



PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

New York City College of Technology values excellence in teaching. Teaching quality and effectiveness include a collaborative effort by the individual instructor and the entire faculty. This shared responsibility should be reflected within the process of evaluating teaching through peer review. The observation of an instructor teaching a class is an important factor in the professional evaluation process, which according to Article 18.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement has a dual purpose: “to encourage the improvement of individual professional performance and to provide a basis for decisions on reappointment, tenure and promotions.”

Each untenured member of the faculty is evaluated at least once a semester through classroom* observation by another faculty member of equal or higher rank in his or her department. Observations of tenured faculty are required for all promotions.

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

PEER OBSERVATION REPORT

In observing faculty members, we are looking to see ways in which instructors help students achieve the learning objectives of each course. We can usefully think about the teaching performance under several necessarily interrelated headings. The five headings and questions for each heading are meant to serve as guides in observation of faculty members.

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

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

* Classroom includes laboratory, studio, or clinical settings.

PROCEDURE FOR THE OBSERVER

Consider each teaching element and evaluate the teaching skills of the instructor (categorized under the five headings) by:

- + Placing a check mark under the term best describing your evaluation of the instructor’s actions;
- + Adding comments to illustrate your evaluation;
- + Providing at least a summary evaluation in each category, and evaluations and comments on individual points where you feel you have observed enough to make them.

5 HEADINGS AND QUESTIONS FOR THE OBSERVER

- + Instructional Coherence
- + Teaching Strategies
- + Subject Mastery

- + Instructor and Student Attitudes and Characteristics
- + Classroom Management

1/ INSTRUCTIONAL COHERENCE. Is the lesson under observation coherent in itself, with a clear focus which is clearly presented and reinforced by the instructor? Does the instructor provide/ elicit enough depth and detail to adequately consider the subject? Is the lesson part of a coherent learning process? Is the pacing of the lesson appropriate to the course and to the students? Are topics/ activities sequenced logically? What evidence is there that the class fits in with a series of lessons designed to help students achieve the objectives of the course?

2/ TEACHING STRATEGIES. What teaching strategies or premises about teaching does the instructor rely on? How is the subject of the class related to the course objectives? How effectively does the instructor's teaching help students achieve the course objectives? How does the instructor's presentation of material, including discussion, questioning, class and group activities, support learning objectives? Is the teaching of critical thinking* emphasized? Is there good use of examples/explanation to clarify points, including those questioned by students? Are student questions encouraged? Is sufficient time given for students to respond to instructor's questions? Is there opportunity for students to interact so that they may discover, discuss, or apply content points? Are graphics, chalkboard, etc. used effectively? Does the instructor encourage utilization of available and appropriate lab equipment? Does the instructor use hands-on demonstration to properly demonstrate lab techniques? Was students laboratory progress checked and timely feedback provided? Were students encouraged to self-assess?

3/ SUBJECT MASTERY. Does the instructor demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and understanding of the learning situation (including a sense of the students themselves) in which the subject matter is presented? Is the subject matter and level of analysis being asked of the students of a degree of difficulty suitable to the course? Is the material presented relevant to the purpose of the course?

4/ INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS. Are interactions in the classroom respectful, positive, and educationally productive? Is it clear that both instructor and students are prepared for the class? What evidence is there of interest, enthusiasm, and engagement in class activities on the side of the instructor and of the students? Does the instructor motivate students and encourage student learning in appropriate ways? Does the instructor respond appropriately to student behaviors and concerns? Does the instructor's tone, voice, etc. contribute to engaging students?

5/ CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT. Does the instructor lead the classroom effectively? Was attendance taken? Is the atmosphere in the class conducive to learning? Did the class begin/ end on time? Were laboratory equipment and materials arranged for and prepared prior to the start of the session? Were safety precautions discussed and adhered to? Were sanitation rules followed?

*Critical Thinking could include any of the following: challenging students to understand complex ideas, analyze, compare/contrast, evaluate arguments carefully considering a variety of perspectives, draw conclusions, synthesize.

EXAMPLES OF TYPES OF CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES:

- + Lecture
- + Discussion
- + Small Group Activities
- + Laboratory Demonstration
- + Laboratory Exercise
- + Student Presentations
- + Media Examples
- + Quiz or other short assessment
- + Independent Student Activities



PEER OBSERVATION REPORT

OBSERVATION DATE: _____

TIME BEGAN: _____

TIME ENDED: _____

INSTRUCTOR: _____

OBSERVER: _____

DEPARTMENT: _____

DISCIPLINE: _____

DISCIPLINE: _____

RANK OF OBSERVER (circle one):

Professor Associate Prof. Assistant Prof. Lecturer

COURSE: _____

SECTION: _____

BUILDING/ROOM: _____

What is the topic of this lesson?

