

Faculty Peer Review



Peer Review Council
2017

Timeline

END OF LENS

DEADLINE	ACTION	INITIATED BY
<ul style="list-style-type: none">April 15	Form Review Panel	Supervisor

FORMATIVE REVIEW

DEADLINE	ACTION	INITIATED BY
<ul style="list-style-type: none">August	In-service Orientation <i>Candidate and All Panel Members Must Attend</i>	Peer Review Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Second Week of September	First Meeting to Agree on Process	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fall & Spring	Observations, Regularly Scheduled Meetings	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">First Week of March	Formative Summary to Candidate	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Second Week of March	Candidate Feedback Form to PRC Chair	Candidate

SUMMATIVE REVIEW

DEADLINE	ACTION	INITIATED BY
<ul style="list-style-type: none">August	In-service Orientation	Peer Review Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Second Week of September	First Meeting to Agree on Process	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fall	Observations, Regularly Scheduled Meetings	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">First Week of December	Summative Report to Candidate and Supervisor and Peer Review Process Evaluation Form to PRC Chair	Review Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Second Week of December	Candidate Feedback Form to PRC Chair	Candidate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Timeline	Front cover, back
Overview, Background, and Goals	2
Procedure for Peer Review Evaluation	3-6
Document Samples and Forms	7
Performance Appraisal Worksheet	8
Observation Report (formative)	9-11
Formative Report	12-13
Observation Report (summative)	14-15
Summative Report	16-17
Checklist for Online Observations (formative and summative)	18-19
Pre-Observation Discussion	20
Checklist for Observations	21-22
Student or Other Audience Reaction Survey	23-24
Post-Observation Discussion	25
Candidate Feedback	26
Peer Review Process Evaluation	27-29
Peer Review Council	30-32
Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation	33
Report of the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation	34-36
Appendix A: Meeting Guidelines for Specific Groups	
Teaching Faculty	37
Non-Teaching Faculty	38
Librarians	39

Overview

The purpose of peer review is to foster cooperation leading to excellence of the faculty at Johnson County Community College (JCCC). In addition, peer review gives experienced faculty members a voice in faculty employment decisions. Through collaboration, peer reviewers provide instructional, collegial, and professional support. The peer review process benefits both the people being reviewed and the reviewers. These benefits offer the faculty the opportunity for growth and success in the college and community.

Background

Faculty peer review at JCCC was initiated by the faculty in 1993. After a study by a joint committee of the faculty and administration, the program was approved and two years later was accepted by the Board of Trustees. After that, a joint committee worked out the details of the process. In 1997, the faculty members at the college participated in the process for the first time, completing this first cycle in 1999.

Faculty peer review provides a number of benefits. First, the use of faculty colleagues provides more complete information for faculty evaluation than was previously available. Since its beginning, the college has used student, self, and administrator evaluation; research has shown that each of these sources casts light on job performance. Colleagues, who are experts in both teaching and the discipline taught, provide invaluable additional information.

Faculty peer review, however, is far more than evaluation; it fosters collegiality and mutual respect. For new faculty members, it provides professional support in their first years at the college. For those who are faculty with continuing contracts, the program provides opportunities for useful collaboration.

Although peer review occurs most frequently with probationary faculty members, those who have continuing contracts are encouraged to use the program for professional development. In fact, some of the most senior and accomplished teachers on campus have taken part. For faculty members with continuing contracts, this process can provide additional documentation of discipline-related skills, useful in supporting grant and award applications.

Goals

- To make use of all available resources to enhance performance of professional duties.
- To further improve evaluation and achieve higher levels of reliability.
- To employ faculty expertise in reaching the highest academic and professional standards.
- To increase collegiality, mutual professional responsibility, and shared decisionmaking.
- To make the best possible employment decisions.

Procedure for Peer Review Evaluation

The peer review process is as follows. If there are extenuating circumstances which would prevent or considerably delay a required activity—such as not being able to conduct an observation—an alternate timeline for meeting the requirement should be agreed upon by all panel members and the candidate.

Who Is Reviewed and When?

- All new full-time regular faculty members, regardless of previous status at this college or elsewhere, must undergo peer review during their first three years of full-time regular faculty employment at JCCC.
- Most new faculty begin the *formative* review during the second year. The evaluation panel gives the person being reviewed a copy of the formative report, but does not submit it to either the administration or that person's JCCC personnel file.
- In the third year, however, the process is *summative*: the panel provides the summative report to the administration, where it becomes an element in the decision about further employment.
- Persons with three years of employment as full-time regular faculty members at JCCC may choose to undergo peer review, but for them the decision is purely voluntary. They may choose either *formative* or *summative* review. In either case it is only a one-year process.
- According to Kansas Statute (72-5445) full-time continuing contract faculty who are hired from another Kansas community college where they have been under continuing contract for at least one year will have a two-year probationary period at their new institution. Thus, they will begin their *formative* year their first year at JCCC. Furthermore, a full-time faculty member hired in January and offered a second contract would begin *formative* evaluation the same year.

How Are Peer Review Panels Identified?

- Supervisors must ask for volunteers for peer review panels from eligible faculty members who have mastery of their disciplines.
- All full-time faculty members with continuing contracts are potential panel members. Ideally, the majority of the panel members should be from the same or a closely related discipline. Emeritus JCCC faculty who teach at least one course during a calendar year at JCCC, or its equivalent for librarians and counselors, are eligible to serve as members of peer review panels.
- The person being reviewed will select one faculty member to serve as chair for the peer review panel. The candidate and chair of the peer review panel, with input from the supervisor, will select the two remaining panel members. The chair will be the liaison between the peer review panel and the Peer Review Council (PRC) representative.

- The supervisor must submit the names of peer review panel members to the Director of Staff Development and to the Chair of the PRC by **April 15th**.

What Are the Requirements?

