

Faculty Senate 2008/2009
Academic Policy Committee
Final Summary
April 22, 2009

Committee Members:

David Genereux, PAMS
Cindy Hemenway, Co-Chair, CALS
Helmut Hergeth, Co-Chair, Textiles
Thomas Honeycutt, Engineering
Janet Hudson, CHASS
Akram Khater, CHASS
Jean Ristaino, CALS
Raymond Ting, CED
Juei-Feng Tu, Engineering

John Ambrose, Interim Dean of DUAP
Ken Esbenshade, Director Academic Programs, CALS

The APC worked on three main agenda items during the 2008/2009 academic year.

1. Throughout much of the fall term, we worked with the Evaluation of Teaching Committee and the Senate to revise the Evaluation of Teaching REG05.20.10 in a manner that was consistent with the Senate Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching (adopted 4/22/08). This REG was approved by both the full Senate (1/13/09) and the EOTC (1/23/09), and is now moving forward through administrative channels. In October 2008, Karen Helm and Trey Standish from University Planning and Analysis presented their findings on ClassEval data to the APC. They summarized their data in terms of response rates relative to class size, type and other factors.
2. During the spring semester, Senator Jay Tu led the drafting of principles and best practices for departmental interpretation of ClassEval data as one component of teaching evaluations. This document was discussed twice by the Senate Executive Committee and presented to the Senate on April 7, 2009. It was recommended that this document be revised and possibly included in the additional references section of the Evaluation of Teaching REG05.20.10. The revised document was modified and approved during the Senate meeting on April 21, 2009. It will be presented to the Evaluation of Teaching Committee to consider attachment to REG05.20.10.
3. Through our liaison to the Graduate School, Senator Jean Ristaino, we reviewed and made suggestions for the Academic Difficulty REG01.45.1 and English Proficiency Requirements for International Applicants, REG02.15.2. Dean Duane Larick attended the APC twice throughout the year to present and discuss information on course requirements for graduate degrees, graduate exams involving

student or committee members at remote locations, and the Accelerated Bachelor's/Master's (ABM) Degree Program REG02.25.11.

Authority	Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Title	Evaluation of Teaching
Classification	REG05.20.10
PRR Subject	Academic Policies and Regulations
Contact Info	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs(919-513-7741)

PROPOSED REVISION

Rationale:

1. The university instrument was previously titled the University Evaluation Instrument (UEI) but since going online has been renamed ClassEval. Thus the reg has been revised to reflect this name change.
2. The University Standing Committee on Evaluation of Teaching unanimously endorsed the revision in section 4.1.3.2 on 11/14/08. The time consuming process of iterations for approval was not deemed to add any value to the ultimate set of questions approved. UPA is capable of assuring that the optional questions are methodologically sound and would consult with the Office of Legal Affairs if any legal issues arose.

Review Process:

11/14/08 USC on Evaluation of Teaching proposes revisions.
 11/14/08 Provost authorizes transmittal of PRR for review
 11/19/08 General Counsel review (Lannom for Kurz)

12/2/08 Faculty Senate: after lengthy discussion agreed that they want April 2008 Resolution incorporated into this regulation
 1-13-09 Faculty Senate approved revised version

_____ Univ Standing Committee on Evaluation of Teaching

_____ Deans Council review

_____ University Council (notification)

_____ Board of Trustees (notification)

History: First Issued: May 11, 1994. Last Revised: May 23, 2006. [Additional History Information.](#)

Additional References:

[UNC Policy Manual Chapter 400.3.1.1\[G\]](#) (previously Board of Governors' Memorandum 338)

[NC State Guide on Peer Review of Teaching](#)

[RPT Process Description](#)

Chism, N. 1999. *Peer Review of Teaching: A Source Book*. Anker Pub. Co., Bolton, MA

Young, C., & Young, L. 1999. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching* . 10:63,76

