EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the 1993/1994 Faculty Senate will be held on **Tuesday, October 19, 1993**, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Approval of Minutes**

   September 14, 1993

III. **Special Order of the Day**

   A.   Roll Call

   B.   Announcements

   C.   Marlene Springer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

   D.   J. Craig Souza, Chairman of the East Carolina University Board of Trustees

   E.   Gerry Clayton, Assistant Director of Admissions
        Breakdown of the 1993/94 Freshman Class

   F.   Larry Hough, Faculty Assembly Delegate
        Meeting of September 17, 1993

IV. **Unfinished Business**

V. **Report of Committees**

   A.   Committee on Committees, Brian Harris
        1.   Nominee for the Enrollment Management Council (attachment 1).

        2.   First reading of the Revised Student Retention Committee charge(attachment 2).

   B.   Curriculum Committee, Donald Neal
        Undergraduate Curriculum matters contained in the September 23, Committee Minutes, including revisions of:
        1.   BS in Environmental Health
        2.   Religious Studies minor
        3.   International Studies minor concentration in Latin American Studies

   C.   Educational Policies and Planning Committee, Ken Wilson
        Revision to the *Faculty Manual*, Part III, Academic Information (attachment 3).

   D.   Faculty Affairs Committee, Henry Ferrell
        1.   Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policy Statement and Procedures (attachment 4) (Due to the report's bulk, relevant policies of the Board of Governors and specific forms for disclosures and notices will be distributed, under separate cover, to unit code administrators, Faculty Senators, Alternates, and upon request.)

        2.   Faculty Opinion Survey on Merit Pay (attachment 5) (Due to the report's bulk, the statistical information, unedited comments, and bibliography will be distributed, under separate cover, to unit code administrators, Faculty Senators, Alternates, and upon request.)

   E.   Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Parmalee Hawk
        Peer Review (attachment 6).

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Nominee for the Enrollment Management Council

Robert Bernhardt, Department of Mathematics

CHARGE: The Council is charged to make recommendations to the Chancellor on enrollment management on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including but not limited to physical plant adequacy, instructional resources, library and other educational support services resources, and faculty workload analyses. The Enrollment Management Council should initiate its agenda with a consideration of the fifteen recommendations accepted by the Chancellor form Faculty Senate Resolution #93-13. The Enrollment Management Council should bring before the Faculty Senate and/or the Graduate Council matters appropriate to the deliberations of those bodies prior to making any related recommendations to the Chancellor. The Enrollment Management Council should address the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council at least annually and regularly provide minutes to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors.

◇◇◇

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

FIRST READING OF REVISIONS TO THE STUDENT RETENTION COMMITTEE CHARGE
(**additions in bold print**............deletions are underlined)

1.   Name: Student Retention **and Advising** Committee

2.   Membership:
6 faculty members and 1 student member. Ex-officio member (with vote): The Chair of the Faculty. Ex-officio members (without vote but with all other parliamentary privileges): The Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Vice Chancellor for Student Life, Chair of the Readmission Appeals Committee or their appointed representatives.

3.   Quorum: 4 elected faculty members exclusive of ex-officio.

4.   A. Committee Functions:
The Student Retention **and Advising** Committee is concerned with matters relating to the retention **and advising** of students. The Committee reviews policies and procedures governing orientation, and retention, **and advising** of students. **Policies and procedures regarding advising in the General College will be coordinated with the General Education Committee.**

B. To Whom The Committee Reports:
The Committee recommends policies and procedures governing orientation, and retention, **and advising** of students to the Faculty Senate.

C. How Often The Committee Reports:
The Committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and other times as necessary.

D. Power Of The Committee To Act:

The Committee makes recommendations concerning the implementation and administration of policies and procedures regarding the orientation, and retention, **and advising** of students to the appropriate University officials.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed Revisions to the *Faculty Manual*
(**additions in bold print,** deletions are underlined)

Revise the *Faculty Manual*, Part III, Academic Information, Subsection, Curriculum Development (pp 39-40) to read:

Curriculum development is a faculty responsibility. Recommendations for new courses and course revisions originate within the various schools and departments and within interdepartmental committees. Courses are approved by the unit faculty in accordance with unit code provisions and by the Council for Teacher Education, when appropriate. Undergraduate and 5000-level courses require consideration by the following bodies: the College or School Curriculum Committee; the University Curriculum Committee; the Faculty Senate; and the chancellor. In addition to unit approval and, when appropriate, teacher education council approval, 5000-level and other graduate courses require consideration by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. New and revised areas of concentration **and** options, **and revised** minors, etc. which **that** do not require UNC-General Administration approval are also approved by this Procedure. **New minors must follow the campus procedures for new degree programs.**

The development of new degree programs is a shared responsibility of the faculty, the administration at East Carolina University, the ECU Board of Trustees, the UNC-General Administration, and the UNC Board of Governors; the Board of Governors has final statutory responsibility to determine the functions, educational activities, and academic programs of the constituent institutions.

