OSU COM FAME/CTT Peer Review Program
Large Group Presentation Peer Review Form
<u>Program</u>

Who/What?
Peers (other faculty members or other health care professionals involved in the educational mission of the college, trainees are <u>not</u> peers) sit in on lectures, attend teaching rounds, or shadow other clinical teaching activities to provide feedback to teaching faculty. It is recommended that senior or master teachers in ones own department or the college serve as peer reviewers. CTT/FAME has trained a group of OSU OM CTT/FAME Peer Reviewers and they can be viewed on the OSU FAME Education Programs web page. This process is a review of content and the teaching and learning process using structured observation forms that cover common criteria for "good" lecturing or clinical teaching (see LARGE CLASSROOM, SMALL GROUP/INDIVIDUAL TEACHING, CLINICAL TEACHING [STANFORD FD] FORMS).

How?
1. Faculty member initiates Peer Review (PR) by contacting CTT/FAME administrator (Bev Trout) through OSU FAME Education Programs web page [faculty member may suggest desired Peer Reviewers who may be in or outside of Department] or email.
2. Faculty member chooses format and completes Self-Assessment [see suggested format table] and communicates the evaluation process and goals with Peer Reviewer prior to PR.
3. The Peer Reviewer uses the appropriate OSU COM CTT Peer Review of Teaching form to document the review.
4. After the Peer Review observation, the Peer Reviewer and the faculty member discuss what was observed with any suggestions for improvement [by meeting, phone or email].
5. The faculty member receives copy of completed form for her/his review and record.
6. If desired by the faculty member, a letter/memorandum summarizing the evaluation is prepared by Peer Reviewer which serves as documentation for formative feedback and for the faculty member's P&T file (see SAMPLE LETTER).
7. PR form is filed with the CTT/FAME Peer Review Program unless the faculty member decides to not have it stored there. Peer Reviewer clarifies this with faculty member and if desired, the form is sent to Bev Trout for CTT/FAME PR files (and is available to faculty member from this repository in future) .
8. Peer Reviewer completes online documentation that PR was performed.

Why?
* To reinforce "good" teaching characteristics and suggest areas for improvement.
* To develop documentation for P&T that is consistent with University guidelines.
* To provide a "teachable" moment for faculty development.
* To facilitate reflective improvement of teaching when conducted over time.

Who
* CTT members, LSI Expert Educators and experienced OSU faculty are trained and available to provide peer review of your teaching. [List of trained reviewers available on the OSU FAME Education Program web page]
* Contact Bev Trout for more information and a peer reviewer.

When and Where?
It is up to the faculty and peer to decide. At least one documented peer review per year is recommended.

We are excited about offering this Peer Review opportunity to our faculty!
Any questions, please contact me at John.mahan@nationwidechildrens.org

John D Mahan, MD

Adapted from documents developed by Andy Hudson PhD.

9.20.16

Faculty Peer Review of Teaching in LSI

Overview – Peer Review process is designed to:

1. Help assist faculty in continual improvement of teaching
2. Improve the LSI experience for learners
3. Provide opportunities for educational program enhancement

Faculty Information:

1. OSU COM Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) process focuses on instructor/teacher development by starting at what area the faculty member particularly desires assessment and feedback
2. The PRT is completed by LSI Expert Educator faculty or a member of the OSU COM Courage to Teach Peer Review Group assigned by educational leadership to do the Peer Review
3. There are no 'grades' required of teaching faculty
4. All faculty will eventually receive PRT
5. The faculty (instructor) may indicate preference for a specific Peer Reviewer; assignment will be made by education leaders
6. The instructor initiates process by identifying areas for particular emphasis by the reviewer
7. The instructor completes a self-assessment as part of understanding process and chance for reflection; this may be incorporated into the debriefing session at the instructor's discretion
8. Opportunities for feedback on the educational program from the instructor to educational leaders is available as part of the process
9. The Peer Reviewer discusses/debriefs the teaching activities and review with the instructor at the end of the teaching session or later by phone/personal meeting
10. The instructor receives a copy of the PRT form suitable for inclusion into her/his P&T dossier

OSU COM FAME/CTT Peer Review Program
Large Group Presentation Peer Review Form

INSTRUCTOR: _____   **DATE:** _____

COURSE AND TOPIC: _____   **EVALUATOR:** _____

REASON FOR EVALUATION (CIRCLE ONE): Self-initiated / recommended by other / required by other / P&T

