

UNC Intercampus Dialogue
on
Peer Review of Teaching
Results & Recommendations

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are expressed to:

- Dr. Judith Pulley and the UNC General Administration for a grant to the Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching for support of the Intercampus Dialogue on Peer Review of Teaching
- The small group discussion leaders during the Intercampus Dialogue, who also served as the review/editing committee for this document:

Nancy Barrineau (UNCP)
Dick Bernhard (NCSU)
Beth Bowser (WCU)
Dot Clayton (ECU)
Judith Hunt (ECU)
Bonnie Kelley (UNCP)
Ben Ward (WCU)

- Dr. Ed Neal, Director, Teaching and Learning Center, UNC Chapel Hill, for sharing materials he has developed and used and for serving on the review/editing committee for this document.
- Dr. Judith Stillion, UNC GA, for her insights and suggestions in compiling this document.

This document was endorsed by the UNC Faculty Assembly at its meeting on April 18, 1997.

May 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
I. Acknowledgments	1
II. Background	3
III. Definitions	4
IV. National Climate	5
V. Recommendations	6
VI. Bibliography	11
VII. Electronic Resources	15
VIII. Appendices	16
A. Executive Memorandum 338	17
B. Issues Identified During Intercampus Dialogue	20
C. Key Points from Literature	24
D. Basic Recommendations -Additional Notes	26
E. Peer Observation Form	29
F. Characteristics of Effective Observers	30
G. Constructive Criticism Guidelines	31
H. Formative Observations: Questions for Reflection	32
I. Model for Formative Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching - Maryellen Weimer	33
J. Model: School of Public Health UNC-CH	34
K. Workshop Model: Training for Classroom Observation -ECU	39

UNC INTERCAMPUS DIALOGUE ON PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

II. Background

In 1993, the UNC General Administration issued Memorandum 338 (see Appendix A), which directed all constituent institutions to design and implement procedures for peer review of teaching. In 1996, the Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching received a grant from UNC GA to design and sponsor an Intercampus Dialogue on Peer Review of Teaching. Fifty-six (56) faculty from UNC universities, including eight (8) Faculty Assembly delegates, assembled to exchange information on the current status of their efforts in this regard.

During this dialogue the following points became evident:

- progress in developing procedures for peer review of teaching varies greatly among campuses and also within colleges and departments in the same university.
- plans and procedures often are developed in isolation.
- efforts are often tailored to local needs and politics with little grounding in professional literature.
- as a system, we still are in a trial-and-error period of experimentation.
- valid and reliable assessment is difficult to achieve.
- a basic manual for developing sound procedures for peer review of teaching is needed.
- dialogue about peer review successes/failures needs to continue.
- the professional literature on this topic is growing rapidly.

Evaluation of faculty performance generally includes three areas: teaching, research, and service. While each is important in its own right, the weight of each area varies according to the institution and its mission. However, there is general agreement that the quality of teaching is perhaps the most difficult component to evaluate. Yet it is a crucial element in the current paradigm shift that moves the focus away from the information the teacher offers to consideration of what is best for student learning and development.

The purposes of this document are:

- to summarize the intercampus dialogue (see Appendix B)
- to present fundamental recommendations for developing sound procedures for peer review of teaching.
- to share a basic bibliography of resources.

III. DEFINITIONS

NOTE: Frequently, the words “peer “ and “colleague” are used interchangeably. However, the distinctions between the two may be important when developing policies and procedures within the climate and culture of your local setting. If you find the distinction helpful, consider the implications of these terms as you read through this document and develop policies and procedures for your campus and/or department. Because Administrative Memorandum 338 used the phrase “Peer Review,” this is the term used throughout this document, but we use it to mean either peer or colleague review.

Peer a co-worker with equal status.

Colleague a co-worker who may be of another rank.

Assessment of teaching is the process that may take place through any or all of the following means: colleagues or peers, a department chair/dean, self- reporting, faculty development specialists, or students. It may be formative, summative or a combination of both.

Formative Evaluation concentrates on improving teaching performance/effectiveness.

Summative Evaluation uses information to determine personnel matters, including hiring, promotion, tenure, dismissal. Awareness of campus politics and relationships is critical when interpreting information gathered for this purpose.

Peer Review is assessment, by colleagues or peers, of all teaching related activities. Components may include preparation and presentation of course subject matter (including syllabi, course content, and assignments); student evaluations; interactions with students; documentation of teaching philosophy, expectations, style, and reflections (teacher self-evaluation); peer observation of classroom teaching; and other activities which may be appropriate to a discipline.

IV. NATIONAL CLIMATE

The climate in higher education today is substantially different than that of the past. Demands for increased accountability come from many sources, including private and public sectors, regional accrediting agencies, and state governing boards. At the same time, numerous voices from within higher education are calling for more attention to teaching. Not only are new insights into the teaching/learning environment challenging the comfortable boundaries long enjoyed by teachers and students, but explosions in information and technology also are forcing us to deal with new issues and reassess our role(s). Perhaps of greater impact is the reality that the activities of teaching and learning, once considered the private domain of faculty members and their institutions, now are claimed as public territory.

There is no doubt that the classroom door has been forced open by society's expectations, needs and desires, as well as by the growth of technology. As a result, whether the topic is faculty load, outcomes assessment, post-tenure review, or peer review of teaching, it seems as if everyone has an opinion about what "needs to be done."

However, the voices that frequently are absent in these discussions are those of the teachers. There is a tendency to perceive the lack of agreement as permission to continue "business as usual." On the other hand, there is the growing realization that involvement in the discussions is one way to show what we do. The climate in higher education is such today that if we (the teachers) do not claim these issues as our own territory, others will continue to claim them as theirs, often to the detriment of our roles and missions.

Higher education issues and climate in the State of North Carolina mirror those of the national scene. For this reason, the Intercampus Dialogue on Peer Review of Teaching was held to engage faculty members from across the UNC system in a conversation designed to give voice to their thoughts and concerns on this current and important issue.

V. BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS - PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

This document is written for use by both faculty and administrators. During the Intercampus Dialogue it became evident that ongoing dialogue between and intentional involvement of these two groups on each campus are essential in developing and implementing effective peer review policies and procedures.

The following recommendations came out of the Intercampus Dialogue and attempt to identify the best practices in peer review policies and procedures. A limited number of additional suggestions and/or models will be found in Appendices E-J.

Since campuses, and even departments within the same University, are at different places in developing peer review policies and procedures, the suggestions are categorized into three sections:

- **First Steps** - for faculty and administrators just beginning to consider what needs to be done.
- **Implementation** - for faculty and administrators who want ideas about what to include and how to proceed.
- **Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching** - for specific considerations for summative evaluations.

In addition, a section on **Legal Issues and Recommendations** is included because of issues and concerns that may arise, especially in summative matters.

Instructional techniques and policies must be in accord with the purpose of the institution and appropriate to the specific goals of an individual course. Instruction must be evaluated regularly and the results used to ensure quality instruction.

"Criteria for Accreditation: Commission on Colleges." Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. 1996, page 30.

BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS - PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

I. First Steps - Getting Started

- A. Be familiar with the requirements and spirit of Memorandum 338 (See Appendix A).
- B. Identify and define terms (language) which need a common basis of understanding (peer review, excellence in teaching, etc.).
- C. Become familiar with the existing peer review policies and procedures of your campus, college, department, and/or unit.
- D. Initiate discussion with faculty and administrators about criteria and standards to be used in evaluating teaching activities.
- E. Know who needs to approve any policies/procedures and the timeline for such approval.
- F. Determine the institutional culture and environment of your campus and the department within which teaching will be reviewed. For example, is instructional diversity recognized, valued and encouraged? How are faculty attempts to achieve excellence in teaching recognized and rewarded?
- G. Determine which peer review policies/procedures will be uniform across campus and when allowances will be made for college, department or unit.
- H. Determine whether peer review will be interdisciplinary or intradisciplinary.
- I. Define the purpose of peer review of teaching. Will it be formative, or summative, or a combination of both? Make clear the ways in which formative points will be joined with summative information.
- J. Identify who will be involved and with whom the results will be shared.
- K. Use the expertise and services of your Teaching Center or instructional development unit to assist with the design of the peer review of teaching.
- L. Make available and encourage faculty members to consider a variety of teaching improvement activities, such as reading, videotaping/microteaching, dialogue, seminars/workshops, discussion groups, private conversations, mentoring, true team teaching, small group instructional diagnosis (SGID), interdisciplinary teaching, instructional observation of teaching, instructional grants, etc.

BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS - PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

II. Implementation - Beyond First Steps

- A. Invite faculty to participate in the process of determining and implementing peer review policies and procedures, including those related to time commitments and rewards.
- B. Determine how best to communicate with all persons involved in the peer review process.
- C. Identify which teaching activities will be evaluated: syllabi, exams, reading assignments, interaction with students, course objectives, etc.
- D. Include a variety of methods to gather data: portfolio, self-reporting, classroom observation, student evaluations, peer/colleague narratives, etc.
- E. Determine when data will be gathered.
- F. Design, test, and revise evaluation instruments.
- G. Design and implement training for all persons involved in classroom observation/peer reviews. (See Appendix K for one workshop model to train classroom observers.)
 - Determine training coordinators/leaders
 - Identify and recruit persons to serve as classroom observers and/or peer reviewers.
 - Determine training content - "What needs to be covered?"
 - Set date, location, time. Reserve room space and needed equipment.
 - Prepare material(s) to be used in training.
 - Make arrangements for any follow-up training or meetings.
- H. Have a "no fault" implementation period (i.e., the opportunity to modify plans and procedures).

BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS - PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

III. Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching

Clarity of intent and procedures in the peer observation of classroom teaching are critical for both formative and summative purposes. However, it is generally agreed that most formative observations will **not** require all of the procedures necessary for the purposes of a summative observation. The “best practices” shared here focus on peer observation for administrative (summative) purposes. See Appendices H, I and J for examples/models of formative peer observation of classroom teaching.

The literature on peer evaluation indicates it is very important that peer observations for administrative purposes (promotion, tenure, etc.) be conducted the same way in every case. The following recommendations are suggested as ways to insure the validity and reliability of classroom observations. These were gleaned from the literature by Ed Neal, Director of Faculty Development, UNC Chapel Hill.

- A. There should be more than one observer to provide more than one perspective on the observed performance.
- B. Both observers should attend the same class session(s) so they can compare their impressions of the same teaching behaviors.
- C. The observers should be trained. Untrained observers are subject to many kinds of biases, and although subjectivity can never be removed from the system, training can help reduce bias. Training also is necessary to insure that the observers fully understand the purpose and procedures of the observation system.
- D. The observers should use a standardized observation/report form so that they focus their observations on the same dimensions of teaching.
- E. At least two class sessions should be observed in order to provide an adequate sample for review.
- F. A pre-observation conference between the observers and the instructor is required so the instructor can provide the appropriate context for the observation.
- G. A post-observation conference is required, as soon as possible after the observation occurs, to provide feedback to the instructor and to insure that the outcomes of the evaluation are open and above-board.
- H. The observation report must be jointly written by the two observers to insure that the product is one of consensus.
- I. All procedures for the evaluation process must be carefully followed by the participants. Any deviation from the specified procedures will jeopardize the validity, reliability, and fairness of the assessment.

Additional notes on team composition, classroom visits, pre-observation conference, observations, and the post-observation conference and report will be found in the Appendices.

BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS - PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

IV. Legal Issues and Recommendations

The most troublesome areas in faculty review involve confidentiality of peer reviews, contract rights, constitutional rights, and discrimination. Whatever policies and procedures are adopted, it is important, at a minimum, to have them reviewed by the legal counsel for your campus. The goal is to prevent problems before they arise. The following general suggestions are adapted from *Reflective Faculty Evaluation* (Centra 1993):

- A. Conduct periodic “legal audits” of all offices. What policies and procedures have been developed and are being used for faculty evaluations? Do they conform to present state and federal laws?
- B. Conduct periodic performance reviews of all faculty, to let them know how they are doing.
- C. Be clear about criteria and standards used in evaluations.
- D. Involve faculty in designing evaluation systems and in conducting assessment reviews.
- E. Have in place clear policies for promotion, tenure, hearings and dismissal.
- F. Comply with policies/procedures printed in the faculty contract and/or handbook.
- G. Provide feedback in a timely and accurate manner.
- H. Base personnel decisions on job related and nondiscriminatory evidence.
- I. Document decisions with specific examples of the faculty’s performance.
- J. Allow faculty response to individual evaluation reports or to clarify information.
- K. Inform faculty of process for review of internal decisions.
- L. Include in contracts any standards that reflect unique characteristics/conditions that may occur in disciplines.
- M. Allow for different teaching styles that may be effective.

VI. SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association for Higher Education. *From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1995.

American Association for Higher Education. *Making Teaching Community Property*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1993.

Annis, Linda. "Partners in Teaching Improvement." *Journal of Staff, Program and Organizational Development*. vol. 7, no. 1, Spring 1989, 7-11.

Summary of a project at Ball State University that used pairs of faculty colleagues who observed each other's classes regularly and met weekly to devise strategies for teaching improvement. The project's two primary goals were to improve the teaching effectiveness of faculty partners and to empirically assess the effectiveness of the partners approach. A related goal was to develop a model program that would be applicable to other institutions of higher education.

Arreola, Raoul A. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Handbook for College Faculty and Administrators on Designing and Operating a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton: Anker Publishing Co., Inc., 1995.

The purpose of this book is to "provide a practical, proven model for developing and using a comprehensive faculty evaluation system." The author claims that "Following the steps in this handbook will result in developing a customized faculty evaluation system which responds to the specific needs, concerns, and characteristics of the faculty and administration of an individual academic unit."

Braskamp, Larry A., and Ory, John C. *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

This book is written for faculty, administrators, and faculty development professionals who consult with faculty on evaluation. Part one (chaps. 1-2) describes the role of faculty assessment in higher education. Part two (chaps. 3-4) defines the work of the faculty and explores faculty expectations in the light of recent discussions about the scholarly nature of faculty work. Part three (chaps. 5-7) discusses collecting and organizing evidence to be used in evaluation decisions. Part four (chaps. 8-10) examines ways in which faculty and their administrative colleagues can use evidence as a part of faculty assessment for faculty development and for institutional decision making. Part five (chaps. 11-17) describes a number of different methods and techniques that can be used to collect evidence about faculty work, including rating scales, observations, interviews, videotaping, etc.

Braskamp, Larry; Brandenburg, Dale; Ory, John, eds. *Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness; A Practical Guide*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1984.

A practical guide designed to assist faculty and administrators in critiquing, designing, and implementing teaching evaluation procedures. It is written from the point of view that the evaluation of teaching should be assessed from a variety of perspectives; in other words, no single piece of evidence collected from one source is sufficient to judge the competence of a teacher. Also, the purpose of the evaluation needs to be taken into account when and even before evaluating. Includes guidelines on how to use as a guidebook.

Brinko, Kathleen. "Instructional Consultation with Feedback in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education*, Jan.-Feb. 1990; 65-83.

A study of the process and the efficacy of instructional consultation with feedback through systematic examination of the verbal interactions between instructional consultants and their faculty clients.

Centra, J. A. *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

This book expands Centra's earlier work *Determining Faculty Effectiveness* (Jossey-Bass, 1979) and underscores the importance of active methods of teaching and the need for less traditional means of evaluating them. Faculty, faculty development specialists and administrators all share responsibility for and must be involved in the process of evaluating and improving teaching. Guidelines and new research insights, as well as time-tested principles, are included.

Centra, J. A. "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction." *Journal of Higher Education*, May-June 1975; 327-337.

A discussion of a study whose evidence indicates that colleague ratings of teaching effectiveness based primarily on classroom observation would in most instances not be reliable enough to use in making decisions on tenure and promotion. However, there are several aspects of teaching that colleagues would seem to be able to judge.

Centra, John; Froh, Robert; Gray, Peter; Lambert, Leo; Diamond, Robert, ed. *A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*. Acton: Copley Publishing Group, 1987.

The book's primary purpose is to help improve the process of evaluating teaching for use in tenure and promotion decisions. It identifies three basic steps for a logical and comprehensive evaluation process. Includes ideas on what should be evaluated, data collection techniques, and sample questionnaires and observation worksheets.

Cohen, Peter and McKeachie, Wilbert. "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching." *Improving College and University Teaching*, Fall 1980; 28, 147-154.

Explores the roles colleagues may play in the teaching evaluation process. The paper is divided into three major sections: 1) criteria of teaching effectiveness most appropriate for colleague evaluation, 2) potential colleague roles in a summative evaluation of teaching, and 3) suggestions for using faculty colleagues to assess and develop teaching.

Davis, Barbara Gross. *Sourcebook for Evaluating Teaching*. Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley, Office of Educational Development, 1988.

This sourcebook offers a variety of strategies for describing and assessing a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The emphasis is on ladder-rank faculty. The sourcebook is organized by sources of information (e.g., colleagues, students) in conjunction with specific types of evaluation methods (e.g., observation, rating forms). Sample survey forms and questionnaires are included.

Eble, Kenneth. "Can Faculty Objectively Evaluate Teaching." *New Directions for Teaching & Learning: Practices that Improve Teaching Evaluation*. French-Lazovik, G., ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, No. 11, September 1982.

Eble exposes weaknesses in current evaluation practices and shows how subjective judgments often undermine supposedly objective procedures. He also suggests a remedy for this problem.

Elbow, Peter. *Embracing Contraries*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1986.

A collection of essays about learning and teaching. Includes a section on a collaborative peer evaluation program at The Evergreen State College (pp. 177-214).

Hoyt, Donald. "Using Colleague Ratings to Evaluate the Faculty Member's Contribution to Instruction." *New Directions for Teaching & Learning: Practices that Improve Teaching Evaluation*. French-Lazovik, G., ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, No. 11, September 1982.

Focuses exclusively on the faculty member's role as "instructor" in the consideration of colleague ratings as a source of evaluative data. Hoyt looks at the rationale for considering colleague ratings, obstacles that impede their use, and the principles by which they can make a constructive contribution to the evaluation of instructional effectiveness.

