

April 29, 2025 at 3:00 PM

Room: U-219

Meeting of the College Council Volume 52 Number 6

The College Council met on Tuesday, April 29, 2025 at 3:00 PM in Room U-219.

There were in attendance:

Alley-Young, Gordon	Kane, Daniel	Rothacker, Thomas	<b><u>Students</u></b>
Armstrong, Rick	Kapetanakis, George	Rozenboym, Anna	Aminjonova, Aziza
Cally, Scott	Lax, Jeffrey	Sawyer, Jeremy	Cranston, Aaliyah
Caravello, Shannon	Levy, Dawn	Schnee, Emily	Gomez, Carlos
Cohen, Judith	Matthew, Martin	Schwartz, Eric	Gomori, Jackson
Warren Cook, Sharon	McKinney, Ryan	Segal, Jacob	King, Kiara
D'Alessandro, Mark	Mikalopas, John	Shah, Ashiza	Kryzhanovsky, Katrine
Dawson, Mary	Mintz, Tommy	Shannon, Mary	Lakhter, Steven
Del Principe, Ann	Mullen, Avery	Spear, Michael	Lwin, Nay Chi
Dillon, Sarah	Olubummo, Catherine	Tila, Dorina	Omer, Doha
Duitch, Suri	Olvina, Cynthia	Wetzel, Dominic	Rozyyeva, Enegyz
Escobar, Andres	Parker, Stuart	Yarmish, Rina	Segall, Rivka
Franquiz, Juan	Phillips, Audrey		Young, Shaquana
Gartner, Matthew	Polizzotto, Kristin		Zan, Myat Khine
Hume, Don	Ricciardi, Paul		
Jaret, Steven	Risolo, Paula		
Kalin, Amanda	Rodriguez, Michael		

College Council Chair, Daniel Kane, called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM

I. The Minutes of the meetings held on March 18, 2025 were approved by acclamation.

II. Reports

A. Updates from the Chair of College Council, Daniel Kane

- I know it's been a while since we last met, and we've heard about Middle States. I want to highlight that Middle States did say great things about the College Council and everything we are accomplishing. I want to thank everyone here. It's due to all your hard work that the College Council was able to get recognized during the Middle States process.

- Here are some updates from around CUNY
  - I had the opportunity to participate in an informal discussion with Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost Alvero. Here are some of the topics that were discussed. This is additional information related to the email we received before Spring Break. Remember that this can change at any time and nothing is set in stone
    - In terms of Grants:
      - The CUNY Office of Research and the Research Foundation of CUNY are working together to keep everyone updated about grants
      - Currently, some grants may receive a stop-work order, only to have it lifted, then reinstated, and then pulled again.
      - Some grant providers are reaching out to CUNY to confirm that grant proposals follow protocols, such as listing only Male and Female genders in surveys.
      - Lawsuits are holding up the cost proposals from grants, so everything is being paid out at the normal price. There have been no issues here.
      - Due to the grant issues at the moment, they are considering creating a working group to discuss, maybe adding a year or two onto the tenure clock. This can help faculty members who heavily rely on grants and provide them with additional time.
    - International Students SEVIS Status:
      - 26 Students (1 from KCC) SEVIS status across CUNY were revoked. I am happy to say that as of yesterday, 100% of the SEVIS statuses were reinstated. Gavin Ireland and the team at International Student Affairs are doing a great job and are monitoring the needs of our international students. If anyone has a question, please contact the International Student Affairs office.
    - Additional Information around CUNY
      - Sarah Chinn and others from Hunter College created a foundation for a concept that creates a mutual defense alliance among colleges. They are asking the Governor of New York to create a Higher Education Defense Fund that can provide legal support to students, faculty, and staff. Also, to fund losses from the federal government. CUNY colleges have created a version of the original document or are using the "Together We Stand" document from UFS. A resolution for a SUNY and CUNY mutual defense alliance recently passed the SUNY UFS. Colleges that are participating are Hunter, QCC, Hostos, John Jay, BMCC, City, Guttman, Lehman, LaGuardia, Medgar Evers, York, Brooklyn, and CSI is discussing it. A member of the Council has submitted this topic to New Business and will explain more.