Recommendations for new degree programs originate within the various schools and departments or within interdepartmental committees. **Before making any formal request to plan a new program, the unit must consult with all other units that may be affected, including Joyner Library, Health Sciences Library, and Computing and Information Systems.** Requests for authorization to plan are reviewed on campus by the undergraduate or graduate committee in the faculty governance curriculum review procedures depicted in chart form, as follows. Through administrative channels, the unit dean recommends to the vice chancellor for academic affairs or the vice chancellor for health sciences, as appropriate, who recommends to the chancellor. For graduate programs, the graduate dean will forward his or her recommendations with those of the Graduate Council to the appropriate vice chancellor, who will recommend to the chancellor. Requests for authorization to plan new degree programs are forwarded to the president of the University of North Carolina by the chancellor. Proposals for new degree programs require authorization to plan from the president of the University of North Carolina and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs of the Board of Governors.

Requests to establish new degree programs that have received authorization to plan must be approved by the unit faculty according to unit code requirements. **Before making any formal request to establish a new program, the unit must again consult with all other units that may be affected, including Joyner Library, Health Sciences Library, and Computing and Information Systems.** The requests to establish are then reviewed according to the faculty governance curriculum review procedures depicted in chart form, as follows. The administrative approval process is the same as that described above for requests for authorization to plan. The chancellor forwards the proposed new degree programs with the requests for authorization to establish to the president of the University of North Carolina for approval. The president submits the proposed program to the UNC Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs, which recommends to the Board of Governors. If the new degree program requires new resources, the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs, acting jointly with the board's Committee on Budget and Finance, will so recommend to the board. The president will communicate to the chancellor the decision of the board and, in the event of favorable action, an approximate date for the initiation of the program.

Authorization to establish new tracks in already established degree programs follows the same procedure as that outlined in the above paragraph for authorization to establish new degrees. It is not necessary to request authorization to plan a track.

Formats for requests for authorization to plan and to establish new degree programs and tracks are available in the offices of deans and vice chancellors. The additional information required by on-campus reviewers is listed in the Faculty Senate office.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy Statement and Procedures

(Due to the report's bulk, relevant policies of the Board of Governors and the specific forms for disclosures and notices will be distributed, under separate cover, to unit code administrators, Faculty Senators, Alternates, and upon request.)

CONTENTS

Introduction

The Concepts at Issue

Procedures

Annual Faculty/Professional Staff Disclosure Form

Relevant Policies of the Board of Governors (not included here)

    ❧   Policies and Guidelines of the Board of Governors Concerning Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Affecting University Employment

    ❧   Policy Statement on External Professional Activities of Faculty and Other Professional Staff

Specific Forms for Disclosures and Notices (not included here)

    A.   Disclosure of Directorships and other Corporate Interdependencies

    B.   Notice of Intent to Engage in External Professional Activities for Pay

    C.   Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest Relating to Teaching and Ownership of other Intellectual Property.

INTRODUCTION

Effective July 1, 1993, all EPA faculty and other professional staff of East Carolina University are subject to new or revised policies concerning conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment affecting University employment and external professional activities. These policies were approved by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina on April 16, 1993, and are for implementation during the 1993-94 academic year.

The following sections of this appendix:
◆ REVIEW the concepts at issue in the policies,

◆ LIST the procedures to be followed in implementing these policies,

◆ PROVIDE a copy of the "Annual Faculty/Professional Staff Disclosure Form" which is the focus of those procedures,

◆ CONVEY the complete text of the relevant Board of Governors' policies on these matters, and

◆ ILLUSTRATE the three specific forms that must be used when appropriate to record administrative oversight of these activities.

Any questions regarding these procedures or the Board of Governor's policies upon which they are based should be directed to the Office of the University Attorney.

