

Policy Number: UFCD, Academic, 2.16

Effective Date: June 2017

Last Revised Date: May 2023

Next Review Date: May 2025

Policy/Guideline Custodian: Associate Dean of
Faculty Affairs

Category: Academic

Title

Peer Teaching Evaluation Policy on Process and Guidelines
--

Policy

Purpose:

The College of Dentistry values excellence in teaching. Such excellence can be enhanced through constructive and candid peer evaluation of teaching. In addition, periodic peer teaching evaluations can serve as helpful and productive supplements to student evaluations and for faculty promotion and tenure. The process and guidelines in this document for evaluation of didactic, pre-clinical, and clinical instruction should be used for all UFCD peer teaching evaluations.

The College of Dentistry also values excellence in the mentorship of undergraduate, DMD, Resident, MS and PhD students and recognizes these endeavors as service to the educational mission of the college and university. These interactions will be evaluated using metrics other than peer evaluations outlined elsewhere.

Frequency and Coordination:

At the beginning of each fiscal year (July) the faculty's chair and mentoring team (where applicable) will meet with the faculty member to determine which didactic, pre-clinical and/or clinical courses will be reviewed in the upcoming review period. This would be most easily accomplished during the faculty's annual evaluation. This information should be recorded in the Faculty Toolkit. The College encourages a minimum of 1-2 peer evaluations per year. The faculty, the faculty's chair and mentoring team (where applicable) will also identify the individual(s) who will perform each peer evaluation. This too should be recorded in the Faculty Toolkit.

Individuals conducting the peer evaluation should have rank of Associate Professor or above and be the same rank or above as the faculty being reviewed. Chairs should not be peer evaluators of faculty in their department, but can be evaluators of faculty members of another department. Individuals conducting the peer evaluation can be within or outside an individual's department, college and/or university, but the review must adhere to the process and guidelines in this

document. Peer evaluations should be completed in the form of a narrative letter addressed to the faculty member's chair and provided to the chair and faculty member in PDF format. The faculty being reviewed should also provide a copy to the Office of Faculty Affairs and mentoring team (where applicable). The appended template is provided to use as a tool to record the key points observed during the evaluation, but serves as only a guide to completing the narrative letter, and thus should not be submitted in place of the narrative.

Responsibilities of the faculty being reviewed:

1. The faculty being reviewed should schedule the peer evaluation with the peer reviewer.
2. The faculty being reviewed should provide previous student and peer evaluations to the peer reviewer prior to the review session such that any previous issues can be addressed in the evaluation.
3. The faculty being reviewed is responsible for uploading a copy of the narrative evaluation into the faculty's Toolkit.
4. The faculty being reviewed should provide the mentoring team (where appropriate) a copy of the evaluation in PDF format.

Responsibilities of the faculty reviewer:

1. The reviewer should arrive before the session starts and plan on staying the entire length of the session.
2. The reviewer should observe as discreetly as possible and not physically interfere in any way with the educational environment that being reviewed.
3. The reviewer should not be assigned to the same preclinical or clinical session in which the review is being performed.
4. As soon as possible after the session, while everything is still fresh in mind, the reviewer should type up a narrative review of the observed teaching using notes taken on the appended form as a guideline.
5. The reviewer should complete the review and submit to the faculty member as well as the faculty's chair within two weeks of the observation.

Didactic Peer Review of Instruction:

Students and staff should be informed that they are not being evaluated in any way. All evaluators should devote their full attention to the task of evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching they are assigned to appraise.