Bush, L., Maid, B., and Roen, D. 2002. In: Wehlburg, C. and S. Chadwick-Blossey (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy* , Anker Pub. Co., Bolton, MA, pp. 312-315

1. INTRODUCTION

UNC Policy Manual chapter 400.3.1.1[G] requires each institution in the UNC System to develop teaching evaluation policies for all teaching faculty members that include student and peer evaluations of teaching performance on a regular and ongoing basis. This regulation describes NC State University's philosophy and procedures for the evaluation of teaching. This regulation establishes procedures that must be followed for the summative evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness. This regulation does not establish procedures for formative evaluation of teaching effectiveness that occurs at the faculty member's discretion.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1. Formative Evaluation

Evaluation that is used for the purpose of self-improvement is defined as “formative evaluation”. The instructor collects student and peer perceptions of teaching effectiveness solely for the purposes of modifying and enhancing teaching strategies.

2.2. Summative Evaluation

Evaluation for the purpose of making personnel decisions and for enhancing teaching effectiveness is defined as “summative evaluation”. Administrators and departmental voting faculty evaluate data from students, peers, and the instructor in order to make informed decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure, for post tenure review of faculty, teaching awards or for consideration of merit pay increases.

2.3 Peer Evaluator

For reviews of teaching, the peer reviewers may be colleagues of any rank mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the department head or academic administrator,

pending resolution by the Dean if there is disagreement. The peer reviewers may be selected from inside or outside the department. In small departments or in highly specialized disciplines, it may be difficult to find colleagues who can provide the requested insights within the same department.

3. SCOPE

3.1 All courses delivered by faculty of NC State University must be evaluated by students each time each course is taught except as indicated in 3.5 below.

3.2. Faculty or a departmental designate must explain to students how evaluations will be administered for their class.

3.3. Peer review is to be conducted for all faculty with teaching assignments.

3.3.1. Peer review of professors must be completed every five years.

3.3.2. Peer review of associate professors must be completed every three years.

3.3.3. Peer review of assistant professors must be completed annually.

3.3.4. Peer review of special faculty must be completed annually for the first three years and then every three years.

3.4. In addition to student evaluations and peer review, faculty evaluations may include other measures of teaching effectiveness such as teaching portfolios, exit interviews, and alumni surveys. For additional resources related to the peer review of teaching see departmental guidelines and the NC State Guide on Peer Review of Teaching.

3.5. Courses that do not present course material (e.g., undergraduate and graduate research, internships, independent study, supervised teaching) will not be evaluated using NC State's ClassEval online system.

4. INSTRUMENTS FOR EVALUATION

4.1 Student Evaluation Instruments

The university instrument for evaluation of instruction (ClassEval) consists of a set of core closed-ended and open-ended questions, and a section(s) for optional approved questions that may be added by the teacher, department or college.

4.1.1. ClassEval Core questions

4.1.1.1. All departments must use the university core questions.

4.1.1.2. The Evaluation of Teaching Committee will review core questions every three years.

4.1.1.3. Core questions may be revised following recommendations made by the Evaluation of Teaching Committee and approval of the provost.

4.1.2. ClassEval Core specific questions

4.1.2.1. All lab courses must use the set of questions related to lab/~~lab~~ courses.

4.1.2.2. All distance education classes must use the set of questions related to distance education.

4.1.2.3. The Evaluation of Teaching Committee will review core-specific questions every three years.

4.1.2.4. Core-specific questions may be revised following recommendations made by the Evaluation of Teaching Committee and approval of the provost.

4.1.3. ClassEval Optional questions

4.1.3.1. The instructor, department, and college may add optional questions to ClassEval.

4.1.3.2. Optional questions must be approved by University Planning and Analysis for methodological soundness prior to being added to the approved question bank used to produce ClassEval.

4.2. Peer Evaluation Instrument

The development of an instrument(s) for documenting peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness is a departmental responsibility. However, the instrument used in the evaluation must contain the general requirements specified below.

