

Faculty of Arts
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Peer Review of Teaching Guide

Revised September 2015

1) Background

The guidelines in this document were developed as part of the UBC Peer Review of Teaching Initiative, which aims to support the best practices of peer review of teaching (PRT) and foster as much consistency in PRT as is feasible across UBC and within the Faculty while recognizing the diversity of teaching and learning contexts and cultures. This document accordingly is designed to provide Faculty guidance for implementing the principles of PRT as notably indicated in the [2009 UBC Peer Review of Teaching Working Group Report](#) (hereafter *2009 PRT Report*) presented to UBC Senate. In addition to improving teaching and other purposes indicated below, these guidelines are intended to support the Faculty in providing the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) with fair, consistent, transparent, rigorous and credible evidence-based assessments of the teaching effectiveness of its faculty members when they undergo periodic review during reappointment, promotion and tenure.

2) Objectives

Peer review of teaching is a well-established practice at UBC whose key purposes and benefits, as identified by the *2009 PRT Report*, include:

- Contribution to reflection on teaching and professional development of faculty members.
- Increased awareness of the value of teaching within the university.
- Positive impact on the quality of teaching and student learning.
- Enhanced evidence beyond student evaluations of teaching to support assessment of teaching for decision-making purposes (such as reappointment, tenure and promotion; teaching award nominations; etc.).

Peer review of teaching practices serve two main functions:

- **summative** PRT provides evaluative and comparative information for faculty members about the effectiveness of their teaching practice for decision-making purposes, including re-appointment, promotion and tenure as stipulated in the *Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC [hereafter 'UBC Guide']*, and the *UBC Collective Agreement*.
- **formative** PRT has as its focus the professional development of teaching through periodic collegial mentoring of instructors by colleagues.

This document is designed as a resource identifying suggested best practices to assist units in conducting fair and rigorous peer reviews by outlining exemplary elements and practices of PRT that units may adopt and adapt for their PRT policies and procedures. The following sections 3-7 focus on the elements of summative peer review, and section 8 provides some suggestions for formative PRT.

3) Suitable Data Sources

For a full and fair assessment that makes visible all of an instructor's contributions to the teaching enterprise, the candidate's *entire teaching contribution* (as stipulated by the UBC Guide) at the undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate levels is to be reviewed. The review is therefore meant to be more than a single classroom visit or a review of a single course. It will involve teaching observation and assessment of the dossier. The Head or Director should provide a summary of unit averages.

The peer reviewers themselves should not be primarily tasked with gathering evidence for peer review apart from the teaching observations and meetings (if any) with the candidate. Rather, the unit should ensure a summary dossier of appropriate size for a PRT is compiled from the candidate's overall teaching dossier and data gathered by the unit as appropriate (this would normally be no more than 30 pages or so as a guideline, not including student evaluation comments if added, see below).

Possible data sources for PRT that reviewers may find useful is listed below to help guide rigorous and thorough collection of evidence. It is to be noted that not all candidates are necessarily expected to provide all potential sources of evidence of teaching contributions that are listed below – applicable sources will vary depending on the nature and stage of a candidate's appointment and unit norms and procedures. This list should help guide faculty members and their units in collecting appropriate information for a comprehensive **teaching dossier** that documents the varied contributions to teaching and student learning.

Suggested data sources may thus include:

- Information from the Department / School / Program as appropriate given unit procedures, such as grade distributions for the instructor, supporting documentation for teaching awards, and information about unit expectations and norms which are critical to place the candidate's contributions in appropriate context.
- Teaching observations: visits to the classroom or other teaching activities
- Meeting with students if done through formal procedures
- Meeting with the instructor (see possible Protocols below)
- A teaching dossier assembled by the candidate. Note that the UBC Guide stipulates that the complete teaching dossier is often an important factor in assessment for promotion and tenure by a candidate's Department, School or Faculty, and by the external referees. However, full teaching dossiers should *not* be forwarded to SAC. (For cases in the Professor of Teaching stream involving reviews for promotion (with tenure) to the rank of Senior Instructor or promotion to Professor of Teaching, where more evidence is required in order to demonstrate the candidate has met the requisite standard of excellence or outstanding achievement the full teaching dossier, less the following material, can be submitted to SAC: course outlines/syllabi, assignments and handouts, and full sets of students evaluations).

