NOTICE: This Material may be protected by copyright law. (Title 17 US Code)

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning 3 (2011) 106–115

Currents in Pharmacy Teaching & Learning

http://www.pharmacyteaching.com

Peer observation: a faculty initiative

Tamra S. Davis, PhD

University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy, Clinical and Administrative Sciences, Tulsa, OK

Abstract

In institutions of higher learning, concern for the process and outcomes of teaching continues to grow. The definition of successful teaching remains somewhat elusive. Excellent teaching has been described in the literature, and a number of behaviors have been identified as exemplifying quality teaching. At The University of Oklahoma Department of Pharmacy: Clinical and Administrative Services-Tulsa (PCAS-T), student evaluations and activity reports were the primary means for faculty evaluations. The faculty recognized the limitations of both forms of evaluation and requested that the administration investigate a peer observation program. Peer observation of teaching became an additional component of the comprehensive assessment of teaching, in addition to self-assessment/reflection, administrator evaluation, and student assessment. The process of peer observation provides value for improvement of teaching and in the scholarship of teaching, thus elevating teaching to the same status as research at the university level. The purpose of this study was to document the peer observation process and make initial inferences with respect to its utility. The results of this study will serve as the first step in a comprehensive evaluation of the peer observation program. The peer observation process began as a faculty initiative to supplement student evaluations and has developed into a program with value to the faculty. The description of the process and future reports from the evaluation of the program will add to the primary literature that is currently missing evidence of value of peer observation to academic programs in colleges of pharmacy.
© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Peer observation; Faculty evaluations; Assessment of teaching

In institutions of higher learning, concern for the process and outcomes of teaching continues to grow.[1–4] According to Zlatic, "To be successful in that profession [teaching] one needs to be concerned about outcomes, methods, strategies, and techniques."[5] Defining success for teaching, while described extensively, remains at least somewhat elusive.[5–8] Each teacher is unique with regard to his/her ability, knowledge, skills, experience level, and personality. There have been a number of behaviors routinely identified that exemplify excellent teachers.[6,8,9] These behaviors include the integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes.[5] Boyer wrote, "Teaching is often viewed as a routine function, tacked on, something almost anyone can do."[6] In addition, Boyer advocated that the work of the professoriate should be assessed.[6]

The research and publications of renowned education scholars, such as Chickering and Gamson,[9] Hunter,[7] and McKeachie,[8] provide resources to help determine important teaching competencies. Assessment of effective teaching may include evaluations from students, peers, administration, alumni, and faculty self-evaluation or reflection. Each method used in faculty evaluations contains bias and shortcomings. Through the use of multiple methods to evaluate teaching, a more comprehensive assessment can be completed. At The University of Oklahoma Department of Pharmacy: Clinical and Administrative Services-Tulsa (PCAS-T), student evaluations and faculty activity reports were the primary means for faculty evaluations. The faculty recognized the limitations of both forms of evaluation and requested that the administration investigate a peer observation program. Recognized by the faculty in PCAS-T, peer observation of

Reprint requests to: Tamra S. Davis, PhD, Clinical Assistant Professor and Instructional Design Specialist, University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy, Clinical and Administrative Sciences-Tulsa, 4502 E. 41st Street 2H25 Tulsa, OK 74135.

E-mail address: tamra-davis@ouhsc.edu.

1877-1297/11/$ – see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.cptl.2011.01.009

teaching became an additional component to be included in a comprehensive assessment of teaching in addition to self-assessment/reflection, administrator evaluation, and student assessment. The faculty felt that a well-rounded view of teaching prowess should be formed through triangulation of data from multiple sources and at multiple points.

The University of Oklahoma (OU) mission statement indicates that OU "is to provide the best possible educational experience for our students through excellence in teaching, research and creative activity, and service to the state and society."[10] Specifically, the College of Pharmacy (COP) mission statement is "to educate and empower professional, graduate, and post-graduate students to be highly qualified pharmacy practitioners, scientists and educators."[11] Based on the mission of the college and university and request of the college's faculty, PCAS-T supports and provides a formal framework for peer observation of teaching to supplement the required student evaluations completed at the end of each semester. The program developed for PCAS-T recognizes the value of peer input from all levels of the faculty. The department chair and the investigator believed it to be a learning opportunity even for junior faculty to be part of the observation team, rather than just being observed, and that faculty's agreement with this concept, notwithstanding the potential political ramifications, was approved via departmental vote. This paper documents the process that the department has implemented for peer observation and review of teaching and is the first step to a comprehensive evaluation of the process recently implemented.

