**Standing Committee**

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes**

**Thursday, November 8, 2019: 10:30am to 11:45am\***

Clark Hall 405 Conference Room

# Agenda

1. Vote to approve the minutes of Oct 3, 2019 meeting
2. Update on changes to REG 05.20.10
3. Discussion on alternatives to the proposed teaching evaluation report for dossier purposes
4. Additions to sub-committee to look at the ClassEval questions
5. Future agenda items
	1. Evaluation of ClassEval questions – On schedule for Spring 2020
	2. Appropriateness of ClassEval for graduate/research courses
	3. Continue to develop/add to the literature on bias in students’ response to teaching evaluations
6. Suggestions for other items to add to future meeting

# 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:**

Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Business Management

Regina Schoenfeld, Molecular Biomedical Sciences

Jason Osborne, Statistics

Matthew Warren, Graduate Student, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

James Bartlett, ELPHD, College of Education

Mi Kim, History

Grae Desmond, Institutional Planning & Research (Classeval contact)

April Kedrowicz, Dept of Clinical Sciences

Katherine Stewart (KS), Provost Office Liaison

Suzanne Williams, Health and Exercise Studies

Jennifer Stanigar, Office of Faculty Development

**Not Present:**

Anna Howard, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering

Diane Chapman, Director of the Office of Faculty Development

Andrey Kuznetsov, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering

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

Shweta Trivedi, Animal Science

Ashley Cummings, Student, College of Sciences

Angela Ramsdell, Student, College of Sciences

Grace Parker, Student, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Begin meeting 10:32 am

