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Abstract

In 2014 a private School of Nursing in Tennessee began a Faculty Peer Review Program (FPRP). Emphasis was generated from a Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education self-study. The project question was, “In what ways will a FPRP foster innovative approaches to teaching/learning, enhance teaching pedagogies, encourage collegial harmony, boost classroom confidence, and increase overall job satisfaction among full-time and adjunct nursing faculty in a baccalaureate nursing program”. The purpose was to describe best evidence related to FPRP. The project’s aims were to improve the faculty evaluation process and promote the sharing of teaching strategies, provide constructive feedback, build professional relationships, and increase the faculty member’s confidence in the classroom. A pre-post questionnaire provided insight on faculty perceptions of the FPRP and included faculty demographics and peer review program evaluation. Face validity of the faculty-developed peer review encounter tool was based on agreement that items within could accurately measure peer review observations. A convenience sample (n=18) was followed for two semesters. Inclusion criteria were based on faculty role definition. Seventeen faculty members completed the FPRP. Statistically significant differences were noted in terms of defining student evaluation and peer feedback processes, whether feedback from faculty peers is constructive and appropriate, and whether peer feedback may identify participants’ understanding of the subject being taught. The FPRP project was effective for evaluating and recommending strategies for improving teaching performance. Participants recommended continuing the FPRP as a method to enhance faculty teaching and that in-class evaluations should be limited to once per semester.

Keywords: Faculty Peer Review (FPR), Faculty Peer Evaluation, Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Faculty Peer Review “and” Teaching.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

School of Nursing programs are required to be accredited at state (state governments have licensing and disciplinary agencies) and national levels (National Council of State Boards of Nursing, 2014; Kim, 2012). These governing bodies help to ensure that nursing programs are congruent with national health care needs and demands. They offer guidance for nursing programs by providing a list of standards needed for accreditation as well as identifying essential nursing competencies that align with faculty and student learning objectives, goals, and needs.

Nature of Capstone Project

Following a Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) self-study, room for improvement in faculty evaluation processes was identified at a private school of nursing in the Southern US. The evaluation process (CCNE Standard IV, 2012) is a critical component to identifying the schools success, especially related to student learning and faculty teaching effectiveness. At the time of the self-study, student evaluations of teaching (SETs) and annual performance appraisal were the primary evaluation methods used. Other forms of evaluation included teaching portfolios, student performance on standardized exams, and informal formative assessments such as comments provided by students and/or faculty.

Description of the Problem, Environment, and Target Population

The nursing faculty members identified the problem within the evaluation process and they unanimously agreed that immense benefit could be achieved by implementing additional alternative methods for measuring teaching effectiveness. In response to the concern and as a Doctorate in Nursing Practice student and nursing faculty member, the DNP capstone project
was established toward the development and implementation of a new faculty peer review program (FPRP) within the School of Nursing. The program proposal was accepted and approved by university administration and they further displayed interest in integrating the program university-wide once it was piloted and evaluated by the School of Nursing.

The project was developed by applying the problem within the context of the acronym PICOT to assist in identifying the elements of the practice question: (P) population, (I) intervention or issue of interest, (C) comparison intervention or issue of interest, (O) outcome(s) of interest, and (T) time it takes for the intervention to achieve the outcome(s) (Stillwell et al., 2010). The PICOT question designed and determined for the proposed FPR project was: “In what ways will implementing a Faculty Peer Review Program foster innovative approaches to teaching/learning, enhance teaching pedagogies, encourage collegial harmony, boost classroom confidence, and increase overall job satisfaction among full-time and adjunct nursing faculty in a baccalaureate nursing program?” Table 1 provides a description of the PICOT question based on the model presented by Stillwell and colleagues (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DNP Capstone Project PICOT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: (P) patient population, (I) intervention or issue of interest, (C) comparison intervention or issue of interest, (O) outcome(s) of interest, and (T) time it takes for the intervention to achieve the outcome(s) (Stillwell et al., 2010).*
**Purpose and Objective of the Capstone Project**

The primary purpose of the faculty quality improvement project was to describe best evidence related to academic peer review programs. Secondary goals included knowledge dissemination related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of a faculty peer review program at a baccalaureate school of nursing. The project’s aim was to improve the faculty evaluation process while at the same time, promoting the sharing of teaching strategies, providing constructive feedback, building professional relationships, and increasing the faculty member’s confidence in the classroom.

**Significance of the Capstone Project**

University administrators, school of nursing deans, and other nursing faculty are interested in peer review programs for two reasons: cost (as it relates to training and turnover) and ability to recruit new faculty to the university. The ability of university administrators to recruit and retain nursing faculty is becoming more challenging than ever before. An annual survey of schools of nursing conducted in 2008 suggested that out of 84% U.S. nursing schools, 79% found recruitment difficult and approximately one in three schools found it very difficult (National Advisory Council on Nurse Education and Practice (NACNEP), 2010). The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) reported U.S. nursing schools to have turned away 75,587 qualified candidates from baccalaureate and graduate nursing programs (2011) for several reasons that include inadequate numbers of faculty and clinical preceptors, limited classroom space and clinical sites, and diminishing financial resources (AACN, 2012). Approximately two-thirds of the nursing schools that responded to the survey noted faculty shortages as the reason for not accepting qualified students (AACN, 2012). The *Special Survey on Vacant Faculty*
Positions (2012) that included 662 baccalaureate nursing schools identified a total of 1,181 faculty vacancies (AACN, 2012). In addition, surveyors identified a need for 103 more faculty positions to meet student demand (AACN, 2012). A common reason for nurse faculty shortage is dissatisfaction related to faculty role, increasing teaching workloads, increasing demands for scholarship and service, non-competitive compensation, and long hours (NACNEP, 2010).

