

2022

## Peer Feedback on Teaching for Health Professions Lectures

Brian P. Boerner

Elizabeth L. Beam

Beth Culross

Michelle Howell Smith

Kristan Lester

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/iae\\_tools](https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/iae_tools)

 Part of the **Education Commons**

---

---

**Authors**

Brian P. Boerner, Elizabeth L. Beam, Beth Culross, Michelle Howell Smith, Kristan Lester, Analisa McMillan, and Kim Michael

# PURPOSE OF RUBRIC



The Peer Feedback on Teaching Rubric was developed to support health professions educators in improving their teaching. This tool is not designed nor intended to provide reliable ratings that can be compared over time or between individuals (e.g., performance reviews or research). Rather, it **provides meaningful feedback to individuals to make incremental improvements in their teaching and lectures.**

While some individuals may be encouraged by supervisors to seek out peer feedback on their teaching, this process ultimately works best when the individual is seeking out feedback based on their own desire to improve.

## THREE WAYS TO USE THE RUBRIC

### FOR SELF-REFLECTION

Educators who want to improve their lectures should begin by first using the rubric to self-assess their own teaching. You might video record a lecture to review later or simply reflect on a lecture shortly after delivering it. Rating yourself can help you identify areas to focus on for future lectures.

Your self-reflection can also be used as a starting point for peer feedback, so your reviewer can pay special attention to the areas you identified along with providing feedback in other areas.

### TO OBSERVE A MASTER TEACHER

One of the best ways to learn how to deliver better lectures is by watching a master teacher in action. Identify a master teacher by asking your department chair for recommendations in your field or ask fellow educators to identify someone in an unrelated field. Most colleagues welcome someone to discuss teaching strategies with, so don't feel shy about asking them.

While you will not use this rubric to "grade" their teaching, it can be useful to identify important teaching techniques and see how they are effectively implemented. This is helpful if they are concepts you want to work on, based on your self-reflection. If your colleague is willing, schedule a debrief with them to ask why they made certain choices or to talk through ideas for how you might adapt some of their strategies in your teaching.

### TO RECEIVE PEER FEEDBACK

The Academy has a cadre of members who are willing to provide feedback on other's teaching. Reach out to us and we will connect you with a fellow faculty member. For example, if you are most interested in feedback related to your command of the subject and logical flow of delivery, we can connect you with someone closely related to your field. On the other hand, if you are most interested in general, non-content related feedback on your lecture delivery skills, we can connect you with someone in a different department or college.

Need helping finding a peer feedback reviewer?

Email [iae@unmc.edu](mailto:iae@unmc.edu), and we will connect you with someone based on your needs.

### PREPARING FOR AN OBSERVATION

To get the most out of the peer feedback on your teaching, touch base with your observer beforehand. If you have done some self-reflection on your teaching and have identified specific areas you want to improve, share that with your observer. It is also helpful to let them know a bit about your teaching philosophy and the format of the class they will be observing. Most importantly, discuss when and how you will receive your feedback, and if the observer is willing, schedule a time to debrief after the observation.

## DEBRIEFING AFTER AN OBSERVATION

Each reviewer will have their own style for how they want to provide feedback to you. Some may print off the rubric and take notes on a paper copy while others may prefer to type in their notes during the observation. Some observers may give you their feedback at the end of the class while others may want time to compose their feedback more carefully before sharing it with you.

There is great value in receiving written feedback from a peer observer, but we strongly encourage that this rubric also be used to guide a **debriefing conversation after the observation**. Previous participants, both lecturers and observers, have commented that the true value of the peer feedback process was the conversations stimulated later.

#### Adapted from:

Newman, L. R., Roberts, D. H., & Schwartzstein, R. M. (2012). *Peer observation of teaching handbook*. MedEdPORTAL. [https://doi.org/10.15766/mep\\_2374-8265.9150](https://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.9150)

Rudd, M., Nagler, A., & Crumley, H. (2014). *Teaching triangles*. MedEdPORTAL, 10, 9966. [https://doi.org/10.15766/mep\\_2374-8265.9966](https://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.9966)

College of Allied Health Professions. (n.d.). *Peer evaluation of faculty* [Unpublished document]. University of Nebraska Medical Center.

#### To cite this work:

Boerner, B., Beam, E., Culross, B., Howell, M. C., Lester, K., McMillan, A., Michael, K. (2022). *Peer feedback on teaching for health professions lectures*. Interprofessional Academy of Educators, University of Nebraska Medical Center. <https://go.unmc.edu/feedback-rubric>

Instructor:	Course:
Feedback Provider's Name:	Date:
Title/Topic:	# of Learners in Person:
Brief Description:	# of Learners Online:

**Instructional Delivery Mode** *(check all that apply for observation)*

- In Person
- Remote Classroom(s)
- Individual(s) Online/Zoom

**Observer Location**

- In Person with Students & Instructor
- In Person with Students in Remote Classroom
- Individually Online/Zoom

**Please use the following scale:**

- 4 = Exceptional** Demonstration of Criteria
- 3 = Very Good** Demonstration of Criteria
- 2 = Satisfactory** Demonstration of Criteria
- 1 = Developing** Demonstration of Criteria
- NA = Not Applicable**