Innovative Higher Education, Vol. 20, No. 4, Summer 1996. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Kaplan, W.A. *The Law of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Kaplan, W.A., and Lee, B.A. *The Law and Higher Education, 1985-1990 Update*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Attorneys., 1990.

Presents legal issues in higher education and the implications for policies and procedures.

Keig, Larry and Waggoner, Michael D. *Collaborative Peer Review: The Role of Faculty in Improving College Teaching*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, No. 2, 1994.

Millman, Jason, ed. *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

A guidebook that focuses on the currently available approaches for evaluating teachers and details the strengths and shortcomings of each. The goal of the book is to put the reader in a position to know the special advantages and distinctive liabilities of all commonly used teacher evaluation strategies.

Noble, A. Candace. "Assessment of Course-Related Materials: A Method for Determining Colleague Teaching Effectiveness." Paper presented at a meeting of AERA in New Orleans, LA, April 1984.

Descriptions and conclusions of a study that explored a course materials assessment method of evaluating teacher effectiveness. The researcher specifically wanted to determine what elements of a faculty member's course materials weigh most with colleagues in making decisions regarding the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

Seldin, Peter and Associates. *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Thirteen educators offer suggestions for creating institutional policies and procedures that promote effective teaching and give it high priority on college/university campuses. The guidelines are field-tested, practical, and specific and cover such topics as peer reviews, teaching portfolios, classroom research, teacher training, faculty reward and incentive systems, effective workshops/retreats, and public forums on teaching.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching Evaluation and Improvement and The Center for Teaching. "Teaching Portfolio." The University of Massachusetts, Amherst. December 1993.

Looks at the uses of teaching portfolios in teacher improvement, administrative decisions, and teacher evaluation. Includes explanation of what a teaching portfolio is, why it is useful, and what it includes.

Way, David, Director of Instructional Support, Cornell University. "Teaching Evaluation Handbook." 1993.

This handbook has three purposes: 1) assist faculty members seeking tenure to document and improve their teaching, 2) aid tenure committees in evaluating a tenure candidate's teaching, and 3) help department heads and deans to ensure that the process of evaluating teaching for tenure and promotion is conducted with the same degree of fairness and thoroughness as the evaluation of a tenure candidate's research work.

Weimer, Maryellen. *Improving College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Written for faculty, faculty development professionals, and other administrators at all levels, this book presents strategies for creating an environment that promotes teaching improvement. Case studies and practical charts show how colleges/universities can implement improvement programs, regardless of institutional size or situation.

VII. INTERNET ADDRESSES FOR ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

- AAHE. Peer Review of Teaching: **Summary of First Two Years**. From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching.
<http://www.aahepeer.iupui.edu/SUMMARY.html>
- AAHE. Peer Review of Teaching: From Idea to Prototype: **Lessons From a Current AAHE Teaching Initiative Project**.
<http://www.aahepeer.iupui.edu/BULLETIN.html>
- England, James, Pat Hutchings, and Wilbert J. McKeachie. **ACLS Occasional Paper No. 33. The Professional Evaluation of Teaching**. American Council of Learned Societies. <http://www.aahepeer.iupui.edu/>
- Hutchings, Pat, ed. Peer Review of Teaching: **WORKBOOK Table of Contents**. FROM IDEA TO PROTOTYPE: THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING, A PROJECT WORKBOOK. AAHE.
<http://www.aahepeer.iupui.edu/WORKBOOK.html>

VIII. APPENDICES

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT Tenure and Teaching in the
University of North Carolina

NUMBER 338
DATE September 28, 1993

I. Introduction

At the November 1992 meeting of the Board of Governors, questions were raised about the procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure and about the evaluation, recognition, and reward of teaching, particularly in tenure decisions. The Chairman of the Board referred the questions and concerns to two standing committees, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs. The report entitled *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina*, adopted by the board on September 10, 1993, distilled what was learned by the committees and recommended additional steps to encourage good teaching within the University and to see that the quality of teaching continues to be a prime consideration in tenure decisions.

In its report, the board reaffirmed the concept of tenure. The central question that led to the review was whether sufficient consideration is given to the quality of teaching when tenure decisions are made. The board recognized that the relative importance given to the three major functions of teaching, research, and public service varies at specific institutions depending upon their respective missions. Nevertheless, the report confirms that, regardless of classification, "each institution should view teaching as a core requirement. The board states in its long-range plan that teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions. Thus while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions."

II. Recommendations

This memorandum lists the recommendations adopted by the Board of Governors and provides instructions to be followed by the constituent institutions in complying with them.

1. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the Chancellors of each institution to do the following:*
 - a. *Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University.*
 - b. *Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance*

at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;

- c. *Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.*

Any proposed revisions to institutional mission statements necessitated by the review referenced in Recommendation 1.a. should be submitted to the President by January 21, 1994 so that they can be acted upon prior to adoption of the revised long-range plan. A full report on actions taken in response to Recommendation 1 with respect to criteria for faculty personnel decisions and policies and procedures for evaluation of faculty teaching performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels should be sent to this office by April 4, 1994. Proposed changes to tenure policies and regulations, which require the approval of the President and the board, should be separately identified in the report.

2. *That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.*
3. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the college/school level.*

Institutions that do not now have awards for outstanding teaching should submit a report on the actions taken in response to Recommendation 3 by April 4, 1994.

4. *That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)*

Chairman Poole has appointed an ad hoc committee to work out the details to implement the awards. Institutions are invited to submit recommendations or suggestions by December 1, 1993 for the consideration of this committee.

5. *That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.*

The report recognized the special efforts of many institutions to emphasize professional development activities intended to have a direct and positive impact on

teaching. But it also acknowledged that greater efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of campuses, especially those with limited resources available for such initiatives. Despite financial strains, it declared that “each institution should allocate a portion of its budget for faculty development and target a specific part of that for the development of teachers and teaching.” It is the board’s clear expectation that an institution which does not have a special center for teaching and learning should plan to create such a center as soon as possible. The report also urged institutions to provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and non-tenured faculty and graduate assistants to take advantage of these professional development opportunities. In addition, Recommendation 5 commits the board to seek appropriations in biennial budget requests to give greater support to centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence.

6. *That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.*

A committee from the University-wide Graduate Council is addressing this recommendation and should report to General Administration by February 1, 1994. Thereafter, the Council’s proposals will be shared with constituent institutions for their reactions and comments.

Copies of the report on *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina* are being printed and will be provided to constituent institutions. Chancellors should ensure that the report is disseminated as widely as possible among the faculty, especially among department chairs and members of department personnel committees.

C.D. Spangler, Jr.

cc: Chief Academic Officer

Summary of deadlines (please submit three copies of each response):

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| December 1, 1993 | Recommendations or suggestions to Board of Governors <u>ad hoc</u> committee on Awards for Excellence in Teaching (Recommendation 4). |
| January 21, 1994 | Proposed revisions to institutional mission statements (Recommendation 1.a.). |
| April 4, 1994 | Report on actions taken (or proposed, where the President’s and the board’s approval is required) in response to Recommendations 1 and 3. |

ISSUES

This section identifies and briefly explores basic issues which need to be considered when instituting and conducting peer review of teaching, whether it is used for formative or summative purposes. The identification of these issues or concerns comes primarily from the dialogue at the September 1996 Carolina Colloquy Conference, "Intercampus Dialogue on Peer Review of Teaching." During this conference it became obvious that the North Carolina State Universities, and even departments within these universities, are at different points in developing and implementing peer review of teaching. One explanation for this can be found in the context or environment within which peer review occurs on a given campus. It is the context or environment that affects the shape and form of an issue as well as its frequency and the approaches to handling it. Important elements of the context or environment include:

1. Requirements established by UNC General Administration.
2. Institutional and/or unit culture or environment
3. Institutional and/or unit procedures or requirements concerning personnel decisions.
4. The nature and the allocation of the available resources.

In spite of the diversity represented at the conference, there was agreement upon five common issues or concerns:

1. How Is Peer Review of Teaching Defined?

Is the review for summative or formative purposes?
 What is being reviewed?
 Who is a peer?

Knowing the purpose of the review is important in answering the other two questions. While the process for formative and summative evaluations may be similar, the outcomes are quite different. (See the section on Purpose of the Peer Review of Teaching for further comments.) Another consideration is whether or not the review is voluntarily sought by the faculty or is imposed from another source. The usual assumption is that formative peer reviews are voluntarily sought, while summative ones are not; however, this may not always be true. Therefore, clarity of purpose becomes one crucial factor in the review process.

When determining what is being reviewed, consider the primary focus. Will it be upon the substantive content of the course and/or the mode and skill of presentation? The "object" which is being reviewed can vary, and the type of peer review used may vary with that "object." For example, is overall classroom instruction (using classroom in its broadest meaning) being reviewed or is the focus on an element of instruction (e.g., the use of a particular technique such as group discussion or an active learning project)? Will the review be concerned with the organization and substantive content of a course? Or will the review focus on the manner in which the teaching occurs? While there are important variations within liberal arts and professional school settings, these differences are much more pronounced at the university-wide level. This is an important concern for those who are trying to establish common minimum requirements for evaluative purposes (a uniform, campus-wide process) or to provide, within limited budgets, resources to enhance teaching.