THE CONCEPTS AT ISSUE

The distinction between conflicts of commitment and interest is not always clear. In general, conflict of commitment relates to allocation of time and should become apparent in the annual review process conducted by the administrative superior. Conflict of interest involves matters which might unduly influence employee judgment in the conduct of employee affairs, such that some merely personal advantage is or might be unduly gained.

Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy Statement and Procedures (continued)

More specifically, CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT occurs when the pursuit of outside activities involve an inordinate investment of time that interferes with the faculty or professional staff member's obligations to students, to colleagues, and/or to the missions of the University. CONFLICT OF INTEREST occurs when financial or other personal considerations compromise the faculty or professional staff member's objectivity in fulfilling University duties or responsibilities, including research activities.

The purpose of asserting policies concerning these concepts is not to limit responsible external activities, but rather to ensure that all activities are accurately disclosed and to reduce the probability of the occurrence of inappropriate activities.

PROCEDURES
Effective July 1, 1993, each faculty member as well as all other EPA employees will be required to disclose the extent of their relevant activities each year. To facilitate disclosure and to ensure appropriate uniformity across the University, each individual will complete the "Annual Faculty/Professional Staff Disclosure Form." Each administrator will distribute this form [see sample below] to all faculty and professional staff [EPA non-faculty] under his or her supervision.

The purpose of this form is to identify employees' activities which may lead to actual or perceived conflicts of commitment or interest such that appropriate administrative intervention can resolve any problem. The employee and the administrative superior are to complete and sign the annual disclosure form, which implies that the administrative superior has reviewed the form. The forms will be maintained in the administrative office and no further action will be required if all questions are answered "no."

Further disclosure and review is required if activities elicit any "yes" on the annual form. The employee must then complete and sign the appropriate additional forms and these forms must also be reviewed and signed by the administrative superior. These completed forms must be forwarded to the next higher administrator for final approval [e.g., to the dean where a chairperson was the original administrative superior, or to the appropriate vice chancellor where a dean was the original administrative superior]. These disclosure forms will be maintained in the originating administrative office.

If after review by the designated administrative officer, questions remain regarding ethical issues or if disagreement exists between the employee and the administrator regarding the permissibility of any activity, the case shall be referred to the appropriate vice chancellor who would then consult with the associate vice chancellor for research, and other deans and faculty as deemed appropriate, before rendering the administrative decision.

ANNUAL FACULTY/PROFESSIONAL STAFF DISCLOSURE FORM
Completion of this form is required annually of all faculty and EPA nonfaculty employees of the University. Further, specific forms must be completed, respectively, if any questions listed in Sections A, B, and C below are answered in the affirmative.

Moreover, if you intend to undertake activities for pay which do not involve the professional knowledge for which the University retains your services, your signature and the signature of your administrative superior are taken to indicate that you and that superior have discussed these activities and that such activities have been deemed consistent with proper fulfillment of your University duties and, therefore, cause no conflict of commitment.

SECTION A: If the answer to any of questions 1 through 5 are "yes," then complete the specific form entitled "Disclosure of Directorships and other Corporate Interdependencies."

1.   Are you or a member of your immediate family on the Board of Directors of a company that sponsors research, outreach, extension, testing, or service projects in which you are a participant?

2.   Are you or a member of your immediate family an officer of a company that sponsors research, outreach, extension, testing, or service projects in which you are a participant?

Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy Statement and Procedures (continued)

3. Do you or a member of your immediate family have an ownership/equity interest/expectancy in a company that sponsors research, outreach, extension, testing, or service projects in which you are a participant?

4. Are you or a member of your immediate family an employee of a company that sponsors research, outreach, extension, testing, or service projects in which you are a participant?

5. Are you in a position which may supervise, select, or otherwise evaluate services provided to the University by a company in which you or a member of your immediate family have an ownership interest?

SECTION B: If the answer to any of questions 6 through 8 is "yes," then complete the specific form entitled "Notice of Intent to Engage in External Professional Activities for Pay."

6. Are you or a member of your immediate family engaged in professional activities for pay with a company that sponsors research,. outreach, extension, testing, or service projects in which you are a participant?

7. Do you supervise any graduate students that work for a company in which you are on the board of directors, an officer, have ownership interest, or are employed by for professional activities for pay?

