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/

E   A   S   T
CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY

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

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
Minimum Criteria for Departmental Peer Evaluation Plans

The requirement for peer evaluation of the teaching of
faculty members employed by constituent institutions of the
University of North Carolina was stated in Administrative
Memorandum #338 from the University's Board of Governors on
September 28, 1993. East Carolina University Faculty Senate
Resolution #93-44, which was approved by the Chancellor on
February 8, 1994, is the university's response to Administrative
Memorandum #338. The resolution includes a set of procedures and
a sample form for peer evaluation. In an effort to provide
assistance to School of Medicine departments, a Peer Evaluation
Task Force was formed by the School. The Task Force report was
submitted to the Dean on November 11, 1994 and includes
recommendations addressing the requirements mandated by the
Administrative Memorandum #338 and Faculty Senate Resolution #93-
44, as well as sample forms for collecting data during peer
evaluations. The minimum criteria for approval of departmental
peer evaluation plans in the School of Medicine were drawn from
these three documents and pertinent sections of the East Carolina
University Faculty Manual.

Each of the following items should be addressed in
departmental peer evaluation plans so that all faculty subject to
the process will understand departmental policies and procedures.

1.   Non-tenured, probationary term faculty members in their

      first and third years of employment must have their teaching

evaluated by their peers. The dates on which the first and third years begin are the dates in faculty members' contracts that specify when faculty members actually enter the tenure track.

2. The department's peer evaluation policies and procedures must be discussed with each faculty member prior to initial employment, and a record of this discussion must be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The criteria against which teaching effectiveness will be evaluated must be discussed, and copies of the approved forms that will be used for evaluations in the department should be given to the faculty member.

3. A minimum of two (2) peer evaluations must be conducted during both the first and third years of employment of each faculty member subject to peer evaluation.

4. Peer evaluators must be tenured faculty members.

5. Peer evaluators must be trained in programs approved by the School of Medicine.

6. Each peer evaluation will be conducted by two (2) evaluators. Faculty members to be evaluated will select one evaluator, and the other evaluator will be selected by the department. The School of Medicine recommends that the department chair and personnel committee jointly select the second evaluator. Evaluators from other departments or disciplines may be selected by either party. However, the School of Medicine recommends that whenever possible,

evaluators be members of the same department or discipline as the faculty member being evaluated.

7. The faculty member to be evaluated will specify the date and time of the evaluation and the teaching environment in which the evaluation will be conducted. (The date and time may be negotiated if the faculty member to be evaluated teaches in the selected environment frequently or regularly.)

8. A pre-evaluation conference attended by both evaluators and the faculty member to be evaluated should be held at least three (3) working days prior to the evaluation. The purpose of this conference is to enable the faculty member who will be evaluated to orient the evaluators to the teaching session they will observe. For example, the faculty member might give the evaluators copies of handouts to be used in the session, discuss the educational level of the learners, or place the session in the context of the course or clerkship.

9. During the pre-evaluation conference, a copy of the evaluation form the evaluators will use to record their observations is to be given to the faculty member. The form should be completed by the faculty member after the teaching session as a personal evaluation of his or her teaching during the session.

10. A post-evaluation conference must be conducted within ten (10) working days of the observed teaching session. The forms completed by the evaluators and the faculty member's

self-evaluation should be distributed to all three participants before this conference. The contents of these forms should be used to guide a discussion of the faculty member's teaching strengths, areas of teaching that could be improved, and potential faculty development activities.

11. Following the post-evaluation conference, the evaluators may complete a joint evaluation report or individual reports. Reports must include copies of the evaluation forms completed during the observation and a summary of the discussion during the post-evaluation conference.

12. Copies of the evaluators' report(s) should be sent to the faculty member within ten (10) working days of the post-evaluation conference, and the original report(s) should be placed in the faculty member's personnel file at the same time. The self-evaluation form should be retained by the faculty member.

13. Reports from the peer evaluations during the first and third years of a faculty member's employment by the School of Medicine must be included in any personnel action dossier (PAD) submitted by a faculty member in an application for reappointment or in an application for tenure and promotion, or both (Administrative Memorandum #338 and the East Carolina University Faculty Manual Appendix C, p. C-5, III. 1. b. and Appendix D, p. D-12, IV. F. 2 d).

14. The School of Medicine recommends that departments use the forms developed by the Peer Evaluation Task Force.

Modifications of these forms that expand the information provided are acceptable. Revisions that reduce the amount of information provided by these forms, or different forms, must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences.

15. Departmental plans must specify who is responsible for implementing the peer-evaluation process for faculty members and who is accountable for compliance with departmental policies and procedures for peer evaluation.