The teaching dossier could include

- summaries of student evaluations. If student comments are added, it must be a comprehensive set obtained through formal procedures (i.e., collected by a third party such as P&T or internal PRT committee member) that is

- representative of students taught (rather than a selection by the candidate); e.g., one large lecture course and a seminar.
- Peer and student evaluations from previous institutions should also be included if available.
- a representative selection of syllabi
- concise statement of teaching practice (one or at most two pages)
- sample assignments and examinations
- assessment practices
- samples of student work
- teaching responsibilities: numbers of classes, students and range of courses taught, including directed readings, visiting teaching with partner institutions, etc.
- availability to students
- teaching awards
- contributions to curriculum development, program or course direction
- development of instructional materials or innovations in teaching
- evidence of student learning beyond the classroom, and evidence that the instructor reflects upon, monitors, and improves teaching practices.
- Evidence assessing the candidate's performance as a supervisor of students (including undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral supervision) can include
 - number of students supervised
 - nature of supervisory activity - e.g., exam committee member, thesis committee member or supervisor, mentoring of research and/or student conference activity, supervision of teaching or research assistants, and so on.
 - students' degree completion
 - student publications, awards, and subsequent professional success such as job placement.
 - Information solicited from supervised students could include the instructor's availability, provision of direction and support, provision of feedback on student work, and any concerns about supervision.
 - The UBC Handbook of Graduate Supervision can provide a useful reference guide for recommended supervisory practices.

4) Standards

The data provided in the final written reports (see below) should seek to provide rigorous evidence for an “overall summary of the candidate’s performance as a university teacher and educator” (*UBC Guide*). While summative peer reviewers should not be asked to provide recommendations regarding processes such as promotion and tenure as part of their report, for summative review the report should recognize whether candidates meet, exceed, or fail to meet unit expectations and norms of fulfilling the appropriate University standards for teaching. As indicated in the *UBC Guide* and *Collective Agreement*, for promotion to Associate Professor, the expected standard is “evidence of successful teaching... beyond that expected of Assistant Professor,” and “ability to direct graduate students.” For promotion to full Professor, “appropriate standards of excellence” are “high quality” teaching. For appointments in the Professor of Teaching Stream (Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Professors of Teaching), external peer reviewers are only expected to assess the contribution of the candidate to teaching and learning; the assessment of educational leadership is to be left to other parts of the overall review process. With those

provisos in mind, promotion and tenure of Instructors I to Senior Instructors requires evidence of excellence in teaching, demonstrated educational leadership, involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives. . Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching requires evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in the field of teaching and learning, sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design and other initiatives that advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandate.

5) Professionalism & Ethics

Peer reviewers are to treat all materials and information with confidentiality.

Summative peer reviews should be conducted by teams of at least two peer reviewers as determined by the Head or Director. Ideally at least one of the peer reviewers will have some expertise / training in peer review evaluation; to that end, training workshops are offered by the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT), and can be periodically provided by the Faculty of Arts Representative for Peer Review of Teaching as needed. Comparable to the arm's-length function served by external reviewers of research, for the most credible peer reviews of teaching one of the reviewers should be external to the unit of the candidate's appointment - a principle identified by the UBC PRT Initiative Faculty representatives, the *2009 PRT Report*, the Senior Appointments Committee at UBC, and the scholarly literature on peer review as critical for enhancing the integrity and credibility of summative reviews. One of the reviewers should have familiarity with the instructional content area as much as is feasible to ensure sensitivity of the review to the substantive teaching context and expertise of the instruction, as well as unit norms and expectations. For units with sufficient peer reviewer capacity, the Head might provide the instructor with a list of potential internal peer reviewers from which the instructor may identify at least several as agreeable, analogous to a candidate's input on potential reviewers of research.

For summative reviews, junior faculty members are not expected to review senior faculty members. Senior Instructors and Professors of Teaching are considered senior faculty.

The reviewers will take into account gender, ethnicity or other such factors that might influence the review. If a faculty member has such concerns, they should identify them to the reviewers and/or Head or equivalent as appropriate. Confidentiality of any student feedback on the instructor is to be maintained.

