North Carolina State University
Minutes of the Fall 2019 General Faculty Meeting
Tuesday, October 8, 2019, 3:00 p.m.
Talley Student Union, Coastal Ballroom

1.   **Call to Order**

Chair Kellner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.   **Remarks from the Chair**

Chair Kellner welcomed the faculty and introduced former Chairs of the Faculty who were in attendance.

Chair Kellner provided announcements:

1 – The second annual Ombuds Day is recognized members of the Faculty Senate and asked them to stand. She expressed her appreciation for the Senators' dedication and service to the Faculty Senate and reported to the Faculty that they were very well-represented by this group of Senators. Chair Kellner recognized Phil Sannes, Associate Chair of the Faculty for approval of the October 30, 2018 General Faculty meeting minutes.

3.   **Approval of the March 5, 2019 General Faculty Meeting Minutes**

Associate Chair Kimberly Ange-van Heugten recognized a motion for approval of the minutes. The motion passed to approve the minutes as submitted.

4.   **Remarks and Discussion** – *Randy Woodson, Chancellor*

Chancellor Woodson thanked Chair of the Faculty Carolyn Bird for her leadership. "I think this is your last General Faculty meeting as Chair. "You have done a great job, and continue to do a great job. So thank you for your leadership."

Chancellor Woodson reported that the University is in the middle of fall admission and the good news is that NC State continues to be in high demand across the state of North Carolina and across the nation. "We have received, to-date, somewhere between 31,000 and 32,000 applications. We have done early admissions, and we have admitted the first group of students to NC State and we are getting a lot of takers. We will have a second round of admissions later this month. The good news is that there continues to be a lot of interest in attending NC State, and that is good for all of us."

Chancellor Woodson brought attention to a few highlights regarding the University. "*Issues in Higher Education*, which is a magazine that comes out monthly, recently highlighted our College of Engineering for its efforts in educating under-represented groups." He added that currently, the College of Engineering is ranked in the top ten in America, in terms of the enrollment of women, which is a real change from what Engineering was just 20 years ago. "We are currently one of the

leaders in terms of large public research-intensive universities. In addition to that, we were ranked seventh in the top producers of masters degrees in Engineering earned by African Americans, and fourth in Engineering degrees earned by Native Americans." He stated that this is a great story for NC State and is something that our colleagues in the College of Engineering are proud of.

Chancellor Woodson added, "Our faculty continue to get a lot of recognition. We were just included among the top four in the country in Fulbright Scholars to faculty. I think we had seven or eight, which puts us fourth in the country, tied with the University of Michigan." He stated that this is really a result of our faculty working hard to apply for those scholarships and go abroad and not only take NC State to other parts of the world, but bring back parts of the world to NC State.

The Chancellor reported that we have a new member of the National Academy of Engineering, Rodolphe Barrangou, who was elected to the National Academy of Sciences last year and was elected by the National Academy of Engineering this year – a fairly rare feat, to be members of both Academies, particularly when you're in your early 40's. "It was great to get him back to NC State; he got his degrees here, his graduate degrees, then left for a while to work in the private sector, and has been back as a Professor in Food Science since 2012."

Chancellor Woodson announced that this year, two NC State students won the Mike Hennessy Scholarship. "Two out of 69 globally. Those students are Madison Maloney, who will pursue her doctoral degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford; Zayid Ali will study for his doctoral degree in Electrical Engineering. This is a great tribute to NC State and to the students that we have educated here and no doubt keeps us in the minds of other universities around the country." He pointed out that both of these students are Park Scholars.

The Chancellor reported that there had been a Commission announcement; My Future NC Commission, which is a commission that was established by President Spellings and co-chaired by Dale Jenkins, who is a CEO and is Chair of the UNC Health System Board. "They chaired this commission to look at educational attainment levels for the State of North Carolina. Currently, prior to this Commission's work, North Carolina was only one of seven states in the country that did not have educational attainment goals for its citizens. We did not have a stake in the ground staying we expected this number of citizens within the state to have a post-high school credential; an associate's degree from a community college, a bachelor's degree or higher." He added that with this Commission's work, they looked at the population of the state, the diversity of the state, and the educational pipeline and they've set an audacious goal of two million citizens of North Carolina educated with post-graduate, post-high school degrees by the year 2030. "That is a daunting task when we are at about a million now. So it puts a lot of pressure on community colleges, higher education, and other organizations to think about what we can do to elevate the educated workforce for North Carolina." He added that Ann Goodnight was a convener of the Commission and wanted this to be announced at NC State, which was a good thing.

