



Form 1: Presentation Checklist

Update to the Peer Review Handbook to include information for Online Course review

Name: Theresa Harper

Date: 1/31/2024

Department: eLearning & Academic Technologies

COCC Contact Information: tharper2@cocc.edu / 541-383-7569

Use the instructions for this document to complete your presentation checklist; then e-mail your completed presentation checklist (*not* the instructions) to the Academic Affairs chair by his or her specified deadline. **Please note:** If an item listed is not relevant to your specific presentation to Academic Affairs, please mark as **N/A**. Use as many pages as necessary.

PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

The proposal is to add specific Online Course Review Rubric and guidance into the existing Peer Review handbook.

During the 2019-2020 academic year a Online Course review rubric was created by the Online Instruction Workgroup. Due to the timing of its completion and the pandemic, it was never formally put into practice. A heightened interest to bring full COCC programs/degrees online, combined with the addition of an instructional designer to eLearning, emphasized the need for uniform online course evaluation. In Fall 2023 eLearning in coordination with Disability Services updated the language of the original rubric to reflect current technologies and national standards. It was also suggested that the language used was for specialists in the areas of disability services and academic technology to conduct deep course evaluations but may not be appropriate for use for faculty peer-reviews. An abridged rubric with guidance was created specific to the faculty peer-review process with the intention it could also be used for self-review of a course.

Attached: Peer Review Handbook, Proposed peer Evaluation Review Standards for Online Courses

TYPE OF AGENDA ITEM

- Information Item (requires approval of AA Chair)
- Action Item
 - Information and committee feedback
 - Procedure—revision (Attach current procedure with proposed changes illustrated with track changes)
 - Procedure—new

Identify suggested location in *GPM*: _____
 - Policy—revision (Attach current policy with proposed changes illustrated with track changes)
 - Policy—new

Identify suggested location in *GPM*: _____
- New academic program (Complete only items #1 and #2 on this form and attach stage 2 document.)
- Other: _____

BUDGET

n/a

INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Impacts the faculty peer review process materials. May necessitate faculty training for use of the updated rubric.

OPERATIONAL NEEDS, CURRENT AND FUTURE

Collaboration between eLearning and the Accessible Technology Coordinator (Disability Services) to offer in-person training and provide print and web-based materials to further explain and demonstrate use of the rubric.

Members of eLearning available as needed to support online course peer review efforts as part of existing staffing.

STUDENT IMPACT

Positive student impact as online faculty are provided a more consistent peer-review process to improve course quality, access to instructional materials, and the student experience. Courses better suited for the post-COVID online educational space will help to improve student success and retention.

ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Fall 2023: Disability Services and eLearning update the language of the 2019 Online Course review rubric. (eLearning: Kristine Roshau, Yasuko Jackson, Theresa Harper. Disability Services: Jamie Rougeux, Jenna Fromme)

Theresa Harper (Instructional Designer) adapts for peer review use.

Winter 2024:

eLearning: bring draft rubric and guidance to AA for review and feedback. Theresa Harper.

Winter / Spring 2024:

Materials created for faculty training on the rubric. In-person training offered. Theresa Harper, Scott Dove (Academic Technology Support Specialist) Jenna Fromme (Accessible Technology Coordinator)

Summer/Fall 2024:

In-person training offered. On-going support by eLearning and Disability Services to faculty review teams as needed. This is a targeted expansion of current consultation support.

Winter 2025 - Winter 2026:

Survey of peer-review teams using the rubric for feedback. Survey conducted by eLearning. This is a new process.

Spring 2026

Begin new review process to update/revise rubric and guidance. Recommend 3 year cycle.

Using the Peer Review Rubric for Online Courses

Standard 1:

Course Overview and Information. The course contains appropriate and adequate information for a student to successfully access course material, navigate content, and participate. Expectations for students are transparent and readily available.

Rubric – Standard 1 criteria

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
1.1	The syllabus is present in web-friendly and printable formats.	Syllabus present, easily located and in a web friendly format. The syllabus is updated for the current course and term.	Syllabus is present but maybe difficult to locate, not formatted to print well, or in a format other than .pdf or .doc.	no syllabus available
1.2	The course outcomes are present and consistent with outcomes as listed in college catalog/Courseleaf.	A current and complete list of course outcomes are stated in the syllabus.	Course outcomes listed are outdated or incomplete.	no course outcomes listed
1.3	A course schedule of due dates and major events is provided.	Course deadlines are listed in the syllabus including exam dates and due dates for major assignments such as projects. The deadlines for assignments are standardized (i.e., Sundays at 11:59) or stated in the syllabus or a separate course schedule document.	Course deadlines are listed for all major assignments / exam / projects in the course but assignment deadlines may be missing or unclear.	Course deadlines for major assignments exams, or projects are missing.

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
1.4	The course contains a 'Getting Started' area.	Netiquette guidelines, the syllabus, an instructor introduction, and the instructor contact information are contained in a clearly marked "starting" section of the course. A course navigation or video tour of the course are recommended.	The Getting Started area of the course is missing one or more required components: syllabus, netiquette guidelines, instructor introduction, instructor contact information.	There is no labeled "getting started" (or "start here" or similar) area in the course
1.5	The instructor contact information is present.	The instructor contact information is available and includes office hours, office location, and phone number. A representative photo, preferences for best contact method, and expected reply times are recommended.	The instructor contact information is missing one or more of the following: office hours, office location, or phone number	There is no instructor contact information present.
1.6	Minimum technology requirements for the course are clearly stated.	The required technology is listed. Technology can include: hardware (computer/laptop), peripherals (webcam, etc), software, plug-ins, mobile apps, subscriptions.	The instructor lists some but not all technologies used in the course.	No information is provided regarding required technology.
1.7	Student data and Privacy information is included.	The instructor provides information about privacy for all technologies used in the course (for example Zoom, discussions, external tools). This can be in the form of a link to a third-party privacy statement.	The instructor provides information about privacy for some but not all technologies used in the course.	No information is provided regarding student privacy.

