



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 7, 1995

Dr. Richard Caston, Chair
Department of Sociology
East Carolina University

Dear Dr. Caston:

I am pleased to approve the procedures and instrument for peer evaluation of teaching developed for use in the Department of Sociology. Please share this letter with the chair of the unit personnel committee.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs

pwp:3

RECEIVED
FEB 03 1995
College of Arts & Sciences

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tinsley E. Yarbrough
Interim Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

VIA: Keats Sparrow, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

FROM: Richard Caston, ^{RC} Chair
Department of Sociology

DATE: February 2, 1995

SUBJECT: Peer Review of Teaching

RECEIVED
FEB 06 1995
VICE CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Keats Sparrow
2/3/95

By a unanimous vote, the Department of Sociology has approved the attached procedures and instrument for peer evaluation of teaching. We now seek your approval of these procedures and instrument. Thank you.

(NOTE: APPROVED BY THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE AS POLICY AT
ITS OCTOBER 26, 1994 MEETING)

Departmental Peer Review of Teaching Policies

A. General Policy

The Faculty Work Plan shall include, in addition to what is stated in the departmental code, a section on teaching. The chair and the faculty member will identify teaching effectiveness goals and evaluation measures which may be needed such as in-class peer review, portfolio review, class videotaping, and self-assessment. The conclusions reached will be written and signed by the faculty member and the chair.

B. Policy for Tenure Track Appointees

Peer teaching evaluations (in-class observation) will be used in departmental personnel decisions involving reappointment, tenure and promotion. Tenure-track faculty will be peer reviewed during their first and second years of employment and will also have two peer reviews conducted within two years prior to the time that a tenure/promotion decision is to be rendered. Any faculty member seeking promotion must have had two peer reviews conducted within two years prior to the time that a promotion decision is to be rendered. Fixed term faculty should have one peer review per year in order to be considered for an additional term appointment.

The peer review will use the approved departmental form. Additional peer reviews or other teaching evaluations may be requested by either the faculty member or the chair of the department as part of the annual Faculty Work Plan.

The selection of the peer reviewer will be agreed upon by the faculty member and the chair of the department. At its completion, the chair, the reviewer and the faculty member will meet to discuss the contents of the review and to sign a statement indicating that the review has been read and discussed by all three parties. Within seven days of that meeting, the faculty member may forward to the chair a written statement raising concerns over the review or the review process. The chair and the reviewer likewise may comment in writing on the quality of the review or the review process. The review and the related comments, if any, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and Personnel Action Dossier for use in personnel decisions. Any comments added to the file and dossier will be made available to the other two parties for inclusion of response.

(NOTE: THIS MEMORANDUM WAS APPROVED BY THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE AS POLICY AT THE NOVEMBER 9, 1994 MEETING)

M E M O R A N D U M

TO:

FROM Richard Caston, Chair
Sociology

DATE:

SUBJECT: Peer Review of Teaching for XYZ

Thank you for agreeing to write a peer review of teaching for XYZ. I shall expect this review from you by (date). Your review must include your judgement of the quality of XYZ's work with respect to each of the following five points:

1. Course syllabi for all courses taught this semester.
2. The tests, quizzes, assigned readings, and the specifications for course papers and for other graded assignments for all courses taught this semester. (Since your review is midway through the semester, not all of these may be available.)
3. Any lecture notes, handouts or other teaching materials or written statements the instructor chooses to share with you. Note: student teaching evaluations or student testimonials would not normally be part of your review.
4. The classroom performance of the instructor. The reviewer must attend at least one class session of no more than two courses taught this semester, and your attendance must be pre-arranged with the instructor. If multiple sections of the same course are taught, ordinarily only one section will be evaluated. The reviewer is to observe and comment on the following items "a" through "f" as you deem appropriate. These items are drawn from the department evaluation worksheet to be used in the preparation of this in-class review. You should use your judgement in selecting among these items and suggested foci to create a fair and thorough classroom assessment.
 - a. Organization of class sessions
 - b. Class content
 - c. Teaching technique
 - d. Student responses
 - e. Instructor's speech mannerisms
 - f. Instructor's body mannerisms

5. Overall Assessment - You are required to answer these two questions and they should conclude your report.
 - a. What are the instructor's principal strengths?
 - b. What areas for teaching improvement do you see for the instructor and what recommendations would you make for accomplishing these improvements?

