

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
of  
The City University of New York

Peer Review of Teaching

Kingsborough Community College values excellence in teaching. Teaching quality and effectiveness include a collaborative effort by the individual instructor and the entire faculty. This shared responsibility should be reflected within the process of evaluating teaching through peer review.

Each untenured member of the faculty is evaluated at least once a semester through classroom observation by another faculty member of equal or higher rank in his or her department. Observations of tenured faculty are required for all promotions. The observation of an instructor teaching a class and the evaluation of teaching effectiveness by a peer have two purposes. Article 18 of the CUNY-PSC Collective Bargaining Agreement states:

The evaluation of the professional activities of all employees in a public institution of higher education is essential to the maintenance of academic and professional standards of excellence. The purpose of professional evaluations shall be to encourage the improvement of individual professional performance and to provide a basis for decisions on reappointment, tenure and promotion . . . . Evaluation of a member of the teaching faculty shall be based on total academic performance, with special attention to teaching effectiveness . . . .

The observation and evaluation of teaching by one's peers should foster professional growth. While there is no single best way to deliver instruction, the observation and evaluation of classroom teaching should reflect practices of good teaching which the departmental faculty values.

The purposes of the attached form are to provide a systematic basis for observation and evaluation of instruction that is as equitable as possible for all disciplines, styles, and modes of instruction (in-person, hybrid, and online) and to create a standardized record that promotes greater reliability among different observers. The form is a combination of checklist, rating sheet and written analysis. By using the form to its fullest capacity, the observer can mentor new instructors, assist colleagues, and promote teaching excellence. Personnel and Budget Committee decisions regarding reappointment, promotion or tenure should not be the first time a member of the faculty hears he or she needs to improve teaching effectiveness. Observers have responsibility for providing specific feedback and suggestions via this process each time they evaluate a colleague's performance.

Furthermore, the observer's task is not only to evaluate, but to create a dialogue between peers. The focus of the discussion should be the theories, best practices and ideas about what constitutes excellence in teaching. It is hoped that both practitioners of the art of teaching benefit from the peer review process.

Peer Review of Teaching Report

In observing faculty members, we are looking to see ways in which instructors help students achieve the learning objectives of each course. We can usefully think about the teaching performance under several necessarily interrelated headings. We understand that different disciplines will entail different pedagogical emphases, and so we have allowed room for departments to create their own questions under Departmental Priorities. In addition, the mode of instruction (in-person, hybrid, or online) may necessitate shifts in emphasis within these guidelines. Throughout the observation form the term "learning unit" is used instead of lesson in order to be inclusion of all delivery modes. This Departmental Priorities section also provides space for the

department and/or the observer to note the areas they feel are most significant for a given discipline and/or mode of instruction. The following questions are meant to serve as guides in observation of faculty members.

1. Classroom or Course Site Management. Is the instructor an effective facilitator for the learning environment? Is attendance recorded? Is the atmosphere in the learning environment conducive to effective learning? Are course expectations and standards of behavior clearly communicated?
2. Instructional Coherence. Is the lesson under observation coherent in itself, with a clear focus which is clearly presented and reinforced by the instructor? Does the instructor provide/ elicit enough depth and detail to adequately consider the subject? Is the lesson part of a coherent learning process? Is the pacing of the lesson appropriate to the course and to the students? Are topics/activities sequenced logically? What evidence is there that the class fits in with a series of lessons designed to help students achieve the objectives of the course?
3. Teaching Strategies. What teaching strategies or premises about teaching does the instructor rely on? How is the subject of the lesson related to the course objectives? How effectively do the instructor's strategies help students achieve the course objectives? How does the instructor's presentation of material, including discussion, questioning, class and group activities, support learning objectives? Is the teaching of critical thinking\* emphasized? Is there good use of examples/explanation to clarify points, including those questioned by students? Are student questions encouraged? Is sufficient time given for students to respond to instructor's questions? Is there opportunity for students to interact so that they may discover, discuss, or apply content points? Are graphics, chalkboard, etc. used effectively?  
\*Critical Thinking could include any of the following: challenging students to understand complex ideas, analyze, compare/contrast, evaluate arguments, carefully consider a variety of perspectives, draw conclusions, and synthesize information.
4. Subject Mastery. Does the instructor demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and understanding of the learning situation (including a sense of the students themselves) in which the subject matter is presented? Is the subject matter and level of analysis being asked of the students of a degree of difficulty suitable to the course? Is the material presented relevant to the purpose of the course?
5. Instructor and Students Attitudes and Characteristics. Are interactions among students and instructor respectful, positive, and educationally productive? Is it clear that both instructor and students are prepared for the class? What evidence is there of interest, enthusiasm, and engagement in class activities on the side of the instructor and of the students? Does the instructor motivate students and encourage student learning in appropriate ways? Does the instructor respond appropriately to student behaviors and concerns? Does the instructor's tone, voice, etc. contribute to engaging students?
6. Departmental Priorities. In what ways does the lesson support the specific educational priorities of a given department? Are there any specific elements of instruction that warrant stronger emphasis than others, due to the nature of the discipline or mode of instruction? Additional Departmental Observation Elements (if needed) will be determined annually by each departmental P&B.