What meeting Standard 1 "LOOKS LIKE" in an online course

- 1.1 You find the syllabus easily - it's on the home page, in a getting started module, or in the Syllabus canvas navigation area. The syllabus is current and accurate, using the COCC template.

If the syllabus is included as a file it is either a .doc or .pdf file. The syllabus may be posted in multiple locations, but should be the identical information/file in each location.

- 1.4 The course has a “getting started” module (can be titled something else such as “Start Here” “How to Get Started” etc, but should be clear for students that it is where to go first in the course.) Inside this module the syllabus is posted as well as information about the instructor (including contact information.) Module may contain other information such as course policies, textbook requirements, course policies, etc.) A video of how to navigate the course is highly recommended, however text based instructions on course navigation are acceptable.
- 1.7 Course tools privacy statements may be as simple as a link to the COCC Academic Technology database entry when available.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 1:

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Course Overview and Information can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- video introductions
- instructor photo with contact information
- expected response times to various communication methods
- the Syllabus can be included in both a web viewable and printable format
- ensure all course assignments / due dates are entered prior to the start of the term so the automatic Course Schedule (inside the Canvas Syllabus navigation area) populates correctly

Standard 2:

Course Structure and Organization. The course is designed and organized in such a way that navigation is intuitive and consistent. Learning materials are up to dates and tools are functional. Institutional resources and technologies are accessible and explained.

Rubric – Standard 2 criteria

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
2.1	Modules are clearly labeled and organized intuitively.	There are distinct modules. (A consistent labeling or organizational structure and links to specific tools and materials in the course may not be consistently present.)	All course material is embedded in one content area when there is no guidance for navigating the content area to find pertinent material.	No course structure present.
2.2	The course links are active, materials are current, and activities are functioning as intended.	90% of more of course links, materials, and activities open and function properly.	The course links, materials, or activities are no longer valid or otherwise do not function properly.	
2.3	Links to Student Resources are provided and their purposes are explained.	Links to Student Resources are included in the course.	Some links are included to Student Resources. Common resources for the discipline or student level may be missing.	Links to Student Resources are not included in the course.

What meeting Standard 2 “LOOKS LIKE” in an online course

2.1 Links to tools or materials in the course refers to hyperlinking to the Canvas page, assignment, or navigational area when it is mentioned on another Canvas page or assignment. Not every connection needs to be linked to meet this criteria. Best practice is to link assignments at a minimum. For example:

Steps to complete

- Review materials in this module. This can include videos, links to Canvas Guides, and informational pages. Interact with the topics most relevant to you and your current familiarity level with Canvas.
- Complete the [Canvas Fundamentals quiz](#).

2.3 Student resources include the Accessibility tools provided as part of the course template. Additional resources may be added, but none should be removed. Additional student resources that may be listed include Disability Services, Testing and Tutoring, Student Help resources

(<https://www.cocc.edu/departments/student-life/student-resources/help.aspx>) or others relevant to the course.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 2:

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Course Structure and Organization can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- Links to student resources are accompanied by descriptions of the resource. Canvas Help is explained.
- Links are included to the majority of referenced distinct areas of the course (assignments, pages, navigation areas, etc) or information is provided for students how to access the material.
- All links are functional and open in new windows or tabs.
- Information about student resources are included in a Getting Started area.

Standard 3

Communication and Interaction. The course encourages interaction between the student and the instructor, between peers, and with the content itself. Regular and substantive interaction is evident.

Rubric – Standard 3 criteria

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
3.1	Announcements about the course are posted with regularity and focus on course content, activities, or assessments.	Announcements are made at least once per week and are related to course content or reference specific course events. The instructor’s tone is straightforward or friendly.	Announcements are sent randomly and/or are accessible in various course tools. The announcement does not refer to course content or specific course events.	No announcements in course.
3.2	The instructor provides timely and constructive feedback on student work. The timing students can expect to receive a grade after due date is stated.	Regular feedback is provided and aligned to assignment objectives. Feedback is made available for students to view through the LMS. The instructor communicates when grades and feedback are available to students and where feedback can be found.	Feedback may be provided, but the instructor does not identify standards for when and how it is delivered, or the identified standards are not met. Feedback does not align to assignment objectives.	Feedback is not provided on assignments.

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
3.3	The instructor engages with and/or moderates students within course activities or other RSI as appropriate.	The instructor is at least nominally present in a facilitation capacity and moderates as needed.	Instructor overtakes the dialog and stifles peer-to-peer engagement.	Instructor has no visible presence in the activity.
3.4	Students formally introduce themselves to the instructor and to each other.	Students are asked to participate in an introductory activity as part of the first week's content. The activity remains available throughout the term.	The introductory activity does not respect student privacy or appropriate boundaries.	No introductory activity included in the course.
3.5	Students have a variety of consistent opportunities for peer-to-peer interactions via course tools.	The course makes use of tools that encourage and facilitate peer-to-peer interactions. Students have opportunities to connect with peers through graded assessments.	The course has limited, or strictly ungraded, opportunities for peer-to-peer interactions.	The course has no opportunities for peer-to-peer interactions.

What meeting Standard 3 “LOOKS LIKE” in an online course

3.1 Announcements are posted regularly, at least once per week, and can be found in the same location each week. This could be using the announcements tool (preferred), as a page post added in the same location in each module, or as an email. The tone of the message is professional or friendly. The content of the message is related to course content and goes beyond due dates to connections to course material.

3.2 A timeline for grading is communicated to students, and followed by the instructor. The timeline could be provided in the syllabus, getting started area, or in the assignment description area. (Including it in all three areas is preferred.) Grading is completed in Canvas.

