teaching 400 level?) The danger of means is that people create differences where they may not exist, thinking that 4.1 is better than 4.0. The distribution of responses is more important.
- Penny Jeffery is updating the FAQ about ClassEval online and will bring to the next meeting - this can be the place for providing context about how the EOT committee thinks about ClassEval. Anna proposed that we need a statement on the web that we can point to - a reminder letter to faculty and DH's that SET is not a sole data point and give the link to FAQs. Jennifer will contact Penny to offer help on the FAQ.
- Feb 11 meeting will be held on Centennial Campus EB3, room 3235 - we hope to have a draft of FAQ and LR.

Adjourned 12:58