EXAMPLE 1: PEER REVIEWER FEEDBACK

TO: Faculty Member

FROM: Peer Reviewer

RE: Peer Review

Phase:
Dates of Observations: Monday, April 2, xxxx and Wednesday, April 11, xxxx
Time: 9:00-10:30

Also attached: Interaction Diagram and Tutor Peer Review Attributes Form

Strengths: The interaction with your group is very positive. On both occasions there was an initial settling in period that you used to establish rapport with the group. There was a congenial and friendly atmosphere, but serious, within the tutorial room. Although students address you directly with their questions, for the most part, you direct your comments/questions to the group as a whole or redirect to the person asking the question. Your questions back to the group are designed to encourage greater critical thinking by the students and included such phrases as “Why isn’t it ...”, “So what else ...”, “What’s going on?”, “What about ...”, “What ways...”, “What does X have to do with Y?” You also provide kudos when students have contributed positively to the group with comments such as: “that was an insightful comment”, “Good”, “You guys got there on your own”, etc.

During the first observation, we discussed that the interaction analysis diagram indicated that there were two triads reflected in the student interaction, one more dominant than the other. One student appeared to have little interaction with the group, or either of the triads. Additionally, no interaction was observed during the first 1 ½ hours between the student and the colleague sitting right next to her. She did leave the room at one point indicating that she did not feel well, so that may have affected her level of interaction. You did confirm that she is usually very quiet, but engaged and often makes the most insightful comments. During the second interaction analysis, she was more engaged, though most of her comments were directed toward you.

To address these problems, you began changing your seat for each group. This broke up the triads to some extent because the student who was displaced moved to another seat at the table. You indicated that changing seats had appeared to be effective in changing the interactions during tutorial groups. During the second observation, the beginning of a new triad appeared to be in the making; we discussed observing these three students to ensure that the interaction didn’t continue.

The interaction analysis on the second observation also indicated that you displayed a greater frequency of redirecting/commenting behaviors to the whole group, rather than an individual student, when a student specifically addressed you.
Weaknesses:
During the second observation, the reviewer noted your tendency to look down when addressing the group, though the reviewer did not note this behavior during the first observation. This may be a result of redirecting questions back to the group and involving the group, rather than interacting with an individual student, an area we noted for improvement in the first observation. Avoiding looking down when you address the group or discuss an issue would be a facilitation skill to continue to develop. As indicated earlier, there appeared to be another triad forming. In the future, focusing on looking at the group might ameliorate this occurring.

Also during the second observation, one student appeared to be dominant regarding interaction with you; the interaction analysis, however, did not indicate that you interacted to any greater extent with the student. This student was sitting directly across the table from you so this may have been a response on his part to your looking down, rather than up when you talked to the group.

I appreciate the opportunity to observe you and participate in the peer review process. It was a learning experience for me and I look forward to incorporating some of the insights gained during this process to my own small groups in the future.
EXAMPLE 2: PEER REVIEWER FEEDBACK

Peer Review Summary
XXXXXXX, PhD

Summary

Two observations occurred. The first was January 12, 2007, Renal Phase. The group has fun. It appears to be a balanced group with a good bit of dialogue, but carried primarily by four individuals. There are very smart students in the group. You provided clarification of case issues during the first 10 minutes. It was refreshing to hear you provide information that you had researched for the group. You were relaxed and supportive. I like the way you use questions. You also were willing to look into magnesium/vitamin D issues for them. You gave positive feedback to the student who did the board presentation. You were able to bring the group back to task when it got off base.

The second observation was January 24. It was clear that the group was not prepared. I appreciated your attempts at getting the group going. You clarified issues. Members of the group, however, looked to you for more directions. You handled it by asking them questions. You provided information to them about 17 times and asked about 10 questions. The same members seemed to dominate the group. However, the group was quiet. I appreciate your ability to be able to say, “I don’t know.” Perhaps sometime you could turn the question asked of you back to the group, with “What does the group think?”

