



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/tsonline/>

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

AGENDA QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED IN THE PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE:

Suggested Pre-Observation Questions

During the pre-observation session, the colleague observer obtains information from the teacher concerning his/her session goals, students, and particular teaching style. The following questions provide a structured way of obtaining such information.

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

Classroom Observation Steps

1. Classroom observations, regardless of their nature, must be conducted in a positive atmosphere.
2. Effective observations are part of a consultation process, not an end product in themselves.
3. Both parties should share with students the nature and purpose of any visits.
4. In addition to in class/lab observation focusing on specific interests specified by the faculty member during pre-visit conference, the visitor should attempt to capture holistically what occurs in the classroom/lab; and remain for the full class/lab period.
5. The results of the observation visit are recorded on specified forms.
6. A post-visit discussion critically important for giving feedback is scheduled.
7. It is helpful to record the teaching improvement activities that emerge from the post-visit discussion.
8. The two parties should discuss effective ways to integrate the information gleaned through the visit with other teaching data, and they should plan, if possible, follow-up visits to assess and document the teaching enhancements.

WRITTEN PEER CLASSROOM/LAB OBSERVATION SUMMARY REPORT
AND POST-OBSERVATION DISCUSSION AGENDA

1. The colleague observer is to open the post-observation conference and feedback discussion by following the suggested post-observation conference questions.

Suggested Post-Observation Conference Questions

The post-observation conference is most helpful if it occurs within one to three days after the observation. The observer needs to be sure and review his/her notes no later than one day after the in classroom/lab observation. The following questions will help initiate the follow-up discussion.

1. In general, how did you feel the class/lab 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 any suggestions or thoughts on how you can improve your teaching?

PART I INSTRUCTIONS for the colleague observer:

The colleague observer at the completion of the in-class observation session and prior to the post-observation conference is to respond in writing to items 2 and 3:

2. List the recipient teacher's teaching strengths by identifying the specific situations or behaviors you observed that were positive.

3. List any specific suggestions for improving teaching qualities and process skill and/or course design elements based on the observed classroom/lab and the course materials.

*NOTE: observer submits the original rating forms and part 1 of the summary report to the chair within 1-2 days after the post-observation conference and provides copies of the forms/summary to the recipient teacher at the post-observation conference. All forms/summary are placed in the teacher's personnel action dossier.

PEER RATING OF COURSE DESIGN FEATURES

Faculty Member Observed _____ Date Observed _____
 Title or Subject of Presentation _____ Length of Observation _____
 Date Reviewed with Faculty Member _____

Direction: record in the space provided the degree (1-5) to which each criteria was met. With completion of assessing each criteria listed for the four categories calculate the average for each category and record in blank provided.

Response Scale: 1 = lowest possible rating
 2
 3 = satisfactory
 4
 5 = highest possible rating
 Interpretation scale: outstanding = 4 to 5 highest possible rating
 satisfactory = 3 to 4 satisfactory
 marginal = 2 to 3
 unsatisfactory = 1 to 2 lowest possible rating

1. Organization and Goals/Objectives Average _____

- Criteria:
 * Class objectives were clear and easily understandable (1-5) _____
 * Class outline and sequence of topics were logically organized to meet class objectives (1-5) _____
 * Class requirements (lab/demonstration/readings/assignments) were included in outline (1-5) _____
 * Summary/closure of key terminology and concepts were included in media/handout (1-5) _____

Strengths Recommendations

2. Content/Intellectual breadth Average _____

- Criteria:
 * Activities were planned to stimulate the use of presented material in problem solving/critical thinking (1-5) _____
 * Alternative views and interpretations were identified (1-5) _____
 * Information presented included current recognized practices, research, and technology (1-5) _____
 * Higher level activities/questions/assignment asked students to compare, contrast, analyze and integrate information (1-5) _____

Strengths Recommendations

PEER RATING OF TEACHING QUALITIES/PROCESS SKILLS

Faculty Member Observed _____ Date Observed _____
Title or Subject of Presentation _____ Length of Observation _____
Date Reviewed with Faculty Member _____

Direction: record in the space provided the degree (1-5) to which each criteria was met. With completion of assessing each criteria listed for the four categories calculate the average for each category and record in blank provided.