6) Criteria

The criteria for PRT identified in the Guide that follows on p.9 are not meant to be exhaustive or definitive, nor offered as a rigid template that all units need mechanically follow; units may well employ other criteria suited to their own specific needs. The criteria are offered as a helpful menu of teaching practices that are often relevant to help guide assessment of a candidate's contributions to effective teaching. While there are many appropriate criteria that can be usefully deployed for PRT, the categories in the Guide that follows correspond to and adapt for PRT UBC's principles of *Effective Teaching Principles and Practices* (UBC Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Teaching Quality, Effectiveness and Evaluation, May 1999). The Criteria Guide beginning on p.9 is not to be submitted as part of a PRT report but rather is designed to provide a handy framework for note taking as

reviewers assess the portfolio, engage in class observations, and review any other evidence of teaching practice. This can then inform the final 2-3 page written PRT report discussed in the next section.

Each criterion for effective teaching in the PRT Guide includes examples of exemplary practices to help reviewers identify and assess appropriate aspects of teaching. These criteria and suggestions are informed by exemplary existing Faculty and UBC practices in peer review, *UBC Guide* (section 3.2.3), the *2009 PRT Report*, the deliberations among Faculty representatives of the UBC Peer Review of Teaching Initiative during 2010-11, the scholarly literature on PRT, and the comprehensive PRT resources located on the UBC PRT Initiative website (<http://ctl.ubc.ca/about-isotl/programs-events/ubc-peer-review-of-teaching-initiative/>).

7) Protocol

Well in advance of the period in which the summative peer review is to transpire, the Head will advise the instructor and peer reviewers of the process and provide them with this Faculty of Arts Peer Review of Teaching Guide as well as any unit specific documentation regarding Peer Review of Teaching policy and practices. At this time the Head or unit PRT representative will also inform the Faculty of Arts Peer Review of Teaching Representative of any external reviewer needs so that the Representative can relieve Heads and Directors of this task and coordinate the provision of external reviewers from the pool of external reviewers that will be comprised of available reviewers identified by each unit. In order to allocate equitably, it is generally expected that for every external reviewer requested by a unit for a given year, that unit will make available the same number of external reviews from among its own faculty for other units in the Faculty. Accordingly, units requiring external reviewers must identify for the Faculty of Arts Representative their own faculty who will serve as external reviewers in a given year. Units will determine how many faculty members they will make available as external reviewers as appropriate given their unit procedures and service allocations, and accordingly will also allocate how many external reviews each of those reviewers will be expected to undertake to provide the Faculty with an overall equivalent to their own unit's external reviewer needs. Such reviewers are normally expected to have some PRT experience and/or training such as a PRT workshop. Participation as external reviewers is to be recognized as a valuable service for the Faculty.

Heads or Directors will make clear to the external reviewer the exact role that the external reviewer is to undertake in fulfilling the unit's need for an external reviewer for its PRT procedures, as that may vary depending upon the nuances in unit procedures; external reviewers are to honour unit procedures. The Head or Director must confirm with each reviewer whether or not they will be providing their review anonymously. By anonymous it is meant that the identity of the reviewer is not known to the person being reviewed.

Meetings and Observations: The peer reviewers will review the teaching dossier and other data gathered, and depending upon the model of PRT adopted by the unit (see below), they or the instructor may request a preliminary meeting to convey any additional information about teaching context not in the dossier as deemed appropriate. Alternatively, to convey any such information, the candidate may meet with the Head or Director, and then the reviewers meet with the Head or Director if the reviewers are to be anonymous. The class visits should occur at a point in the term after the instructor has been able to develop a

comfort level with the class. The reviewers should work with the instructor or Head or Director as appropriate to ensure that the classes they observe are as representative of various levels and diverse types of teaching as is feasible (e.g., large lectures, tutorials, labs, performances, field trips, etc.).

Where appropriate and desired, reviews of videotaped teaching sessions may substitute for direct observation. Internal reviewers should arrange for video-taping of sessions with Arts ISIT as needed. . Instructor acknowledgment and student consent must be attained before video-taping classes in which they may be recorded (forms attached at the end of this document). Instructor acknowledgement and student consent must be attained before video-taping classes in which they may be recorded (forms attached at the end of this document). A benefit of video-taping classes is that it permits for anonymity of the reviewers, analogous to the critical element of arm's-length credibility provided by external reviewers of research. The analogy is not a perfect one, however, as external reviewers of research are experts in the subject field whereas peer reviewers of teaching, particularly external reviewers, are often not experts on the subject matter. However, external reviewers are enjoined to assess the more generic pedagogical elements of the delivery of effective teaching and evidence of student learning. Video-taping may not always capture as well as personal classroom visits the dynamics of student engagement and attention in a given setting. Units will thus decide where in their PRT procedures they wish to strike the balance between the additional level of arm's-length frankness that can be obtained through video-taped reviews and anonymous peer reviews, and the richness of in person classroom observations, which have their different advantages and imply different procedures as indicated in this document.