4.2.1. The instrument must address the wide range of strategies, media and materials used in achieving learning objectives.

4.2.2. The instrument must include categories such as instructor organization, instructional strategies, choice of content, mastery of content, presentation skills, instructional materials and/or media, interaction with students and additional items appropriate for laboratory, clinic, studio or field settings.

4.2.3. The instrument must include a section for comments and other observations relevant to the discipline or type of class. Examples of peer evaluation instruments, including some for distance education courses, may be found in references listed in related information above.

5. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Anonymity and confidentiality are the basic principles that govern distributing, collecting and handling student evaluations. Strict adherence to procedures that insure anonymity and confidentiality is imperative so that students feel free to provide honest and candid perceptions of teaching effectiveness.

Students may choose not to submit an evaluation if, for example, he or she feels the instructor may recognize a particular student as the source of a particular evaluation (e.g., if the class is very small, optional written comments would suggest who the student is, or some other factor pertains). There is no penalty to students who decline to submit evaluations.

5.1. Student evaluations of teaching must be conducted every time a course is taught except as noted in Section 3.5. The electronic evaluation instrument for a class will be made available to each student via a unique URL during the last two weeks of a regular term or during a proportionately similar period during summer terms.

5.2 No form of incentive should be provided to increase response rate.

C Hemenway 4/22/09 11:48 AM

Comment: Inserted text

5.3 All faculty who teach courses as part of their regular assignment and all teaching assistants for a class will be evaluated.

5.4. Faculty and administrators must not have access to evaluation data until after final grades for the course have been submitted.

5.5. The Provost will designate the administrative unit that will carry out data analysis in a timely manner so that data will be available for personnel decisions and for enhancing teaching effectiveness.

5.6. Data and student responses to open-ended questions will be compiled and returned to the faculty member and department head for review with faculty.

5.7. Distance education and other classes offered outside the classroom will be evaluated using ClassEval. Guidelines for completion of ClassEval must be presented to students prior to the last ten percent (10%) of the course.

6. PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION

Peer evaluation of teaching requires observation of instruction methodologies, review of course materials, and a written assessment of these observations. Each department must develop an evaluation instrument (see Section 4.2). Multiple reviewers should be assigned to each course.

6.1. Observation Procedures

6.1.1. The evaluator(s) communicates and meets with the teacher prior to making observations in order to learn the course objectives and become aware of the range of methods/materials/media utilized to achieve these objectives.

6.1.2. Observation must include visits to the classroom or course Web site for online courses, review of the key media and other materials used in instruction, and review of electronic interactions between students and teacher as applicable.

6.1.3. The evaluator must complete a section of the peer evaluation instrument during the class observation period.

6.2. Review of Learning Materials

6.2.1. Learning materials may include the syllabus, examinations, handouts, electronic materials and examples of students work.

6.2.2. Peer evaluation of materials should include accuracy and currency of content, assessment strategies, and difficulty level.

6.2.3. The evaluator must complete the written assessment of learning materials by the end of the semester or at the discretion of the department head.

6.3. Assessment

The written assessment of class observations and learning materials is discussed with the instructor by the evaluator. The written assessment is signed by the evaluator and instructor and submitted to the department head with a copy to the instructor.

7. MAINTAINING STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION DATA

Completed student and peer evaluation instruments and resulting summary data are confidential.

7.1. Student and peer evaluations become part of the faculty member's personnel file.

7.2. Faculty members must be provided access to completed evaluations and any summary data resulting from those evaluations.

7.3. Original or summary data from student evaluations, including student responses to open-ended questions, and from peer evaluations must be retained for at least six years.

7.4. Data collected via electronic student evaluations (ClassEval) will be securely stored by the university.

8. EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Because the results of student and peer evaluations of teaching are used in personnel decisions, interpreting evaluation results must be done with caution.

8.1. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness must not be based on any single source of data. It may include peer review, faculty evaluations, teaching portfolios, exit interviews, and alumni surveys.

