CUESTA COLLEGE

##### Instructional Faculty: Peer Review Committee Evaluation Form

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Employee:** | **Semester/Year:**  |
| [ ]  **Regular Tenured** [ ]  **Tenure-track** [ ]  **Temporary**  **Full-time** [ ]  **Temporary**  **Part-time** [ ]  **Temp. w/o assignment rights** |
| **Evaluators:** | **Observation Date:** | **Time:** | **Modality:** | **Course Name:**  | **CRN:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *If you are evaluating a course taught in a* ***hybrid******or blended*** *modality, please briefly explain how the course is divided between online and face-to-face components:*  |
| *For an off-cycle review, indicate below the third member of the evaluation team and check which Sections are under review:* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [ ] Instruction (I) [ ]  Interaction with Students (II) [ ]  Materials (III) [ ]  Chair (IV) [ ]  Responsibilities (V) |

**BACKGROUND:**

The processes and procedures that govern all faculty evaluations are set forth in Article VII of the *SLOCCCD/CCFT Collective Bargaining Agreement* (CBA). The performance criteria utilized in this document reflect the professional standards established by the Academic Senate of Cuesta College.

All instructional faculty are assessed by their peers in five performance areas: Instruction (Section I), Interaction with Students (Section II), Instructional Materials (Section III), and Professional & Divisional Responsibilities (Section IV and V). The peer evaluators then determine an Overall Assessment of Performance, documented in Section VI.

The Division Chair (or Manager’s faculty designee where there is no Division Chair) shall provide input into the evaluation by completing Section IV of this form. Section IV should be completed by the Division Chair (or manager’s faculty designee where there is no Division Chair) **in consultation with the chair** **of the Division Tenure Committee/Peer Review Committee**. The information in Section IV should be taken into consideration by the peer review committee in determining the Section V and the Overall Assessment of Performance.

**RATING RUBRIC:**

Instructors are evaluated in each of the performance areas using criteria specified in each section, and rated according to the following rubric:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **SCALE** |
|  | **Excels**  | **Meets Standards** | **Needs to Improve** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Assessing Individual SectionCriteria** | The instructor is highly effective. | The instructor is consistently effective. | The instructor is not consistently effective. | N/A |
| **Assessing EachSection** | A majority of criteria are assessed as “Excels” **or** one or some criteria are so outstanding as to warrant an “Excels” **and** there are no criteria assessed below “Meets Standards.”  | A majority of criteria are assessed as “Meets Standards.”  | A majority of criteria are assessed as “Needs to Improve” **or** the evaluator deems a “Needs to Improve” is appropriate due to one or more essential criteria. | N/A |
| **Overall EvaluationAssessment** | Two (2) or more sections are assessed as “Excels,” and the remaining sections are at least “Meets Standards.” | All sections are assessed as “Meets Standards,” or three (3) are assessed as “Meets Standards” and one (1) is assessed as “Excels.” | One (1) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve.” **This will trigger an off-cycle evaluation for sections rated “Needs to Improve.”** | Three (3) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve” **or** the evaluator deems performance in SECTIONS I or II is gravely deficient. **This will at a minimum trigger an off-cycle evaluation and may lead to action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.** |

**SECTION I: ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

Section I criteria will be completed after examining or observing the following:

1. classroom observation (face to face, synchronous online, and blended/hybrid), or the learning environment (blended/hybrid, asynchronous online and correspondence). The portion(s) of the online learning environment to be examined shall be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member being evaluated and the peer evaluation committee
2. Visitation or Planned Interaction (correspondence) form.
3. Student evaluations
4. Other student interactions or learning materials only as agreed upon by the faculty member being evaluated and the peer evaluation committee.

**This Instructor:**

1. **Clearly articulates goals and objectives for the class session, the learning module, and/or the learning unit.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Makes effective use of class time (face to face and synchronous only).**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Is prepared and organized for class sessions (face to face and synchronous only).**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Presents different perspectives on issues or problem-solving methods.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Creates and maintains an environment that promotes learning.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Provides presentations and/or information that demonstrate pedagogical currency and appropriate depth of knowledge in the discipline.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Integrates challenging ideas or critical thinking in instructional presentations and content.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Promotes students’ engagement in the subject matter.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Ensures each student enrolled in the course is positively identified and is the same student who completes the coursework.**

**[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Provides course materials in an organized, easy to locate manner.**

 **[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Provides instructor-initiated regular and effective contact. [DE only]**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Provides necessary pre-enrollment information, such as a sample syllabus. [DE only]**

 **[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Facilitates a progression of learning through an established cycle of assignment submissions and feedback. [CORRESPONDENCE only]**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

