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

E A S T
CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY

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

April 22, 1996

Dr. Edwin Bell, Chair
Department of Educational Leadership
  School of Education
Speight 102C

Dear Dr. Bell:

On the recommendation of Dr. Dorothy H. Clayton, coordinator of faculty development, I am pleased to approve the "peer observation for evaluation" portion of the Department of Educational Leadership's LEED Peer Evaluation and Development Program. In addition, I wish to join Dr. Clayton in commending you and your colleagues for establishing a separate program of peer observation which is solely developmental in purpose.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

TEY/rb

Memorandum

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: Department of Educational Leadership, Peer Classroom Observation

I have reviewed the "Peer Observation for Evaluation" portion of the Department of Educational Leadership's LEED Peer Evaluation and Development Program. Professor Bell stated in a telephone conversation (4-16-96, 1:15 P.M.) that the chair of the department is responsible for placing, in the observed faculty member's personnel file, the materials resulting from the peer classroom observation for evaluation purposes. This follows the department's normal procedure where chair places items in a personnel file. The department's procedures and instrument meet 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 Observation for Evaluation" procedures and instrument.

The department has a second observation program which is solely developmental in purpose. While it is not part of my "charge" to review such a program, I do want to compliment the department on taking an important initiative in this matter.

Please send notification to Professor E.D. Bell, chair, Department of Educational Leadership.

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

School of Education
Educational Leadership
102-A Speight Building

919-328-6862
919-328-4219 Fax

TO: Dr. Tinsley E. Yarbrough, Acting VCAA

FROM: E. D. Bell, Chairman Educational Leadership

RE: Faculty Peer Review Process in Educational Leadership

DATE: April 3, 1996

I have enclosed the peer review process that Dr. Allan Glatthorn developed in collaboration with the faculty of Educational Leadership. The Educational Leadership faculty approved this draft of April 1, 1996. I hope the process that we have developed is satisfactory. Thank you for time and consideration that you will spend on this document.

c: Dr. Charles R. Coble, Dean SOE

Greenville,
North Carolina
27858-4353

East Carolina University is a constituent Institution of The University of North Carolina.
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Allan A. Glatthorn
April 2, 1996

/Draft 3/ LEED PEER EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

All experts in the evaluation of teaching agree that peer observation will be effective only if a clear distinction is made between two separate functions: evaluation, the assessment of teaching for making personnel decisions; and development, observing teaching in order to help the instructor develop professionally. Therefore, the LEED peer evaluation and development program includes two components: peer evaluation; and peer development.

Peer Observation for Evaluation

Peer observation for evaluation will be used any time a personnel decision is to be made--about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion. The peer evaluation component will be used as university policies require. The LEED program will conform with all the requirements of the Faculty Senate guidelines, with some minor exceptions. First, each observer must observe a total of two hours; this requirement may be met by making two one-hour observations or one two-hour observation. Second, the two observers need not observe the same class at the same time. Third, LEED will use the criteria and form shown in Figures 1 and 2. Finally, if the faculty member to be evaluated wishes to get student feedback, he or she may use the form shown in Figure 3. (Students will be oriented in the use of the form.)

The following specific provisions will apply in the peer evaluation of faculty.

1. Two observers make two observations each, with feedback..
2. All faculty will be trained.
3. Peer observations for evaluation will be made during the professor's first
   year and the fourth year.
4. Observation procedures
   *Pre-observation conference
   *Professor chooses classes to be observed
   *Post-observation conference within 5 days of observation,
       with a faculty development plan

(See Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44 for further details.)

Peer Observation for Development

This section proposes a developmental model for using peer observation as a means of fostering growth in teaching. The first section explains the assumptions of the model; the second, the details of the model; the third, the training needed.

Assumptions of the Model

The model is based on several assumptions.

1. A clear distinction should be made between peer observation for evaluation and peer observation for development. Peer observation for evaluation should be used only for purposes of deciding about contract renewal, tenure or promotion. This proposed model is concerned solely with faculty development in the improvement of instruction.

2. All faculty, regardless of experience, rank, and tenure status, should systematically develop their instructional skills and expand their instructional repertoires.

3. Improvement in instruction requires feedback. Such feedback can come from both students and colleagues.

4. Peer feedback should focus on a specific element of instruction and should be objective in nature.

Details of the Model

The model would operate as follows.

Forming Collegial Teams

1. Each faculty member would submit to the chair of the department the names of three colleagues with whom he would like to work.

2. The chair will use these expressions of preference to organize collegial teams of 2-3 faculty.

Arranging for Peer Observations

1. Each faculty member would invite one of his or her team members to make a focused observation. It is expected that one such observation will be made each semester. The faculty member to be observed is designated here as the observed; the faculty member making the observation, the observer.

2. The observed would determine the focus of the observation. The focus typically would be an instructional skill that the observed wishes to develop.

3. Together the observed and the observer will develop or acquire a focused observation form that will enable the observer to collect the data desired. A sample form is shown in Figure 4. These focused observation forms will be kept on file in the departmental office as they are developed and tested and made available to other faculty who wish to use them.

4. The observed specifies the class to be observed or taped, taking into account the availability of the observer.

5. They agree as to whether the observation will be live or whether it will take the form of the analysis of a video tape of a class.

Making the Observation

1. If the observation is to be live, the observed explains to the class the reason for the presence of the observer. If the observation is to be taped, the observed arranges for the taping.

