



Faculty Senate
East Carolina University
140 Rawl Annex • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6537 office • 252-328-6122 fax
faculty senate@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



RECEIVED
FEB 15 1995
VICE CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

RECEIVED
FEB 15 1995
College of Arts & Sciences

Department of Chemistry
College of
Arts and Sciences
205 Flanagan

919-328-6711
919-328-6210 Fax

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
VIA: Dr. Keats Sparrow *Keats 2/16/95*
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
FROM: Chia-yu Li *CL*
Chair, chemistry Department
DATE: February 15, 1995
RE: Chemistry Department Peer Review Procedures and Peer Review
Instrument

*Approved -
Tinsley E. Yarbrough
2-17-95*

Thank you for your letter of January 30 in which you approved our Teaching Evaluation Method (noted as Document A). Now, I am submitting to you another document (Document B) which deals with the peer review procedures and a survey instrument, for your approval.

Document B was taken from the Faculty Senate approved version of December 7, 1993 (Resolution #93-44) with minor alterations. To facilitate proofreading, the alterations are printed in boldface. The chemistry faculty approved Document B on February 15, 1994.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Robert Morrison, Chair, Chemistry Executive Committee
Dr. George Evans, Chair, Chemistry Personnel Committee

Approved by Chemistry Faculty 2/16/93

Approved by Dr. Tinsley E. Yarbrough, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 1/30/95

Department of Chemistry Teaching Evaluation Method

The Chemistry Department is committed to provide students with best possible instruction in chemistry, to achieve distinction in both undergraduate and graduate education, and to continue strengthening the commitment to excellence in teaching by its faculty. To evaluate each faculty member's teaching performance, the department chair shall base his/her evaluation on: (A) student opinion of instruction survey and (B) documented evidence of effective teaching.

A. Student Opinion Survey

A significant portion (no less than 60%) of each faculty member's teaching rating will be based on the results of the student opinion survey conducted each semester by the University. When evaluating the results of the survey, the department chair shall consider the unit mean as well as the performance of other instructors in similar courses. In addition, the department chair may consider factors such as teaching experience, class size, nature of course, course level, multiple section assignments, and laboratory assignments.

B. Presenting evidence of effective teaching

Up to 40% of the evaluation will be based on documented evidence of effective teaching. It may include, but is not limited to the following items:

- a. Effectiveness as a lab and/or lecture coordinator.
- b. Publication of pedagogical materials, including lab manuals, study guide, etc.
- c. The timeliness of the subject matter taught by the faculty member.
- d. Evidence of innovation in the classroom and lab instruction such as use of video recording of a regular class or lab presentation.
- e. Development of new experiments.
- f. Development of new courses.
- g. Student interest in research with the faculty member.
- h. Level of student interest in courses taught by the faculty member.
- i. Preparation of class schedules, handouts, exams, etc. prepared by the faculty member for distribution to students.
- j. Comparative student performance on standardized tests and common final exams.
- k. Other tangible evidence such as development of innovative ideas in presenting lecture and lab materials.
- l. Peer review of classroom/lab teaching (see description below).

Faculty members may also wish to use peer review of classroom/lab teaching as a means of evaluation or as a means to improve his/her teaching skills. This shall be done on a voluntary basis. In the event that the faculty member chooses to participate in this activity, an ad hoc committee consisting of no less than two faculty colleagues will be nominated by the department chair to conduct peer review. One of these committee members may be selected by the faculty member from within or outside the department. At least one visit per faculty will be conducted by the committee during the academic year. Toward the end of the academic year, the committee shall draft a formal report summarizing its opinion and forward it to the department chair. The faculty member has the option of having a class or laboratory presentation videotaped, for later review by the ad hoc committee.

Department of Chemistry

**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

PROCEDURES FOR PEER OBSERVATION

- I. Two observers per observation.
 - A. One trained observer to be selected by the professor's department chair and/or personnel committee.
 - B. One trained observer selected by the professor.
- II. Selection of trained observers.
All tenured faculty in the **Chemistry department shall be trained.**

- NOTES:
- 1. All observers must complete training.
 - 2. The most suitable observers are faculty who are attentive to details, highly organized, and active listeners.
 - 3. Where possible the observers shall come from the department/discipline of the faculty member being observed.

- III. Observation cycle (minimum).
 - A. During the professor's first year -- two observations in lecture and one observation in lab, with feedback.
 - B. During the professor's fourth year -- two observations in lecture and one observation in lab, with feedback.
- IV. Observation procedures.
 - A. Pre-observation conference (observers and professor).
 - 1. Professor provides observers with copies of handouts and a list of materials to be used during class plus a current syllabus and any other pertinent information.
 - 2. Observer selected by professor provides a self-evaluation form to professor.
 - B. Schedule and course selection.
 - 1. Professor chooses the classes to be observed.
 - 2. Observers coordinate a date/time for the observation.
 - C. Post-observation conference (within 5 working days of observation with both observers).
 - 1. Go over observation and self-evaluation.
 - 2. Discuss strengths, any needs for improvements, and search for strategies to improve.
 - 3. Write a Faculty Development Plan.

ATTACHED IS A SAMPLE COPY OF A PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT

**** SAMPLE INSTRUMENT ****

Professor _____
 Class _____

Time _____
 Students _____

of

**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 and ends class on time in an orderly, organized fashion
- clearly states the goal or objective for the period
- reviews prior class material to prepare students for the content to be covered
- summarizes and distills main points at the end of class
- presents material in a well-organized and coherent fashion
- adheres to the distributed course schedule

needs improvement	does well	NA/VO

Comments: _____

Category 2: Content

- selects examples relevant to student experiences/course content
- presents up to date developments in the field
- answers student questions clearly and directly
- demonstrates command of subject matter
- content is suitable to course level and scope

needs improvement	does well	NA/VO

Comments: _____

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

	needs improvement		does well	NA/NO
--clearly explains directions or procedures				
--has materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity readily available				
--careful safety instruction and supervision is obvious				
--allows sufficient time for completion				
--remains accessible to students during the lab period				
--monitors student progress during the lab				
--gives careful attention to waste disposal and lab cleanliness				

Comments: _____

NA/NO - not applicable/unable to observe

Observer _____ Date _____ Time in _____ Time out _____

Areas of Strength:

Areas to consider for Faculty Development Plan