Definition, purpose, and concerns of peer observation

"Peer review of teaching is informed colleague judgment about faculty teaching for either fostering improvement or making personnel decisions."[12] In general, peer review provides a way for faculty to examine teaching for self-improvement.[13] Echoing Roberts' assertion that for teaching to be valued, it must be peer reviewed,[14] Chism stated:

> That in order for teaching to be valued, it must go beyond the private and personal. When teaching is viewed as professional knowledge, there must be an accepted way to define characteristics of teaching excellence and to make judgments based on a stated set of criteria and standards that reflect the complexity of teaching. Because peer review is a way to making teaching public, it is also seen as enhancing the value of teaching and engaging peers in scholarly examination of their profession.[12]

The process of peer observation and review can provide value for improvement of teaching and in the scholarship of teaching, thus elevating teaching to the same status as research at the university level.[6,14–16] Historically, teaching has not been evaluated in an open forum, such as through peer observation. Instead, evaluation of teaching has typically occurred in isolation, relying primarily on student evaluations or the quantity and quality of research and publications produced by the subject teacher. Assessment of teaching represents a controversial topic.[6] Mundy and Grabau concurred saying, "Although teaching evaluation is generally improving, teaching quality is still not always rigorously scrutinized."[17] Just as quality research finds its basis in the quality of peer-reviewed publications, peer review of teaching seeks to accomplish similar goals, that is, to ensure that the product passes the muster of learned peers and thus achieves a certain level of quality. As Roberts stated, "Teaching, like research, should be peer reviewed. Indeed, *until* teaching is peer reviewed, it will never be truly valued."[14] Wolfgang et al. reported, "Pharmacy faculty members . . . indicated an appreciation for the importance of research and scholarly activity in the evaluation of their performance, but they also expressed the desire to have more importance placed on other aspects of their work, especially teaching."[18] The findings of Wolfgang et al. support a previous study by Jarvis.[19] Applying evaluation research to the assessment of teaching provides both formative assessment and summative assessment of an individual's teaching.

Benefits of peer observation appear throughout the literature and include improvement of teaching, faculty ownership, and enhancement of teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the process provides documentation of teaching and places attention on the craft of teaching. Peer observation can also stimulate reflection on the teaching process, development of collegial relationships between faculty, improvement of faculty morale, decreased feelings of teacher isolation, and elevation of teaching to a scholarly activity.[12,13,16,17,20–23]

Objections to peer observation include "anxieties about openness and possible threats to academic freedom, the difficulty of defining a peer, problems with finding time to devote to peer review, concerns about the validity and reliability of peer review, and concerns about undesirable aftereffects of the approach."[12] A prominent barrier listed is that the process is time consuming and paperwork intensive. An additional barrier to a successful peer observation program may include feelings of being under scrutiny and concerns that the observation will be personalized, subjective, and unreliable. Concerns that the observed class session is nonrepresentative of actual teaching were also cited as a barrier to the peer observation process.[16,21,22]

The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education Standards includes a guideline for colleges of pharmacy to incorporate some method of peer review for performance evaluation. Guideline 26.2 states, "The faculty and staff evaluation process should be annual, involve self-assessment, and include appropriate input from peers, supervisors, and students."[24] A study published in 1998 found that 36 of the 79 colleges of pharmacy incorporated some form of peer evaluation of teaching.[25] In the pharmacy education literature, the number of reports of colleges and schools of pharmacy that use peer observation is limited. A review of

the literature found only four articles published during the past decade that describe or assess peer observation programs. A more comprehensive search that used multiple educational search engines and databases revealed few additional publications that described or assessed current peer observation programs. Most publications described how to create a peer observation program.

Assessment or evaluation?