3.3 Instructors are visible in all interactive areas (such as discussions) and moderate in a timely and thoughtful way. Moderation should not overtake the student-student interaction, but provide additional information, corrections of course related information, and reminder on netiquette and civil discourse as needed. No students are singled out by name for correction in a public forum, but can be coached one-on-one to correct posts that contain inappropriate, bullying, or harassing comments. If an instructor has stated they will primarily be an observer for a particular course area or topic, moderation may be minimal.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 3:

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Communication and Interaction can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- Announcements are delivered in a consistently friendly and welcoming tone.
- Announcements reference materials or discussions from the previous week in addition to upcoming content.
- Provide rubrics for assignments and use the option to provide written feedback in addition to the score
- Comments acknowledge student contributions and participation (including In areas where instructor’s intention is to primarily observe.) This could be through discussion posts/comments, announcements, or grading feedback to students.
- Instructor responds to every student discussion post early in the term to model posting and ensure students feel “heard” and their ideas welcomed.
- Student opportunities to connect with peers occur across several formats – graded and ungraded, assessments, activities, etc.

Standard 4

Learning Materials. The course offers a variety of resources to support the stated objectives; facilitate student learning and collaboration; and promote the development of higher-order analysis, problem solving, and critical thinking skills.

Rubric – Standard 4

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
4.1	Unit level objectives are present and written from the student perspective.	Module (or unit, or weekly depending on structure) objectives are present and are written in a way that is measurable.	Unit level objectives are inconsistently present.	No unit level objectives.
4.2	Learning materials directly support and align with the stated unit objectives.	Learning materials align with course or unit level objectives.	Learning materials are only vaguely aligned with stated course or unit level objectives	Learning materials are not aligned with course and/or unit objectives.

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
4.3	The intended purpose and use of the learning materials provided are clearly stated in the context of the lesson. (What is the material, why is it included, how should students use it)	The description for learning materials addresses the purpose or use of the material, or both.	Learning materials are not aligned with the stated context of the lesson.	No purpose or use of learning materials is given.
4.4	Learning materials are presented in multiple modes and formats appropriate for an online environment.	Learning materials are presented in a manner that shows the instructor considered variety and student engagement.	Learning materials have limited variety or are in a format difficult for students to engage with in an online environment.	Learning materials are all in a single mode.
4.5	The course content is appropriately cited, and copyright provisions made when applicable.	Course content links to required citation information.	Citations for course content are not always included or are inaccurate.	No course content citations.
4.6	Estimated time for completion of learning materials is appropriately equivalent to face-to-face class expectations.	Learning materials require an appropriate time commitment relative to the course credit hours.	Learning materials require too much time, or much less time than would be expected from an in-person section of the same course.	n/a

What meeting Standard 4 “LOOKS LIKE” in an Online Course

4.1 Objectives are listed for students in a prominent location at the beginning of a course unit (or module or week). The objectives used measurable language (avoids terms such as “know”, “learn”, “explore” etc.) and connect to course objectives.

4.2 Learning materials ideally have stated connections to unit or course objectives. If not stated, you can easily determine which objective is supported by the material.

4.4 Learning materials are presented in a variety of modes in each unit/module of the course. Examples of modes include text, interactive activities, video, discussion/debate, hands-on experience or experiment, case studies, demonstrations, collaborative activities, ungraded surveys/quizzes to self-check understanding, writing/thinking prompts, and many more.

4.5 For course citations you as the peer reviewer are not expected to confirm the accuracy of every citation. You should check a sample of the citations in the course or accuracy.

4.6 Assessing the time required for a student is difficult. For a 4 credit course a good estimate is that students will need about 10-12 hours, with 3-4 of those counting as the "contact hours" or "class engagement" (discussions, activities, group work) and the remaining time spent on readings and individual assignments. As you evaluate a course look at the amount of reading and video, the number of and depth of thinking in discussions, and the length and any required research for assignments. The actual time each week needed will vary slightly, but should average this 3-4 hours of engagement and 7-8 hours of study and independent work.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 4:

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Learning Materials can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- Write unit objectives from the student perspective. Ensure alignment between Blooms level of course objectives and unit objectives.
- Create transparent descriptions for all learning materials and assessments that connects the purpose and use of materials and unit and course objectives.

Standard 5

Assessment and Evaluation. The course offers a variety of methods for students to prove competency and mastery of the course learning outcomes and unit objectives. Assessment policy and expectations are clearly stated in advance. Regular and substantive feedback is provided for submitted work

Rubric – Standard 5

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
5.1	The course assessments are aligned with stated unit-level objectives.	Assessments and unit objectives align. Assessment instructions use language that connects the assessment with learning materials.	Little observable continuity between unit objectives and given assessments.	No alignment between objectives and assessment.
5.2	Expectations for successful completion of assignments are included in assignment directions.	Full assignment directions are present, as well as points possible, due date, and other essential details.	Few assignment instructions are included, with little or no details given for submission	Assignment expectations are not included in directions.

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
5.3	Course grade policy and rationale are referenced in graded assessments.	Possible points are included. May direct students to the syllabus for an expanded grade policy.	Assignment may or may not refer to points possible, with limited mention of how points are earned or deducted.	Assignment does not refer to points possible, and/or no mention of how points are earned or deducted.
5.4	Multiple methods are used to measure students' knowledge and skills.	A variety of formative and summative assessments are presented in the course and reflect the intended learning objectives.	Little or no variety in assessment types is available. Assessments do not accurately reflect the learning objectives.	n/a
5.5	Assessment and course grades are available and updated regularly in the online gradebook.	Online gradebook accurately reflects assignments and grading schema as listed in syllabus. Dates are correct and updated for the current term.	Online gradebook is incomplete and/or does not accurately represent grades earned throughout the term.	Online gradebook not used.