Questions and Discussion

Question - microphone not engaged (inaudible)

Chancellor Woodson responded that the reality is that we have actually recently expanded our daycare services, from 34 spots that we currently have with Bright Horizons, to 134, between Bright Horizons and Goddard. So we have actually expanded the opportunities for our faculty and staff with subsidized daycare, all four to five star facilities. We have increased the number of facilities so,

depending on where you live, it may be more convenient to you. So it is true that we lost the facility that was on DHHS property, because that was acquired by the City of Raleigh and they had a limit to their willingness to lease that back to us. So we lost that facility, but the people that owned the facility and that run it, Bright Horizons, sold us 34 spots. Then we partnered with Goddard now, to expand the total offering to 134. This is just the beginning; I've got HR and our finance office looking at what other things can we do. It is true that we do not want to own a daycare, because that's not what we do. The last thing we want to do is be responsible for the education of preschool young people; we leave that to the professionals. We will always outsource that service to a licensed provider but the question is what can we do to expand it. If you look at the number of our faculty and staff who currently use the childcare benefit, it's around 330. So we are under-providing, no doubt, but we have expanded what we've had in the past.

With regard to "Dixie," that's not my call. The Alma Mater is actually adopted by the Alumni of the University and by the Board of Trustees. So that will be for others to decide.

Marie Williams responded as well – inaudible (microphone not engaged)

Question - microphone not engaged (inaudible)

Chancellor Woodson responded, thank you, but again, the Chancellor does not own the Alma Mater. It was written by Alumni for Alumni. There were two authors, as you recall. One was an alumnus, one was a professor.

Remarks and Discussion – *Warwick Arden, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost*

Provost Arden spoke about the Faculty Scholars Program, saying, "We just announced our latest cohort of University Faculty Scholars. This is the seventh cohort, and brings our total number to 146 individuals who have been named as University Faculty Scholars. You may remember that we began this program seven or eight years ago. This has been an extremely successful program. These are some of the most high achieving individuals among our faculty. We will publish those names, so please reach out to these individuals and congratulate them.

I have started a new program, called Provost's Faculty Fellows Program, a cohort membership/leadership program where I buy out a quarter of the time of up to six individuals from across the university. They will be developing projects and programs. Those individuals this year are Carolyn Bird, Jane Lubischer, Jason Bocarro, Paola Sztajn, Janice Odom, and Roger Narayan.

In closing, Provost Arden spoke briefly about the promotion and tenure process. "Because we have hired so many faculty, Tenured and Tenure Track faculty especially, in the last seven years – almost 500 – we have turned over more than one-third of those individuals. Many of those individuals are now moving through the promotion and tenure process at different ranks, so this was a big year. We had 185 dossiers that we have just completed this year, which includes 69 faculty members seeking re-appointment, 38 for promotion from assistant to associate with tenure, 46 promotions to full professor and 24 promotions of non-tenure track to professional track faculty." He added that in his ten years of doing this, this is probably the best process that he has seen. "Process-wise, there were very few hiccups; voting-wise, a lot of really clean voting. This was a very successful process. Dr. Katharine Stewart and Amy Jinnette, in my office, have put a lot of work into this over the years, and it is really gratifying to see where they are in this process."

Questions and Discussion

None

5.   **Evaluation of Teaching**
Moderator: Dr. Richard Kotek, Co-Chair Academic Policy Committee and Executive Committee Member

Each presenter will speak for 5 minutes

An Overview of Evaluation of Teaching
Dr. Anna Howard, Chair, University Standing Committee on Evaluation of Teaching

"The first thing I want to say is that evaluating teaching is really hard. This is a funny thing where we are charged with advising on matters of teaching evaluation, on the current state of the research involving teaching evaluation practice and policies at NC State, and on compliance around the departments. That is what we are supposed to be doing. Every three years, the committee is charged specifically with evaluating the questions that we ask during class evaluations, which will be next year. We are also in charge of reviewing the effectiveness of those teaching evaluations, the selection process for all of the teaching awards and the outstanding teachers. We serve on that committee, we serve on the Gertrude Cox Committee, and two others for outstanding teacher awards."