- **Orientation:** All candidates beginning their formative year and the members of their Peer Review Panels **must attend** the fall semester peer review orientation held during the professional development days prior to the beginning of fall classes.
- **Participation:** All peer review panel members and candidates must actively participate in meetings and the peer review process.
- **First Meeting (no later than the second week of September):** If there is an option, the panel will determine the type of evaluation, either "**formative**" or "**summative**." The panel will also discuss and agree on the procedure, including forms and rating scales to be used. The person being reviewed will propose goals and methods for the process, submitting the *Performance Appraisal Worksheet* to the panel. The panel will agree on meeting dates and times.
- **Subsequent Meetings:** These meetings will be devoted to discussing professional styles, basic job responsibilities, and professional development. Please refer to the appendix for further information regarding meetings as they apply to teaching faculty, non-teaching faculty, and librarians.
- **Panel Observation of Candidate:** Each panel member will observe the candidate fulfilling his/her professional duties at least once during both the **formative** and **summative** years. The panel may do this as a group or individually. In assessing the candidate's performance, the panel should consider any details that may impact their evaluation (such as the time of day, time of the semester, and types of students in the class), and must be cautious in comparing the candidate with others.

Pre-Observation Discussion: The panel should meet with the person evaluated for a pre-observation discussion. The questions on the *Pre-Observation Discussion* form provide a list of points to discuss at this preliminary meeting.

Observation and Post-Observation Discussion: The panel members will rate the candidate's professional performance using the appropriate form. Students must complete the *Student or Other Audience Reaction Survey* following the observation. The panel members should conduct a post-observation discussion with the candidate, using the *Post-Observation Discussion* form.

- **Candidate Observations of Panel Members:** The candidate will observe each panel member perform her/his professional duties at least once. During the session, the person being reviewed should make note of particular strategies, events and any questions worth discussing after the observation.

- **Evaluating Additional Resources and Responsibilities:** The panel will evaluate a sample of the candidate's professional materials appropriate to his/her position. The person being reviewed may offer additional items for discussion.
- **Formative Report (due 1st week of March in the Formative year):** The panel will write a *formative* report based on their observations of the candidate and their review of the candidate's professional materials. This will include an account of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations offered by the panel members. The *formative* report is given to the candidate only and is not placed in the candidate's personnel file. The person being reviewed may choose to submit the *formative* report to his or her personnel file and/or supervisor.
- **Summative Report (due the 1st week of December in the Summative year):** The panel will write a *summative* report based on their observations of the candidate and their review of the candidate's professional materials. This will include an account of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations offered by the panel members. The *summative* report will be given to the candidate and her/his supervisor, and will be included with the supervisor's continuing contract recommendation. It will also be placed in the candidate's personnel file.
- **Peer Review Process Evaluation Form:** At the end of the *summative* year, panel members should complete the Peer Review Process Evaluation form and send the form to the PRC Chair. The form may be completed anonymously or may include the name of the panel member(s).
- **Candidate Feedback:** At the end of the *summative* year, the person being reviewed will complete the attached *Peer Review Feedback* form and submit it directly to the PRC chair.

What Is the Process for Replacing a Panel Member?

- When a member of a review panel is unable to complete his/her term, the remaining panel members should consult the division representative to the PRC to identify possible replacement panel members.

How Is Privacy Maintained During the Peer Review Process?

- Every interview, observation, discussion, conversation, and document involved with the Faculty Peer Review process must remain confidential to insure the integrity of the process. All involved agree to abide by this rule, except as provided for by other college policy and state law.
- Upon completion of the *formative* year, all documents must be destroyed or given to the candidate.
- At the end of the *summative* process the chair of the panel must retain all files and personal notes in a secure place for three years. At the end of that time, all documents must be destroyed or given to the candidate.

What Role Does Collaboration Play in the Process?

Collaboration is the key to the success of this process. All participants should be treated with respect and professional courtesy with due regard to individual styles and professional methods. If the person being reviewed has questions or suggestions, she or he should not hesitate to contact the panel.

Similarly, panel members with problems, questions or suggestions should contact the PRC liaison. Liaisons are elected members of the Peer Review Council who ensure that all panels are on task with the timeline of activities during the formative and summative years. Each PRC member is assigned a certain number of panels to oversee and communicates directly with both the probationary faculty member as well as with the panel.

Resolving Problems in the Peer Review Process

Any candidate in the peer review process, regardless of whether she or he is in the formative or summative year, should address questions or concerns first to the panel members or chairperson.

If the questions or concerns remain unresolved, then the candidate should contact the liaison citing the specific concern(s) to the assigned PRC liaison, who will work with the panel chair, or the entire panel if necessary, to resolve the concern.

All communications and decisions in the grievance process should be made in a timely manner to avoid jeopardizing the peer review process.

Documents

The following samples have been redacted to maintain privacy. All documents and forms resulted from the combined efforts of peer review panel members. That is, individual members visited different class sessions of the candidate, took notes, and then collaborated to focus on the most important and, especially, the most consistent behaviors for the various reviews and reports.

The following forms, referenced earlier in this handbook, may be used by panel members (and the candidate) as they complete each stage of the review process. These samples are provided to give you a sense of the style, tone, and development of a typical document. The forms include recommended points to consider or questions to ask the candidate or students. Other questions may be more appropriate and more meaningful for your circumstances. Please include notes of the particular circumstances of your observation or discussion session.

- A. Performance Appraisal Worksheet
- B. Classroom Observation Report (**formative**)
- C. Formative Report
- D. Classroom Observation Report (**summative**)
- E. Checklist for Online Observations (**formative and summative**)
- F. Summative Report
- G. Pre-Observation Discussion
- H. Checklist for Classroom Observation
- I. Student or Other Audience Reaction Survey
- J. Post-Observation Discussion
- K. Peer Review Feedback
- L. Peer Review Process Evaluation

Note: These forms may be reproduced as needed by the panel and the candidate.

