



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



April 22, 1996

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. Cynthia Johnson
Human Environmental Sciences
HESC 115B

Dear Dr. Johnson:

On the recommendation of Dr. Dorothy H. Clayton, university coordinator of faculty development, I am pleased to approve your unit's procedures and instrument for peer classroom observation.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Tinsley E. Yarbrough'.

Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

TEY/rb

cc: Dr. Mel Markowski



Memorandum

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

To: Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: Dorothy H. Clayton *Dorothy H. Clayton*
Coordinator, Faculty Development Programs

Date: April 15, 1996

Subject: CDFR Procedures and Instrument for Peer Classroom Observation

The Department of Child Development and Family Relations is using the Faculty Senate Procedures and Instrument for peer classroom observation. The only variation in the procedures is to allow the chair of the Personnel Committee to manage the distribution of observers to ensure that all eligible observers have equal chances of being selected. The department is also requiring the inclusion of a narrative account as part of the instrument with an additional written narrative of clinical classes. The department plans to assess its experiences with the instrument after one year's use to decide if it needs to make modifications.

The department's current modifications are consistent with the requirements as stated in "Minimum Criteria for Unit Peer Observation Plan" issued by your office on March 5, 1996. I recommend approval of the department's peer classroom observation procedures and instrument.

Please send notification to Professor Cynthia E. Johnson, Chair, Department of Child Development and Family Relations. A copy should also go to Professor Mel Markowski, chair, Personnel Committee.



RECEIVED

APR 08 1996

VCAA

Department of
Child Development
and Family Relations
School of Human
Environmental Sciences

919-328-6908
919-328-4276 fax

Child Development
Laboratory
919-328-6926

Marriage and Family
Therapy Clinic
919-328-4236

MEMORANDUM

To: Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: Cynthia E. Johnson *Cynthia E. Johnson*
Chair, CDFR

Date: April 4, 1996

RE: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures and Instrument

The faculty in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations have discussed the classroom observation procedures and instrument and I submit to you the departments' decisions.

Instrument. The faculty will use the approved Faculty Senate peer classroom observation instrument and procedures. A narrative will accompany each observation with an additional written narrative of clinical classes. After this academic year, the faculty will reassess the instrument to determine its effectiveness for meeting the needs of the classes in CDFR.

Procedures. The CDFR Personnel Committee will coordinate the peer observation process. Tenured-track faculty will be observed by tenured faculty. Each tenured-track faculty members will select one peer observer and the Personnel Committee will randomly select the second peer observer. If the second observer's name is selected twice in a row either by the same faculty or by another faculty, that observer can decline, and the next name is pulled. This procedure will ensure that all eligible tenured faculty have equal chances of being selected as peer classroom observers. A copy of the completed instrument and support documents will be placed in the observed faculty member's personnel file. The chair of the Personnel Committee who will coordinate the peer classroom observation process is Dr. Mel Markowski. He can be reached at x1333.

Please call me if you have any questions.

cc: Dorothy Clayton
Helen Grove
Mel Markowski

Faculty Senate Resolution 93-44

Approved by the Faculty Senate: December 7, 1993

Approved by the Chancellor: February 8, 1994

PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES AND A SAMPLE COPY OF A PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT

Peer Review Procedures and Sample Instrument with the following caveats:

- 1) that the instrument and procedures be used to assess and improve teaching;
- 2) that all observers be trained to evaluate teaching through special sessions to be designed and implemented later;
- 3) that the Chancellor appoint a committee of no fewer than three members to do a three year validation study on this instrument, the results of which may necessitate additions and/or deletions in the procedures and/or instrument; and
- 4) that departments have the option of selecting other instruments and procedures which would be approved by the appropriate vice chancellor.

Further, in accordance with the spirit of multiple evaluation procedures, the professor is recommended to supplement the results of the observations with any additional appropriate evidence of effective teaching such as portfolios, student evaluations, etc.

TRAINING OUTLINE

- I. Observation/Documentation
 - A. Clarification of categories and items.
 - B. Methods of documenting what is observed.
 - C. Practice documentation.
 - D. Analysis of observed/documented behaviors.
- II. Conferences
 - A. Pre-conference.
 1. Interview guide
 2. Scheduling
 - B. Post-conference.
 1. Interview guide
 2. Giving and receiving feedback
 - C. Faculty Development Plan.
- III. Procedures for Observation

Faculty Senate Resolution 05-03

Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 25, 2005

Approved by the Chancellor: February 7, 2005

**PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT TO
INCLUDE REVIEW OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES**

Professor _____

Class _____

Time _____

of Students _____

**EAST CAROLINA PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING INSTRUMENT
FOR NON TENURED AND FIXED TERM FACULTY
(Peer Version)**

Using the items below, record your observations. Your mark(s) on or somewhere between the distinctions "does well" and "needs improvement" should indicate what overall assessment for the category is assigned.

Category 1: Organization

- Begins the instructional session in a timely fashion
- Provides needed information in a timely manner
- Clearly states goals or objectives for the instructional session
- Reviews prior instructional material to prepare the students for the content to be covered.
- Summarizes and/or distills main points at the close of the instructional session
- Presents topics in logical sequence and flow

Comments:

Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA/U O

Category 4: Rapport/Interaction

Establishes and follows established criteria for class interaction
 Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner
 Respects diverse points of view
 Establishes an environment that encourages students' participation and questions
 Responds constructively to students' questions, opinions and comments
 Provides corrective feedback to wrong answers
 Prompts students to answer difficult questions and solve complex problems by providing cues and encouragement
 Facilitates student to student communication and interaction
 Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge
 Comments:

Needs Improvement		Does Well		NA/U O

Category 5: Active Learning (labs, PE activities, clinics, etc.) OPTIONAL

Clearly explains directions or procedures
 Facilitates access to materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity in a timely manner
 Explains safety procedures when warranted
 Allows sufficient time for completion
 Comments:

Needs Improvement		Does Well		NA/U O

NA/UO - not applicable/unable to observe