## B. President's Report

### **Middle States follow-up**

The team report has been submitted to the commission with its recommendations, which, as has been stated previously, will be voted on by the commission in late May, with official notification to us in June. We had an opportunity correct factual errors, which we did – there were few. The report was consistent with the team's exit presentation. Just to repeat a couple of their major points:

- The report was overall quite positive. The report talked about us having a strong mission and being clear about our commitment to carrying it out, and for a college culture that is highly collegial. We were called out for offering strong student supports, and for the fact that student feedback about their experiences was highly positive across the board; we say that KCC is a student-centered institution and our students agree that such is the case.
- We were recognized, as well for our commitment to strategic planning, and in particular the committee strongly concurred with our decision to move forward with strategic planning this year and with our overall approach to be highly focused on goals, initiatives and measurable metrics of progress toward the goals
- The report specifically mentioned good work on the part of the faculty and in particular the curriculum committee, to offer rigorous and coherent academic programs. It was suggested that the college continue to evaluate the liberal arts major, again consistent with work that is already underway by the faculty in those fields.
- There was a recommendation under Standard V about further work around data literacy, and in particular use of data indicators focused on student success.
- As you all are aware, we received recommendations, and one requirement under Standard VI. The requirement is around addressing our structural deficit. And the recommendations are around increased transparency in the budget process, and comprehensive facilities and technology planning.
- And finally, under standard VII, we received recognition of the great work done to improve college council by electing leadership and more broadly engaging the college community in our governance.

So again, while we are certainly starting to think about how to address the team's advice, recommendations, and its one requirement around our structural deficit, we are also waiting for the board vote and the official notification that we expect in early June.

### **Strategic Plan development**

Thanks to those of you who attended our spring convocation on April 3<sup>rd</sup> and gave feedback during the polls regarding programmatic priorities under the strategic plan goals. As a reminder, we have five goals, four of them focused on some aspect of student success, and one on program quality. I think one important next step for us to is to design a sixth goal that is directly responsive to the

findings of the Middle States team related to Standard VI, which I would describe as operational excellence and coordinated planning across the college.

The issues raised by the Middle States teams are longstanding ones at the college – they didn’t suddenly emerge now, so we need to respond to them with appropriate urgency but also be deliberative, because we are setting the stage for several years’ worth of work to get to a place where our administrative functioning is at the level it needs to be at.

We have a meeting of the college council strategic planning and budgeting committee on Thursday where we will certainly talk about this, and then the executive leadership team for the strategic plan will meet in a few weeks to come up with a plan for how to develop that sixth goal.

### **Immigration policy**

Just to reiterate statements that I have already made at the past few College Council meetings – Kingsborough has a clear protocol in place for what to do if we receive either requests for access to students related to immigration status, or requests for information related to immigration status. I want to also note that we have not to this point had the need to actually utilize the protocol.

### **Commencement**

Finally, I want to say how excited I am to be in commencement season at Kingsborough – the best time of the year! We are unveiling components of our 60<sup>th</sup> commencement over time, but here are some highlights. First, we have some great creative work going on leading up to the event, spearheaded by faculty members Sarah Dillon, Tommy Mintz, and our faculty chair, Keisha Thompson – I encourage you to participate in passing along the beautiful student-designed wave cap, and in creating a square for the tapestry that will be displayed and used as a backdrop during commencement.

As you know, we are holding it at the Coney Island Amphitheatre, right on the boardwalk, a beautiful historic venue. Congressman Hakeem Jeffries is our keynote – that is going to be interesting, I’m sure! And we’ll have some Coney Island style entertainment to go along with it all. I strongly encourage staff to volunteer, and faculty to attend and cheer on your graduates. We will also have a watch party on campus for those unable to attend or volunteer.

### **C. Two-Meeting Rule Vote: College Council Membership**

College Council Chair, Daniel Kane, presented the plan to increase College Council membership for vote.

The following Amendments were made to the College Council New Membership Plan:

- Amendment to move “only” to before “faculty” first paragraph, last sentence, **passed** by majority.
- Amendment to include one (1) Part-Time Faculty member to the College Council New Membership Plan **passed** with 35 (Yes), 1 (No), and 5 (Abstentions).
- Amendment to increase Delegates-at-Large from the HEO/CLT Series from one (1) to four (4) in the College Council New Membership Plan, **passed** by majority with 7 (Abstentions).

- Amendment stating *only* Full-Time Faculty would be able to vote on Curriculum agenda items at College Council **failed** to reach majority with 4 (Yes) and 10 (Abstentions).