Problems arise when very narrow definitions of peer review of teaching are used that equate it with only one approach or method, such as classroom observation or review of the course syllabus. In a summative setting this is often related to the comfort level of those conducting the evaluation with how to assess the method being used. Indeed, an important issue is how to encourage the use of multiple indicators with multiple (repeated) measurements when lack of time, familiarity with different approaches, and discomfort with evaluating the teaching of other faculty members create pressures to “stay with one familiar approach.” Problems also are created when a narrow definition of teaching style is used (e.g., just lecture presentation with class discussion) as the basis for choosing the kinds of peer review which will be available for use or prescribed for use in certain situations. The same happens when the “location” of the teaching is too narrowly defined (e.g., automatically assuming that what is appropriate for a traditional classroom can, “with a few changes,” fit fieldwork or clinical settings).

Another variant of this issue is establishing “criteria” used to measure “good” teaching. While it may be possible to create, at a general or abstract level, broad support or consensus for a particular list of elements, disagreements often are produced when applying the criteria. Again, the major concern is with prescribing one way to teach under the guise of articulating criteria for “good” teaching. This can occur regardless of whether the peer review is being used for summative or formative purposes.

The question “who is a peer?” is not a trivial one. For example, a chair who may be considered a peer for some purposes (e.g., mentoring) is not a peer for purposes of direct peer classroom observation as required by Memorandum 338. Nor is the definition of a peer solely related to the function of peer review for formative or summative use, although it is more likely to be a consideration for summative purposes. Some departments or units may consider only a departmental or unit colleague, at the same rank, as a teaching peer, while others extend such a definition across disciplinary boundaries and ranks. A perspective which limits a teaching peer by disciplinary boundaries constrains formative, as well as summative, peer review of teaching.

2. How Do We Foster A Climate In Which Productive Peer Review May Occur ?

How do we move teaching from a “private” activity to one that has a collegial, collective concern with the quality of teaching?

How does a faculty member be “more collegial” on the one hand, yet be “better than others” in order to receive “rewards” for his/her achievements?

How do we deal with the widespread cynicism about the value of teaching versus research?

How do we create an atmosphere of trust within which peer review of teaching takes place?

How do we achieve “enough” administrative responsibility so a peer review process can be implemented and supported, yet preserve faculty involvement?

Should there be different performance standards for tenured/non-tenured or junior/senior faculty ?

Because culture and climate are not changed easily, any shift in focus will be slow and difficult. The change is not impossible, but it will take careful and intentional planning, action and interaction. Since the same word may mean different things to different people, it will be important for each campus and/or unit to work toward a common understanding of such concepts as collegiality, “good” teaching, rewards, and performance standards, as well as the relationship between research and teaching.

The emphasis on research is widely accepted within institutions of higher education. Professional prestige often is tied to research. Until the internal emphasis is modified, it will not be easy to persuade some faculty members to participate in formative peer review of their teaching (they may feel their time priorities need to be elsewhere), or to have a summative peer review of teaching be taken seriously.

An equally important issue is how to create an atmosphere of trust within which any peer review of teaching takes place. There are many factors associated with a lack of trust, including a factional atmosphere within an academic unit, philosophical biases that intrude into the review process, or the presence of a strong dichotomy between a faculty member and administrator. Peer reviews required for summative purposes cannot be postponed until trust is established. Where trust is a problem, professionally sound suggestions, advice, and/or feedback may not serve the faculty well. Also, some changes in teaching practices by a faculty member may place him/her in the midst of philosophical, doctrinal, or other internal disputes.

Without responsible administrative oversight, faculty members may either avoid doing anything or perform a “meaningless” review. If this occurs in a summative setting, it raises serious questions about the unevenness of review implementation. A related concern is whether or not all faculty, regardless of rank or status, are held accountable to the same standards. If not, any review process sends the message that peer review of teaching really is about promotion and tenure, not improving teaching. On the other hand, if the peer review of teaching is solely for formative purposes, then administrative support can be evidenced in such areas as adequate resources and encouragement to develop and use policies and procedures for peer review of teaching. Whether the peer review of teaching is formative or summative, it is important for all persons involved to be open-minded, because not all modifications, based on suggestions from such reviews, will be successful.

3. What Are The Purposes Of Peer Review Of Teaching?

What responsible ways (i.e., responsible personnel practices, in general) can be developed whereby information gained through summative evaluation can provide information and assistance for professional growth and development in the area of teaching?

How can the emphasis of peer review of teaching be placed on improving the quality of teaching, regardless of whether the purpose is formative or summative?

Generally, faculty members perceive that administrators focus on summative peer review of teaching and prefer summative quantitative data (often “a” number) which will facilitate their evaluations of faculty members. Faculty members are seen as preferring formative uses which provide qualitative data that can be used to enhance or modify their teaching. There probably is not a simple solution to this dilemma, because both types of review are important and can provide useful information.

Any attempt to make an absolute distinction between formative and summative evaluations ignores another issue: an awareness that even in instances where peer review is limited to formative purposes, the actions based on the recommendations or suggestions provided through the process may have negative as well as positive results on personnel matters.

4. How Do We Implement Peer Review of Teaching?

How much time is involved in peer review of teaching?

How can the process recognize and/or be sensitive to different teaching philosophies, styles/methods, disciplinary differences, and teaching environments ?

If there are to be “common standards,” what is the clearest and most helpful way to express them, yet allow for the diversity that exists?

Encouraging faculty members to use peer review to improve their teaching, regardless of the purpose of such reviews, often encounters a major obstacle: “When am I supposed to find the time to do this?” The volume and number of professional demands upon faculty members’ time have increased and will continue to do so. Adding another layer of responsibility and expectations on already overloaded schedules will not help. Allowing adequate time and training for such activities is important to achieve maximum benefits from the process. This issue is particularly critical when the results will be used in personnel matters.

There are different styles, methods, and philosophies of teaching. When peer review of teaching is used for summative purposes, faculty become concerned about the lack of training to help them recognize or be sensitive to different approaches to teaching, as well as to the disciplinary differences and different teaching environments that exist. Both faculty members and administrators need training to conduct peer review and evaluations. In addition, there is the need to make the peer review process and any use of its results (teaching portfolio, classroom observation, etc.) as professional and objective as possible.

5. How may Peer Review of Teaching Improve The Status of Teaching?

How can teaching be reviewed so that it counts and is rewarded?

Will the review process itself help to increase the focus on teaching?

If “good” teaching is not perceived as “valued,” then the overall motivations and incentives at the personal level are not likely to encourage or prompt faculty to pursue opportunities for formative peer review. “Rewards” should promote efforts to increase good teaching and cooperation, not competition, among faculty members. And there need to be rewards for those who make the time to review a colleague’s teaching.

The opportunity for peer review of teaching and the support of its use for professional growth and development can send a message to faculty members, just as the absence of opportunities and support do. How peer review of teaching is used in summative or personnel matters also can assign a different importance to teaching, especially when contrasted with often more elaborate means of evaluating other professional responsibilities.

KEY POINTS FROM LITERATURE

The literature in the field of Peer Review is growing so rapidly that no one report can do justice to what is available. It also must be noted that a lack of consensus fuels the ongoing debate as to what role, if any, formative practices and resulting information should play in administrative (summative) decisions.

The key points recorded here are taken primarily from three sources, which offer a background for framing questions and identifying issues for further consideration:

Centra, John A. *Reflective Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.
 Seldin, Peter and Associates. *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
 Weimer, Maryellen. *Improving College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990

1. Summative and formative assessment are related and necessary in the sense that they give an overall picture of instructional effectiveness at a college/university.

If the concern is to improve teaching, then the information most important to faculty members is that which helps them focus on the impact of their instructional policies, practices and activities on student learning as well as on their own performance. The issue is not whether teaching is good or bad, right or wrong, but whether or not it maximizes student learning and produces the best possible teaching performance.

2. Assessment of teaching activities should include feedback from multiple sources, rather than total or primary reliance on one type of evaluation.

Information needs to be received from colleagues/peers, students, and the individual faculty member. Ideally, this feedback will be continuous, reflective, and documented regularly.

3. At least four conditions must be present to increase the chances that improvement in teaching will take place:

- (a) Faculty members must receive new information about their teaching performance; they must learn something new.
- (b) They must trust the source of information as well as the evaluation process itself.
- (c) They must receive helpful, specific and realistic information on ways to change.
- (d) There must be positive motivation for change to occur, both intrinsic - coming from within the faculty member; seeing work as meaningful; feeling responsibility for work outcomes; and receiving regular, informal feedback about teaching activities; and extrinsic - support and meaningful rewards from the institution. There needs be consistency between what is said and what is practiced.

These four points can be used to design a formative assessment plan, and can serve as checkpoints for information received from students, colleagues/peers, and self-reports from teachers. It is imperative that both the teacher and the reviewer understand the teacher's definition of good teaching and what he/she expects students to learn in the specific course. When this is done, formative assessment then focuses on the consistency between the teacher's assumptions and the behavior used to achieve the desired results.

Furthermore, it helps to answer such questions as “How do I teach?” “Why do I teach this way?” and “What evidence is there that I am effective?” The process helps the faculty member to clarify his/her own values and why he/she does things a certain way.

