

Sauder School of Business
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Peer Review of Teaching
Approved by Caucus: April 26, 2012

Preamble: The goals in developing this program are: (a) to help enhance student learning and engagement, (b) to broaden, add rigor, and increase the fairness of the teaching evaluation process, and (c) to provide opportunity for self-development of faculty members' teaching portfolio. This review is an opportunity for the candidate to highlight and demonstrate their achievement in teaching and learning. This process is also to provide a record of a dialogue between a faculty member and the reviewers regarding the faculty member's teaching record.

As faculty members, we endeavor to provide an evidence-based process for the purposes of development and teaching assessment. Recognizing that there are many different ways to teach effectively, the objective is not to prescribe a particular approach.

Objectives: Peer review of teaching (PRT) serves at least two functions: (a) To provide evidence for the assessment of a faculty member's teaching for promotion and tenure, contract renewal, and other purposes as set out in the UBC Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures and the UBC Collective Agreement ("summative" review); and (b) To provide constructive feedback to instructors as part of their professional development in improving teaching ("formative" review). This document describes both summative and formative functions.

Scope of evaluation: The PRT should provide rigorous evidence for an overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university educator. The review considers the candidate's teaching contribution at the undergraduate and graduate levels and can include information on the context of teaching (e.g., teaching workload, numbers of students, and range of courses taught, etc.).

PRT reports do not provide recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, merit, and adjustment to compensation, which are the responsibility of other committees. Nevertheless, summative reviews should recognize whether candidates meet, exceed, or fail to meet the appropriate University standards for teaching.

Peer Reviewers: Peer reviews should be conducted by teams of at least two peer reviewers selected from Sauder faculty by the Dean¹: (a) one of whom is from the candidate's division and has familiarity with the instructional content, and (b) one who has some expertise / training relevant to peer review evaluation and is external to the candidate's division. The peer reviewers will normally be of the same or higher rank as the candidate; junior faculty members are not expected to review senior faculty members.

¹ Dean can refer to the Dean's designate (e.g., Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research).

Senior Instructors are considered senior faculty. Ethical conduct and confidentiality of reviewers' assessments is to be maintained.

Data Sources: Peer reviewers will draw data from the following sources:

(a) The candidate

- i. Teaching Statement (i.e., What are you trying to achieve and how?) – one page maximum
 - Challenges you face in the classroom
 - In what ways are you innovating/renewing yourself?
 - ii. Course materials pertaining the class that will be observed
 - Summary of courses taught over the past year including number of students, and students supervised
 - Syllabi
- Instructor assessment and examinations for the class that will be observed
- Samples of student work if available (made anonymous)
 - Impact (students achievements)

(b) Classroom observation

(c) UBC/Sauder student evaluations of teaching

The Summative Review Process

Frequency: Normally, summative reviews will occur for those seeking sixth year re-appointment, promotion, and tenure. Appendix A contains a proposed schedule for reviews for the various faculty ranks. The Dean can also request a summative report whenever concerns arise about teaching performance.

Meeting Protocol: The Dean will inform the instructor and peer reviewers of the process at the start of the term in which peer reviews are to take place, and provide them with copies of the Peer Review of Teaching Forms. The candidate can nominate up to five faculty members (three members as internal reviewers and two members from the list of trained external reviewers). At least two representative class sessions are to be observed by the peer reviewers (who observe the class session together) in the term the candidate is being evaluated. Separate observation forms are to be completed, but a *final summative report* is prepared by the two reviewers and written by the external reviewer; any dissenting views between the reviewers should be recorded.

Observations: Together, the candidate and reviewers will select which courses are deemed most appropriate; if the faculty member is teaching both graduate and undergraduate then both levels could be included in the review. The candidate will select the class session that is to be observed. The class visits and follow-up meeting should occur normally during weeks 4-8 of the full academic term, or in weeks 3-4 for half term courses to allow instructors time to develop a comfort level with the class and receive useful feedback from colleagues before the term ends. External evaluators will receive

teaching credit in proportion to the number of evaluations they conduct, and their training is described in Appendix B.

Scheduling and Meetings: The peer reviewers will review the course materials and contact the instructor to arrange two classroom visits. The peer reviewers and instructor should meet before the class visits (“pre-observation meeting”) to familiarize one another about the process and add additional information as appropriate.

The external reviewer is responsible for submitting the report, along with supporting documents, to the Dean. The Dean will then arrange to meet with the candidate to share the results. The reports will also be made available to responsible committees reviewing candidates for re-appointment, promotion and/or tenure.