You are a good tutor. Perhaps in the future when a group isn’t prepared, dismiss them. Don’t let them waste your time when they clearly aren’t “getting it”. That will come with time as you tutor. It was a pleasure observing your group. Keep up the good work.

Strengths

Group enjoys each other. The group ran well the first observation where you only had to redirect and clarify issues. You gave positive feedback to the student who presented. You allowed a nice transition from your setting the stage and then the group taking over. You are at ease. The students respect you. You add a lot to the group. Even the quiet students seem to be involved during the discussion, but they don’t contribute verbally.

Weaknesses

A weakness is the lack of active participation with 2-3 members of the group. The second observation showed the same participation styles but a quiet, un-prepared group. Perhaps excusing them might help. But, with the collegiality of this group, I would probably have asked them if their time could better be used preparing.

This was a pleasure for me. If I can help you in any way in your faculty roles, please let me know.

Attachments-Tutor Peer Review Attributes Form and Interaction Analysis
EXAMPLE 3: PEER REVIEWER FEEDBACK

Tutor Peer Review Report
XXXXXXXXX, MD
Phase A, 2006

First Observation – August 25, 2006

Dr. XXXXXX has a good group. They had met well before 9, without him, and were into going over their notes from this weekend. Group continued on its own and ended with more of Dr. XXXXXX’s input on the discussion of the cholera case. Dr. XXXXXX used questions approximately 11 times and then clarified approximately nine areas primarily related to the case.

The interaction analysis I conducted on the group indicated that one person was not involved, and the discussion was controlled by three of the group members. From the non-verbal interaction it appeared that the other two quiet individuals were following the discussion but not contributing to it.

Strengths

Dr. XXXXXX brought the group back when it went in an unhelpful direction. He used clinical relevance. He helped the group through a clarifying style. He emphasized the important issues they should address.

Weaknesses

Although not a big problem, nothing was done to include the quiet students in the discussions. SOAP issues were of primary concern by the students even this early in the phase.

Summary

Dr. XXXXXX is excellent in knowledge and enthusiasm. He is good at encouraging, is responsive, and has control of the time by group consensus.

Second Observation – September 11, 2006

Again, the group was already rolling when I arrived. The group does work well together. A lot of time was spent on how to present the SOCA in a SOAP format. It appears to be a challenge for the students and faculty. Students asked Dr. XXXXXX to present a SOAP and he did. Then they proceeded to compare case summaries and he emphasized what he would accept as a summary.

The interaction analysis this second observation showed three individuals not involved. One student was a bit disruptive with many questions; however, the group and Dr. XXXXXX were patient with him.
The other quiet students were not pulled into the discussion. However, one who was a concern at the first session asked if he could present his summary. He did, and it was acceptable.

The second half of the observation was controlled by Dr. XXXXXXX in helping the group prepare for the SOCA. He presented an overview of what he would accept as a summary. Dr. XXXXXXX also assured the group that it was not the end of the world if you failed, and also let them know that he thought that the students probably would do fine on the SOCA.

Dr. XXXXXXX helped the group get to the meat of a case presentation. This seemed to relieve the group’s anxieties a bit. However, only five presented their summaries.

**Strengths**

The group seems to be running well. It needs very little direction from Dr. XXXXXXX, and it seems to know when to ask for it. Dr. XXXXXXX is very willing to help the students. He is knowledgeable, enthusiastic and has good facilitation skills. He is very responsive to the students and constructively critical.

**Weaknesses**

The group seemed to spend way too much time on the SOCA. It is hard to determine how much of this is needed because it is a new format. It would have been helpful to draw in all of the students into the discussion. Some still were very quiet. The student I was worried about in the first observation, made an extra effort to present his summary to the group.

**Summary**

It was a pleasure observing the group. Dr. XXXXXXX is an experienced and well-prepared tutor. He enjoys the group and has a positive sense of humor. He also is a good teacher and makes good use of the “teaching moments”. He is knowledgeable and applies clinical relevance to the cases and the discussion. The only area to work on is assuring that each student is involved in the discussions.