8. Do you employ any graduate students in your external professional activities for pay?

SECTION C: If the answer to question 9 or 10 is "yes," then complete the specific form entitled "Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interests Relating to Teaching and Ownership of other Intellectual Property."

9. Are you the author of a textbook, course pack, lab manual or other material, for which you receive royalties or other compensation from sources other than the University, that is required for any class that you teach?

10. Are you the owner of any intellectual property [patent, trademark, copyright, software, or trade secret] that the University uses?

SIGNATURES

EPA Employee _____   Date _____

Title_____

Department/Office_____

Administrative Superior _____   Date _____

Next Higher Administrator_____   Date _____

Revised editorially — see memo + attachments dated 10-4-93

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

Faculty Opinion Survey on Merit Pay at East Carolina University

(Due to the report's bulk, the statistical information, unedited comments, and bibliography will be distributed, under separate cover, to unit code administrators, Faculty Senators, Alternates, and upon request.)

<u>OVERVIEW</u>

The term "merit pay" is persistently used in higher education to identify a system that determines, by assessing the quality of the individual's performance, annual salary increments for a faculty member. General agreement exists that the for determining such a reward comes from three areas--teaching, research, and service. More difficult to answer are the questions : What is merit pay? How is it allocated? What does it achieve? To answer these questions requires an assessment of each institution. There exists no commonly accepted means for implementing merit pay. In research institutions, the conventional wisdom holds that research and publication of the results of such research is the commanding factor in the reward of merit. In other institutions--as community colleges-- teaching is the prime mover. Additionally, in service-oriented colleges, service may be a more significant factor. Ironically, in the instance of comprehensive universities, all three in varying degrees are part of the merit formula.

Several common problems do exists in all institutions. The most basic conundrum evolves from the great difficulty in quantifying the unquantifiable. Although published research may be readily assessed by peer review and may be relatively uniform in assessment standards, teaching and service evaluations carry taxing challenges. In the administration of merit pay, how much of the annual salary increment should be given to merit? In using student opinion polls of teaching, what allowances are made for the conditions that may exists that shows a professor may be an excellent teacher in small classes but less so in large classes? What standards can be used to mitigate time required by new faculty learning how to teach effectively large classes? Does the time of day that a course is taught effect student opinion of teaching? In using the summary of teaching scores, does the individual teach compete against her colleagues in the award of merit for teaching? Does a 4.3 compared to a 4.5 on a five point scale indicate anything? Is a 3 an adequate evaluation by a student, but a disaster to the faculty member when the unit mean is 4.3? Is there an inherent cultural and/or gender bias on the part of students that influences their scores? What are the subtle differences in determining the quality of service? Thus, the list of questions grows when quantification predominates in assessing the unquauntifiable.

Nationally, there exists two extremely different types of pay systems. Professor W. Lee Hansen[1] has labeled one a structured system. The other he chooses to identify as a flexible, unstructured salary system. In the first, faculty members are tied to a single fixed salary approach. Merit is not a factor. Each new class of faculty advance at the same rate until some cap occurs, usually in twenty or twenty-five years. In the second system, annual increases vary between faculty members as each year's increase is determined on merit. Most institutions lie within two poles. Some combine longevity, rank, and inflation adjustments with a merit allocation.

In University of North Carolina system, merit pay is the standard identifying characteristic of the salary system and has been for twenty years or more, save when the legislature, on rare occasions, mandated an across the board increment to faculty. This has been either by a specific figure or a percentage of total monies available for raises. The Board of Governors and the present and immediate past president of the system have preferred a merit system that allows for each constituent institution's to determine the factors that compose the merit award system. Only recently has there been any discussion by the Board of Governors in considering any priorities in the award of merit pay at the system level. Thus, at this level, the practice has been to implement a flexible, unstructured salary system.

When the annual salary increment funds arrive at East Carolina University, the last several chancellors have generally allowed the individual units' administrators to recommend merit increases based upon local, approved unit interpretations of the triune of research,

---

[1]W. Lee Hansen, "Merit Pay in Higher Education," in *Academic Labor Markets and Careers*, David Breneman and Ted Youn, editors, New York: Falmer Press, 1988, pp. 114-137 at the time of publication of this article, Professor Hansen was Professor of Economic and Industrial Relations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is a leading commentator on labor markets and higher education.

