ANNUAL REPORT

University Standing Committee   - Evaluation of Teaching Committee
Academic Year Covered by Report   - 2019-2020
Date Report Submitted   - June 1, 2020
Report Submitted by   - Srinivasan Krishnamurthy, Chair
Number of times committee met   - Seven (March 2020 meeting was cancelled, discussion via Qualtrics survey)
Name of Chair Elect (if known)   - Not known

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2020-2021 EOT COMMITTEE

a) Follow up on progress to the changes to REG 05.20.10 – Evaluation of Teaching that were approved by the EOT.

b) Follow up on the results of the pilot use of the Comment Selection Tool (CST).

c) Continue to update the literature on bias in student evaluations, and to examine ways to educate the DHs/DVFs (and maybe even students) on issues of bias / implicit bias.

d) Discuss whether any changes need to be made to the teaching section of the RPT dossier (e.g., providing for a teaching statement).

e) Discuss use of inappropriate language by students in the comments section of ClassEval (CE).

2. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS/ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE

a) REG 05.20.10 – Evaluation of Teaching
The EOT voted to approve changes to REG 05.20.10 – Evaluation of Teaching. We have not received any update and do not know if there has been any further progress on this from the APC-Faculty Senate.

b) Comment Selection Tool (CST)
The EOT discussed the pros and cons of the pilot version of the CST. The principal advantage is to eliminate selection bias by faculty, who could cherry pick the best comments to add to the dossier. Concerns include the inability of CST to provide a representative sample when there are few comments from some or many sections. Comments from sections with more responses are more likely to be included/are more likely to be representative of the quality of instruction in that class. The EOT agreed to defer making any decisions until more data can be collected.

c) DH Lunch and Learn – Potential bias in student comments on ClassEval (CE)
The EOT participated in the DH Lunch and Learn hosted by Vice-Provost Stewart (Sep 11, 2019). The objective was to obtain feedback on the issue of bias in student responses via CE, and the information/data that is reported in the CE report that is used for personnel/RPT decisions.

Participants provided their feedback on several proposed versions of the CE report. This issue was further discussed in subsequent EOT meetings.

After much discussion (over multiple meetings), the EOT voted to recommend a revised format for the CE report that can be used for personnel/RPT decisions (see Exhibit A). The main innovations are (a) providing the entire distribution, not just the mean and standard deviation, and (b) alerting DHs/DVFs to potential bias in student evaluation responses by adding a note to this effect in the CE report.

d) Continue discussion on bias
The EOT recommends that we continue to alert/provide education to DH/DVFs (and maybe even students) about the existence of bias and its impact on ClassEval responses.

e) (new) Teaching statement in dossier
The EOT discussed allowing a separate teaching / reflection statement in the dossier, where faculty can provide their viewpoint regarding teaching, teaching philosophy, changes made in response to student comments, teaching innovations, etc. Such a statement could allow the faculty to complement the information in the CE report and "present their side of the story". This may help mitigate the impact of bias by providing DHs/DVFs with additional information that can assist them in making a fair and impartial decision.

f) (new) EOT meeting times
The EOT recommended that meeting times be fixed in advance, so that members do not have teaching or other conflicts. Vice-Provost Stewart agreed, and starting with the 2020-2021 academic year, the EOT will meet on the second Wednesday of each month (Sep-Dec and Jan-Apr). The meeting time will be 10am to 11am.

g) (new) Teaching Award Committees
EOT members stepped forward to serve on the teaching award committees for 2019-2020.

h) (new) Evaluation of the ClassEval instrument
The EOT discussed the CE instrument for on-campus face to face classes during several meetings in Spring 2020. As a result of the deliberations, the EOT recommends (with majority approval) the following structure for the CE instrument for on campus classes.

The proposed seven instructor-related questions are:
1. The instructor was prepared for class.
2. The instructor explained the material well.
3. The instructor was available to students during office hours.
4. The instructor gave useful feedback.
5. The instructor consistently treated students with respect.
6. The instructor cared about students' learning.
7. Overall, the instructor was effective.

The proposed five course-related questions are:
8. The course was aligned with the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus.

9. The course materials (e.g., textbooks, handouts, etc.) were valuable aids to learning.
10. The course assignments (homework, term papers, projects, etc.) were valuable aids to learning.
11. This course improved my knowledge of the subject.
12. Overall, the course was a valuable learning experience.

The EOT did not discuss and hence does not recommend any changes to the five-point Likert scale, so student responses to all these questions will be captured using the same five-point scale, as before. The EOT also does not recommend any change to the CE open-ended questions.

