A Rubric for Summative Peer Review of Teaching

GUIDANCE NOTES

The rubric was developed in March–June 2018 by an *ad hoc* working group comprising faculty members, Faculty leadership and members of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (see a full list here). To facilitate sharing and development, this work is licensed through a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Why did we develop the Rubric for the Summative Peer Review of Teaching?

Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPRT) is an important and required component of re-appointment, promotion and tenure processes, and a vital counterweight to information from Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT). Discussions between representatives with responsibility for overseeing processes in individual Faculties, and members of the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) suggested there was an opportunity to develop a more consistent approach to reporting on peer evaluations of teaching, whilst still preserving the individualized approaches Faculties have taken to implement SPRT processes.

What were our goals?

- To complement (and enhance) existing Faculty, School and Department processes for SPRT.
- To develop a more standardized approach to reporting SPRT.
- To develop a shared and more nuanced understanding of levels of attainment for SPRT and dimensions of teaching activity that are part of evaluation of teaching by peers.
- Not to create additional work for faculty members or Departments who already put significant time and energy into SPRT processes.
- To develop resources that would also provide support for formative (developmental) evaluations of teaching.

Who do we expect might use the rubric?

We anticipate that this rubric will be of use to a range of stakeholders:

- Faculty members, as reviewers or reviewees, will develop a clearer understanding of minimum expectations for teaching for different roles and ranks, together with examples of activities at various levels of attainment.
- SPRT committees / Heads of Department will be able to make use of a consistent, yet flexible, framework to effectively evaluate teaching and build a case for support to Faculty-level committees and SAC.
- Deans (and their Advisory Committees on Promotion and Tenure) and SAC members will receive consistent and more differentiated SPRTs, allowing them to be more effectively weighted against student evaluations.

Language and terminology — levels of attainment

The rubric defines seven levels of attainment in teaching: the lowest two of these fall below the minimum expectations for promotion and tenure as described in the UBC Collective Agreement. The remainder are defined using language taken from the relevant sections of the Collective Agreement, and thus specify the minimum levels of attainment for various ranks, i.e.

- Assistant Professor (3.06) — potential for successful teaching
- Associate Professor (3.07) — evidence of successful teaching beyond that of an Assistant Professor
- Full Professor (3.08) — high quality in teaching
- Instructor (3.02) — evidence of ability and commitment to teaching
- Senior Instructor (3.03) — evidence of excellence in teaching
- Professor of Teaching (3.04) — outstanding achievement in teaching

Language and terminology — dimensions of teaching

Dimensions of teaching incorporate the activities that contribute to fulfilling the institution's teaching and learning mandate. They encompass the design of course-level and program-level curricula, the various activities of instruction through different engagement with students (lecture, seminar, lab, fieldwork, community learning etc.) and modalities (web-enhanced, blended and online). Judgment and evaluation of these dimensions is made through a combination of meeting with a reviewee, examination of course and curricular materials and class observation. The dimension of educator development (i.e. growth and improvement in one's own practice) is not formally part of a SPRT, but is an important contributing element to the overall evaluation and holistic assessment of a reviewee's teaching over a period of time, complementing the 'single-point-in-time' assessments normally associated with evaluation of learning design and teaching activity elements.

The examples listed at each level in the accompanying documents are intended to help the reviewers and candidates gain a sense of the various levels of attainment. They are representative, not authoritative, and we strongly encourage users of these documents to create their own disciplinary and context specific examples. In keeping with this intention, the rubric and associated documentation are Creative Commons licensed for continuing development and improvement. Candidates are not expected to be able to "check-off" all the examples listed in order to achieve a particular level.

Limitations and exclusions

The working group members deliberately focused on elements of teaching evaluation (other than SEoT) that would form part of a Head's letter in a candidate's file. Exclusions or limited inclusions were:

- Educational leadership (EL) — defined as 'impact beyond one's own classroom', is a required component for promotion and tenure files for candidates in the Educational Leadership stream. This rubric excludes EL contributions and instead focuses on teaching practice. Thus, our descriptors and examples do not consider the impact that a candidate's practice has had on peers, the department, the discipline or the institution more broadly, nor the dissemination of educational innovations or enhancement. In reality, the distinction between teaching practice and educational leadership is blurred. Resources to support the articulation of EL activities and impact, and how it differs from service contributions in the arena of teaching and learning can be found online[1].
- The direction and supervision of individual students' work (undergraduate and / or graduate) is regarded as a component of teaching in the Collective Agreement. This aspect of teaching is represented in the rubric through the faculty member's contribution to the overall intellectual growth of their students.

---

[1] https://ctlt.ubc.ca/programs/all-our-programs/teaching-and-educational-leadership/

Future developments and revisions

This draft rubric will be further refined through pilot adoption during the 2019 academic session. If you have questions or comments, please contact: Dr. Simon Bates, Associate-Provost Teaching and Learning, at simon.bates@ubc.ca, or Dr. Christina Hendricks, Academic Director, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology, at christina.hendricks@ubc.ca.

Download the rubric in a PDF format here.