2. Whether using live or taped instruction, the observer collects observational data using the focused form.

Providing Feedback

1. The observed and the observer confer at a mutually agreeable time.

2. The observer and the observed discuss the data collected on the form. There is no discussion of the observer's evaluation of the class session, unless the observed requests an evaluation..

Reporting the Observation

1. The observed completes a report that is signed by the observer and submits it to the chair. The report simply notes the date of the observation or the taped session, the focus of the observation, the date of the conference, and the names of those involved.

Training the Faculty for the Model

The training should occur in two sessions--one prior to the observations and one following. The trainer should be a faculty member from the School of Education who has experience in teacher evaluation. The workshops should employ a manual for faculty use and tapes of university-level classes. The following topics should be examined prior to the observations.

1. Selecting a focus for the observation.
2. Developing a focused observation form.
3. Observing a live classroom.
4. Using video-tape analysis.
5. Giving and receiving focused feedback.

The following topics should be discussed after the observations have been completed.

1. What was learned from the peer observations.
2. How the model might be improved.

The training workshops should be supplemented with peer coaching.

FIGURE 1. EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR OBSERVING LEED FACULTY

1. Planned effectively.

   Indicators: Had materials and equipment available; communicated plan to students; showed relationship of class session to previous and following ones.

2. Organized instruction effectively.

   Indicators: Clarified objectives; provided overviews; emphasized key concepts; made effective transitions; summarized or had students summarize.

3. Demonstrated a deep and current knowledge of the topic.

   Indicators: Made reference to current research; responded to students' questions in a manner that reflected deep and current knowledge; presented current theory and research.

4. Enabled the students to gain access to meaningful knowledge.

   Indicators: Provided up-to-date reading lists; used current materials; enabled students to learn from each other; directed students to current sources; used technology appropriately; explained clearly.

5. Fostered the students' application of knowledge to meaningful and contextualized professional problems.

   Indicators: Posed questions requiring application; presented students with educational problems to solve.

6. Monitored and assessed student learning.

   Indicators: Observed student behavior closely; questioned students to check comprehension; used writing to assess learning; encouraged questions that would reveal student understanding; used monitoring data to adjust teaching; gave students timely feedback on assignments.

7. Fostered reflection.

   Indicators: Modeled reflection; asked probing questions; used student responses to advance deliberation; identified unresolved issues.

8. Made efficient use of time.

Indicators: Began class on time; maintained a task orientation; used routines to eliminate wasted time; used entire time provided.

FIGURE 2. FORM FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

OBSERVER:_____

NAME OF FACULTY EVALUATED _____

DATE:_____   CLASS_____

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES:

CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE	EVALUATIONS		
	MORE THAN SATIS	SATIS FACT ORY	LESS THAN SATIS
1. PLANNED EFFECTIVELY			
2. ORGANIZED INSTRUCTION EFFECTIVELY			
3. DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE OF TOPIC			
4. ENABLED ACCESS TO KNOWLEDGE			
5. FOSTERED PROBLEM SOLVING			
6. ASSESSED STUDENT LEARNING			
7. FOSTERED REFLECTION			
8. MADE EFFICIENT USE OF TIME			

OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND COMMENTS

FIGURE 3. STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM

To LEED students: In order to improve teaching, your instructor would like your feedback about the quality of his or her teaching. Each criterion is listed below, along with the indicators of quality performance. Consider each criterion and then assign one of these grades:

A: Excellent; B: Very good; C: Good to fair; D: Minimally satisfactory; E: Unsatisfactory

1. Plans effectively. Indicators: Had materials and equipment available; communicated plan to students; showed relationship of class session to previous and following ones.

GRADE____

2. Organizes instruction effectively. Indicators: Clarified objectives; provided overviews; emphasized key concepts; made effective transitions; summarized.

GRADE____

3. Demonstrates a deep and current knowledge of the topic. Indicators: Made reference to current research; responded to students' questions in a manner that reflected deep and current knowledge; presented current theory and research.

GRADE____

4. Enables the students to gain access to meaningful knowledge. Indicators: Provided up-to-date readings; used current materials; enabled students to learn from each other; directed students to current sources; used technology; explained clearly.

GRADE____

5. Fosters the students' application of knowledge to meaningful and contextualized professional problems. Indicators: Posed questions requiring application; presented students with educational problems to solve.

GRADE____

6. Monitors and assesses student learning. Indicators: Observes student behavior closely; questioned students to check comprehension; used writing to assess learning; encouraged questions that would reveal student understanding; used monitoring data to adjust teaching; gave students timely feedback on assignments.

GRADE____

7. Fosters reflection. Indicators: Modeled reflection; asked probing questions; used student responses to advance deliberation; identified unresolved issues.

GRADE_____

8. Makes efficient use of time. Indicators: Began class on time; maintained a task orientation; used routines to eliminate wasted time; used entire time provided.

GRADE:_____

COMMENTS: LIST ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

COMMENTS: LIST THE SPECIAL STRENGTHS

Glatthorn, A. A. (199
HarperCollins

Glatthorn, A. A. (199
Newbury Part

ecu2 peer 1

FIGURE 4. EXAMPLE OF FOCUSED OBSERVATION F

Observational focus: Responding to students' answers.

Directions: Each time the instructor responds to a student ansv
of the categories noted below and make a tally mark. Total the
the lesson.

RESPONSE	TALLY
1. Repeats	
2. Affirms	
3. Praises	
4. Negates	
5. Criticizes	
6. Re-directs	
7. Paraphrases	
8. Probes	
9. Differentiates	
10. Makes no response	