Hessler and Ritchie (2006) found several issues regarding the transition from nurse practice role to faculty role. They suggested several positive hiring considerations that may influence recruitment and retention of new nursing faculty which included: provision of guidance, socialization encouragement into faculty role, flexible workload, orientation, support, facilitation of collaboration, allowing for mistakes, coordinating teaching assignments, growing your own, and offering rewards (Hessler & Ritchie, 2006).

Definition of Relevant Terms

Relevant terms identified included Faculty Peer Review (FPR), Faculty Assessment, Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Formative evaluation, Summative evaluation, Peer Review of Teaching (PRoT or PRT), Peer Observation Report (POR). FPR, PRoT, and PRT are used interchangeable throughout literature. SET is a numerical rating from student evaluation of teaching often utilized by colleges and universities to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Formative and Summative evaluation are method approaches used by faculty and administration to evaluate teaching performance and effectiveness.
Assumptions

The faculty peer review program will influence and enhance teaching methodologies, faculty member confidence, professional collegial working relationships, and overall job satisfaction. This suggests that performance is enhanced by feedback.

Limitations

Though beyond the scope of this project additional positive effects of a robust peer review process may enhance student learning by improved teaching methods and school of nursing recognition and growth within the University. Enriched student learning and performance may further lead to student reports of program satisfaction, better NCLEX-RN pass-rate percentages, and continued growth of the nursing program. However, these assertions would need to be studied in greater detail.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Summary of Relevant Research

A literature review was performed to establish a background understanding of the faculty peer review process in terms of significance, best evidence, implementation, and evaluation standards. A database search was conducted using keywords and phrases identified from the PICOT question. These included: Faculty Peer Review, Faculty Peer Evaluation, Faculty Peer Review “and” Teaching, and Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). Searched databases included: CINAHL Complete, ProQuest Medical Library, Academic Search Premier, PsycINFO, SocIndex with Full Text, Education Research Complete, and Business Source Complete (See Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Number of Studies and Articles Retrieved from Data Base Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CINAHL Complete</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Peer Review “and” Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Peer Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CINAHL = Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature*

The search yielded voluminous articles related to faculty peer evaluation, especially related to student evaluation of teaching. Search results were narrowed by year of publication (2008-2014), English, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Journals, Humans, and Adults. Remaining
articles were retained or discarded based on a cursory review of abstracts and titles. Selection criteria included articles specific to faculty peer review programs utilized within higher education settings and related to university methods for evaluating faculty. Retained research studies were critiqued based on type of study conducted, sample, setting, methodology, and conclusions. Levels of evidence included well designed controlled studies, peer-reviewed, and theory-based evidence from expert opinion. Critiquing each study involved an objective assessment of several components which are presented by Patton (2010) and include: Introduction, Hypothesis or Question, Review of Literature, Conceptual/Theoretical Framework, Research Methods, Research Design, Data Collection & Measurements, Procedures, Results (Data Analysis), Findings, Discussions & Interpretation of Findings, and Implications and Recommendations.

Overall, there is a paucity of robust studies related to peer review programs. Twenty-one studies and nine articles were retained having met review criteria. Among the studies, primary methods used were pre- and/or post-intervention surveys and qualitative approaches by obtaining data through participant focus groups, questionnaires and/or interviews. Subjective outcome measures included evaluation by administrators, faculty peer members, and students.

Primary essential components of higher education were described in the literature as effective evaluation processes of faculty teaching-related performance. Systematic peer review has been described as an optimal approach for measuring teaching-related outcomes with importance placed on teaching strategies as the best method for evaluating teaching effectiveness (Cosser, 1998). The literature revealed two common methods for teaching evaluation, which include student evaluation of teaching (SET) and peer review (summative and/or formative) (Ackerman, Gross, & Vigneron, 2009; DiVall et al., 2012; Hubball & Clarke, 2011). Over the
past two decades summative and/or formative peer review evaluation methods among college and university administration and faculty members have gained attention (Ackerman et al., 2009; Bernstein et al., 2000; Carter, 2008; Iqbal, 2012; Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Larison & Jones 2008; Osborne & Purkey, 1995). Data representative of formative and summative evaluation in the Hubball and Clarke’s (2011) study indicated two scholarly approaches to peer review of teaching; formative peer review of teaching (PRT) that places greater significance on teaching development, and summative PRT that places greater significance on teaching evaluation. Formative peer review highlights the importance of intermittent feedback for faculty members to assist with developmental increments and enhancements in teaching practice while summative approaches concentrates on critical and comparative information for the faculty member in regards to his/her teaching acumen (Hubball & Clarke, 2011). The Center for Teaching Excellence at Texas A & M University (2014) defines formative assessment as informal, ongoing, detailed, individual, private, and for the purpose of improving one’s teaching practice, whereas summative assessment is formal, specific points in time, general, comparative, and public to recognize and reward. Summative peer reviews are often used for administrative decisions for promotion, reappointment, or tenure (Iqbal, 2013).

Peer review in academia has been described as best evidence of an essential practice used for assessing teaching effectiveness; hence, this process should be advanced and supported among faculty members in today’s teaching practices (Ackerman et al., 2009). Faculty peer review has produced positive outcomes. For example, value-added course content and enriched delivery that reinforces good teaching with greater faculty development and improved feelings of self-worth (Sullivan, Buckle, & Atkinson, 2012), advancement of skills and exchange in teaching philosophies (Wellein, Raggucci, & Lapointe, 2009), acquisition of innovative methodologies for
teaching and increasing confidence with teaching pedagogy (Shultz & Latif, 2006), and endorsement of self-examination and improvements in epistemic tautology (Larison & Jones, 2008). Essential to these improvements is collaboration among academic staff (Cosser, 1998). Peer review of teaching is key for successful integration of teaching development into a broader perspective of the institution and program-level (undergraduate and graduate) change initiatives, and it offers critical evidence to University administrators when making decisions based on teaching effectiveness for professional advancement, tenure, or commendations for teaching, service, and scholarship (Hubball & Clarke, 2011). Two key advantages are that faculty members’ benefit from the observations of their peers at work and the process serves as a medium for the free exchange of ideas (Carter, 2008; Sullivan et al., 2012; Wellein et al., 2009). Additionally, faculty peer-based evaluation is described as a process that fosters the opportunity for mentoring to take place between seasoned and novice faculty (Goldberg et al., 2010; Larison & Jones, 2008; Sullivan et al., 2012). Notably, the Peer Review of Teaching (PRoT) program implemented and evaluated by Mager et al. (2014) concluded that an effective peer review of teaching project was essential in nursing programs for meeting both formative and summative reviews, and for fulfilling the requirements of accreditation.

