

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching Instructions**  
(revised June, 2017)

Faculty members who are considering promotion/tenure applications in 2016/17 must meet the requirements of the Sauder School of Business peer-evaluation for teaching (PRT). The PRT process is as follows:

1. Candidate nominates up to 2 evaluators from the list of *external evaluators*. These are individuals who have been trained in peer evaluation (see Appendix 1).
2. Candidate nominates up to 3 evaluators from their own Division (tenured faculty), labelled *internal evaluators*.

Note: Please inform Janet Gannon who your nominees are – the Dean’s Office will then initiate the process (either in this term or next term depending on your teaching assignments).

3. From these nominations, the Dean’s Office will select 1 individual from the external evaluators and 1 individual from the internal evaluators list. These individuals will conduct an evaluation of teaching for the candidate in the 2016-2017 academic year.
4. The candidate provides the reviewers with the following information before a pre-observation meeting:
  - a. A teaching statement (maximum one page). This includes a description of (i) your general philosophy about effective teaching, (ii) the challenges you face in the classroom, and (iii) ways in which you are updating and renewing yourself as an instructor.
  - b. A summary of courses taught over the past year, class size, and students supervised.
  - c. Course materials pertaining to the classes that will be observed (syllabi, notes, exams and other assessments, anonymous samples of student work if available).
  - d. Other materials that the candidate deems relevant to his/her teaching.
5. The internal and external reviewers should meet to familiarize themselves of the process and clarify the goals of the PRT.
6. The candidate and the reviewers arrange a *pre-observation meeting* to discuss the teaching statement, cover any particular details about the reviewers might expect to see in the class, and schedule when the classroom observations will occur. There needs to be two classroom observations, and both reviewers attend both sessions together. At this pre-observation meeting, the external reviewer, who should be more familiar with the PRT process and rating criteria, should explain the process to the candidate. The reviewers should spend most of the time in this meeting asking the candidate questions about:
  - a. What the course(s) content covers;

- b. His/her goals and learning outcomes for the course (what will the students learn or be able to do as a result of this course?);
  - c. His/her overall teaching approach; how does he or she consider different learning styles;
  - d. What is going well and what challenges he or she might have;
  - e. What the reviewers might expect to see in the class observation.
7. For each classroom observation, each reviewer completes a "*Peer Review of Teaching Observation*" form (see pages 5 to 8).
  8. The Dean's Office will supply the reviewers with a summary of student evaluations of teaching for courses taught by the candidate. Reviewers have discretion to use this information before or after the classroom observations (some reviewers may feel that these data could contaminate their opinions if seen before the observation).
  9. The external reviewer will draft a report of the summative review in consultation with the internal reviewer. This report takes into consideration the different sources of information collected (materials submitted by the candidate, PRT Observation forms of both reviewers, and student evaluations). Dissenting opinions should be noted in the report.
  10. The external reviewer submits the *Final Report* to the Dean's Office.<sup>1</sup>
  11. The Dean or Dean's designee meets with the candidate to discuss the results of the Final Report as soon as practical after receiving the Final Report. In this meeting, the reviewee is given an opportunity to ask questions. To enhance confidentiality, the reviewers' individual rating forms are destroyed and not given to the candidate.

The Final Report consists of the following information:

1. Overview of the pre-observation meeting. This includes date and a short summary of the discussion points.
2. Summary of the notes taken during the classroom observation.
3. Comments that explain the overall assessment, and any additional comments that may be helpful to the instructor (e.g., criteria that are not covered in this form and characteristics that may pertain to the unique nature of the class/course).
4. Opportunities for improvement.

Note: To enhance confidentiality and procedural consistency, reviewers are not to communicate directly with the candidate during this process. For any program guidance, please contact Daniel Skarlicki directly (skarlicki@sauder.ubc.ca).

---

<sup>1</sup> Two types of evaluations are possible. The Summative Review is evaluative and is used for decision-making purposes by the Dean and UBC (e.g., promotion and tenure). The Formative Review is for faculty developmental purposes only and the final report is not seen by the Dean's office. Instead, both reviewers meet to review the report with the candidate. Any faculty member can request a formative review by contacting the Dean's Office.