She added, "Teaching evaluation has, at its heart, three parts. We tend to only talk about one of them, but I want to make sure that we start with all three parts. The first one is peer evaluation. The Evaluation of Teaching Committee spent the whole year last year working with what do we mean by peer evaluation and how is it done well and how can we help departments with that? What load does that put on the departments? Nobody wants an unfunded mandate. That was our push last year."

Dr. Howard added that this year, the push has been more about how class evaluations are received and what flaws it has and how those are mitigated, as well as self-reflection. "I would expect in the next 5-10 years, the Evaluation of Teaching Committee will start a self-reflection piece, which is becoming more and more common across the country."

She added that many of the concerns that are raised about the evaluation of teaching comes in how it is used in personnel decisions, the RPT committee and the post-tenure review, all of these things, especially when it comes to non-tenure track faculty personnel decisions and whether that is being done appropriately. "This is what we have been talking about a lot this year. Nothing is perfect; none of these things is perfect. The student evaluation of teaching, all of them have pluses and minuses; peer evaluations have pluses and minuses. You can get a great peer evaluation if you happen to be friends with somebody and a really lousy one is you happen to be enemies or research competitors. Those things all happen; we want to mitigate their effects as much as we possibly can."

Dr. Howard stated that some of the other panelists will talk about what class evaluation data they have and what good uses and bad uses there are, and what data they cannot get. "None of this is perfect. If you're going to evaluate teaching, the best thing you can do is take several imperfect metrics and combine them to get a good idea. There is no way to quantitatively say you are a 3.92. There is no metric in the world that can evaluate all of our teaching down to that kind of accuracy. So you want to start with the notion that all of these are imperfect measurements, that there are more than one, and when you want to talk about the best way to mitigate the problems with each of them and maximize the potential that we can from each of our pieces of information."

Student Participation, Trends, and Class Evaluation Reports
Mr. Grae Desmond, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Mr. Desmond spoke to the faculty regarding student participation in the evaluation process and that he manages the application, makes sure it works, makes sure it is compliant and that it will work in different browsers.

He stated, "One of the questions I have received is regarding student participation and how I manage that. I can do a couple of things; the first one is that I send the daily reminders – so I am hated by all students. They get an email from me every day that they do not complete all of their evaluations. That is pretty much the main tool that I have that I can implement to try to increase their participation. I have also tried using other methods as well." He added that the only other thing he can do is remind faculty to have the faculty tell the students how important their participation is. "I send an email to the faculty and suggest to the faculty some proven methods to increase participation, including telling the students how the results have been used in the past, and giving students class time to complete the evaluations, which increases response rates. If it is a full semester evaluation I try to do a second round about half-way through, saying go to the dashboard and see how your response rate is doing and if you want to improve it, here are some tips."

Mr. Desmond also spoke about trends. "Since I've been running class evaluations, it's generally been between 45% and 50%. One thing I found out is that few people know about the dashboard. The instructors tab of the dashboard, you can put in your Unity ID and see your responses as they're going online."

Regarding responses, he stated that generally, every semester around the 500 level you start jumping over 50%. "If you go back and choose the dashboard view and select a semester, you can look at your responses and response rates. This is public data and cannot be any more granular, since it is considered personnel data and is protected by State Law; only the instructor, Department Head and Dean can see it."

Data and Cautions
Dr. Jason Osborne, Member, University Standing Committee on Evaluation of Teaching

Dr. Osborne reported to the faculty that he spends a great deal of his time working with people who collect experimental data, helping them analyze their data and draw defensible conclusions. "In doing that, I have to ask probing questions about how they achieve their data. There are concerns

about low response rates. I look back at my last ten courses and I have not broken the 50% barrier. So there is non-response, and it is conceivable that whether or not somebody fills out an evaluation is related to how they feel about the course." He added that it is quite a challenge to try to make inferences about all students in the presence of non-response bias.

"Someone wrote me with a concern about the quality of the evaluations as well. I learned a new term – satis-ficing – which is a combination of satisfying and sufficing; accepting an available option that is satisfactory rather than trying to seek out the optimal option. So an example would be straight-lining to these evaluations where if you look down a column in your report and you don't see very much variation, you see the frequency is rather constant across all the questions, it could be that a respondent is straight lining their responses and not putting a lot of effort into the different questions. In light of this potential difference between respondents and non-respondents and concerns about validity, I worry about conducting statistical inference. Formal statistical inference is problematic."

