

Peer Review of Online Teaching Guide

In consideration of UBC's decision to continue to offer most classes online during the Fall 2020, the Faculty of Arts is proposing the implementation of the following temporary measures to support the conduct of rigorous, objective and thorough peer evaluation of teaching.

While this Guide reflects most of the content in the Faculty of Arts Summative Peer Review of Teaching it also includes some recommendations to better serve the needs of Peer Review of Teaching of Online Course.

This Guide includes the following topics:

- 1. Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching**
- 2. Summative Peer Review of Teaching: Protocol, Preparation and Process**
 - a. Protocol
 - b. Preparation and observation of face-to-face or virtual synchronous or asynchronous session(s)¹
 - c. Reporting

Appendix A: UBC Criteria for Appointment, Re-appointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appendix B: Questions to Consider for the Preliminary Meeting

Appendix C: Cover Sheet

Appendix D: Guidelines for Assessment/Observation

1. Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching

As outlined in the Faculty of Arts Peer Review Teaching Guide (PRT Guide) the **Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching includes the following:**

- Support assessment of teaching either for decision-making purposes (reappointment, tenure and promotion; teaching award nominations, etc.) or for the purpose of mentoring;
- Provide the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) with consistent, rigorous and credible evidence-based assessments of the teaching effectiveness of its faculty members when they undergo reviews for reappointment, promotion and tenure;
(Please refer to page. 1 of the Faculty of Arts Peer Review Teaching Guide, for the full text)

2. Summative Peer Review of Teaching: Protocol, Preparation and Process

2a. Protocol

The **Summative Peer Review of Teaching** is be conducted

- for each review process, whether reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- during the academic year *prior to* the year in which the candidate is reviewed, or during the first term of the review year.
- by **two tenured faculty, one internal** and appointed by the Head, and **the other external** to the unit, as assigned by the Faculty of Arts PRT Coordinator. External reviewers are to honour the unit's PRT procedures.

(Please refer to page. 2 of the Faculty of Arts Peer Review Teaching Guide, for the full text)

¹ **Session** may refer to a single face-to-face lecture or to a virtual class, which can include a number of different components such as a short video, one or more break-out sessions, polls, or student collaborative work.

Heads and Directors will submit their PRT requests to the PRT Assistant (Silva Krall, silva.krall@artsreception.ubc.ca) as soon as possible and no later than the end of August. Upon receiving the PRT requests, the PRT coordinator, Luisa Canuto, will look for appropriate external reviewers and communicate the name and contact information to the Heads and Directors (or their unit's PRT Coordinator) who have submitted the PRT requests.

2b. Preparation

To prepare for the Summative PRT, **Heads** will **advise the instructor** and **peer reviewers of the process** and **provide them with this Peer Review of Teaching Guide** as well as any **unit-specific documentation** regarding Peer Review of Teaching policy and practices. When preparing for Summative PRT, Heads and Reviewees should also discuss and decide **which course(s) should be reviewed**, whether it is **online** or **face-to-face**.

The preparation for the Summative PRT should include the following:

TEACHING DOSSIER

The **instructor** being reviewed will provide the Head with **the teaching dossier** and **include**

- Statement of teaching philosophy / approach to teaching practice;
- Overview of teaching responsibilities (list of courses with student enrollment; assessment practices; teaching objectives and methods);
- Teaching awards;
- Course syllabus/syllabi.²

Instructors in the **educational leadership stream** should also include:

- sample assignments, sample exams;
- evidence of teaching recognition;
- other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., lesson plan, slides or other accompanying AV materials, class website/Canvas platform);
- documentation of contributions to course design (new or significantly revised courses and programs);
- development of instructional materials or innovations in teaching, student evaluation of teaching (SEoT) data.

PEER REVIEWS of ONLINE/VIRTUAL TEACHING

Depending upon the model of PRT adopted by the reviewee's unit, the reviewee **OR** the Department administrator will make **arrangements to give peer reviewers Observer-level access to the online Canvas course(s)** to be reviewed. Reviewers will be able to view all the course content but **NOT** the gradebook or any other sensitive information. If reviewers need to be kept anonymous, ARTS ISIT will arrange to an anonymous review access.

- To access the Canvas course the reviewer(s) will provide their **Campus Wide Login (CWL)** to the Heads and Directors (or their unit's PRT Coordinator) who have submitted the PRT requests, so they can be added to the course.