4. Lecture and active learning activities (of which there are many), each have their own strengths, limitations and appropriate use.

There are different theories about how students learn. Teachers may use different theories and methods at different times, depending upon their goals and variables such as course content, class size, time of day, course level, and whether the course is an elective or a requirement. An effective assessment plan respects diversity by recognizing a variety of suitable teaching styles/methods and a number of course variables, while encouraging faculty members to identify and clarify their own assumptions. Insights gained from this process will help teachers decide what to keep and what to change.

5. There is no one best or right way to conduct peer review of teaching.

Research indicates that multiple sources of information provide the best and most helpful results, regardless of whether the purpose is formative or summative. Student evaluations, teaching portfolios, and classroom observation all can be helpful tools, especially in formative reviews. Centra (89-93) lists twelve guidelines for using student evaluations. Key factors include clarity of purpose, use for formative or summative purposes; access to results, or confidentiality; and interpretation of results gathered over time. All three writers emphasize the need for awareness of the limitations of student evaluations.

6. Materials in teaching portfolios should include:

- (a) Examples of student work, as products of good teaching
- (b) Course syllabi and related materials
- (c) Descriptions of how these materials are used in teaching
- (d) Any innovations attempted and the results;
- (e) Assessments from students and colleagues/peers
- (f) Reflections on one’s own teaching philosophy, style, standards, efforts, etc.
- (g) Evidence that a teacher has met the standards for success as defined by the institution, the department, and him/herself.

7. Peer observation of classroom teaching requires time and preparation in order to gain maximum results from this experience.

Centra’s (118) review of the literature by Cohen and McKeachie (1980) reveals ten criteria of effective teaching that colleagues are best able to judge:

- (a) Mastery of course content
- (b) Selection of course content
- (c) Appropriateness of course objectives
- (d) Appropriateness of instructional materials (readings, media, etc.)
- (e) Appropriateness of evaluative devices (exams, written assignments, reports)
- (f) Appropriateness of methodology used to teach content
- (g) Commitment to teaching and concern for student learning
- (h) Student achievement, based on performance on exams and projects
- (I) Support of departmental instructional efforts

8. There is the need and the desire to improve teaching.

This is a basic assumption of peer review of teaching and formative evaluation, which grows out of the external and internal forces influencing present day higher education. While it is not always an easy process, improving instructional quality is possible and worth the effort. Since there are many ways to achieve better teaching, and many ways good/effective teaching can occur, each institution needs clear policies and procedures to encourage and facilitate teaching improvement.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM SECTION III

Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching (Summative purposes)

Team composition. Teams of two faculty members will form visitation groups for the evaluation procedure. The observers will be tenured members of the faculty, with rank and functional expertise appropriate for the faculty member being observed.

Classroom visits. Both members of the team will observe at least two classes (in the same course) by prior arrangement with the teacher. Both observers must observe the *same* classes.

Pre-observation conference. Team members will meet with the teacher to arrange times for their visits and to discuss the teacher's instructional goals, methods, style, and aspects of the course that provide context for the observation. At the pre-observation meeting the teacher should provide materials that are relevant for understanding the context of the classes being observed and should discuss his/her teaching methods and goals. In addition, the team members should discuss the categories of the Peer Observation Form with the instructor. Among the questions that observers usually ask during pre-conference interviews are:

1. How would you characterize the typical student in your course (motivation, ability, interest in the material, etc.)?
2. What are your goals for the classes we will observe? (What will students gain from the sessions?)
3. How will you evaluate what they learn in these classes?
4. What teaching methods do you expect to use in each of these classes? (Describe what we can expect to see in each class.)
5. What will students be asked to do to prepare for these classes?
6. How do these classes relate to previous (and subsequent) classes?
7. Will these classes represent a typical example of your teaching? If not, what will be different?
8. Is there anything in particular that you would like the team to focus on in these classes?

Observations. The observers should discuss the teaching categories on the Peer Observation Form (Appendix E) before visiting the class, to insure that they have a consensus on the meaning of the categories and questions on the form. The Peer Observation form has three categories on which the team will be expected to focus: subject matter, instruction, and style. The form also includes "cueing questions" under each of these categories as guides to specific teaching behaviors that may be observed. It would also be a good idea for the observers to review the characteristics of effective observers (see Appendix F). The observers may choose any method to record their impressions of the classes they visit. Some observers prefer to take "narrative notes (often including lecture content) because it stimulates the student's experience in class while allowing for marginal notations of a more evaluative nature. Others may prefer to take "reflective" notes in which they analyze the teaching process as it occurs.

Observers should be extremely careful not to disrupt the class. They should try to be as unobtrusive as possible: arrive early (well before the class starts), sit in the back of the class or in a place where they will not draw attention to themselves, keep silent during the class session, and stay for the entire class period.

As soon as possible after completing an observation, preferably within 24 hours, each member of the team should review the observation notes and outline his/her impressions on the report form.

Post-Observation Conference and Report. As soon as possible after the last class observation, the team should meet to compose their observation report and arrange to meet with the teacher to share the report. The post-observation conference should occur no later than two weeks after the last class observation. The report (based on the categories on the Peer Observation Form, Appendix E) should reflect a balanced picture of the instructor's teaching, specifying area of particular effectiveness as well as areas that could be improved and suggestions for carrying out the improvements.

In the post-observation conference, the team can initiate a discussion with the teacher using questions such as these (as a preface to their report):

1. How did you feel these classes went?
2. Did the students accomplish the goals you set for them?
3. What do you think worked well, or not so well, in these classes?
4. What do you think are your teaching strengths? Weaknesses?
5. Do you have any suggestions or strategies for improvement?

The observation report should be shared with the teacher and discussed. (Appendix G outlines suggestions for providing constructive feedback to teachers.) If there are still disagreements between the team and the teacher after the conference, the teacher can submit his/her own report that can be attached to the report.

Observation Procedures for Formative (Developmental) Purposes

Focus and structure also are required for meaningful formative observations. However, all of the detailed procedures used in a summative process (as described above and in III - Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching, page 9) may be modified to fit the purpose of a developmental observation. For example, a review may be focused on one area of teaching a person desires to improve or develop in some way (i.e., lecturing, asking questions, media use, etc.). A single observer might provide this kind of feedback, and fewer classroom observations may be needed. Appendix H lists questions that may be used to guide formative observations and help teachers reflect on their instructional approaches.

To increase the reliability of peer observations, observers must try to focus on the same elements of teaching. This form, based on generic dimensions of instruction, is intended to be used as a framework for the observation. The observers should discuss these categories prior to their classroom visits to insure that they are in agreement about the definitions and the meaning of the "cue questions" under each category. This form is *not* intended to function as a checklist, but rather as an organizing framework for the observation itself and the (jointly-written) report on the observation. The cueing questions are neither exhaustive nor prescriptive; depending upon the course and the teaching method, some questions may not apply or additional questions might be necessary. The observation team and the teacher being observed should decide if modifications are required. In practice, the observers should look for *specific evidence* of performance under each category, with the understanding that they may not be able to observe all of these elements in the two classes they visit. Some of these questions relate to course materials that the observations teams should obtain from the instructor.

I. Subject Matter

- Is the depth and breadth of the material appropriate for the level of the course and the students?
- Does the course appear to be intellectually rigorous?
- Does the instructor emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?
- Do the instructor's goals emphasize higher-order learning and critical thinking?
- Does the instructor incorporate recent developments, ideas, or approaches to the subject?
- How well does the material relate to other courses in the curriculum?

II. Instruction

Method:

- Does the method of teaching seem appropriate for the material?
- Is the method being used effectively?

Organization:

- Is the overall organization of the class session logical?
- Is the material appropriately sequenced and paced?

Outcomes:

- How well does the instruction match the teacher's goals for the lesson?
- Are the goals at an appropriate level for the lesson?
- Is it clear how the teacher intends to evaluate what students learn in the lesson?

III. Style

- Does the instructor appear to be enthusiastic about teaching?
- Does the instructor appear to be enthusiastic about the subject matter?
- Are the instructor's interactions with students conducive to learning?
- How effectively does the instructor respond to questions?
- Does the instructor show interest in students and their learning?

Student Behavior

- How are the students reacting to the lesson? (Are they attentive, engaged, prepared, actively involved, confused, angry?)
- What are the implications of the observed student behaviors for the instructor's approach to teaching?

Classroom Facilities

- Are there inadequacies in the physical surroundings (e.g., lighting, acoustics, seating, media equipment, etc.) that might adversely affect teaching in this particular classroom?

(Reprinted with permission from another school in the UNC system.)

Characteristics of Effective Observers

The primary characteristics of effective peer observers are closely related to characteristics of good teachers. A good observer:

1. Has sensitivity; can empathize with the person being observed.
2. Sees teaching improvement as an important objective of the observation process.
3. Is reflective about his/her own teaching.
4. Is a good listener.
5. Has the ability to give advice; gives constructive feedback.
6. Takes the observation process seriously and carefully prepares for the observation.
7. Accepts the validity of different teaching methods and styles, even when they differ from his/her own.