When a panel member signs the summative report, he or she should use the appropriate title. For example, use John Doe, Panel Member, not John Doe, Professor. (The Summative Report Guidelines include the appropriate designation.)

Performance Appraisal Worksheet

Printable Version

Name: _____

Date: _____

1. Areas on which I intend to focus my attention during the peer review period:

- Because I'm new to the College, I would appreciate informal conversation about my grading of student projects—amount and quality of feedback and my grading standards.
- I have used conferences rather extensively in the past, but I have more students now. I would like advice on how to integrate conferencing and large numbers of students.
- Professional development possibilities—computer training and internationalizing courses.
- I've noticed JCCC promotes collaborative groups in the classroom. I intend to incorporate this strategy and will need help from you and/or others.
- I also want to develop something innovative, and positive, concerning attendance.

2. Data, methods and steps I wish to be used in my review:

- Besides the classroom visits and other documentation prescribed by the JCCC Faculty Peer Review, I would like to have two or three of my classes videotaped by the Television Department. Then, my team and I can view the tape away from the classroom and discuss the instructional performance.
- I will copy graded exams and papers for peer review team feedback. Maybe you can share some of yours.
- I'd like to meet with you at least once a month during the first semester, maybe less after that.
- I'd like some help with student evaluation forms/reports. Is there a workshop that explains them?

3. Instructions for using my peer review report:

Formative Peer Review—choose one of the following

_____ My peer review report will be part of my evaluation process for my supervisor.

_____ My peer review report will not be part of my evaluation process for my supervisor.

Summative Peer Review—select the following

_____ The peer review summative report will be part of my annual evaluation.

3. Other comments:

Observation Report (*Formative*)

Printable Version

Instructor: _____

Observers/Review Panel: _____

The following is a checklist of characteristics rated during the classroom observation. Each of the five areas observed was rated on the following scale:

(1) Needs some improvement

(2) Satisfactory

(3) Superior

I. Knowledge of Subject: How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject he/she is teaching?

Rating: 3

- A. Exhibits a broad, up-to-date knowledge of the subject. Referenced current research and drew upon own professional experience and expertise in relating content to students
- B. Knowledge base is clearly superb. However, could strengthen position as a content expert by approaching difficult questions in a different way. For example, when students raise questions about a difficult concept, such as _____ rather than stating "I'm not exactly clear on it either...", try one or all of the following approaches: (1) Take adequate time to reflect on the question. If not feeling comfortable addressing the question, simply state: "This is a tough concept, let me think of a better way to convey the idea and we'll discuss it next hour..."; (2) Encourage students to think on the concept and share their understanding, or unique way/s of comprehending the concept; (3) Let the question become the "question of the week" and defer discussion; (4) Follow up with clarification at a future class time and revise for the following year (e.g., use visual ways to convey the essence of the concept using PowerPoint pictures).

II. Instructional Techniques: What instructional techniques are used by the instructor? How are the students engaged?

Rating: 2

- A. Very enthusiastic lecture about the subject. Throughout the presentation, instructor asked important questions and kept the students' interest by using a PowerPoint slide show that included visual, graphic, and textual representations and explanations of major ideas.

The following recommendations:

1. Continue working with PowerPoint addressing each slide. Avoid “jumping over” slides, dismissing them as “knowledge the student already knows.” Use the opportunity to reinforce learning; link the review with what is being taught in the current session, and tie concepts into what will be taught in future class sessions.
2. Take steps to remain centered on the topic. This would include deferring student questions that address concepts/issues that are more advanced and/or planned for future discussion. Positively acknowledge such questions and encourage students to retain the thought or idea. Return to the issue when the subject/topic is scheduled for discussion.
3. Work through several _____ situations or case scenarios, designed to stimulate thinking and problem solving, an effective way to both promote review of concepts and sharpen thinking skills.

III. Organization of Class: How well does this instructor select and prepare the materials and format for the class?

Rating: 3

- A. Instructor connects new material to previous lesson.
- B. The instructor took additional time when students expressed confusion.

IV. Learning Environment: How does the instructor create a dynamic and constructive learning environment?

Rating: 3

- A. Effectively communicated with each student. Maintained eye contact when interacting with students, and recognized their knowledge base. Attentively listened to their questions and responded in a positive manner.
- B. Students engaged in active problem solving with instructor guidance.

V. Student Rapport: How well does the instructor work with students?

Rating: 3

A. Very interested and concerned about student learning. Asked relevant questions and the students were respectful and attentive throughout the entire class period. It was evident that the students enjoyed this instructor's enthusiasm as both a professional and as a teacher. Nonjudgmental and open to student comments.



Formative Report

Instructor:

Peer Review Panel:

Submitted to:

Because every class period has unique moments, creating both highs and lows in instructional success, we have collated our reactions. Our purpose: to create consistency in our observations as well as suggestions. We believe this approach will provide effective and efficient mentoring activity for the remainder of the Peer Review Program.

Your Peer Review team visited different classes and sections and met with you individually several times. Our observations:

You are very animated in the classroom, modulating your voice and emotional intensity nicely. Clearly, we noticed much enthusiasm for the work at hand, using gestures to drive home a point. You move around the room, smile and provide encouragement frequently. Students are receptive — both to you and the assignments.

Professional development and organizational involvement are outstanding. You have been involved with the professional community this year, participating in the American Education organization, hosting its fall and spring meetings/workshops/award ceremonies — an excellent public relations gesture as it allows high school teachers and their students the opportunity to see aspects of our program at JCCC. You also attended the winter planning meeting in January. As a member of an academic fraternal organization, you attended both the fall and spring meetings of the organization and coordinated the annual retreat.

You have maintained currency in the field through your involvement in the Community College Consortium and the Education Research Group, both national organizations. Currently coordinator of the community college forum of ERG, you coordinate workshops and learning sessions for the organizations' two national conferences.

