

**Standing Committee
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes

Wednesday, August 12, 2020, 10:00 to 11:00 AM

Via ZOOM

Agenda

1. Welcome and new member introduction
2. Questions about EOT activities?
3. Vote to nominate the Deputy Chair of the EOT for 2020-21
4. Dr. Stewart - Holistic look of EOT data in RPT data
5. Use of inappropriate language by students in ClassEval report (from Spring2020-Summer2020)
6. Discussion on review of ClassEval (for lab and online courses)
7. Establish procedure for dealing with requests for ClassEval reports from faculty who may have left the university
8. Suggestions for other items to add to future meetings

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 - EOT Committee Chair

Regina Schoenfeld, Molecular Biomedical Sciences - EOT Deputy Chair

James Bartlett, ELPHD, College of Education

Jason Osborne, Statistics

Lori Rothenberg, Textile & Apparel, Technology and Mgt.

Mi Kim, History

Shweta Trivedi, Animal Science

Rishika Rishika, Business Management

Gary Beckman, Music

Stacy Supak, Center for Geospatial Analytics

Pierre Gremaud, Graduate School-Dean's Office

Grae Desmond, Institutional Planning & Research (ClassEval contact)

Katharine Stewart, Provost Office Liaison

Diane Chapman, Director of the Office of Faculty Development

Jennifer Stanigar, Office of Faculty Development

Not Present:

Roger Narayan, Biomedical Engineering (prior notice, he had an IRB meeting)

Meeting called to order in Zoom at 10:03 AM with a quorum present.

1. Minutes from the [April 10, 2020](#) meeting were approved via email on May 21, 2020 (Suzanne, Mimi, Srini, Shweta, Mike Carter, Regina, Lori, James, Angella Ramsdell, Matthew Warren, April K)
2. Chair Krishnamurthy welcomed several new members. All new and existing members introduced themselves and shared their years of service on the EOT Committee.
 - a. Chair Krishnamurthy provided a short summary of the EOT activities
 - i. [EOT Overview slides](#) were attached to the calendar invitation.
 - ii. ClassEval <https://oirp.ncsu.edu/classeval/>
 1. Instrument evaluated every three years
 2. Work toward eliminating bias in student evaluations of teaching
 - iii. Teaching-related portion of the reappointment, promotion and tenure regulation (RPT REG)
 - iv. Make recommendations to the Provost
 - b. Dr. Stewart posted a link to Evaluation of Teaching REG 05.20.10 <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-10/>
 - i. It is very important that every member of this committee review that regulation because it does include some of our charge
 - c. Teaching-related portion of the RPT REG is important for this committee specifically with regard to section 2 of RPT dossiers: <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-20/>
 - d. The webpage for EOT committee on the Provost's site: <https://committees.provost.ncsu.edu/evaluation-teaching/>
3. Chair Krishnamurthy proposed to select Dr. Regina Schoenfeld as Deputy Chair, and this motion was seconded by Dr. Mi Gyung Kim. This is a new role that will provide continuity of the work of the committee between Chairs and save time in the future.
4. Dr. Stewart acknowledged the hard work of this committee - both in the robust and animated discussions and for staying current with the literature - on the topic of bias in student evaluations of courses and how student evaluations appear to have fairly systemic bias based on gender and race of the instructor, and other forms of bias.
 - a. Of foremost concern is the format in which ClassEval reports are included in the RPT dossier - in particular the statistical data on the numeric responses of students
 - b. The chief complaint is that DVF and CRPTC can misinterpret and misrepresent this data, overinterpreting the means, even when the distribution is provided.

There is a tendency to compare individuals to department means, very misleading for 'above' or 'below' average.

