

---

Santa Rosa Junior College  
**SRJC Guidelines for Peer Observation of Classroom (Face-to-Face) Teaching**

**Approved by DTREC 04/03/2012**  
Revised June 2012 to eliminate the “Commendable” category.

The information in this document may be used as a guide for evaluating face-to-face instruction. (See also “Guidelines for SRJC Peer Observation of Online Instruction,” which are posted on the AFA website under Forms.)

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p><b>Organization:</b></p> <p>Effectively organized instructional period with regard to pace, level of difficulty, and focus on course content.</p>	<p>The lesson's structure has defined and realistically achievable learning goals and has a logical progression.</p> <p>Learning expectations and objectives are explained to the students and are related to the material presented during lecture and other classroom activities.</p> <p>The material presented during lectures and other classroom activities is in accord with the COR (Course Outline of Record).</p>	<p>Learning expectations and objectives are mostly apparent to the students and are realistically achievable. Most of the material presented during lectures and other classroom activities is related to the instructor's objectives and the COR (Course Outline of Record).</p> <p>Some work may be needed to ensure that all material presented relates to the learning expectations, objectives and the COR, or goals and objectives should be more clearly stated.</p>	<p>Instructor's expectations and objectives are often not clear and apparent to the students and/or may not be realistically achievable. Much of the material presented during lectures and other classroom activities may not be directly related to the course objectives and the COR (Course Outline of Record).</p> <p>Instructor's lesson plan may be rambling, disjointed or inadequately related to the objectives of the course or lesson.</p>
	<p>There is a variety of classroom activities, and the pace of activities is organized so that students are able to keep up.</p>	<p>The pace of classroom activities is somewhat organized but may not be well balanced or manageable.</p> <p>There may not be a sufficient variety of activities to maintain students' interest.</p>	<p>The pace of activities is not efficient or perhaps not clearly connected. Classroom activities may be too difficult or too simplistic for students.</p>
	<p>Class content is delivered with a theme that appears to augment material previously presented. The material supports the COR at an acceptable level of rigor and provokes student interest in future topics related to the discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Class content is delivered with a loose theme that seems to have little relationship to material previously presented. Some material may not be in accord with the COR—for example, some areas, such as tests and assignments, may not be representative of an acceptable level of rigor.</p>	<p>Class activities seem to have a limited or unclear theme that does not seem to have a relationship to previous material presented, or does not support the Course Outline, and/or is not conveyed at an acceptable level of rigor.</p>

<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructor explains how the lesson fits into the overall course subject matter.</li> <li>• Learning expectations and objectives for the lesson are written.</li> <li>• The material presented during lectures and other classroom activities is in accord with the COR (course out line of record) and includes references to topics and issues that a student can pursue in advanced/other courses.</li> <li>• The pace of activities is exceptionally well organized and appears easily manageable by the students.</li> <li>• The balance of activities may include note-taking, discussion, problem-solving, collaborative activities, tests and review of assignments.</li> <li>• The lecture or other classroom activity is delivered with a comprehensive theme and provides a sense of continuity from previous classroom sessions and/or to future classroom sessions.</li> <li>• The material or activities presented are at a challenging level of rigor.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Criterion</b></p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (3)</b></p>	<p><b>Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)</b></p>	<p><b>Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)</b></p>
<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>Preparation:</b></p> <p>Prepared for lecture, lab, activity presentation, or demonstration.</p>	<p>Instructor arrived on time and conducted the class for the full instructional period.</p> <p>The instructor was clearly knowledgeable concerning the material presented.</p> <p>Instructor’s teaching materials, i.e., lectures, handouts, media, quizzes, exams, PowerPoint presentations, etc., were well thought out, varied, and enhanced the classroom learning experience. The materials were complete, correct, current and easy to follow.</p> <p>Technology or classroom activities, if used, were effective and adequate and were knowledgeably employed.</p>	<p>Instructor may have arrived late or may not have conducted the class for the full instructional period.</p> <p>Instructor was prepared with most course materials needed to effectively support the activities and information presented. Some of the materials may not have been complete or current, may have contained minor errors, or may not have been easy to follow.</p> <p>Technology and classroom activities, if used, were mostly effective and adequate; however, there may have been problems with setup or knowledgeable use of the equipment or activity.</p>	<p>Instructor was not adequately prepared for lecture, lab, activity presentation or demonstration.</p> <p>Materials to support the activities may not have been adequate or appropriate, or may not have been complete, or may have had errors. Students may have had difficulty following or understanding the materials.</p> <p>Technology or classroom activities, if used, were ineffective or inadequate, or the instructor may need some training in its use or conduct.</p>
	<p>The instructor provided adequate supplemental instructional resources to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>	<p>The instructor used only publisher-prepared materials (e.g., the textbook) without any enhancement and did not cite references or additional material to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>	<p>The instructor did not provide publisher-prepared materials and did not cite references or additional material to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>

