Dept. of Criminal Justice

School of Social Work Procedures

Faculty Senate Instrument
Memorandum

To: James Anderson  
Chair, Department of Criminal Justice

From: Dot Clayton  
Co-Director, Center for Faculty Excellence

Date: November 27, 2006

Subject: Peer Classroom Observation

Is the Department of Criminal Justice using the School of Social Work Procedures and the Faculty Senate Instrument which it used when it was a part of the School of Social Work? If the department is using something else, please let me know.

Thank you.
Memorandum

To: Gary R. Lowe
    Dean, School of Social Work

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 School of Social Work’s peer classroom observation procedures. Your procedures indicate that your unit will use the Faculty Senate’s instrument for observation.

I look forward to receiving the results of your Teaching Effectiveness Committee’s report to the school on the implementing decisions for its peer classroom observation procedures. As you are aware, the decisions referenced in Mike Duffy’s memo (11/15/95) on behalf of the Faculty Senate Teaching Effectiveness Committee are considered implementing decisions and do not require approval by me. If, however, any of those decisions change elements of your approved procedures, then those modifications need to be approved by this office.

cc: Dorothy H. Clayton
    Coordinator, Center for Faculty Development
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Richard Ringeisen
   Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

FROM: Gary R. Lowe, Dean

DATE: October 29, 1996

RE: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures

I am responding to your memo of October 8 that was addressed to units without peer classroom observation procedures. I have enclosed a copy of a decision reached by our faculty last Spring about our peer classroom observation procedures.

In addition, we have established a Teaching Effectiveness Committee that is presently considering the comments from the memo of 11/15/95 regarding issues that have not been specified in the Faculty Senate policy. Our Teaching Effectiveness Committee will report to our faculty at the next meeting (11/6/96) for action on these various questions raised by the memo from Mike Duffy. I will forward this decision to you following that meeting.

GRL:jao
Enclosure
Memo to Dean Lowe  
From Reginald O. York, Chair, Personnel Committee  
3/27/96

Re: Procedures for peer evaluation of faculty performance.

Here are our recommendations on peer evaluation procedures.

1. The School will establish a Teaching Effectiveness Committee that will be responsible for facilitating the Peer Review Process and the Development of Teaching Effectiveness for the faculty. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee will be a standing committee of the faculty. This committee will be elected by the faculty and will elect a chair.

2. All faculty members will have their classroom teaching observed. For probationary term faculty, there will be a minimum of one classroom observation experience (as outlined in this document) prior to each re-appointment evaluation. For tenured faculty, there will be a minimum of one classroom observation experience every four years.

3. Only trained observers are to be used for peer classroom observation. Training for the Faculty Senate approved procedures and instrument will be held at the beginning of each semester. There will be a minimum of four faculty members, two tenured and two nontenured, who will be trained each semester until all faculty have been trained.

4. One of the two observers for each experience will be selected by the faculty member to be observed and the other will be selected by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee.

5. For each observation experience, at least 4 class sessions will be observed over a specified time and these class sessions will be observed by a minimum of 2 observers.

6. The faculty member to be observed chooses the course to be observed.

7. The observers will employ the instrument established by the Faculty Senate.

8. There will be a pre-observation conference between the observers and the faculty member who is to be observed. The purpose of this conference is for the faculty member to provide the observers with appropriate information so they can more effectively observe the classroom teaching in the designated class session.

9. There is to be a post-observation conference between observers and the faculty member to be observed. The purpose of this conference is to provide timely feedback from the observation to the observed faculty member. Sound professional practice indicates that the observed faculty member should receive a copy of an observer’s completed instrument at least 24 hours prior to this post-observation conference.

10. The completed observation instruments will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file and the faculty member will have the right to provide a written statement in response.

11. Materials from the peer classroom observation process will 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.
School of Social Work

Faculty Senate Instrument
Faculty Senate 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

1. Observation/Documentation
   A. Clarification of categories and items.
   B. Methods of documenting what is observed.
   C. Practice documentation.
   D. Analysis of observed/documentated 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
Faculty Senate Resolution 05-03
Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 25, 2005
Approved by the Chancellor: February 7, 2005

**PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT TO**
**INCLUDE REVIEW OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES**

Professor_________________  Class_________________

Time__________________  # of Students_________________

**EAST CAROLINA PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING INSTRUMENT**
**FOR NON TENURED AND FIXED TERM FACULTY**
(Peer Version)

Using the items below, record your observations. Your mark(s) on or somewhere between the distinctions “does well” and “needs improvement” should indicate what overall assessment for the category is assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Organization</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Does Well</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begins the instructional session in a timely fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides needed information in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly states goals or objectives for the instructional session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews prior instructional material to prepare the students for the content to be covered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizes and/or distills main points at the close of the instructional session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents topics in logical sequence and flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________

________________________________________
### Category 4: Rapport/Interaction
Establishes and follows established criteria for class interaction
Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner
Respects diverse points of view
Establishes an environment that encourages students’ participation and questions
Responds constructively to students’ questions, opinions and comments
Provides corrective feedback to wrong answers
Prompts students to answer difficult questions and solve complex problems by providing cues and encouragement
Facilitates student to student communication and interaction
Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Does Well</th>
<th>NA/UnO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

### Category 5: Active Learning (labs, PE activities, clinics, etc.) OPTIONAL
Clearly explains directions or procedures
Facilitates access to materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity in a timely manner
Explains safety procedures when warranted
Allows sufficient time for completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Does Well</th>
<th>NA/UnO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

NA/UnO - not applicable/unable to observe