He added that the next item is about averaging ordinal responses. "In general, when we build models for ordinal responses, we are more concerned with class frequencies, which are the sufficient statistics, so they contain all the information from the data about the population. Boiling it down to an average may involve information loss. It's easy to think about two different samples of class evaluations that have the same average but very different distributions. So there is information loss in just considering the average. Knowing all the frequencies with each response is more informative."

He also stated that they have discussed the possibility of binning class frequencies; proportions of 3's, 4's and 5's, versus the proportions of 1's and 2's. "There's also information loss there. One thing we discussed is that if you don't include the average with the standard deviation in your report, then people are less likely to do formal statistical inference."

"If you have a high frequency of 1's and 2's, then that would help identify issues, which is one purpose of these evaluations; to identify issues with teaching. There is some support from the committee for binned class frequencies."

Research and Trends in Student Evaluation
Dr. Jade Berry-James, Co-Chair, Academic Policy Committee and Member, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

Dr. Berry-James stated that one of the things that NC State is doing is trying to evaluate teaching effectiveness. "One of the challenges we have is that we are finding some static in the class evaluation data. The static that we are seeing is bias, in and of itself, and then we are questioning whether or not we are doing the right thing. I wanted to offer a couple of different interesting models on how to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Those models rest on really defining what it is."

She added, "One of these models looks at the high expectations we have on teaching, it looks at the academic attitudinal social outcomes that we expect to find, it looks at the diverse resources that we hope that faculty will bring to the classroom, it looks at the development of a classroom and/or a school that really values diversity, or any other value that we hold near and dear. Another model

looks at the last piece, which is really the way in which faculty or teachers work together in a collaborative way. This is one of many different models that exist around evaluating teaching effectiveness."

Dr. Berry-James pointed out that what is interesting about this model is that they use a couple of different approaches. "One, they do what we do, which is they look at class eval and peer evaluations through class observation. They also look at value-added models. One thing I would say about the Harvards and the Yales and the Princetons is that they have the top students that come to the university, so of course their teaching is excellent. We don't know that; it is just an assumption that we make about that. So having a value-added model – what happens to the student once they're in our classroom, in our degree program, in our institution, and can we measure that. People like me think that we can measure all kinds of things, and so there are classroom artifacts that we can look at, there are portfolios that faculty put together, there are teacher self-reflective practices, and then there are student evaluation and reflection. I learned about how important student evaluation and reflection is through the Office of Faculty Development." She reported that she took the two-year certification program that is available at NC State, and that it taught her a lot about what she thinks she is doing and whether or not it works, in addition to how to evaluate it.

She added, "In regard to bias, bias in high-stake decisions is really important. From my perspective, it leaves the university vulnerable. We already know that we have been looking at bias, and so there are a couple of different studies that confirm that bias really does exist. If you look at 1,000 male students and 1,000 female students and you look at the same kind of matched comparison for male and female professors, what you find is that if you examine teacher appeal and teacher effectiveness, the reality is that all students give female faculty poor ratings. So gender matters in that circumstance. When you look at the Downey and Krebesh reports, what happened there is that we are looking at the behavior of the teachers; how do teachers perceive students in the classroom. So the research says that teachers think that the student is disengaged, has the wrong behavior in class, or that student is not the right fit for the classroom. That is a problem too."

Dr. Berry-James stated that one article she wants to review looks at the intersection between race and gender. "What we see there is the perfect professor, the one who communicates what you need to know is the white male professor. That doesn't just happen at NC State; this is happening throughout the higher education system. And so you think well, is there a difficulty bias, a non-response bias or no bias, and does it really matter. Of course it matters because it skews our results."

She concluded, "When I used to be in institutional research, we could make data say almost anything. So what do we want the data that we are collecting about teacher effectiveness to say about what we do in the classroom, the students that we develop, the things we do in our programs, across colleges, what do we want the data to say? I think we should really take a minute to reflect on what we are doing, where the bias is, where the fat is and how we can reduce it."