1/3/96

Peer Evaluation Form for Large Group Presentations
(Generally more than Twelve People)

Faculty Member Observed_____

Title or Subject of Presentation_____

Date Observed_____ Length of Observation_____

Observer_____ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member_____

Response Scale: OUTSTANDING = met all or virtually all of the criteria
SATISFACTORY = met most of the criteria
MARGINAL = met some of the criteria
UNSATISFACTORY = met few or none of the criteria

Clarity and Organization (circle one)–	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Begins on time
States purpose of presentation
Outlines clear objectives for presentation
Explains clearly how presentation relates to previous content
Presents material in organized manner
Uses effective transitions between key points
Uses instructional media appropriately
Summarizes key points of the presentation

Strengths	Recommendations

Presentation Style (circle one)–	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Is enthusiastic
Stimulates interest in the topic
Speaks clearly
Paces the presentation to allow note-taking
Presents without distracting mannerisms
Maintains appropriate eye contact

Strengths	Recommendations

Group Interaction	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Encourages participation
Uses questions appropriately to stimulate discussion
Answers questions clearly
Answers questions in non-demanding way

Strengths	Recommendations

Content	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Presentation follows the outline and/or syllabus
Defines terminology
Presents appropriate amount of information
Presents material at appropriate level of complexity
Material presented is up-to-date
Handouts or other materials reinforce the key points

Strengths	Recommendations

Overall Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Peer Evaluation Form for Small Group Presentations
(Generally Four - Twelve People)

Faculty Member Observed_____

Title or Subject of Presentation_____

Date Observed_____   Length of Observation_____

Observer_____   Date Reviewed with Faculty Member_____

Response Scale: OUTSTANDING = met all or virtually all of the criteria
SATISFACTORY = met most of the criteria
MARGINAL = met some of the criteria
UNSATISFACTORY = met few or none of the criteria

Clarity and Organization	(circle one)-	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Begins on time
Is prepared for the session
Explains clearly the purpose of session
Explains clearly how the session relates to previous content
Explains clearly how the session is organized
Explains clearly what students are expected to do
Summarizes content at the end of presentation

Strengths	Recommendations

Presentation Style	(circle one)-	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Is enthusiastic
Stimulates interest in the topic
Maintains appropriate eye contact
Speaks clearly
Speaks without distracting mannerisms
Encourages group interaction

Strengths	Recommendations

Group Interaction	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Facilitates rather than directs the discussion
Gets participation from all members of the group
Does not allow one or two members to dominate
Keeps the group on target
Answers questions or provides guidance when necessary
Treats students respectfully

Strengths	Recommendations

Promoting Thinking Skills	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Checks to see information is understood
Appropriately relates clinical and basic science information
Uses questions to encourage students to think
Allows students to solve problems
Encourages students to seek additional information outside class
Encourages students to question/critique their peers' statements
Provides effective feedback

Strengths	Recommendations

Overall Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Peer Evaluation Form for Laboratory Teaching

Faculty Member Observed_____

Title or Subject of Presentation_____

Date Observed_____   Length of Observation_____

Observer_____   Date Reviewed with Faculty Member_____

Response Scale: OUTSTANDING = met all or virtually all of the criteria
SATISFACTORY = met most of the criteria
MARGINAL = met some of the criteria
UNSATISFACTORY = met few or none of the criteria

Clarity and Organization (circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Begins on time
Is prepared for the session
Explains purpose of session or task to be done
Explains clearly what learner is expected to do
Summarized outcomes of the session
If relevant, explains how session relates to other sessions

Strengths	Recommendations

Presentation Style (circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Is enthusiastic
Stimulates interest in the topic
Maintains appropriate eye contact
Speaks clearly
Speaks without distracting mannerisms

Strengths	Recommendations

Learner Interaction	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Answers questions clearly
If appropriate, demonstrates how to perform a task(s)
Keeps the session on target
Treats learners respectfully
Spends appropriate time with each learner

Strengths	Recommendations

Promoting Thinking Skills	(circle one)→	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Checks to see information is understood
Appropriately relates clinical and basic sciences information
Encourages students to think
Encourages students to seek additional information outside class
Provides effective feedback

Strengths	Recommendations

Overall Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

a\peer\evaluate.frm

Peer Evaluation Form for Unstructured Teaching
(Example: Teaching Rounds and Precepting
Generally Fewer than Four People)

Faculty Member Observed_____

Setting_____

Date Observed_____ Length of Observation_____

Observer_____ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member_____

Response Scale: OUTSTANDING = met all or virtually all of the criteria
SATISFACTORY = met most of the criteria
MARGINAL = met some of the criteria
UNSATISFACTORY = met few or none of the criteria

Interaction with Learners	(circle one)-	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Is enthusiastic
Makes efficient use of time
Makes key points clear
Maintains learners' attention
Accommodates different education levels of learners
If time not available, negotiates where/when learner could get information needed

Strengths	Recommendations

Promotion of Thinking Skills	(circle one)-	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Checks with learners to verify information was understood
Asks questions to test problem-solving skills
Allows learner(s) to solve problems
Asks "what if" questions
Encourages learner(s) to participate
Provides constructive feedback

Strengths	Recommendations

Role Modeling	(circle one)--	O	S	M	U

Criteria:
Treats all members of the patient care team professionally
Effectively demonstrates clinical skills if appropriate
Demonstrates effective relationships with patients and families
Acknowledges areas of controversy in patient care
Displays up-to-date knowledge of medical care

Strengths	Recommendations

Overall Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____