Provide a brief summary of the lesson:

What are the objectives of this lesson? (Objectives must be provided by instructor to the observer prior to observation.)

List them:

INSTRUCTIONAL COHERENCE

- + Is the lesson coherent in itself, with a clear focus which is clearly presented and reinforced by the instructor?
- + Does the instructor provide/elicit enough depth and detail to adequately consider the subject?
- + Is the lesson part of a coherent learning process?
- + Is the pacing of the lesson appropriate to the course and to the students?
- + Are topics/activities sequenced logically?
- + What evidence is there that the class fits in with a series of lessons designed to help students achieve the course objectives?

THE INSTRUCTOR:		Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Outstanding	Not Applicable	COMMENTS (Mandatory for a rating of Unsatisfactory or Outstanding)
1	Introduced the lesson (overview or focusing activity).						
2	Covered topics in a manner consistent with the departmental course outline.						
3	Paced topics or activities appropriately.						
4	Sequenced topics or activities logically and with continuity.						
5	Skillfully used the laboratory equipment for planned and unplanned learning experiences.						
6	Related the lesson to previous or future lessons or assignments.						
7	Summarized or reviewed major lesson objective points.						

(N.B. "Needs Improvement" and "Effective" and "Outstanding" are to be considered satisfactory evaluations; "Not Applicable" shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTIONAL COHERENCE (MUST BE PROVIDED BY THE OBSERVER)

TEACHING STRATEGIES

- + What teaching strategies or premises about teaching does the instructor rely on?
- + How is the subject of the class related to the lesson objectives?
- + How effectively does the instructor’s teaching help students achieve the lesson objectives?
- + How does the presentation of material, including discussion, questioning, class and group activities, support learning objectives?
- + Is the teaching of critical thinking* emphasized?
- + Is there good use of examples/explanation to clarify points, including those questioned by students?
- + Are student questions encouraged? Is sufficient time given for students to respond to instructor’s questions?
- + Is there opportunity for students to interact so that they may discover, discuss, or apply content points?
- + Are graphics, chalkboard, etc. used effectively?

IF APPLICABLE:

- + Does the instructor encourage utilization of available and appropriate laboratory equipment?
- + Does the instructor use hands-on demonstration to properly demonstrate techniques?
- + Was student’s laboratory progress checked and timely feedback provided? Were students encouraged to self-assess?

*Critical Thinking could include any of the following: challenging students to understand complex ideas, analyze, compare/contrast, evaluate arguments carefully considering a variety of perspectives, draw conclusions, synthesize.

THE INSTRUCTOR:		Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Outstanding	Not Applicable	COMMENTS (Mandatory for a rating of Unsatisfactory or Outstanding)
8	Presented or explained content clearly.						
9	Used relevant examples to clarify points.						
10	Varied explanations to respond to student questions or need for clarification.						
11	Fostered critical thinking*.						
12	Emphasized important points.						
13	Used chalkboard, graphics, visual aids or other enhancements to support presentation.						
14	Demonstrated and ensured use of appropriate equipment for procedure.						
15	Encouraged student participation/ questions.						
16	Encouraged and assisted student with use of lab equipment.						
17	Asked questions to assess student understanding.						
18	Waited sufficient time for students to answer questions.						
19	Provided opportunities for students to interact together to discover/discuss or practice content points.						

(N.B. “Needs Improvement” and “Effective” and “Outstanding” are to be considered satisfactory evaluations; “Not Applicable” shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

SUBJECT MASTERY

- + Does the instructor demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and understanding of the learning situation (including a sense of the students themselves) in which the subject matter is presented?
- + Is the subject matter and level of analysis being asked of the students of a degree of difficulty suitable to the course?
- + Is the material presented relevant to the purpose of the course?

THE INSTRUCTOR:		Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Outstanding	Not Applicable	COMMENTS (Mandatory for a rating of Unsatisfactory or Outstanding)
20	Presented content at a level appropriate for the students.						
21	Presented material relevant to the purpose of the course.						
22	Demonstrated command of the subject matter.						
23	Explained and discussed results of lab/clinical/studio exercise.						
24	Followed theoretical principles and professional experiences to integrate the didactic and lab/clinical/studio application.						

