

**Standing Committee
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes

Monday, February 11, 2019: 11:30-1pm*

Centennial Campus, EB3, Room 3235

1. Approve Minutes from November 12, 2018, Notes from December 10, 2018, and Minutes from January 14, 2019
2. Updates
 - Reg changes are coming. Katherine Stewart will update us again.
 - Comment Selection Tool Trial: check with TECs and Forestry
3. This month:
 - Propose we write two letters: one for distribution at the end of this semester, one for distribution at the beginning of next semester. All in favor?
 - Propose we examine what information should be on the dossier export.
 - What goes in the letter to the faculty who are going up for promotion next year?
4. Next month:
 - Update FAQ from OFD by Classeval opening
 - What can we tell the DVF's?
5. Adjourn

* The Provost's Committee for the Evaluation of Teaching is subject to the Open Meetings Law in North Carolina. Public notice, agendas, and minutes are posted on the web.

Present:

Anna Howard, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering

Diane Chapman, Director of the 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

Matthew Warren, 3rd year Ph.D.

Mi Kim, History

Mike Carter, Graduate School, Dean's Office & Staff

Molly Vanhoy, Student Senate - College of Sciences

Penny Jeffrey, Sci, Tech, Engr & Math (STEM) Education, College of Education

Prakhar Kumar, Masters Student in ECE, College of Engineering

Samuel Flynn, Ph.D. Student in the College of Sciences

Whitney Jones, Dept of Biological Sciences

Not Present:

Katherine Stewart, Provost Office Liaison

Kelia Ray, MS student in Technical Communications, College of Humanities & Social Sciences

Maria Gallardo-Williams, Chemistry

Shweta Trivedi, Animal Science

Paul Williams, Accounting, College of Management

Rebekah Davis, Doctoral Student in the College of Education

Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Business Management

Begin meeting 11:32am

1. Minutes were approved from [November 12, 2018](#), Notes from December 10, 2018, and Minutes from [January 14, 2019](#)

- Everyone is talking about ClassEval - faculty senate, etc.
- Goals are unclear. People agree SET should not be a sole data point. Committee has worked at length on this, but people are worried about validity, in particular response rate. Some have raised the question about eliminating ClassEval.
- Strawman vote - if asked today - do we keep or ditch SET? Molly Vanhoy from student senate recently finished a round of Classeval and she said “it is important for students to have a way to give professors feedback. While not perfect, it is an opportunity to give feedback without attacking, but as a student it makes you feel that your voice is important and you have a say in your education. I am not sure what happens after classeval, but as a student it makes me feel that someone is listening to my concerns.”
- If the eval happened in mid semester, would that be better? Yes, student senate plans to consider this and could be more valuable than end of semester evaluations.
- Student feedback is valuable and the way we solicit it now may not be the best. In statistics degree program they “exit interview” students to increase awareness of areas students report being deficient.
- Comments about lack of information from one student can be taken personally in cases where the faculty has repeated said information over and over. Faculty comes away unhappy.
- FAR evaluation - the DH can say something like “comments are mixed”, they are there - so they are going to use them.
- Everyone agrees that SET is important - faculty are “sometimes desperate for anything that will prove that they are effective teachers”. This committee believes that SET should be kept in some format.
- A proposal was made to stop including the data for ClassEval in RPT decisions? Or - to be included during the department’s decisions, and not outside of the department. It would go to the DH and faculty who know what type of course it is, etc. (this would

require some education to the department) but that these numbers would not go beyond the department. There may be problems with having only one person, or just a Department Chair, making the decisions. DVF's sometimes have full access to candidate details and numbers (but this is not consistent across departments). There is problem a disparity between the college committee and the Dean, who have no access to the data.