- Response Scale:
- 1 = lowest possible rating
 - 2
 - 3 = satisfactory
 - 4
 - 5 = highest possible rating
- Interpretation scale:
- outstanding = 4 to 5 highest possible rating
 - satisfactory = 3 to 4 satisfactory
 - marginal = 2 to 3
 - unsatisfactory = 1 to 2 lowest possible rating

1. Structure and Goals/Objectives Average _____

- Criteria:
- * Class objectives, content and activities planned for the class period were reviewed (1-5) _____
 - * Lecture/demonstration was presented in organized and appropriately sequenced manner (1-5) _____
 - * Lecture/discussion/assignment were presented with appropriate transitions made between key points and summary points reenforced (1-5) _____
 - * Relevancy of presentation to clinical practice and utilization of basic science information were given (recognized and built-upon previous learning) (1-5) _____

Strengths	Recommendations

2. Teaching behaviors Average _____

- Criteria:
- * Probing/challenging questions were asked of students that stimulated critical thinking (go beyond superficial or incomplete answer) (1-5) _____
 - * Adequate time was allowed for note-taking and questions (1-5) _____
 - * Instructor demonstrated appropriate behaviours (mannerisms/gestures/repeated vocalizations) (1-5) _____
 - * Information was presented in an enthusiastic manner (verbal/nonverbal communication) (1-5) _____

Strengths	Recommendations

Peer Classroom Observation Process Flow Chart and Checklist

Physical Therapy Department
School of Allied Health Sciences

- **Planning Stage**

Time: Summer term prior to the academic year when observation will occur

Chair

- ___ sends the list of eligible observers to the faculty member who is to be observed
- ___ chooses 1 name from list of possible observers

Recipient Teacher

- ___ chooses 2 names from list of possible observers
- ___ identifies primary course to be reviewed
- ___ notifies chair of these choices

Chair

arranges the academic year's scheduling of classroom/lab peer reviews by:

- ___ notifying those chosen as observers of their selection and requesting that they contact the recipient teacher
 - ___ sending copies of all appropriate forms to observer and recipient teacher
 - ___ identifying the observer's activity as part of teaching or service percent of annual load
 - ___ keeps the calendar of scheduled observations
-

- **Pre-observation Conference Stage**

Scheduling: Occurs very early in the semester of classroom/lab peer review

Observer

- ___ initiates courtesy contact of recipient teacher

Recipient Teacher

- ___ schedules time and location of pre-observation conference
- ___ schedules a date for the classroom/lab visit

Conference

Observer

- ___ gathers information on classroom/lab session's goals, students, and teaching style (see Pre-observation Conference Materials)

Recipient Teacher

- ___ provides teaching and course materials to observer
 - ___ schedules a date for the post-observation conference
 - ___ notifies chair of the dates for the scheduled conferences and the classroom/lab observation
-

- **Preparing for In-Classroom/Lab Observation**

Observer

- ___ completes *Peer Rating of Course Design Features* form (**after** the Pre-observation Conference **but before** the Classroom/Lab Observation)

● **Classroom/Lab Observation Stage**
Recording Observations

Observer

- ___ becomes very familiar with the criteria for the 4 categories of the *Peer Rating of Teaching Qualities/Process Skills* form

Following the Classroom/Lab Observation

Observer

- ___ completes (as soon as possible following the observation) *Peer Rating of Teaching Qualities/Process Skills* form
- ___ completes Part I, items 2 & 3, of *Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report*

Recipient Teacher

- ___ prepares self-evaluation report (variety of formats possible)
- ___ makes notes appropriate for Part II, items 4 & 5, of *Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report*

● **Post-observation Conference Stage**
Time: conducted within 3 days after the classroom/lab observation

Observer

- ___ sends copies of completed forms to recipient teacher prior to post-observation conference meeting:
Peer Rating of Course Design Features
Peer Rating of Teaching Qualities/Process Skills
Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report, Part I, Items 2 & 3
- ___ uses Post-observation Conference Materials to identify areas of teaching strength and areas for constructive change

Recipient Teacher

- ___ discusses with observer the completed forms and the classroom/lab observation
- ___ makes notes for later use in the *Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report, Part II, items 4 & 5*

● **Closing Stage**

Observer

- ___ sends originals of completed forms to the chair within 2 days of post-observation conference:
Peer Rating of Course Design Features
Peer Rating of Teaching Qualities/Process Skills
Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report, Part I, items 2 & 3

Recipient Teacher

- ___ completes *Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report, Part II, items 4 & 5*
- ___ sends the following to the chair within 5 days of post-observation conference:
self-evaluation report (variety of formats possible)
Written Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report, Part II, items 4 & 5

Chair

- ___ files the peer review forms/reports and the self-evaluation report in the recipient teacher's personnel action dossier (PAD) for review by the recipient teacher and appropriate personnel action committee(s)

Schedule of Meetings:

Type	Date	Time	Location
Pre-observation Conference	_____	_____	_____
In-Classroom/Lab Observation	_____	_____	_____
Post-observation Conference	_____	_____	_____