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Objectives

• **Learning Objective #1:** Participants will be able to outline the purpose for a nursing peer review process.

• **Learning Objective #2:** Participants will be able to discuss the strengths and limitations of a nursing peer review process.

• **Learning Objective #3:** Participants will be able to explain the importance of the peer review process in supporting evidence-based pedagogical practices among nursing faculty.
Introduction

• Welcome
• School of Nursing Demographics
• Importance of Good Feedback (Big Bang Video)

Negative Reinforcement VS. Positive Punishment

• Nursing and Peer Review
  – 1988 ANA Position
School of Nursing Curriculum

- Concept based
- Competency based
  - Patient-Centered Care
  - Teamwork & Collaboration
  - Evidence Based Practice
  - Quality Improvement
  - Safety
  - Informatics
NLN Nurse Educator Competencies

- Facilitate learning
- Facilitate development of socialization
- Use assessment and evaluation strategies
- Participate in curriculum design and evaluation of program outcomes
- Function as a change agent and leader
- Pursue continuous quality improvement in the nurse educator role
- Engage in scholarship
- Function within the education environment
Background

• SON had been through a lot of change
  – Concept-based teaching and learning model
  – Peer Review Task Force created and assigned to support faculty
• Literature supports a formal faculty peer-review as effective regarding:
  – Faculty Development
  – Implementation of new teaching and learning
• Facilitate Review without pressure
• Feed our own needs in Faculty Development
• Increased sense of faculty collegiality
We were asked to complete the following tasks:

- Develop a peer-review tool that reflects concept-based teaching and learning pedagogy
- Identify the core faculty developmental needs related to the development and implementation of concept-based teaching and learning pedagogy
Framework

• Purpose: The purpose of this study was to investigate the contribution that a voluntary faculty peer-review process may have upon a member’s perceived faculty development and peer collegiality.

• Method
  – Qualitative interpretive descriptive design
    • Ability to examine experiential question that cannot be suitably addressed with traditional designs
Framework continued....

• Data Collection: Survey on Survey Monkey-Pro® software.
  – Anonymous
  – 10 questions
    • Open-Ended
    • Dichotomous
    • Ratio Scale

• Data Analysis
  – QSR-Nvivo® qualitative data analysis software
  – Descriptive Statistics
Research

• Need for Quality Teaching
• Definition of Peer Review
• Summative v. Formative Methods
• Faculty Resistance
• Committee of Peers
  – Adding a theoretical framework
    • Theory of Human Caring
    • A way for nurses to care for nurses
Recommended Protocol

• Determine objective
• Committee of Peers
• Design rating forms
  – Observation rating
  – Course materials rating
• Training of committee evaluators
• Pilot – test reliability
• Re-examining evaluation methods and tools
Implementation

- Participation: Voluntary
- Recruited Participants based on the following criteria:
  - Completed the first-year new faculty orientation period and a minimum of two semesters teaching the same course
  - Full- or part-time faculty whose primary assignment is teaching and student advisement
- Recruited Reviewers based on four criteria:
  - Full time faculty with primarily teaching & advising responsibilities
  - Minimum 3 years of experience teaching
  - Consistent student overall teaching evaluation greater than 3.0
  - Faculty who are willing to dedicate the required time to accomplish the PR evaluation process
4 Stage Peer Review Process

- Stage I Pre-observation
  - Meeting between reviewer and faculty member
  - Review course documents
- Stage II Classroom Observation
  - 1 hour
- Stage III Post Observation
  - Reviewer shares insights
- Stage IV Faculty Development
### Implementation: potential bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Propose strategy to address concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Clarification of Purpose:**  
  1. Formative versus Summative  
  2. Future uses could include:  
    a. Periodic performance evaluation  
    b. Retention & Tenure evaluation  
    c. Promotion evaluation  
| 3. Initial process will be formative (to improve teaching)  
  4. Evaluate faculty integration of concept-based pedagogical strategies in teaching |
| One class may not provide a representative picture of the instructor’s teaching skill & presence of observer could increase the likelihood of atypical performance by the instructor- possibly better and possibly worse | 1. Multiple observation sessions (minimum of two separate observations)  
  2. Minimum of two reviewers assigned to each instructor to be reviewed |
| **Reviewer bias** |  
| **Inter-rater reliability issues** |  
| **Consensus related to what constitute good teaching** |  
| **Who is qualified to be a peer reviewer** |  
| **Possibility of personal biases affecting ratings** |  
| **Time demands on the reviewers** |  
| **Peer Review Process specific to teaching modality** |  
| |  
| | 1. Peer Review committee includes faculty representation from all campus locations  
  2. Instructors reviewed by Peer Reviewers who are assigned to a different campus than themselves  
| |  
| | Peer-reviewers participate in training  
  3. Peer-reviewers participate in inter-rater reliability exercise  
  4. Multiple observations by a minimum of two independent reviewers  
| | Integrate evidence-based characteristics of effective teaching strategies into evaluation form (Ref: CNE teacher characteristics)  
| | Full-time faculty with primarily teaching & advising responsibilities  
  3. Minimum 3-years of experience teaching  
  4. Consistent student overall teaching evaluation greater than 3.5  
| | Peer Review committee members elected by faculty  
| | 6. Traditional face-to-face  
  7. Online  
  8. Hybrid  
  9. Clinical  
  a. Onsite in facility  
  b. Nursing Practice Lab  
  c. High-fidelity simulation setting |
Evaluation Tools

- Peer Review Documentation Form
  - Part I: Questionnaire for Faculty
  - Part II: Preliminary meeting with faculty
  - Part III: Peer Reviewer evaluation of course components
  - Part IV: In-class observation
  - RED FLAG: Follow up...
Statistics

• Return Rate: 69%
• Recommend Review to others: 88.89%
• Would not recommend: 11.11%
Describe your experience:

• Positive
  – Easy to participate
  – Useful feedback
  – Excellent experience
  – Positive and Low stress
  – Professional
  – Exciting to have other faculty observe

• Negative
  – A little disorganized
  – Somewhat bad
  – Concerned with being judged unfairly
  – Did not receive any follow up
How would you describe the Peer Review Process as it relates to Faculty Development

- Faculty Development
- Educational Opportunities
- Positive
- Environment
Recommend to colleagues

- Yes
- Needs to be fair
Evaluation Tools

- Could be improved
- Need more feedback
- Request for clinical faculty form
What was positive?

• Quality feedback
• Improved teaching strategies
• Value in peer observation
• Evaluators were accommodating and professional
• Unsure
What was negative?

• Biased opinions
• Giving feedback to instructors
• Misconception
• No feedback
• Scary
• Time
Suggestions for moving forward...

• More faculty buy-in and input
• Improved feedback
• Continue doing it and explaining the reasons “why” to faculty
• Make it permanent policy
• More opportunities for growth
Discussion/Implications

• Peer review when utilized as a mentoring process and based in evidence-based pedagogy, results in highly satisfied faculty
Recommendations/Limitations

- Poor feedback loop
- Need for Closure
  - BIG BANG: Closure
- Improve forms
Next Steps

• No longer voluntary
• Assist reviewers in becoming better peer reviewers
• Remain focused on faculty development needs
• Improve communication between peer review committee and faculty development committee
• Develop Clinical Peer Evaluation Process
• Develop Online Peer Evaluation Process
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