E A S T
CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY

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

East Carolina University School of Nursing
Minimum Criteria for Probationary-Term Faculty
Approved by Faculty Organization October 3, 1996

The requirement for peer evaluation of the teaching of faculty members employed by constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina was stated in Administrative Memorandum #338 from the University's Board of Governors on September 28, 1993. East Carolina University Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44, which was approved by the Chancellor on February 8, 1994, is the university's response to Administrative Memorandum #338. The resolution includes a set of procedures and a sample form for peer evaluation. In an effort to provide assistance to School of Nursing departments, the Faculty Affairs Committee has studied the peer evaluation process and makes the following recommendations. These include addressing the requirements mandated by Administrative Memorandum #338 and Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44, as well as a sample form for collecting data during peer evaluations. The minimum criteria for approval of this peer evaluation plan in the School of Nursing were drawn from these three documents and pertinent sections of the East Carolina University Faculty Manual.

Each of the following items should be addressed in departmental peer evaluation plans so that all faculty subject to the process will understand departmental policies and procedures.

1. Non-tenured, probationary-term faculty members in their first and third years of employment must have their teaching evaluated by their peers. The dates on which the first and third years begin are the dates in faculty members' contracts that specify when faculty members actually enter the tenure track.

2. The department's peer evaluation policies and procedures must be discussed with each faculty member prior to initial employment, and a record of this discussion must be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The criteria against which teaching effectiveness will be evaluated must be discussed, and copies of the approved forms that will be used for evaluations in the department should be given to the faculty member.

3. A minimum of two (2) peer evaluations must be conducted during both the first and third years of employment of each faculty member subject to peer evaluation.

4. Peer evaluators must be tenured faculty members.

5. All department chairs and tenured faculty must be trained in programs approved as mandated in Administrative Memorandum #338 and Faculty Senate Resolution #93-44.

6. Each peer evaluation will be conducted by two (2) evaluators from the department. Faculty members to be evaluated will select one evaluator, and the second evaluator will be selected jointly by the department chair and personnel committee.

7. The faculty member to be evaluated will specify the date and the time of the evaluation and the teaching environment in which the evaluation will be conducted. (The date and time may be negotiated if the faculty member to be evaluated teaches in the selected environment frequently or regularly).

8. A pre-evaluation conference attended by both evaluators and the faculty member to be evaluated must be held at least three (3) working days prior to the evaluation. The purpose of this conference is to enable the faculty member who will be evaluated to orient the evaluators to the teaching session they will observe. For example, the faculty member might give the evaluators the syllabus, handouts to be used in the session, class objectives, and discuss the educational level of the learners, or place the session in the context of the course.

9. During the pre-evaluation conference, a copy of the evaluation form the evaluators will use to record their observations is to be given to the faculty member. The form should be completed by the faculty member after the teaching session as a personal evaluation of his or her teaching during the session.

10. The evaluator selected by the faculty member must arrange and conduct a post-evaluation conference within ten (10) working days of the observed teaching session. The forms including the narrative comments completed by the evaluators and the faculty member's self-evaluation should be distributed to all three participants before this conference. The contents of these forms should be used to guide a discussion of the faculty member's teaching strengths, areas of teaching that could be improved, and potential faculty development activities.

11. Following the post-evaluation conference, a summary of the discussion will be prepared by the second evaluator and distributed to all three participants.

12. Original copies of the peer-evaluation forms, post-conference summary, and self-evaluation form should be sent to the department chair by the second evaluator within ten (10) working days of the post-evaluation conference. The department chair will place these documents in the faculty member's personnel file.

13. Reports from the peer evaluations during the first and third years of a faculty member's employment by the School of Nursing must be included in any personnel action dossier (PAD) submitted by a faculty member in an application for reappointment or in an application for tenure and promotion, or both (Administrative Memorandum #338 and the East Carolina University Faculty Manual Appendix C, p. c-5, III. 1. b. and Appendix D, p. D-12, IV. F. 2 d).

14. Departmental plans must specify who is responsible for implementing the peer-evaluation process for faculty members and who is accountable for compliance with departmental policies and procedures for peer evaluation.

Professor _____   Class _____

Time _____   # of Students _____

(Approved by Faculty Organization, October 6, 1996)

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF NURSING
PEER TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
FOR PROBATIONARY-TERM FACULTY
(Self/Peer Version)

Using the items below, record your observations. Your mark(s) on or somewhere between the distinctions "outstanding" to "not observed" should indicate what overall assessment for the category is assigned. Likert Scale ranges from 5=Outstanding to 0=Not Observed.

Category 1: Teaching Methodology

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Begins class on time						
Clearly states the purpose of the class						
Defines the relationship of this class session to the previous session						
Selects an effective methodology for teaching class content						
Presents topics with a logical sequence and flow						
Uses state-of-the-art technology as appropriate						
Paces class content appropriately to meet learning objectives						
Answers students' questions clearly and directly						
Relates today's content to future class sessions						
Presents up-to-date developments in the field						
Selects examples relevant to student/experience/course content						
Summarizes main points at the end of class						

Comments:_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Category 2: Content

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Demonstrates command of the subject

- Presents different points of view regarding subject matter
- Augments with research that addresses key points to be made
- Relates overall subject matter to nursing theory and science
- Gives relevant examples of theory and research applications

Comments:_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Presentation Category 3: Presentation

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Speaks audibly and clearly

- Communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement toward the content
- Presentation style facilitates note taking, if appropriate
- Carefully explains assignments
- Uses humor appropriately to strengthen retention and interest
- Facilitates critical thinking and decision making
- Responds constructively to student opinions/comments/questions
- Listens carefully to student comments and questions
- Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner
- Encourages students to answer difficult questions by providing cues and encouragement
- Respects diverse points of view
- Acknowledges error/insufficient knowledge

Comments:_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Category 4: Flexibility in Approaches to Teaching

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Assigns readings or relevant activities when appropriate
- Demonstrates ability to stimulate students' interests
- Uses different approaches to explain complex and difficult material
- Uses experiences to illustrate ideas

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Assigns readings or relevant activities when appropriate						
Demonstrates ability to stimulate students' interests						
Uses different approaches to explain complex and difficult material						
Uses experiences to illustrate ideas						

Comments:_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Category 5: Clinical Teaching

	Outstanding		Meets Expectations		Weak	NO
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Demonstrates clinical expertise						
Models the role of the professional nurse, consistent with the school and profession						
Clearly states course objectives						
Builds upon /expands previous course learning						
Identifies innovative clinical experience/practice sites						
Implements practice experiences that complement course theory						
Facilitates critical thinking and decision making						
When applicable, conducts pre-and/or post-conferences that complement course theory						
Holds students accountable for professional standards of nursing practice						

Comments:_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

(0 - not applicable/unable to observe)

Areas of Strength:

Areas to consider for Faculty Development Plan:

Observer _____ Date _____ Time In _____ Time Out _____

A copy of the School of Nursing peer evaluation plan has been given to me, and its provisions have been explained to me.

_____
Faculty Member Signature

_____
Department Chair Signature

_____
Date

_____
Date

1.   Original to faculty member's personnel file

2.   Copy to faculty member