Assessment of effective teaching in professional schools, colleges, and universities has often been limited to student evaluations conducted near the end of the semester and possibly a visit to the classroom by the department chair or dean.[14,17] Teaching is a multifaceted discipline that requires a multifaceted approach for evaluation and assessment.[14] In constructing a successful peer observation model, definitions of assessment and evaluation are required. According to University of Texas at El Paso Center for Effective Teaching and Learning/Instructional Support Services, assessment and evaluation are unique constructs.[20] Braskamp and Ory define assessment as "the collection, analysis, interpretation, and use of information about programs and people."[26] In addition, assessment will incorporate values, quality, and effectiveness into the process.[26] Assessment is taking a measure of effectiveness, whereas evaluation is passing judgment as part of an administrative process. Both effective assessment and evaluation of teaching require data drawn from multiple sources, including student surveys, peer observations/reviews, course documentation, self-evaluations, and administrative observations.[12,14,20,26] The approach taken by PCAS-T follows the Braskamp and Ory model in that a dialogue between the observed and the observers help all parties understand the perspective of the others in the process,[26] and it is a process of formative assessment; however, faculty are afforded the opportunity to include peer evaluations in dossiers for promotion and/or tenure. This contradiction can be explained in the philosophy of the department's peer review system. Although not sanctioned university-wide, it may be used to help faculty in a myriad of positive ways.

The process

Before the introduction of peer observation and review, the OUCOP faculty were evaluated by the division chair and/or a representative of the Instructional Sciences and Assessment Office when requested by the faculty member, using a form created internally within the COP. Faculty in the PCAS-T department requested the creation of a formal process for peer observation.

After an extensive literature review concerning peer observation, the PCAS-T department developed a program that was reviewed and approved by the faculty in spring 2008. The program was piloted with the department faculty during the 2008–09 academic year. Full program implementation began in the fall of the 2009–10 academic year. The current peer observation process design incorporated the seven principles of good practice introduced by Chickering and Gamson[9] and elements of the Hunter Mastery Teaching Model.[7] Good practice encourages contact between students and faculty, develops reciprocity and cooperation among students, uses active learning techniques, gives prompt feedback, emphasizes time on task, communicates high expectations, and respects diverse talents and methods of learning.[9] The Hunter Mastery Teaching Model contains eight components. Essentially, it identifies the purpose of the lesson, sets the stage with a short activity to capture the students' attention, and then delivers the information to be learned. Modeling behaviors to be learned is encouraged in the Hunter Model. A key component of the model is the need to check for understanding, followed by guided and/or independent practice of the skills learned. The lesson ends with a review or closing activity.[7] The peer observation program developed used the seven principles of Chickering and Gamson, while incorporating the components of the Hunter Mastery Teaching Model to define specific behaviors to be observed. The faculty of PCAS-T reviewed the program components before voting the current program into practice during fall 2008.

Faculty peers are assigned by the department chair with consideration given to workload, faculty rank, and content area. This process is appropriate for the department in that the department chair has complete access to faculty teaching loads, clinic schedules, areas of expertise, and annual development goals. In addition, another consideration is the identification of an observer who is in the same "general" area of expertise or who will have some knowledge of the given area, but who is not involved in the same course and would not be preoccupied with either falsely praising the observed faculty nor in a mentality of "I would teach it this way." Cons include the administrative workload for program coordinators, faculties' possible perception of loss of autonomy, and the idea that the program will be used more for summative (especially punitively) rather than formative evaluation.

Thus, a team of two individuals—a content peer and the department's instructional design specialist (IDS)—participates in each observation. It is believed that the use of a pair of observers mitigates concerns of bias, and in this case, the IDS and content expert can both focus on the particular aspects of teaching with which they are comfortable. Each faculty at the assistant professor level is observed at least once annually, but depending on load and previous evaluations up to every semester in which he or she is involved in teaching. Other faculty are observed at least once every two years, but are given the opportunity to request additional observations. An observation consists formally of a pre-observation meeting, two visits to the classroom, and a post-observation meeting. Development programming was offered to the faculty peers to prepare them to act as faculty peer observers. Ongoing peer development is provided each

semester in a one-on-one format for peers seeking a review of the process or for new faculty members serving as peers for the first time. The development programming included information about what the peers should include in the observation, such as the classroom environment, student engagement, teaching methodology used, and nonverbal communication between faculty and students. In addition, specifics about how to record the observation were shared along with tips for a successful observation. A thorough discussion of bias was included in the development process. Faculty was encouraged to record what was actually seen in the classroom and to write questions about what was observed. Making a judgment about the quality of teaching was not the purpose. All feedback was to be constructive and not critical.