Student interviews and surveys indicate much comfort with you, many commenting that you really care about your students and they are very comfortable talking with you. They also note you are very available — both with time and in spirit. The student surveys do not reveal any problem areas and consistently A's and B's for just about all questions. It seems you know your students, and they know you. And that's good.

Our Suggestions:

1. We feel collaborative learning strategies might help involve students more actively. Indeed, focusing on specific group tasks could reduce the emphasis upon the instructor.
2. Student response to questions was limited and then to only a few students. Two possibilities: First, ask the students to respond on paper (or in small groups) to one or two questions. Then, open the discussion to the full class who now might have something to say. Second, “hang-time” for a difficult, but worthy, question might be extended. Thirty seconds of critical thinking might help you avoid having to answer your own questions. On the other hand, try to resist asking any question you expect you probably will have to answer yourself. Some questions appear to be rather narrowly focused, limiting student response. We have specific suggestions which we will discuss with you.
3. Instructional media needs to be updated and made more visually attractive (and readable). Overhead transparencies need attention. Too much copy (text) on some overheads. Use handouts. In fact, some overheads became handouts later in the class. Why not give students the handouts at the beginning; then, students can write notes on the handouts. Clarity of some overheads is a problem, some not easy to see or read just a few rows back. Generally, static overheads create static students (not always). PowerPoint could enhance presentations in three ways: First, the color and clarity make for better reading. Second, you have the option of presenting by computer (progressive disclosure) or by color transparency. Third, PowerPoint doesn’t allow for so much text per screen. As a result, students might not be visually overloaded. Caution: PowerPoint can reduce instruction to a passive slide show. However, there are some nifty strategies for involving students. We’ll show you!
4. Another element of active learning — notetaking — was noticeably absent in two of the classes. We all have to remind students to engage in active listening (which includes some notetaking). However, we will discuss specific strategies that foster this activity.
5. Although student behavior was appropriate, only about a third of the class seemed actively involved, verbally responding or asking questions. On any day, this can happen to the best instructor, but we think specific strategies can improve those numbers. We’ll chat about those.
6. The scale of some projects needs to be reduced and then component parts dealt with one at a time. Students appeared overwhelmed, especially with the evaluation guide.

Of course, each class was different, each representing a different challenge. We have already discussed any issues relating to those differences with you individually.

The remainder of this year and into the next, we will work with you on specific classes, helping you to implement the six suggested areas of instructional development. We should also mention our working with you has been a genuine pleasure. We remain your faithful servants; don’t hesitate to ask for help or advice. Thanks!



Observation Report (*Summative*)

Instructor: _____ Observers/Review Panel: _____

The following is a checklist of characteristics rated during the classroom observation. Each of the five areas observed was rated on the following scale:

(1) Needs some improvement (2) Satisfactory (3) Superior

- I. Knowledge of Subject:** How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject he/she is teaching? **Rating: 2.5**

As demonstrated previously, exhibits a broad, up-to-date knowledge of the subject. Draws upon _____ experience and expertise in relating content to students. Although did not seem quite comfortable with the _____ content, does convey in-depth understanding of _____ content. However, needs to work on ways to clearly communicate knowledge of concepts to the students. Use of visual aids to help convey concepts such as _____ would increase confidence in teaching tough concepts and enhance learning.

- II. Organization of Class:** How well does the instructor select and prepare the materials and format for the class? **Rating: 1**

Clearly demonstrated improvement in terms of beginning the class with more structure. Identified class objectives and goals, reviewed concepts taught in previous classes and defined terms. Content organization throughout the majority of the presentation, however, does not consistently relate how the material relates to previously studied concepts; tends to jump from one idea to another rather than completing discussion of the topic before introducing another. New concepts were mentioned but not adequately addressed or deferred to future discussions.

- III. Classroom Management:** How well does the instructor perform responsibilities related to management of the classroom? **Rating: 3**

All students were in class on time and prepared to begin. Students are comfortable speaking in class and asking questions; instructor makes each student feel valuable. Exhibited greater self-awareness (e.g., noting how the teacher tended to speak to one side of the classroom) and was

more confident fielding questions from the students. Recommend paying close attention to scheduled break times.

IV. Instructional Techniques: How effective are the instructional techniques used by the instructor.

Rating: 2

Clearly is enthusiastic about the subject and teaching. Students collectively commented on the instructor's energy. Promoted discussion, asked if students had questions, and did a better job of reviewing concepts rather than assuming content was learned. Again, needs to continue working on staying focused rather than allowing thoughts to go too far away from the subject matter. Students also commented on this tendency and noted that it would be more effective to 'either talk to us without the use of PowerPoint, or make PowerPoint presentations match or follow the handout.' Students are somewhat frustrated when flow of ideas is not congruent with the handout being used. Recommend continue working on incorporating teaching techniques that stimulate higher-level thinking and learning. Presentation centered on the lecture method. Use of props, small group work and case situations are several techniques that would enhance critical thinking, improve comprehension and capitalize on this individual's strengths as a teacher.

Rather than telling students the content will not be on the test, emphasize the importance of knowing the information for effective practice. Help students to see connections between theory and practice and across disciplines. Work on telling the students the connection between practice (how to) and lecture (why). For example, re-emphasize or point out the importance of knowing and for the purposes of effectively and safely or explain why a basic understanding of a assessment is essential in determining the effectiveness of measures.

V. Student Rapport: How well does the instructor work with students?

Rating: 3

Without question, students enjoy this instructor, who is interested in students and listens to their points of view. Encouraged students to access other resources for important information, and is open to student comments. Enjoys interacting with students on a personal, friendly level; nevertheless, this teacher needs to be sensitive to the importance of maintaining a professional distance that promotes a working relationship between student and instructor, and commands respect of one another's time and space.

