

1. Please comment on the selection/appointment process for faculty reviewers, including faculty selection, confirmation of appointments by the senate, facilitation of key benchmarks to adhere to the process timeline (e.g. the mid-semester meeting between weeks 8 and 10), or other elements relevant to selection/appointment of reviewers.

- I was not aware of approved appointments.
- I know very little about the process or how appointments are done other than what the timeline that the Dean dictates.
- I am aware of the process but finds it challenging how faculty cannot serve on multiple peer review teams. I only select tenured faculty within my School because of their knowledge and I am aware of their availability.
- I select reviewers that I know and respect. I think confirmation by the Senate is not necessary due to lack of communication from them. It's necessary to clarify what is the criteria for eligible peer reviewers.
- As a peer reviewer, I think the process works well and meetings are very helpful.
- Peer reviewers need clarifications on how they are selected. We agree to be part of the process because it fits our schedule.
- It was a challenging start but mainly due to learning curve. A full cycle of the same process is recommended before any changes are made.
- I'm not clear how the selection process and criteria work. I recommend including Deans in the peer review process but recognizes the problems in that situation also.
- Peer reviewers should be selected by reviewee. I do not agree that Senate needs to approve this because it only causes delay. I'm not clear what needs to be done by the benchmark. Deans should not be a reviewer but maybe a facilitator.
- I had a positive experience with the peer review process. The reviewers were considerate of reviewee's schedule when scheduling mid-semester and end of the semester meetings.
- Being selected as a peer reviewer is like parenthood because I didn't understand what the whole process entails. Overall experience was good and outcome was satisfactory. I did not know about Senate confirmation. I recommend to assess the process for improvements.

2. Please comment on the peer review timeline, including any problems and/or suggested improvements for how to implement effectively each element of the semester-length process.

- The process is cumbersome and time consuming while teaching the maximum overload.
- Timeline works fine.
- I recommend more training on the process to ensure consistency.
- Timeline is reasonable but I suggest the following: (1) Selection process needs to occur with the first 2-3 weeks versus 5th, (2) peer review conference should consist of the peer review committee, and (3) provide a checklist to help keep reviewers on track.
- Timeline is helpful and there are no areas that need improvement.
- The process is not clear. Student evaluations shouldn't be done early in the semester. I'm concern about where evaluations are stored.
- I'm worried about the workload created by serving on this committee.
- I recommend mentorship instead of peer review on new instructors because evaluation will only provide skewed prospective and place reviewee under stress while learning the culture of SCC. Alternatively, initial reviews on new instructors should be done later in the semester with mentorship afterwards.
- Timeline is fine but vague expectations on what needs to be done. The directions need to be explicit. For example, I'm not sure if the meetings include Deans or is it 1:1 meeting with the reviewee only. Student evaluation is not helpful because reviewee cannot view it until grades are posted. Mid-semester evaluations creates large amount of workload and can result a back-log.
- The process is efficient; however, student evaluation is too early.

- Mid-semester evaluation puts excessive work on the reviewers and a distraction to what instructors need to do (teach and help students). I recommend 2 of the peer reviewers to attend the evaluation instead of all 3 and 1 should attend a lab.

3. Please comment on the Worksite Observation portion of the peer review process, including any insight into the logistics of scheduling, the evaluation form and narratives, the integration of the peer evaluation into the final evaluation, and the identification of items/elements you found lacking or missing from this part of the process.