Before the observation, a pre-observation meeting occurs that allows the faculty member to share with the observation team artifacts of the lecture, such as the course syllabus, course goals and objectives, teaching strategies, assessment methods, the instructor's teaching philosophy, and specific concerns or areas of focus. During this meeting, the observation team also learns about the instructor's role in the course, including level of input in syllabus and course design. On occasion, the peer may not be able to attend the pre-observation meeting because of unexpected clinical obligations at their practice site. When this happens, the IDS shares the information with the peer before the first observation. Peer teams usually consult with the instructor about the dates observation will occur, but they reserve the right for an unannounced visit. Peers observe the faculty member and record qualitative observations, but they also employ the use of a standardized Likert-scale template (Appendix A). In general, the peer observation should include comments about the general presentation style and evidence to demonstrate planning, student-faculty contact and communication, active learning, student cooperation, a supportive learning environment, respect for diverse learning situations, student engagement in the learning process, and the proper use of instructional media. Handouts, examinations, quizzes, and presentation materials also may be reviewed as part of the process. As part of the observation, the faculty peer will record observations about the content delivered. Specifically, the peer will supply information about the content mastery, breadth and depth of the content, and whether content was missing or extra content was presented. Assessment of the content is based on the knowledge of the peer content expert. After the final observation, a post-observation meeting occurs to discuss the overall process. The discussion at the post-observation meeting focuses on content and presentation style. As part of the meeting, the faculty member reflects on their teaching sessions. After all activities, the observation team creates and shares a formative assessment report with the faculty member. The report includes a narrative of all areas involved in the peer observation process including, but not limited to, presentation style, content delivery, student involvement, and learning environment. The report is submitted to the department chair, who reviews teaching performance with each faculty at least annually, but sometimes more frequently. Peer reports are not submitted to the dean or to university administrators unless the faculty member opts to include them in a dossier.

Study purpose and objectives

The purpose of this study was to document the peer observation process and make initial inferences concerning its utility. The survey used in this study was created following the survey design methodology described by Hutchison.[27] This study received approval from the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center Institutional Review Board.

The study sought to answer four basic questions: (1) Did faculty perceive value in the peer observation process?, (2) Did faculty incorporate feedback from the process into future teaching opportunities or plan to incorporate feedback into future teaching opportunities?, (3) What recommendations did faculty have to improve the process?, and (4) Were faculty observers prepared to perform peer observation? The target population included all faculty involved with peer observation during the 2008–09 academic year. The results of this study will serve as the first step in a comprehensive evaluation of the peer observation program. In addition, the results were shared with the OUCOP administration and faculty.

Methods

Survey construction and deployment

Using a mixed-method design for collection and analysis of data, the current study was descriptive in nature. The primary investigator created the survey based on peer observation program goals and a review of the literature. A research faculty member provided input for revisions. A group of three faculty colleagues not involved in the peer observation process during the implementation phase reviewed the revised survey questions for content and applicability. The survey was created using SelectSurveyASP Advanced 8/1/10 and housed on a secure server. Deployment was through the official OU Health Sciences Center e-mail system with a link to the secure survey. Surveys were returned to the server in an anonymous fashion. All participants received the same survey, because many persons in the program served as both observer and as one being observed, except for only the most junior of faculty, who were only observed. Faculty completed the pertinent portions of the survey based on their role in the process.

Survey analysis

Frequency statistics were calculated and used to describe the data. Qualitative questions were asked to provide a

richer, more detailed picture of faculty perceptions into the process. The primary investigator conducted thematic analysis, a process that involves coding and then segregating the data by codes into data clumps for future analysis and description,[28] to discover commonalities in the qualitative data and was used to compare the data provided through the open-ended questions answered by the faculty members. Anonymity of the respondents was assured through the survey deployment and return process.

Results

Quantitative component

Nineteen faculty members participated in the pilot version of the peer observation process during the 2008–09 academic year. All 19 faculty members were invited to participate in the follow-up survey administrated during the 2009 fall semester. Because of the small population involved in the study, only one survey instrument was used. Faculty that completed the survey were asked to identify whether they were observed, the observer, or both. The questions asked were designed to elicit perceptions about the overall process, not about specifics of being the observer or observed. Fifteen surveys were returned for a 79% return rate. Ten respondents participated as both faculty peers and as those being observed. Three faculty members were observed but did not act as faculty peers, and two faculty members were observers only. Eleven faculty members categorized themselves as either comfortable or very comfortable in the classroom setting. The four remaining faculty categorized themselves as uncomfortable or very uncomfortable in the classroom setting. Of the 12 faculty members who were observers in the process, 10 indicated that the training session for the observation process prepared them to be observers. Two indicated that they felt somewhat unprepared to be peer observers.