8.2. Departmental Voting Faculty will establish guidelines for interpretation of student evaluations ~~must be based on all questions from~~ ClassEval data that will be employed in departmental decisions affecting employment status or compensation of faculty. Personnel decisions shall be evaluated based on the guidelines established a minimum of one year prior to the decision under consideration.

C Hemenway 4/22/09 11:48 AM

Comment: Inserted text.

9. CONFIDENTIALITY OF CLASSEVAL DATA

9.1. Individual evaluation data may be shared only with department voting faculty, administrators, and other faculty (e.g. college RPT committees) involved in personnel decisions.

9.2. Faculty may share their individual evaluation data, but not the evaluation data of TAs or other instructors involved in the class without written permission.

9.3. Aggregate evaluation data may not be presented in a way that would allow identification of an individual faculty member.

Guidelines/Principles for the Use of Student Teaching Evaluations

Purpose:

Concern has been expressed from across the University as to how student evaluation of teaching is used, particularly in regard to potential over interpretation of numerical data. The purpose of these guidelines/principles is to provide some perspective and best practice in their use. The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina requires “(1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis.” See The UNC Policy Manual: 400.3.1.1[G] section II.c. [\[1\]](#)

Best Practices for Use of Student Evaluations for Assessment of Teaching:

Student evaluations of teaching performance using the ClassEval instrument offer both formative and summative feedback for the ultimate purpose of providing a better learning experience and producing high quality graduates. Faculty may utilize ClassEval data for making improvements in their teaching as part of their formative evaluation. ClassEval data comprise one component of the summative review process for evaluation of teaching used in personnel decisions. For teaching evaluation reviews at the departmental level, the departmental voting faculty (DVF) will establish guidelines for interpreting the ClassEval data following the principles outlined below.

Principles for interpretation of ClassEval data for the purpose of personnel decisions

1. Guidelines for interpreting ClassEval data should be developed by the DVF a minimum of one year in advance of the faculty evaluation process for which they will be used to ensure (a) that the individual being evaluated and those conducting the evaluation have a mutual understanding regarding procedures, standards and expectations, and (b) that the criteria for evaluation are consistently applied to all individuals being evaluated by a unit. Such departmental guidelines should be reviewed periodically (~3 years) or sooner if the ClassEval instrument and/or process change.
2. Teaching evaluation scores are statistical data that are subject to variations due to course level, course content and difficulty, class size and composition, teaching style and student evaluation response rate. Therefore, DVF should evaluate a given instructor/course based on scores provided for that instructor/course combination

from year to year in order to assess consistency and improvements made to ensure quality teaching. Individual course or instructor data are not suited to comparison to a departmental mean.

3. Numerical data from ClassEval should not be considered as absolute numbers because confidence levels vary depending on response rate. Information on analyses is available to faculty through University Planning and Analysis.

4. Faculty are encouraged to address constructive criticism provided in students' written feedback as an important part of self-improvement in teaching. The DVF and responsible administrators should recognize faculty efforts to address students' concerns and detail their innovations in teaching and course development.

5. Faculty have the right to provide a brief statement addressing ClassEval data issues such as isolated and unsubstantiated personal criticism or teaching innovations in response to ClassEval critique. Such a statement should be considered part of the "summary of student evaluations" in any assessment requiring the evaluation of teaching such as reappointment, tenure or post tenure review decisions.

6. The goal of producing highly qualified students requires rigorous course standards and excellent teaching, and should not be compromised for the sole purpose of achieving higher teaching evaluation scores.

7. Diversity in teaching styles should be encouraged. Each faculty member is urged to develop his or her unique teaching style that will provide the best educational experience for their students.

Authority and Contact for These Guidelines

The authority for these guidelines shall reflect shared responsibility between the Faculty Senate and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and consultation with the University Standing Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching. Any questions about, or proposed revisions to these guidelines should be addressed to the Chair of the Faculty (919)515-2279