These characteristics consistently appear in the literature on peer observation, and successful programs emphasize the necessity of keeping them constantly in mind when performing observations. By contrast, poor observers may fall into one or more of the errors listed below:

Things to Avoid

The "Halo" Effect

Allowing one positive factor to outweigh all other aspects of the assessment.

The "I Don't Like Your Face" Effect

Allowing one negative factor to outweigh all others.

Leniency

Being uncritical in order to avoid controversy.

Central Tendency

Evaluating everyone as "average" because it is less trouble.

Tunnel Vision

Focusing on only one part of the performance rather than the whole picture.

Going Through The Motions

Not taking the evaluation seriously, or
Making up your mind in advance.

I'm The Expert

Using your own teaching performance as criteria for judgment rather than agreed-upon evaluation standards.

Gotcha

Using the evaluation for political purposes or personal revenge.

One problem that surfaces consistently in the early stages of peer observation programs is the difficulty in keeping an open mind about teaching styles and methods different from our own. One should be very cautious about absolute statements such as "you should never use overhead transparencies that way," or "Case studies should only be conducted this way." Our task as observers is to ascertain if the method being used seems to be effective, not whether it conforms to notions of teaching derived from our own experience. There are many ways to be effective.

(Reprinted with permission from a school in the UNC system.)

What are the Essential Elements of Constructive Criticism?

Positive phrasing -- provides a positive framework for the message.

Concreteness -- is grounded in specific, observable behavior

Action-orientation -- gives the individual a specific plan of action to follow.

Focus -- provides feedback on behavior that the individual can change.

When providing feedback to the teacher, it is important to follow the principles of constructive criticism. Constructive criticism is **descriptive** and **specific**; it focuses on the **behavior** rather than on the **person** and it is directed toward behavior that a person can change. Constructive criticism also is **affirming** in the sense that achievements and efforts toward change should be acknowledged, and suggestions for change should be made in a positive way. When giving constructive criticism one should always check to insure clear communication -- verify that the receiver understands exactly what you are talking about. The examples below exemplify various aspects of constructive feedback.

"The time and energy you devoted to the preparation of the class discussion questions is clearly well-received by the students; they do the work and are clearly interested in the subject. This is a definite plus. However, you might find that many of the detailed, fact-based questions that you asked in class might be given to the students ahead of time to self-test their comprehension, and emphasize higher-order, integrating questions in class discussion. This tactic would allow you to delve more deeply into the issues with the students."

"The case study discussion seemed to be very productive and most of the students participated with meaningful comments and good answers to your questions. Unfortunately, there didn't seem to be enough time for closure, and I sensed that the students needed to have some resolution of at least the major issues in the case, especially since their mid-term is coming up soon. Since you are trying to keep to your schedule, it is probably impractical to resume the discussion in the next class, but one solution might be to prepare a handout to tie up some of the loose ends that you can give to the students next time."

"your opening points of the lecture were very interesting and I could see how they were related to the day's topic, but during the lecture the students seemed a bit confused about the connections. Perhaps you could write these points on the board or prepare them ahead of time on an overhead transparency so you could refer to them again during the remainder of the lecture."

(Reprinted with permission of a school in the UNC system.)

Formative Observations: Questions to Stimulate Reflection*

The following questions are examples of the kind of reflective questions that are often used in developmental observations. There are many other possibilities, but the teacher and the observer should choose questions (or create new ones) that promise to yield the most useful insights into teaching.

1. Did the lesson proceed in the way you had planned it? Why?
2. Did the students react to the lesson in the way you thought they would?
3. What specific things did you do to help the students understand difficult parts of the lesson?
4. Did you do anything that confused the students or made it difficult for them to understand the lesson?
5. How did the students react to your lesson?
6. During the lesson, did you feel confident and enthusiastic? Why?
7. What did you do in the lesson to allow for individual differences in students' learning styles or abilities?
8. Do you think your students learned all that you wanted them to learn in this session? What brings you to this conclusion?
9. What did you do in the lesson to make students feel that they had some control over what they were learning?
10. What did you do to encourage the students to participate actively in the lessons?
11. Did anything in this class reinforce or contradict your beliefs about teaching and learning?
12. What did you learn about teaching from this class?
13. What did you learn about student learning from this class?
14. What targets for improvement have you set yourself for this class, and are they realistic?
15. If you were to teach this lesson again tomorrow, what would you do differently, and why?

*Adapted from: Killen, R. (1995) "Improving Teaching Through Reflective Partnerships." *To Improve the Academy*, 14,125-41.

MODEL FOR PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

These five recommendations come from the work of Maryellen Weimer (1990) and are suggested for formative (developmental) purposes:

- Pair faculty. Pairing across disciplinary lines will help keep the focus on teaching rather than on content. This also tends to reduce anxiety and increase confidentiality.
- Have pairs meet to share their basic orientation to teaching, their beliefs about teaching, how they know when they succeed, why they keep trying, etc.
- Have pairs identify and agree upon the aspect(s) of instruction to be observed, the schedule and other details for the observation(s).
- Be descriptive rather than judgmental in both verbal and written reports.
- Meet at a neutral site to discuss observations. Allow plenty of time for the discussion and avoid interruptions.

POLICY ON PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH BEHAVIOR & HEALTH EDUCATION
 SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
 UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
 MAY 20, 1996

Committee on Peer Review of Teaching:

Robert F. DeVellis, Chair

Vangie Foshee

Sarah Korbin

Allan Stecklet

Katherine Turner

and

Faculty of the Department of Health Behavior & Health Education

Background

The Committee on Peer Evaluation of teaching within the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education was formed in April, 1995 by Dr. James Sorenson, Chair, and held its initial meeting on May 19 of that year. Dr. Sorenson charged The Committee with the development of a recommended policy for the process of peer review within the department. More specifically, he asked that the committee (a) identify the principles underlying peer review, (b) develop a draft policy on peer review, (c) recommend what should be included in department teaching portfolios, (d) review existing teaching evaluation forms, and (e) identify a process and set of criteria for peer review of teaching effectiveness [memo to Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review of Instruction, dated April 5, 1995]. This charge was in response to multiple factors, both local and national. Throughout the field of higher education, there has been an increasing emphasis on the importance of peer evaluation as a mechanism for improving teaching. Like many institutions, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has acknowledged the importance of peer review and has adopted policies towards its implementation. The University's Board of Governors issued a report entitled *Tenure and Teaching at the University of North Carolina* (adopted by the Board in September, 1993) addressing multiple issues, including the utility of peer review in evaluation for promotion and tenure. In an Administrative Memorandum, dated September 28, 1993, President Spangler quoted a recommendation adopted by the Board of Governors that states, in part, that institutional policies should establish clear, specific, write policies for evaluation of teaching and that peer review should be an integral part of the evaluation process. Subsequently, the School of Public Health in its *Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Manual* (October, 1994) included a guide for peer review of teaching.

The first priority of the Committee has been to address points (a) and (b) of its charge, i.e., to inform ourselves and the department of the nature of peer review as a process and to recommend a departmental policy to the faculty. Our first action after the initial organizational meeting was to examine existing materials pertinent to peer review of teaching. These included both published guides and actual evaluation materials and protocols used at this University and elsewhere. Dr. Ed Neal of the Center for Teaching and Learning, who met with Dr. DeVellis in June 1995, provided extensive background materials. During the Fall semester of the 1995-96 academic year, the Committee met as a body on several occasions to define the scope of peer review of teaching and to identify suitable evaluation methodologies. In February and March, 1996, the Committee presented its findings and recommendations to the Faculty at two successive DPAC meetings. The Committee Chair presented various options and examples to the Faculty, who expressed their collective preferences. The Policy Draft that follows reflects our perception of their views.

Effective policies must satisfy the seemingly contradictory criteria of delineating enduring standards and guidelines while maintaining relevance and utility despite changing circumstances. The challenge these criteria pose is perhaps never greater than during the initial period of a policy's application. With that in mind, the Committee recommends that the following policies and procedures concerning peer review be re-examined after the completion of the first cycle of reviews within HBHE. On the basis of that initial experience, these policies and procedures should be amended as necessary.

I. Guiding Principles

- A. Peer review of teaching, including classroom observation, is an integral part of teaching evaluation.
- B. The purposes of peer review include optimizing the teaching effectiveness of all faculty and providing a fair, effective, and uniform set of criteria for incorporation in promotion and tenure decisions.
- C. Information about the procedures used to conduct peer review and the criteria by which instructional competence is evaluated should be openly available to faculty and to the public.
- D. To the extent consistent with a fair and objective evaluation, the process should be collaborative and participatory. Emphasis should be placed on achievable improvements in teaching in addition to evaluation.
- E. Peer review is but one of several components of a comprehensive teaching evaluation.

II. Classroom Observation

Classroom observation is an integral component of peer review of teaching. Each evaluation should include classroom observation. Generally, the team assigned to review a faculty member's classroom teaching will observe that teaching in person during normal class times. Under unusual circumstances, some alternative (e.g., video taping) may be arranged with the mutual consent of the evaluators and the instructor being evaluated.