Faculty Opinion Survey on Merit Pay at East Carolina University (continued)

teaching, and service. These assessments are translated into a figure for or figures for the purposes of ranking a faculty member's performance and awarding merit salary increments. Funds have also been made available for salary adjustments owing to inequities or market conditions. This local system is more structured than the UNC system approach geared to individual academic units' concepts of merit, operating under a university-wide set of standards. The term "merit pay" tends to be a variable concept at East Carolina University.

Hansen concluded his commentary on merit pay with the following:
> We know too little about merit pay in higher education. A comprehensive research program is needed to describe how merit pay systems operate, their effectiveness in rewarding meritorious faculty members, and the response of faculty members to their merit increases.[2]

The Faculty Affairs Committee has sought to determine what faculty members believe merit pay is how faculty members think it is allocated, and what faculty members believe it accomplishes at the University. In doing so, the Committee believes it is aiding in determining the nature of merit pay in higher education.

<u>DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT</u>

Members of the Subcommittee on Merit Pay were appointed by John Moskop, Chair of the Faculty, and included Henry Ferrell (Chair), Artemis Kares, Karen Hancock, Bob Hursey, Susan McCammon, and Stephen Thomas. John Crammer with the Department of Mathematics served as the statistical consultant. The subcommittee met on October 7, 1992, to discuss its charge "...to investigate merit pay." The subcommittee continued to meet during October and November to determine the parameters of its charge in developing a faculty survey to be distributed during Spring semester 1993.

In NA effort to assist the members with the development of the survey, assorted merit-related publications were distributed, including articles form *Academe*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Higher Education*, *AAUP*, and questionnaires from several universities. As the subcommittee met it discussed these publications and their use in developing the ECU survey. In their efforts to ascertain a focus, the members discussed issues including the application and use of merit pay, a definition of merit pay, sources of merit pay, the impact of merit pay on faculty morale and performance.

The subcommittee agreed that the survey should be sent to all tenured and tenured-track faculty. Faculty in fixed-term appointments would not be surveyed.

Three members of the subcommittee were assigned the task of developing a merit survey. This group began the process by reviewing merit surveys/questionnaires constructed by several other universities. Based on the subcommittee's charge and a review of pertinent literature and available surveys, primary focus areas were identified and used as the outline for developing survey items. In general, these areas included:
1. How merit awards were determined.
2. The perceptions about merit.
3. The effect of merit on performance

Each question on the initial survey draft was reviewed by the survey development team and revised as needed. The resulting 54 item survey was then reviewed and edited, item-by-item, b the subcommittee. The subcommittee presented the proposed survey to the Faculty Affairs Committee where it was reviewed, amended, and approved. The final survey was distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty at the beginning of the 1993 Spring semester.

Survey responses were based on a Likert-type scale with answers to be recorded on a NCS answer sheet for computer analysis. This first section contained 45 questions that addressed the determination, perceptions, and effects of merit. The second section, with nine questions, covered biographical data of the respondent. The third and final section provided for comments regarding merit that the respondent felt were not adequately addressed in the questionnaire.

---

[2] Ibid., 133.

Faculty Opinion Survey on Merit Pay at East Carolina University (continued)

SYNOPSIS

In late March 1993, the subcommittee forwarded to the more than 900 tenured and/or tenure-track faculty (including the School of Medicine faculty) a questionnaire designed to determine faculty perceptions of merit pay policies and practices at ECU. Nearly 360 surveys were completed and returned (a return of approximately 40% whose mix of respondents seems reasonably representative of the survey audience). Reduction of the data revealed the following attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions :

Respondents feel -- though weakly -- that they understand unit criteria and practices for determining merit pay awards (Q6); however, they are less certain of their unit criteria and practices for determining individual award amounts, manifesting roughly the same degree of uncertainty that merit magnitudes mirror quality of performance (Q8, 10, 11).

Respondents strongly oppose determination of merit awards by administrators external to their unit (Q14), nor do they seem to care much for merit award determination by a unit committee (Q12): Unit administrator judgment was the preferred method of individual merit determination (Q13).

Respondents perceive that little weight -- perhaps too little -- is accorded teaching effectiveness in determination of merit awards (Q17, 18), that great emphasis -- perhaps too great -- is accorded research/creative activity (Q19, 20), and that little -- perhaps too little -- weight is accorded service (Q21, 22). Respondents also failed to confirm the consistency of ECU merit pay policies and the mission of ECU (Q25).