The resulting edits to the College Council New Membership Plan are based on the results of the above Amendments and are included below in **red text**.

**The College Council New Membership Plan with the below edits included in red text was presented for vote and passed 47 (Yes), 2 (No), and 2 (Abstentions).**

Adding one new representative from each academic department, **one new part-time instructional staff**, one new support staff, seven UFS senators, and ~~one~~ **four** new HEO/CLT Delegate-at-Large. A total of ~~23~~ **27** new seats on the College Council would increase the voting membership to ~~97~~ **101** members. In addition, ~~the~~ **only the** faculty (**full-time and part-time College Council voting members**) would ~~only~~ vote on the Curriculum agenda items at the College Council.

Total	Number
Voting Members	<del>97</del> <b>101</b> (Voting Members)
<del>49</del> <b>50</b> seats are guaranteed Faculty (If UFS members are not already CC members)	<del>51</del> <b>50%</b> Voting Members
10 Full-Time Instructional Staff Delegates at Large are held by Faculty (as of now)	<del>60</del> <b>59%</b> Voting Members are Faculty (Total)
CC Quorum	<del>49</del> <b>51</b>
Average Standing Committee (Not Curriculum) and if SGA is filled	<del>11</del> <b>12</b>

Additional Information:

- KCC UFS membership numbers can change over time. The UFS currently lists seven KCC UFS senators; alternatives will not be included.
  - A member can hold dual membership but will only have one vote at the College Council.
- The new members would be staggered in over the next few years. New academic members would join the council when their department has elections.
- UFS members will join the council membership at the start of the new council term.

The College Council New Membership Plan is included in the Minutes as *Attachment A for the 4/29/25 Meeting –College Council New Membership Plan*. Included is a Table outlining the changes to Article II: Composition of College Council.

D. Instructional Committee, Dorina Tila, Chair

- Two-Meeting Rule Vote: Updated Peer Observation Form to include RSI.

Dorina Tila, Chair of Instructional, presented the updated Peer Observation Form, which included language related to compliance with Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) minimum requirements. The updated language was included on page 1 of the Peer Observation Form, number two, under *Description of the Process* (see red text)

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
Of  
The City University of New York

**Peer Observation of Teaching**

Peer observation of teaching is a collaborative process between colleagues with the primary goal of conducting a dialogue to improve teaching. Beyond evaluating teaching for personnel action (reappointment, promotion), peer observation of teaching provides an opportunity for faculty to share best teaching practices, grow as educators, and support one another so that the best possible learning environment and experiences are provided to students. Please refer to [Article 18](#) (also, see Article 18, [Memorandum of Agreement](#)) of the CUNY-PSC Collective Bargaining Agreement as well as the [KCC Faculty Handbook section on evaluation processes](#).

**Description of the Process**

1. Notification: A faculty member will be contacted about their review of teaching, in accordance with the notification process as per Article 18, using the notification process determined by their academic department. The faculty member will be asked to respond that the date and time of the observation is acceptable. Prior to the observation, the aims of the lesson and an outline are sent the observer. Although not required, the observer may ask to meet with the observee for a conversation about specific areas of focus for the observation and how the observer can best assist the faculty member to improve their teaching.
2. Observation of the lesson: The observer will complete the Peer Observation of Teaching report. The purpose of the report is to serve as a tool to evaluate instruction in a way that is as equitable as possible for all disciplines, styles, and modes of instruction (in-person, hybrid, and online) and to create a standardized reporting format **and comply with Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) minimum requirements**. The observer rates the instructor's performance based on each criterion and provides written comments to assist colleagues to identify specific strengths or opportunities for instructional improvement.
3. Post Observation Conference Memorandum report: After the observation of the lesson is complete, the observer and observee will meet to discuss the Peer Observation of Teaching report and engage in a dialogue between colleagues offering suggestions, thinking about the instructor's teaching strengths, and possible areas for improvement. The conversation is documented in the Post Observation Conference Memorandum.

The update to the Peer Observation Form to include language related to compliance with Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) minimum requirements, **passed** 46 (Yes), 0 (No), and 4 (Abstentions).

The full Peer Observation Form with the included RSI language is included in the Minutes as *Attachment B for the 4/29/25 Meeting –Updated Peer Observation Form*.