Here are some additional guidelines for your review:

1. The written review is due by (date).
2. I expect the review itself to be thorough, competent, and professional.
3. I would prefer that your written review will be no more than two pages in length.
4. The instructor is to assemble and deliver to you for your review the materials described in points 1 through 3 above. You are to return these materials after your review.
5. You, the instructor, and I will meet to discuss your written review after it is completed. We will all sign a statement indicating that we have read and discussed this review. Therefore at the end of your review, please add this sentence: "We have read and discussed this review." Then include three lines for our signatures.
6. The review will be placed in the instructor's personnel file (PF) and "personnel action dossier" (PAD) to be used in future personnel decisions. Within seven days of our meeting (described in point 5 above), the instructor may deliver to me written comments challenging or raising concerns over the review or the review process, and these comments will be included in the PF and PAD. The Chair and the reviewer likewise may comment in writing on the quality of the review or the review process and these comments will also be included in the PF and PAD. Any comments added to the file and dossier will be made available to the other two parties for inclusion of response.
7. Should you or the instructor have any questions about these procedures, please see me.

cc: Instructor XYZ

Evaluation Worksheet

PEER REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

course Name and Number _____ Day/Time _____

Instructor _____ Submitted By _____

Place a number in the left-hand column using the following scale: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = average, 2 = poor, 1 = unacceptable, NA = not applicable to the class observed. Please augment your numerical rankings with comments to explain any ratings that may require justification or clarification.

Section I. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLASS

- Class goals were stated clearly in the introductory period
- The class presentation had a coherent structure
- The class was efficiently and clearly organized
- Transitions from section to section were achieved smoothly and with proper distinction
- The terminology was chosen properly and used correctly
- The stated goals were achieved in the class period

Comments:

SECTION II. CLASS CONTENT

- The overall content of the class was suitable for the level and scope of the course
- The instructor related concepts to theories and methods in the discipline where appropriate
- Concrete examples of concepts and theories were used where appropriate
- The class presentation covered the stated topic/objectives adequately
- The content presented was current, significant, and relevant to the stated class goals

Comments:

SECTION III. TEACHING TECHNIQUE

What technique was employed by the instructor? _____

- The instructor's technique was appropriate to the topic and content covered in the class
- The instructor reviewed the required text readings adequately during the class
- The instructor incorporated relevant and timely supplementary materials in the class presentation
- The instructor used activities or questions/examples to stimulate student responses to the topic or to involve students in considering issues relevant to the topic

Comments:

SECTION IV. STUDENT RESPONSES

- Students paid attention to the instructor
- Students took notes on the materials
- Students participated in the class by asking questions or making comments on the materials/points raised
- Students appeared to have no difficulty in grasping the materials presented by the instructor

Comments:

SECTION V. INSTRUCTOR'S SPEECH MANNERISMS

- The instructor's pronunciation was distinct and correct
- The instructor's speech was audible and understandable to the entire class
- The instructor's grammar was correct
- The presentation was accomplished in a pleasing and interesting tone
- The speaker did not use distracting idioms or vocalizations

Comments:

SECTION VI. INSTRUCTOR'S BODY MANNERISMS

- The instructor seemed at ease with the class
- The instructor used body movements for emphasis adequately
- The instructor had no distracting body mannerisms

Comments:

SECTION VII. SUMMARY EVALUATION

Please summarize your observations.

1. Teaching Strengths:

2. Teaching Weaknesses:

3. Overall Rating (use scale of 1 to 5 and justify):

4. Recommendations for Improvement in Teaching