A. Scope of Peer Review and Classroom Observation. Peer review, including classroom observation, is of potential value to instructors at all levels of experience and rank. As the peer review process within the departments matures, the faculty should apply it broadly as a tool for achieving and maintaining educational excellence. The process, however, requires considerable resources. Initially, faculty facing promotion or tenure should be given priority as candidates for peer review of their teaching. Ideally, for faculty members approaching a tenure decision, two separate peer reviews should transpire prior to the tenure decision. The first peer evaluation would occur during the latter part of the faculty member's first appointment period. The second would occur during the latter part of their reappointment period so that the evaluation results could be included in their promotion and tenure package. For tenured faculty facing promotion, peer review should occur during the year prior to their promotion evaluation so that the evaluation results can be included in their promotion package. Other faculty will be reviewed periodically.

B. Classroom Observation Team. The evaluation team will include one or more HBHE faculty who have received training as peer reviewers and a staff member from the Center for Teaching and Learning. The team reviewing a faculty member's teaching competency will be appointed by the Department Chair. Faculty members who are to be evaluated may express their preference for who from the Department will serve on the evaluation team, although necessarily other factors also will influence the team's makeup. The team and the instructor should function as a working unit whose goal is to strive for teaching excellence. Team members should work actively toward establishing a constructive and non-adversarial relationship with the instructor, while maintaining a commitment to fairness and objectivity.

C. Number of Observations. The evaluation team will plan two (or more) observation sessions. Typically, they will observe two entire class periods. Observations will **not** take place without the prior knowledge of the instructor. Prior to each classroom observation, the evaluation team members will meet with the faculty member being evaluated for the purpose of planning the observation session. At this time, evaluation team will ascertain the type and level of students enrolled in the course and the instructor's objectives for the session to be observed. Following each occasion of classroom observation, the team will again meet with the faculty member under review. At this time, all parties may discuss issues related to the class observed, including suggestions, clarifications, recommendations, resources and similar matters.

D. General Principles Guiding Classroom Observations.

1. The evaluation process must be fair, objective, and consistent. Standard forms for collecting and reporting classroom observation data should be specified and used on all occasions and for all faculty members whose teaching is subject to peer review.
2. The evaluation should be constructive.
3. Evaluation criteria should be grounded in the instructional goals of the course.
4. Peer reviewers should be tolerant of different styles of teaching and should not impose standards predicated on a single acceptable technique.
5. Recommendations resulting from the review process should be specific and achievable.
6. A plan for accomplishing recommended changes should be an integral component of the evaluation process.
7. The instructor who has been evaluated should be made aware of available resources that might facilitate recommended changes.

E. Dimensions of Classroom Teaching to Observe. The instructional goals of the course being observed will influence the choice of domains. As noted elsewhere, these domains should be explicated during the pre-observation meeting between the instructor being evaluated and the evaluation team. Major dimensions of classroom teaching include the following:

1. Content - e.g., currency, accuracy, level appropriateness, and scope of material covered in class and in assigned readings; the instructor's mastery of the material covered; the appropriateness of syllabi and other materials.
2. Style - e.g., the teaching methods, communication skills, innovativeness, organization, preparation, enthusiasm, respect for diversity, and pacing exhibited by the instructor in the classroom.
3. Access - e.g., the instructor's availability before or after the class or at office hours, responsiveness to calls or e-mail from students, approachability, and attentiveness to student concerns.
4. Fairness - e.g., the amount of work assigned in the course, appropriateness of tests and the criteria used for scoring them, clarity of expectations, differentiation of opinions from facts, receptivity to alternative views, respect for students, and equal treatment of students.

5. Mentoring - e.g., exposure of students to relevant opportunities for learning or career development, encouragement of further pursuit of ideas, and consult as a role model.

6. Outcome - e.g., course test performance, student performance on course-related portions of the comprehensive exams, student performance in more advanced courses of the same type, and student self-reported knowledge gains.

F. *Written Summaries.* The evaluation process should yield two separate written summaries. Each of these should conform to a format developed during the initial round of peer evaluation and classroom observation. Fairness, accuracy, and objectivity are fundamental to both summaries. One should include specific detailed observations and recommendations for the primary purpose of assisting the instructor in improving teaching. This report will be given only to the instructor. The second summary, not necessarily containing the same level of detail, will be provided to administrators for the purpose of gauging the instructor's teaching effectiveness. The latter may omit details not directly relevant to an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness but must be consistent with the more detailed report.

III. Other modes of evaluation.

Methods other than classroom observation should be integral to peer review of instruction because some important data cannot be directly observed and not all teaching occurs in the classroom. Several alternative data sources pertinent to teaching effectiveness are discussed below.

A. *Teaching Portfolio.* The teaching portfolio shared with peer observation the distinction of being required of departments and faculty members in the School of Public Health. The *Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Manual* of the School of Public Health states that, "It is the responsibility of each tenure-track faculty (and appropriate clinical faculty) to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio. This portfolio should be updated annually, and should be presented at the time of promotion and tenure" (p.7). Also included in the *Manual* is an Appendix describing teaching portfolios. The Center for Teaching and Learning is also available for consultation regarding the development of teaching portfolios. This collection of documents describing a faculty member's teaching philosophy and accomplishments is a fundamental component of the data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

B. *Course Evaluations.* The third component that is essential to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is student course evaluations. The practice of collecting student evaluations at the conclusion of each course should continue and the information gathered should be an integral part of the data on which teaching effectiveness is judged.

In addition to peer observation, the teaching portfolio, and student evaluations, other data sources may provide important information about teaching effectiveness. These sources may be particularly relevant for documenting teaching effectiveness outside of the classroom, e.g., in the capacity of advisor or as research or field supervisor. The utility of any particular data sources from those described below may depend on the specific instructional activities of individual faculty members. Therefore, not all of the following need be collected or examined routinely nor does the absence from the following list of other potentially relevant data sources preclude their use.

C. *Testimonials.* Endorsements of instructors based on interviews with present students, letters from past students, or evaluations from co-instructors of team-taught courses may be relevant sources of data on teaching effectiveness. When evaluative information is solicited from present or former students, there must be assurances that this information is provided voluntarily and, if preferred by the student, anonymously. The *Faculty Advising & Mentoring" Student Evaluation Form* may be used for this purpose.

D. *Archival Data Indicative of Teaching Outcomes.* Another potentially relevant source of information is archival data that testify to student learning or faculty teaching effectiveness. Such data may include completion rates for student projects (e.g., Master's papers, dissertations, IPs), faculty-student co-authored publications, advisee graduation rates, post-graduation employment of former advisees, or faculty-developed instructional products adopted by other instructors or institutions.

E. *Other Relevant Data Sources.* The preceding is not an exhaustive list of indicators of teaching effectiveness. The inclusion of other data sources is appropriate when their relevance to the assessment is self evident or can be demonstrated. Teaching outside of the classroom may be especially difficult to document and data sources other than those mentioned above may be appropriate. Particularly when a faculty member's teaching evaluation will affect imminent tenure or promotion decisions, the faculty member should discuss with the Chair the appropriateness of including data sources other than those customarily employed.

**WORKSHOP: TRAINING FOR CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
FOR UNITS USING
THE FACULTY SENATE PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENT**

DATE:

LOCATION:

TIME:

WORKSHOP COORDINATORS:

Janna Brendell, Chair, Teaching Effectiveness Committee
Dorothy Clayton, Coordinator, Center for Faculty Development
Judith Hunt, Center for Faculty Development

AGENDA:

• **Introduction**

An Overview of the Peer Classroom Observation Process

• **Pre-Observation Conference**

Responsibilities
Topics for Discussion

• **Preparing for the In-Classroom Observation**

Know your instrument: the Faculty Senate Peer Review Instrument

• **Break**

• **In-Classroom Observation**

Recording the observations: Descriptions rather than Evaluation
Faculty Senate Peer Review Instrument: scenarios for practice
Providing written feedback for the Faculty Member who is observed

• **Post-Observation Conference**

Responsibilities
Topics for Discussion

• **Evaluation of Workshop**

The following pages provide:

1. Suggested Questions for the Pre-Observation Conference
2. Guidelines for Providing Written Feedback
3. Descriptive Chronology: Junior/Senior Level Social Work Class
4. Peer Review Procedures and Sample Copy of Peer Review Instrument
5. Suggested Questions for Post-Observation Conference

1. Suggested Questions for the Pre-Observation Conference

The following are suggested questions which the observers ask during the pre-observation conference. These can be varied as needed for the particular circumstances of the observation. What is important is that the observers gather information from the instructor concerning his or her class session goals or objectives, particular teaching style or methods, and the nature of the students.

An agenda of questions provides the observers with a structured way of obtaining this information. The faculty member who is being observed needs to read the questions and think about how he or she can effectively provide that information to the observers. The purpose is to have informed observers who can better observe the class. It is the instructor who needs to set the class in the context of the course for the observers.

1. Briefly, what will be happening in the class session I will observe?
2. What is the composition of the students in the class?
3. What do you hope the students will gain from this session? What are the goals?
4. What do you expect the students to be doing during the session to reach the stated goals?
5. What can I expect to see you doing during the session? What teaching strategies and methods will you be using?
6. What have the students been asked to prepare for this session?
7. What was done in earlier sessions to lead up to this moment of instruction?
8. Is there anything in particular you would like me to focus on during the sessions?
9. Are facilities and resources adequate to support your teaching needs?