² Please see Vancouver Senate policy on Content and Distribution of Course Syllabi. A course syllabus would include description of course learning objectives and course evaluation methods (e.g., assignments, projects, exams, etc.).

- Heads and Directors (or their unit’s PRT Coordinator) who have submitted the PRT requests **will contact** arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca and CC the reviewee, to add the reviewer’s CWL to the reviewee’s Canvas course, and be given **observer-level access** to the online Canvas course to be reviewed.
- Upon completion of the review, the reviewee should contact arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca and ask to **remove the reviewer from the Canvas course**.
- If reviewing needs to be **anonymous**, reviewers should **sponsor** a “guest CWL” for themselves that will not reveal their identity.
 - **To sponsor a CWL**, reviewer(s) would need to click on: <https://it.ubc.ca/services/accounts-passwords/campus-wide-login-cwl/how-sponsor-guest>, use an email (Gmail for example) that will not reveal their identity and create a new email for this peer reviewing, that does not contain their name.

After sponsoring a guest CWL for themselves, reviewers would provide the CWL to the Heads and Directors (or their unit’s PRT Coordinator) who have submitted the PRT requests,
- Heads and Directors (or their unit’s PRT Coordinator) **will contact** arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca and CC the reviewee, to add the reviewer’s CWL to the reviewee’s Canvas course, and be given **guest-level access** to the online Canvas course to be reviewed.
- Upon completion of the review, the reviewee should contact arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca and ask to **remove the reviewer from the Canvas course**.

PEER REVIEWS of Face-To-Face TEACHING

Heads, in consultation with the instructor under review, will schedule one or more visits to classes. Heads should ensure that the classes being observed are representative of various levels of teaching. Where appropriate and desired, reviews of recorded teaching sessions may substitute for direct in-class observation. The Head or departmental peer review coordinator/internal peer reviewer should arrange for recording of sessions with Arts ISIT as needed. Instructor acknowledgment and student consent must be attained before recording classes.

NOTE: Reviewers will **not** normally meet with, or take comments from individual students.

FOR ALL PEER REVIEWS

The **peer reviewers** will **review** the **teaching dossier**, the **online course(s)** and **other data** gathered in advance of the class observation.

Depending upon the model of PRT adopted by the unit, the reviewee and the reviewers (separately or together, as decided by the reviewee) will have a **preliminary, remote meeting** to convey any additional information about the teaching context. During the preliminary meeting, reviewers are encouraged to ask questions about the course design, content, development and on other points as suggested in the **Questions to be Considered for Preliminary Meeting (Appendix B)**.

In the **absence of a pre-meeting** between the instructor and the peer reviewer(s), the PRT department administrator can collect the instructor’s answers to all or some of the Questions to be Considered for Preliminary Meeting and send them to the peer reviewer(s).

2c. Reporting

Reviewers may find it helpful to use the Guidelines observation and assessment form provided to guide their teaching observation. Along with other data collected, the review will provide the basis for a one-to-two page-summary report. The **PRT report** should be prepared by the reviewers either team-written or as two separate reports, depending on the preference of each unit. This report should contain all the relevant observations of reviewers that impact their assessment, for an “overall summary of the candidate’s performance as a university teacher and educator” (SAC Guide), including any dissenting views from a consensus in a team-written report.

NOTE: The Chair of the Summative Peer Review of Teaching Committee or Head will include the reviewers’ summary report(s) (whether team-written or as two separate reports) in their comprehensive Summative Assessment of Teaching for review by DAC, SAC and the President (see SAC Guide, Appendix 2, pg. 50).

When formulating their assessment, reviewers should also refer to the appropriate University standards for teaching (e.g., “successful”; “high quality”; “excellent”; “outstanding”) as identified in the *Collective Agreement*. Reviewers should also feel free to comment if they assess the instructor as not meeting expectations in certain core competency areas (e.g., “poor”). Final reports should not contain attribution to any third parties (for example students) and the Head or equivalent may exercise discretion to redact or revise the report to remove any comments attributable to third parties.

Heads will meet with the instructor to discuss the results of the review, provide them with a copy of the summative report, give them the opportunity to respond, and determine any follow-up as appropriate, including indicating in writing if there are concerns about teaching. If there are such concerns, instructors should provide a written response within one month outlining a plan for improvement. This should be followed by a formative peer review.