Pervasive dissatisfaction with perceived ECU merit pay policies and procedures is confirmed by Q26 (and Q27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36). Moreover, respondents disagree strongly that ECU merit pay policies have: increased faculty morale; increased institutional loyalty; increased teaching effectiveness; made ECU a better place to work; promoted collegiality; been consistent with professional goals and standards; or encouraged ethical behavior. Respondents do, however, believe that ECU merit pay policies have increased publication (Q30), even though they disagree that the quality of research/creative activity has been increased by said policies (Q31). Combining faculty responses to the 10 questions, Q27-36 whose characteristics are the subject of this paragraph, the respondents disagree rather strongly that ECU merit pay policies have positively influenced those characteristics.

Furthermore, among those faculty who responded to questions 1 and 26 and who have "generally received more than average merit awards" (25.6% of respondents), less than half (49%) agreed (by having responded either "very greatly" or "completely" to Q26) that they were satisfied with ECU merit pay policies and procedures (Q26). Similar comparisons of this favored group's opinions revealed that: less than half (48%) felt that merit pay policies had increased quality of research/creative activity (Q31); only 17.4% felt that institutional loyalty had been increased; only 15.2% felt that faculty morale had been increased; only 27% felt that teaching effectiveness had been increased; only 47.94% felt collegiality had been increased; only 33% felt that ECU had been made a better place to work; and 54% agreed that merit pay policies had been consistent with their professional goals and standards.

Respondents agreed that raise monies should be used to rectify salary inequities (Q37, 38), that (in response to inflationary pressures) smaller merit and larger across-the-board increases should be provided (Q40), that the establishment of a competitive level of pay for all faculty is more important than assignment of individual merit awards (Q42), that raises should be influenced by unavailability of past merit monies (Q39), that merit evaluations should cover a period longer than one year (Q43), and that each unit should receive an equal percentage of its salary budget for merit increases.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Peer Review

The North Carolina Legislature has recently mandated peer observation of teaching for all new and non-tenured faculty. On September 10, the Board of Governors approved the following statement"...that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants..."

The following information is the Teaching Effectiveness Committee's recommendation for the procedures and instrument to conduct those observations. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee recommends these procedures and this instrument with the following caveats:

♠ that the instrument and procedures be used to assess and improve teaching;

♠ that all observes be trained to evaluate teaching through special sessions to be designed and implemented later;

♠ that the Chancellor appoint a committee of no fewer then 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

♠ the department have the option of selecting other instruments and procedures which would be approved by appropriate persons.

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

Procedures for Peer Observation

1.   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.

2.   Selection of trained observers to form university pool
     A.   Winners of Teaching Effectiveness Awards.
     B.   Nominations/recommendations from academic deans.
     C.   Volunteers.

     NOTES: 1) All observers must complete training.
             2) The most suitable observers are faculty who are attentive to details, highly structured, and active listeners.

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

4.   Observation procedure
     A.   pre-observation conference (observers and professor)
          1. professor provides observers with copies of handouts and a list of materials to be used during class.
          2. external observer 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.

ATTACHED IS THE PROPOSED EAST CAROLINA PEER REVIEW INSTRUMENT

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. You should be able to explain your assessments with specific examples of what the instructor did or did not do to cause you to so conclude.

Category 1: Organization

	needs improvement			does well	NA/UO
--begins class on time in an orderly, organized fashion					
--clearly states the goal or objective for the period					
--reviews prior class material to prepare students for the content to be covered					
--summarizes and distills main points at the end of class					
* _____					
* _____					

Comments: _____
_____
_____

Category 2: Presentation

	needs improvement			does well	NA/UO
--speaks audibly and clearly					
--communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement toward the content					
--presentation style facilitates note taking					
--selects teaching methods appropriate for the content					
--selects examples relevant to student experiences/course content					
--relates current course content to what's gone before and will come after					
--carefully explains assignments					
* _____					
* _____					
* _____					
* _____					

Comments: _____
_____
_____

Category 3: Rapport/Interaction

	needs improvement			does well	NA/UO
--responds constructively to student opinions/comments					
--listens carefully to student comments and questions					
--answers student questions clearly and directly					
--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					
* _____					
* _____					

Comments: _____
_____
_____

Category 4: Active Learning (labs, PE activities, clinics, etc.) OPTIONAL

--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/UO - not applicable/unable to observe