2. GUIDELINES FOR PROVIDING WRITTEN FEEDBACK

Written and verbal feedback should contain positive reinforcement of good teaching practices as well as suggest constructive changes. These statements help both the instructor and the Personnel Committee document what the faculty member does well in the classroom/lab. When offering suggestions for modifications or changes, the wording should indicate your interest in the recipient teacher's effectiveness in the classroom and should be sensitive to the fact that the written comments will be used in the personnel process. Constructive feedback for East Carolina University's peer classroom/lab observation has two purposes:

1. To help the instructor look at his/her behavior in the classroom without placing them on the defensive.
2. To provide basic information about classroom/lab behavior and activity which can be used by the Personnel Committee and the Chair in assessing, for personnel decisions, that faculty member's teaching.

The role of the observer is to collect data by observation in the classroom/lab not perform the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching for personnel decisions. Information and materials collected by the peer classroom/lab observation are one among several sources of information used by the Personnel Committee and the Chair to assess the quality of the faculty member's teaching.

Be as descriptive and specific as possible when writing the "strengths" and "recommendations" portions of the peer review forms as well as the narrative portions. The observation forms should be marked and written with care. Do not use jargon or vague words. Use active voice rather than passive voice. Look at the subject, verb, and object or complement for each sentence. Those three words should convey the sense of the sentence. Be careful about the adjectives and modifying phrases which you use.

- Be descriptive (rather than evaluative) and specific (rather than general) when writing the "strengths," "recommendations," and the summary portions of the peer classroom/lab review forms. This will help those who will read your comments to gain an accurate picture of the class or lab.
- Place your comments in context. This will help both the instructor and others clearly understand your meaning. Use examples to support general statements.
- Make your comments collegial and professional.
- Phrase your comments in a positive manner whether they are compliments or suggestions for change.
- Begin the discussion and the written summary with a statement of "what went well" or the "teaching strengths."

2. Guidelines for Written Feedback - continued

- Be careful when using adjectives or linking words or phrases (...but, ... on the other hand) as the latter increase the ambiguity of statements.
- Be sensitive to different teaching styles. Make recommendations appropriate for the teaching style.
- Direct your suggestions or recommendations toward behavior the teacher can do something about. Suggestions that require resources or support which are not available, that require complete revisions of courses, or major departures from the individual's teaching style are likely to be neither helpful nor doable.
- Be balanced and unbiased in your comments and recording of what occurred. The following is an example of a descriptive chronology of a class:

3. DESCRIPTIVE CHRONOLOGY of JUNIOR/SENIOR LEVEL
SOCIAL WORK CLASS

The class observed was about clinical interventions. There were a total of 21 students of mixed ages, gender and ethnicity. The majority were of typical college age, female and Caucasian. The class was one hour in length. The focus of this particular class was supervision.

The professor arrived on time and began the class with a few minutes of open discussion, asking whether there was any unfinished business from the last class to be addressed and if there were any issues of note that had arisen since the last class. The professor then introduced the topic for the day, supervision, indicating the importance of this topic to the students by noting that in their careers they would be both supervised and supervising. The professor then asked the students to think about their own experiences with supervision, good and bad, and to discuss these with respect to what characteristics they would prefer in a supervisor. As the students relayed their experiences, the professor summarized their comments on the blackboard. Then, when the students were done recounting their experiences, the professor had an extensive list on the board from which she was then able to work. The use of their personal experiences seemed to make it easier for the students to understand the more abstract notions of supervision. This process also provided them with a sense of empathy for the experience of supervision.

The professor then proceeded to clarify the similarities and differences between this broad array of supervisory experiences provided by the students and the specific experience of supervision as it tends to occur in the profession. With the broad array as a basis, the students seemed to grasp the distinction between the various types of supervision fairly easily and quickly. The professor then went into more detail about the various types of supervision that tend to occur in the profession. Strengths and weaknesses of the various types of supervision were then identified. Additionally, ways in which a supervisee could respond to the supervision were discussed.

Throughout this discussion, the professor moved freely about the room, moving from the front of the class to the side and then back to the front. When the professor made a new point, she would speak more slowly and repeat as often as needed (as seemed to be indicated by whether the students were still writing or not) in a summary fashion the main points of the comment. Questions were received whenever students had them and incorporated into the ongoing lecture.

The professor also used her own experiences to illuminate various comments. These were often somewhat amusing in nature and would elicit laughter from the class. On the other hand, some of the examples provided were very serious and clearly caused the students to think thoughtfully. By the end of the class, students were encouraged to think about the goodness of fit (my term) between the supervisor and supervisee, recognizing that each has his/her own style. Consequently, students were able to see that some combinations will work well whereas others will be quite problematic.

At the end of the class, the professor reiterated and summarized the main points of the lecture. Issues to be discussed in the next class were mentioned briefly. Class was concluded on time. Those students who had questions discussed these with the professor as the others left the classroom.

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
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 observations with any additional appropriate evidence of effective teaching such as portfolios, student evaluations, etc.

TRAINING OUTLINE

- I. Observation/Documentation
 - A. Clarification of categories and items.
 - B. Methods of documenting what is observed.
 - C. Practice documentation.
 - D. Analysis of observed/documented behaviors.
- II. Conferences
 - A. Pre-conference
 1. Interview guide
 2. Scheduling
 - B. Post-conference
 1. Interview guides
 2. Giving and receiving feedback
 - C. Faculty Development Plan
- III. Procedures for Observation (see next page)

PROCEDURE FOR PEER OBSERVATION
East Carolina University

- I. Two observers per observation.
 - A. One trained observer to be selected by the professor's department chair and/or personnel committee.
 - B. One trained observer selected by the professor.

- II. Selection of trained observers.

All tenured faculty in a department shall have the opportunity to be trained.

NOTES:

 1. All observers must complete training.
 2. The most suitable observers are faculty who are attentive to details, highly organized, and active listeners.
 3. Where possible the observers shall come from the department/discipline of the faculty member being observed.

- III. Observation cycle (minimum).
 - A. During the professor's first year -- two observations with feedback.
 - B. During the professor's fourth year -- two observations with feedback.

- IV. Observation procedures.
 - A. Pre-observation conference (observers and professor)
 1. Professor provides observers with copies of handout and a list of materials to be used during class plus a current syllabus and any other pertinent information.
 2. Observer selected by professor provides a self-evaluation form to professor.
 - B. Schedule and course selection.
 1. Professor chooses the classes to be observed.
 2. Observers coordinate a date/time for the observation.
 - C. Post-observation conference (within 5 working days of observation with both observers).
 1. Go over observation and self-evaluation.
 2. Discuss strengths, any needs for improvements, and search for strategies to improve.
 3. Write a Faculty Development Plan.

-demonstrates command of subject matter

* _____
* _____
Comments: _____

Category 3: Presentation

needs
improvement

does
well

NC/UO

-speaks audibly and clearly

-communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement
toward content

-presentation style facilitates note taking, if appropriate

-selects teaching methods appropriate for the content

-relates current course content to what's gone before and
will come after

-carefully explains assignments

* _____
* _____
Comments: _____

Category 4: Rapport/Interaction

needs
improvement

does
well

NA/UO

-responds constructively to student opinions/comments

-listens carefully to student comments and questions

-treats all students in a fair and equitable manner

-responds to wrong answers constructively

-encourages students to answer difficult questions by providing
cues and encouragement

-respects diverse points of view

-is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge

(Peer Review Instrument-cont.)

Appendix K
East Carolina University

* _____
* _____

Comments: _____

<u>Category 5: Active Learning (labs, PE activities, clinics, etc.)</u> OPTIONAL	needs improvement	does well	NA/NO
--	-------------------	-----------	-------

- clearly explains directions or procedures
- has materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity readily available
- careful safety supervision is obvious
- allows sufficient time for completion

* _____
* _____

Comments: _____

* Optional additional criteria to be determined by department

NA/NO - not applicable/unable to observe

Observer _____ Date _____ Time in _____ Time out _____

Areas of Strength:

Areas to consider for Faculty Development Plan

5. Suggested Questions for the Post-observation Conference

The following are suggested questions which the observers may ask during the post-observation conference. These can be varied as needed for the particular circumstances of the observation.

The observer, chosen by the faculty member being observed, begins the conference by asking a general question regarding the observed's perception of how the class session went. You want to begin the post-observation conference in as collegial and comfortable as manner as possible.

The post-observation conference needs to occur no later than five days after the observation. Each observer needs to be sure and review his or her notes no later than one day after the classroom observation. These questions will help initiate the follow-up discussion in the post-observation conference.

1. In general, how did you feel the class session went?
2. How did you feel about your teaching during the session?
3. Did students accomplish the goals you had planned for this session?
4. Is there anything that worked particularly well for you in the session? Does that usually go well?
5. Is there anything that did not go as you had planned? Is this a typical problem area for you?
6. What are your teaching strengths?
7. What areas of your teaching do you believe are in need of improvement?
8. Do you have new teaching ideas you want to explore to enrich or improve your teaching? Do you have any suggestions or thoughts on how you can do this?