



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



Memorandum

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

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

From: Richard D. Ringeisen  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Date: November 6, 1996

Subject: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures and Instrument

I am pleased to approve the School of Social Work's peer classroom observation procedures. Your procedures indicate that your unit will use the Faculty Senate's instrument for observation.

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

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



*Dot,  
For you,  
Rich*

**MEMORANDUM**

School of Social Work  
Ragsdale Building

919-328-4383  
919-328-4196 fax

Office of the Dean  
328-4208

Office of the Associate Dean  
for Undergraduate Studies  
328-4192/4194

Office of the Associate Dean  
for Graduate Studies  
328-4199/4206

Office of Field Education  
328-4211/4210

Office of the Director  
of Criminal Justice  
328-4572

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

FROM: Gary R. Lowe, Dean

*Gary R. Lowe*

DATE: October 29, 1996

RE: Peer Classroom Observation Procedures

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

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

GRL:jao  
Enclosure

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

Re: Procedures for peer evaluation of faculty performance.

Here are our recommendations on peer evaluation procedures.

1. **The School will establish a Teaching Effectiveness Committee that will be responsible for facilitating the Peer Review Process and the Development of Teaching Effectiveness for the faculty.** The Teaching Effectiveness Committee will be a standing committee of the faculty. This committee will be elected by the faculty and will elect a chair.
2. **All faculty members will have their classroom teaching observed.** For probationary term faculty, there will be a minimum of one classroom observation experience (as outlined in this document) prior to each re-appointment evaluation. For tenured faculty, there will be a minimum of one classroom observation experience every four years.
3. **Only trained observers are to be used for peer classroom observation.** Training for the Faculty Senate approved procedures and instrument will be held at the beginning of each semester. There will be a minimum of four faculty members, two tenured and two nontenured, who will be trained each semester until all faculty have been trained.
4. **One of the two observers for each experience will be selected by the faculty member to be observed and the other will be selected by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee.**
5. **For each observation experience, at least 4 class sessions will be observed over a specified time and these class sessions will be observed by a minimum of 2 observers.**
6. **The faculty member to be observed chooses the course to be observed.**
7. **The observers will employ the instrument established by the Faculty Senate.**
8. **There will be a pre-observation conference between the observers and the faculty member who is to be observed.** The purpose of this conference is for the faculty member to provide the observers with appropriate information so they can more effectively observe the classroom teaching in the designated class session.
9. **There is to be a post-observation conference between observers and the faculty member to be observed.** The purpose of this conference is to provide timely feedback from the observation to the observed faculty member. Sound professional practice indicates that the observed faculty member should receive a copy of an observer's completed instrument at least 24 hours prior to this post-observation conference.
10. **The completed observation instruments will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and the faculty member will have the right to provide a written statement in response.**
11. **Materials from the peer classroom observation process will be included in any personnel action dossier (PAD) submitted by a faculty member in an application for reappointment or in an application for tenure and promotion, or both.**

School of Social Work

Faculty Senate Instrument

1

## **Faculty Senate Resolution 93-44**

Approved by the Faculty Senate: December 7, 1993

Approved by the Chancellor: February 8, 1994

### **PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES AND A SAMPLE COPY OF A PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT**

Peer Review Procedures and Sample Instrument with the following caveats:

- 1) that the instrument and procedures be used to assess and improve teaching;
- 2) that all observers be trained to evaluate teaching through special sessions to be designed and implemented later;
- 3) that the Chancellor appoint a committee of no fewer than three members to do a three year validation study on this instrument, the results of which may necessitate additions and/or deletions in the procedures and/or instrument; and
- 4) that departments have the option of selecting other instruments and procedures which would be approved by the appropriate vice chancellor.

Further, in accordance with the spirit of multiple evaluation procedures, the professor is recommended to supplement the results of the observations with any additional appropriate evidence of effective teaching such as portfolios, student evaluations, etc.

#### TRAINING OUTLINE

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

**Faculty Senate Resolution 05-03**

Approved by the Faculty Senate: January 25, 2005

Approved by the Chancellor: February 7, 2005

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

Professor \_\_\_\_\_

Class \_\_\_\_\_

Time \_\_\_\_\_

# of Students \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Category 1: Organization

Begins the instructional session in a timely fashion

Provides needed information in a timely manner

Clearly states goals or objectives for the instructional session

Reviews prior instructional material to prepare the students for the content to be covered.

Summarizes and/or distills main points at the close of the instructional session

Presents topics in logical sequence and flow

Comments:

Needs Improvement		Does Well		NA/U O

---

---

---

**Category 4: Rapport/Interaction**

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

---

---

---

Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA/U O

**Category 5: Active Learning (labs, PE activities, clinics, etc.) OPTIONAL**

Clearly explains directions or procedures  
Facilitates access to materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity in a timely manner  
Explains safety procedures when warranted  
Allows sufficient time for completion  
Comments:

---

---

---

Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA/U O

NA/UO - not applicable/unable to observe