



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



School of Allied Health Sciences  
 East Carolina University  
 Belk Building • Greenville, NC 27858-4353  
 252-328-4400 office • 252-328-4470 fax  
 www.ecu.edu

- Dean  
328-4400
- Associate Dean  
328-4415
- Biostatistics  
328-2741
- Clinical Laboratory Science  
328-4426
- Communication Sciences  
and Disorders  
328-4404  
328-4469 fax
- Community Health  
328-4400
- Health Services and  
Information Management  
328-2202
- Occupational Therapy  
328-4441
- Physical Therapy  
328-4450  
328-0707 fax
- Physician Assistant Studies  
744-1100  
744-1110 fax
- Rehabilitation Studies  
328-4455
- Speech-Language and  
Hearing Clinic  
328-4405  
328-4469 fax

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Stephen W. Thomas, EdD., Dean  
School of Allied Health Sciences

**FROM:** Elizabeth Layman, PhD, RHIA, FAHIMA, Department Chairman  
Department of Health Services and Information Management

**DATE:** April 5, 2004

**RE:** Form for Peer Observation of Faculty Teaching Distance Education Courses

*Elizabeth Layman*

The faculty members in the Department of Health Services and Information Management (HSIM) have found it necessary to modify the department's approved peer observation form. This modification is for faculty members teaching distance education courses. The department is now requesting approval of the modified form (attached).

**Background**

On October 11, 1995, Dr. James Hallock, former Vice Chancellor, approved the department's original form (attached). On September 11, 2000, Dr. Hallock approved the department's policy on peer evaluation of faculty (attached). The policy of the HSIM Department is to use the university-approved plan and to use an alternate form.

The development of the department's on-line academic programs has necessitated the creation of a second, modified version for faculty members who teach on-line courses. Between December 2003 and February 2004, the HSIM faculty members developed this form using modifications from ECU's Approved Faculty Senate instrument (Peer Review for Faculty Teaching On-Line) and a model from Florida Atlantic University.

.....

I have reviewed the documents submitted and I  approve/  do not approve the modified form for peer observation of teaching.

*Stephen W. Thomas*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dean, School of Allied Health Sciences

4/5/04  
 Date

.....

I have reviewed the documents submitted and I  approve/  do not approve the modified form for peer observation of teaching.

*Michael J. Lewis*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Michael J. Lewis, M.D., Ph.D.  
 Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

5-04-04  
 Date

cc: Personnel Committee Chairman  
 Department Chairman

**Attachments**

**Peer Evaluation Form for Distance Education Faculty  
Department of Health Services and Information Management**

Faculty Member Evaluated \_\_\_\_\_

Course, Unit, or Module Observed \_\_\_\_\_

Course Format asynchronous \_\_\_\_\_ synchronous \_\_\_\_\_

Week Observed \_\_\_\_\_ Length of Observation \_\_\_\_\_

Observer \_\_\_\_\_ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation 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  
 NA/NO = not applicable/not observed

General Format of Course	√	NA/NO
Provides course goals		
Provides course/unit objectives		
Sets out expectations/instructions clearly		
Organizes course materials		
Provides methods for communication		

Strengths	Recommendations

Evaluation Scale – Clarity and Organization (circle one) →	O	S	M	U
--	---	---	---	---

<b>Instructional Design – (Electronic Modalities)</b>	√	NA/NO
Presents organized course materials		
Incorporates multiple tools in the delivery of media		
Uses a variety of instructional resources		
Uses a variety of teaching methods		
Provides explanation (Examples: generalizations, concrete examples, every day examples, illustrations, etc.)		
Facilitates students' tracking of their grades in the course.		

Strengths	Recommendations

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

<b>Content</b>	√	NA/NO
Follows outline and/or syllabus in module/unit		
Defines new language as needed		
Selects up-to-date developments in the field		
Provides up-to-date bibliography/recommends additional resources/supplemental information		

Strengths	Recommendations

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

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_



Office of the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences  
and Dean, The Brody School of Medicine

East Carolina University • Brody Medical Sciences Building • Greenville, NC 27858-4354

252-816-2201 office

252-816-3192 fax

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Dr. Elizabeth Layman, Chair  
Department of Health Information Management

From: James A. Hallock, M.D. *JAH*  
Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

Subject: Departmental Plan for Peer Review of Teaching

Date: September 11, 2000

This acknowledges receipt of your memorandum dated September 7, 2000, documenting that your department's policy for Peer Review of Teaching includes use of the university-approved plan (approved by the Chancellor February 8, 1994) in concert with an alternate form approved by me as Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences in a memorandum dated October 11, 1995.