### III. New Business

- A. A motion was made by Stuart Parker and seconded to enter a No Confidence Vote for the Interim President under the Two-Meeting Rule for discussion:

**Whereas**, the College Council of Kingsborough Community College, in fulfillment of its responsibility to safeguard the welfare of the College and to uphold its academic mission, deems it necessary to address matters of leadership affecting the institution; and

**Whereas**, internal communication at the College has all but collapsed under the current interim leadership, undermining collaboration, operations, and trust within the campus community; and

**Whereas**, there has been a demonstrated lack of transparency regarding enrollment data, decisions, and projections critical to the planning and wellbeing of the institution; and

**Whereas**, there has been a demonstrated lack of transparency surrounding the College's budget, impairing the ability of faculty, staff, and governance bodies to engage in informed decision-making; and

**Whereas**, baseless accusations of mismanagement have been made, further eroding trust and damaging the reputation of members of the campus community without cause; and

**Whereas**, the interim administration has demonstrated a consistent disregard for the work, expertise, and contributions of faculty and professional staff, undermining morale and the academic mission of the institution;

**Be it resolved**, that the College Council of Kingsborough Community College hereby expresses a vote of No Confidence in the Interim President and calls upon the Chancellor to immediately address the leadership situation at Kingsborough Community College.

Discussion of the motion followed.

- B. A motion was made by Jacob Segal and seconded to enter the CUNY UFS *Together We Stand* Statement for endorsement under the Two-Meeting Rule for discussion:



<http://www1.cuny.edu/sites/cunyufs>

John Verzani | Chair

[John.Verzani@cuny.edu](mailto:John.Verzani@cuny.edu) | 646-664-9035 | 205 East 42 Street, Rm 1012, New York, NY 10075

## TOGETHER WE STAND

We, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate of the City University of New York, believe that institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good, and

- that the success of the common good depends on the production and dissemination of knowledge;
- that the accumulation of knowledge requires an environment allowing for a critical, open, unending process conducted with discipline and rigor;
- that a byproduct of knowledge is wisdom, a respect for justice, and an appreciation of civic duty;
- that a student-centered urban university system requires a focus on access, affordability, academic excellence, and research and innovation; and
- that only by preserving all these qualities can CUNY remain an engine of equity and upward mobility able to advance the well-being of all residents of the City and State of New York.

In the face of accelerating attacks on academic freedom, shared governance, and higher education as a public good, the defense of knowledge, wisdom, and justice is of vital importance.

We join with faculty colleagues throughout higher education in a call for unity to preserve the central role higher education plays in civic society. Together we stand; divided we fall.

In particular, we urge the CUNY Board of Trustees and the CUNY Chancellery to formally propose and take a leading role in establishing an alliance among the public colleges and universities of New York State in defense of higher education, research, and academic freedom.

Under this alliance, all participating institutions would cooperate to support any member institution under direct political or legal infringement. Such support would come by mobilizing constituencies to preserve the institutions and resources they have built to further the common good and to recognize and respond to attacks on the fundamental right to higher education.



In instances of direct political interference, participating institutions would make available the combined services of their legal counsel, governance experts, and public affairs offices to coordinate a vigorous and unified response.

We further call on the state to engage in necessary legal actions and provide financial support to CUNY and SUNY to defend the integrity and principles of higher education in the State of New York.

*Eruditio populi liberi spes gentium*

Professor John Verzani, Chair, College of Staten Island

Professor Victoria A. Chevalier, Vice Chair, Medgar Evers College

Professor Kathleen Barker, Medgar Evers College

Professor Ned Benton, John Jay College

Professor Kerin Coughlin, New York City College of Technology

Professor Douglas Alberto Medina, Guttman Community College

Professor Enid Stubin, Kingsborough Community College

Professor Cynthia Wiseman, Borough of Manhattan Community College

Professor Jason Young, Hunter College

Signed April 22, 2025

Discussion followed.

A motion was made to waive the Two-Meeting Rule, which **passed** with a simple majority with 6 (No) and 0 (Abstentions).

The Resolution to endorse the CUNY UFS *Together We Stand* Statement **passed** by a vote of 38 (Yes), 0 (No), and 9 (Abstentions).

Jacob Segal will notify the CUNY UFS to add Kingsborough Community College to the list of colleges that endorse the statement.

