



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



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: Scott W. Snyder  
Chair, Geology Department

From: Richard D. Ringeisen  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Date: November 6, 1996

Subject: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures and Instrument

I am pleased to approve the Geology Department's peer classroom observation procedures and instrument contained in the department's "Procedures for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness."

cc: Keats Sparrow  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Richard Mauger  
Chair, Personnel Committee  
Geology Department

*D*orothy H. Clayton  
Coordinator, Center for Faculty Development

## **Department of Geology Procedures for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

In keeping with the emphasis on high quality teaching at ECU, the Department of Geology uses the following procedures to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of faculty.

Teaching personnel are evaluated by members of the Department Personnel Committee. Specific procedures for the evaluation are outlined below.

### Evaluation of Full-Time, Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty and Fixed-term Faculty

Teaching personnel are required 1) to document their teaching activities by submitting specific documents (described below) to the department office every semester, and 2) to participate in teaching effectiveness evaluations (also described below) scheduled for each member of the department according to rank and timing of the last evaluation.

#### *Scheduling of Evaluations*

All full-time, tenure-track faculty are required to undergo teaching-effectiveness evaluations every year, for the first four years of appointment. Fixed-term faculty will be evaluated every year. A teaching-effectiveness evaluation must also be included in all tenure and promotion evaluations.

Any full-time, tenured faculty member who is under review for promotion must participate in a teaching-effectiveness evaluation as part of the promotion evaluation. Further, all full-time tenured faculty members must participate in a teaching-effectiveness evaluation every five years and whenever specific and recurring complaints or problems about their teaching performance have come to the attention of the department chairperson. In the latter case, the chairperson shall inform the faculty member of the need for an evaluation during or before the first week of the semester in which the evaluation is to take place.

#### *Instructor Responsibility*

All faculty and instructors shall submit copies of course syllabi to the department chairperson at the beginning of each semester and shall participate in university-sponsored student evaluations. In addition, faculty and instructors shall append a section on Teaching Activities to their University reappointment, tenure and promotion documents. That section shall include the following information:

1. Current teaching and/or administrative assignment.
2. Field of special competence. (Include areas of special competence bearing on teaching effectiveness)
3. Teaching assignment. (Include list of courses taught and thesis research directed; new courses developed; statement of teaching methods and philosophy; innovation; preparation of course materials; special responsibility for classroom, lab facilities, equipment, collections or supplies, curriculum developments; etc.).
4. Participation in student activities (advisement, sponsorship, etc.).

This information shall be supported in the appendices to the documents. The appendices must include 1-3 below, but *may* include additional supporting information such as those suggested in 4 and 5.

1. Course syllabi (including reading lists, grading policies, etc.)
2. Representative exams, papers, or other evidence of student learning.
3. List of theses directed and thesis committee memberships (not applicable to fixed-term personnel).
4. Letters of support from former students and participants in workshops/conferences.
5. Selected faculty-solicited, narrative student evaluations.

All items in the appendices are the property of the instructor and will be returned to that instructor following the evaluation.

The instructor shall review the Departmental committee evaluation and, if desired, respond to the evaluation in writing before it is forwarded for higher level review. The faculty response must be given to the committee within ten days of receipt of the review document.

*Joint Instructor/Committee Responsibilities*

During a teaching-effectiveness evaluation, each faculty member shall undergo peer evaluation of teaching performance by some combination of the following: classroom visitation, evaluation of course materials, and evaluation of university-sponsored or faculty-solicited student evaluations. Evaluation of all tenure-track faculty and instructors must include classroom visitation. Tenured faculty may elect to be evaluated without classroom visitation. All teaching personnel may elect to include university-sponsored student evaluations in their evaluation materials. Those evaluations may not, however, be included without the consent of the evaluatee. The committee will discuss these options with each faculty member and make recommendations concerning the usefulness of each evaluation procedure for the current situation. The faculty member will then choose any optional procedures. If classroom visitation is chosen, the committee and the faculty member, together, will select the course and the date/time for the visitation. All classroom visitations will include a pre- and post-observation conference between the observed faculty member and the observers.

