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This Guide provides a comprehensive description of the Peer Review of Teaching process. It is organized according to the following topics and it includes the forms for the PRT Report:

1. **Introduction**
2. **Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching**
3. **Summative Peer Review of Teaching: Protocol, Preparation** and **Process**
   1. Protocol
   2. Preparation
   3. Process [Teaching Dossier; Class visits; Reporting]
4. **Formative Peer Review of Teaching**
5. **Appendices:**
   1. **Checklists of tasks to organize departmental PRT Requests**
   2. **Guidelines and Assessment Forms for Peer Reviewers**
      * **General Considerations**
      * **Guidance for Assessing Key Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness**
      * **Guidance for Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness**
      * **FORMS**
        1. **Cover Sheet**
        2. [**Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**](#Narrative)
        3. **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness**
      * **Guiding Questions for Optional Pre-Observation Meeting**
   3. **Audience Consent to Recording of Classes for PRT**
   4. **Acknowledgement of Recording of Classes for PRT**

**1. Introduction**

A **Summative Peer Review of Teaching** takes into consideration an instructor’s **teaching materials** and **teaching activities** for the evaluation of teaching quality and teaching effectiveness. The review involves **teaching observation** as well as the **assessment of the teaching dossier** (or of **a summary dossier** of appropriate size, which includes all of the items indicated in section 3c), as well as other teaching materials.

This Guide is designed to provide faculty with guidance for implementing the principles of Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) as indicated in the [2009 UBC Peer Review of Teaching Working Group Report](http://wiki.ubc.ca/images/c/c3/Ubcprtfinalreport.pdf) (hereafter 2009 PRT Report). It outlines exemplary elements and practices of summative reviews that units may adopt and adapt for their PRT policies and procedures, in consultation with the Faculty of Arts, and in the context of consideration for a summative PRT for the purposes of reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. Updates to this report have been informed by close to 50 faculty members who participated in a summative PRT in 2020-21, either as reviewee, reviewer or PRT departmental coordinator. Committee members[[1]](#footnote-1) have also informed some of the updates to this document.

Section 4 of this document outlines the purpose of a **Formative Peer Review of Teaching**, as well as some recommendations which may prove useful to those departments that wish to promote mentoring and the professional development of teaching in their faculty.

The final section includes forms and guidelines to help both internal and external peer reviewers conduct their evaluation.

**2. Purpose** and **Principles of Peer Review of Teaching**

The goal of this PRT Guide is to support the conduct of rigorous, objective and thorough peer evaluation of teaching. UBC places a high value on evidence of teaching effectiveness in its career progress review process for faculty and both peer and student evaluations of teaching constitute mandatory and significant elements of that evidence.

In particular, the **key purposes** and **principles of peer review of teaching** include 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 departments, the Dean of Arts Office and Dean’s Advisory Committee and 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
* Increase awareness of the value of teaching and standards of teaching effectiveness within each department, the Faculty, and the university
* Enhance the positive impact on the quality of teaching and student learning
* Contribute to reflection on teaching and professional development of faculty members
* Foster a collegial culture of peer review practices within each unit

Evidence of the quality of teaching must be carefully presented and considered at the **level of the department** and of **the Faculty** in arriving at decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure. Furthermore, the Dean must defend recommendations arising from those deliberations when cases are brought to the level of the **Senior Appointments Committee** and the **President**. The PRT process is designed to strengthen the basis for strong and defensible decisions.

**NOTE**: Determination of whether a candidate for promotion and/or tenure meets unit expectations for teaching **rests with the departmental standing committee** and **the department Head**. In reviewing the full teaching record, the standing committee and department Head will treat the summative reports as input, and they may disagree with the assessments in these reports.

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

Summative PRT provides evaluative information for faculty members about the effectiveness of their teaching practice for re-appointment, promotion or tenure, as stipulated in the Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC (the “SAC Guide”) and the UBC Collective Agreement.