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
of  
The City University of New York

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING REPORT

INSTRUCTOR \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SUBJECT \_\_\_\_\_  
OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF OBS. \_\_\_\_\_  
Course \_\_\_\_\_ Section \_\_\_\_\_ Room \_\_\_\_\_  
Time Obs. Began \_\_\_\_\_ Time Obs. Ended \_\_\_\_\_  
Instructional delivery: \_\_\_ Face-to-face \_\_\_ Hybrid \_\_\_ Online  
Purpose: Reappointment [ ] Year \_\_\_\_\_ Promotion [ ]  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

What is the topic of this lesson?

---

---

---

---

What are the objectives of this lesson? (Must be obtained from instructor prior to observation)

---

---

---

---

Were the objectives of the lesson communicated to the students? \_\_\_\_\_

Were the objectives of the lesson met? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

What evidence was there that the instructor did or did not achieve these objectives?

---

---

---

---

Brief summary of lesson:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Consider each teaching element below and evaluate the teaching skills of the instructor by placing a check mark under the term best describing your evaluation of the instructor's actions. Add comments to illustrate your evaluation. Provide at least a summary evaluation in each category, and evaluations and comments on individual points where you feel you have observed enough to make them. (N.B. "Needs Improvement", "Effective" and "Highly Effective" are to be considered satisfactory evaluations. "Not Applicable" shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

<b>Management of Learning Environment</b>	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
<b>The instructor:</b>						
1. Timeline of the learning unit, including start and end times, is clearly communicated and applied.						
2. Attendance is recorded.						
3. Standards of conduct conducive to learning are clearly communicated and maintained.						

Summary

<b>Instructional Coherence</b>	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
<b>The instructor:</b>						
4. Introduced the learning unit (overview or focusing activity).						
5. Paced topics or activities appropriately.						
6. Sequenced topics or activities logically and with continuity.						
7. Related the learning unit to previous or future learning units or assignments.						
8. Provided summary or review of major learning unit points.						

Summary

<b>Teaching Strategies Used</b>  <b>The instructor:</b>	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needs	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
9. Presented or explained content clearly.						
10. Used examples to clarify points.						
11. Varied explanations to respond to student questions or need for clarification.						
12. Fostered critical thinking.						
13. Emphasized important points or highlighted learning objectives in activities.						
14. Used enhancements (to support presentation).						
15. Encouraged student participation / questions.						
16. Asked questions to assess student learning.						
17. Provided opportunities for students to discuss and answer questions.						
18. Provided opportunities for students to interact together to discover / discuss or practice content points.						

Summary

<b>Subject Mastery</b>  <b>The instructor:</b>	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needs	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
19. Presented content at a level appropriate for the students.						
20. Presented material relevant to the level of the course.						
21. Demonstrated command of the subject matter.						

Summary

<b>Instructor and Student Attitudes and Characteristics</b>  <b>The instructor:</b>	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
22. Instilled appreciation for the subject.						
23. Showed respect for student questions and responses.						
24. Communicated effectively with the students and was easy to understand.						
25. Presented information or led discussions with enthusiasm and interest.						
26. Responded appropriately to student behaviors and concerns.						
<b>The instructor maintained an environment where students were expected to:</b>						
27. Engage in the learning process and activities.						
28. Show evidence of preparation.						
29. Maintain an atmosphere of civility and mutual respect.						

Summary

<b>Additional Departmental Observation Elements (if needed) to be determined annually by the departmental P&amp;B</b>	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Not Applicable	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Areas of emphasis specific to the discipline or mode of instruction.</b>						
1. Management of learning environment						
2. Instructional coherence						
3. Teaching strategies						
4. Subject mastery						
5. Instructor and student attitudes						
6. Departmental priorities						

Summary

Evaluation of Lesson:

Comments:

Specific Recommendations for Improvement:



Additional Comments:

Overall Evaluation of Lesson:

Satisfactory:

Unsatisfactory:

Signature of Observer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

I understand that my signature means only that I have read this observation report:

Faculty member's signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_