*Committee Responsibilities*

All faculty shall be provided with a copy of this document before the official evaluation process begins. All faculty engaged in classroom visitation must be trained observers. Attendance at a workshop offered through Faculty Development Programs shall constitute appropriate training.

If classroom visitation is to be part of the evaluation process, two observers, one selected by the Personnel Committee and one by the person being observed, shall observe the faculty member in at least one class. That class must be the one agreed upon by the committee and the faculty member. The observers may use an evaluation checklist (such as the one attached) to review the teaching performance, but shall provide a *narrative* evaluation of the faculty member's classroom technique. The checklist may not be substituted for the narrative evaluation.

The Review Committee shall review the faculty member's teaching documents, student evaluations (if submitted by the faculty member), and teaching performance and shall prepare an evaluation document that includes the items listed below. If a personnel decision is also underway, the document shall be forwarded, along with other required materials to the next appropriate level.

Department Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness  
(required outline for committee evaluation)

- A. Departmental Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
1. Evaluate the faculty member's knowledge of the subject; teaching methods; philosophy, innovations, and objectives; course materials such as syllabi and examinations; performance in Departmental/College seminars; curriculum development; direction of student research; interest in students as shown by participation in student advisement, utilization of office, or other evidence. Please describe the basis for this evaluation (e.g., evidence considered, methods of evaluation).
  2. Other peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., signed memoranda from colleagues, analysis of classroom visitation, in accordance with *Joint Instructor/Committee Responsibilities*, outlined above).
- B. Student Evaluations (if submitted by the faculty member)
1. A student evaluations summary table. (Include each course evaluated, the statistical analyses for the course, and a comparison of the faculty member's scores with available College and Departmental scores.)
  2. A narrative analysis of the faculty member's scores and of any optional narrative student evaluations that are included. Include your answer to the following questions: Is the faculty member's performance in other courses generally consistent with that reported? Do the narrative student evaluations (if included) indicate that the faculty member is meeting the goals of the course?

At least ten days before the document is forwarded for any additional review or immediately upon completion of the evaluation (if no additional review is required), the committee shall make its evaluation available to the faculty member for review. In this way, the document will serve the dual purpose of aiding in personnel decisions and promoting faculty improvement. The faculty member may respond, in writing, to the committee evaluation. The response will become part of the official evaluation document that is retained by the department and forwarded for other appropriate review. The committee will return the supporting materials to the faculty member after the evaluation process is complete.

**Department of Geology**  
**CHECKLIST FOR TEACHING EVALUATION VIA CLASSROOM OBSERVATION**

Use the items below to guide your thoughts regarding the teaching performance of the instructor you are evaluating. *Please remember that all of the items listed will not be appropriate for all courses or for all sessions of a particular course.* It is recommended that you make notes during your visitation and use those notes, along with this checklist, to prepare your narrative evaluation. Experience has shown that it is best to prepare the evaluation as soon as possible following the observation session. Do not include this checklist in the evaluation materials and do not attempt to assign numerical scores to the items listed.

**CATEGORY 1: Organization**

- begins 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 the class
- presents topics in logical sequence and flow

**CATEGORY 2: Content**

- selects examples that are relevant to student experiences/course content
- relates course material to field, laboratory, or other activities or applications
- presents up-to-date developments in the field
- answers student questions clearly and directly
- demonstrates command of the subject matter

**CATEGORY 3: Presentation**

- speaks audibly and clearly
- communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement toward the content
- presentation style facilitates note taking
- selects teaching methods appropriate for the content
- relates current course content to what's gone before and will come after
- carefully explains assignments

**CATEGORY 4: Rapport/Interaction**

- responds constructively to student opinions/comments
- listens carefully to student comments and questions
- treats all student comments in a fair and equitable manner
- responds to wrong answers constructively
- encourages students to answer a difficult question by providing cues and encouragement
- respects diverse points of view
- is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge

**CATEGORY 5: Active Learning (for labs, field exercises, etc.)**

- clearly explains directions or procedures
- has materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity readily available
- careful safety supervision is obvious
- allows sufficient time for completion