Together these two documents constitute an approved departmental plan for Peer Review of Teaching in compliance with university requirements. For purposes of establishing an official approval date, I approve this departmental plan effective this date, September 11, 2000.

Faculty whose teaching was peer reviewed after implementation of the approved form on October 11, 1995, and under the university-approved procedures (contained in Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44), are deemed to have been properly reviewed in accordance with university regulations.

JAH/sh

cc: Dr. Harold P. Jones, Dean  
Dr. Dorothy Clayton, Director of Faculty Development



School of Allied Health Sciences  
East Carolina University  
Belk Building • Greenville, NC 27858-4353  
252-328-4400 office • 252-328-4470 fax  
www.ecu.edu

Dean  
328-4465

Associate Dean  
328-4415

Biostatistics  
328-4434

Clinical Laboratory Science  
328-4426

Communication Sciences  
and Disorders  
328-4404  
328-4469 fax

Community Health  
328-4434

Environmental Health  
328-4434

Health Information  
Management  
328-4426

Occupational Therapy  
328-4441

Physical Therapy  
328-4450  
328-0707 fax

Physician Assistant Studies  
328-4411  
328-2098 fax

Rehabilitation Studies  
328-4455

Speech-Language and  
Hearing Clinic  
328-4405  
328-4469 fax

## MEMORANDUM

TO: James A. Hallock, M.D.  
Vice-Chancellor for Health Sciences

FROM: Elizabeth Layman, PhD, RHIA, CCS  
Chair, Department of Health Information Management

RE: Procedure for Peer Review of Faculty

DATE: September 7, 2000

This memorandum serves to document the departmental policy on peer evaluation of faculty. The policy of the Department of Health Information Management in the School of Allied Health Sciences is to use the university-approved plan and to use an alternate form. Attached is the university-approved plan (Resolution #93-44) as prepared by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate (December 7, 1993) and Chancellor (February 8, 1994). The Vice-Chancellor approved Department's alternate form on October 11, 1995.

c: Dr. Harold P. Jones  
Dean, School of Allied Health Sciences

Attachment

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



## 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 a department shall have the opportunity to 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 with feedback.
  - B. During the professor's fourth year -- two observations 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**



October 11, 1995

Office of the  
Vice Chancellor for  
Health Sciences and  
Dean, School of Medicine  
Brody Medical  
Sciences Building

919-816-2201

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Peggy Wood, Chairman  
Department of Health Information Management

FROM: James A. Hallock, M.D. *JAH*  
Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

SUBJECT: Peer Evaluation Form

I approve the Peer Evaluation Form for your department as submitted to me by you on October 9, 1995. You may implement its usage in accordance with university peer evaluation policies as soon as feasible.

Thank you and your faculty members for their diligent efforts on behalf of teaching excellence.

JAH/sh

cc: Dr. Harold Jones

**Peer Evaluation Form**  
**Department of Health Information Management**

Faculty Member Observed \_\_\_\_\_

Title or Subject of Presentation \_\_\_\_\_

Date Observed \_\_\_\_\_ Length of Observation \_\_\_\_\_

Observer \_\_\_\_\_ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation 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  
                           **NA/UO** = not applicable/unobserved

<b>CLARITY AND ORGANIZATION</b>	✓	NA/UO
Begins on time		
States goals and objectives of presentation		
Briefly relates previous content to current presentation		
Presents material in an organized manner		
Uses instructional media appropriately		
Summarizes key points of the presentation		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	
<b>Evaluation Scale - Clarity and Organization (circle one) →</b>		
O	S	M U

<b>Presentation Style</b>		✓		NA/VO	
Is enthusiastic					
Stimulates interest in the topic					
Speaks clearly					
Presentation style facilitates note taking					
Maintains appropriate eye contact					
<b>Strengths</b>		<b>Recommendations</b>			
<b>Evaluation Scale - Presentation Style (circle one) →</b>		O	S	M	U
<b>Group Interaction</b>		✓		NA/VO	
Encourages participation					
Uses questions that encourage discussion by providing cues and encouragement					
Responds to wrong answers constructively					
Respects diverse points of view					
Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge					
<b>Strengths</b>		<b>Recommendations</b>			
<b>Evaluation Scale - Group Interaction (circle one) →</b>		O	S	M	U

Content		✓	NA/NO		
Presentation follows the outline and/or syllabus					
Defines terminology					
Uses examples relevant to course content					
Handouts or other materials reinforce key points					
<b>Strengths</b>		<b>Recommendations</b>			
<b>Evaluation Scale - Content (circle one) →</b>		<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>U</b>

OVERALL COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by Faculty 9/95