- c. There is value in robust and regular Peer Reviews of teaching.
 - d. Dr. Stewart asks this committee to consider recommending to the Provost that it is time for NC State to take a holistic look at how we use EOT data in RPT decisions:
 - i. How we document teaching effectiveness in RPT dossiers, specifically for the purpose of summative decision making in personnel decisions
 - ii. Other institutions have revised how teaching is presented in promotion and tenure dossiers
 - iii. Task a working group/task force that works with the EOT committee to evaluate best practices in the presentation of teaching effectiveness data for promotion and tenure purposes
 - e. A few members shared ideas and comments (preferences for use of peer evaluations of teaching and teaching portfolios). There are different forms and aspects of teaching, flexibility and freedom needed, based on discipline. Look at arbitrary scales (e.g., Likert 7-point). What are the questions in common?
 - f. One of the committee's tasks is to revisit proposals for how ClassEval reports will look going forward, inclusive of the feedback from department heads.
5. Regarding fall 2020 ClassEval, Dr. Pierre Gremaud asked about whether any short-term accommodations would be made because faculty are teaching in unfamiliar formats due to changes imposed by COVID-19.
- a. Provost sent a memo in March 2020 that ClassEval will not be included in the dossier for RPT for Spring/Summer 2020 due to pandemic (exceptions for planned DE courses)
 - b. Provost also believes fall will be disruptive, and this ClassEval data will provide good formative information for faculty to have about their classes but not used in RPT dossiers.
 - c. ClassEval data are considered personnel data. Can be viewed by the department head, dean, or Provost, and should not be shared outside of this chain.
 - d. Peer evaluation data and supplementary materials and can be used for RPT.
6. Dr. Mimi Kim asked for categories to discuss, and have a sense of the outline for:
- a. How we are using EOT for the RPT process.
 - b. How the teaching evaluations and comments are presented in the RPT process.
 - c. Dr. Stewart said a work group would have a specific charge, and a deadline, to provide recommendations to the Provost. How might we improve Section 2 of the RPT dossier to provide more valid data and/or more contextualized data, richer more complete data about a faculty member's development as an instructor.

- i. It is likely that the Provost will form a work group including a selection of people from the EOT committee, representatives from faculty senate and department heads.
 - d. Chair Krishnamurthy formed a 4 member subcommittee to look at Section 2 (consisting of Srini Krishnamurthy, Mimi Kim, Rishika Rishika, James Bartlett) for prioritizing/ranking items to report back to the larger group.
 - i. Look at other institutions; USC has been doing this. Look at Chronicle/Inside Higher Ed. Dr. Bartlett offered to gather resources.
 - ii. Dr. Osborne expressed concern with the term 'best practices' in quantitative analysis - 4.5 vs. 4.7 for grade evaluations. Each course is different and has different requirements - they vary from course to course and department to department. Any best practices need to be minimal, and do not try to extrapolate to different fields. The departments are where the expertise lies in assessing teaching effectiveness. Not an easy task.
 - iii. NC State has general guidelines for what is, and is not, in the dossier to standardize some of the RPT format, but allow departments and colleges control to set their own standards.
7. Regarding students' use of inappropriate language (hate speech, profanity) in written responses in ClassEval. Dr. Grae Desmond did an analysis. He compared a list of profanity, derogatory racial terms, threats of violence, list of hate speech, and had to do a lot of manual review to look at context.
 - a. There were very few cases (in the single digits). Even when using a listing of words, they didn't come up often. It did not seem systemic.
 - b. Several of those were from a single incident - the same one that prompted this look (one student made comments that were extremely violent and extremely offensive, both racist and sexist, used derogatory terms for women and presumptions about the instructors ethnicity).
 - c. University has mechanisms in place to handle those comments - flagged to Student Conduct
 - d. Even though it is rare - profanity is one thing, but hate speech is another. No one should have to go through this. One case is one too many, we want it to be zero.
 - e. Dr. Chapman suggested making these expectations clearly visible - a statement that it is unacceptable to use any kind of racial or hate speech in the comments.
 - f. Include a disclaimer on the ClassEval website, instrument and announcements: "If you say something that threatens harm to yourself or others, the confidentiality will be waived".
 - g. Chair Krishnamurthy suggested a statement to alert faculty to report any instances of inappropriate language they see, and these cases can be passed to Student Conduct and flagged for review.

- h. Dr. Kim questioned if this was a form of linguistic censorship - thinking that hiding racism doesn't eliminate it, and students find other ways to insert racism without those terms. We need a procedure for faculty to report it and be part of the RPT process so that they are not unduly damaged in the process.
 - i. I would direct folks to the Code of Student Conduct. Whatever we recommend should be in concert with the Office of Student Conduct.
<https://studentconduct.dasa.ncsu.edu/code/>
8. Items not discussed for next meeting:
- a. Discussion on ClassEval report recommendations for dossier
 - b. Discuss ClassEval instrument review for lab and online courses
 - c. Establish procedure for dealing with requests for ClassEval reports from faculty who may have left the university

Meeting adjourned at 11:04am.