**3a. Protocol**

1. A summative PRT must be conducted for each review process, whether reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
2. Peer reviews are to be conducted either during the academic year prior to the year in which the candidate’s file is reviewed for promotion and/or tenure, or during the first term of the review year. Advance planning is important, especially if the candidate will not be teaching during the review year.
3. At least **two tenured faculty members** will conduct the summative PRT review. Normally, one peer reviewer will be **internal**, appointed by the Head, and the other will be **external** to the unit, as assigned by the Faculty of Arts PRT Coordinator. For summative reviews, **untenured faculty members do not review** other faculty members.
4. Reviewers who do not already have some PRT experience or training in peer evaluation are encouraged to take the PRT Online Canvas Course and also attend one of the **PRT training workshops**, which are offered periodically by the Faculty of Arts PRT Coordinator. The Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT) periodically offers workshops focused on **formative** peer review of teaching.
5. 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 colleagues who can serve as external reviewers for other units. Heads/Directors (or the departmental PRT coordinator) will provide external reviewers with their reviewee’s materials and clarify expectations.
6. External reviewers are to **honour the unit’s PRT procedures**.
7. In joint appointment cases, the home unit typically takes the lead on reappointment, promotion and tenure review processes. However, unit heads should confer about the assignment of at least ONE internal reviewer and ONE external reviewer.
8. Heads must ensure that **peer reviewers** are at **“arm’s length**” to the extent that they are not in conflict of interest (for additional information on conflict of interest, consult <https://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/subject-areas/coi/coi-overview/id-coi/>).
9. PRT reviewers and Heads are asked to reflect on the potential that **gender, ethnicity or other such factors might influence the review**. If the instructor has such concerns, they should identify them to the reviewers and/or Head, or equivalent, as appropriate.
10. As a norm, each reviewer is expected to observe two different class sessions, either in person or remotely. Reviewers can observe on the same classes. Recordings of live classes do not provide the same level of information, and should be used only in exceptional circumstances. Recorded material (ie. video posted to Canvas in lieu of a live meeting) is included in these PRT recommendations in the category of teaching materials, rather than as teaching for review.

**3b. Preparation**

Heads and instructors will discuss timing of PRT reviews during their **annual 5.02 meeting.** Well in advance of the period in which the summative peer review is to take place, Heads will advise the **instructor** of the process and provide them with this PRT Guide, as well as any unit-specific documentation regarding PRT practices (i.e., pre- and/or post- class visit meeting with reviewee, timing for the review and any other departmental specific PRT policies). Heads and instructors will also discuss what documentation would need to be shared with the reviewers and whether the instructor’s Canvas Course(s) should also be included[[2]](#footnote-2).

**NOTE**: All information is confidential and must be disposed of in a secure manner upon completion of the review.

Once all PRT cases for the unit have been confirmed, the Head or the Director (or the PRT unit coordinator) should start considering possible **internal reviewers**. When selecting **internal reviewers**, Heads should consider a balance of substantive disciplinary expertise and experience as a peer reviewer. They should also ensure that **peer reviewers** are at **“arm’s length**” to the extent that they are not in conflict of interest (for information on conflict of interest, consult <https://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/subject-areas/coi/coi-overview/id-coi/>).

They should also inform the Faculty of Arts PRT coordinator of any requests for **external reviewers**. Heads and Directors should also make available the same number of colleagues who can serve as external reviewers for other units in that year or if not possible, in the following year. Participation as external reviewers should be recognized as a **valuable service for the department and for the Faculty.**

Heads and Directors will provide reviewers with all necessary documentation for their peer review of teaching (i.e., teaching dossier as well as departmental specific PRT policies) and help the reviewee make the following arrangements to give reviewers **observer-level access to the online Canvas course(s) to be reviewed, if the reviewee so chooses:**

Contact [arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca](mailto:arts.helpdesk@ubc.ca) (and CC the reviewee), to add the reviewers’ CWL to the reviewee’s Canvas course and include:

* + Name and number of the reviewee’s Canvas Course
  + CWL of reviewers to be added
  + Reason for access (i.e., “to **observe** the course for peer review of teaching”)
  + The start and end date for reviewers to access the Canvas course

**NOTE**: The **observer role** allows reviewers to see all Canvas content except any student-created material, the gradebook or any other sensitive information.

