

2019-2021 COM Interim Procedure for Peer-Review of Teaching

This procedure is to comply with UT Board of Trustees (BOT) revision to UTHSC Faculty Handbook approved in March of 2019. See attached 'UTHSC-Peer-Review-Teaching-Handbook-Revision'. *Below denotes requirement of this Faculty Handbook - BOT revision.

Who must undergo peer-review of teaching? *All faculty up for tenure consideration beginning in the Fall of 2019 and after must undergo peer-review of teaching.

Selection of Peer Reviewer: A Peer-Reviewer will be agreed upon by the faculty and chair. The Reviewer should be at the same or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. The chair and faculty must be careful to pick a Reviewer that does not have a conflict of interest (COI). Typically, the best candidate will be outside the department, and is familiar with the teaching modality to be observed, i.e. if teaching event is a TBL, then reviewer should be well experienced in TBL.

If a single Peer-Reviewer cannot be agreed upon by the chair and faculty under review, then 2 Reviewers will be used in which one will be selected by the faculty and one will be selected by the chair.

- As noted above, Reviewers should be at the same or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, and COI should be given careful consideration.
- The two observations of teaching (see below) should typically be done on the same teaching event by the 2 Reviewers. Reviews of a common teaching event will help the chair and faculty better understand concerns, and help them in devising how the faculty might improve.
- The faculty member being reviewed has the right to reject the first Reviewer proposed by the chair. This right to exclude one proposed Reviewer must be done with written notification of exclusion given to the chair within 48 hrs after the chair has made their initial recommendation. The chair will then need to pick a different Reviewer.

Training of Peer Reviewers: Training will consist of the requirement that peer-reviewers read, and follow the attached guide "2019-2021 Tips for Peer-Reviewers of Teaching".

Selection and Set-Up of Two*, Specific Teaching Events For Observation:

- Setting must be in the faculty *primary teaching setting, i.e. lecture hall, research lab, clinical setting. Setting to be determined by *chair in consultation with faculty. If the chair agrees, faculty can request the review be by remote viewing of real-time or recorded class event.
- Faculty to be reviewed will pick the exact date and time of 2 teaching observations

Teaching Materials to be Reviewed: Any materials associated with the 2 teaching events under observation should be provided to the Reviewer(s) at least 3 days prior to observation events. Examples of materials include PowerPoint of lecture, TBL handout, or manuscript for editing session with graduate student.

Required Post-Observation Feedback Session: A post-review meeting to provide feedback of the 2 observations is a requirement. The sooner the better so that specifics rather than vague concepts can be discussed. Email is not sufficient for the post-review feedback. This verbal feedback is confidential between reviewer and faculty. It is to be a 2-way discussion that elaborates on short notes taken during the observation or in using recorded lecture by the Reviewer, or concerns raised by the Faculty being reviewed. If 2 reviewers were utilized, separate feedback sessions are required.

Minimum Written Requirements Following Peer-Review:

- A completed form “2019-2021 Peer Reviewer Documentation of Observation” for “Classroom”, “Lab” or “Clinical Setting” for each observation. These forms will go to the chair, faculty, and faculty file. Short notes the Peer-Reviewer might take during observations will not be submitted to the chair or faculty file, but discussed with faculty during the feedback session.
- If the Peer-Reviewer identifies 3 or more criteria that the faculty is determined to be of “Significant Concern” in any one observation, the faculty teaching is considered to “Need Improvement” and a *memo from chair documenting steps and strategies for improvement is required. This memo will be developed in consultation with the Faculty and the Peer-Reviewer and cover a year timeframe.
- If there were 2 Peer-Reviewers, each Reviewer must have independently identified 3 or more criteria that were of “Significant Concern” in an observation for the faculty to be considered to “Need Improvement”.
- Should the faculty not agree with the final rating of “Needs Improvement”, they may appeal through administrative channels (starting with the Chair) or Faculty Senate per Faculty Handbook Section 7.

Deadline for Peer-Review of Teaching: Review and forms should be completed before Oct of a given year so that compliance with the requirement of peer-review of teaching can be confirmed prior to the beginning of tenure consideration.

Timeline and Process for Approval of this Procedure: Given this is intended as an interim policy for those faculty coming up for tenure consideration beginning in the fall of 2019, the following is proposed:

1. Feb 21: Rough draft completed by Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs
2. Feb 21-Feb 25: Reviewed by 8 faculty; minimum of 2 from DFAC, 2 chairs, 2 PhDs, and 2 MDs. These were: Drs. Pfeffer, Cooper, Whitt, Park, Ryan, Ennis, Cross, Womack.
3. Feb 26: Revised version completed and request for edits on new version to be sent to:
 - Faculty under review for tenure beginning in 2019 (with explanation)
 - Original 8 faculty reviewers
 - Chairs of COM
 - Entire DFAC
 - Chief Academic Officer (Lori Gonzalez, PhD)
4. Feb 26-March 11: Edits will be collected for those listed in bullet #3.
5. March 13: A new revised version from step #4, collated by the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, to be reviewed and agreed on by President of DFAC (Larry Pfeffer; PhD & active researcher), Assoc Dean of Faculty Affairs (Polly Hofmann; Dean’s office), Chair of Anatomy & Neurobiology (Matt Ennis; Chair), General Internal Medicine Division Chief (Catherine Womack; MD & clinically active).
6. March 19-20: All Chairs, DFAC representatives, Dr. Gonzalez will be asked to vote to agree to accept or reject the procedure and, if accepted by majority, faculty coming up for tenure will immediately begin planning to use.
7. Addendum: Step 6 was completed and all stakeholders approved. Email was sent to all tenure track faculty coming up for tenure beginning in the fall of 2019 that they must undergo peer review.

