



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



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

February 6, 1996

Dr. Roger Biles, Chair
History Department
Brewster A-316

Dear Roger:

On Dr. Dorothy Clayton's recommendation, I have approved the procedures and instrument for peer classroom observations submitted by the Department of History. Attached, however, is a copy of a memorandum to me in which Dr. Clayton offers several suggestions to you and your colleagues regarding implementation of the unit's procedures and instrument. She is available, of course, to discuss the memorandum with you if you wish.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

TEY/rb

Attachment

cc: Dorothy Clayton

Memorandum

To: Gene Yarbrough

From: Dot Clayton

Date: January 31, 1996

Subject: History Department's Procedures and Instrument for Peer Classroom Observation

Procedures

The History Department's procedures are essentially the same as the Faculty Senate's procedures. The one item which I would recommend adding is the number of observations per semester. I understand from speaking with Roger Biles that the intent is one per semester (two per academic year).

Instrument

The instrument proposed by the History Department is identical to that approved for the English Department (stamped received in Academic Affairs April 3, 1995 but there is no date on your letter to Palumbo). It requests a "summary report of the class observation."

I suggest some guidance to observers from the department regarding

1. Does "summary report" mean a descriptive chronology of the observation?
Or, does it mean a more selective account of part or parts of the observation?
2. If a summary report means a descriptive chronology, are there some common dimensions or elements of classroom teaching which are to be referenced in the report?
3. If it means a selective account of part or parts of the observation, is this completely at the discretion of the observer?

I think some guidance is desirable so there will be some minimum comparability from one observation to another for the same observed faculty member as well as from one faculty member to another. The form (or format) for the guidance depends upon which option the department chooses in number 1.

Some common elements would still allow room for comments on special or noteworthy activities or practices in the classroom. It could be designed so that it encourages a tailored discussion of teaching strengths for that instructor, if that is what the department wishes.

I think having some "instructions" for the observer would give him or her more confidence that he or she is providing a usable and useful report. It would make the writing of the observation report a more manageable task.

I also think some "instructions" serve to inform the observed faculty member about aspects of classroom teaching that the department considers important or fundamental.

Department of History
Peer Observation of Teaching

As required by Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44, the Department of History will conduct peer classroom observation as part of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Direct observation of classroom teaching is mandatory for all new faculty and tenure-track faculty. Each semester tenure-track faculty will be observed by two members of the History Department Tenure Committee, both of whom have completed the appropriate training. The faculty member who is to be observed will select one observer; the chair of the Tenure Committee will select the other. The faculty member who is to be observed, in consultation with the observers, will choose the classes for observation. Each observer will complete the departmental evaluation form. Within five working days of the classroom observation, the observers and the observed instructor will meet to discuss and sign the written evaluations. These forms will then be submitted to the Department Chair, who will insert them into the tenure-track faculty member's Personnel Action Dossier. The Department Chair will consider the peer evaluations, along with the results of the student opinion surveys and other relevant teaching materials, in annual review of teaching.

ECU History Department Peer Observation Report

I. Part One. To be completed by peer observer:

In compliance with the classroom observation policy adopted by the Department of History, I observed

_____, teaching _____,
(observed instructor's name) (course number and title)

_____, _____,
(course description) (course enrollment)

on _____. I did / did not participate in
(date of observation)

a pre-observation interview to discuss class objectives with the instructor. Following is a summary report of the class observation [attach additional sheets as necessary]:

Following are recommendations (if any) for improving instruction [attach additional sheets as necessary]:

_____; _____
(peer observer's signature) (date)

II. Part Two. To be completed by observed instructor:

I have read this report, but my signature does not imply either agreement or disagreement with its content. I waive my right to attach a response to this report. A response to this report is attached.

_____; _____
(observed instructor's signature) (date)