Summative Report

Instructor:

Peer Review Panel:

Submitted to:

I. Goals/Recommendations (date)

- A. Provide more structure and direction in the classroom.
 - 1. Deal with complex content questions more effectively.
 - 2. Organize content to improve logical flow of ideas, moving from simple to complex.
 - 3. Outline plan, implement the plan, and summarize essential points.
- B. Use opportunities to reinforce learning by reviewing content rather than assuming students are comfortable with the material (e.g., skipping over slides).
- C. Stay centered on the topic. Defer student questions that address content planned for future presentations or require 1:1 discussion with that student.

II. Summary of Classroom Visitation (date)

- A. Overall, improvement was demonstrated and recommendations made in the (date) peer review session were addressed, some to a greater extent than others. The following recommendations for continued growth are based on observations made in both classroom visitations.

III. Recommendations for Continued Growth

- A. Work on identifying teaching techniques and methodologies that help communicate knowledge of concepts to students.

- B. Continue developing organization schemes and tactics that facilitate logical flow of ideas and demonstrate connections between theory and practice.
- C. Develop personal strategies for staying centered on the topic.
- D. Incorporate a variety of teaching modalities that promote higher-order thinking and enhance comprehension and learning.

IV. Recommendations to the College

- A. This instructor is a valued member of an excellent educational program. Style both contrasts and complements fellow colleagues. The committee is unanimous in recommending continued employment.
- B. Pair this instructor with a college mentor to cultivate classroom organization skills and instructional techniques that promote higher-level learning.
- C. Provide flexible curriculum that maximizes instructor's strengths (e.g., optimize this instructor's strengths as a small group facilitator and hands-on teacher while cultivating abilities as lecturer through a mentorship program).

Sample

Panel Member

Panel Member

Panel Member

F Checklist for Online Observations for Probationary Faculty (formative and summative)

Printable Version

Instructor _____ Observer _____ Date _____

The following is a checklist of characteristics to rate during the observation of an online section. Each of the areas observed is to be rated on the following scale:

1. Needs some improvement 2. Satisfactory 3. Superior

- A. Course introduction and navigation instructions
 - Welcomes students to course, tells them how to navigate it
- B. Syllabus
 - Easily accessible; describes ground rules of course; meets college standards
- C. Schedule or other means of communicating assignments
 - Provides students with clear information about assignments and deadlines
- D. Ease of navigation within the course
 - Logical and clear (depending on the learning management system)
- E. Academic quality of content
 - Meets standards of rigor and currency generally accepted within discipline for the course's academic level
 - The instructor establishes a regular presence in the course appropriate to the duration of the course (for example, weekly communication with class for a fifteen-week course)
 - Course content reflects the instructor's individual contribution to and knowledge of the course material and discipline
- F. Quality of assigned student activities
 - Appropriate for academic level of course
 - Effective in helping students learn material in discipline

G. Examinations

- Complies with discipline, division, and department standards (some require specific content or format, supervision of by proctors, or uniformity of department finals)

H. Grading

- Appropriateness, consistency, and timeliness

I. Effectiveness of Instructor-student communications

- Clarity
- Promptness in responding within appropriate and announced response time. (Under most circumstances, 24 hours during weekdays should be considered normal)
- Description of appropriate student communication within course, announced to all students



Pre-Observation Discussion

Printable Version

In the pre-observation interview, the observer obtains information from the instructor concerning his or her class goals, students, and particular teaching style. The interview schedule listed below provides a brief, structured way of obtaining such information.

1. Briefly, what will be happening in the class I will observe?
2. What is your goal for the class? What do you hope students will gain from this session?
3. What do you expect students to be doing in class to reach stated goals?
4. What can I expect you to be doing in class? Describe your role and teaching methods.
5. What have students been asked to do to prepare for this class?
6. What was done in earlier classes to lead up to this one?
7. Will this class be generally typical of your teaching? If not, what will be different?
8. Is there anything in particular that you would like me to focus on during the class?
9. Explain how you will be observing and recording during the class. Settle the issue of whether you will be introduced or not.



Checklist for Observations

Printable Version

Instructor: _____

Observer: _____

Date: _____

Type of class observed:

_____ General lecture/discussion/demonstration

_____ Open laboratory or studio

_____ Integrated lecture/laboratory or studio

_____ Activity

_____ Instructional lab or studio

The following is a checklist of characteristics to rate during the classroom observation. Each of the five areas observed is to be rated on the following scale:

1. Needs some improvement

2. Satisfactory

3. Superior

I. Knowledge of Subject.

How well does this instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject he/she is teaching?

1 2 3

e.g., Exhibits a broad, accurate, up-to-date knowledge of the subject needed to teach at the college level.

Comments:

II. Organization of Class.

How well does this instructor select and prepare the materials and format for the class?

1 2 3

e.g., Gives the students a clear overview of the material to be covered and relates it to the objectives of the course. Frames the class session so that students understand how the material fits with that studied previously or to be undertaken. Selects and/or develops effective and engaging examples, case histories, samples, models, etc. Provides effective and engaging instructional media (handouts, transparencies, PowerPoint programs, etc.) when appropriate.

Comments:

III. Classroom Management.

How well does this instructor perform responsibilities related to management of the classroom?

1 2 3

E.g., communicates effectively. Monitors student response; responds appropriately. Deals with disruptive or dominating students effectively. Arrives on time prepared to begin the class. Concludes class session effectively.

Comments:

IV. Instructional Techniques. How effective are the instructional techniques used by this instructor?

1 2 3

e.g., Uses clear and understandable questions. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject. Promotes class discussion (where appropriate). Promotes active learning (writing, collaborative groups, modeling, problem-solving, any opportunities for class participation and interaction). Employs techniques that stimulate students to high intellectual efforts. Encourages higher-level learning in addition to necessary memorization.

Comments:

V. Student Rapport.

How well does this instructor work with students?

1 2 3

e.g., Encourages learning and values student questions. Encourages students to seek assistance outside when needed. Displays concern for student learning and development. Displays sensitivity to student problems, points of view, and diversity. Promotes the class as a community of learners.