2019-2021 Tips for Peer-Reviewer(s) of Teaching

Pre-Observation Logistics

- Be sure Peer-Reviewer(s) and Faculty know the exact, date, time, location of observations
- If the observations are to be with a small group of trainees (for examples clinical rounds or a research lab meeting), determine how the Peer-Reviewer(s) is/are introduced to trainees so that they are not anxious with another faculty joining the group.
- Pre-schedule the required post-review feedback session for <10 days after the observations.
- Note to Faculty being reviewed that the feedback session conversations will be confidential.
- Ask the Faculty being reviewed if they have any specific feedback they would like commentary on from the Peer-Reviewer(s). For example, a Faculty might want the Peer-Reviewer(s) to assess whether the faculty provides clear explanations of complex concepts or manages time well.
- Be sure everyone has a copy of the observation form that will be completed by the Peer-Reviewer(s), shared with Faculty, and given to Chair. Forms: "2019 - 2021 Peer-Reviewer(s) Documentation of Observation" for "Classroom", "Lab" or "Clinical Setting"

Peer-Reviewer(s) Observations

- Bring feedback form to observations. Keep in mind forms' purpose is to help guide / focus the observations. Real value to the faculty may be in the short notes/ideas you will discuss with the faculty during the feedback session.
- Take short notes about the teaching, not the topic being taught.
- Write down specific examples that can be discussed in the feedback session.
- Peer-Reviewers should not participate in the teaching session. Politely decline if asked.
- The rating "Significant Concern" should only be used for an obvious and fatal flaw. The majority of rankings are anticipated to be "Very Good" or "Satisfactory, i.e. opportunities for improvement with time and development. "Truly Exceptional" should be reserved for criteria in which you cannot think of anyway the faculty could improve.

Post-Observations Feedback Session

- Remind the faculty that the feedback conversation(s) is/are confidential.
- Avoid one-way conversations, ask for the faculty member's input. Get their opinion on how the session went, if goals were accomplished, their sense of strengths and opportunities for growth.
- Feedback should cover (1) any areas on which the faculty asked the Peer-Reviewer to focus on, (2) strengths of the teaching, and (3) opportunities for growth. Keep opportunities for growth to 3 points maximum.
- When giving feedback on opportunities for growth, share reflections rather than give advice. Let the faculty member work out how they might improve.
- Use the evaluation form as a template to guide your discussion.
- Make observations on behavior rather than judgements. For example "When you asked a question, you immediately answered it yourself" instead of "You need to stop talking over the fellows".
- Provide concrete examples from the observations to discuss.
- Identify only the things the faculty member can control or change.
- The Peer-Reviewer(s) should work to problem solve an issue WITH the faculty.

Some tips are paraphrased from Newman L, Roberts D, Schwartzstein. Peer Observation of Teaching Handbook. MedEdPORTAL; 2012. Available from: www.mededportal.org/publication/9150

**2019-2021 Peer Reviewer Documentation of Observation
Class Room Teaching – Small Group, TBL, and Lecture Hall**

Instructors Name:

Date:

Peer Reviewer's Name:

Short Description of Session Observed:

Instructions: circle one rating/criteria, use added blank pages for notes, majority of ratings should be "B" or "C".

Ratings: A. Truly Exceptional B. Very Good C. Satisfactory D. Significant Concerns

Pre-Class					
1. PowerPoint, handout, objectives provided > 48 hrs in advance to learners	A	B	C	D	NA
2. Any assigned reading or prerecorded lecture was relevant, appropriate level, and of appropriate length	A	B	C	D	NA
Body of Presentation					
3. Presented main points in organized fashion	A	B	C	D	NA
4. Taught at appropriate level for learners	A	B	C	D	NA
5. Effectively used technology, visuals, handouts, demonstrations; used pointer, set stage, etc	A	B	C	D	NA
6. Provided clear transitions between topics	A	B	C	D	NA
7. Utilized examples to explain, for clarity, and make subject matter more meaningful	A	B	C	D	NA
8. Emphasized key points during presentation	A	B	C	D	NA
9. Summarized major principles at end	A	B	C	D	NA
Instructor Qualities					
10. Presented professional appearance	A	B	C	D	NA
11. Projected poise, confidence, enthusiasm for material/teaching	A	B	C	D	NA
12. Provided adequate enunciation, volume, gestures, eye contact	A	B	C	D	NA
13. Paced the presentation appropriately and to allow note taking	A	B	C	D	NA
14. Encouraged active participation and/or stimulated thought	A	B	C	D	NA
15. Responded to learner's questions clearly and concisely	A	B	C	D	NA
16. Maintained control of session and managed time appropriately	A	B	C	D	NA
17. Demonstrated respect for learners	A	B	C	D	NA
18. Used notes and class materials effectively	A	B	C	D	NA
19. Overall was well prepared for session	A	B	C	D	NA
In Class Teaching Materials					
20. Slides were clear, legible, and uncluttered	A	B	C	D	NA
21. Overall usefulness of teaching materials; inclusive of pre-class materials	A	B	C	D	NA