In contrast, literature also suggests faculty perceived notions may present obstacles for FPR programs such as fear of reproach or shortcomings noted by their colleagues. For example, many faculty groups are comprised of members with varying levels of experience and backgrounds so determining reviewer criteria related to both novice and expert educators may also create challenges in academia peer review. Carter (2008) noted that formal in-person evaluations done in the guise of peer review is the worst-case scenario leading to feelings of oppression and fear, fostering novice faculty to attempt to conceal teaching limitations that the
process could address. During process revision, Mager et al. (2014) identified that junior faculty felt anxious about the planned peer observational visit and at times were distressed over written comments that frequently were not fully explained. Salih’s (2013) study examining teachers’ perceptions of peer evaluation as an enhancement for quality teaching supported the relevance and effectiveness of peer review in context to teacher perceptions as positive perceptions as well as some fear of bias towards peer review processes which provided important implications. Results were consistent with other research in that teachers at times “approached peer review with some concerns and trepidation” (p. 110). Salih (2013) recommended that special considerations be given toward the social dynamic of peer review by ensuring reviewers act as critical friends providing objective feedback in a professional, collegial, and constructive manner. Additionally, Salih (2013) suggested that some consistency in the interpretation of peer review processes be outlined in policies and procedures by the institutions in higher education which adopt it. Goldberg et al.’s (2010, p. 81) study on administrators and non-administrators knowledge and experiences with peer review showed that remaining unaware of the components of an effective peer review process could increase the risk for those being peer reviewed or reviewing, such as feeling anxious about the review process, perceiving negatively that it was being imposed upon them, and/or considering the process as meaningless or in-authentic.

Although research findings suggested faculty peer review as providing best evidence for faculty evaluation and development, the most common and popular institutional approach for higher education is faculty evaluations related to assessment of teaching effectiveness by the numerical rating from student evaluation of teaching (SET) (DiVall et al., 2012; Hammersley-Fletcher & Orsmond, 2004; Iqbal, 2013; Kealey, 2010; Turpen, Henderson, & Dancy, 2011; Schultz & Latif, 2006; Wellein, Ragucci & Lapointe, 2009). Turpen et al.’s (2011) qualitative
study examined faculty perspectives about the methods that both they and their institutions used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Findings demonstrated that there is a drastic difference between the information instructors and institutions are using to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Turpen et al. (2011) found four important factors related to the assessment of teaching effectiveness among physics faculty across the U.S.:

1. Faculty are much more positive about the methods that they use to evaluate their teaching than the methods that their institution uses to evaluate their teaching.
2. Institutions typically base most or all of their assessment of teaching effectiveness on the numerical rating from SETs, a measure that many faculty are skeptical of.
3. Faculty tends to base most or all of their assessment of teaching effectiveness on student test performance and ongoing formative assessments.
4. Neither faculty nor their institutions make much use of the available nationally normed research-based assessments (such as the FCI). (p. 4)

Turpin et al.’s (2011) study illustrates the ongoing discontinuity between academic institutions and their faculty in regards to the type of data that should be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Turpin et al. (2011) suggest broadening the assessment sources specifically through use of nationally normed assessments that would allow for inter-institutional comparison (i.e. Force Concept Inventory).

Schultz and Latif’s (2006) study findings resembled Turpin et al.’s in that SETs were described as a primary method used in every school of pharmacy in the U.S. to evaluate course and teacher effectiveness with only approximately 50% using some form of faculty peer evaluation. However, Schultz and Latif suggested incorporating multiple assessment methods for optimizing evaluation of teaching, such as a triangulation of assessment that includes peer
evaluation, self-evaluation, and SET. Based upon this notion, they conducted a study that implemented a pilot peer review, teaching project. Study outcomes were shown to be successful and beneficial among faculty; all of the faculty members who served as reviewers or who were reviewed reported satisfaction related to acquisition of innovative teaching strategies, new insight into their teaching, and improved confidence in teaching pedagogy (Schultz & Latif, 2006).

Iqbal (2013) conducted a study that consisted of 30 tenure-track faculty members from a research-intensive university to examine their lack of engagement in the summative peer review of teaching process. Findings indicated that major barriers to engagement in summative peer reviews were institutional reward systems that preferred research activities more so than teaching and placed too much emphasis on student evaluation of teaching. Iqbal suggested that if university administrators want to endorse successful practice of summative peer reviews of teaching then they should also develop processes and practices that are designed to empower academia to perform consequential summative peer reviews of teaching that have meaning to the faculty (Iqbal, 2013).