Comments:



Student or Other Audience Reaction Survey¹

Printable Version

I would like to know your reactions to today's class. Please read each of the statements below and circle the letter corresponding to the response that best matches your reaction in today's class. Your choices are:

- a. No improvement is needed. (Terrific! This works for me. Keep it up.)
- b. Little improvement is needed. (Maybe a ragged edge or two, but nothing to lose any sleep over.)
- c. Improvement is needed. (Not awful, but this merits some attention.)
- d. Considerable improvement is needed. (This is causing me problems. Please help.)

Today, the instructor...

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. limited the scope of the lecture to a manageable amount of material. | a | b | c | d |
| 2. made it clear why the material might be important. | a | b | c | d |
| 3. told us what we would be expected to do with the material
(memorize it, use it to solve problems, or whatever). | a | b | c | d |
| 4. highlighted the key ideas or questions. | a | b | c | d |
| 5. presented plenty of good examples to clarify difficult material. | a | b | c | d |
| 6. used methods to involve us actively in the learning process. | a | b | c | d |
| 7. provided enough variety to keep us reasonably alert. | a | b | c | d |
| 8. found ways to let us know whether we were understanding
the material. | a | b | c | d |

¹Source: Bette LaSere Erickson and Glenn R. Erickson, Instructional Development Program, University of Rhode Island.

9. helped us summarize the main ideas we were supposed
to take away from class. a b c d
10. let us know how we might be tested on the material. a b c d
11. provided in-class exercises or a take-home assignment so that
we could practice using the material. a b c d
12. What is your overall rating of *today's class*?
- a. Excellent
 - b. Good
 - c. Satisfactory
 - d. Fair
 - e. Poor
13. What made you rate today's class as high as you did?
14. What kept you from rating today's class higher?
15. Was today's class session representative (typical) of this instructor's teaching (classroom performance)? If so, how? If not, what was different?

¹Source: Bette LaSere Erickson and Glenn R. Erickson, Instructional Development Program, University of Rhode Island.



Post-Observation Discussion

Printable Version

In this phase, the observer helps the instructor to analyze what happened in class. The following set of questions provides ways to initiate the follow-up discussion. The observer can reinforce and add to the instructor's perceptions by referring to the log of class events.

1. In general, how did you feel the class went? Was it a normal session in your opinion?
2. How did you feel about your teaching during the class session?
3. How did you feel about the students during the class session?
4. Is there anything that worked well for you in class today – that you particularly liked? Does that usually go well?
5. Is there anything that did not work well – that you disliked about the way the class went? Is that typically a problem area for you?
6. What were your teaching strengths? Did you notice anything you improved on or any personal goals you met?
7. What were your teaching problems – areas that still need improvement?
8. Do you have suggestions or strategies for improvement?
9. What kinds of help do you need to improve aspects of your teaching?
10. Did having an observer in the classroom affect the class?

K**Candidate Feedback (to be completed by the candidate)**

	YES	NO
1. I have a clear idea of the results expected of me in my job.	___	___
2. I had an opportunity to meaningfully participate in discussing the measures to be used in the peer review process.	___	___
3. I understood the criteria used to evaluate my performance.	___	___
4. My peer review was helpful in identifying actions I may take to improve my performance.	___	___
5. My peer reviewers accurately assessed my job performance.	___	___
6. Overall I am satisfied with my peer review.	___	___
7. I have suggestions for improving the peer review process.	___	___

Comments:

 Signature

 Date

In both the formative and summative year a copy of this form must be submitted directly to the PRC chair.



Peer Review Process Evaluation (This form should be completed by each panel member at the end of the summative year and returned directly to the PRC Chair.)

The Peer Review Council would like to take this opportunity to thank you for participating in peer review. We would appreciate your open suggestions about the process. This form should be completed and submitted to the PRC Chair at the end of the summative year. The council members will review this information to identify strengths and any problem areas, and to facilitate ongoing development of the overall process. Your feedback will remain anonymous.

Please indicate your responses for the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The fall in-service orientation was important in helping me understand the peer review process better.					
2. The peer review process contains a sufficient number of classroom visits and team meetings during the year.					
3. The peer review objectives are clearly outlined in the Peer Review Handbook.					
4. My supervisor has a good understanding of the peer review process.					
5. Other faculty members in my department have a good understanding of the peer review process.					
6. I would recommend becoming a peer review panel member to other faculty in my division.					
7. I would volunteer to be on a peer review panel again if the opportunity arises.					

Please indicate to what extent you believe the goals of peer evaluation were met:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. To make use of all the available resources to enhance teaching.					
2. To further improve education & achieve higher levels of reliability					
3. To employ faculty expertise in reaching the highest academic and professional standards.					
4. To increase collegiality, mutual professional responsibility, and shared decision making.					
5. To make the best possible employment decisions.					

In what ways could your Peer Review Council representative be more helpful to you and your panel of reviewers?

Name one or two things you would like to see changed within the peer review process.

Please indicate whether or not you participated on other division/college committees in addition to serving as a peer reviewer. Discuss in what ways it would be beneficial and/or disadvantageous to be released from committee work during peer review.

Are there other parts of the peer review process that you would like to see addressed in this evaluation form?

Peer Review Council

Purpose

The Peer Review Council (PRC) supports the peer review process and maintains a strong, continuing structure under which the peer review process will grow. The council itself does not participate in any activities related to making comparisons between faculty members. The council itself does not evaluate faculty members, nor does it participate in activities related to granting any honors, awards, or rewards. However, members acting in other roles may participate in such activities.

All council representatives on the PRC should be actively engaging the candidates and panel members in discussions regarding the process and its timeline and keeping the panel informed of changes to procedures in the *Peer Review Handbook*.

The Council

- Interprets the peer review agreement between the Faculty Association and the JCCC administration to the faculty and administration.
- Mediates as necessary.