What meeting Standard 5 "LOOKS LIKE" in an Online Course

5.1 The unit and/or course objectives are directly stated or linked in the assignment/assessment description. Additionally, the description may include reference to learning materials or activities that should be completed prior to starting the assignment/assessment. (Recommended)

5.4 Look through units/modules for evidence of both summative and formative assessment. Formative assessment will usually be low-stakes or ungraded that provides information to the instructor about student progress toward objectives. This could include discussions, informal writing assignments, individual quiz questions, self-checks, "muddiest point" or other reflective response, etc. Summative assessments may be throughout the course or found in more traditional "midterm" or "final" type quizzes or assignments.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 5:

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Assessment and Evaluation can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- Both assessments and learning materials reference each other and unit and course objectives to show connection and alignment.

- Assessments include rubrics or other descriptions/examples of what satisfactory submissions will include.
- Assessments include a variety of submission types and flexibility for students to support learning preferences.

Standard 6

Accessibility. The course is accessible to all students.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Criteria	Description	Acceptable	Needs Revision	Missing
6.1	Information is provided about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course.	The institutional syllabus containing an ADA statement and links to Disability Services is present. Recommended to add additional connections to resources such as Testing and Tutoring in a prominent course location.	Instructor has removed the institutional syllabus.	n/a
6.2	The course uses UDL principles and provides alternative means of access to course materials in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.	File types used are standard (includes PDF, HTML, Word, PowerPoint). All course content is in file types supported by Panorama to allow student choice in format.	Some documents are in non-standard file types or require revision to facilitate the use of student-facing accessibility tools.	n/a
6.3	The course design facilitates readability.	Documents and files have been tested for basic text-to-speech compatibility using file specific tools such as Readspeaker and accessibility checkers provided by Canvas, Office, Google Suite, and Panorama. The colors and fonts used have appropriate contrast and are consistent throughout the course.	Documents are not able to be read by a screen reader. Color and font choices are inconsistent and present visibility issues when viewed on screens.	n/a
6.4	Course multimedia facilitates ease of use.	Video and audio content items are uploaded using approved platforms which enable auto-captioning.	Closed captions are not available for streaming media and/or content is directly embedded into the LMS (not streaming via an approved platform).	n/a

6.5	Instructor partners with Disability Services to meet accommodation requests	If presented with accommodation requests, instructor has actively connected with support services to permit a course materials review and work to provide alternative content to students in a timely fashion that promotes student success.	Faculty with accommodation requests have not connected with support staff in Disability Services or eLearning to explore options for creating or providing accessible content.	n/a
-----	---	--	--	-----

What meeting Standard 6 “LOOKS LIKE” in an Online Course

6.1 Course tools accessibility statements may be as simple as a link to the COCC Academic Technology database entry when available.

6.2 UDL Multiple Means of Representation promotes providing learning different ways to engage with course materials. For example: including both text and multimedia learning materials to support different learning preferences, strengths, and technology.

Panorama supports DOC, DOCX, PPT, PPTX, PDF, HTML, TXT, GIF, XLS, XLSX, ODT, ODP, ODS, and RTF file types. Scanned pdfs may not be accessible unless formatted by OCR.

6.3 Peer reviewers are not expected to test the readability using a screen reader for all documents in the course, although testing a few from each format (.pdf, .doc, etc.) is recommended. For color contrast consider the visual readability of the page to you as the reviewer, are any words hard to make out due to font selection or background colors? (Examples: white text on a yellow background, or dark blue text on a black background.) Accessibility checkers in Canvas and office complete a basic contrast check as well.

6.4 Captions should be present and at least 80% accurate. Terms crucial to the course material (discipline specific vocabulary and people’s names) are correct. Kaltura, Zoom, and YouTube are examples of platforms that can provide auto-captioning.

6.5 Peer reviewers may not be able to determine a rating for this criteria. Teaching faculty can share any experience working with Disability Services but should not share actual communication or student names requesting accommodation.

NEXT STEPS for Standard 6

Courses that meet expectations in all areas of Accessibility can add in recommended features to promote student connection and engagement such as:

- Instructor training: internal or external (QM, WebAim, etc.) training or certification completed in the area of accessibility for students.
- Video captioning is 100% accurate and provided for all video content.

- ❑ Documents are accessible at a high level – this includes consistent use of heading structures, tagging, and navigation. All scanned documents have been converted with OCR and reviewed for accuracy.
- ❑ Course demonstrates high level of application of Universal Design for Learning principles that reduce barriers for students with disabilities (and support all students.) Course materials and activities are designed to reduce the need for accommodation requests.

DRAFT

FACULTY PEER EVALUATION HANDBOOK – ONLINE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: SHARED VALUES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AT COCC.....	2
SECTION 2: COCC FACULTY MEMBER CATEGORIES.....	3
PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS.....	3
ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS.....	3
FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY MEMBERS.....	3
FULL-TIME TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS.....	4
SECTION 3: PEER TEAM GUIDELINES FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY.....	6
SETTING UP A PEER TEAM.....	6
TENURED FACULTY PEER TEAMS.....	7
TEMPORARY FULL-TIME FACULTY.....	7
PEER TEAM INITIAL MEETING.....	7
SYLLABUS.....	8
PEER TEAM REVIEW OF SYLLABUS.....	8
SYLLABUS REQUIREMENTS.....	8
SYLLABUS RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8
ONLINE/VIRTUAL COURSE OBSERVATIONS.....	8
USING THE PEER EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR ONLINE COURSES.....	9
PEER EVALUATION RUBRIC STANDARDS.....	9
DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION.....	10
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING.....	10
STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSIVE TEACHING.....	11
THE REPORTS.....	11
FORMATIVE PEER TEAM REPORTS.....	11
SUMMATIVE AND SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.....	11
SECTION 4: DESIGNATED EVALUATOR BEST PRACTICES.....	13

SECTION 1: SHARED VALUES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AT COCC

The following are shared values concerning teaching and learning at Central Oregon Community College.