Reporting: Reviewers may find it helpful to complete separate forms of the relevant sections of the Guide for each teaching observation, which along with other data collected will provide the basis for a summary report that is to be submitted in timely fashion to meet unit timelines. A final summative report (suggested two pages) should be prepared by the reviewers. This report should contain all relevant observations of reviewers that impact their assessment. Final reports would not contain attribution of comments to any specific reviewers or to any third parties (for example students). Any dissenting views from a consensus in a team-written report could be recorded. Units are encouraged by the Senior Appointments Committee to include these full summative reports in materials for re-appointment, promotion and tenure. Instructors should be given a copy of the summative report. The Head or equivalent may exercise discretion to redact or revise the report to remove any comments attributable to individual reviewers or third parties. The Head will arrange for a meeting with the instructor in timely fashion to discuss the results of the review, provide the instructor with the opportunity to respond, and determine any follow-up if and as appropriate (see Formative Peer Review section below).

Frequency: The SAC Guidelines indicate that summative peer reviews of teaching will include a minimum of 1 recent summative report consisting of at least two assessors' assessments OR a minimum of two recent summative reviews, obtained through formal departmental processes. Accordingly, at least two full summative peer reviews should be conducted for pre-tenured faculty and for those seeking promotion; for the former this would typically take place in the second year and the first term of the fifth year of appointment in preparation for the three and six-year re-appointments in the case of Assistant Professors. In the case of Instructor I's, the summative peer reviews could

typically be undertaken in the first year or in term 1 of the second year in preparation for the second-year reappointment review, and in the third or fourth years in preparation for the fourth-year reappointment review. Earlier or more frequent summative and formative reviews (see below) are encouraged at any time, and may be triggered by a request from the faculty member, or from the Head in the case of problematic student evaluations or other teaching concerns. Reviews of instructors with other appointments such as lecturers, sessional instructors and post-doctoral fellows may be undertaken as appropriate for units' internal assessments of adequate standards of teaching, though particularly in situations of many such reviews, full reviews involving a team with an external peer reviewer are not expected to be practicable.

8) Formative Peer Review of Teaching

All instructors are encouraged to be involved in periodic formative peer review of teaching, that is, the process whereby colleagues provide collegial feedback to each other to facilitate reflection on teaching practices and promote professional development, leading to improvement in teaching and enhanced student learning. Summative and formative peer review processes should be kept distinct to ensure the rigour, integrity, credibility and professionalism of the evaluative process of summative review; yet, there are a range of appropriate methods of formative review, from informal practices to more formal follow-up of summative peer reviews that may leverage the results of summative reviews, avoiding duplication of effort. Gains in the quality of teaching are to be had not only for the instructors being reviewed but by the reviewers as well who are exposed to their colleagues' teaching techniques, and thus units are strongly encouraged to foster a collegial culture of formative peer review practices as part of their faculty's on-going professional development. Periodic formative reviews on a timely basis for all instructors are encouraged and may be particularly valuable for newer instructors including as a 'dry-run' before summative reviews in order to facilitate the incorporation of suggested improvements in teaching in advance of summative assessment.

The PRT Representative of each unit is enjoined to foster a culture of formative peer review in their unit. Workshops are offered by the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology to provide guidance for faculty members in conducting formative peer review of teaching. These sessions will amplify upon the range of possible formative review practices from informal to formal, such as the following two kinds of models that are offered as examples of different kinds of useful practices.

Follow-up of Summative Reviews

Every summative peer review should be reviewed by the unit Head/Director and the results discussed with the faculty member. Instructors should be given a copy of the summative report. The Head may exercise discretion to redact or revise the report to remove any comments attributable to individual reviewers or third parties. Strategies should be considered as appropriate to support teaching development, which might include the resources of UBC's Centre for Teaching and Learning. Should the summative peer review report trigger a concern, the faculty member or Head/Director should have the opportunity to request a follow-up formative peer review process. Even in the absence of any particular concern, faculty members and Heads are encouraged to initiate follow-on formative reviews to leverage the results of the summative review for the professional development purposes of improving teaching and enhancing student learning.

