



Faculty Senate
East Carolina University
140 Rawl Annex • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6537 office • 252-328-6122 fax
facultySenate@mail.ecu.edu
<http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Unit Code Administrator

FROM: Mark Taggart, Chair of the Faculty *Mark Taggart*

DATE: November 20, 2006

SUBJECT: Review of Peer Review Procedures and Instrument(s)

Peer review continues to be a part of our current faculty evaluation process. The 2005 revised Peer Review Instrument includes Distance Education Peer Review (attached) to aid those faculty teaching DE courses. As stated in the original 1993 Peer Review Procedures (attached) academic units have the option of selecting other instruments and procedures to conduct peer review, once approved by the appropriate vice chancellor. Both of these documents are available online at <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/facdev/peer.cfm>.

Also stated in the 1993 resolution is a caveat that the Chancellor appoint a committee to conduct a three year validation study on the original peer review instrument. I have asked members of the Academic Standards Committee to undertake this three year validation study and report preliminary information to the Faculty Senate in April 2007. The results of the three year study may necessitate additions and/or deletions in the procedures and/or instrument being used.

In preparation, and as a follow up to the Administrator/Personnel Committee Workshop held earlier this semester, I am writing to ask that you review the attached Peer Review Procedures and Instrument and, if your unit has sought one, your unit's approved Modified Peer Review Instrument (attached) and let Dorothy Muller, Co-Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence know if either or both of these documents are currently being used in your unit. Please also let Dr. Muller know the number of peer reviews documented this year in the Personnel Action Dossiers compiled.

The Academic Standards Committee, chaired by Linda Wolfe, will begin its work on this important issue in early Spring 2007. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 328-6537 or Professor Wolfe at 328-9453 if you have questions about this request.

Thank you.

attachments

1993 Peer Review Procedures and 2005 Revised Peer Review Instrument
Approved Modified Peer Review Instrument (if on file)

c: Members of the Academic Standards Committee
Jim Smith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
Dot Clayton, Co-director of the Center for Faculty Excellence
Dorothy Muller, Co-director of the Center for Faculty Excellence



Office of the
Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs
106 Spilman

919-328-6241
919-328-6040 Fax

Administrative Staff
215 Spilman

919-328-6242
919-328-4010 Fax

July 10, 1996

Dr. George Bailey, Chair
Department of Philosophy
Brewster A-327

Dear Dr. Bailey:

On the recommendation of Dr. Dorothy H. Clayton, university coordinator of faculty development, I am pleased to approve your unit's procedures and instrument for peer classroom observation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Rich Ringeisen'.

Richard D. Ringeisen
Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs

pwp:1

cc: Dorothy H. Clayton ✓
Keats Sparrow
Richard McCarty



RECEIVED

MAY 15 1996

VCAA

Department of
Philosophy
College of Arts
and Sciences
A-327 Brewster

919-328-6121
919-328-6301 Fax

TO: Tinsley Yarbrough, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

FROM: George Bailey, ^{GB}Chair, Philosophy

DATE: May 14, 1996

SUBJECT: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures

Enclosed is a copy of our revised Peer Classroom Observation Procedures. These procedures are being submitted to you for your review and approval. The procedures were developed by the Personnel Committee and were approved by a unanimous vote of the department.

PROCEDURES FOR
PEER REVIEW OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
APRIL 1996

Valuing teaching excellence, while recognizing the unique challenge of philosophical teaching, members of the Philosophy Department have developed procedures and an instrument for peer review of classroom teaching. They will also implement their own training procedures for peer-review observation.

The following is an outline of the Philosophy Department's procedures for Peer Review of Classroom Teaching.

1. Faculty Subject to Peer Review
2. Frequency of peer review observations
3. Selection of observers
4. Eligibility of peer-review observers
5. Training of peer-review observers
6. Scheduling of peer-review observations
7. Pre-observation conference
8. Observation
9. Post-observation conference
10. Peer-review reports
11. Filing peer-review report

Attachment: Outline for Reports on Peer-Review of Teaching

1. **Faculty Subject to Peer Review**
All new faculty in the Philosophy Department subject to annual review and evaluation by the unit head, and all probationary-term (tenure-track) faculty members, shall have their classroom teaching observed according to the following procedures for peer review.
2. **Frequency of Peer-Review Observations**
The classroom teaching of all probationary term (tenure-track) faculty shall be observed no less than once a year, but at least eight times during their probationary term.
3. **Selection of Observers**
At the beginning of each fall and spring semester, all faculty members to be observed in that semester shall be notified by the unit head. Within one week, the faculty member to be observed shall select at least one faculty member eligible to serve as a peer-review observer, and

report his or her choice to the chair of the personnel committee. The chair of the personnel committee shall then report the selection to the faculty member(s) selected to observe for peer-review, and make arrangements for the training of selected observers, if necessary.