Areas for focused feedback as identified by faculty member: _____

_____

KEY: NO= NOT OBSERVED   NI= NEEDS IMPROVEMENT   EF= EFFECTIVE AS IS   EX= EXEMPLARY   NA= NOT APPLICABLE

		NO	NI	EF	EX	NA
1.	Preparation for lecture (faculty was well prepared for lecture) Comments:					
2.	Rationale/orientation and objectives for lecture (faculty presented a rationale and or objectives for the lecture) Comments:					
3.	Interest, enthusiasm and rapport with the audience (faculty exhibited interest in his/her topic) Comments					
4.	Organization of lecture material (faculty presented in organized manner that was easy to follow and understand) Comments:					
5.	Audiovisual and learning materials (teaching materials were clear, legible, of the right size and sufficient contrast to be read by the audience) Comments:					
6.	Handouts (if available, were easy to follow, clear, included important points of the lecture and were coordinated with the AV materials) Comments:					
7.	Observation of student reactions and interests (faculty maintained eye contact with audience, observed and responded to their reactions) Comments:					
8.	Pace and level of the lecture (was not too fast or slow and was at a level of understanding appropriate for the audience) Comments:					
9.	Asking and answering questions (faculty use rhetorical questions, encouraged audience Q&A, and repeated questions that were asked) Comments:					
10.	Use of examples (used examples, cases, problems, etc. to explain concepts) Comments:					
11.	Knowledge base (seemed knowledgeable about subject matter) – *Check only if evaluator able to assess* Comments					
12.	Overall lecturing quality (rate the overall quality of the lecturer) Comments					

OSU COM FAME/CTT Peer Review Program
Large Group Presentation Peer Review Form

Comments:

1. STRENGTHS (1-3 ITEMS):

2. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT (1-3 ITEMS):

3. REVIEWER RECOMMENDATIONS:
A. SPECIFIC (1-3 ITEMS):

B. RECOMMENDED RESOURCES
- ☐ **FACULTY ADVISOR _____**
- ☐ **OSU FAME EDUCATION PROGRAMS WEB PAGE**
- ☐ **OSU COM FD4ME (ONLINE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT MODULES]**
- ☐ **READINGS_____**
- ☐ **OTHER_____**

4. COMMENTS FROM INSTRUCTOR ON THE COURSE/CLINICAL RING/ROTATION:

8.21.16

OSU COM FAME/CTT Peer Review Program
Large Group Presentation Peer Review Form
<u>Self-Assessment</u>

INSTRUCTOR: _____ **DATE TO BE OBSERVED:** _____

COURSE AND TOPIC: _____

REASON FOR EVALUATION (CIRCLE ONE): Self-initiated / recommended by other / required by other / P&T

Base Self-Assessment on previous experience in that teaching environment (typically 1-2 areas chosen for focused feedback)

<u>Areas for focused feedback as identified by faculty member:</u> _____

_____

KEY: NO= NOT OBSERVED   NI= NEEDS IMPROVEMENT   EF= EFFECTIVE AS IS   EX= EXEMPLARY   NA= NOT APPLICABLE

		NO	NI	EF	EX	NA
1.	Preparation for lecture (faculty was well prepared for lecture) Comments:					
2.	Rationale/orientation and objectives for lecture (faculty presented a rationale and or objectives for the lecture) Comments:					
3.	Interest, enthusiasm and rapport with the audience (faculty exhibited interest in his/her topic) Comments					
4.	Organization of lecture material (faculty presented in organized manner that was easy to follow) Comments:					
5.	Audiovisual and learning materials (teaching materials were clear, legible, of the right size and sufficient contrast to be read by the audience) Comments:					
6.	Handouts (if available, were easy to follow, clear, included important points of the lecture and were coordinated with the AV materials) Comments:					
7.	Observation of student reactions and interests (faculty maintained eye contact with audience, observed and responded to their reactions) Comments:					
8.	Pace and level of the lecture (was not too fast or slow and was at a level of understanding appropriate for the audience) Comments:					
9.	Asking and answering questions (faculty use rhetorical questions, encouraged audience Q&A, and repeated questions that were asked) Comments:					
10.	Use of examples (used examples, cases, problems, etc. to explain concepts) Comments:					
11.	Knowledge base (seemed knowledgeable about subject matter) Comments					
12.	Overall lecturing quality (rate the overall quality of the lecturer) Comments					

Self-Assessment

Comments:

1. STRENGTHS (1-3 ITEMS):

2. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT/TO WORK ON (1-3 ITEMS):