Qualitative component

The first question asked about the preparation process for the peer observer. Seven of 15 responses indicated that the faculty member was either not an observer or did not provide feedback to improve the peer observation preparation component of the process. Of those with suggestions, three faculty members indicated that requiring the peer to participate in the pre-observation meeting would be beneficial. In the current process, the peer observer is requested, but not required, to attend the preobservation meeting. One faculty member indicated that a one-page guide for the peer observer would be helpful.

Faculty members were asked to describe what they liked and disliked about the peer observation process. Nine of 15 faculty members indicated that the feedback received was the most beneficial aspect of the process and the feedback provided valuable information about possible areas for teaching improvements. In addition, faculty members indicated that the process facilitated reflection on the teaching activities that they observed and apply these observations to their own teaching practices. Issues that the faculty did not like about the process varied; however, the time commitment involved in the process, especially if both being observed and serving as a peer, and perceived discomfort in evaluating peers were most commonly cited. Additional responses in this area could be found across the spectrum. For example, one faculty member wished to be observed multiple times over the semester, whereas another faculty member felt that more than one observation was "redundant."

Suggestions for improvement were offered by 60% of the respondents. Comments included: (1) Adding a follow-up program to review best practices and "what not to do" as related to classroom teaching and in the observation process, (2) reducing the time involved in the process, (3) requiring the peer observer to attend all meetings before and after the classroom observations, and (4) requiring the peer to be from the same practice area (i.e., adult medicine, pediatrics, ambulatory care, etc.) as the faculty member being observed.

The final set of questions on the faculty survey asked about the benefits of the program and how the faculty member intends to use the feedback received. Faculty respondents indicated that the process forced them to reflect on course delivery. By observing peers, the process allowed the observers to see teaching from the perspective of a peer rather than from that of a student. The common theme in this area was that the process broadened their personal perspective of the classroom experience. Faculty members saw different teaching styles and teaching technologies used. Through observation, faculty members were able to see how to use a variety of active learning strategies and how the students responded to the differences in teaching styles. Four faculty members indicated that they had already incorporated the feedback into the current year's lectures and felt that the feedback made a positive difference in their teaching.

Discussion

Peer observation has a place in the professional education classroom. Numerous benefits have been documented in the literature.[14,17,20,23] In addition, concerns about the process have also been raised.[16,21,22] Benefits and concerns expressed in the literature are important; however, the accrediting body for Colleges of Pharmacy has indicated that peer input is an integral part of the evaluation process.[24] Although literature from schools or colleges of pharmacy is limited, four articles were found describing and/or assessing local peer observation programs.

The faculty in the PCAS-T department expressed opinions and perspectives that mirrored the current literature. Based on the information shared by the department faculty, the benefits are important as they work to improve personal teaching effectiveness. The department faculty indicated

that attending lectures provided an opportunity to learn about different teaching styles and techniques, to share information about what works or does not work in the classroom, and to begin a conversation about what others are teaching. Moreover, the concerns expressed by department faculty can be addressed by revising the process.

Faculty concerns of the current process will continue to be addressed during the 2010–11 academic year. PCAS-T is a small department, but every effort will be taken to select peers with the same or similar practice areas and/or similar areas of expertise. In addition, peers will be strongly encouraged to attend all meetings, realizing that in any health sciences program, emergencies may occur. The entire process has been streamlined to minimize the time involved. Little can be done to change the actual time involved in the classroom observations. During spring 2010, the ISD planned a presentation for department faculty sharing the lessons learned from the peer observation.

The faculty concern about the possible negative impact of the process was addressed by ensuring that the feedback provided was constructive and offered as advice, not as a mandate to change. Because this process is new, many of the faculty observed during the 2008–09 academic year have not delivered lectures in the 2009–10 academic year at the time of this writing. The next step in the process will be to conduct a comprehensive evaluative study of the departmental peer observation process.

Schultz and Latif[29] indicated that the description provided in their 2006 article was one of the first, if not *the* first, study of peer observation in colleges and schools of pharmacy. In this description, feedback indicated that the process "reinforced teaching pedagogy as well as exposed faculty members to new techniques and insight on mannerisms and language."[29] The faculty was opposed to a process that was summative in nature and a required component added to their responsibilities at the university. It was noted in the study that the process of peer observation was time consuming. The PCAS-T faculty comments mirrored the comments presented by the Bernard J. Dunn School of Pharmacy (Shenandoah University) faculty.