#### IV. Events/Announcements

Maria Patestas, on behalf of the Office of Institutional Advancement, shared information on the 2025 Annual Scholarship Fundraiser on Thursday, June 5, 2025. Messaging concerning the Scholar Ship Fundraiser is included below:

## Support Our Students thru the Annual Scholarship Fundraiser – <https://asf25.givesmart.com/>

This year's *Annual Scholarship Fundraiser* will take place on **Thursday, June 5 at 6pm**. This event—formerly known as *Seaside Splash* and *The Gala*—has a new name that reflects its true purpose: raising funds that go **directly to student scholarships**.

The Office of Institutional Advancement and the KCC Foundation work year-round to raise scholarship funds that support every departmental award at Awards Night (coming up June 12), as well as named scholarships, major gifts, and endowments distributed throughout the academic year.

We fund both **need-based and merit-based** scholarships. So far this year, we've distributed **over \$380,000** in scholarships and emergency grants to **more than 330 students**.

We've also made key improvements to increase equity and access to scholarships by **eliminating GPA requirements and tax implications** for need-based and emergency grants. Next year, we will launch a new **electronic application process** to improve transparency and access for all eligible students.

### Ways to support students at this time:

- **Purchase a ticket to attend:** Faculty and staff can purchase up to two discounted tickets at \$200 each. The event will include a cocktail hour, open bar, a drawing, dinner and dancing.
- **Can't attend?** Consider one of the following:
  - **Donate a GIK (gift-in-kind):** We're accepting items for our event drawing. Think of a prize *you'd* like to win. You can donate individually or take a collection as a department!
  - **Purchase an ad in the event journal:** Shoutout your department, congratulate your student graduates or ask a favorite local business to show their support. *This can also be something College Council does as a group effort.*
  - **Make a direct cash donation:** Any amount helps—and in many cases, **goes even further than purchasing a ticket.**

Thank you for all the ways you support our students—whether through your time, presence, or financial generosity. And special thanks to those who've already contributed this year!

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Amanda Kalin, Secretary

## COLLEGE COUNCIL CALENDAR 2024-2025

Tuesday, May 27, 2025 @ 3:00 PM in U-219

***Attachment A for the 4/29/25 Meeting –College Council New Membership Plan***

Adding one new representative from each academic department, one new part-time instructional staff, one new support staff, seven UFS senators, and four new HEO Delegate at Large. A total of 27 new seats on the College Council would increase the voting membership to 101 members. In addition, only the faculty (full-time and part-time College Council voting members) would vote on the Curriculum agenda items at the College Council.

<b>Total</b>	<b>Number</b>
Voting Members	<b>101 (Voting Members)</b>
50 seats are guaranteed Faculty (If UFS members are not already CC members)	<b>50% Voting Members</b>
10 Full-Time Instructional Staff Delegates at Large are held by Faculty (as of now)	<b>59% Voting Members are Faculty (Total)</b>
CC Quorum	<b>51</b>
Average Standing Committee (Not Curriculum) and if SGA is filled	<b>12</b>

Additional Information:

- KCC UFS membership numbers can change over time. The UFS currently lists seven KCC UFS senators; alternatives will not be included.
  - A member can hold dual membership but will only have one vote at the College Council.
- The new members would be staggered in over the next few years. New academic members would join the council when their department has elections.
- UFS members will join the council membership at the start of the new council term.

## **Example of the College Council New Membership**

### **2025 - 2026**

- BIO – **one additional** Department Delegate
- BUS – **one additional** Department Delegate
- COM – **one additional** Department Delegate
- LIBRARY – **one additional** Department Delegate
- NUR – **one additional** Department Delegate
- The **six** UFS Members (#7 is already a member of College Council)
- **Three** Delegates-at-Large from the HEO CLT series (includes activation of third staggered seat).
- **One** Part-Time Faculty
- **Two** Support Staff (one existing seat is currently vacant)

**TOTAL ADDITIONAL = 17**

### **2026 - 2027**

- AHM – **one additional** Department Delegate
- BEH – **one additional** Department Delegate
- ENG – **one additional** Department Delegate
- HIS – **one additional** Department Delegate
- **One** Delegates-at-Large from the HEO CLT series

