

COM Peer Review of Teaching for Promotion and Tenure

Exert from COM ByLaws, Section 4,

<https://uthsc.edu/medicine/faculty-affairs/documents/com-bylaws-2020.pdf>

-----Begin Exert from COM ByLaws-----

Formal Peer Review of Teaching

All faculty being considered for tenure or promotion must undergo peer-review of teaching. A peer reviewer will be agreed upon by the faculty member and chair. The reviewer should be at the same or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. The chair and faculty member must be careful to pick a reviewer that does not have a conflict of interest (COI). Typically, the best candidate will be from outside of the department, and one who is familiar with the teaching modality to be observed, e.g., if teaching event is a team based learning (TBL), then reviewer should be well experienced in TBL.

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 the exclusion given to the chair within forty-eight (48) hours after the chair has forwarded their initial recommendation to the faculty member being reviewed. The chair will then pick a different reviewer. If a single reviewer cannot be agreed upon by the chair and faculty member under review, then two (2) reviewers will be used in which one will be selected by the faculty member 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 conflict of interest (CoI) should be given careful consideration.
- Two (2) observations of teaching activities of the faculty member are required. For consideration in either tenure or promotion, typically the peer reviews of teaching are not done in the same year, but an initial peer review and then a second peer review at a late time to allow time for the faculty to potentially improve their teaching and/or demonstrate a consistent level of excellence. These reviews can both be by a single reviewer or two (2) different reviewers as described above.
- One reviewer:
 - This reviewer will evaluate two different teaching sessions.
- Two reviewers:
 - Ideally, two (2) observations of teaching should be performed on the same teaching event by the two (2) reviewers. Reviewers of a common teaching event will help the chair and faculty member better understand concerns and help them in devising how the faculty member might improve.

Training for peer reviewers will consist of the requirement that peer reviewers read and follow the guideline provided by COM; currently entitled "Tips for Peer Reviewers of Teaching" [Appendix A]. Setting for the peer review must be in the faculty member's primary teaching setting, i.e., lecture hall, research laboratory, clinical setting, etc. The setting is to be determined by the chair in consultation with the faculty member. If the chair agrees, the faculty member can request that the review occur by remote viewing of real-time or recorded class event. Those who teach in a clinical setting should suggest a suitable approach, e.g., to invite the reviewer(s) to join a teaching session with students on rotation, or to record a session for the reviewer(s) to audit thereafter. In like manner, those who teach in laboratories should suggest a suitable format by which to review their teaching.

The faculty member to be reviewed will pick the exact date and time of the two (2) teaching observations. Any materials associated with the two (2) teaching events under observation should be provided to the reviewer(s) at least three (3) days prior to observation events. Examples of materials include Power Point of the lecture, TBL handout, or manuscript for editing session with graduate student(s).

A post-review meeting to provide feedback of the two (2) observations is a requirement of this procedure. The meeting should occur as soon as possible after the review 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 the reviewer(s) and faculty member. It is to be a two (2)-way discussion that elaborates on short notes taken by the reviewer during the in the person observation(s), remote viewing of real-time or recorded event(s), or concerns raised by the faculty member being reviewed. If two (2) reviewers were utilized, separate feedback sessions are required.

Following Formal Peer Review:

- A completed form, currently entitled, “Peer Reviewer Documentation of Observation” for “Classroom”, “Lab” or “Clinical Setting” is required for each observation [Appendix B]. These forms will go to the chair, faculty member, and faculty and be part of the faculty member’s next annual review. Short notes that the peer reviewer(s) might take during observations will not be submitted to the chair or placed in faculty member’s file but discussed with the faculty member during the feedback session.
- Determination of Needs Improvement:
 - **One peer reviewer:** If the peer reviewer identifies six (6) or more substantive criteria over the two (2) observations where the faculty member's performance is determined to be “Unacceptable”, the faculty member's teaching is considered to “Needs Improvement” and a memo from chair documenting steps and strategies for improvement is required. This memo will be developed in consultation with the faculty member and the peer reviewer and cover a year timeframe.
 - **Two peer reviewers:** If there are two (2) peer reviewers, they must have cumulatively identified six (6) or more substantive criteria where the faculty member’s performance is determined to be "Unacceptable" for the faculty member to be considered to "Needs Improvement".
 - Should the faculty member not agree with the final rating of “Needs Improvement”, he/she may appeal through administrative channels (starting with the Chair) or through Faculty Senate per the approved UTHSC Faculty Handbook.
 - Should the initial peer review of teaching indicate the need for improvement, a formal improvement plan must be developed as part of the next annual review.
- Review and forms should be completed before August of the year in which tenure or promotion consideration is to occur so that compliance with the requirement of peer review of teaching can be confirmed prior to the beginning of tenure or promotion consideration. Reviews are required documents to be submitted when a faculty member comes up for consideration of tenure and/or promotion.

-----End Exert from COM ByLaws-----

Appendix A. Tips for Peer Reviewers 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: “Appendix B: 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

Appendix B: 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

Appendix B: 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

Appendix B: 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