CRITERIA	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)
<p><b>1. Knowledge</b> Demonstrates command of the subject matter</p>	<p>Demonstrates strong understanding of subject matter (e.g., cites literature, draws upon personal experiences, speaks to advances or controversies in the field, provides informative answers to questions)</p>	<p>Demonstrates command of the subject; elaborates on content, explains difficult concepts, answers questions</p>	<p>Demonstrates some command of subject, but breadth of understanding is limited (e.g., unable to elaborate with greater detail or information)</p>	<p>Does not yet demonstrate a command of subject matter</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>2. Organization</b> Presents material in a clear, organized fashion</p>	<p>Uses an explicit, organized framework so the presentation flows logically (e.g., articulates a structure and sequence to the talk, frames subtopics, links concepts)</p>	<p>Presentation is organized for students with some structure, sequencing, and linking</p>	<p>Presentation has some organization, but limited structure, sequencing, and/or linking</p>	<p>Does not yet present material in clear, organized fashion</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>3. Organization</b> Clearly states goals of the talk</p>	<p>Clearly communicates purpose of the presentation (e.g., overview of content, expected learning outcomes, rhetorical/challenging questions to be answered)</p>	<p>Communicates the goals of the talk with some detail</p>	<p>Communicates the goals, but description is limited in scope (e.g., only provides topics to be covered or the format of talk)</p>	<p>Does not yet provide overview nor communicate goals of talk</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			

CRITERIA	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)
<p><b>4. Organization</b>                      Provides a conclusion to the talk</p>	<p>Concludes presentation by summarizing main points as they relate to the learning objectives; if appropriate, invites/responds to questions and open to hearing learners' perspectives/opinions</p>	<p>Provides global summary of talk with exchange of discussion and questions, if appropriate</p>	<p>Provides summary of talk but limited in scope; invites few questions and/or provides limited or ambiguous responses</p>	<p>Does not yet summarize information nor solicit questions/opinions</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>5. A/V Materials Development</b>                      Audio and visual aids reinforce the content effectively</p>	<p>Appropriately chooses and designs instructional material to expand key points, demonstrate relevance, or stimulate thought</p>	<p>Appropriately chooses and designs instructional material to reinforce key points and point to helpful resources</p>	<p>Some of the audio/visual aids reinforce content, or material is less than effective</p>	<p>Audio/visual aids do not yet reinforce content</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>6. A/V Materials Delivery</b>                      Audio and visual aids are audible/legible</p>	<p>Tailors audio/visual aids so all students are actively engaged</p>	<p>Tailors audio/visual aids so all students can see and hear (e.g., checks if audience can hear/see material; talks to audience not blackboard, laptop, or screen; visual material is well organized; text is legible; graphics are clear)</p>	<p>At times audio/visual aids are inaudible/illegible</p>	<p>Audio/visual aids are inaudible/illegible</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			

CRITERIA	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)
<p><b>7. Presentation</b> Speech is clear and appropriately paced</p>	<p>Voice uses inflection and pacing consistently allows students time to take notes</p>	<p>Voice is clear and pacing usually allows students time to take notes and questions, if appropriate</p>	<p>At times voice is unclear and pace of speech inconsistently allows students time to take notes</p>	<p>Voice is unclear and pace of speech does not allow students time to take notes</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>8. Enthusiasm</b> Shows enthusiasm for topic</p>	<p>Demonstrates keen enthusiasm for topic through voice, energy, movement and/or body language (e.g., varies pitch, inflection, tempo and volume; eye contact; gestures to emphasize importance)</p>	<p>Demonstrates enthusiasm for the topic using elements of engagement, such as voice, energy, movement, and/or body language</p>	<p>Shows some enthusiasm for topic, but limited in display</p>	<p>Does not yet show enthusiasm for the topic</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>9. Student Engagement</b> Encourages appropriate audience interaction</p>	<p>Stimulates active participation (e.g., solicits comments and questions, polls the audience, uses deliberate silence, poses open-ended questions, invites learners to interact with each other, manages flow of discussion)</p>	<p>Active participation is used effectively at times</p>	<p>Encourages some interaction or uses less effective strategies (close-ended questions, little wait time, often turns back to audience and reads from slides)</p>	<p>Does not yet engage or encourage interaction (e.g., reads all slides without looking at audience, defers questions and does not answer them)</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			

CRITERIA	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)
<p><b>10. Builds Connections for Student Understanding</b> Communicates or demonstrates importance of the lecture’s key concepts</p>	<p>Consistently emphasizes key concepts in a reliable way for the students throughout the learning experience (e.g., identifies important points; uses examples, analogies, metaphors; thinks out loud)</p>	<p>Clearly explains the key concepts’ relevance, context, applicability, and/or the significance to the audience</p>	<p>Refers to the importance of key concepts, but provides limited description of why learners need to know the material</p>	<p>Does not yet communicate or describe why the key concepts are of importance</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			
<p><b>11. Builds Connections for Student Understanding</b> Monitors audience’s understanding of material and responds accordingly</p>	<p>Routinely assesses and responds to audience’s understanding of material (e.g., asks probing questions or polls audience; rephrases or provides alternative examples; adjusts the pace of lecture to accommodate learners)</p>	<p>Occasionally assesses the audience’s understanding of the material; responds to audience’s understanding; tailoring of a teaching response to audience’s understanding is developing</p>	<p>Pays some attention to the audience’s understanding of topic, but students are expected to follow up individually if challenges with materials arise</p>	<p>Does not yet pay attention to the audience’s understanding of material</p>
<p>Rating</p>	<p>Comments</p>			

**Overall, how would you rate this lecture?**

Exceptional

Very Good

Satisfactory

Developing

**Additional comments:**