- This part of the process was smooth with reasonable paperwork but the number of observations were redundant.
- This process is fine.
- The evaluation forms worked well. The observation form mirrors the evaluation and provides guidance to peer reviewers.
- Planning was insufficient; therefore, scheduling was challenging.
- I received clear directions from my Dean about this portion of the review.
- I consider visiting the instructor's class the best part of the process because of learning opportunity.
- Initial worksite observation should be done by mentors not reviewers until later or next semester. Evaluation forms and narratives should be made available from the beginning and not at the final evaluation meeting to help the reviewer see the whole picture. I recommend reviewers to respond independently and separately to prevent one reviewee dominating the entire evaluation. The entire process of the review needs to be deeper and more encompassing (i.e. planned syllabus, lesson plans, grading, feedback strategies, rubrics, etc.) because a portion of the class does not represent the larger skills and approach of an instructor; therefore, should not carry heavy weight in evaluating performance. I recommend facilitating "true conversations," rather than dictated critical feedback.
- The process did not provide a deep or complex responses from reviewers.
- Scheduling meetings were challenging because it conflicted with teaching schedule. It should be made clear if substitutes will be available for reviewers. I recommend an increased compensation for reviewers who are evaluating night/weekend classes.
- The meetings with reviewers helped tremendously in turning weaknesses to strengths.
- It's imperative that instructors in Anatomy or similar classes should include lab evaluations to help determine if the reviewee's teaching style is "half ham" or "whole hog." I recommend including Deans in class observation and to have a lab experienced reviewers to evaluate the lab portion of the evaluation.
- I do not understand the responses I received on the Instructional Faculty Performance evaluation form.

4. Per Senate-adopted recommendations and outcomes, the peer review process should: (1) Create opportunities for critique to improve teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services and learning; (2) Identify and share best practices for teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services and learning. Please comment on where or how the process does or does not at present meet these expectations.

- It meets expectations and provide constructive discussion.
- This portion of the evaluation became a forum of views on teaching and discussion on how to improve teaching techniques.
- From my experience, reviewers and reviewee found the process beneficial as they shared/learned best practices.
- Planning was difficult. Worksite observations were conducted immediately after mid-semester meeting, which didn't provide reviewers sufficient time to prepare constructive comments.
- This process meets expectations.
- This enhanced exchange of best practices.
- Classroom observations and follow-up meeting provide these type of opportunities.

- It was better and seamless. I recommend adding professional development with peer review.
- My first semester experience did not accomplish these outcomes. It did not help me with any professional growth. I did not find construction or depth in my review. Reviewers should provide more encouragement to new instructors and treat reviewee as an equal and not as undisciplined child.
- The process is more of a formal review than a peer review maybe partly because of the Dean's involvement.
- The evaluation meets its goals and expectations. I was evaluated by a dedicated team who truly helped me improved.
- The process meets its goals. As a reviewer, I also learned teaching techniques during the evaluation that I'm now using in class.

5. To accomplish these outcomes, the peer review process should: (1) encourage professional growth (including mastery of discipline and craft of teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services); (2) establish strong collegial ties across disciplines and the College; (3) improve student success; (4) provide a meaningful review for the benefit of faculty and students. Please comment on where or how the process does or does not at present meet these expectations.

- The process strengthens collegial ties but again too cumbersome.
- I would recommend incorporating professional development plans with the peer review process. In summary, the experience that I had this semester pointed to a well-designed and well executed peer review process that fulfilled its purpose.
- The process meets the objectives stated above as the feedback was a valuable tool for the faculty being evaluated. The only challenge is finding faculty peers to serve on the review team given that they each have their own busy schedules and then coordinating the meetings at the same time.
- The student reviews should be facilitated by members of the peer review committee. It is difficult to ask a students to conduct such an important task.
- The process met all of these expectations. There was an opportunity to learn from each other. This will ultimately lead to increased student success.
- Support for peer evaluation needs to be commensurate with the time and commitment—it is not currently. Also, we need more institutional buy-in to the process so more faculty are engaged.
- The basic structure and goals of this process are solid with the following recommendations: (1) examine whether including the Dean or higher level faculty is appropriate, (2) the program would be more effective if it included mentorship by non-reviewers, and (3) the process needs to broaden and more inclusive of all aspects of teaching expertise. A well-structured peer review can offer an opportunity for reflection, shared experience (not simply the reviewers offering theirs, but listening and learning from the experience of the reviewee) and comradery, that can help a teacher become their very best, and support their students in the same way.
- I believe the process meets the goals of #1, #2 and #4. However, since the peer review process is mostly done by faculty within one's own department, I do not think it helps at all with #2. If this is a goal, then the process should specify that one of the reviewers NOT be from the faculty members own discipline or department.
- I believe the evaluation process accomplished all these outcomes except to "establish strong collegial ties across disciplines," because my evaluators were my colleagues.
- Inclusion of a "self-evaluation" of previous years is a good addition into the process. It's important that reviewers reviewing the lab portion have the knowledge of what is taking place in the lab.