New Directions in Evaluation of Teaching
Dr. Anna Howard, Chair, University Standing Committee on Evaluation of Teaching
Dr. Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Dr. Anna Howard

Dr. Howard stated, "So we take all of that information about bias and we know, for example, when we're looking at Class Eval, and you know it is going to go up if you teach a senior level class versus the same class that you're teaching your freshman. We know that it will go up if you put a white male in front of the classroom. Some of the interesting research pairs online classes where they do nothing but switch the names of the professors and you can watch the teaching evaluations shift."

She added that measuring teaching is hard, and that our instruments are imperfect. "What we end up with is, at the baseline, at a university it's not like we can ditch the notion that students have something to say to us about teaching. They may not be saying it as clearly as we'd like them to be. They may not be pedagogy experts. But we need their information." She stated that one of the things the Evaluation of Teaching Committee has been working very hard at is how to maximize the good and minimize the bad. "What is it good for? It is good for identifying in a general way, whether faculty are performing in line with their peers. If you get people who are getting 4's and 5's on all 12 questions, and people who are getting all 1's and 2's on all 12 questions, you probably have something you want to look at."

Dr. Howard stated that It is good for formative assessment of the teachers themselves, especially at the beginning of their career, those open-ended questions are important. "You want to hear what the students have to say. Comparing averages becomes the biggest problem. You cannot compare a teacher who gets a 3.8 with a department average of 4.0 and say this teacher is not performing up to the average of the department. That does not work."

"Over-interpreting these averages as if they were exact and under-interpreting the frequencies; what are your data coming from and where are we going from this? We are developing new ways of looking at the data by talking about eliminating that average." She added that if we don't tell you what it is then you won't be able to compare with it. "We are talking about educating the faculty. You got a letter from us last year at Class Eval and we have two more in the pipeline to go out in the summer of 2019 to go out to the candidates who are going up for promotion and tenure, and the departments who are voting on those people. Then binning the information so we tell you how many 4's and 5's did you get, how many 1's and 2's did you get? This gets rid of the average."

Dr. Katharine Stewart

Dr. Stewart reported to the faculty that the Evaluation of Teaching Committee and Academic Policy Committee have all been really wrangling with what does it mean to evaluate teaching well and what does it mean to grapple with the bias that exists.

She underscored that it is important to be aware of bias, both when you are the one being evaluated, because that bias is affecting you, and it's important to be aware of bias when you're the one doing the evaluating. She added, "I believe strongly that the major processes for recognizing and rewarding faculty at an institution have to belong to faculty. So during a promotion and tenure review, or a post-tenure review, ultimately the DVF, the Department Head, the CRPTC and the Dean are all weighing in on the question of "is this person a good teacher, is this person a good scholar?"

Dr. Stewart added that the presentations today that focused on teaching really underscore the fact that any decision that is that broad – a question of is somebody a good teacher, is somebody a good

scholar – is going to be incredibly difficult, and ideally needs to be based on multiple sources of data, which all are going to have some noise in them. She stated, "An H index isn't perfect either; it is an estimate. So I think the thing that I would ask all of us to consider as we are thinking about this is have we designed the ways we are evaluating teaching, whether that's student data, peer data, self-reflection data, in way that mitigate this bias and are we holding one another accountable for our own biases when we are evaluating one another."

She stated that If someone is inappropriately saying this is a 3.8 and the department average is 4.0 so obviously this person is a poor teacher, someone needs to ask if this is a fair comparison. "We need to hold each other accountable in those ways. So I think this has to be a continuing process and discussion and it needs to be something that we are doing together as a community." She added that the other thing is that as EOT and APC do this work, it is also useful to think about models of teaching effectiveness. "I believe there are ways to evaluate teaching effectiveness that are possible in a deep and meaningful way at the department level, but may not roll up very well or scale up very well. Having the conversation at the department level about what do we want to be looking at for one another as good teachers is an important conversation to have as well."

She concluded by stating that all of these are ways that we can continue to improve and continue to hold each other accountable for not eliminating, but for mitigating noise or error in the data and making sure we have multiple sources of information. "I look at averages a lot, but if I would not compare two averages and call them the same in my own laboratory's data, I should not be looking at a colleague's teaching data and call those averages the same or different either. If it is not a difference that I can make, or not an inference I can make with my own laboratory data, I for sure should not be making those inferences with my colleagues' careers. That is the way I think about it as somebody who is in a data-driven science and a quantitatively driven science"

Questions and Discussion

Stephen Vincent: I am one of those who is skeptical of the statistics, and I was shocked when I was on the RPT committee in CHASS that we didn't get the qualitative evaluations on teaching; we only got the statistics, which seems to me sort of wrong-headed. So I'm wondering if there has been any consideration of the value of the statements that students make coming forward to these committees, rather than relying on the statistics, which every study indicates are quite unreliable. I think the qualitative statements are more useful.