MASTERY OF THE COURSE CONTENT AND SKILLS, INCLUDING

- using appropriate discipline-specific pedagogy;
- staying abreast of current knowledge and new developments in the subject matter field;
- using course materials and co-requisites that complement course objectives and effectively assist students in mastering course content and skills.

COURSE STRUCTURE THAT

- allows students the opportunity to succeed;
- uses course time effectively;
- clearly defines course outcomes;
- provides students with adequate time and reasonable preparation to complete assignments and exams successfully;
- incorporates assessment practices that are consistent, fair, and responsible;
- gives students regular, timely feedback on their progress and performance in the course;
- and provides students with access to all course materials and feedback on assessments given in the course.

COMMUNICATION THAT INCLUDES

- enthusiasm and passion for the subject, engaging students in the content and motivating them to learn;
- examples, explanations and directions that are clear, direct, relevant, and unambiguous;
- and instructor's expectations and evaluation criteria for student work which are clearly articulated in advance of due dates and are consistently applied by the instructor in practice;

CREATION OF A LEARNING ENVIRONMENT THAT

- is safe, constructive, and stimulating, including tolerance of disagreement; is open to suggestion and criticism and encourages the expression of multiple points of view, when appropriate;
- is fair and equitable, fostering mutual respect in the online learning environment without condescension or favoritism;
- uses fair and consistent course policies which are communicated clearly and applied equitably to all students;
- effectively employs diverse teaching strategies to accommodate different learning styles in an effort to bring all students into the learning process and keep them engaged;
- allows for taking risks in the spirit of innovation;
- works respectfully and cooperatively with colleagues and students;
- and is accessible to all students with or without accommodations.

SECTION 2: COCC FACULTY MEMBER CATEGORIES

PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS

These are COCC instructors that receive no more than 24.4 load units (LU) per academic year. (As a reminder, all faculty are eligible for online course revision stipends per [COCC's Online Course Development criteria](#)). The following apply to this faculty category:

1. Summer is not normally part of the load unit total.
2. Not eligible members of the Faculty Forum and no benefits.
3. Assigned load as needed by their Department Chair on a term-by-term basis.
4. Paid according to the Adjunct/Part-Time Salary Schedule.
5. Peer evaluations and Designated Evaluator (DE) reviews completed in their first two academic years. Subsequent peer evaluations and DE reviews will be scheduled no more than 3 year later as determined by the DE.
 - a. [Classroom Observation form for Full-Time Temp and Part-Time Faculty](#) (may require COCC login to access and is specific to in-person rather than online instruction)
 - b. [GP manual](#) (PT Faculty Evaluation Policy)
6. Have no peer team.

ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS

These are COCC instructors that are on an annual contract with the intent to teach a minimum of 24.5 LU and a maximum of 37.5 Load Units per each academic year. (As a reminder, all faculty are eligible for online course revision stipends per [COCC's Online Course Development criteria](#)).

The following apply to this faculty category:

1. Summer is not normally part of the load unit total.
2. Eligible to be members of the Faculty Forum and eligible for adjunct benefits.
3. If position is approved, Adjunct Faculty Members are assigned an estimated load for the academic year prior to Fall term (Courses and LU could change based on department needs and enrollment).
4. Paid according to the Adjunct/Part-Time Salary Schedule.
5. Peer evaluations and Designated Evaluator (DE) reviews completed in their first two academic years. Subsequent peer evaluations and DE reviews will be scheduled no more than 3 year later as determined by the DE.
 - a. Link to [Classroom Observation form for Full-Time Temp and Part-Time Faculty](#) (may require COCC login to access and is specific to in-person rather than online instruction)
6. Have no peer team.

FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY MEMBERS

COCC instructors that are on an annual contract (typically not longer than 3 straight years) with the intent to teach approximately 45 Load Units each academic year. (As a reminder, all faculty are eligible for online course revision stipends per [COCC's Online Course Development criteria](#)).

The following apply to this faculty category:

1. Summer is not normally part of the load unit total, unless they are on an approved alternative contract.
2. Eligible to be members of the Faculty Forum and eligible for Full-Time benefits.
3. If position is approved, Full-Time Temporary Faculty Members are assigned an estimated load for the academic year prior to Fall term (Courses and Load Units could change based on department needs and enrollment).
4. Paid according to the Full-Time Faculty Salary Schedule.
5. Evaluated by the Designated Evaluator or designee in their first academic year and every 2-3 years thereafter.
 - a. Link to [Classroom Observation form for Full-Time Temp and Part-Time Faculty](#) (may require COCC login to access)
6. Have no required peer team.

FULL-TIME TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS

COCC instructors that are on an ongoing contract with the intent to teach approximately 45 Load Units each academic year.

The following apply to this faculty category:

1. Summer is not normally part of the load unit total unless they are on an approved alternative contract.
2. Eligible to be members of the Faculty Forum and eligible for Full-Time benefits.
3. Assigned an estimated load for the academic year on an ongoing basis. In addition to primary assignment (includes student advising responsibilities), also have expectations in the areas of college service, and professional improvement. In addition, community service is expected for Assistant Professor II and beyond.
4. Paid according to the Full-Time Faculty Salary Schedule.
5. Evaluation / Peer Team:
 - a. Peer Team Formative Evaluation: In the first year as a Full-Time tenure-track faculty member, a 3-person peer team composed of the DE, a faculty member from within the department, and a faculty member from outside the department will be established to provide feedback for improvement. No documentation goes to their personnel file in Human Resources (HR).
 - b. Peer Team Summative Evaluation: In the second year as a Full-Time tenure-track faculty member, a 3-person peer team composed of the DE, a faculty member from within the department, and a faculty member from outside the department will be established to evaluate performance. Summative peer team reports will be submitted to the faculty member's personnel file in Human Resources (HR). After the faculty member is tenured, peer teams can be reduced to the DE and one other faculty member. After first- and second-year peer team evaluations, summative evaluation will occur the year prior to tenure and every fifth year thereafter.
 - i. [LINK TO OFFICIAL EVALUATION PRACTICES](#)

NOTE: Part-time and Adjunct faculty members are eligible to move to the next rate of pay each Fall provided that they have met the criteria of “next three quarters with successful evaluation.” For purposes of counting quarters, a contract of three load units or more counts as a quarter. Contracts of less than three load units over several quarters may be aggregated to count as a quarter. More than 24 load units in two quarters may be counted as three quarters. [LINK TO COURSE EVALUATIONS FAQs](#) (This link contains information about course evaluations FOR ALL FACULTY CATEGORIES.)