- What data is needed? What is the purpose of this data? How much does the SET data come into play? Is it ever good?
- Are we dealing with the perception of this being awful, or is it being used in a negative way? YES, it is being used as a negative, it is either you meet the standard, or are deficient. Not only are there biases of gender and race, there is equity bias in merit pay decisions - are they good or bad is one thing, and then how are they used? Some dept chairs put in order teaching evaluations high to low, and number of publications, and using that to give merit pay.
- What is going to fill the gap? Peer evaluation? It should, but it is not enough and not done well for the most part. If we don't have a university evaluation, the department will go with a qualitative evaluation that has the potential for more subjectivity.
- They are biased, and they may be misused. They CAN be a club, but probably not often.
- Do SETs do what they should do? Yes, we see improvement, especially in 3rd year review. Anecdotal evidence shows where the numbers and comments improve. It works for a formative assessment. Vote for the RPT: Keep it but fix it? 8 in favor Ditch it? 2
- How do we fix it to mitigate the negatives?
- We believe SET is important in promotion decisions, or we can do without it?
- At the current state, the numerical evaluation serves a function, but there are adjustments that need to be made. A better presentation of histograms?
- From a student perspective - RPT meetings - what are those, what purpose do they serve, how does this affect students? TT faculty come up for tenure, provide dossier to show FAR. How do you show you are a decent teacher? Classic conception is that faculty do teaching, research, outreach. At it's best the Asst. Professor 3rd year review, looking at teaching, has to be evaluated every year. A best practice is that the voting members have input on the teaching that they see related to students, the measures from ClassEval. It can work well to intervene and provide support to early faculty, match with mentors to help them improve. NTT faculty present dossier at reappointment.
- What we can fix? What goes in the dossier. One page for every class you teach. "My ClassEval Report" and "RPT report"
- What is looked at? Department average - are you above it or below it? Can that reflect a standard deviation or range? If you overload with extra data they will not pay attention. Can we flag people who really fall out of this range? Also to show improvement.
- Deficient teaching - the department can handle needed interventions. Department can arrive at a consensus that there is an issue.
- Many factors affect response rate - it can be perceived so differently. Is there a way we could send the information to the DVF committee and not have it as a number form in the

dossier? The state law restricts IR from giving the data to the supervisory chain- at this time it goes to the department. We cannot give access to the department head and not give it to the Dean. The Dean overrides the departmental vote due to ClassEval data - it is a problem. How often does that happen?

- Do we have any data where other institutions have gotten rid of SETs?
- There are only two numbers that need to be reported based on a factor analysis of ClassEval questions. What questions are those?
- Maybe use a small number of questions that address the conduct of teachers and not about the quality of teaching. What kind of question could be asked to get at the conduct? (e.g., Does the professor answer the questions with respect?) Will students take out frustration about teaching on the conduct questions?
- What data do members of the RPT committee need? When does it come into play where it will make a difference in the vote. Ideas are showing a histogram, or other evidence like a portfolio that shows teaching innovation? Or could we start with the assumption that everyone is a great teacher and look for evidence that it's not? What could be the red flag other than a low average or one bad complaint?
- Maybe if more than half the students express dissatisfaction? Comments are still there to help for the formative evaluation of teaching.
- Replace the Average and Department Mean with two columns - # of 3s, 4s and 5s, # of 1s and 2s, and number of responses.
- Reduce number of 5-4-3, number 1-2, number of respondents, and department mean of 5-4-3s and 1-2s.
- ClassEval can be considered a summative assessment because nothing can be done after the numbers have been submitted.
- Classeval data -College and University Means
<https://oirp.ncsu.edu/classeval/classeval-results/college-and-university-means/>
- Student comments may be more biased even when the numbers may be equivalent to other faculty who are teaching just as effectively. Maybe use comments for continuous improvements rather than RPT decisions.
- Grae fielded a question from a student who wanted to see her own comments - this is the first time it has ever been asked. Is there a logical positive reason why students need to be able to log in to view read-only versions of their past SETs? There is the possibility of both good and bad intentions for doing this. Anna will respond to the student emails.
- Create a letter to faculty for when Class Eval opens this semester, and for fall, Create a letter for DVF to explain the changes in the output data - Vote to take to Katharine 10 in favor/0 opposed to request this change. Then if Katharine approves, it will go to Grae for a change. Can the RPT report old semesters generate with the questions? The two reports are separate routines. ClassEval reports will be changed going forward and RPT reports would be retroactive.

Adjourned 12:57