The following attributes of the process are to be evaluated:

1. Lecture objectives are clearly stated and adhered to

2. Clarity and organization of lecture delivery
3. Use of visual aids and other resources
4. Display of up-to-date knowledge and/or incorporation of evidence based lecture content as appropriate
5. Summation of key points and answering questions clearly
6. Stimulation of interest in the lecture content
7. Stimulation and encouragement of critical thinking
8. Encouragement of student self-assessment and providing constructive feedback
9. Answering questions clearly
10. Note what the instructor does particularly well, as well as what might be done in the future to improve

Pre-clinical and Clinical Peer Review of Instruction:

Students and staff should be informed that they are not being evaluated in any way. Peer teaching evaluations should not be performed during competency assessments. Evaluators should NOT be working in the clinic while they are evaluating a colleague. All evaluators should devote their full attention to the task of evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching they are assigned to appraise. The following attributes of the process are to be evaluated:

1. Session objectives clearly stated and adhered to
2. Engagement of student(s) and active teaching in procedures to be completed
3. Display of up-to-date knowledge and/or incorporation of evidence-based dentistry as appropriate
4. Stimulation of interest in the session content
5. Stimulation and encouragement of critical thinking
6. Encouragement of student-self-assessment and providing constructive feedback
7. Answering questions clearly
8. Demonstration of effective, professional, and respectful relationships with students, patients and/or families
9. Note what the instructor does particularly well, as well as what might be done in the future to improve.

Peer Review Evaluation Template: DIDACTIC

This form is to be completed during the review of instruction only as a means to take useful notes for a subsequent report. Try to assume a student perspective as you observe the class. Be as specific and objective as you can, so as to provide the most valuable feedback to the instructor. **Note what the instructor does particularly well, as well as what might be done in the future to improve.** Evaluate the most relevant Review Criteria below. All Review Criteria need not be addressed.

The appended template is provided to be used as a tool to record the key points observed during the evaluation, but serves as only a guide to completing the narrative letter. Thus, this form should not be submitted in place of the narrative. The narrative letter should be sent to the faculty’s chair, the Office of Faculty Affairs, and mentoring team (where applicable).

Instructor: _____ **Course:** _____

Evaluator: _____ **Course Type:** didactic

Length of Evaluation: _____ **Evaluation Date:** _____

Didactic Peer Review of Instruction	
Review Criteria	Reviewer Notes
Session objectives are clearly stated and adhered to	
Clarity and organization of information delivery	
Use of visual aids and other resources enhanced the overall presentation	
Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and/or incorporates evidence- based content as appropriate	

Nature and importance of this content, other contexts, or professional practice is clearly discussed.	
Stimulates interest in content through enthusiasm (smiling, highly descriptive and positive word choices, and pleasant variations in pitch and tone).	
Summarizes key points and answers questions clearly	
Stimulates interest in the session content	
Stimulates and encourages critical thinking	
Encourages student self-assessment and provides constructive feedback	
Answers questions clearly	

Peer Review Evaluation Template: PRE-CLINICAL OR CLINICAL

This form is to be completed during the review of instruction only as a means to take useful notes for a subsequent report. Try to assume a student perspective as you observe the pre-clinical or clinical session. Be as specific and objective as you can, so as to provide the most valuable feedback to the instructor. **Note what the instructor does particularly well, as well as what might be done in the future to improve.** Evaluate the most relevant Review Criteria below. All Review Criteria need not be addressed.

The appended template is provided to be used as a tool to record the key points observed during the evaluation, but serves as only a guide to completing the narrative letter. Thus, this form should not be submitted in place of the narrative. The narrative letter should be sent to the faculty’s chair, the Office of Faculty Affairs, and mentoring team (where applicable).

Instructor: _____ **Course:** _____

Evaluator: _____ **Course Type:** pre-clinical clinical

Length of Evaluation: _____ **Evaluation Date:** _____

Pre-Clinical or Clinical Peer Review of Instruction	
Review Criteria	Reviewer Notes
Session objectives clearly stated and followed	
Engagement of student(s) and active teaching in procedures to be completed	
Displays up-to-date knowledge and/or incorporates evidence-based dentistry as appropriate	
Stimulates interest in the session content	

Stimulates and encourages critical thinking	
Encourages student-self-assessment and provides constructive feedback	
Answers questions clearly	
Demonstrates effective, professional, and respectful relationships with students, patients and/or families	

Contact Information

Dr. Joseph Riley, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs

Important Dates

- Effective Date: June 2017, Approver: Dr. A. Isabel Garcia, Dean
- Review: March 2020, Approver: Dr. A. Isabel Garcia, Dean
- Review: May 2023, Approver: Dr. A. Isabel Garcia, Dean