SECTION 3: PEER TEAM GUIDELINES FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

These guidelines are provided as a productive first step toward instituting more consistency in our peer observation practices and evaluation criteria. These guidelines are intended as starting point for a conversation within departments and peer teams. Designated Evaluators in conversation with the faculty and peer team members should adapt these to best fit the specific teaching situations.

SETTING UP A PEER TEAM

The Designated Evaluator is responsible for setting up the peer team. See guidance for setting up this team in Section 4.

FULL-TIME TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

FORMATIVE PEER TEAM (YEAR ONE)

During the first year at COCC all Full-Time, tenure-track faculty will have a formative peer team. This peer team consists of three members. In organizing the Peer Team, the DE should consider gender representation. Ideally, the peer team will include:

- A Designated Evaluator (DE), the DE is usually, but not always, the Department Chair
- An internal peer (usually someone with content knowledge of the area when possible)
- An external peer

The formative goals of the peer team include the development of a collegial/mentoring atmosphere, the introduction of the faculty member to the procedures and culture of COCC, the development of an environment aimed at the sharing of ideas on teaching and mutual learning, the provision of prompt and informal feedback after visitations. The faculty member should consider the members of his/her peer team as resources to consult concerning any aspects of the primary teaching assignment, procedures at the College, or other areas of concern.

SUMMATIVE PEER TEAM (YEAR TWO)

During the second year at COCC all Full-Time, tenure-track faculty will have a summative peer team. This team can be, but is not necessarily, the same as the formative peer team. The summative peer team consists of three members. In organizing the Peer Team, the DE should consider gender representation. Ideally, the peer team will include:

- A Designated Evaluator (DE), the DE is usually, but not always, the Department Chair
- An internal peer (usually someone with content knowledge of the area when possible)
- An external peer

The summative goals of the peer team include the evaluation of the faculty member's role in the primary teaching assignment; determining areas for growth or areas of concern; offering positive, concrete suggestions for that growth; and documenting the faculty member's development as a teacher.

PRE-TENURE PEER TEAM (YEAR FOUR)

The pre-tenure peer team should be structured much as the summative peer team with three members. In organizing the Peer Team, the DE should consider gender representation. Ideally, the peer team will include:

- A Designated Evaluator (DE), the DE is usually, but not always, the Department Chair
- An internal peer (usually someone with content knowledge of the area when possible)
- An external peer

TENURED FACULTY PEER TEAMS

All faculty members will continue to have regular peer teams every five years after tenure. At this point faculty may elect to have a smaller peer team, consisting of the DE and 1 additional peer.

TEMPORARY FULL-TIME FACULTY

Temporary Full-Time faculty do not have peer teams but are evaluated by their DE or their designee. Evaluators use the [Classroom Observation form for Full-Time Temp and Part-Time Faculty](#) (may require COCC login to access and is specific to in-person rather than online instruction).

PEER TEAM INITIAL MEETING

The designated evaluator will call an initial meeting among peer team members and the faculty member to discuss peer team responsibilities and establish deadlines, including when access will be granted/requested to online course spaces. For reviews spanning an academic year, review access should be granted prior to the start of classes for at least one term so that potential Week 0 and Week 1 practices can be observed.

The faculty member is given the opportunity to share individual goals and requests for feedback from the peer evaluators and to give peer evaluators the opportunity to ask questions and offer suggestions. Some suggestions for questions to include in this initial conversation may include:

- What could the person reviewing your class focus on that will most help you improve your teaching?
- Describe your assessment practices and explain how they connect to student learning outcomes.
 - How will assessment practices be demonstrated to the Peer Team?
 - Share how you plan to communicate assessment guidelines with students.
 - What is your policy regarding timing and delivery of student feedback?
- What concerns or challenges do you foresee related to teaching this course?
 - Are there any areas that you are having difficulty with (Student interaction, group work, maintaining policy, resources, etc.)?
- What assistance from COCC would be beneficial to help you become a better instructor?
- Are there other questions or concerns you have that can be addressed either in the peer team follow-up session or by the department or department chair?
- Does your delivery method allow you to host Peer Team members in a live setting, and if so, how will you coordinate this?
 - Will you also use these live meetings for an opportunity to receive immediate feedback?
- Review the Peer Evaluation Rubric for Online Courses and discuss what elements of the course structure and design will be reviewed.

- What are the prerequisites of the course and the general abilities and level of students?

The committee should also consider strategizing the structure of the review. Be sure to contact the eLearning office to gain access to the course(s) you will be reviewing. Some suggestions to consider as you are strategizing include:

- If the instructional assignment includes year-long sequences and the period of the peer team assignment allows, consider reviewing more than just the first term course in the sequence. Reviewing second and third-stage courses in the sequence allow you to monitor continuity, concept building, and student development at different stages of the year-long learning experience.
- Establishing where and how student-faculty interactions occur (on Canvas or via email or in some other location) and the nature of assessment in the courses.

SYLLABUS

PEER TEAM REVIEW OF SYLLABUS

The faculty member should provide all Peer Team members with copies of syllabi for all courses, every term during the peer evaluation year.

