

**Standing Committee
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes

Monday, March 18, 2019: 11:30-1pm*

Clark Hall, Room 405 - Conference Room

1. Approve Minutes from [February 11, 2018](#)
2. Updates
 - Reg changes are coming. Katherine Stewart will update us.
 - Comment Selection Tool Trial: check with TECs and Forestry
 - Report from the General Faculty Meeting on March 5th
3. This month:
 - Nominations for Chair-Elect for EoTC
 - Finalize the ClassEval report recommendation
 - OFD FAQ for ClassEval
 - Letter for DVFs over the summer
 - Letter for Faculty Candidates for the beginning of fall
4. Next month:
 - Finalize FAQ for OFD changes
 - Finalize letters to faculty
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

Jennifer Stanigar, Office of Faculty Development

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

Molly Vanhoy, Student Senate - College of Sciences

Mi Kim, History

Whitney Jones, Dept of Biological Sciences

Katherine Stewart, Provost Office Liaison

Paul Williams, Accounting, College of Management

Grae Desmond, Institutional Planning & Research (ClassEval contact)

Jason Osborne, Statistics

Matthew Warren, 3rd year Ph.D.

Rebekah Davis, Doctoral Student in the College of Education

Maria Gallardo-Williams, Chemistry

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

Not Present:

James Bartlett, ELPHD, College of Education

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

Prakhar Kumar, Masters Student in ECE, College of Engineering

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

Shweta Trivedi, Animal Science

Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Business Management

Begin meeting 11:30am

1. Minutes were approved from [February 11, 2019](#).

- Reg changes are coming. Katherine Stewart - the dossier format reg is updated, which includes the changed guidance about peer review. The EOT reg need to check with academic policy, they will contact Anna. We are close to the end of the faculty senate year at the end of April, Katharine Stewart will follow up.
- A report from the General Faculty on March 5th - evaluation of teaching was discussed. 3 EOT members and VP Katharine Stewart, along with Jade Berry-James from the Academic Policy Committee, spoke. The overall impression was very good.
- Nominations for Chair-Elect for EoTC - only a few individuals are qualified to serve as Chair, and some have removed their names from consideration, leaving only 4 members who can fill this seat. This needs to be done by the next meeting.
- OFD FAQ for ClassEval - Penny/Jennifer brought a draft for review. It was revised to remove the red text and deficit tone/negative wording. Suggestions from the committee include, (1) put a link to related strategies within the accordion-style questions, (2) change the name to 'ClassEval Response Rates FAQ', (3) change the order of questions, and (4) update citation numbers to start at 1. Send URL of final page to Grae to link from his FAQ. Unanimous vote to approve. Will do final updates and give to Jonathan Holloway to create web-based resource and printable pdf to be housed on OFD website.
- ClassEval report recommendation - The committee believes in having students evaluate their classes. It is better to fix ClassEval reporting than to start over. The committee asked whether DVFs and DH's making personnel decisions should have access to any/all of the data for RPT decisions. What is in the summary report that goes into the RPT dossier? What access do Deans and DHs have to raw SET data on their faculty? Need a ruling from General Counsel about whether the raw data and comments can be requested by any Dean/DH who asks for it for performance purposes. What are the limits here? Our questions: (a) What faculty see, (b) What DHs/Deans see, and (c) What dossier formats see. Can (a) and (b) can be different? Can DH request to pull the raw data? And should the faculty member be informed that this has been requested?
- It was proposed to change the table of findings from ClassEval from the current Mean/Dept Mean, to the format with 5s, 4s, & 3s and 1s & 2s compared to the department, along with n for faculty and department. The discussion around where to put 3s since they are more ambiguous - is it more important to see the outliers? This is

problematic because we cannot compare because we do not have relative frequencies.

The Provost is concerned about this and feels like the 3s are conceptually different since they neither reflect 'agree or disagree'. We need to make a case for where to put 3s, since these are people who do not 'disagree'. We can still look at 1s&2s carefully to see where there are teaching performance concerns.

- We should be able to convey the data in the format we want them to use it in, so they are not having to recalculate. Converting individual class data to percentages without counts is misleading. Remove the 'n' column and convert 5/4/3 and 1/2 to relative frequencies for the Department totals. The same report is used for contract renewal for teaching track/NTT faculty.
- Jason suggested consolidating columns to highlight 5/4/3 and total count and relative frequencies, for example, Q12: Individual 47/52 90%, Dept. 1599/1863 86%. This is the committee's first choice.
- Second choice ? - we are grappling with how to handle abstentions. For example: Individual 5s&4s/frequency, 3s, 2s&1s, N, Department 5s&4s % and 1s&2s %
- Committee unanimous vote in favor that AVG/SEM/Dept Avg/N report be eliminated.
- Interpretability is important - people like 2 choices, easier story to tell. Similar to the point that ClassEval needs to have 4 scale choices, not 5, but that is for next year.
- A way to account for the non-response bias - Jason described a confidence interval that would capture the proportion who did not respond (e.g., (.8, 1.0). Concerns about how this statistic may be misused. If there is a very low response rate, the faculty member could be penalized. We would need to provide the same interval for the department. After all, the committee feels this interval may be confusing for some and misused as a result.
- Get answers from General Counsel for earlier questions- what is this committee willing to sacrifice for RPT?
- Did not get to some items today: Letter for DVFs over the summer, Letter for Faculty Candidates for the beginning of fall, and Finalize letters to faculty
- Comment Selection Tool Trial: check with TECs and Forestry. No news.

Adjourned 1:00pm