The literature identified mixed faculty perceptions on SETs, as being a reliable assessment tool and often faculty perceive SET ratings with skepticism (Ackerman et al., 2009; Cleary et al., 2013; Turpin et al., 2011). There is supporting evidence that describes SET as having potential bias (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; Holmes, 1972; Marsh & Roche, 1997; Kealey, 2010; Reid, 2010; Wellein et al., 2009) and it is well documented to influence faculty-grading leniency (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997). However, in contrast, there is supporting evidence that SETs, if developed, applied, and examined in a constructive way, is a useful evaluation tool for faculty and administration (Ackerman et al., 2009; Cleary et al., 2013;
Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997). Ackerman et al.’s (2009, p. 34) study findings showed faculty informants perceiving SETs as valuable feedback on teaching effectiveness from the learners perspective and SETs providing a better method for assessing the quality of what is occurring throughout the course term including student interaction, which extended findings of the literature in this area. The study results further suggested faculty perceiving peer observation reports (POR) as a superior method for evaluating teaching effectiveness related to class room subject matter (Ackerman et al., 2009).

**Summary of Literature Review**

All articles reviewed pertaining to peer review indicated the process as valuable for measuring teaching effectiveness and enhancing teaching strategies, improving personal and collegial skills, and aiding in a better understanding of curriculum goals and objectives. There is no single peer review program established as superior, however, peer review itself is highly recommended and considered to be best practice for evaluative efforts of faculty labor in academic settings (Carter, 2008; Goldberg et al., 2010; Hubball & Clarke, 2011; Larison & Jones, 2008; Mager et al., 2014; Toth & McKey, 2010; Wellein et al., 2009). Importantly, for the success of a peer review program and to lower perceived shortcomings, faculty members whom are involved in the process should feel they own the process (Ackerman et al. 2009). Mager et al.’s (2014) success of their revised PRoT program was largely influenced by including nursing faculty from the beginning and seeking buy-in from all SON faculty members.

Further recommendations places prominence on formative and summative peer-review of teaching (Hubball & Clarke, 2011). There is a distinct difference between formative and summative activities. Hubble and Clarke (2011) study findings distinguish the two clarifying formative PRT having more emphasis on teaching development and summative PRT having
greater emphasis on teaching evaluation. As Kealey (2010) notes, the distinction between formative and summative PRT is found in its purpose – formative stimulates change while summative reflects the degree of teaching mastery. Formative peer review is optimal if the ultimate goal for FPR is to encourage peer collaboration, self-reflection, and enhance teaching methods.

Authors have attempted to compartmentalize theories for teaching evaluation and frameworks, however Hubball and Clarke (2011) suggest that teaching evaluation in higher education is perceived differently among faculty specifically related to varying conceptions of what evaluation is, what inter-relationships of teaching evaluators should be, faculty members and other stakeholders being evaluated, the criteria for scrutinizing the teaching evaluation itself, and who is most capable for making relevant critical assessments of teaching practice. Hubball & Clarke (2011) list perspectives and definitions that differ among literature:

- Measurement of teaching performance,
- The use of the resulting information for the purposes of faculty development to meet the needs and circumstances at hand,
- The use of the resulting information in contributing to informed institutional policy and decision-making,
- Enhancing the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate programming and the quality of student learning experiences; and,
- Empowering key stakeholders by engaging them in the teaching evaluation process.

(p. 3)
These varying faculty perceptions on evaluation, specifically related to the evaluators and the reviewed, suggest a gap in knowledge. In light of this, emphasis should be placed upon providing clarity among faculty members and administration prior to FPR implementation.

**Theoretical Framework**

Academia encounter challenges with complexities that consist of numerous confounding variables and multiple stakeholders bringing different perspectives, values, and concerns to consider and work through. Ludwig von Bertalanffy introduced General Systems Theory in 1968. Von Bertalanffy developed a legitimate theory that embraced universal principles applicable to systems in general (Panarchy, 2013). The theory viewed human activity as a circular construct constantly interacting and operating within an internal environment (Panarchy, 2013). The system dynamic has purpose, and exchanges energy, matter (body; many members), and information with external environment to exist (Panarchy, 2013). A primary focus of von Bertalanffy’s system is the relationship of the parts (subsystems), and in terms of the whole, more than the sum of the parts (Chen & Stroup, 1993). Explicating that, any one thing that affects the system as a whole affects each subsystem and any change in a subsystem affects all other subsystems individually and the system as a whole (Chen & Stroup, 1993). Midgley (2006) gives a simplistic definition of systems thinking, by viewing things in terms of the overall big picture. A system can be physical, biological, social, or symbolic; or it can be comprised with one or more of these (Chen & Stroup, 1993). A global perspective of systems theory can be noted in Chaos theory which demonstrates interconnectedness and complexities of all things. Mathematician and meteorologist, Edward Lorenz’s (1972) article, “Does the flap of a butterfly’s wing in Brazil set off a Tornado in Texas”, coined the term “Butterfly Effect”. Often, this term
is used in literature when referring to chaos theory (Huber, 2015). Huber (2015, p. 33) describes how chaos theory can be applied to health care:

As many health care organizations move away from bureaucratic models and recognize organizations as whole systems, more organic and fluid structures are replacing the older ones. Sometimes referred to as “learning organizations,” these structures are tapping into the inherent capacity for individuals to exhibit self-organization. In the transition, experiences of change, information overload, entrenched behaviors, and chaos reflect human reactions to organizations as living systems that are adapting and growing (Wheatley, 1999). Complexity and a sense of things being beyond one’s control create a search for a simpler way of understanding and leading organizations.

When considering systems thinking in terms of the health care system, health of the population should be observed beyond illness and the biology and behavior of the individual. Best outcomes may be achieved when health care practitioners consider all the interrelationships that population health today encompasses such as; practice settings, academia, and the populations served. Reviewing examples of health care related issues within the context of systems theory may assist health practitioners and educators understand the complex and dynamic part-and-whole interactions that make up the healthcare systems.

The peer review project was framed in systems thinking; viewing health education subsystems, specifically among nurse disciplines. Individuals (faculty) that exist and intermingle within the school of nursing (system as a whole) were closely examined to identify existing needs, address those needs, to improve overall unification and strength of the university.

