



Faculty Senate
East Carolina University
140 Rawl Annex • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6537 office • 252-328-6122 fax
facultySenate@mail.ecu.edu
<http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Unit Code Administrator

FROM: Mark Taggart, Chair of the Faculty *Mark Taggart*

DATE: November 20, 2006

SUBJECT: Review of Peer Review Procedures and Instrument(s)

Peer review continues to be a part of our current faculty evaluation process. The 2005 revised Peer Review Instrument includes Distance Education Peer Review (attached) to aid those faculty teaching DE courses. As stated in the original 1993 Peer Review Procedures (attached) academic units have the option of selecting other instruments and procedures to conduct peer review, once approved by the appropriate vice chancellor. Both of these documents are available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/facdev/peer.cfm>.

Also stated in the 1993 resolution is a caveat that the Chancellor appoint a committee to conduct a three year validation study on the original peer review instrument. I have asked members of the Academic Standards Committee to undertake this three year validation study and report preliminary information to the Faculty Senate in April 2007. The results of the three year study may necessitate additions and/or deletions in the procedures and/or instrument being used.

In preparation, and as a follow up to the Administrator/Personnel Committee Workshop held earlier this semester, I am writing to ask that you review the attached Peer Review Procedures and Instrument and, if your unit has sought one, your unit's approved Modified Peer Review Instrument (attached) and let Dorothy Muller, Co-Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence know if either or both of these documents are currently being used in your unit. Please also let Dr. Muller know the number of peer reviews documented this year in the Personnel Action Dossiers compiled.

The Academic Standards Committee, chaired by Linda Wolfe, will begin its work on this important issue in early Spring 2007. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 328-6537 or Professor Wolfe at 328-9453 if you have questions about this request.

Thank you.

attachments

1993 Peer Review Procedures and 2005 Revised Peer Review Instrument
Approved Modified Peer Review Instrument (if on file)

c: Members of the Academic Standards Committee
Jim Smith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
Dot Clayton, Co-director of the Center for Faculty Excellence
Dorothy Muller, Co-director of the Center for Faculty Excellence

Muller, Dorothy

From: Muller, Dorothy
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2007 1:15 PM
To: Newman, Joyce Joines
Cc: Mathews, Holly
Subject: here is the Anthropology email

From: Mathews, Holly
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2006 12:59 PM
To: Muller, Dorothy
Subject: Peer Review
Hi Dorothy:

I am responding to the memo from Mark Taggart about Review of Peer Review Procedures. He sent us back a copy of our modified peer review instrument and asked that we let you know if this is being used in our unit. Because this form was very similar to what the faculty senate eventually adopted, we have been using the faculty senate version since it was adopted.

This year, we have completed peer reviews using the faculty senate form on five of our tenure-track and tenured faculty for their PADs. In the spring semester, we will complete three additional reviews using this form for our fixed-term faculty. Thanks and let me know if you need any other information. Best, Holly Mathews, Chair Personnel Committee,
Anthropology
Professor, Department of Anthropology
Flanagan 207
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858
252-328-9452

Muller, Dorothy

From: Muller, Dorothy
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2007 1:18 PM
To: Newman, Joyce Joines
Subject: more anthropology

From: Wolfe, Linda
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2006 10:42 AM
To: Clayton, Dorothy H; Muller, Dorothy
Subject: Peer Review

We have been using the faculty senate procedures and current form. The only changes in the faculty senate procedures is that we don't have the faculty numbers to have two faculty review each teachers who needs observation. But we do the pre and post conference. We have done about 5 reviews this semester. All of our reviewers have been through Dot Clayton's training.

--
Linda Wolfe, anthropology

Dorothy H. Muller, Ph.D.
Special Assistant to the Provost
Co-Director, Center for Faculty Excellence
2307 Old Cafeteria Building
East Carolina University
252-328-1426; 252-328-9324
mullerd@ecu.edu

9/19/2007



Center for Faculty Development
East Carolina University
124 Ragsdale Building • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6470 office • 252-328-4268 fax
claytond@mail.ecu.edu

Memorandum

To: Linda Wolfe
Chair, Department of Anthropology

From: Dot Clayton *Dot Clayton*
Co-Director, Center for Faculty Excellence

Date: November 27, 2006

Subject: Peer Classroom Observation

Linda, I have the instrument that was approved by then Vice Chancellor Yarbrough. I do not have a copy of the procedures. Would you please send me a copy of your department's procedures? If you are using the Faculty Senate Procedures, would you please let me know.

Thank you.



February 6, 1995

Office of the
Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs
106 Spilman

919-328-6241
919-328-6040 Fax

Administrative Staff
215 Spilman

919-328-6242
919-328-4010 Fax

Dr. Linda Wolfe, Chair
Anthropology Department
A-214 Brewster
East Carolina University

Dear Dr. Wolfe:

I am please to confirm that this office has approved the Department of Anthropology instrument and procedures for peer review of teaching originally submitted in 1993.

Please share this information with the Chair of the unit personnel committee.

Sincerely,

Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

TEY/rb

PEER REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Course Name and Number: _____ Day and Time: _____

Instructor: _____ Submitted By: _____

Place a number in the left-hand column using the following scale: 5=excellent, 4=good, 3=average, 2=poor, 1=unacceptable, NA=not applicable to the class observed. Please augment your numerical rankings with comments to explain any ratings that may require justification or clarification.

Section I. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS

- _____ Class goals were stated clearly in the introductory period.
- _____ The class presentation had a coherent structure.
- _____ The class was efficiently and clearly organized.
- _____ Transitions from section to section were achieved smoothly and with proper distinction.
- _____ The terminology was chosen properly and used correctly.
- _____ The stated goals were achieved in the class period.

Comments:

Section II. CLASS CONTENT

- _____ The overall content of the class was suitable for the level and scope of the course.
- _____ The instructor related concepts to theories and methods in the discipline where appropriate.
- _____ Concrete examples of concepts and theories were used where appropriate.
- _____ The class presentation covered the stated topic/objective adequately.
- _____ The content presented was current, significant, and relevant to the stated class goals.

Section III. TEACHING TECHNIQUE

What technique was employed by the instructor? _____

- _____ The instructor's technique was appropriate to the topic and content covered in the class.
- _____ The instructor reviewed the required text readings adequately during the class.
- _____ The instructor incorporated relevant and timely supplementary materials in the class presentation.
- _____ The instructor used activities or questions/examples to stimulate student responses to the topic or to involve students in considering issues relevant to the topic.

Comments:

Section IV. STUDENT RESPONSES

- _____ Students paid attention to the instructor.
- _____ Students took notes on the materials.
- _____ Students participated in the class by asking questions or making comments on the materials/points related.
- _____ Students appeared to have no difficulty in grasping the materials presented by the instructor.

Comments:

Section V: INSTRUCTOR'S SPEECH MANNERISMS

- _____ The instructor's pronunciation was distinct and correct.
- _____ The instructor's speech was audible and understandable to the entire class.
- _____ The instructor's grammar was correct.
- _____ The presentation was accomplished in a pleasing and interesting tone.
- _____ The speaker did not use distracting idioms or vocalizations.