Richard Kotek: I think the numerical ratings in some other universities are abandoned because they are not reliable in some ways because of the bias and other factors. But we use those numerical evaluations that were presented, and there may be some problems.

Anna Howard: We are working on how to get a good sampler of the student open-ended questions from Class Eval into the dossiers. That is still an ongoing conversation. The other thing is that the peer evals that have some of that qualitative data that we re-vamped last year, we are hoping to get more of that involved as well.

Katharine Stewart: There is value in those statements. I think it is especially valuable for performance evaluation, but I think your point is if we're going to have the numerical data, it is also

helpful to have the student comments. The challenge is which comments. If it is a selection, who selects? If it's all of them, for some faculty you are looking at scores of pages of data, which may not be reviewed. If it's a random sample and you just happen to randomly get the four negative comments that happen to be in the entire universe of your class's comments that semester, it's problematic as well. So the question of the value of the comments I don't think anybody would dispute; it's the logistics of getting it in a dossier. Those comments certainly can and should be used in annual reviews with your department head, and in your own formative work with your department.

Rajade Berry-James: One of the challenges that we have is that we are assuming these averages are accurate. We already talked a little bit about response bias, so we have some people who choose to respond to the class evaluation. The research says that students who are angry about their classroom experience will either respond or choose not to respond. So we already are not getting representative responses. The other piece is level for a measurement – nominal, ordinal, interval or ratio. Nominal, ordinal data are words; interval and ratio data are numbers. What we are doing when we create a mathematical average is that we are taking that ordinal data and we are turning that label into a mathematical means, which means nothing; it has no interpretive value. It's not something we would normally do, and it holds people careers to the outcome that we receive. Additionally, in the department where you take one individual faculty member and you compare that individual faculty member to the entire department, the problem is that one individual faculty member is not teaching all of the English classes or not teaching English classes with other English faculty. It makes no sense when we are looking at comparative mean. We may need to find a way to do it a little bit better so we know we are doing it right. What we have right now is a measure of what students say; we don't know if that's really a measure of teacher effectiveness. It's just a measure of what students who chose to answer the course evaluation says.

Eileen Taylor: I've heard if the response rate is below 50%, we shouldn't be looking at it at all. Is that true?

Unidentified: No, that is not true.

Anna Howard: The problem is that no matter what you get, if you get a response rate of anything, you're making some assumption about what the others would have said. If you assume that those people would have given you better – they were happy so they didn't bother – or you assume that those people are those that are so angry they didn't bother, or you assume that the people who didn't answer actually would have said approximately the same response rate as the people who did. It might be accurate and it might not. There's no magic line that you can draw in the research that is supported by "under here you have a problem."

Eileen Taylor: So that's contrary to what we've heard in the past. On the one question you asked about when students are asked to evaluate if you teach difficult material well. I really have a problem with that question because if you teach difficult material – well they don't think it's difficult or if you don't teach it well then obviously it's difficult material and maybe you didn't teach it well or you did teach it well and it was difficult and they didn't get it. That question, to me, is not a valid question.

Katharine Stewart: I think it's timely that you brought that up today because we can, between Anna and me and Grae, there's at least three people sitting on this panel who will be able to make sure that evaluation of teaching takes up that issue when they start looking at the class eval questions next year. Thank you for bringing that up.

Eileen Taylor: I don't think that the student comments are super valuable and I'm looking at mine from this 8-week course. (Read several examples) The irrelevant comments I get are "make the slides shorter" or "time the exam right before finals, not before spring break." Those are technical suggestions but the comments are as good as people claiming on a website and I don't read those either.

Unidentified: When one student is knowledgeable will be able to give a good analysis rather than any student. When a good student who knows what they are talking about, their comments should be weighed more heavily in the evaluation process. I don't know how you can depend on that in the data-driven process. Maybe the committee can consider bringing that back in some way to complement the other aspect.