**TOTAL ADDITIONAL = 5**

### **2027 - 2028**

- ART – **one additional** Department Delegate
- HPER – **one additional** Department Delegate
- MATH – **one additional** Department Delegate
- PHY – **one additional** Department Delegate
- TAH – **one additional** Department Delegate
- **One** Delegates-at-Large from the HEO CLT series

**TOTAL ADDITIONAL = 6**

<b>CURRENT</b>		<b>NEW</b>	
ARTICLE II: COMPOSITION OF COLLEGE COUNCIL:		ARTICLE II: COMPOSITION OF COLLEGE COUNCIL:	
The College Council must be composed of:		The College Council must be composed of:	
i. The President of the College	1	i. The President of the College	1
ii. The Chief Academic Officer of the College	1	ii. The Chief Academic Officer of the College	1
iii. The Chief Administrative Officer of the College	1	iii. The Chief Administrative Officer of the College	1
iv. The Registrar	1	iv. The Registrar	1
v. The Chairperson of each instructional department	14	v. The Chairperson of each instructional department	14
vi. One department delegate from each instructional department	14	vi. <b>Two</b> department delegate from each instructional department	<b>28</b>
vii. Full-time instructional staff delegates-at-large equal to the number of departments	14	vii. Full-time instructional staff delegates-at-large equal to the number of departments	14
viii. Two part-time instructional staff delegates-at-large	2	viii. <b>Three</b> part-time instructional staff delegates-at-large	<b>3</b>
ix. Three delegates-at-large from the HEO and CLT series	3	ix. <b>Seven</b> delegates-at-large from the HEO and CLT series	<b>7</b>
x. One alumni delegate	1	x. One alumni delegate	1
xi. Two delegates elected by the full-time regularly appointed non-probationary supporting staff	2	xi. <b>Three</b> delegates elected by the full-time regularly appointed non-probationary supporting staff	<b>3</b>
xii. Twenty student delegates	20	xii. Twenty student delegates	20
xiii. One non-voting delegate-at-large seat to be designated for Emeritus/Emerita Teaching Faculty	1	xiii. One non-voting delegate-at-large seat to be designated for Emeritus/Emerita Teaching Faculty	1
		<b>xiv. Seven UFS Senators</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total Members:</b>	75	<b>Total Members:</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Total VOTING Members:</b>	74	<b>Total VOTING Members:</b>	<b>101</b>

***Attachment B for the 4/29/25 Meeting –Updated Peer Observation Form.***

**KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**Of**  
**The City University of New York**

## **Peer Observation of Teaching**

Peer observation of teaching is a collaborative process between colleagues with the primary goal of conducting a dialogue to improve teaching. Beyond evaluating teaching for personnel action (reappointment, promotion), peer observation of teaching provides an opportunity for faculty to share best teaching practices, grow as educators, and support one another so that the best possible learning environment and experiences are provided to students. Please refer to Article 18 (also, see Article 18, Memorandum of Agreement) of the CUNY-PSC Collective Bargaining Agreement as well as the KCC Faculty Handbook section on evaluation processes.

### **Description of the Process**

1. Notification: A faculty member will be contacted about their review of teaching, in accordance with the notification process as per Article 18, using the notification process determined by their academic department. The faculty member will be asked to respond that the date and time of the observation is acceptable. Prior to the observation, the aims of the lesson and an outline are sent the observer. Although not required, the observer may ask to meet with the observee for a conversation about specific areas of focus for the observation and how the observer can best assist the faculty member to improve their teaching.
2. Observation of the lesson: The observer will complete the Peer Observation of Teaching report. The purpose of the report is to serve as a tool to evaluate instruction in a way that is as equitable as possible for all disciplines, styles, and modes of instruction (in-person, hybrid, and online) and to create a standardized reporting format **and comply with Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) minimum requirements**. The observer rates the instructor's performance based on each criterion and provides written comments to assist colleagues to identify specific strengths or opportunities for instructional improvement.
3. Post Observation Conference Memorandum report: After the observation of the lesson is complete, the observer and observee will meet to discuss the Peer Observation of Teaching report and engage in a dialogue between colleagues offering suggestions, thinking about the instructor's teaching strengths, and possible areas for improvement. The conversation is documented in the Post Observation Conference Memorandum.