The University of Colorado School of Pharmacy (USCHSC) created an evidence-based peer teaching program for their college. The college created a peer assessment tool based on three validated teaching models: the Hunter Mastery Teaching Model,[7] a clinical supervision model by Goldhammer[30] and revised by Cogan,[31] and Cognitive Coaching.[32] Positive comments from the USCHSC program included that the faculty learned about their peers and received feedback that could be implemented into future classes. Concerns were expressed about the lack of content experts to observe, a perceived lack of appreciation for teaching style differences, and concerns about administrative issues and how the reports would be used.[33] In the OUCOP program, the design and tools appeared to be very similar, as well as the desire for content experts to be used as peers. In a small department, it may be problematic to find peers with the same content experience. In addition, the faculty of PCAS-T were concerned about the use of the reports. The approved department policy resolved this issue, mandating that the peer observation reports were for formative purposes only and would only be included in any documentation that left the department at the individual faculty member's discretion.

Northeastern University School of Pharmacy (NUSOP) described the development and pilot study of the process used. As part of the development, NUSOP created the Peer Observation Evaluation Tool (POET) used in their program. General faculty concerns were discussed by NUSOP. The concerns from their study included faculty fears that assessment could violate some perceived norms around the privacy of teaching faculty, self-doubt about teaching expertise, and the ability to act in the role of peer, time involved in the process, and potential bias by the reviewers. The concerns were addressed by NUSOP with the POET as a valid and reliable instrument and based on the fact that the program at NUSOP was for formative purposes only.[34] Once again, the observations and concerns of the OU PCAS-T faculty mirrored the comments from the faculty at NUSOP. The department also handled the concerns in a similar manner by creating a document that was considered valid and reliable by the faculty and using the process for formative purposes only.

The faculty at South Carolina College of Pharmacy created a process similar to the three programs described above. After the program completed one cycle, the faculty were surveyed using an anonymous tool to evaluate the program. The process at OU was also evaluated using an anonymous tool after the completion of one academic year with very similar results. The faculty indicated that the process was organized and well explained. In addition, the faculty indicated that the program should be required annually. The survey revealed that faculty appreciated the feedback and that it was a learning experience to simply attend the lectures of other faculty members. It was suggested that the requirement be decreased from an annual observation to once every two years by some faculty.[35]

Evaluation of the program at PCAS-T will use the methodology of Scriven's Key Evaluation Checkpoints (KEC)[36] as the basis for the evaluative study. Because the purpose of a KEC is primarily program evaluation, often in educational settings, this methodology was selected for the basis of a more comprehensive evaluation. The KEC follows a specific checklist to determine the quality, value, and/or importance of the program. As with most evaluation methodologies, a KEC includes descriptions of the program, the stakeholders of the program, and a process evaluation. The purpose of any evaluation is to lead to the overall significance of the program and recommendations for improvement.

Summary/limitations

Although the data are limited to one department in a college of pharmacy, the peer observation process appears to provide a way to offer constructive feedback and encouragement to the newest members of the pharmacy education profession, as well as provide confirmation and feedback to the more experienced members of the education community. Another positive aspect is that a formal peer observation process can provide valuable documentation for faculty as they seek promotion and tenure. In addition, the current PCAS-T program was useful and instructive for the creation of the joint mentoring program currently under development for both the Department of Pharmacy in Tulsa and the Department of Pharmacy in Oklahoma City.

Conclusion

Although the peer observation process in the department is still a work in progress, it appears to have proven value and usefulness to department faculty members. The program developed for PCAS-T recognizes the value of peer input from all levels of the faculty and the importance of involving the IDS in the process. The program for the department is unique when compared with the programs described in pharmacy literature in that the program was developed not only with faculty input, but also with the input of the IDS. The IDS takes part in each peer observation along with a content peer. This team approach provides the opportunity for the observed faculty member to receive input about content and teaching behaviors. The peer observation process began as a faculty initiative to supplement student evaluations and has developed into a program with value to the faculty members of the department. The description of the process and the future reports from the evaluation of the program will add to the primary literature that is currently missing evidence of value of peer observation to academic programs in colleges of pharmacy.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank the PCAS-T faculty for their participation in the peer observation program and the evaluation process of the program, and Chair Shane Desselle for his guidance throughout the implementation and evaluation of the program.