## **Appendix I: Peer Review of Teaching External Reviewers**

### **Accounting & Management Information Systems**

Ron Cenfetelli

Kin Lo

Carson Woo

Jenny Zhang

### **Finance**

Kai Li

Lorenzo Garlappi

Jenny Zhang

### **Law and Business Communications**

Ellen McIntosh

### **Marketing and Behavioural Sciences**

Joey Hoegg

Dale Griffin

Tim Silk

Daniel Skarlicki

Ting Zhu

### **Operations and Logistics (OpLog)**

Jonathan Berkowitz

Robin Lindsey

Stephen Schechter

Anming Zhang

### **Organizational Behaviour / Human Resources (OBHR)**

Perry Atwal

Brain Bemmels

Tracey Gurton

Nancy Langton

### **Strategy and Business Economics (SBE)**

Jim Brander

Peter Nemetz

**Sauder School of Business**  
**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING REPORT COVER SHEET**

<b>Name and Rank of Instructor:</b>	
<b>Name and Rank of 2 Reviewers:</b>	<b>Date of Peer Review:</b>
<p><b>Nature of Peer Review:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Formative (developmental)  <input type="checkbox"/> Summative (evaluation)</p> <p>-----</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Required Review for Tenure, Promotion, or Dean's Office Request  Current rank _____  Years in rank _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Optional Review for Tenure, Promotion, or Dean's Office Request  Current rank _____  Years in rank _____</p> <p>Note: Years in rank refers to years at UBC and, if maternity or paternal leave was taken and delayed the tenure clock, do not count that year.</p>	<b>Materials provided by the instructor prior to the peer review:</b>

**Sauder School of Business  
PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING OBSERVATION**

<b>Name of Instructor:</b>	<b>Course Name and Number:</b>
<b>Name of Reviewer:</b>	<b>Date of Observation:</b>
<b>Class location:</b> <b>Class size:</b> <b>Number of students in attendance:</b> <b>Class length:</b>	<b>Materials provided by the instructor pertaining to this class prior to the peer review:</b>

**Sauder School of Business**  
**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING OBSERVATION**

**Instructions:**

- Each peer reviewer should fill out one form per classroom visit.
- The instructor should inform students of the class visit by a colleague as part of UBC policy and Sauder’s commitment to teaching excellence.
- To the degree that these are observable, the data for each criterion are drawn from **course materials and classroom observation**.
- There is no one right way to teach effectively. Each criterion for effective teaching below includes **examples only** to help guide the assessment.
- Peer reviewers should **use their own judgment** when evaluating the instructor.

**Peer Review Criteria**

**1. Engages students and manages classroom effectively.**

Rating:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

**Examples:**

- Instructor was well prepared and material was well organized
- Teaching methods are varied (e.g., lecture, small group discussion, cases)
- Instructor interacted with students (rather than one-way communication).
- Instructor explained key concepts and provided concrete examples
- Visual aids were clear and meaningful
- Instructor provided timely and constructive feedback
- Demonstrated excitement about the learning process and the material being taught
- Students were attentive and respectful to instructor and other students
- Instructor was attentive and respectful of students

*Comments that explain the rating:*

**2. Implements course in manner consistent with goals.**

Rating:	1	2	3	4	5
---------	---	---	---	---	---

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

**Examples:**

- Learning objectives were clear and well defined
- The class ended with key learning takeaways
- Classroom activities were linked to learning objectives
- Assessments reflected learning objectives
- Class grades are commensurate with student effort and learned outcomes

*Comments that explain the rating:*

**3. Demonstrates command over subject matter.**

Rating:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

**Examples:**

- Instructor exhibited a high degree of topic relevant knowledge.
- Instructor showed his or her familiarity with recent developments in the field
- Complex arguments were built at an appropriate pace from simpler logically connected ideas
- Course or instructor introduced latest research into the class where relevant

*Comments that explain the rating:*

**4. Develops students intellectually**

Rating:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

**Examples:**

- Course delivery provided important new knowledge or new ways of thinking
- Course developed students' ability to analyze data, integrate ideas, evaluate alternatives, and make decisions (“critical thinking”)

- The instructor created a certain level of discomfort in the student so as to stimulate curiosity
- Key ideas were discussed from several perspectives

*Comments that explain the rating:*

**5. Overall assessment of the effectiveness of instruction observed:**

- Exceeds expectations (check only if instruction warrants a teaching award nomination)
- Meets expectations
- Needs improvement in order to meet expectations

Comments that explain the overall assessment, and any additional comments that may be helpful to the instructor (e.g., criteria that are not covered in this form and characteristics that may pertain to the unique nature of the class/course):