See next page for overall assessment of Instructional Effectiveness …

**Provide an overall assessment of Instructional Effectiveness:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF** **SECTION IA: INSTRUCTION:****CLASSROOM/LABMODALITY** | **Excels** | **Meets Standards** | **Needs to Improve** | **N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation** |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Comments:** *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

**SECTION II.**  **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS:**

*Student evaluations and observation of student-faculty interactions shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.*

**This instructor:**

1. **Provides a syllabus students perceive explains course policies and what is expected of them.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
2. **Provides goals for the class session, the learning module, and/or the learning unit that are clear to students.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
3. **Is perceived by students to make good use of class time. (face to face and synchronous only)
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
4. **Promotes a learning environment students perceive as positive.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
5. **Is perceived by students to explain or provide materials that explain the subject matter well.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
6. **Assigns coursework students feel helps them understand the course material.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
7. **Provides feedback students perceive as helpful.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
8. **Provides grade updates or other assessments of progress in a manner students feel is readily accessible.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
9. **Provides tests, papers, projects, and other assessments students feel accurately reflect course content.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
10. **Is perceived by students to encourage them to think deeply about the subject matter presented.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
11. **Treats students in a manner they feel is respectful.**
**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
12. **Responds to student questions in a timely manner as indicated outlined in the course syllabus.**

**[ ] [ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

 **[ ]**

1. **Sent a welcome message (e.g., email or announcement) with important information to help students get started. (Not applicable for face to face or synchronous courses)**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Provides an online or correspondence course structure students perceive as well organized and easy to navigate (Not applicable for face to face or synchronous courses)**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

See next page for overall assessment of Interaction with Students …

**Provide an overall assessment of Interaction with Students.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF** **SECTION IIA: INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS** | **Excels** | **Meets Standards** | **Needs to Improve** | **N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation** |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Comments:** *Written comments are required. If the overall assessment is not consistent with the student evaluations please expla*in.

**SECTION III. ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS**

*Review of syllabi, a range of graded student work, and instructional materials provided to students shall be the basis of evaluation of this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.*

**This instructor’s:**

1. **Syllabi clearly explain course requirements, grading policy, student learning outcomes for the course(s) as developed by the division, and adhere to the official Course Outlines of Record.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
2. **Instructional materials are organized and relevant to the subject matter.**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Tests and/or projects accurately reflect** **the course material.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
2. **Tests and/or projects effectively measure students’ knowledge and skills.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
3. **Instructional materials (e.g., homework, in-class activities, group work, readings, discussions) accurately relate to course goals and objectives.[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
4. **Instructional materials demonstrate currency and depth appropriate to the course level.**[ ]  Excels [ ]  Meets Standard [ ]  Needs toImprove
5. **Instructional materials present information and assignments clearly and effectively by utilizing visual, textual, kinesthetic, or auditory activities.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
6. **The instructor makes course materials readily available to students.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
7. **Online instructional materials meet accessibility requirements.
[ ]**  Excels  **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]  [ ]** No online material was reviewed

**Provide an overall assessment of Instructional Materials.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF** **SECTION IIIA: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS****CLASSROOM/LAB MODALITY** | **Excels** | **Meets Standards** | **Needs to Improve** | **N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation** |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Comments:** *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

**SECTION IV: DIVISION CHAIR (OR MANAGER’S FACULTY DESIGNEE) EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

*The Self-Evaluation form, student evaluations and evidence of participation in divisional and college-wide responsibilities since the last evaluation cycle as required by employee status shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated. This page is to be completed by the Division Chair (or by a FT faculty-member selected by a manager if the faculty does not have a division chair).*

**This Instructor:**

1. **Works productively with students.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
2. **Maintains currency in their academic field and faculty service area (professional development).
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
3. **Maintains educational and professional contacts with the community when relevant to professional commitments (not applicable unless specifically required by law or job description).
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
4. **Is regularly available for help during posted office hours**. **(Check N/A for PT faculty with less than a 20% load; they are not required to hold office hours).
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
5. **Meets the scheduled class or service days and hours.
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
6. **Works collegially with other faculty and staff in the division/service area.
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
7. **Contributes to the work of the division/service area (development and assessment of SLOS, curriculum development, textbook selection, peer evaluation, hiring committees, etc.) Not required of part-time faculty.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
8. **Attends meetings necessary to participate in college or division business. Not required for part-time faculty.
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
9. **Meets divisional and college obligations in a timely manner (textbook orders, flex contracts, grades, reports, and requisitions, etc.).
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
10. **Meets college participatory governance committee obligations.
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable
11. **Gives final exams or final projects in accordance with the official schedule unless permission has been received from the area Dean or Director to do otherwise.
[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

**Comments:** *Written comments are required only if “Needs to Improve” is indicated in one or more of the criteria.*

**SECTION V. ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND DIVISIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