NOTE TO HEADS:

Heads are required by the Senior Appointments Committee to include full summative PRT reports in materials sent forward for re-appointment, promotion, and tenure cases. As Heads assemble these materials, they should remember to report on supervisory activity: names of undergraduates, MA and PhD student, and postdoctoral fellows supervised; nature of supervisory activity for each (e.g., thesis supervisor or committee member, RA supervisor); degree completion (for graduate students); students’ publications and/or placement; external examinations, comprehensive examinations, prospectus committees.

Appendix A

UBC Criteria for Appointment, Re-Appointment, Tenure and Promotion

excerpts from the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty, Part 4, Articles 3 and 4*
<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/appointment-faculty/#4>

Professor Path

Appointment or Promotion to Assistant Professor	Tenure	Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment or Promotion to Professor
<p>"judged principally on performance in teaching" 4.01 (a); "evidence of ability in teaching"; "successful teacher, and is capable of providing instruction at the various levels in his or her discipline, but it is sufficient to show potential to meet these criteria" 3.05(a)</p>	<p>"have maintained a <u>high standard</u> of performance in meeting the criteria [of teaching, scholarly activity and service] ... and <u>show promise of continuing to do so</u>" 4.01(a);</p>	<p>"evidence of <u>successful teaching</u>... beyond that expected of an Assistant Professor" 3.06 (a); "teaching as defined in Article 4.02"; "ability to direct graduate students" 3.06(a)</p>	<p>"contributions judged by the criteria set out in Article 4) are considered <u>outstanding</u>"; "appropriate standards of excellence"; "<u>high quality in teaching</u>" 3.07(a)(b)</p>

Professor of Teaching Path

Appointment to Assistant Professor of Teaching	Promotion to and Tenure as Associate Professor of Teaching (or Appointment to Associate Professor of Teaching)	Promotion to Professor of Teaching (or Appointment to Professor of Teaching with Tenure)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Normally requires completion of academic qualifications, evidence of ability and commitment to teaching" 3.02 • "Judged principally on performance in teaching" 4.01 (b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Requires evidence of <u>excellence</u> in teaching" 3.04 • Tenure: "Granted to individuals who have maintained a <u>high standard</u> of performance in meeting the criteria... (of teaching, educational leadership, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Requires evidence of <u>outstanding</u> achievement in teaching" 3.05 • "Requires evidence of... <u>distinction</u> in field of teaching and learning" 3.05

	service)...“and <u>show promise of continuing to do so</u> ” 4.01 (a)	
--	---	--

Appendix B

Questions to Consider for the Preliminary Meeting*

1. **Canvas Module or Section for observation:** Is there a particular module or section to be reviewed? What is the significance of this module in the course as a whole?
2. **Course design:** Is your course design based on sound pedagogical practises? What is the extent of your contributions to this Canvas course design? Was it developed with the help of an instructional designer? When was it last updated? Which tools are you using in the course outside of Canvas and why?
3. **Content development:** What is the extent of your contribution to content development? Are there aspects of the course content that you cannot change due to program policy or other factors?
4. **Creating Community:** Explain steps you have taken to foster a learning environment that is supportive, inclusive and motivates students to learn. Describe how you encourage student-to-student interaction in course assignments and other learning activities. Discuss how you communicate your expectations for participation and collaboration.
5. **Motivating Students:** Explain strategies you use to encourage students to take responsibility for their learning. Describe your approach to delivering timely and appropriate constructive feedback.
6. **Communication and Responsiveness:** Discuss your approach to responding to student concerns and course-related issues. What kind of office hours do you hold? What are means of contact are you using?
7. **Ongoing Reflection and Improvement:** Explain how you evaluate the effectiveness of your course and your strategy for updating and refining course content and assignments. Explain how make sure that your course promotes student learning and intellectual growth. Describe ways in which you seek out student feedback to improve your course.

*The above questions have been adapted from the Open Resource, Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines, Oregon University, https://senate.oregonstate.edu/sites/senate.oregonstate.edu/files/peer_review_observation_formrev.pdf

Appendix C COVER SHEET

A Summative PRT takes into consideration an instructor’s teaching materials and teaching activities for the evaluation of teaching quality and teaching effectiveness. A class assessment is but one component of the summative peer review. The “Guidelines for Teaching Assessment/Observation” that follow provide guidance to peer reviewers as they formulate their evaluative comments for their Summative PRT Report. They are structured along **key indicators of teaching effectiveness**, in keeping with the language of the Collective Agreement. Questions and suggested statements are provided to prompt reviewers’ consideration of criteria.

