

Guidelines for Peer Observation of Clinical Teaching

Evaluation of clinical faculty will be conducted according to the current procedure for faculty evaluation placed in effect by Appalachian State University and the University of North Carolina Board of Governors. Clinical faculty are classified as EPA Administrative and are governed by the process of Reappointment and Promotion as designed by the Department of Language, Reading, and Exceptionalities. Evaluation of faculty is primarily conducted for faculty development purposes and secondarily for personnel decisions.

Appalachian State University and the University of North Carolina System have mandated that faculty members be reviewed using student evaluation, conducted at regular intervals (at least one per semester), and that a peer review be conducted. The faculty member must have feedback from the evaluation procedures.

A component of the Reappointment and Promotion Process, as well as the multi-year fixed-term contract renewal, is the assessment of performance and accomplishments related to "clinical teaching." Measures of clinical teaching effectiveness consist of a variety of strategies that are dependent upon qualitative and quantitative data that compose a personal portfolio of accomplishments and growth in this area. The portfolio will include:

- Results of clinical educator ratings conducted by graduate students enrolled in CD 5564 and CD 5565.

- Results of peer conducted evaluations of clinical teaching effectiveness.

New clinical faculty must have peer review observations at least every year for the first three years of employment. The second observation will help determine if the faculty member moves to a two-year contract during the third year of employment. All other clinical faculty must have a peer review every three years. Anyone who engages in clinical education must adhere to the review process. The purpose of peer evaluation of clinical teaching is to enhance and improve teaching. To this end the review team will be comprised of at least two reviewers and the Clinical Educator.

The review may be comprised of different scenarios designed by the Clinical Educator. Two scenarios are presented for information.

Case Presentations

Peer review can be presented as one or two case presentations with information concerning student feedback and supervision. Faculty members participating in

clinical education are encouraged to use cases which are complicated and for which they would like additional feedback. There are four parts to the observation process:

1. **Pre-Observation Discussion** – The clinical educator being reviewed will provide the team with the pertinent handouts and other information relevant to teaching and student supervision.
2. **Presentation of the Case** – The faculty member will gather certain information concerning the cases chosen for review. This information will be presented to the review team and will include:
 - ✓ The rationale for the particular case selected by the Clinical Educator
 - ✓ A copy of the diagnostic report
 - ✓ A concise history of the client under discussion
 - ✓ A verbal summary of the initial evaluation conducted with the client
 - ✓ A copy of the most recent treatment plan
 - ✓ A verbal summary of previous treatment plans
 - ✓ An excerpt of a video of a session with the client
 - ✓ A copy of feedback given to the student

The reviewers should note any suggestions concerning the diagnostic or treatment plan, effectiveness and currency of the treatment, comments concerning supervisory strategies used, as well as address any issues identified in the pre-observation discussion.

3. **Post-Observation Discussion** – The team will examine and discuss the observations recorded. Notes and completed forms prepared by the team will remain with the faculty member.
4. **Summary Form** – Within one week of the post-observation discussion, the review team will summarize the process followed on the summary form attached and provide a copy of this form to the faculty member under review and to the Coordinator of the Clinic and the Chair of the Department of Language, Reading and Exceptionalities.

Course Portfolio

Peer review can be presented as a course portfolio, designed to look at one aspect of the clinical education process. The portfolio is a qualitative study of the clinical education provided by the faculty member and should include any materials relevant to the clinical education endeavor.

1. **Preliminary Portfolio Review** – The team should meet to determine the minimum standards for the review project.

2. **Portfolio construction** - The faculty member can then begin to construct the portfolio. It should contain information concerning:
 - ✓ Student-centered learning
 - ✓ How the clinical educator acts as a facilitator during the clinical process
 - ✓ Problems that arise during the clinical process and how they are solved
 - ✓ How students gain critical thinking skills through the practicum experience
 - ✓ The acquisition of self-reflection skills by the students.

Once the portfolio is constructed the review team should meet to discuss the work. They should note any suggestions concerning comments concerning supervisory strategies used, as well as address any issues identified in the preliminary portfolio review.
3. **Portfolio Revision** – The clinical educator will have the opportunity to revise and re-submit any areas of the portfolio needing clarification.
4. **Summary Form** – Within one week of the portfolio revision, the review team will summarize the process followed on the summary form attached and provide a copy of this form to the faculty member under review and to the Coordinator of the Clinic and the Chair of the Department of Language, Reading and Exceptionalities.

Steps to follow:

1. At the beginning of the semester in which the faculty member will be reviewed, the faculty member will
 - a. Select method for review.
 - b. Select peers to undertake the review, at least one must be within the Communication Disorders Program.
 - c. Turn in a plan for review to the Coordinator of the Clinic for inclusion in the faculty's personnel file.
2. At the conclusion of the review process, each member of the review team will sign and date the summary form, which should reflect both process and outcome.
3. Peer reviewers may write letters of recommendation for the individual faculty member under review.