**2019-2021 Peer Reviewer Documentation of Observation
Clinical, Unstructured Teaching – Examples: Teaching Rounds or Teaching in Clinic**

Instructors Name:

Date:

Peer Reviewer's Name:

Short Description of Session Observed:

Instructions: circle one rating/criteria, use added blank pages for notes, majority of ratings should be "B" or "C".

Ratings: A. Truly Exceptional B. Very Good C. Satisfactory D. Significant Concern

Organizational					
1. Makes expectations clear for learner participation in patient care as well as in role as member of team (if on teaching rounds)	A	B	C	D	NA
2. Uses time effectively	A	B	C	D	NA
3. Controlled discussion sufficiently to keep focused on points of discussion	A	B	C	D	NA
Interaction with Learners					
4. Establishes rapport	A	B	C	D	NA
5. Encourages all learners to participate, gives learners opportunity to display knowledge	A	B	C	D	NA
6. Accommodates for different educational level of learners	A	B	C	D	NA
7. Encourages learners to defend opinions	A	B	C	D	NA
8. Elicits opinions before offering diagnosis	A	B	C	D	NA
9. Asks "what if" questions or asks questions to test problem-solving skills	A	B	C	D	NA
10. Provides appropriate/constructive/real-time feedback	A	B	C	D	NA
11. If time not available, identified where/when learner could get needed information	A	B	C	D	NA
12. Encourages self-reflection in learners for performance, progress, patient care	A	B	C	D	NA
13. Ensures pertinent clinical questions were framed, and concepts were clearly and succinctly explained	A	B	C	D	NA
Instructor Qualities and Professionalism					
14. Demonstrates respect for patients, co-workers, learners	A	B	C	D	NA
15. Poised, confident, enthusiastic for teaching/clinical care	A	B	C	D	NA
16. Adequate volume, gestures, enunciation, eye contact	A	B	C	D	NA
17. Demonstrates ethical conduct, and discusses ethical issues or areas of controversy in medicine with learners	A	B	C	D	NA
18. Effectively demonstrate clinical skills, modeling effective interviewing/listening, proper physical diagnostic techniques	A	B	C	D	NA
19. Displays up-to-date knowledge of medical care	A	B	C	D	NA
20. Promoted and modeled use of medical literature	A	B	C	D	NA
21. Fostered a cost effective approach to diagnosis and therapy	A	B	C	D	NA
22. Demonstrated effect use of consultants, data, interpretation of lab data	A	B	C	D	NA
23. Maintains and models rapport with patient, includes patient in discussion, clearly communications with patient, sits down when talking to patient	A	B	C	D	NA

**2019-2021 Peer Reviewer Documentation of
Observation Research Laboratory Setting**

Instructors Name:

Date:

Peer Reviewer's Name:

Short Description of Session Observed:

Example of possible "Sessions" include, but are not limited to: directing journal club, PI directing a research laboratory meeting, working with an individual student on a manuscript/abstract/poster or analysis/planning of experiment, teaching techniques in the lab, or research seminar/grand rounds presentation.

Instructions: circle one rating/criteria, use added blank pages for notes, majority of ratings should be "B" or "C".

Ratings: A. Truly Exceptional B. Very Good C. Satisfactory D. Significant Concerns

Session					
1. Organized and clear goals of session	A	B	C	D	NA
2. Instructor facilitated discussion, asked questions conducive to learning	A	B	C	D	NA
3. Reasonable balance maintained among participants, engaged all levels of learner	A	B	C	D	NA
4. Content coverage is relevant, comprehensive, and appropriate level	A	B	C	D	NA
5. Meeting had closure, wrap up, clear expectations set for follow up meeting/activity	A	B	C	D	NA
6. Provided opportunity to allow student(s) to demonstrate mastery	A	B	C	D	NA
7. As appropriate, research discussed was put in context of lab budget or grant submission	A	B	C	D	NA
8. As appropriate, research discussed was put in context of broader publication and overarching aim	A	B	C	D	NA
Instructor / PI Qualities					
9. Poise, confidence, enthusiasm for material	A	B	C	D	NA
10. Adequate volume, gestures, enunciation, eye contact	A	B	C	D	NA
11. Demonstrate adequate knowledge base	A	B	C	D	NA
12. Responded to questions clearly and concisely	A	B	C	D	NA
13. Maintained control of session and managed time appropriately	A	B	C	D	NA
14. Demonstrated respect for learners	A	B	C	D	NA
15. Was well prepared for session	A	B	C	D	NA
16. Appropriate decorum maintained	A	B	C	D	NA