1. Approved [Minutes from October 3, 2019 meeting](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B803QUmO644fWUN5UXZWSkxNNDBuYk5Cb2RJUnJkRDdKTVM4)
2. At the opening of the meeting, a quorum was not present. Some members arrived late, and a quorum was present by the end of the meeting.
3. REG 5.20.10 Update
	1. Waiting to hear from OFA if there is a final draft, so we can discuss with the Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee (APC).
4. Discussion on alternatives to the proposed teaching evaluation report for dossier purposes
	1. Main comments from Department Heads (DHs)
		1. Liked that we are considering addressing the bias issue;
		2. Did not like our proposal, and doing away of the means. They can get dept. mean and instructor mean anyway (from semester reports).
	2. Short term - a specific teaching evaluation report for dossier with decision points:
		1. The distribution of scores. Do we include all five categories, or three categories %1,2s; %3s; %4,5s, with or without instructor average;
		2. No benchmark, DHs did not like it, either benchmark by course level or by course history;
		3. Add language alerting DH/DVF to the different forms of bias in SETs;
		4. Educate DH/DVF on bias - prepare a presentation with research base.
	3. Medium/long term
		1. Add language to SETs, alerting students to bias;
		2. Add reflection on teaching or statement of teaching philosophy to dossier;
		3. Modify/change the Classeval questions. Current questions include course difficulty, workload, learning, preparation for student’s future, etc. There are 8 questions about the instructor, 4 about the course.
	4. Comments from EOT Committee
		1. Prior Chair Anna Howard: “..biggest concern is that we not offer a statistically unsound single average - even if that is what the faculty want. The EOTC understands that such averages are biased and imprecise”;
		2. DHs are using the average as a ‘precise measure’ which adds other types of bias. If we can use a full histogram instead of percentages, it doesn’t take up more pages and it gives more information;
		3. The departmental mean could be used, except it should be coupled with the availability of the grade distribution. There is a huge difference between instructors who give 90% A’s, 60% A’s, or 30% A’s. There are instructors who get 5s who give a lot of As, and people who get 5s because they are truly excellent teachers;
		4. There are ramifications for the department’s teaching culture (e.g.,Does instructor make students read? If not, they are more popular!). There are consequences, faculty should know that someone will be looking at grade distribution as part of the review;
		5. If a faculty member is going up for RPT, the report should give a ‘way out’ for instructors who want to hold onto a standard of teaching;
		6. If we are going to do a grade distribution, report this by gender and ethnicity to look at equity issues;
	5. The EOT committee needs to think carefully about the feedback received about the proposed changes to the Classeval (CE) report and develop a statement:
		1. We can tweak the CE report for the short-term, or we can look at the section about teaching effectiveness of the dossier REG and propose a fundamental shift that goes beyond improving the CE report;
		2. Do we believe that the CE Report is broken and tweaking is not enough, thus we need to fix the teaching evaluation process?
		3. We are hearing lots of add this and remove that...and concern is starting with fundamentally the thing - if we can’t fix the CE report to the satisfaction of the EOTC;
		4. We think CE are good for formative work between DH and faculty and a good tool for that. But do we think in a promotion dossier the teaching portfolio should look fundamentally different? Does the CE report not belong in the dossier because people use it as a summative instead of formative evaluation?
	6. Universities around the country are grappling with the fact of bias in SETs and the potential benefits of formative use. How do we get the best out of SETs and not use them in ways that makes their use in personnel decisions problematic? There are many universities who are improving that process and have changed the way they do SETs without giving up the voice of students - we don’t need to reevaluate the problems. NC State will not negate the voices of students.
		1. This committee advises the Provost - we need to address this in a more fundamental way. First, improve the CE report that goes into the RPT dossiers. If the CE report cannot be improved enough that we trust having it in a teaching evaluation for RPT, we can advise the Provost that we completely upend it. The EOT has spent many hours on improving the CE report;
		2. One response is to compromise - or another is to do much bigger than this ‘you want radical, we can give you radical’ (e.g., eliminate ClassEval);
		3. Is the committee worried that this would backfire and that we will go back to using qualitative evaluation at the dept level?
		4. We don’t have to make this up - let’s look at other Universities who have tried to reduce the biases that students have around differences, and biases that other faculty have about faculty who are different in whatever way. We can find and contact other Universities and find the committees who worked on them. These are our colleagues. Can we learn from you?
5. Further comments about alternatives to the CE report
	1. Instead of offering the mean, you could use the median departmental score. Some problems can be solved by using appropriate measures;
	2. If we are trying to improve teaching in the department - the average will go against one instructor who shares ideas/innovates (Srini, I didn’t catch this…)
	3. It is norm vs. criterion grading;
	4. Can grade distribution be combined with ClassEval reports? Need to investigate if that is possible. Grae asked Katharine. If the dossier REG says that these can be part of the package, then it becomes information that is part of the personnel file. Ask Sarah Lannom (General Counsel). It is publically available on the web;
	5. How might it affect those who teach in professional programs? These are competency-based. Would it put those faculty at a disadvantage? No, it would only be at the College level. There is only one vote from the Provost, who is looking at a more ‘Gestalt’ level and it is expected that the grade distribution would receive scrutiny at the department and college level.
6. Voting: Review handout of options: A summary of the current report vs. initial proposal, backup plan, and Anna’s idea.
	1. KS didn’t hear that DHs need an average to accept the proposal. Some are totally fine with that idea;
	2. Does this committee want to recommend the categories, the numbers and percentages for these three categories: 5s,4s; 3s; and 1s,2s?
	3. Do we want to have the departmental benchmarks? 5 Nos, 1 Yes, 2 Abstain - Voted to NOT have the departmental benchmark;
	4. Do we want to add grade distribution? Jason suggested we look at [gradeinflation.com](http://www.gradeinflation.com/) from Duke. It is an issue. Information about how an instructor grades is formatively useful, not sure about summatively;
	5. Add language alerting DH/DVF to bias and Educate DHs with 2-3 slide presentation - Unanimous vote to ADOPT this for the ClassEval report;
	6. EOT Committee can send Provost a message: Do you want to charge this committee with this work, or form a working committee to make a more inclusive group? The Faculty Senate would have to see it, do it all and present ‘fait accompli’ but generally speaking changes of that magnitude need participation and transparency. Engage the people who will be most likely to be involved with implementation.
7. Additions to Sub-committee that will look at ClassEval questions
	1. Sub-committee members: Srini, Mi, Andrey, James, Matthew, and Grae
	2. Each college and department have different ways of assessing students for learning, therefore each college/department should submit the questions they think are ‘missing’ to compare lists and to have something to work with.
	3. What are the questions that are pertinent for the EOT committee as a whole that can be discussed by the sub-committee in the Spring 2020? Both additions and subtractions. James asked: what about doing a factor analysis to see what questions are measuring the same thing? Mi: Is there a way we can get a more diverse perspectives/feedback in this process?
8. Future agenda items
* EOT Committee may suggest for the medium/long term to:
	+ Add language to SETs, alerting students to bias
	+ Add a section on faculty reflection, teaching statement, etc. to dossier
	+ Modify/change the ClassEval questions
* Appropriateness of Class Eval for graduate students
* Continue to develop the literature

Meeting adjourned at 11:44 am