<b>Other factors to consider:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Instructor was available before and/or after class (in addition to required office hours).</li><li>• The instructor had clear mastery of the material in the lesson.</li><li>• Technology or classroom activities, if used, were effective, were organized in advance, and were knowledgeably employed.</li><li>• The instructor provided exceptional or extensive supplemental instructional resources.</li></ul>
-----------------------------------	--

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p><b>Content Communicated:</b></p> <p>Communicated course content clearly.</p>	<p>Course content was communicated well and addressed some higher-level learning and understanding so as to engage the students' critical thinking.</p> <p>For example, content was delivered with a theme and attempted to engage students, building on what they had already learned.</p>	<p>Most of the course content was communicated at a sufficient level of learning and understanding for the course but there are suggestions for improving the presentation.</p> <p>For example, the theme was somewhat vague and/or the content did not build upon what students had already learned and/or did not engage students sufficiently.</p>	<p>The course content was inadequately communicated and does not address a sufficient level of learning, understanding, or critical thinking by students.</p>
	<p>The course content of the observed class session was of competent quality and addressed most of the stated learning objectives.</p>	<p>Course content was of adequate quality but may not have addressed the stated learning objectives sufficiently.</p>	<p>The course content in the observed class session was of low quality and inadequately addressed stated learning objectives.</p>
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course content was communicated clearly and effectively and advances higher-level critical thinking by students.</li> <li>• Content was presented with a clear theme and added new material in a way that stimulated critical thinking by students.</li> <li>• The course content in the observed class session was of exceptional quality and addressed the stated learning objectives.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p><b>Instructional Modes</b></p> <p>Demonstrated a variety of instructional techniques.</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> A variety of techniques, approaches, and strategies could include lectures, group work, moving around the classroom, discussion, PowerPoint presentations, video or other media, problem-solving exercises, quizzes, student presentations, writing activities, etc.</p>		
	<p>Instructor provided a variety of techniques, approaches and strategies in the learning environment to enhance student interest and to help improve learning, comprehension, retention of information, and critical thinking.</p> <p>There were diverse course materials, assignments, and classroom activities to provide variety and challenge.</p>	<p>The instructor provided a limited variety of techniques, approaches, and strategies in the learning environment and in course materials, assignments, and classroom activities.</p>	<p>Instructor made little or no effort to provide variety and challenge in the learning environment by varying techniques, approaches and strategies.</p> <p>For example, all assignments were reading assignments, or the only classroom activity was a lecture by the instructor.</p>
	<p>The instructor incorporated appropriate resources to enhance the material presented.</p>	<p>The instructor made minimal use of appropriate resources.</p>	<p>No additional resources were used.</p>
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor created a dynamic and challenging classroom environment through the use of multiple techniques, approaches and strategies.</li> <li>• Choice of course materials, assignments and classroom activities enhanced the learning environment.</li> <li>• The instructor used innovative and varied methods for delivering course content and effectively incorporated appropriate resources.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Engaged and maintained student interest.</p>	Instructor's presentation is professional and clear. In addition, delivery is stimulating and engaging.	Instructor's presentation is unclear and somewhat confusing; or delivery may be weak.	Instructor's presentation may be monotone, uninteresting, unprofessional and/or confusing. In addition, delivery may be boring and dull or difficult to understand.
	Instructor effectively communicates enthusiasm and interest to the students by creating a learning environment that is stimulating and challenging, as evidenced by student participation and attention.	Instructor communicates interest by creating a learning environment, but it may need more stimulation, as evidenced by minimal student participation and attention.	Instructor does not adequately communicate enthusiasm and interest to the students and there was a notable lack of student participation.
	Instructor uses techniques, resources, and activities that encourage student interest and participation.  Timely and constructive instructor feedback is also evident.	Instructor uses minimal techniques, resources and activities to encourage student participation.	Instructor does not use effective techniques, resources and activities to encourage student participation.
	Instructor provides for student involvement through questions, class activities, reflection, discussions, and/or group work.	Instructor provides little opportunity for students to become involved, to work with the subject matter, or to ask questions.	Instructor does not provide opportunities for students to become involved, does not promote questions or discussion or provide opportunity for group work.
	Technology, if used, was effective and contributed to enhancing student interest.	Technology, if used, did not contribute effectively and creatively to engaging student interest.	Technology, if used, was ineffective and did not engage student interest.
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor's presentation is professional, clear and eloquent. In addition, delivery is stimulating and dynamic.</li> <li>• Instructor communicates exceptional enthusiasm and interest by creating a learning environment that is stimulating, exciting and rigorous, as evidenced by a high level of student participation and attention.</li> <li>• Techniques such as dynamic discussions (meaningful and topic-based), pertinent questions or (individualized) comments about assignments resulted in a challenging classroom with considerable student involvement and participation.</li> <li>• Instructor provides ample opportunity for students to participate actively through questions, activities, reflection, and/or small group work.</li> <li>• Technology was used in an effective and creative manner to engage student interest.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <p><b>Interaction:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated rapport and respectful interaction with students.</p>	<p>The instructor is friendly, approachable, available and helpful.</p> <p>Instructor has built satisfactory classroom rapport as evidenced by many of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing personal experiences;</li> <li>• Calling on students by name;</li> <li>• Tolerating opposite points of view;</li> <li>• Communicating high expectations;</li> <li>• Listening carefully to others' statements;</li> <li>• Including all (or most) students in discussions;</li> <li>• Asking questions of the class;</li> <li>• Encouraging questions from students;</li> <li>• Providing encouraging responses and meaningful feedback;</li> <li>• Displaying concern for students and their progress;</li> <li>• Encouraging cooperation among students;</li> <li>• Valuing diversity;</li> <li>• Encouraging student-faculty contact by talking with students before and/or after class and encouraging students to visit during office hours;</li> <li>• Using interactive activities to build student-to-student rapport;</li> <li>• Dealing promptly with biased student comments rather than ignoring them.</li> </ul>	<p>The instructor is approachable and rapport was minimally established with students; however, instructor needs to incorporate more of the characteristics listed.</p> <p>There is a minimum of student involvement in discussions and/or activities.</p>	<p>The instructor is insufficiently approachable and did not establish an effective rapport with students.</p> <p>Instructor shows inadequate respect toward students, and very few of the characteristics listed were apparent in the classroom.</p> <p>There is very little or no student involvement in discussions or activities.</p>
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<p>Instructor has built exceptional rapport with students as evidenced by most of the characteristics listed above.</p>		



Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p><b>Classroom Management:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated successful classroom management techniques by maintaining an environment conducive to learning.</p>	<p>Instructor started the class on time and did not allow disruption to the flow of learning if a few students arrived after the start of class.</p>	<p>Instructor may not have started the class on time and/or late-arriving students were somewhat disruptive of the flow of learning.</p>	<p>Instructor may have been late and/or it was apparent that more than a few students were in the habit of arriving late, causing disruption to the flow of learning.</p>
	<p>Instructor maintained adequate control of the classroom environment and monitored students' activities and class discussions effectively. The students were prepared for class and were kept on task most of the time.</p>	<p>Instructor controlled the class too much so as to be stifling or not enough so as to appear too lax. Some students may not have been prepared for class activities. The instructor did not keep all students on task.</p>	<p>Instructor's lack of control of the classroom environment and/or student activities produced a sense of chaos that did not support the purpose of the course. The instructor failed to keep students on task.</p>
	<p>Instructor includes many/<u>most</u> students in class discussions, avoiding dominance by a small minority of students.</p> <p>Instructor regularly monitors whether students understand the material presented and provides abundant opportunities for questions, feedback and adequate instructor responses.</p> <p>Positive and respectful behavior of instructor and students contributed to a productive and well-managed learning environment.</p>	<p>Instructor tends to call on just a few students during discussions and/or a few students tend to dominate.</p> <p>Instructor needs to monitor more frequently whether students understand the material and may need to provide more opportunity for questions, feedback and adequate instructor responses.</p> <p>The learning environment was not always well managed with respect to student and instructor behavior. It may not be clear to students what the expectations are in this regard.</p>	<p>There was little effort to include students in discussion.</p> <p>There was no attempt to monitor students' understanding of the material.</p> <p>Some of the students' and/or instructor's behavior was at times inappropriate, disruptive and/or disrespectful.</p>
	<p>Technology, if used, was set up in advance, was current, and was competently used.</p>	<p>Technology, if used, may not have been used competently.</p>	<p>Technology, if used, may not have been used competently.</p>
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor was in control of all activities conducted in class and monitored students' activities and discussions very effectively.</li> <li>• Students were well prepared for class activities and were kept on task at all times.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
	The course syllabus is clear, easy to read, and is comprehensive.	Some information in the course syllabus may be confusing, making it somewhat difficult to understand and follow.	The course syllabus is confusing and difficult for students to understand and follow.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>8</b></p> <p><b>Course Syllabus:</b></p> <p>Organized course, syllabus, and presentation to correspond to the most current Course Outline of Record (COR).</p> <p>3.9.1P COURSE SYLLABI (SRJC Policy)</p>	<p>The course syllabus is in compliance with the Course Outline of Record (COR) in terms of student learning outcomes, course content, assignments, and methods of evaluation. (AFA Contract Articles 14 and 17)</p> <p>The course syllabus includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course description, including student learning outcomes</li> <li>• Reading and lecture schedule</li> <li>• An electronic link or direction to the COR</li> <li>• Office location, office hours, and instructor contact information, including an SRJC email address</li> <li>• Required texts and supplemental materials</li> <li>• List of assignments</li> <li>• Grading policy, including grading scale</li> <li>• Late work policy</li> <li>• Attendance and lateness policy.</li> <li>• Statement about academic integrity and consequences</li> <li>• Date and time of the final exam according to the established college final exam schedule.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the syllabus includes many or all of the following optional best practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of topics</li> <li>• Calendar of assignments with language indicating that dates are tentative</li> <li>• Instructor’s pedagogical philosophy</li> <li>• Emergency preparedness information, including evacuation areas and directions about specific emergencies, such as an earthquake, fire, or live shooter.</li> <li>• Guidelines about student conduct and appropriate classroom behavior</li> <li>• Information on services for students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>The course syllabus may be <i>minimally</i> non-compliant with the course outline of record in terms of student learning outcomes, course content, assignments, and methods of evaluation.</p> <p>For example, some assignments may not be in agreement or percentages are inconsistent with the Methods of Evaluation stated in the COR.</p> <p>The course syllabus may be <i>minimally</i> missing some of the information required by Policy 3.9.1P/AFA Contract Art. 17)</p>	<p>In major ways, the course syllabus is non-compliant with the Course Outline of Record. For example, topics covered may not have been in alignment with the Topics and Scope in the COR.</p> <p>The course syllabus is missing some or many of the required elements.</p>
	<p>The material presented in class corresponds to the information provided in the course syllabus and is in alignment with the Course Outline of Record.</p>	<p>Material presented in class may not have corresponded completely to the information given in the course syllabus and/or is inconsistent with the Course Outline of Record.</p>	<p>Material presented in class may not have corresponded to the information provided in the course syllabus and was inconsistent with the Course Outline of Record.</p>