## **Peer Observation of Teaching Report**

Observers will use the Peer Observation of Teaching Report to provide instructors with feedback so they can better assist students in achieving the course's learning outcomes. Throughout the observation report, terminology is used that can be applied to all course modalities (in person, hybrid, or online). For example, the term "learning unit" is used instead of "lesson" to be inclusive of all three modes of delivery. The form has a total of 19 evaluative criteria, divided into the following five sections:

- Management of the Learning Environment (2 criteria)
- Instructional Coherence (4 criteria)
- Instructional Strategies (8 criteria)
- Instructor Communication Skills (3 criteria)
- Fostering Student Engagement (2 criteria)

For each criterion, the observer will check a rating, and write individual comments, if appropriate. In addition, at the end of each section the observer will write comments to share their perspective on what they observed, and their perceptions related to that section of the observation report. Following the 19 criteria, the observer will write their impressions based on what they observed, including the instructor's strengths, and specific recommendations for improvement. If applicable, there is a section for the observer to write comments about areas of emphasis specific to the discipline or the mode of instruction.

As the Peer Observation of Teaching is designed to improve teaching, selecting "Needs to be developed" in evaluative criteria need not contribute to an unsatisfactory evaluation. If, however, the overall evaluation of the faculty member is determined to be 'unsatisfactory', the observer must clearly provide a rationale for the assessment.

**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING REPORT  
COVER SHEET**

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Observer: \_\_\_\_\_ Observation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_

Room (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Instructional delivery mode: Face-to-Face ☐ Hybrid ☐ Online ☐

Additional modality attributes, if any (e.g., Hyflex, Synchronous, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_

If class is HyFlex or Hybrid, then the observation should be conducted Face-to-Face.

If class is Online and partly Synchronous, then the observation should be in Synchronous mode.

In either case, except if the instructor requests otherwise with Chair approval.

The Manner in which the observation was conducted:

Face-to-Face ☐

Synchronous ☐

Asynchronous ☐

Purpose: Reappointment ☐ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Promotion ☐

Other \_\_\_\_\_

Information obtained from the instructor prior to the observation:

Topic of the lesson/learning unit:

Learning outcomes for the lesson/learning unit:

Were the objectives of the lesson communicated to the students? Yes ☐ No ☐

Were the objectives of the lesson met? Yes [ ] No [ ]

What tools, methods, or teaching strategies did the instructor use to achieve these objectives?

Summary of lesson/learning unit:

**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING  
REPORTING FORM**

1. Management of Learning Environment	Unsatisfactory	Needs to be developed	Effective	Highly effective	Not applicable	Comments (optional)
Timeline of the learning unit/lesson is clear and applied.						
Instructional environment is respectful and conducive to learning.						
Comments:						

<b>2. Instructional Coherence</b> The instructor:	Unsatisfactory	Needs to be developed	Effective	Highly effective	Not applicable	Comments (optional)
Introduced student learning outcomes/goals.						
Topics and activities were well paced and sequenced.						
Reviewed major concepts.						
Connected the outcomes/goals to previous or future course content.						
Comments:						

<b>3. Instructional Strategies</b> The instructor:	Unsatisfactory	Needs to be developed	Effective	Highly effective	Not applicable	Comments (optional)
Used examples to clarify points.						
Encouraged student engagement.						
Used supporting materials (e.g., videos, images, text).						
Responded to student questions.						
Asked questions to assess learning.						
Prompted critical thinking.						
Provided opportunities for students to interact.						
Comments:						

<b>4. Instructor Communication Skills</b> The instructor:	Unsatisfactory	Needs to be developed	Effective	Highly effective	Not applicable	Comments (optional)
Respectfully responded to student participation.						
Communicated effectively.						
Maintained an atmosphere of mutual respect.						
Comments: <div></div>						

<b>5. Fostering Student Engagement</b> The instructor created and sustained an environment where students were expected to:	Unsatisfactory	Needs to be developed	Effective	Highly effective	Not applicable	Comments (optional)
Be prepared.						
Participate in the learning process and activities.						
Comments:						



<b>Summary of observation:</b>
Describe your overall impressions of the learning unit/lesson, including supporting examples.
List specific strengths of the instructor based on learning unit/lesson.
List specific recommendations for the instructor to improve their pedagogy based on what was observed.
Additional comments on area(s) of emphasis specific to the discipline or mode of instruction:

Overall evaluation of lesson:

Satisfactory [ ]      Unsatisfactory [ ]

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signature of Faculty \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_