



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



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

Dr. Donald Palumbo, Chair  
English Department  
GCB 2091  
East Carolina University

Dear Don:

I am pleased to approve the instrument and procedures for peer review of teaching recently adopted by the Department of English.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Tinsley'.

Tinsley E. Yarbrough  
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

TEY/rb

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1995

College of Arts & Sciences

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Dr. Tinsley E. Yarbrough  
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

**VIA:** Dr. Keats Sparrow, Dean  
College of Arts and Sciences

*Keats 3/30/95*

**FROM:** Dr. Donald Palumbo, Chair  
English Department

*DP*

**DATE:** March 28, 1995

**SUBJ:** Peer Review of Teaching

RECEIVED

APR 03 1995

VICE CHANCELLOR  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

---

In response to your memorandum of 1 February 1995, I have attached the English Department's "Method for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness," which includes a description of procedures for initiating peer reviews of teaching, and the department's "Peer Observation Report" form. The 1 February memo authorizes units to undertake classroom observations through alternative procedures and instruments adopted by the unit and approved by your office. I would appreciate it if your office would approve the procedures and instrument for generating peer review of teaching adopted by the English department.

The procedures and instrument attached were adopted by the department last spring and are now fully implemented. However, while the attached "Method for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness" indicates that peer observation is optional, further communication with faculty has established that all faculty who anticipate going through tenure or promotion review are required to include peer observation as one element in their teaching effectiveness package.

## English Department Method for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness

The English department is committed to providing students with the best possible quality of instruction, to achieving distinction in both graduate and undergraduate education, and to continuing to strengthen its faculty's commitment to excellence in teaching. The department chair will base his or her evaluation of each faculty member's teaching performance on the following data:

- the student opinion of instruction survey and
- evidence of teaching effectiveness provided by each faculty member.

The department will negotiate the relative weight of each of these two measures with each faculty member early each fall term. The only exception to this will be for classes for which the University does not require the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey; in such cases, teaching effectiveness will be assessed solely by evidence of teaching effectiveness provided by each faculty member.

### Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

From 10% to 90% of each faculty member's teaching rating will be based on the results of the student opinion of instruction survey conducted by the University each semester. When evaluating the results of the survey, the chair will consider the unit mean as well as the performance of other instructors in similar courses. In addition, the chair may consider such factors as teaching experience, class size, the nature of the course, course level, assigned time outside the classroom, and the number of courses and preparations assigned to the faculty member that semester.

### Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness to be Provided by Each Faculty Member

From 10% to 90% of the evaluation will be based on evidence of teaching effectiveness provided by each faculty member in the form of a faculty report. This report may include, but is not limited to, the following items:

- student evaluations of the course in addition to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey
- names and numbers of courses taught
- number of students taught and advised
- service as thesis director, on thesis committees, and on MA comprehensive exam committees
- providing directed reading courses
- a list of teaching "strengths"
- description of teaching methods
- evidence of involvement in developing instructional materials
- publication of pedagogical materials, including manuals, study guides, etc.
- evidence of innovation in the classroom
- evidence of changes made in teaching methods
- evidence of changes made in the course
- development of new courses
- student interest in pursuing a research agenda with the faculty member
- examples of syllabi, schedules, handouts, exams, etc., distributed to students
- evidence of other activities that would promote effective learning

In addition, each instructor has the option of securing classroom observation reports from at least two peer observers as an additional means of demonstrating teaching effectiveness and improving teaching skills. If a faculty member chooses to participate in a peer evaluation, he or she must choose two faculty members within the department of equal or higher faculty rank and submit their names prior to the observation to the department chair. The faculty member being observed may choose to schedule a pre-observation interview with the peer observers to discuss class objectives and methods. In any case, each peer observer will make at least one scheduled visit to the evaluated faculty member's class during the academic year, prior to March 31, and will draft a formal report summarizing the class observation and submit it to the department chair by April 10. The faculty member has the option of having the observed class presentations videotaped for review by the chair. Classroom observation reports are required of all faculty who anticipate going through tenure or promotion review at any time in the future.

## ECU English Department Peer Observation Report

### •Part I--to be completed by peer observer:

In compliance with the classroom observation option included in the English Department Method for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness, as approved by the English department on 24 February 1993, I observed

\_\_\_\_\_, a(n) \_\_\_\_\_, teaching  
(observed instructor's name) (observed instructor's rank)

an ENGL \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, class  
(course number and title)

on \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_. I ( ) did/( ) did not participate in a  
(date of observation)  
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) (peer observer's rank) (date)

### •Part II--to be completed by observed instructor:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(observed instructor's signature) (date)