Appendix A: Report of Classroom Observation Document

As part of the observation process, please answer these questions about the lecture that was observed. Use the effective feedback criteria whenever possible. Please complete this document electronically and return it to Tamra Davis. Thank you.

Faculty Member Observed:
Faculty Peer:
Date of Observation:

1. Describe the lesson taught, including the subject and methods used.
2. Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, breadth, and depth.
3. Were there any concepts that should have been included and were not? Were there any concepts that were included that you would have left out?
4. How well organized and clear was the presentation?
5. How appropriate were the teaching techniques used for the instructor's goals for this class?
6. Describe the level of student interest and participation you observed.
7. What are the instructor's major strengths? Areas for improvement?
8. What specific recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's classroom teaching?

Table 1
Lecture observation feedback form

Lecture observation feedback form
Faculty member **Date** **Course** **Lecture topic**

Started on time: ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** **Ended on time:** ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**
1. Below adequate levels – development is recommended
2. Adequate – the instructor attempted to do this, but could use some development or revision
3. Needs minor improvement – minor improvements may be recommended
4. Commendable – no recommendation for improvement
NA – no opportunity to observe
M – missing, the instructor did not do this or should consider adding

Table 1
Continued

General Presentation style:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Presented the lesson with enthusiasm
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Articulated and pronounced words clearly
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Avoided the use of verbalized pauses (er, uh, OK, so, etc.)
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Spoke extemporaneously
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized effective voice quality and volume
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized an effective rate of delivery
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized effective body movement/gestures
Comments:						
Evidence of planning:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Stated objectives/goals at the beginning of the lesson
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Emphasized importance/relevance of lesson
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Built on prior knowledge and/or set the stage for future knowledge
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Presented information in an organized manner
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Emphasized and summarized key points throughout and at the end of the lesson
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Presented information with a variety of supporting materials
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized appropriate assignments/activities
Comments:						
Evidence of Student-faculty contact and communication:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Established a rapport with students
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Captured audience attention at the beginning of the lesson
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Paused for questions periodically
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Asked questions at the higher-level thinking skills
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Provided sufficient wait time for student responses (8 + seconds)
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Created an environment conducive to student questions or feedback
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Provided appropriate feedback that was informative to student questions
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Incorporated student responses into feedback as appropriate
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Addressed inattentive/inappropriate students effectively
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Included students on both campuses in question/answer sessions
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Managed mistakes/wrong answers appropriately
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Celebrated successes and/or provided positive reinforcement
Comments:						
Evidence of active learning:						**Activities observed in class: lecture, independent projects, case studies, discussion, demonstration, TBL, ARS, other**
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used the teaching method(s) observed effectively
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used appropriate instructional materials
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Employed a variety of teaching techniques
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Related content to student interests or experiences
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Presented instructions for all activities clearly
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Involved most of the class
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used time efficiently
Comments:						
Evidence of student cooperation:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Offered specific opportunities for peer/team teaching
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Monitored student participation in the learning activity
Comments:						
Evidence of a supportive environment/respect for diverse learning situations:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Created a supportive environment
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Encouraged persistence with difficult materials
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized multiple strategies for student learning

Table 1
Continued

1	2	3	4	NA	M	Provided individual instruction by adapting materials if needed
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Provided multiple methods of instruction
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Stimulated independent thinking, good working habits, etc.
Comments:						
Use of Media:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Presented slides that were esthetically pleasing
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used quality pictures, tables, illustrations, etc. if appropriate
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Provided quality handouts
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used the Elmo effectively
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Used the Audience Response System (clickers) effectively
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Utilized other media effectively explain
Comments:						
Evidence Students are engaged in learning:						
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Students were attentive, interested, involved, participating
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Students asked questions, took notes, performed assigned tasks, asked for assistance, etc.
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Students integrated knowledge to analyze or evaluate situations/problems
1	2	3	4	NA	M	Students applied knowledge to perform tasks
Comments:						