Two conceptual models fit nicely within the framework of systems theory; The Star Model of Knowledge Transformation (ACE) and Translational Research. The ACE is a model
that assists in understanding the cycles, nature, and characteristics of knowledge (UT Health Science Center, 2012). It is a model utilized by nurses in various aspects to translate research to evidence-based practice (EBP) (UTHSC, 2012). The model provides a simple outline that organizes old and new concepts, illustrating relationships among functions (Pape, 2003). The five point star illustrates the five stages of knowledge transformation; knowledge discovery, evidence synthesis or summary, translation into clinical recommendations, implementation into clinical settings, and evaluation (Pape, 2003). The pictorial circle that portrays transformation can be easily understood and provides clear instructional steps for developing the peer review program. See Figure 1 for depiction of the FPR project within ACE Model.

Figure 1. Interpretation of ACE Model applied to FPR project. Adapted from ACE Star Model of EBP: Knowledge Transformation, by K. Stevens, 2004. Academic Center for Evidence-based Practice, The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. Copyright 2004 by K. Stevens. Retrieved from http://www.acestar.uthscsa.edu/acestar-model.asp. Note: ACE = Star Model of Transformation; FPR = faculty peer review; SON = school of nursing; EBP = evidence-based practice. (UT Health Science Center, 2012).
Carper’s (1978) work best illustrates the process of translating evidence into practice (Finkleman & Kenner, 2013). Carper (1978) identified four essential patterns of “knowing” in nursing: empiric, ethics, personal, and aesthetic patterns (Pipe et al., 2005). Translational research builds upon the empiric pattern of Carper and is directed toward closing the gap between new discoveries and endpoint application to clinical practice, health decision-making, and health policy (Mulnard, 2011). This type of research is referred to as the “bench-to-bedside” paradigm (ITHS, 2012). It is relatively a new methodology supported by the National Institute of Health (NIH) and is being encouraged by medicine and nursing to increase evidence based practice in clinical practice (Burns & Grove, 2011). Translation research involves action; moving knowledge gained from research to application (ITHS, 2012). The model encompasses a bidirectional continuum, and is depicted by five phases adopted by Khourey et al. (2007):

- T₀, is characterized by the identification of opportunities and approaches to health problems.
- T₁, seeks to move basic discovery into candidate health application.
- T₂, assesses the value of the application for health practice leading to the leading to the evidence-based guidelines.
- T₃, attempts to move evidence-based guidelines into health practice, through delivery, dissemination, and diffusion research.
- T₄, seeks to evaluate the “real world” health outcomes of population health practice. (ITHS, 2012).

The five phases move in a linear fashion and often interact with each other through the entire spectrum with no particular order (ITHS, 2012). Primary goal for the model is human health improvements. The primary FPR goal related to Translational Health Research is to improve
SON faculty teaching performance through self-awareness, collegial skills, and aiding in better understanding of curriculum goals and objectives. Applying Translational Research concepts added further fluidity in the transition phase of the peer review project as seen by the feedback impact on the faculty population (See Table 3).

Table 3.

Comparison of SON FPR Program Phases to T-Phases of Translational Health Research (UT Health Science Center of San Antonio, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>School of Nursing Faculty Peer Review Program</th>
<th>Relation to Translational Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T0</td>
<td>Identify problems, opportunities and approaches</td>
<td>CCNE Self-study helped to identify problem (evaluation processes) and provided SON opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Discovery or foundational research</td>
<td>Discovery of SON current weaknesses and strengths related to evaluation processes. Identification of areas needed for improvement - faculty member teaching assessment. Need for faculty peer review (FPR) program was discovered through a systematic review of literature in terms of significance, best evidence, implementation, and evaluation standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Health application to access efficacy</td>
<td>Application of a peer review process was identified as best evidence for measuring teaching effectiveness and enhancing teaching strategies, improving personal and collegial skills, and aiding in a better understanding of curriculum goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Health practice; science of dissemination and implementation</td>
<td>A faculty peer review (FPR) process was identified and implemented at SON based upon dissemination of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Evaluation of health impact on real world problems</td>
<td>Evaluation was ongoing throughout FPR project implementation through informal and formal dialogue, pre- post questionnaire and written qualitative feedback. FPR program was determined to close the gap related to SON faculty evaluation processes while at the same time gaining additional benefits such as enhanced faculty collegial relationships and shared teaching methodologies. The SON will continue the FPR program and make changes according to ongoing faculty evaluation recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SON = School of Nursing; FPR = Faculty Peer Review; CCNE = Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
CHAPTER 3. PROJECT DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Project Design and Description

The methodology used to support the project was based upon the assumption that the faculty peer review program would influence and enhance teaching methodologies, faculty confidence, professional collegial working relationships, and overall job satisfaction, suggesting that performance is enhanced by self-reflection and feedback. The project design was descriptive and cross-sectional. Concepts were operationally defined based on the literature. A convenience sample (n=18) of full-time and adjunct faculty at said school of nursing was followed for the proposed project. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were selected based on faculty role definition. Inclusion criteria: nursing faculty employed as full-time, part-time, or adjunct. Exclusion criteria: faculty hired for only clinical positions. A dependent pre- post questionnaire was developed and a statistical analysis was performed. Meetings and project-related events were held at the school of nursing in a designated conference room or classroom.