Name of instructor being reviewed _____

- Current Rank assistant professor associate professor professor
 lecturer assistant professor of teaching associate professor of teaching professor of teaching

Academic unit(s) _____

Academic Year (e.g.: 2020 Winter, Term 1): _____

- Purpose for PRT reappointment review promotion/tenure review
 other (please specify: e.g., award nomination) _____

List materials taken into consideration for the Summative Peer Review of Teaching

Required (all streams):

- statement of teaching philosophy/approach to teaching practice
- overview of teaching responsibilities
- course syllabi

Optional: *While the following are optional for research-stream files, many of the items listed below would be expected in an **educational leadership file***

- sample assignments / exams documentation of contributions to course design
- evidence of teaching recognition student evaluation of teaching (SEoT) data
- other evidence of teaching effectiveness [e.g.: lesson plan, slides or other accompanying AV materials, class website/Canvas platform]

For each class observation (or recorded class), please use the Table below to provide details of the specific context for classroom observation(s). Describe the nature of each course observed (core, elective?) and the course format (*cross-listed, lecture-based, mixed mode, team taught course?*). Describe the attendance and timing of the class. (*How many students attended the class? Is it an early-morning class or evening section?*). [A sample entry is provided.]

Date of class-visit	Names of Peer Reviewer and Reviewer’s Dept	Course number, name, and (session type) e.g., lecture, seminar, tutorial, lab, etc.	Location of classroom	Class size # students enrolled	Attendance # students attended (# late arrivals)
<i>SAMPLE</i>	John Brown (LING) and Anne Black (ENGL)	LING 140, Challenging Language Myths (1-hr lecture; team-taught)	BUCH D205	43	38 (+ 1 late)

Oct 1, 2019 [Fri,8:30am-9:30am]					
------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Peer Reviewer print name: _____ rank/dept: _____ signature: _____ date: _____
--

Appendix D
GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING ASSESSMENT/OBSERVATION

Please be reminded that a **thorough Summative Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)** includes **assessment of the instructor’s broader teaching contribution** and **not just the class observation(s)**.

When formulating their assessment, peer reviewers should bear in mind the language of the *Collective Agreement* with respect to indicators of teaching effectiveness: “...Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor, as indicated by **command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, student engagement, accessibility to students, and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students...**” (*Collective Agreement*, Part 4, Art. 4.02)

Peer reviewers should also refer to the appropriate University standards for teaching (e.g., “successful”; “high quality”; “excellent”; “outstanding”) as identified in the *Collective Agreement*. Reviewers should feel free to comment if they assess the instructor as not meeting expectations in certain core competency areas (e.g., “poor”).

A description of each standard is provided below and should be used as a reference when assessing each indicator of teaching effectiveness:

Outstanding: An educator held in the highest regard by their peers and the institution for the quality of their teaching. Displays a strong and evident commitment to teaching and learning and its continuous improvement, and has made significant contributions to this.

Excellent: An expert educator within their discipline, recognized as such by their peers. Commitment to and engagement in the enhancement of teaching and learning.

High Quality: A highly effective educator within their discipline, as judged by peers, who demonstrates a highly collegial approach to enhancement of teaching and learning.

Successful: A competent educator, as judged by experience and achievement, with a sincere, collegial commitment to the teaching & learning mandate of the discipline.

Developing: An engaged but developing educator, requiring some experience, opportunity, mentorship and/or support to enhance their teaching practice

Poor: An educator who falls short of the expectations of teaching quality, for reasons of either commitment and/or ability

NOTE: For a successful appointment or promotion to Associate Professor the reviewee is required to provide evidence of **successful teaching**; For appointment or promotion to Professor the appropriate standard is **high quality** in teaching.

For a successful appointment or promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching the reviewee is required to provide evidence of **excellence in teaching**; For appointment or promotion to Professor of Teaching the appropriate standard is **outstanding achievement** in teaching.

1. **As you assess the overall (online) course design and content**, to what extent does the instructor demonstrate **command over the subject matter** being taught? When applicable, to what extent does the instructor demonstrate **familiarity with recent developments in the field**?
 - Reading selections and other course materials are appropriate to the aims of the course and illustrative of the instructor's depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject matter being taught.
 - Course materials reflect familiarity with recent developments in the field.
 - Approach to course design shows links to discipline-appropriate pedagogies.