References

1. American Federation of Teachers. Accountability in higher education: A statement by the Higher Education Program and Policy Council. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers; 2000.
2. Zumeta W. Public university accountability to the state in the late twentieth century: time for a rethinking? Review Policy Res 1998;15:5–22.
3. Aleman AMM. Accountability and higher education. London: Routledge Education; 2010.
4. McPherson P, Shulenburger D. Toward a Voluntary System of Accountability Program (VSA) for public universities and colleges. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; 2006.
5. Zlatic TD. Re-visioning Professional education: an Orientation to Teaching. Kansas City, MO: College of Clinical Pharmacy; 2005.
6. Boyer EL. Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1990.
7. Hunter M. Mastery teaching: Increasing instructional effectiveness in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities. Los Angeles, CA: Corwin Press; 1994.
8. McKeachie WJ, McKeachie SM. *s* teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers, 12th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; 2006.
9. Chickering AW, Gamson ZF. Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin. March 1987.
10. University of Oklahoma. Catalog. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma; 2009.
11. University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy. Mission statement. 2009. Available at: http://pharmacy.ouhsc.edu/about/mission.asp. Accessed January 4, 2011.
12. Chism NVN. Peer review of teaching: a source book. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Group; 2007.
13. Perlman B, McCann LI. Peer review of teaching: An overview. Statesboro Gas 1998.
14. Roberts MW. Peer review of teaching: A multi-faceted approach to improving student learning. 2006. Available at: http://intranet.umanitoba.ca/academic_support/uts/media/5_lr_UTShandbook.pdf#page=248. Accessed January 4, 2011.
15. Schultz KK, Latif D. The planning and implementation of a faculty peer review teaching project. Am J Pharm Educ 2006; 70:32.
16. Berk RA. Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. Int J Teach Learn Higher Educ 2005;17: 48–62.
17. Mundy V, Grabau LJ. Planning for peer review of teaching. J Nat Resour Life Sci Educ 1999;28:31–6.
18. Wolfgang AP, Gupchup GV, Plake KS. Relative importance of performance criteria in promotion and tenure decisions; Perceptions of pharmacy faculty members. Am J Pharm Educ 1995;59:342–7.
19. Jarvis DK. Junior faculty development: A handbook. New York: Modern Language Association of America; 1991.
20. University of Texas-El Paso. Peer observation and assessment of teaching: *A* resource book for university faculty, administrators, and students who teach. El Paso, TX; 2006.
21. Adshead L, White PT, Stephenson A. Introducing peer observation of teaching to GP teachers: a questionnaire study. Med Teach 2006;28:e6873.
22. Siddiqui ZSJ-S, Diana C, Sandra E. Twelve tips for peer observation of teaching. Med Teach 2007;29:297–300.
23. Doyle T. Evaluating teacher effectiveness-Research Summary. Available at: http://www.ferris.edu/fctl/Teaching_and_Learning_Tips/Research%20on%20Students'%20Evalution%20of%20

Faculty%20Teaching/EvalTeachEffec.htm. Accessed January 4, 2011.
24. Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education. Accreditation standards and guidelines for the professional program in pharmacy leading to the doctor of pharmacy degree; 2006. Available at: http://www.acpe-accredit.org/pdf/ACPE_Revised_PharmD_Standards_Adopted_Jan152006.pdf. Accessed January 4, 2011.
25. Barnett CW, Matthews HW. Current procedures used to evaluate teaching in schools of pharmacy. Am J Pharm Educ 1998;62:388–91.
26. Braskamp LA, Ory JC. Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1994.
27. Hutchison SR, ed. Survey research. In: deMarrais K, Lapan SD, eds. Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2004.
28. Glesne C. Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education; 2006.
29. Schultz KK, Latif D. The planning and implementation of a faculty peer review teaching project. Am J Pharm Educ 2006;70:Article 32.
30. Goldhammer R. Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winton; 1969.
31. Cogan M. Clinical supervision. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Publishing Group; 1973.
32. Costa AL, Garmston RJ. Cognitive coaching. Morwood, MA: Christopher Gordan Publishing Group; 1994.
33. Hansen LB, McCollum M, Paulsen SM, Cyr T, Jarvis CL, Tate G, et al. Evaluation of an evidence-based teaching assessment program. Am J Pharm Educ 2007;71:Article 45.
34. Trujillo JM, DiVall MV, Barr J, et al. Development of a peer teaching-assessment program and a peer observation and evaluation tool. Am J Pharm Educ 2009;72;Article 147.
35. Wellein MG, Ragucci KR, Lapointe M. A peer review process for classroom teaching. Am J Pharm Educ 2009;73: Article 79.
36. Scriven M. Key evaluation checklist. 2005. Available at: http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/kec_feb07.pdf. Accessed January 4, 2011.