SYLLABUS REQUIREMENTS

According to the [COCC Syllabus Policy](#) (may require COCC login to access) for Credit Classes each instructor must provide a course syllabus to enrolled students at the beginning of the course and to the department administrative assistant (who maintains a historical record for the College) for each section taught. Instructors must complete each syllabus and post it to the Canvas course site before the start of the term.

The syllabus serves as an outline of the course of study and communicates the instructor's design. The syllabus is a legal document and may be used in grievance and judicial hearings; therefore, clarity and specificity are very important.

Please see the [Syllabus Template](#) (may require COCC login to access) for required and optional elements of a COCC course syllabus.

SYLLABUS RECOMMENDATIONS

Syllabi for an online course should accurately reflect and acknowledge the specifics of the delivery method for the class. Specific inclusions may include:

- Communication schedule with different options presented for contact
- Assessment schedule and directions for finding feedback
- Directions on how and where to find grades
- Syllabus and related documents are easily viewable in a web-friendly format
- Accessibility and privacy statements for online tools or software used in the course

ONLINE/VIRTUAL COURSE OBSERVATIONS

The college recognizes and values the diverse teaching situations and discipline-specific objectives and methods that contribute to the educational experience at COCC. As such, the following guidelines are intended to provide a starting point. Each evaluator should adapt and modify their approach to meet

each specific situation. Open conversation between peer evaluators, the DE, and the instructor is essential in balancing the goal of consistency in our evaluation practices and criteria, with the desirability of adapting such practices and criteria to specific and diverse teaching situations.

All peer team members or DE (for non-Full-Time Faculty) should be peer reviewers in Canvas and/or other online platforms used by the faculty member for any online course. It is recommended that at least one peer team member have online teaching experience.

NOTE: During the Peer Team Evaluation year, peer evaluators should attempt to review at least two courses taught by the instructor (i.e., an entry level course and an upper-level course, etc.)

WHILE REVIEWING THE ONLINE COURSE:

If possible, review the entire Canvas course by exploring all navigation folders and resources (such as videos) available to students, including folders and materials that may apply to earlier or later weeks in the term (if available on the date of your observations).

USING THE PEER EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR ONLINE COURSES

[Link to Peer Evaluation Rubric](#)

COCC has developed a rubric that is specifically designed to guide reviewers and faculty through the course of creating and evaluating online courses and virtual class spaces. It will be best applied to courses taught in the following delivery methods:

Online - Asynchronous class. Course instruction happens virtually (through Canvas) with no requirements for students to attend class at a specified time.

In-Person/Online - Mix of synchronous and asynchronous. Student will receive some course instruction virtually (usually via Canvas) and will also attend some class sessions at a specified location at specified times.

Remote/Online - Mix of synchronous and asynchronous. Student will receive some course instruction virtually (usually via Canvas) and will also attend some class sessions virtually at specified times (usually via Zoom).

In particular, the rubric looks at the following aspects of virtual class spaces, which are broken into six Standards. Within each standard are sub-standards which will serve as a checklist for reviewers and include such items as “**1.1** The syllabus is present in web-friendly and printable formats.”

It is recommended that reviewers and reviewees work through the rubric over the course of a term, adjusting content as appropriate and necessary. The rubric has no numeric weighing system, but lists sub-items as ‘Excellent’, ‘Acceptable’, or ‘Needs Revision’. All sub-categories contain examples for each item listed to guide faculty and reviewers through any modifications.

PEER EVALUATION RUBRIC STANDARDS

- 1. Course Overview and Information.** The course contains appropriate and adequate information for a student to successfully access course material, navigate content, and participate. Expectations for students are transparent and readily available.

2. **Course Structure and Organization.** The course is designed and organized in such a way that navigation is intuitive and consistent. Learning materials are up to date and tools are functional. Institutional resources and technologies are accessible and explained.
3. **Communication and Interaction.** The course encourages interaction between the student and the instructor, between peers, and with the content itself. Regular and substantive interaction is evident.
4. **Learning Materials.** The course offers a variety of resources to support the stated objectives; facilitate student learning and collaboration; and promote the development of higher-order analysis, problem solving, and critical thinking skills.
5. **Assessment and Evaluation.** The course offers a variety of methods for students to prove competency and mastery of the course learning outcomes and unit objectives. Assessment policy and expectations are clearly stated in advance. Regular and substantive feedback is provided for submitted work.
6. **Accessibility.** The course is accessible to all students.

Categories for the Peer Evaluation Rubric were modelled on existing course quality assessment rubrics from established groups such as Quality Matters, Quality Online Course Initiative, and the OSCQR – SUNY Online Course Quality Review Rubric. The standards reflect the necessity and application of attributes such as Regular and Substantive Interaction, Universal Design for Learning, and alignment of materials and assessments, but should be flexible enough to allow for individual style and teaching preferences.

Return to [“Setting up a Peer Team”](#)

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

COCC has a commitment to the [Principles of Community](#), including how they are implemented in the classroom. *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is one method instructors may employ to enhance inclusion in their classrooms. If the Peer Team would like to include this as part of the evaluation process, the following can be used as a starting point for that discussion (from [Carnegie Mellon University](#)):

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) is a framework for teaching that integrates cultural content and awareness to enhance achievement for all students. Although it was first developed in K-12 circles, CRT can be applied to college teaching and benefits all students (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009).

CRT recognizes that intrinsic motivation matters for student learning. Motivation can be enhanced or reduced by classroom conditions. Motivation is connected to cultural backgrounds and forms of learning, which means that faculty have a responsibility to promote a culturally responsive teaching environment in their classrooms. To do so, instructors can develop norms and practices for the following four conditions:

1. *Establish inclusion* by creating a learning environment in which learners and teachers feel respected and connected to one another.
2. *Develop a positive attitude* towards learning through personal relevance and volition.
3. *Enhance meaning* by creating challenging and engaging learning experiences that include learners’ perspectives and values.

