

Online learning: collaboration for a formative peer review program

Amy E. Karpenko DDS, Vidya Ramaswamy PhD,
Danielle Rulli RDH, MS, DHSc, Diane C. Hoelscher DDS, MS

Dr. Karpenko is Clinical Assistant Professor of Restorative Dentistry; Dr. Ramaswamy is Associate Director of Curriculum and Program Evaluation; Dr. Rulli is Clinical Associate Professor of Dentistry in the Division of Dental Hygiene and Director of the Graduate Dental Hygiene Program; Dr. Hoelscher is Clinical Assistant Professor of Restorative Dentistry and Director of Innovation in Teaching and Learning. All authors are in the University of Michigan School of Dentistry. Address correspondence to Dr. Diane C. Hoelscher, (248) 302-7123, dhoelsch@umich.edu.

PROBLEM

The COVID-19 pandemic required faculty to quickly switch to online teaching. This required new technical skills and teaching strategies. Faculty wanted to know if they were being effective. Thus, a team of faculty and education experts collaborated to develop a program for peer review of online courses.¹ A formative evaluation process, which focuses on the improvement of teaching, was used as the framework for their work.²

SOLUTION

The Peer Review of Online Teaching (PROT) team developed the PROT program by adapting a model discovered following a literature search of peer review programs. A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State,³ based on Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education⁴ (Figure 1), was adapted using a formative evaluation approach to continuously refine the instrument and process. The PROT program has two goals: provide formative feedback to faculty for setting goals for continuous improvement and provide documentation supporting faculty annual reviews and promotion portfolios.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/jdd.12555.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

The Penn State peer review process and instrument were modified to meet the needs of dental education:

1. Pre-review: Process is presented to the faculty member.
2. Self-assessment: Faculty member uses the checklist to assess their course.
3. Observation: Peer reviewers examine the course.
4. Post-review: Reviewers and faculty member meet to discuss strengths and goals.
5. Adapted peer review instrument:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VaTAK3knW_A4zrZLjtJdMyYRV4CvBfU0_tAA2hnYvjo/edit?usp=sharing

The next step applied formative evaluation to iteratively improve the instrument and process. Four senior dental educators and five department chairs (not part of the PROT team) reviewed the instrument and process. The PROT team conducted pilot reviews of two courses. Minor refinements were made after reviews and pilots. See Figure 2 for the process used to develop the PROT program.

RESULTS

Formative evaluation led the team to conclusions including:

- **Focus on improvement versus assessment:** The review process identifies strengths and considerations for improvement, not direct assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- **Importance of experts:** Faculty reviewees reported benefit from being paired with more experienced faculty.
- **The process takes some time:** Faculty reviewees commented that, even though a time investment, the process would actually save time because the course is better organized, resulting in fewer student questions.

Recognizing that the PROT program will continuously evolve and improve, attention has focused on building a culture of continuous improvement. Early reviews by department chairs have encouraged faculty to seek peer review. Chairs also suggested the program be reciprocating, where faculty who have undergone the peer review process, should then become peer reviewers.

LESSONS LEARNED

Four additional peer reviews are underway. Lessons learned to guide the growth of the PROT program include:

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

- Sustained culture change takes time.
- Focus on continuous improvement; positive tone and approach.
- Reviews should target only essential elements of the course.
- Provide recognition of faculty peer reviewers.

Faculty feedback indicates that the peer review program should be extended from the current focus on remote learning to classroom, preclinical and clinical courses in the post-COVID future. The formative evaluation approach was helpful in growing the program and building widespread support over time.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to acknowledge and thank Dr. Lynn Johnson for her leadership of the team developing this program and assistance with preparing this manuscript.

References

1. Schultz KK, Latif DL. The planning and implementation of a faculty peer review teaching project. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2006;70(2):32.
2. Brittain S, Glowacki T, Van Ittersum J, Johnson L. Podcasting lectures: How formative evaluation strategies helped to identify an unanticipated solution to a learning dilemma. *Educause Quarterly*. 2006;29(3): 24-31.
3. A peer review guide for online courses at Penn State. At: https://facdev.education.psu.edu/sites/default/files/PeerReview_OnlineCourses_PSU_Guide_13June2017.pdf. Accessed December 30, 2020.
4. Chickering A, Gamson Z. Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin* 1987;(39):7.

Figure 1. Chickering & Gamson Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education.

- Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education**
1. Encourages contact between students and faculty;
 2. Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students;
 3. Encourages active learning;
 4. Gives prompt feedback;
 5. Emphasizes time on task;
 6. Communicates high expectations; and
 7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

Figure 2. PROT Program Development Process