The Formative Review Process

Candidates seeking re-appointment, promotion, and tenure will be provided an opportunity for a formative review as a dry run in advance of their summative review, but with different review personnel. A formative review can also be triggered by a request from a faculty member, or in the case of problematic student evaluations or other teaching concerns, from the Dean. A formative review will be conducted on all faculty members at least once every seven years. Upon review and recommendation by the Sauder Awards and Performance Advisory Committee and/or the relevant division chair, the Dean can waive the formative review for faculty members who are performing at especially high teaching levels

The meeting protocol will generally follow the summative process. In the case of formative reviews preceding summative reviews, the formative review and meeting should be scheduled at least one term prior to the summative review in order to give the instructor the opportunity for improvement. Following a formative review, the peer reviewers will meet as soon as possible with the candidate to discuss the results of the review, and to provide all documentation to the instructor. Within a month of the follow-up meeting, the instructor can provide an action plan to the reviewers for ongoing instructional professional development (normally no more than one page). The action plan will be reviewed by the Peer Reviewers and clarified if necessary. The results of the formative review will not be made available to anyone except the instructor, and there will be no communication of the results of the review, formally or informally, to the Dean’s office.

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Name and Rank of Instructor: | |
| Name and Rank of 2 Reviewers: | Date of Peer Review: |
| <p>Nature of Peer Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Formative <input type="checkbox"/> Summative ----- <input type="checkbox"/> New faculty members – periodic review Indicate year of appointment _____ <input type="checkbox"/> New faculty members – tenure and promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Tenured faculty members – promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Tenured faculty members <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> | Materials provided by the instructor prior to the peer review: |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Instructor: | Course Name and Number: |
| Name of Reviewer: | Date of Observation: |
| Class location: Class size: Number in Attendance: Class length: | Materials provided by the instructor pertaining to this class prior to the peer review: |

Sauder School of Business
PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING OBSERVATION

Instructions:

- Each peer reviewer should fill out one form per session visit.
- The instructor should inform students of the class visit by a colleague as per 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.

| | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------|
| 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 accommodate different learning styles and experiences (lecture, small group discussion)
- Instructor moderates class discussion appropriately
- Instructor interacts with students (e.g., explicit/verbal; non-verbal; on-line)
- Provides clear explanations of key concepts and ideas and concrete examples
- Visual aids are clear and meaningful
- Instructor provides timely and constructive feedback
- Demonstrates excitement about the learning process and the material being taught

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 are clear and well defined
- The class ends with key learning takeaways
- Classroom activities are linked to learning objectives

- Assessments reflect learning objectives
- Class grades are commensurate with student effort and learned outcomes

Comments that explain the rating:

3. Develops students intellectually.

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

Examples:

- Course provides important new knowledge or new ways of thinking
- Course develops students' ability to analyze data, integrate ideas, evaluate alternatives, and make decisions ("critical thinking")
- Creates a certain level of discomfort in the student so as to stimulate curiosity
- Complex arguments are built at an appropriate pace from simpler logically connected ideas
- Key ideas are discussed from several perspectives
- Course or instructor introduces latest research into the class where relevant

Comments that explain the rating:

4. Manages classroom effectively.

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

Examples:

- Students are attentive and respectful to instructor and other students
- Instructor is attentive and respectful of students
- Instructor provides clear guidelines and takes corrective actions as needed

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):

Appendix A - Schedule for Formative and Summative Review.

1. Summative Reviews are required as follows:
 - a. Assistant Professors – a Summative Review will be conducted as part of the sixth-year review for re-appointment. This review will be used in the review of the Assistant Professor for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor unless the candidate requests another summative review for that purpose.
 - b. Associate Professors – a Summative Review will be conducted as part of the review for promotion.
 - c. Instructors - a Summative Review will be conducted as part of the fourth year review for re-appointment. This review will be used in the review of the Instructor for tenure and promotion to Senior Instructor unless the candidate requests another summative review for that purpose.
 - d. Lecturers – a Summative Review will be conducted at the request of the Dean’s office. The timing will be based, in part, on the amount of teaching being done by the lecturer. Full-time lecturers should have a summative review by the third year of their full-time service.
2. A Formative Review may be provided as a “dry run” in the academic year prior to a required Summative Review,
3. A Formative Review, however, is required for:
 - a. Assistant Professors within their first three years of appointment.
 - b. Associate and Full Professors and Senior Instructors at least once every seven years, unless otherwise waived by the Dean.