Assessment Tools

The nursing faculty pre- post questionnaire was designed to provide insight on faculty perceptions of peer review which also helped to further guide the development of the peer review tool and best tailored plan for the program implementation. Faculty characteristics were described and compared in terms of demographics and peer review program evaluation. Demographic information included: Years in academics, years at this university, academic prep/background, teaching certification, age, and past experience in peer review. Ten questions were designed in a ranked response and scaled one to four to elicit faculty perception of peer review, best approach, and priority. Additionally, two open-ended questions were designed to
elicit faculty member perceptions about the FPR program usefulness toward improved teaching strategies and program needed revisions: 1) How will you plan to integrate suggestions for improvement into your teaching strategies, and 2) What aspects of the project should be revised (for post survey faculty only). Questions were designed based on and reflective of research studies conducted by DiVall et al. (2012), Hubball and Clarke (2011), Salih, (2013), Schultz and Latif (2006), Sullivan et al. (2012), and Wellein et al. (2008). The pre-post questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

A peer observational review tool was developed and voted on by faculty members. The peer review tool was determined to have face validity in as much as the faculty agreed that it captured teaching effectiveness by measuring components such as class participation and interaction, presentation flow, visual aid creativity, and interpretation of lectured content (see Appendix B).

Capstone Project Intervention

The following describe the faculty peer review project seven-step process.

Step 1: Formal Approval Letter - The FPR project process began with a formal letter to the university president, SON Dean, and SON Evaluation Committee Chair. The letter provided a detailed summary of the DNP capstone project (FPR program) and request for approval and support for the proposed program. All three stakeholders, expressing high levels of interest and support, returned acceptance letters within two weeks.

Step 2: IRB Approval - Quality Improvement (QI) projects are similar to evidence-based practice (EBP) in that it encourages people in the practice setting to improve care, implement changes, collect data regarding those changes, and evaluating the results (Melnyk &
Research and QI are two distinct processes for problem solving that can be difficult to differentiate especially now that clinicians are becoming more rigorous in their QI approaches (Kring, 2008). Although QI projects do not generally require participation of patients, it does involve people and may be seen as research depending upon the risks involved (Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt, 2011). The FPR project was directed toward quality improvement activities specifically related to evaluation processes within the SON that involved faculty members. For these reasons the DNP capstone proposal application was submitted to an Institutional Review Board (IRB) for full review. The IRB, Capella University IRB, Minneapolis, MN, deemed the FPR project as “not research”.

**Step 3: Faculty Meeting** - A faculty meeting within the SON was scheduled and held to provide overview of the FPR project and to receive initial feedback. During the presentation, the DNP project leader focused upon a systems approach by proposing faculty participation and input would establish the overall design and development of the FPR project; they would become primary stakeholders of the project. Faculty response was overwhelmingly positive and commitment was 100%.

**Step 4: FPR pre-questionnaire** – The pre-questionnaire was administered to SON and Health Professions faculty via university private faculty email. Faculty pre-questionnaire responses were received by the DNP project leader, assigned a number, and entered into an Excel spreadsheet. A coding method was used for questionnaire data. The data was kept securely on the DNP project leader’s password-protected computer.

**Step 5: FPR Planning and Implementation** - During the initial planning and throughout the FPR project implementation, formal and informal meetings were arranged to promote continuous open dialogue and to elicit faculty feedback. Faculty members were encouraged to
discuss their opinions and feelings openly and honestly. Primary goals during scheduled meetings were to brainstorm and collaborate on best FPR project approaches which included:

1) Time-frame for the project, 2) Frequency of how many reviewers/reviewed events per semester, 3) Design of peer review tool, 2) Best strategy for pairing faculty, and 4) Summative and formative indications.

The faculty agreed upon initiating the FPR project in Spring of 2014 semester, continuing on into Fall 2014 semester, and concluding near the end of Fall semester 2014. Unanimous decision determined by vote was to begin FPR project with one reviewer/reviewed in the first semester, then increase to two reviewers/reviewed in the second semester. Pairing was determined and voted on by faculty members to be randomly assigned by the DNP project leader with consideration of faculty member course schedules. This was to ensure conflicts with class schedules among faculty pairings did not occur. It was also determined that faculty pairing be changed at the beginning of Fall 2014 semester. In regards to paired faculty process structure, faculty members established that it be left up to each paired-faculty team to determine shared information and when and where pre and post interviews would be held, which was strongly influenced by individual time constraints. All agreed that classroom observation was needed and required. Lastly, faculty determined that the FPR project be observed as “formative”, meaning not to be used for administrative decisions and activities such as promotion, reward, or merit. However, they did express having the opportunity to share their peer review findings upon their annual appraisal if desired.

**Step 6: FPR Wrap-up** - On October 31, 2014, the project concluded and a post-questionnaire was emailed to faculty members via university faculty private email. At the close of the semester, a final meeting was held with faculty members to discuss their overall
perceptions of the peer review project, share statistical analysis, and to determine whether or not
the FPR project would continue as a vital component to the SON faculty evaluation process.

**Step 7: Analysis** – Pre-post questionnaire data was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet
then entered into a statistical software program, Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences
(SPSS-21, IBM Inc.), to conduct the analysis of the data.
CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Eighteen participants were enrolled in the project. One participant withdrew at project mid-point; as a result this participant’s data was excluded from data analysis. Among the seventeen remaining participants demographic data is presented in Table 4. One participant is not a registered nurse but is an educator in health and human performance. A statistical software program, Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS-21, IBM Inc.), was used to conduct the analysis of the data.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Demographics (N = 17)</th>
<th>Years in Academics</th>
<th>Years at University</th>
<th>Years in Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>13.971 (14.3227)</td>
<td>6.029 (4.7908)</td>
<td>22.88 (15.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness (Standard Error)</td>
<td>1.089 (.550)</td>
<td>2.092 (.550)</td>
<td>.366 (.550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min/Max</td>
<td>1.5/45.0</td>
<td>1.5/21.0</td>
<td>0/55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = Number; SD = Standard deviation

There was a statistically significant difference between those with more than 10 years of teaching experience (n = 6, 35.3%) as compared to those with less than 10 years (n = 11, 64.7%) of teaching experience in terms of defining SETs and FPRs as being similar processes \[X^2_{(df=3)} = 8.242, p = .041\]. There was a statistically significant difference between those with more than 10 years at the University (n = 13, 76.5%) to those that worked less than 10 years at the University (n = 4, 23.5%) in terms of whether feedback is constructive and appropriate \[X^2_{(df=1)} = 5.885, p = .015\] and in terms of whether suggestions will improve my teaching \[X^2_{(df=1)} = 3.662, p = .050\]. There was a statistically significant difference between those who have (n = 10, 58.8%) been both a reviewer and a reviewee as compared to those who have not
(n = 7, 41.2%) in terms of the ability of an FPR to identify areas of subject understanding

\[ X^2(df=6) = 18.669, p = .005. \]

Differences between pre- and post-questionnaires were not statistically significant. Four new variables were generated from the faculty’s feedback. The first new variable combined the average of responses for questions 1, 6, and 8 from the questionnaire. These questions are related to the use and characteristics of feedback. The next new variable (performance enhancement) was generated from the average responses for questions 2 and 7. The third new variable (evaluation enhancement) was generated from the averages of questions 3 and 10. And the fourth and final variable (curriculum planning improvement) was generated from questions 4 and 5. Table 5 describes descriptive and comparison statistics for these paired differences.

| Table 5.  
Pre-Post-Questionnaire Comparative Statistics of Paired Differences |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Standard Error of Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.588 (1.661)</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Enhancement</td>
<td>.000 (1.173)</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Enhancement</td>
<td>.118 (1.219)</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>.294 (1.448)</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>-.450</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SD = Standard deviation; t = t-score; df = Degrees of freedom; p = probability (α = 0.05)*

Participants were asked through a post-project questionnaire to describe how they planned to integrate suggestions for improvement into their teaching strategies and to provide any suggestion for improving or revising the project. Five (29.4%) participants did not provide any feedback for either question. Five (29.4%) additional participants did not provide any feedback for improving their teaching strategies. Four (23.5%) additional participants did not provide suggestions for revising the project.
Teaching strategy improvement. One participant stated that they integrated feedback but did not describe how they had done so. Two participants were instructed to increase student participation in the classroom. However, there was not a description of a plan from either of them. One participant will “incorporate active learning” but did not provide a definition or description of the process. Two participants were encouraged to adjust their presentation styles. One will adjust their visual aids, but the other believed that the comments were personal and about style: “Hard to do, some of the comments dealt with stylistic aspects of my teaching and are part of who I am. They are good suggestions but a zebra cannot change his stripes.” Two others agreed that making changes were important but described that changes may take 1-2 semesters to implement. Lastly, one participant described that their peer made no suggestions and that this may have been a result of fear of providing feedback.

Project revision. Four participants provided feedback suggesting no revisions were needed. Among those, feedback was positive in nature. For example, “I think this was a fabulous project and would like to continue it”, “Would be happy to do it a second time”, “The evaluation did give me an idea of how other teachers teach, and confirmed that [the school] has excellent teachers”, and “I really enjoyed observing faculty classes from another area”. Participants’ comments regarding program improvement were specific to the process. One faculty member suggested changing the “evaluation format” by doing the pre-survey, actual review, then post-survey in the same semester. This participant also suggested that the survey could be completed with “the same faculty member but in different semesters by different reviewers to compare the reviews”. One participant suggested limiting the frequency of peer reviewer/reviewed to one per semester versus twice a semester. Two participants described how scheduling demands made it difficult to meet with their assigned faculty member. Lastly, one
participant suggested that reviews be made anonymous: “I believe that peers may not be honest for fear of hurting feelings. If there was a way to remain anonymous when doing the review so that the individual being reviewed would not know who was giving comments peers would have a tendency to be more honest and give suggestions”.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Outcomes as Related to Evidence Based Practice

The Faculty Peer Review (FPR) project piloted at the school of nursing demonstrated similar findings as described in the literature. Faculty participation and feedback indicated that the FPR project was accepted and valued because the faculty members felt ownership of the process. Researchers have described that peer review of teaching can be hampered if faculty are not committed to the process (Ackerman et al., 2009) with others fully attributing program successes to faculty involvement from the beginning (Hubbell & Clarke, 2011; Mager et al., 2014; Shultz & Latif, 2008).

It was difficult to determine how much time and effort was devoted to pre- and post-peer review meetings because faculty members had voted to allow each faculty pair to decide on what worked best according to their schedules. This variability is a factor that should be considered in future implementation efforts because it resulted in one group not meeting. Pre- and post-peer meetings included contact via person, email, and/or telephone. These are common and accepted forms of communication for pre- and post-observation of teaching (Hubbell & Clarke, 2011; Larison & Jones, 2008; Mager et al., 2014). Use of e-mail, video conferencing tools (i.e. Skype), e-portfolios, digital recordings of classroom experiences, phone or video chats for pre-observation or debriefing, and the possibility of lecture capture and “podcasting” have been reported to have increased meeting ability during peer review processes to counter faculty time challenges and scheduling constraints (Hubbell & Clarke, 2011; Mager, 2014). Despite these technological opportunities there were two faculty participants during the second semester observation period that were not able to meet suggesting that future implementation efforts
include a discussion regarding alternative meeting methods with group agreement on the process and timing.

All prior studies included an observation of teaching and completion of a peer review tool. Teaching observations performed by the reviewer were for part of or entire lecture. In the second semester, several of the paired groups were unable to meet for two reviews and one paired faculty did not meet, expressed mostly due to schedule demands and time constraints. Again, this ambiguity is a concern and should be addressed during future implementation efforts.

To enhance participation the school of nursing will need to adopt a philosophy and develop policy for a peer-review program. This will help to ensure peer review assignments are embedded in university culture. How and who will determine faculty pairing? I would recommend that pre-observations be performed to review and discuss syllabus, course content, and how students are evaluated. Full explanation and direction for pre-observation meeting should be performed.

Implications for the Professional Nurse

It is important to consider the effect that faculty peer review may have for the professional nurse. Benner (1984) describes the use of the nursing narrative as a method to understand the progression of direct care (and other) nurses in terms of professional role growth. More recently Benner, Sutphen, Leonard and Day (2009) propose that processes include evaluation methods (i.e., peer review) as a method to transform care practices through early identification of practice-educational gaps. Hospitals have begun to adopt and adapt this process into peer review systems among direct nursing-care providers with mixed results (Steaban, Fudge, Leutgens, & Wells, 2003). It is likely that use of a faculty peer evaluation process could
be used to demonstrate to novice nurses (i.e., nursing students) a process for evaluation that includes observation of practice and feedback that may enhance performance. This shift in focus could alter the professional evaluation milieu and allow nurses early exposure to peer feedback facilitating a new process to improve practice and patient outcomes.

**Conclusion**

Faculty Peer Review is an effective formative assessment process that encourages collegial interaction. It also may enhance teaching pedagogies and increase classroom confidence, though those outcomes were beyond the scope of this project. Faculty members reported the peer evaluation tool to be constructive and useful and helpful for guidance of the peer review process.
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APPENDIX A. STATEMENT OF ORIGINAL WORK

Academic Honesty Policy

Capella University’s Academic Honesty Policy (3.01.01) holds learners accountable for the integrity of work they submit, which includes but is not limited to discussion postings, assignments, comprehensive exams, and the dissertation or capstone project.

Established in the Policy are the expectations for original work, rationale for the policy, definition of terms that pertain to academic honesty and original work, and disciplinary consequences of academic dishonesty. Also stated in the Policy is the expectation that learners will follow APA rules for citing another person’s ideas or works.

The following standards for original work and definition of plagiarism are discussed in the Policy:

Learners are expected to be the sole authors of their work and to acknowledge the authorship of others’ work through proper citation and reference. Use of another person’s ideas, including another learner’s, without proper reference or citation constitutes plagiarism and academic dishonesty and is prohibited conduct. (p. 1)

Plagiarism is one example of academic dishonesty. Plagiarism is presenting someone else’s ideas or work as your own. Plagiarism also includes copying verbatim or rephrasing ideas without properly acknowledging the source by author, date, and publication medium. (p. 2)

Capella University’s Research Misconduct Policy (3.03.06) holds learners accountable for research integrity. What constitutes research misconduct is discussed in the Policy:

Research misconduct includes but is not limited to falsification, fabrication, plagiarism, misappropriation, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. (p. 1)

Learners failing to abide by these policies are subject to consequences, including but not limited to dismissal or revocation of the degree.
Statement of Original Work and Signature

I have read, understood, and abided by Capella University’s Academic Honesty Policy (3.01.01) and Research Misconduct Policy (3.03.06), including the Policy Statements, Rationale, and Definitions.

I attest that this dissertation or capstone project is my own work. Where I have used the ideas or words of others, I have paraphrased, summarized, or used direct quotes following the guidelines set forth in the APA Publication Manual.

Learner name and date
Ronda S. Landers 01/17/15

Mentor name and school
Dr. Lydia Forsythe – School of Nursing Health Sciences
APPENDIX B. FACULTY PEER REVIEW PRE- POST-QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information:

Number of years in Academics: _____________
Number of years at CU: _________________
Department: ____________________________
Academic Background (Circle all that apply)
   Doctoral
   Masters
   BSN
   Other ____________________________
Teaching Certified (Please circle)
   Yes
   No
How many years spent in clinical practice setting as RN? _______
Have you participated in Peer Review (Circle all that apply)
   As a reviewer
   As reviewed
   Neither as reviewer or reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate level of agreement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review provide useful feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review enhances teaching techniques and styles of presentation through collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review expands personal skills of evaluation and self-appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review helps to develop and refine curriculum planning skills in collaboration with a colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review helps to identify areas of subject understanding and teaching activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer verbal and written feedback is constructive and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer suggestions will improve my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review can be used for performance evaluation and promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETs) and Faculty peer review are similar processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peer review has authenticity; on average, a faculty reviewer is open and honest with critique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please continue survey
1. How will you plan to integrate suggestions for improvement into your teaching strategies?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What aspects of the project should be revised? (For post survey faculty review program implementation only)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Definitions

Academics – teaching in higher education; university, college, trade school

Clinical Practice Setting – health care settings where patients are encountered and care is provided such as; hospital (acute care), rehabilitation (sub-acute care), home care, long term care, etc.

Faculty Peer Review – faculty with similar competence evaluating classroom performance of one another’s to enhance standards of quality, teaching strategies, and collegial relationships.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) – At the end of each course, students are asked to complete a survey that rates their teacher’s overall teaching effectiveness. This is a common university approach for faculty evaluations yielding numerical ratings.
APPENDIX C. PEER OBSERVATION TOOL

Lecture topic: __________________________

Please indicate level of agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presented material was organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented material clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented appropriate material for level of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained difficult concepts clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized major lecture topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Techniques</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibited enthusiasm and interest in subject matter being taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke audibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held and motivated students’ interest and attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked for students’ understanding of material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paced lesson and/or class discussion appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunity for student discussion and/or questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used teaching aides appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained classroom control at all times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used physical proximity (doesn’t stay tied to desk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with Students</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created an atmosphere conducive to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded appropriately to criticism and suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handled unexpected situations appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided use of sarcasm and ridicule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated respect for ideas and opinions of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered professional student-teacher relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated mastery of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

________________________  _____________________  ___________________________
Faculty Reviewer         Date                Faculty Reviewed                Date