4. *Engender competence* to help learners see how they are effectively learning something they value and that is of authentic value to their community.

STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSIVE TEACHING

- [Examine your content for diverse perspectives.](#)
- [Establish guidelines for interaction.](#)
- [Be transparent about expectations.](#)
- [Design inclusive assessments.](#)
- [Create accessible content.](#)
- [Do not ask individuals to speak for an entire group.](#)
- [Use multiple and diverse examples.](#)
- [Learn your students' names and how to pronounce them.](#)
- [Get to know your students as individuals.](#)

POST-VISITATION CONFERENCE BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBER AND EVALUATOR(S)

A post-visitation conference should be held promptly between the peer team member and the faculty member to debrief on the course review.

THE REPORTS

FORMATIVE PEER TEAM REPORTS

Individual feedback should be given to the faculty member. Peer teams should meet with the faculty member and designated evaluator to discuss their final review. At that time, possible concerns for the summative stage of the peer evaluation process should be raised. No written report will be submitted to the faculty member's personnel file.

SUMMATIVE AND SUBSEQUENT REPORTS

The Summative Report is submitted to the faculty member's personnel file and is part of the documentation considered for promotion and tenure. The Summative report consists of:

- DE summary and report
- Report from internal peer
- Report from external peer

Peer evaluators should be prepared to write complete, detailed reports to offer positive feedback to the faculty member offering real guidance for further growth as well as documenting perceived problems and identifying goals for the development of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness over time.

The most helpful evaluations are characterized by the following qualities, identified by Stephen D. Brookfield in *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 1990:

- **Clarity:** evaluation criteria are specified and supported with detailed observation and examples; communication is clear and straightforward.

- **Immediacy:** evaluative judgments are given as soon as possible after the assessment process is completed.
- **Regularity:** comments are made regularly even when the peer team member is simply acknowledging that suggestions are being followed; major changes are monitored closely, keeping in mind that the rhythm of significant student learning may fluctuate incrementally (two steps forward, one step back).
- **Accessibility:** peer team members provide the faculty member with opportunities to discuss and consult regarding evaluations.
- **Individualized:** respect for the faculty member's work is evidenced in the peer team's detailed, clearly individualized attention to the faculty member's efforts; however, constructive criticism is focused on the faculty member's actions, not his/her personality, to ensure that the faculty member does not feel that his/her whole being is under assault.
- **Affirming and Balanced:** peer team evaluations acknowledge the faculty member's achievements and strengths before identifying weaknesses and making critical commentary; acknowledge what is good while attention is drawn to what needs work; to maintain and improve the quality of teaching, faculty members need to recognize both their strengths and weaknesses as teachers to support on-going self-assessment and growth.
- **Future-Oriented:** clear suggestions are given about specific actions the faculty member should take in the long and short run to improve or maintain teaching effectiveness.
- **Educative:** good evaluations are those from which the faculty member can learn; to provide such helpful guidance, peer team members should keep this question in mind: What can this person learn from my comments?

The purpose of faculty summative evaluation at COCC is to maintain and strengthen the quality of COCC instruction, and to assess and evaluate a pattern of performance in the primary (teaching) assignment over time as a basis for making personnel decisions (e.g., rehire, tenure, promotions). Toward this end, it is important to identify and to document any problems or concerns as early in the evaluation process as possible so that improvement can also be identified and documented.

In the past, tenure and promotion committees have observed that constructive criticism and documentation of problem areas and growth in those areas rarely appear in peer evaluation reports. Uncritically glowing reports throw into question the value of the peer summative evaluation process. It is important to emphasize that personnel decisions based in part on peer team reports are concerned with long-term trends and that issues of concern raised early in the evaluation process offer valuable benchmarks against which to measure growth and development of the faculty members. Major concerns documented for the first time in tenure and promotion recommendations at the end of the faculty member's fourth or fifth year are threatening to the faculty member, difficult for the designated evaluator to write, and put promotion and tenure decisions in jeopardy. It is important to recognize that the purpose of the peer team is to encourage growth over time. This process must begin at the earliest stages of the faculty member's association with the College and continue throughout the years preceding key personnel decisions.

SECTION 4: DESIGNATED EVALUATOR BEST PRACTICES

- The designated evaluator/chair consults with the faculty on the selection of peer team members. One of the peer team members needs to be a content expert, if possible.
- When observing online or online/remote courses, it is preferable that at least one member of the peer team also have experience teaching online courses.
- It is advisable that the designated evaluator meets with the faculty member prior to the peer team meeting to discuss the process. The designated evaluator should encourage the faculty member to identify areas for feedback from the peer team members.
- The designated evaluator is responsible for confirming the peer team members' appointments and calling an initial meeting (early fall term) with the peer team to discuss peer team responsibilities and establish deadlines.
- During the peer team meeting, the designated evaluator facilitates a discussion about potential areas of feedback and any special circumstances to be considered.
- The designated evaluator also highlights the importance for the team reports to reflect a balance between positive feedback and constructive criticism with specifics on potential areas of growth for the faculty member. It is important to emphasize that tenure and promotion committees rely on such peer reports to identify long-term trends and areas of growth raised early in the evaluation process as valuable benchmarks against which to measure development of the faculty member.
- The designated evaluator ensures that the team members' feedback is submitted by the agreed-upon deadlines.
- For the formative report, it is recommended that the designated evaluator keep notes on the first-year visits and conversations, so that these can be used as needed to measure/report growth in the designated evaluator's second-year summative report.
- For their summative report, the designated evaluator should include their own independent observations as well as any areas of growth noted in the other peer team reports. The designated evaluator should only submit one report.
- Peer team member reports should be submitted to the DE by May 15th.
- The designated evaluator may refer to the [Department Chair Manual](#) (may require COCC login to access).
- Return to [Setting up a Peer Team](#)