

# HEALTH PROMOTION PEER REVIEW IN PRACTICE

Fran Taylor, College of the Holy Cross

Ryan Travia, Harvard University

Joleen M. Nevers, University of Connecticut

# Learning Objectives

## **1. Define peer review strategies for health promotion specialists**

One-on-one, group, listserv, experts in the field, colleagues assess peer and aspiration schools, comparing schools, etc.

## **2. Discuss factors that foster or hinder the learning process or skill building**

Review programs, guidelines, policies, identify barriers or obstacles to learning or skill building, identify encouraging or promoting strategies to learning or skill building, discuss and process factors. Trust, emphasizing the positive, and providing specific constructive feedback will be illustrated.

## **3. Explain the strategy of peer review**

Once explained, we will practice one-on-one and in groups providing direct feedback on skills, goals and objectives, program evaluation, etc.

# What is Peer Review?

---

- Evaluation by others in the same field to maintain or enhance the quality of the work or performance
- Utilizes the independence of the reviewers to obtain an unbiased evaluation
- Helps maintain and enhance quality by detecting weaknesses and errors

# Why Practice Peer Review?

- Accreditation
- Best Practice
- Increases your personal skills
- Improves the impact and efficiency of your programs
- Models professionalism to your students



# Best Practice

- Standards of Practice in Health Promotion in Higher Education
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
- BACCHUS Peer Education
- Healthy People 2020



# Peer Review Strategies

- Listservs
- Local and Area Connections
- Face to Face
- Professional Consultation
- Campus Stakeholders
- National Connections
- Peer and Aspiration Schools



# Ground Rules for Peer Review

- Trust is key.
- Acknowledge vulnerabilities.
- Be open to receiving feedback.
- Provide constructive feedback (generally start with the positive and then move to areas of improvement).
- Ask lots of questions, especially open-ended ones.
- Try to suspend judgment.
- Maintain confidentiality. Be clear with your colleague(s) about what is/isn't okay to share outside of peer review. If you don't know, ask.
- Check-in with your colleague. How are you feeling about this? Is this helpful?
- Only share examples of your own work when asked directly.

# Feedback is...



- ❑ solicited not imposed.
- ❑ descriptive not evaluative.
- ❑ directed toward a behavior the receiver can do something about.
- ❑ taking the needs of the giver and the receiver into account.
- ❑ well-timed.
- ❑ checked to ensure clear communication.



# Case Study: Review with Presenters

# Steps to Peer Review

- For the person who wants something reviewed:
  - ▣ State the what you want reviewed
  - ▣ State what you are looking for in regards to feedback
  - ▣ Provide the example(s) of what you want reviewed to peers and allow time for them to process it
  - ▣ Accept feedback and ask follow-up questions

# Steps for Peer Review

- For the people providing the review:
  - Listen to what the person is asking to be reviewed
  - Ask questions so that you understand what feedback the person is soliciting
    - How can I help?
    - What have you done so far?
    - What do you see as obstacles?
  - Provide the feedback professionally and directly; being mindful of the person's feelings and expectations of the process
  - Only provide examples of your own work when asked

# Practice Time



# Follow-up

- Has this session caused anyone to think differently about peer review?
- Are you more comfortable with peer review?
- If you wanted to solicit a peer review how would you make that happen?
- Is there anything else you would like to share?