*To be completed by the Peer Committee. The Self-Evaluation form and the Division Chair portion of this evaluation packet (Section IV) is used to form the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.*
**This Instructor:**

1. **Maintains currency in their academic field (I.e., professional development).**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Demonstrates pedagogical currency in teaching.
[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve
2. **Maintains educational and professional contacts with the community when relevant to professional**

**commitments (not applicable unless specifically required by law or job description).**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

1. **Works collegially with other faculty and staff in the division/service area.**

**[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve

1. **Contributes to the work of the division/service area (development and assessment of SLOs, curriculum development, textbook selection, peer evaluation, hiring committees, etc.).**

**[ ]** Excels **[ ]** Meets Standard **[ ]** Needs to Improve **[ ]** Not applicable

**Provide an overall assessment of professional and divisional responsibilities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF****SECTION V: PROFESSIONAL AND DIVISIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**  | **Excels** | **Meets** **Standards** | **Needs** **to Improve** | **N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation** |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Comments:** *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

**SECTION VI. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE**

*Provide an overall assessment of Sections I-V, taking into consideration the findings of the Division Chair (or Designee) as indicated in Section V.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **N/A**For off-cycle evaluations, check N/A and complete Section II of the Off-cycle Evaluation Form | [ ]  |
| **EXCELS**Two (2) or more sections are assessed as “Excels,” and the remaining sections are at least “Meets Standards.” | [ ]  |
| **MEETS STANDARDS** All sections are assessed as “Meets Standards,” or three (3) are assessed as “Meets Standards” and one (1) is assessed as “Excels.” | [ ]  |
| **NEEDS TO IMPROVE** One (1) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve”. **This will trigger an off-cycle evaluation only for sections rated “Needs to Improve.”** | [ ]  |
| **UNSATISFACTORY** Three (3) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve” **or** the evaluator deems performance in SECTIONS I or II is gravely deficient. **This will at a minimum trigger an off-cycle evaluation and may lead to action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.** | [ ]  |

**Provide comments that specifically justify the overall evaluation. Attach additional pages if necessary. Written comments are required in at least one area below.**

*Commendations:**Comments in this area summarize how the instructor has demonstrated an ability that is especially noteworthy, or how the*

*instructor’s performance reflects a high degree of effectiveness.*

*Considerations*

*Comments in this area constitute advice to help the instructor surpass standards for specific criteria. They may also represent specific challenges the instructor has had to overcome. However, these suggestions do not require adoption and do not have any bearing on future evaluations.*

*Required Improvements*

*Comments in this area address specific criteria for which the instructor fails to meet standards as enumerated in any of the sections of the evaluation. These comments will be documented here by the evaluator, and the proposed resolution will be provided by the instructor being evaluated and appended to this evaluation. Additionally, the resolution of these specific deficiencies will be addressed on the self-evaluation form during the next regularly scheduled evaluation cycle.*

 *Explanation of Overall Assessment of Needs to Improve:*

*Comments are required in this area only if the Overall Assessment is “Needs to Improve.” Provide an explanation of the area(s) of substandard performance and recommendations for remediation. The peer evaluation committee chair will utilize this information to develop a plan for improvement and will document the plan on the Plan for Improvement Form.*

*Explanation of Overall Assessment of Unsatisfactory:*

*Comments are required in this area if the Overall Assessment of Performance is “Unsatisfactory.” This assessment usually indicates that in the judgment of the evaluator, the instructor’s teaching ability and/or interaction with students is gravely deficient. Fully explain the areas of grave deficiency and provide either a recommendation for remediation or explain why remediation in these areas would not be effective. The peer evaluation committee chair may utilize this information to develop a plan for improvement and document it on the Plan for Improvement Form or may recommend that the Vice President of Instruction (VPI) initiate action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.*

**Upon completion of this form (with all signatures), the chair of the DTC/Peer Review Committee must submit the following items to the Dean/Director’s office:**

[ ]  **Self-Evaluation Form** **[ ]  Peer Evaluation Form** **[ ]  Student Evaluations**

**APPLICABLE SIGNATURES:**

Committee Chair Peer Evaluator Date Peer Evaluator Date

Peer Evaluator Date Division Chair (or Designee) Date

Faculty Member Date

The above-signed individuals have read and discussed this evaluation. The faculty member's signature acknowledges receipt of a copy of the evaluation document. It does not necessarily signify agreement. The Division Chair’s (or Designee) signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the findings of the peer review committee; only that consultation between the Division Chair (or Designee) and the chair of the peer review committee has occurred. **In compliance with Articles 7.7 through 7.7.2 of the CBA, the faculty member may attach written comments to this evaluation prior to its submission to the Academic Dean.**