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding **Excellent** **High Quality** **Successful** **Developing** **Poor**

2. To what extent has the instructor **effectively organized** and **outlined** the **overall (online) course design and content**?
 - The course design reflects a balance between what and how students can learn outside of class time (asynchronously, at their own pace) and during synchronous class time.
 - The course design is consistent (e.g., course content is arranged in sequential weekly modules with reliable structure).
 - The Canvas layout allows for ease of navigation (e.g., a homepage tells students how to begin the course; related content organized together, self-evident titles).
 - The syllabus/course overview provides a clear description of course, including its objectives and structure.
 - The overall course objectives are clearly defined, measurable, and aligned to learning activities and assessments.
 - The role of the instructor as well as expectations for student participation are clearly outlined.
 - The course is structured so that the instructor's regular presence in the course is evident.
 - The instructions for activities and assignments are clear and precise (e.g., how to participate, due dates, and how work will be assessed).
 - The assignment directions or rubrics clearly outline expectations and relate to grading criteria.
 - The course includes guidelines for etiquette to direct students to what are and are not acceptable ways to engage with each other and instructor in person and/or the online course space, as appropriate.

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding **Excellent** **High Quality** **Successful** **Developing** **Poor**

3. **As you observe and assess the session** (whether synchronous or asynchronous, face-to-face or remote), to what extent does the instructor demonstrate **preparedness**?
- The session was well planned and organized.
 - The session included clear and measurable objectives – both what students should know after the lecture and why it is important.
 - The amount of material discussed during the session was appropriate and clearly related to the course aims.
 - The session objectives and key points were emphasized in the beginning and as a summary at the end.

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding **Excellent** **High Quality** **Successful** **Developing** **Poor**

4. **As you observe and assess the session** (whether synchronous or asynchronous, face-to-face or remote), to what extent does the instructor employ **teaching strategies** and **methods** that are **appropriate** to the **subject matter, engaging to students, and effective**?
- Visuals, analogies, demonstrations, and examples were used to reinforce the main points and to help support student learning.
 - The instructor situated complex ideas in context.
 - The instructor's choice of learning resources reflected sound pedagogy.
 - The instructor offered opportunities for learner to learner interaction and constructive collaboration.
 - The instructor designed a learning experience in a way to inspire student interest.
 - Course offers access to a variety of engaging resources that facilitate communication and collaboration, deliver content, and support learning and engagement.

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding **Excellent** **High Quality** **Successful** **Developing** **Poor**

5. **As you observe and assess the session** (whether synchronous or asynchronous, face-to-face or remote) to what extent does the instructor attempt to **communicate with students, create a positive and respectful learning environment, manage the class effectively**? To what extent is the instructor **accessible to students**?
- The instructor spoke clearly and audibly, tone was varied, eye contact was made with students.
 - The instructor effectively dealt with any problems that arose that could adversely affect learning.
 - The instructor responded effectively to questions and was able to elaborate when necessary to enhance students' comprehension of the material, striking a balance between offering students additional info that is relevant/need-to-know and additional info that is compelling and may stimulate further student engagement.
 - Session started and ended on time; the Instructor concluded the session effectively.

- The instructor is attentive to what actions they can take to draw out students' questions and invite student participation, in face-to-face and/or online contexts.
- The instructor provides students with appropriate opportunity to follow up outside of synchronous class time (e.g., office hours; providing other avenues of communication, as appropriate).

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding Excellent High Quality Successful Developing Poor

6. As you assess the overall (online) course design and content as well as the specific session, to what extent does the instructor demonstrate a **positive influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students?**

- The instructor sets clear goals and intellectual challenges or other appropriate engagements for student learning.
- The instructor demonstrates alignment between learning objectives/stated goals and learning activities.
- The instructor sets high yet reasonable expectations of learning appropriate for the level of the course and its place in the curriculum.
- The instructor uses appropriate assignments and assessment techniques.
- The instructor incorporates experiential learning (internships, study abroad, community service learning (CSL), etc.) into the course design, as appropriate.
- The instructor promotes a stimulating learning environment for students.
- The instructor demonstrates sensitivity to the diversity of students' level of abilities/readiness.
- The instructor demonstrates sensitivity to cultural issues and issues of equity and inclusion (e.g., offers accommodation for time zones).

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding Excellent High Quality Successful Developing Poor

7. What is your **overall assessment of the effectiveness of teaching contribution?**
(Please provide summary comments that explain the overall assessment of the instructor's performance as a university teacher.)

Considering this indicator of teaching effectiveness, you assess the instructor to be ...

Outstanding Excellent High Quality Successful Developing Poor