Steve Wiley: I want to raise the point that class eval is not a measure of teaching effectiveness; it's a measurement of student perceptions of their experience. I often compared it to making my kids eat their vegetables when they were little. If we had run an evaluation of dinner time at that point, we would have concluded that I was unreasonably expecting them to eat broccoli. Students are not necessarily in the best position to understand what they're getting out of a course. I would like to see what they say five or ten years down the road when they look back at their NC State education and say well that was a really hard course but now I understand it was valuable but at the time I couldn't see it. So you should keep that distinction between teaching effectiveness and student perception in the classroom.

Unidentified: There are questions that we could maybe ask more specifically that would be helpful that students are equipped to give us feedback about our teaching. For example, how often did I get feedback on my work, which will vary, and also how timely was that feedback that I received to allow me to plan better. So there are really specific ways that you could ask questions that would be of value. It's not necessarily whether the broccoli was good for me or not, but whether what I got from the professor or whether I thought it was good or not. But what did I get from the professor?

Unidentified: I just wanted to reassure you that I served on a committee to identify outstanding teachers and there were letters from students who graduated six or more years ago; so there is evidence of impact. I just wanted to point that out.

Unidentified: Half of us are always going to be below average so if we start running around and gigging everybody because they're below average, we're going to lose half of our faculty. You really have to be really careful about how this is applied. I am also curious; one would think that teaching evaluations vary somewhat inversely with grades and how easy the course is – and I have colleagues in CHASS who have commented on this. I think there are things like freshmen and senior courses, graduate courses, how much homework do you assign, how rigorous is the class, is it required, is it an elective class, etc. I would think there's a regression that one could run to come up with some conclusions that would make this a more informed instrument.

Anna Howard: There's a fair amount of data in the literature on all of those. The highest bias that anyone can come up with is expectation of grade. There are scary ones where you show someone 45 seconds of a lecture and then track the correlation between that evaluation after 45 seconds and the evaluation at the end of the semester. A lot of what we are doing is did we match student expectations. Yes, there is definitely a correlation between how long they've been in the program. I would love it if we could ask students five years later to evaluate my sophomore level class; that would be great. What we have to deal with is this is what we've got. So what we're going to shoot for is educating the faculty, and educating the people who are voting on the faculty to understand some of these things. The best way I can think of to take some of those ways into account is to let people who are evaluating the scores or the histograms or the frequencies or whatever we end up with, when we are evaluating those things, to keep them in mind. There's no numerical way to say we can predict the correlation between this particular class and it would bump you up .05. We just don't have that kind of accuracy. That's how we have decided to handle it this year, but if you have other suggestions of how we could mitigate all of those effects, we would love to hear what they are.

Katharine Stewart: I think what is important to keep in mind is the students. I do think these biases exist; I think expectation of grade can influence things, I think that freshmen and sophomore students may be less able to evaluate how this is going to help me five years down the road versus a senior or a graduate student. I think many of them do think very thoughtfully about that and I think it is important to include their voices while mitigating for some of these issues and thinking about some of these issues. I would also caution us to remember that all data sources for this process may have some bias. We know that gender, race, age and other biases affect peer evaluations as well so we have to be careful about these biases not only in our student evaluations, but we also need to think about when we are the ones who are doing the evaluation and be careful that we are really focusing on teaching effectiveness as much as possible. The Office of Faculty Development worked hard with the Evaluation of Teaching Committee to put together some suggested structures that are based in research on teaching effectiveness, and provide on their website a guide for teaching evaluation. It's not to say that we can entirely eliminate these kinds of issues from student or peer evaluations, it's really a question of how we as a university, and especially you all as faculty, use them when you're making these decisions. Ultimately, the question is about how information gets used, and to a large extent, the faculty have control of that. You have an enormous voice, and it's important to bring these issues to the fore.

Sharon Lubkin: Evaluating curriculum is also important. Wouldn't it be wonderful to hear which were the most valuable courses in the major, which were the most valuable courses not in the major, which courses were their worst experiences? This would be an aid to us as we examine our curriculum.

Unidentified: We talk about this thing of student perception. I think their perception of classroom climate is really critical because that impacts learning as well. Designing questions that really get to their specific experiences, their comfort level in the class, their ability to communicate with that professor. I know we have one or two questions on there, but maybe designing questions that really specifically get at examples of how am I doing in creating a welcoming, inclusive environment in my classroom? Those types of questions would be really valuable and they're the only ones that can tell us that.