Council Liaisons

- Are responsible for the panels as assigned.
- Act as a representative between the peer review panels and the PRC.
- Remind panels about the time line for the process and deadlines.
- Monitor the progress of the panels by checking in at the beginning of each semester, reminding panels of important deadlines, particularly in the summative year, and contacting each probationary faculty member personally once a semester during the process via email or phone call.
- Reiterate the peer review process to peer review members.
- Provide orientation to those being reviewed.
- Attend the peer review orientation session offered each fall.

Membership

The council consists of:

- 12 at-large positions to be appointed by the President of the JCCC Faculty Association who will attempt to have representatives from all divisions; in the event that a division does not have a direct representative, the council will determine which member will represent that division. The Faculty Association President will also appoint two alternates to the council.

- Two ex-officio, voting members:
 1. The past chair of the PRC
 2. A member of the Faculty Association executive council appointed by the Faculty Association President.
- One representative from the administration appointed by the Vice-President of Academic Affairs.

Member Selection

In April of the academic year, the President of the JCCC Faculty Association will appoint four (4) new members to the PRC to replace the outgoing third of the council members, and appoint additional members to fill any vacancies in the Council.

Appointee(s) of vacancy(ies) will serve out the term of the replaced peer review council member(s).

Faculty serving on the PRC must be a faculty association member with continuing contract. Note: This requirement that PRC representatives be dues-paying members of the JCCC Faculty Association was affirmed by a vote of the Faculty Association Executive Council on 2/28/02.

The representative of the administration will be appointed by the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Representatives with peer review experience are preferred.

A council representative may not also serve as a member on any peer review panel to which he or she is assigned.

Alternates will serve whenever a member of the PRC is unable to attend regular meetings due to sabbatical, schedule conflict, or other such circumstances. Alternate representatives will be voting members when serving in the absence of a council representative.

Term

Three years.

Alternate representative – one year.

Council Officers

Chair

- Follows agreed-upon rules for meetings, i.e. Robert's Rules of Order, except as amended by the council.
- Maintains a record of council activity while will be kept in the Faculty Association file.
- Maintains a record and file of all submitted feedback forms.
- Must be in second or third year as a member of the PRC.

- Requests the list of new faculty from the Human Resources office through the Staff Development office.
- Communicates the peer review purpose and procedures to supervisors and other administrative staff as necessary.
- Coordinates in-service training.
- Assigns a council representative to each peer review panel.

Secretary

- Records and maintains minutes of the meetings.
- Distributes minutes to the council members.
- Makes approved changes to the peer review handbooks as requested by the council.
- Makes a list of in-service orientation attendance and non-attendance of all candidates and peer review panel members.

Webmaster

- Maintains a council website which includes the handbook, the current year PRC Members list and the current year list of Summative and Formative Panels.
- Posts other information on the website as directed by the chair.

Term

One year and may be re-elected for one term.

Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation

Faculty peer review at Johnson County Community College is based on negotiated agreements between the Johnson County Community College Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees. The first such agreement is the Memorandum of Agreement, which the Board and Faculty Association agreed to in 1992 (see below, p. 39). It was further agreed that a joint committee representing the administration and the Faculty Association would develop the new peer review system.

In the fall semester of 1993 Stu Shafer, president of the Faculty Association, and Dan Radakovich, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, appointed their respective representatives to this committee, which first met in December of that year. After extensive discussion this committee issued a *Report of the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation* (below). The Board of Trustees approved this report on October 5, 1995. The faculty bargaining unit voted overwhelmingly to accept it as well. This document therefore became part of the contract between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Association, and its provisions are mandatory for the peer review process.

In 1996 the Joint Committee on Peer Review approved *Guidelines for Conducting Performance Appraisal: Full-Time Faculty*. It further agreed that the Faculty Association president and the administration would appoint representatives responsible for training reviewers and implementing the process. Those members were Helen Burnstad, representing the administration, and Vin Clark and Ruth Slesser, representing the Faculty Association. In the fall semester of 1996 this body published objectives and procedures for faculty peer evaluation.

It was subsequently decided that in the absence of a functioning joint committee, a larger body would be useful to supervise the peer review process. In the fall semester of 1999 a new body composed of Burnstad, Clark, and Slesser along with representatives from various areas of the faculty formed the PRC. The Faculty Association Executive Council then designated this body an official committee of the Faculty Association. On behalf of the Association, this Council administers faculty peer review in accordance with the requirements of the contract.

Report of the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation

In accordance with a Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees, the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation was established in 1993-94 for the purpose of developing a peer evaluation component for the evaluation system. Specifically the Memorandum of Agreement stated:

The negotiating teams agree that peer evaluation is a positive and important component in faculty evaluation because it can provide an avenue for nurturing and mentoring faculty. Therefore, we recommend that peer evaluation become a component of the faculty evaluation system. The evaluation committee will determine how to implement this approach.

The President of the Faculty Association and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs further agreed that the joint committee should outline a general plan by which peer evaluation might be accomplished, noting that this plan should set forth the steps necessary to design and implement an effective peer evaluation system, starting with a review of the work and recommendations of the 1992-93 Task Force on Evaluation.

After much discussion and many meetings the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation makes the following consensus recommendations:

- The use of peer evaluation as a component of the evaluation process would be voluntary for tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty could choose for the evaluation to be formative or summative. If the review is formative, the committee and the faculty member would agree as to how it is to be used. If the review is summative, a written narrative provided by the peer review committee would become a part of the faculty member's official evaluation and part of the personnel record created by administrative evaluation.
- Peer evaluation would not be available to probationary faculty during their first year, but would be mandatory for probationary faculty in their second year as a formative process, and in their third year as a summative process.
- Peer evaluation would be completed by a peer review committee consisting of three of the faculty member's peers. A list of potential panel members would be created consisting of tenured faculty from relevant disciplines who volunteer to be on a peer review panel and those tenured faculty who served on the committee that assisted in the hiring of the faculty member. The faculty from the hiring committee could decline to be a potential panel member.
- The faculty member being evaluated would select one member from the list and two would be chosen by lottery.
- Tenured faculty who agreed to serve on peer review committees would be relieved of all additional committee assignments other than the peer review committees for the period of

service. These faculty would also receive training. No faculty member would serve on more than two peer review committees at any one time.

