

**Standing Committee**  
**NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Evaluation of Teaching (EoT) Minutes**

**Wednesday, September 9, 2020, 10:00 to 11:00 AM<sup>1</sup>**

Via ZOOM

**Agenda**

1. Vote to approve the minutes of [Aug 12, 2020](#), meeting
2. Discussion on review of ClassEval for lab and online courses
3. Discussion on the teaching portion of the RPT dossier
  - a. Srin, Mimi, James, and Rishika
4. Establish procedure for dealing with requests for ClassEval reports from faculty who may have left the university
5. Suggestions for other items to add to future meeting agendas?

**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

Roger Narayan, Biomedical Engineering

Stacy Supak, Center for Geospatial Analytics

Molly Vanhoy, Student

Harrison Andrews, Student

Grae Desmond, Institutional Planning & Research (ClassEval contact)

Diane Chapman, Director of the Office of Faculty Development

Jennifer Stanigar, Office of Faculty Development

---

<sup>1</sup> If necessary, the meeting time may be extended to facilitate and/or complete discussion.

**Not Present:**

Pierre Gremaud, Graduate School-Dean's Office

Katharine Stewart, Provost Office Liaison

Meeting called to order in Zoom at 10:00 AM with a quorum present.

1. The Minutes of [Aug 12, 2020](#), meeting were approved. Motion for approval by Dr. Bartlett and seconded by Dr. Schoenfeld.
2. Chair Krishnamurthy advised that the meeting would be recorded for use in capturing the Minutes and not shared publicly.
3. Discussion on review of ClassEval for lab and online courses
  - a. Postpone until Chair Krishnamurthy speaks with Dr. Katharine Stewart
  - b. Points of discussion raised by committee members
    - i. Required to review these every 3 years, by question
    - ii. Considerations for those most affected (recently hired or upcoming RPT with teaching appointments, given it is an extended period of time)
    - iii. Instrument to be used for Fall 20 and Spring 21
      1. Previously designated online courses received normal ClassEval
      2. Courses that moved online - tagged with ID and received COVID-19 survey with 3 open-ended questions (SP/SU 2020)
      3. Every department has been impacted beyond Spring 2020
  - c. Come up with specific questions for hybrid/online delivery COVID-19 semesters that reflect differences between emergency remote teaching vs. now more planned
  - d. Note that in Fall 2020 courses planned for in person delivery had to transition to online, although there are fewer courses that are in this category
  - e. The pandemic has provided an opportunity for this committee to suggest that numeric ClassEval scores no longer appear on the dossier - and instead, faculty members may include changes made based on SET to improve their course; this will help to get away from the known bias of students' evaluation of teaching
4. Discussion on the teaching portion of the RPT dossier
  - a. Review the Guidelines for Section II of RPT dossier and the sections found therein <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-20/>
    - i. Section IIA: Teaching effectiveness
      1. List courses taught with enrollment in each.
      2. Include an evaluation of teaching effectiveness – (a) CE report, (b) Summary of peer evals
    - ii. Section IIB: Instructional Development – Innovations and new developments in courses, curricula, and programs.

- iii. Section IIC: Mentoring activities – Advising, Independent studies, etc. Basically a list of activities and any assessments.
    - iv. Section IID: Graduate Committee Memberships – Chair/Major advisor
  - b. The teaching section of the dossier is primarily quantitative. Objective data may not facilitate objective assessment of teaching based on these points:
    - i. Advantages: objective, less subject to manipulation
    - ii. Disadvantages: numbers are not objective enough, there is little room for faculty to explain what they did in the classroom, affected by bias on the part of student respondents
  - c. Initial thoughts shared by subcommittee - this semester may be the best time to make these recommendations
    - i. Don't ditch SETs completely, otherwise students have no input in assessing teaching effectiveness
      - 1. Remove the numeric scores from the dossier. This does not mean that they are not used for teaching improvements; rather they are not being used for personnel decisions
      - 2. Have an option for not using them in the dossier
      - 3. Keep for limited purposes (e.g., department chair use for reporting, DVF assessment)
    - ii. What "should" be included in Section II of the dossier?
      - 1. How we should be assessing teaching
      - 2. Add a new Section IIE for remarks about teaching that do not fit into other categories
    - iii. Include a teaching philosophy statement, to mitigate the loss of student comments, and this may include:
      - 1. Faculty reflection for each semester the course is taught
        - a. The use of SET to modify, modernize or change the course to improve teaching
        - b. Explanation of student discriminatory or negative remarks in defense of faculty member
        - c. Self-reflection needs to be captured at the completion of each course: How did you feel? What went well? What went wrong?
      - 2. How the range of classes taught fit into the current curriculum
      - 3. The evolution of the course with use of SET and peer evaluation
        - a. Peer evaluator does not need to be from same department
    - iv. Mid-semester evaluation for making formative improvements
- 5. One example from another institution (University of Washington)

- a. Student evaluations, peer evaluations, evaluation by trained professionals, self-evaluation
  - b. Include information about modernization of courses, new courses
  - c. Annual peer reviews
  - d. Regular self-evaluation of teaching after the completion of each course
  - e. Consideration of steps to improve teaching, viewed positively
6. Items not discussed for next meeting:
- a. Establish procedure for dealing with requests for ClassEval reports from faculty who may have left the university

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.