4. **Eligibility of Peer-Review Observers**

All tenured faculty in the Philosophy Department are eligible to be selected as peer-review observers, with the exception of the unit head. Probationary-term (tenure-track) faculty in the unit are eligible only if no more than one tenured faculty member in the unit is available to be selected by the observed faculty member. In such cases, only probationary-term faculty in the unit senior to the faculty member to be observed are eligible to be selected; and for the most senior probationary-term faculty member(s), a tenured faculty member outside the department may be selected.

5. **Training of Peer-Review Observers**

All peer-review observers selected must have completed a peer-review training session before the pre-observation conference with the faculty member to be observed. The training sessions are to be overseen by the unit head, and may be conducted by the unit head, the chair of the unit personnel committee, or a tenured faculty member having completed the training.

6. **Scheduling of Peer-Review Observations**

The selected observing faculty member(s) and the faculty member to be observed shall meet at least one week prior to the class meeting to be observed, in order to schedule the observation. The faculty member to be observed selects the class meeting to be observed, from among those class meetings the observing faculty member(s) will be able to attend.

7. **Pre-Observation Conferences**

Prior to the class meeting to be observed, the observing faculty member(s) and the faculty member to be observed shall meet to discuss the latter's plan of instruction for the class meeting to be observed.

8. **Observation**

During the observation of classroom teaching, the observing faculty member(s) shall attend the entire class meeting, taking notes on the presentation, and content presented. The observing faculty member(s) shall not actively contribute to the presentation, nor raise questions, nor respond to student

questions. The observer's role in the classroom is merely to gather observations for the peer-review report.

9. Post-Observation Conferences

Within one week following the class meeting, the observing faculty member(s) shall meet with the observed faculty member to provide helpful feedback from the observation. Preferably at that time, but at least within 24 hours of the post-observation conference, the observed faculty member shall be presented with a copy of the peer-review report(s) based on the observation.

10. Peer-Review Reports

The observing faculty members' peer-review reports shall be a narrative statement (usually not more than a page) based solely on their observations of the class meeting. The outline the report should follow is attached.

11. Filing Peer-Review Reports

Probationary-term (tenure-track) faculty members shall place copies of each peer-review report in their Personnel Action Dossier (PAD), to be reviewed by the tenure committee at the time of his or her reappointment. The observing faculty member(s) shall also present the unit head with a copy of the peer-review report(s), to be placed in the observed faculty member's personnel file.

OUTLINE
FOR REPORTS ON PEER-REVIEW OF TEACHING

Department of Philosophy
April 1996

The peer-review observation report should be a one-page narrative based solely upon the trained reviewer's observations of a class meeting. The report should address primarily points A. and B.; C. may be omitted at the reviewer's discretion.

Although there can be no observation apart from evaluation, the purpose of the peer-review report is primarily to convey observations, and not the observer's considered evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance. Committees and administrators making personnel decisions are charged with the task of evaluating the observed faculty member, partly on the basis of the peer-review observation report.

A. Observed Teacher's Classroom Presence and Presentation Style
(summary comment)

1. Noteworthy factors about the Teacher which may be mentioned:
 - a) Speech, Communication to Students
 - b) Fitness of Vocabulary, Instruction to Class Level
 - c) Fitness of Presentation to Class Size
 - d) Attentiveness, Responsiveness to Students
 - e) Position of Delivery, Posture
2. Noteworthy facts about the students which may be mentioned:
 - a) Ease of Attentiveness
 - b) Participation, Interaction

B. Content of Classroom Presentation (summary comment)

1. Noteworthy factors about the teacher which may be mentioned:
 - a) Organization of Material Presented
 - b) Understanding of Material Presented
 - c) Fitness of Chosen Material to Class Level
 - d) Effectiveness of Examples
 - e) Pre-Presentation Review; Post-Presentation Summary, Anticipation
2. Noteworthy factors about the students which may be mentioned:
 - a) Ease of Apprehension
 - b) Intellectual Preparedness, Pre-Understanding Resulting from Prior Learning

C. Constructive Feedback Regarding Comments in A. or B. above.