- The criteria and methods for the peer evaluation will be developed by the peer review committee in collaboration with the faculty being evaluated.
- Input from the peer review committee would be restricted to areas of academic expertise, such as content mastery, academic standards, teaching performance, collegiality, etc.
- The Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation will remain a standing committee to assist in resolving issues that arise as a result of implementing the Peer Review Plan.

As a part of this process but not specifically related to peer evaluation, the Joint Committee on Peer Evaluation supports the recommendations of the 1992-93 **Task Force on Evaluation**. These recommendations were:

- that the following be acknowledged as the purposes of evaluation:
for improvement of instruction
for maintenance of academic standards
for making employment decisions;
- that the college continue to use the current evaluation system with the possibility of using a supplementary discretionary in-house form;
- that peer review become a part of probationary faculty evaluation;
- that full-time faculty be evaluated by the immediate administrative supervisor;
- that evaluations occur every semester for the first three years or through the probationary period, and during the fourth year, and every three years thereafter for full review, unless more frequent evaluation is desired by the instructor. (An abbreviated report on performance would be done annually indicating general satisfaction with the performance and intent to maintain the three-year cycle);
- that the approved evaluation forms be available in a computer template form;
- that the instructor and the supervisor meet early in the semester or year of evaluation to focus on areas of attention and agree on data and steps involved (for probationary faculty this would be in September and January; for non-probationary it would be in September);
- that the supervisor submit a memorandum of recommendation or non-recommendation for continued employment (including supplemental documentation) prior to the due date established by the Board of Trustees. (February)
- that the instructor submit a self-appraisal of performance over the period since the last evaluation (probationary-December/May; non-probationary-May)

- that the supervisor prepare an appraisal of performance based on the following types of data:
 1. Materials prepared by the instructor related to classroom performance.
 2. Institutional information related to instruction.
 3. Student evaluations for all sections of faculty undergoing full review including one section of the faculty member's choice during non-evaluation semesters.
 4. Classroom observations.
 5. Other relevant materials.

Appendix A

Meeting Guidelines for Specific Groups

1. Meetings for Teaching Faculty

Strategies Meeting: This includes discussion of teaching philosophies, student interaction, pedagogy, methodology, and development of a teaching style unique to the individual and compatible with the goals of JCCC.

Job Description Meeting: The panel will discuss ways of fulfilling the requirements of the college job description. Additionally, the panel will discuss how to evaluate the candidate's college and community activities according to criteria developed jointly by the panel and the candidate as consistent with the college job description.

Professional Development Meeting: This meeting will include a discussion of ways for the candidate to remain up-to-date and active within his/her discipline, as well as other interdisciplinary professional opportunities. These may include various programs offered by Staff Development.

Follow up Meetings: Certainly, among the most important meetings are those held to discuss the formative and summative reviews and reports.

2. Meetings for Non-Teaching Faculty

First Meeting (no later than the second week of September): It is important for peer review panels to understand that the process is intended to be flexible and appropriate to any non-teaching position. If there is an option, the panel will determine the type of evaluation, either “*formative*” or “*summative*.” The panel will also discuss and agree on the procedure, including forms and rating scales to be used; modification of the checklists provided in this handbook is encouraged. The person being reviewed will propose goals and methods for the process, submitting the *Performance Appraisal Worksheet* to the panel. The panel will agree on meeting dates and times.

Strategies Meeting: This meeting should include discussion of philosophies of service, methods of supervising, consumer interaction, development of a management style unique to the individual or fulfilling other major responsibilities unique to the individual and compatible with the goals of JCCC.

Job Description Meeting: The panel will discuss ways of fulfilling the requirements of the college job description. Additionally, the panel will discuss how to evaluate the candidate’s college and community activities according to criteria developed jointly by the panel and the candidate as consistent with the college job description.

Professional Development Meeting: One meeting will be a focused interview with the person being reviewed concerning professional development within and beyond his/her discipline. This meeting will include discussion about remaining current with available resources, practice, and innovation, as specified by the college job description, as well as other activities the candidate views as important.

Follow up Meetings: Certainly, among the most important meetings are those held to discuss the formative and summative reviews and reports.

3. Meetings for Librarians

First Meeting (no later than the second week of September): It is important for peer review panels to understand that the process is intended to be flexible and appropriate to any librarian position. If there is an option, the panel will determine the type of evaluation, either “*formative*” or “*summative*.” The panel will also discuss and agree on the procedure, including forms and rating scales to be used; modification of the checklists provided in this handbook is encouraged. The person being reviewed will propose goals and methods for the process, submitting the *Performance Appraisal Worksheet* to the panel. The panel will agree on meeting dates and times.

Strategies Meeting: This meeting should include discussion of philosophies of library service, collection development, methods of providing library instruction or fulfilling other major responsibilities unique to the individual and compatible with the goals of JCCC. Certainly, among the most important meetings are those held to discuss the formative and summative reviews and reports.

Job Description Meeting: During the second year of the probationary librarian’s employment, the panel will advise the person being reviewed on ways of fulfilling the requirements of the college job description and evaluate his or her college and community activities according to criteria developed jointly by the panel and the person being reviewed and consistent with the college job description.

Professional Development Meeting: One meeting will be a focused interview with the person being reviewed concerning professional development within and beyond librarianship.. This meeting will include discussion about remaining current with library science resources, practice, and innovation, as specified by the college job description, as well as other activities the candidate views as important.

Follow up Meetings: Certainly, among the most important meetings are those held to discuss the formative and summative reviews and reports.