In such cases, within a timely period after the follow-up meeting of the summative review, the instructor could provide a written response to the results of the summative review to the Head/Director outlining their action plan for improvement of teaching (normally, approximately one page). The action plan could be reviewed by a unit peer reviewer(s), who may provide feedback and assist in the implementation of that plan where appropriate. For example, such colleagues may provide future classroom observation if indicated by the instructor as desired to assess pedagogical innovations, provide feedback on measures implemented by the instructor, assess outcomes, and so on.

Informal Formative Reviews

Units are encouraged to periodically engage all instructors in more informal formative peer review processes to foster professional development and improvement in teaching, including instructors who may not be subject to summative reviews. One model of such collegial reviews could include pairing instructors for sharing mutual class observations and feedback during the course of an academic year. Pre-observation meetings should clarify if there are any particular areas that the instructors hope to get helpful feedback on for their teaching practices.

The criteria for exemplary teaching practices as indicated in the Peer Review of Teaching form (below) could be drawn upon to help identify suggestions for improving teaching. Such peer reviews would have reciprocal benefits for reviewers and the instructors reviewed, as both are exposed to their colleagues' teaching techniques including innovations in teaching such as the incorporation of new learning technologies. No formal report need be produced with such reviews, though the instructor may request a formative report for their teaching dossier, and/or the fact that instructors have undergone such a formative review could be documented as part of their teaching portfolio as evidence of professional development in teaching for instructors and as a recognized department service for those conducting formative reviews.

Faculty of Arts
PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING CRITERIA GUIDE

Instructions

- The form is provided as a **convenient guide** for reviewers to input evidence from all data sources as appropriate for each criteria of assessment. Refer to “Suitable Data Sources” section of this document.
- While many of these criteria in this form will pertain to class observation, a reminder that a fulsome peer review as recommended in this Guide includes assessment of the entire teaching contribution and not just class visits.
- Data from all forms should then inform the final report.
- The instructor should inform students of a class visit by a colleague or inform them ahead of time of class videotaping as applicable, indicating the role of PRT in UBC’s assessments of teaching.

Name and Rank of Instructor:	Course Name and Number:
Name and Rank of Evaluator:	Date of Peer Review :
Class Size # enrolled: # in attendance: # late:	Session Location:
Nature of Peer Review: [] New faculty members – periodic review Indicate year of appointment _____ [] New faculty members – tenure and promotion [] Tenured faculty members – promotion [] Other: _____	Nature of Presentation Observed (e.g., lecture, tutorial, discussion groups, lab, performance, seminar, etc.). Please describe:
Describe materials provided by the instructor prior to the peer review:	Signature of Reviewer: ----- Date:

Peer Review Criteria

1. Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges or other appropriate engagements for student learning. You may want to consider the following as appropriate:

- Course materials contain clear information about learning objectives, appropriate assigned readings or equivalent, evaluation procedures, and policies (e.g., regarding late assignments, accommodations, and other regulations and procedures).
- Sets high yet reasonable expectations of learning appropriate for level of the course and its place in the curriculum.
- Assignments and exams are designed to effectively assess stated learning objectives, and indicate how feedback will be provided to students.
- In the session observed, the instructor indicated what students were expected to learn during that class period.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

2. The instructor employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners. You may want to consider the following as appropriate:

- In course materials and in the session observed, instructor demonstrates command of subject matter and familiarity with recent developments in the field.
- Methods of instruction are appropriately designed to further research, communication, performance, professional, and/or other skills as appropriate.
- In the session observed, the instructor clearly phrased questions to foster critical thinking and promoted active student participation and engagement in learning.
- Evidence of reflection on teaching and incorporation of improvements in teaching methods through professional development opportunities and/or student and other feedback.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

3. In the session observed, the class was well organized and planned. You may want to consider the following as appropriate:

- The instructor was well prepared and well organized
- Pace of class and amount of material covered was appropriate
- The level of teaching was appropriate to the students' abilities/background and the level of the course.
- Any examples, diagrams, demonstrations, etc. were helpful.
- Any hand-outs (downloadable or hard copies) were clear.
- Relevance of the material established
- Learning outcomes linked to student assessment for the course.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

4. In the session observed, the class material was effectively communicated and instructor interacted effectively with students. You may want to consider the following as appropriate:

- The instructor's delivery was clear, loud enough, the tone was varied, and eye contact was made with students.
- Good rapport was established with the students.
- The instructor presented material in a way to inspire student interest and engagement.
- Audio-visual materials were effective and provided appropriately.
- Questions or comments were encouraged to promote student-instructor interactions.
- Methods of student participation were used to enrich educational experiences as appropriate (e.g., small group discussions, presentations, problem solving, hands on learning, performance analysis, etc.).
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

5. Respects Diverse Talents and Learning Needs of Students. You may want to consider the following as appropriate:

- Promotes a stimulating learning environment for all students
- Recognizes and accommodates different learning needs (including background preparation and pace of learning)
- Demonstrates sensitivity to intellectual and cultural issues
- Use of creative assessment techniques and assignments;
- Incorporation of experiential learning (internships, study abroad, CSL, etc.) into course design.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

6. The instructor attends to the intellectual growth of students. In the session observed, you may want to consider the following as appropriate::

- The instructor checked occasionally to ensure students understand class material.
- A wide range of intellectual positions were given respectful consideration.
- The instructor listened to student questions and responded effectively, and was able to elaborate when necessary to increase students' comprehension of material.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

7. Classroom management. In the session observed, you may want to consider the following as appropriate::

- The class started and finished on time.
- The instructor effectively dealt with any problems that arose that could adversely affect learning (e.g., inappropriate student behaviour).
- Sufficient time was provided to students to respond to questions asked.
- Ground rules set at the beginning of the term were enforced as needed (e.g., use of cell phones, talking or interrupting at inappropriate times).
- Instructor concluded the session effectively.
- Other (please specify): _____

Indicate whether instructor meets, exceeds, or fails to meet expectations, provide comments that explain the rating, and any suggestions for improvement:

8. Overall assessment of the effectiveness of teaching contribution:

- Exceeds expectations (candidate for teaching award)
 Meets expectations
 Does not meet expectations

Please provide summary comments that explain the overall assessment of the candidate's performance as a university teacher:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF VIDEOTAPING FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

This is to acknowledge that to facilitate a peer review of my teaching a video recording of one or more of my classes will be made. The time, date and location of the video recording will be scheduled in consultation with me. I acknowledge that copies of the video recordings and other supporting materials will be made available to peer reviewers so that they can evaluate my classes and provide their feedback to my home unit.

I understand that:

- The peer reviewers will be requested to return any copies of the video recordings and supporting materials they have been provided to the Head/Director or equivalent once they have completed their evaluation.
- The video recordings and any supporting materials will be used solely for the purpose of peer evaluation of teaching and the Department / School or equivalent may retain a copy of the video recordings and any supporting materials for that purpose.

Dated

[INSERT NAME of faculty member being reviewed]

AUDIENCE CONSENT TO RECORDING OF CLASSES FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

The following instructions should be followed when video recording lectures or presentations for the purpose of the peer review of teaching.

Instructions

1. The language provided below should be completed as required and displayed in a manner that is clearly visible (e.g. projected as a slide) to those attending the lecture/presentation as they enter the auditorium/classroom and take their seats.
2. Ensure that adequate seating options are available out of the camera's line of sight for those who wish to remain off camera and as best as possible make attendees aware of such seating options as they arrive.
3. The language provided below should also be read aloud to the audience and the start of the lecture and the reading of such language should be video recorded (without capturing the audience in the frame). Once read aloud, anyone wishing to move seats should be afforded the opportunity to do so prior to the start of the lecture and prior to capturing the audience in any recording.
4. If questions or discussion will be permitted during the lecture, ensure that time is also allotted for similar questions and discussion at a time when the camera(s) are not recording.

Language

"Please note that this lecture or presentation is being recorded for the purpose of reviewing my teaching. It will be reviewed by professors who are reviewing my teaching and will not be distributed beyond them. If you do not wish to be captured in the video recording please ensure you are seated _____ [explain where – e.g. in rows XXXX] and save your questions and discussion until we indicate that the camera have been turned off.

If you choose to ask questions and speak during the "on-camera" time during this lecture or presentation, you hereby give the UBC permission to use your image for the purpose of peer review of teaching only.

Any questions about the recording of this lecture or presentation should be directed to the Associate Dean, Faculty in the Faculty of Arts. We appreciate your cooperation and consent to such recording."