Re: distance education courses and courses with labs, the EOT did not have many members with significant experience in these two types of courses, so the EOT did not discuss any changes to these two CE instruments. Hence, The EOT has no recommendations for these two instruments.

i) **(new) Use of inappropriate language in ClassEval comments**
Following a complaint by an NC State faculty member to the EOT, the EOT in its last meeting briefly discussed the incidence of the use of inappropriate language by students in the comment section of CE. While such language may be protected free speech, it was proposed that we could create a dictionary of inappropriate words and electronically flag them, for further analysis. Concerns were raised about whether such behavior was sporadic or was common, and about whether manual intervention would be required to confirm the validity of the flagged items (i.e., whether they really are instances of use of inappropriate language). The members also suggested that DHs be made aware of the resources available on campus and how to respond to such events, when it could rise to the level of a hate crime, etc. Given the limited time available, it was decided to postpone a complete discussion to the next academic year.

j) **(new) Inappropriate requirement by faculty in syllabus, conflict with REG 05.20.10**
The EOT chair responded to a student complaint that a faculty's requirements for CE were directly in conflict with NC State REG 05.20.10. The EOT Chair contacted the concerned DH and requested that the faculty in the department be advised to strictly adhere to NC State REGs. Since this seemed to be a one-off event, this issue was not discussed in the EOT meetings.

3. RECOMMENDATION FOR REVISION OF CHARGE AND/OR MEMBERSHIP CONFIGURATION

a) If the EOT is to evaluate the ClassEval instrument for distance education classes and courses with labs, it is recommended that i) Faculty with such experience be included in the EOT, and/or ii) The EOT be allowed to include faculty with such experience as part of an ad-hoc subcommittee that could be created for this specific purpose.

Course Information
Term: 2019 Sprg
Instr: Test Instructor
Emplid: 000000000
Course: TST 200 001
Courses evaluated: TST 200 001
Title: Test Course
Undergraduate Course

#	Question	5	4	3	2	1	%5	%4	%3	%2	%1	NA	BL	Nq	Mean
1	The instructors teaching aligned with the courses learning objectives/outcomes	39	32	6	4	3	46.4	38.1	7.1	4.8	3.6	0	0	84	4.2
2	The instructor was receptive to students outside the classroom	37	22	15	5	3	45.1	26.8	18.3	6.1	3.7	2	2	82	4.0
3	The instructor explained material well.	20	25	8	21	10	23.8	29.8	9.5	25.0	11.9	0	0	84	3.3
4	The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course	49	25	6	2	2	58.3	29.8	7.1	2.4	2.4	0	0	84	4.4
5	The instructor was prepared for class	47	26	6	3	2	56.0	31.0	7.1	3.6	2.4	0	0	84	4.3
6	The instructor gave useful feedback.	25	22	16	14	5	30.5	26.8	19.5	17.0	6.1	2	2	82	3.6
7	The instructor consistently treated students with respect	52	22	8	2	0	61.9	26.2	9.5	2.4	0.0	0	0	84	4.5
8	Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher	27	26	7	15	9	32.1	31.0	8.3	17.9	10.7	0	0	84	3.6
9	The course materials (e.g., readings, videos, class notes, course packs, FAQs, websites, course webpage, and blogs) were valuable aids to learning	38	21	6	11	5	46.9	25.9	7.4	13.6	6.2	2	3	81	3.9
10	The course assignments (e.g., homework, exams, quizzes, lab reports, papers, presentations, projects, portfolios, artistic impressions, critiques, blogs, and videos) were valuable aids to learning	41	28	6	5	3	49.4	33.7	7.2	6.0	3.6	0	1	83	4.2
11	This course improved my knowledge of the subject	40	26	10	5	2	48.2	31.3	12.0	6.0	2.4	0	1	83	4.2
12	Overall, this course was excellent	26	24	11	14	8	31.3	28.9	13.3	16.9	9.6	0	1	83	3.6

Notes:

a) Student evaluations of teaching are known to be influenced by student bias. The student expectation of grades as well as the instructor's gender, age, attractiveness, race, experience level, and innovation can all affect student ratings. The Evaluation of Teaching Committee recommends that users of this report be aware of such biases when interpreting student evaluations. More information is available at ******.

b) Since the Classeval data is ordinal (categorical) in nature, the distance or interval between categories is not known. Hence, measures such as the mean and standard deviation are not appropriate to assess the data, and positional measures such as percentiles or frequencies are more appropriate.