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p> <p><b>Currency:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated currency in the discipline.</p>	<p>Instructor exhibits comprehensive knowledge in the discipline and explains the material competently to students.</p> <p>Textbooks and other teaching materials contain up-to-date information in the field.</p>	<p>Instructor may have adequate knowledge in the discipline but may not be able to explain the material well to the students.</p> <p>Some textbooks or other teaching materials may not reflect/include the most up-to-date information in the field.</p>	<p>Instructor appears to be lacking in some basic knowledge in the discipline and/or has not kept up with new developments in the field.</p> <p>Textbooks and other teaching materials are not as up-to-date as they should be.</p>
	<p>Instructor cites up-to-date research and/or may provide current information from other sources on developments in the field.</p>	<p>Instructor does not cite research and/or provide the most current information from other sources on new developments in the field.</p>	<p>The instructor does not exhibit adequate familiarity with and/or current knowledge in the discipline and/or did not cite information about appropriate new developments (as applicable).</p>
	<p>Instructor responds to students' questions knowledgeably; refers students to alternative sources, as appropriate; and commits to getting the information/answer if unable to provide it on the spot.</p>	<p>In responding to questions, instructor is not always able to provide the most current or comprehensive information.</p>	<p>Instructor insufficiently responds to students' questions. Information provided may not be correct or the most current in the discipline.</p>
	<p>Course text and materials, including handouts, reflect current developments, theories, and standards in the discipline.</p>	<p>Course text and materials are not as up-to-date as they could be and may not include current developments, theories, standards, and/or research in the discipline.</p>	<p>Course text and/or materials are not current with regard to developments and standards in the discipline. For example, significant materials are outdated, incorrect, or flawed.</p>
<p><b>Other factors to consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor exhibits mastery of and lively interest in the discipline and is able to convey that to students, helping them to relate to the information within a broader context.</li> <li>• Textbooks and other teaching materials include the most up-to-date information in the field.</li> <li>• Instructor frequently cites up-to-date research and/or provides additional resources or information on breaking developments from sources that are current in the field.</li> <li>• Instructor responds to students' questions with the most knowledgeable and up-to-date information in the discipline.</li> <li>• Course text and materials, including handouts, reflect the most up-to-date information, theories, standards, and/or research in the discipline.</li> </ul>		