Anna Howard: In response to the question about getting feedback later on, we administer a tri-annual alumni survey for undergraduates. I reach out to every single college, department and program and invite them to include program-specific questions that we administer as part of that survey. We have been doing this for the past 15 years. Some of those folks ask those very questions on those surveys. I reach out to people across the campus and invite you to have us administer those on your behalf – we do everything and it doesn't cost you anything. We do all the work and then hand the data to you.

Rajade Berry-James: Our university and lots of our degree programs are accredited, so in my field we use direct and indirect measures to talk about effectiveness. So a student evaluation would be an indirect measure of teaching effectiveness. But if you add to that measure other things like examining a classroom artifact or exercise or a signature assignment or a portfolio, those will be more direct measures of teaching effectiveness because that's what the faculty member says students can do after they finish the class. That is an important distinction. Perceptions about teaching effectiveness are really important but the direct measures around teaching effectiveness are equally important.

Anna Howard: Basically that is assessment. That is what this university has been trying to get faculty and programs to do for a long time without much success. We aren't so good at doing what we should be doing in terms of evaluating our effectiveness. Faculty don't like people looking over their shoulders. It is difficult to get faculty to fall in line with that. It's easy to complain about the surveys, but what is the alternative?

Matthew Warren: I would like to apologize on students' behalf for us being very finicky about teaching effectiveness, but I will agree with Dr. Stewart's comments about class evals being utilized for teaching effectiveness. There are ways it can be used incorrectly, the data may not mean anything, but in the end we are all trying to educate these students in terms of trying to teach them what they should try to know about their field or subject matter. They don't even know themselves; they're only going to know what they're learning in their class. They will be responsive about what they like or don't like, but in the end, if they are going to assess us in terms of how well are we teaching this to them because some of the best professors I've had were the most craziest professors that I could imagine, but I was actually really engaged by them. That was a big factor in influencing me to pursue a career in academia because the professor was willing to take something and try to figure out a way to make the students connect with it, and it worked for someone like me. The students that are going to be the most effective in terms of what they're going to say are the ones who actually show it through an example or they're going to say something that others might reflect on – whether it's the fact that the teacher speaks too fast or they make it too unclear or difficult for us to understand. Maybe something that you should look at is how do you better bridge the gap? If the student can't convey what they want to know then are we truly teaching them effectively? Class Eval is not perfect but at least it gives us that opportunity to try to bridge some of the gaps that we need to address.

Anna Howard: Thank you to Matthew Warren for serving on the Evaluation of Teaching Committee this year.

Robert Hayes: Can you confirm that the committee has chosen to add a new question for courses that have a lab component or an outdoor component, that there will be a safety question added so that we can gauge student assessment of safety?

Anna Howard: I am not aware that that question has been added for the coming year, but it certainly can be added for the committee to put a high priority for next year. I am not aware that it will be on the evaluations for the coming academic year.

Jason Osborne: There was an opportunity for Deans, Department Heads and instructors for you to add custom questions during the semester. If you want those on your surveys for this year, I would recommend that you do that. There will be an announcement when the window opens. If you want it to go across the college, the Dean will need to add it, if department, the Department Head would add it and if it's just for your class, the instructor will need to add it. You can get it one there if you need to.

Unidentified: Is there a different evaluation form for online course?

Jason Osborne: Yes, there is. If you go to the OIRP website and go to Class Eval/Instruments, you can see those sample questionnaires there.

6. **New Business**
   Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty

   A. Faculty Senate highlights of the last two years
   B. Report on Faculty Senate meeting discussions to-date

   Chair Bird presented an overview of the activities and initiatives of the Faculty Senate and an overview of the meeting topics of the Faculty Senate meetings this academic year. Please see the Faculty Senate website for the full presentations:

   https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2019/03/General-Faculty-Meeting-Spr2019-Chairs-major-initiatives-overview.pdf

   https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2019/03/Spring-2019-Gen-Fac-Mtg-Chairs-Report.pdf

7. **Issues of Concern (IOCs)**

   a. AIssues of Concern are assigned to the appropriate committee. Minutes from each Committee (Academic Policy; Governance and Personnel Policy; Resources and Environment) are posted on the Faculty Senate website so progress on IOCs can be monitored by all.

   b. New Issues of Concern may be presented by emailing Faculty_Senate@ncsu.edu or by contacting one of your College's Senators.

8.   Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.