(N.B. "Needs Improvement" and "Effective" and "Outstanding" are to be considered satisfactory evaluations; "Not Applicable" shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MASTERY (MUST BE PROVIDED BY THE OBSERVER)

INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS

- + Are interactions in the classroom respectful, positive, and educationally productive?
- + Is it clear that both instructor and students are prepared for the class?
- + What evidence is there of interest, enthusiasm, and engagement in activities on the side of the instructor? students?
- + Does the instructor motivate students and encourage student learning in appropriate ways?
- + Does the instructor respond appropriately to student behaviors and concerns?
- + Does the instructor's tone, voice, volume, and inflection contribute to engaging students?
- + Did the instructor provide timely and specific feedback?

IF APPLICABLE:

- + Was equipment used properly in a safe/sanitary manner?

THE INSTRUCTOR:		Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Effective	Outstanding	Not Applicable	COMMENTS (Mandatory for a rating of Unsatisfactory or Outstanding)
25	Was dressed in appropriate attire for the laboratory/clinical experience.						
26	Communicated appreciation for the subject.						
27	Showed respect for student questions and responses.						
28	Used appropriate voice volume and inflection, and was easy to understand.						
29	Presented information or led discussions with enthusiasm and interest.						
30	Provided constructive and timely feedback on assignments (projects tasks/ experiments/ practice) and encouraged students to self assess.						
31	Responded appropriately to student behaviors and concerns.						
THE STUDENTS:							
32	Were dressed in appropriate attire for the laboratory/clinical experience.						
33	Practiced safe handling and disposal of product and/or equipment.						
34	Were engaged in the lesson.						
35	Showed evidence of preparation.						
36	Had a positive rapport with the instructor.						

(N.B. "Needs Improvement" and "Effective" and "Outstanding" are to be considered satisfactory evaluations; "Not Applicable" shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS (MUST BE PROVIDED BY THE OBSERVER)

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

- + Does the instructor lead the classroom effectively?
- + Was attendance taken?
- + Is the atmosphere in the class conducive to learning?
- + Did the class begin/end on time?
- + Was the classroom left in a neat, orderly and secure manner?

IF APPLICABLE:

- + Were laboratory equipment and materials arranged for and prepared prior to the start of the session?
- + Were safety precautions discussed and adhered to?
- + Were sanitation rules followed?
- + Were equipment and materials returned or stored properly at the end of the session?

THE INSTRUCTOR:		Yes	No	Not Applicable
37	Started class on time.			
38	Checked attendance.			
39	Maintained an atmosphere conducive to learning.			
40	Maintained an organized and orderly, sanitary lab/clinic/studio environment.			
41	Demonstrated safe use of lab/clinical/studio equipment and instructional materials.			
42	Left classroom in a neat, orderly, and secure manner.			
43	Ended class on time.			

(N.B. "Needs Improvement" and "Effective" and "Outstanding" are to be considered satisfactory evaluations; "Not Applicable" shall not be interpreted as a negative evaluation.)

SUMMARY OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT (MUST BE PROVIDED BY THE OBSERVER)



NEW YORK CITY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY



EVALUATION OF LESSON:

How were the objectives of this lesson communicated to the students?

Were the objectives of the lesson met?

Yes [] No []

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

OVERALL EVALUATION OF LESSON:

Unsatisfactory [] Satisfactory []

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

SIGNATURE OF OBSERVER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF INSTRUCTOR

DATE

* I understand that my signature means only that I have read this 8 page peer observation report.



POST OBSERVATION CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM

DATE OF POST OBSERVATION CONFERENCE: _____

DATE OF OBSERVATION: _____
COURSE AND SECTION: _____

OBSERVER: _____
DEPARTMENT: _____
DISCIPLINE: _____
RANK OF OBSERVER: _____

INSTRUCTOR: _____
DEPARTMENT: _____
DISCIPLINE: _____
RANK OF INSTRUCTOR: _____

OBSERVATION WAS FILED ON _____ **WITH CHAIRPERSON** _____
(DATE) (PRINT NAME)

DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE MEMBER OR OTHER ASSIGNED BY CHAIRPERSON

NAME: _____ **RANK:** _____
(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES IF NECESSARY)

SIGNATURE OF OBSERVER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF INSTRUCTOR

DATE

* I understand that my signature means only that I have read this memorandum and that I may attach any comments I wish.

IF APPLICABLE¹

REPRESENTATIVE (PRINT NAME): _____
DEPARTMENT/DISCIPLINE: _____
RANK OF REPRESENTATIVE: _____

REPRESENTATIVE (PRINT NAME): _____
DEPARTMENT/DISCIPLINE: _____
RANK OF REPRESENTATIVE: _____

¹ Article 18 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement