360° Evaluation of Teaching Example Series

Utilizing Peer Observation and Self-Reflection
UConn Department of Pharmacy Practice

The UConn Department of Pharmacy Practice has created a policy for 360-degree teaching evaluations for all of its non-tenure track, tenure-track, and tenured faculty.

Didactic teaching evaluations are conducted using a modified version of the Northeastern University Peer Observational Evaluation of Teaching (POET). The modified POET is provided as an attachment to this document. The POET is a four-part evaluation, including:
  (1) Pre-observation material review (and in-person meeting, if deemed necessary);
  (2) Live instruction observation;
  (3) Post-instruction self-evaluation conducted by the instructor, including review of pertinent materials, exam questions and statistics; and
  (4) Post-observation meeting with the instructor and reviewer for discussion of findings and draft letter finalization.

To provide a complete 360-degree evaluation of teaching, Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) may also be incorporated into the evaluator's letter, depending on the timing and purpose of the review and the need of the faculty.

Clinical teaching evaluations are typically conducted May through July to coincide with the end of the advanced clinical experience learning year. A review of Student Evaluations of Precepting (SEP) scores and comments for the experiential rotations, coupled with the instructor's response to provided questions are included in the evaluation. An in-person meeting is typically conducted for further insight to the experiential learning experience provided.

For didactic and clinical evaluations, once finalized the evaluator's letter is submitted to the department head. The faculty are requested to include the final letter with future PTR dossier submissions. Requests for corrective action to improve teaching performance can be made by the department head based on evaluator's findings.

The department has tasked the assistant department head with conducting 360-degree teaching evaluations of both didactic and clinical teaching, but a faculty member may request for an alternate evaluator of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being evaluated.

If the faculty member is not in agreement with the findings after reviewing the letter and supporting documents from the evaluator, the faculty member may choose to appeal the findings to the department head. If deemed necessary, a subsequent evaluation by the department head or an evaluator chosen by the department head and of equal or higher rank as the faculty being evaluated can occur.

For non-tenure track faculty, the assistant department head conducts teaching observations according to the following timeline:

- Minimum of two (2) didactic AND APPE evaluations completed prior to submission for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor rank
  - One (1) should occur between years two through five (2 through 5);
  - One (1) should occur within one (1) year prior to submission for promotion
  - One (1) should occur during at least one of the faculty member's 2-year reappointments, prior to their 5-year reappointment
- Minimum of one (1) didactic AND APPE evaluation during each subsequent 5-year re-appointment
- Minimum of one (1) didactic AND APPE peer evaluation within 1-2 years prior to submission for promotion to Full Clinical Professor
- Minimum of one (1) didactic AND APPE evaluation during any subsequent 5-year reappointment at the Clinical Professor rank

For tenure track and tenured faculty, the assistant department head conducts teaching observations according to the following timeline:

- Minimum of two (2) didactic AND APPE peer evaluations completed prior to submission for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank
  - One (1) should occur prior to midpoint evaluation;
  - One (1) should occur within one (1) year prior to submission for promotion/tenure
- Minimum of one (1) didactic AND APPE peer evaluation every five (5) years post-tenure
- Minimum of one (1) didactic AND APPE peer evaluation within 1-2 years prior to submission for promotion to Full Professor

Background reading on POET tool:
http://www.ajpe.org/doi/pdf/10.5688/aj7206147
http://www.ajpe.org/doi/pdf/10.5688/ajpe76461
http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1273&context=ojot

UConn Department of Pharmacy Practice Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Purpose:

To promote the improvement of teaching and learning through 360-degree didactic teaching evaluation

Type:

Formative

Process: (please see specific steps (estimated times))

- Reading lecture syllabus, learning objectives, etc.
- Pre observation meeting (if deemed necessary by reviewer)
- Actual classroom observation: duration of chosen lecture(s)
- Review of pertinent material's exam question statistics, post-exam
- Finalizing report
- Post observation meeting: at a time convenient to reviewer/reviewee
- Completion of final letter to instructor and copied to Dept Head

Peer evaluation instrument:

Use modified POET form from Northeastern SoP

Logistics:

- One observer per faculty instructor
- Let the faculty set the agenda in terms of what they should submit in addition to learning objectives, syllabus, handout(s), etc. Submit to observer at least 1 week prior to lecture
- Faculty will identify 2 – 3 lectures to be evaluated (perhaps to include new ones or ones with perceived problems); they will know a head of time which lecture is chosen
- Observation of entire lecture period is optimal
- Faculty are generally not evaluated on lecture content unless there are glaring issues related to content omissions
- Post assessment meeting should ideally occur within 2 weeks of lecture observation

Specific steps:

1.0 Pre-observation time (meeting in-person if deemed necessary) to review objectives, handouts, learning strategies, and teaching pedagogy (occurs 1 week before classroom observation).

    1.1 Faculty member should provide lecture materials to peer observer at least 1 week prior to this meeting for review

    1.2 Peer observer should utilize the scripted interview questions in the POET to complete Section 1

2.0 Classroom observation: the observation should last the entire length of the lecture

    2.1. Peer observer notes positive aspects of the lecture and identifies potential areas, if any, for improvement utilizing a ''teaching observation record''. Section 2 of the POET should be completed as soon as possible after attending the class. The peer observer should not complete the POET during the lecture. Three main focus areas for discussion with the lecturer should be identified.

3.0 Post-observation meeting (within 1-2 weeks; can be delayed until after material has been used on exam)

    3.1 Faculty member should reflect on the lecture and complete Section 3 of the POET prior to the meeting with the peer observer

    3.2 Peer observer should give the opportunity to the faculty member to discuss his/ her reflection on the lecture and discuss strategies to improve lecture content, delivery, and assessment. Peer observer should provide positive feedback and constructive evaluation points, limited to 3 main focus areas.

    3.3 Faculty member should submit original questions submitted for the exam, final version of exam questions (if applicable), and results of item analysis to the peer observer prior to this meeting

    3.4 Peer observer should complete Section 4 of the POET prior to this meeting and provide final comments and recommendations (limited to 2-3). A written letter is subsequently provided to the faculty member highlighting the major aspects of the peer assessment process, including the strengths of the lecturer and the 3 main areas of focus.

    3.5 Letter is reviewed and finalized

4.0 Report submitted

    4.1 Reviewer submits final report to Department Head

    4.2 It is the faculty member's responsibility to include the review with their PTR dossier; the PTR committee is made aware that a review was done; however, the letter is to be provided by the faculty member themselves

5.0 Self-reflection by faculty instructor

    5.1 It is recommended that the faculty member record thoughts and impressions of the process, its outcome and effectiveness in improving teaching. This document is for inclusion in the instructor's teaching folder and not circulated.

Modified Peer Observation and Evaluation Tool (POET)
University of Connecticut Department of Pharmacy Practice

Section 1: Pre-observation visit
*The instructor should provide lecture materials (handouts, resources, etc.) at **least 1 week prior** to this meeting*

Please see scoring rubric at end of Section 4.	DNO	NSD	ND	A	AW	Comments
1. Lecture objectives are clearly stated in the handout/syllabus						
2. Lecture objectives align with the overall course goals						
3. Handout material appears to be relevant to lecture objectives						
4. Lecture outline and organization are logical						
5. Reading list is provided and relevant to lecture objectives						
6. Planned in-class activities reflect appropriate lecture objectives						
7. Planned assessment strategies are consistent with lecture objectives						
8. Instructor appears well prepared for class						

Questions:

- Why did you choose this lecture to be assessed? Is this the first time you are teaching this lecture? If no, what changes have you made to this lecture over the past few times you taught it?

- What questions/concerns do you have? What would you particularly like feedback on? Are you interested in having an active learning inventory of your lecture completed?

- What is your educational philosophy?

- Where is similar content taught in the curriculum? Have you contacted other instructors to determine exactly what they cover? What impact has this had on your lecture and/or student outcomes?

- How does this lecture's content fit within the entire course (e.g. one out of several lectures on the same topic)?

- Have you planned any in-class learning activities? If yes, what lecture objectives will these activities meet? Share how these activities facilitate student learning.

- What is your plan for assessing the content of this lecture?

Section 2: Classroom Observation Items

	DNO	NSD	ND	A	AW	Comments
Content						
Instructor does not spend a lot of time going over material previously taught in other courses; intellectual level of material presented appropriate to the student level						
9. Breadth of material appropriate for the amount of time dedicated to this topic	██					
Instructor is able to go through majority of the material during the class period. Amount of content appropriate for the time						
10. Clear distinction between fact and opinion/ practice experience						
Instructor differentiates between consensus statements, guidelines, expert opinion and personal views, practice, experiences						
11. Divergent opinions or conflicting views presented when appropriate						
Instructor provides examples of conflicting or different guidelines, clinical trials, practices						
Teaching strategies, presentation skills, organization, and clarity						
12. The instructor provides an overview of what is planned for the class period.						
13. The instructor establishes the relevance of information	██					
14. The instructor explains content clearly, providing examples when appropriate	██					
15. The instructor is an effective communicator	██					
Instructor's command of English is adequate; the instructor effectively holds class attention; the instructor uses eye contact effectively; the instructor speaks clearly and loudly enough to be heard throughout the classroom; the instructor employs an appropriate rate of speech (e.g. for note taking); the instructor emphasizes major points in the delivery of the content by pausing, raising voice, etc.; the instructor is enthusiastic and confident on explaining the subject matter						

	DNO	NSD	ND	A	AW	Comments
16. The instructor makes connections with prior learning <u>within curriculum</u>	■					
17. The instructor makes references to the material taught previously <u>within the course</u>	■					
18. The instructor emphasizes a conceptual grasp of the material	■					
Instructor provides clear and comprehensive explanations when required.; instructor points out practical applications of concepts; instructor suggests ways to learn complicated ideas						
19. Instructor provides periodic summaries of the most important ideas and ties things together at the end of the class	■					
Instructor makes appropriate transitions by summarizing ideas and welcoming questions						
20. The learning activities are well organized	■					
Appropriate number of activities; spaced out appropriately, students are given appropriate time to complete them, appropriate discussion at the end of each activity takes place.						
21. Instructor's teaching strategies facilitate student learning	■					
Instructor follows a progressive development of course content and involving active student learning and the application of student involvement building upon Bloom's taxonomy -- knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.						
22. The instructor encourages critical thinking	■					
Instructor asks stimulating and challenging questions periodically; classroom activities and outside assignments include problem solving; students have chances to discuss or apply concepts during class						
23. The instructor effectively uses in class activities and outside assignments to gauge student progress	■					
Instructor employs active learning techniques. Activities and assignments supplement lecture content; instructor provides clear directions for each activity; promotes student engagement and is able to involve everyone in the class, not just the most outspoken students.; provides adequate time and resources for completion; instructor facilitates group work well, mediates discussion well, helps students apply theory to solve problems						

	DNO	NSD	ND	A	AW	Comments
24. The lecture remains focused on its objectives.						
Instructor stays on the subject; does not spend a considerable amount of time on material not covered by objectives; if questions or discussion lead on a tangent, able to get the class back on the subject						
25. The instructor uses class time efficiently.						
26. Questions are welcomed and responded to in an effective and professional manner.						
Instructor asks students periodically if anyone has questions; repeats student questions and answers so all can hear; responds to questions clearly and thoroughly, and/or tells the class that he/she will research and follow up						
27. The instructor effectively uses audio/visual/learning aids to accompany the verbal presentation						
Handouts and/or PowerPoint slides express content clearly; are legible (appropriate font); contain same or similar content covered during the lecture; at adequate level of detail; shows creativity (if applicable); board work (if used) is legible and organized						
28. Instructor emphasizes which material students are likely or unlikely to be examined						
Classroom climate						
29. The instructor creates a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning						
Instructor appears approachable, comes to class early and stays after the class to talk to students and answer questions						
30. The instructor encourages student participation						
Instructor encourages multiple perspectives.; students seem comfortable asking questions						
31. The instructor reacts to student professional behavior issues appropriately						
32. The instructor demonstrates flexibility in responding to student concerns or interests						
Instructor responds well to student differences; sensitive to individual interests, abilities, and experiences; listens carefully to student questions and comments; actively helpful when students need assistance.						
33. The instructor treats students impartially and respectfully.						

Section 3: Post observation meeting

The instructor should complete this form after the observation of their teaching and forward it to the reviewer electronically.

Instructor's self-reflection on the lecture:

- How do you think the class went?

- Is there anything you wanted to accomplish but were unable to do so? If yes, what was it and was it critical? What would you do differently next time to accomplish it?

- In your opinion what went really well? Can you provide evidence that it went well?

- In your opinion what did not go well? Can you provide evidence that it did not go well?

- For items on the pre-observation and classroom observation forms where you gave yourself a rating of "Needs Development" or "Need Significant Development" what are your plans for improvement?

- Did the lecture affect or change your plans for assessment?

- Did you collect student evaluations of this lecture? What did students report to be the most effective and least effective aspects of your lecture?

- What other constructive feedback did you receive through student evaluations? How do you plan to address it?

Section 4: Post assessment (exam) meeting

(within 2 weeks of first major assessment or exam)

The instructor should provide the original questions submitted for the exam, final version of exam questions if applicable, and results of any item analysis if available prior to this meeting.

	DNO	NSD	ND	A	AW	Comments
34. The examination content is representative of the lecture content and objectives	■					
35. The tests used in the course have been well designed and selected	■					
The examination questions are clearly written.; the examination questions are of appropriate length and level of challenge; assessments include activities to assess higher order thinking						
36. Students are given ample time to complete the assignments and take-home examinations.	■					
37. The instructor determines the degree of mastery of lecture objectives	■					
Exam item analysis is performed						

Final Comments and Recommendations (limited to 2-3) will be provided in a letter form

Comments on classroom observation will be provided at the post-observation meeting

Comments on assessment will be provided at the post-assessment meeting

Self Reflection by Instructor

At the end of the entire process, the instructor should reflect on the process and usefulness of the peer evaluation of teaching. These thoughts will be kept in the instructor's folder only for the benefit of the instructor.

DNO	Did not observe	either because was not in the class for the entire lecture duration or instructor did not do and it's not applicable
NSD	Needs significant development	the instructor did not do this and should consider adding
ND	Needs development	the instructor attempted to do this but development/ revision is necessary
A	Accomplished	minor improvements can be recommended
AW	Accomplished well	no recommendations for improvement