Heads and Directors should let reviewers know if the reviewee’ s department expect

**anonymous** reviewing and then ask them to follow the steps in the ‘For Reviewers’ section.

**3c. Process**

**Teaching Dossier**

Faculty members should maintain a teaching dossier to be made available prior to a summative peer review. **The components of a teaching dossier may vary depending on the nature and stage of the instructor’s appointment** and **unit-specific norms** and **procedures.** Regardless, the dossier will not normally include samples of student work.

**For the purpose of a PRT process[[3]](#footnote-3)** and in preparation for a class visit, all faculty members must prepare a teaching dossier, which would include at least:

* statement of approach to teaching practice;
* overview of teaching experience and responsibilities (list of courses with student enrollment; assessment practices; teaching objectives and methods);
* evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., lesson plan, teaching materials like slides or other accompanying AV materials, assessment methods and expectations, course developments based on students’ feedback, class website/Canvas site, etc.);
* course syllabus/syllabi.[[4]](#footnote-4)

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

* evidence of development of instructional materials or innovations in teaching or curriculum;
* documentation of contributions to course design (new or significantly revised courses and programs);
* sample assignments, sample exams and assessments;
* evidence of teaching recognition (i.e., teaching awards and other recognition of teaching excellence).

**NOTE**: When assembling the reviewee’s file, departments should consider whether to include statements on **supervisory activity** as well as the following information:

- names of undergraduates, MA and PhDs students, and postdoctoral fellows supervised

- nature of supervisory activity for each (e.g., thesis supervisor or committee members, RA supervisor)

- degree completion (for graduate students)

- potential evidence for “impact on scholarly development” of graduate students

- external examinations, comprehensive examinations, prospectus committees

**Class visits**

Heads, in consultation with the instructor under review, will schedule the observation of **two class visits**. Heads should ensure that the classes being observed are as representative of various levels and diverse types of teaching (e.g., large lectures, tutorials, labs, performances, field trips, etc.) as possible.

The class visits should occur after the instructor has been able to develop **a comfort level with the class,** (typically after the first few weeks of classes). The instructor must be given advance notice about the time range in which the in-class visits will occur, and advance notice of at least two weeks of the actual date of a scheduled in-class visit.

The observation of the classes should normally be in person (classes observed remotely or **recorded teaching sessions** may substitute for direct observation in exceptional circumstances, as noted above). Specific class meetings focused around **guest lecturers** are not normally appropriate as teaching for evaluation**:** the inclusion of guest lecturers is encompassed in the course design portion of the PRT.

theclass is to be recorded in lieu of a visit, the instructor will circulate the consent form provided in **Appendix H**, “Audience Consent to Recording of Classes for Peer Review of Teaching.” The instructor is asked to sign the form provided in **Appendix I** “Acknowledgement of Recording of Classes for Peer Review of Teaching.”

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

**Reporting**

To guide their teaching observation reviewers **may want to refer to the Guidelines for Observation and Assessment form** provided in this document. The form was developed with the language of the Collective Agreement and the indicators of teaching effectiveness in mind (Collective Agreement, Part 4, Art. 4.02). Structured around **seven main questions and a number of statements to prompt reviewers’ consideration of criteria**, the form encourages reviewers to also take into account 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.

**The form is not intended to be used as a checklist. Questions and examples are provided to help reviewers in their review.**

Along with other data collected, the PRT report will provide the basis for the **four to five page comprehensive summary report, which is normally completed by the Head** as part of a file for promotion and/or tenure**.**

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 be at least 2 to 3 pages in length, be informative, informed and evaluative, and not merely descriptive. It 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, pg. 88) including any dissenting views from a consensus in a team-written report.

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.

**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 the candidate’s file (see SAC Guide, Appendix 2, pg. 50 and pg. 53 for more detailed information).

In due time the Head will provide the reviewee with a copy of the PRT report. If concerns are raised, Heads should meet with the instructor to discuss the results of the review. Should the summative peer review report trigger a concern, the faculty member should have the opportunity to respond, and determine any follow-up as appropriate.

**4. Formative Peer Review of Teaching**

A description of a typical formative PRT program (FPRT), of its purpose and possible elements, is provided in the following paragraphs to support those departments and schools in the Faculty of Arts that are interested in establishing such a program.

**Introduction**

A formative peer review of teaching has as its focus the professional development of teaching through periodic collegial mentoring of any faculty member, regardless of their stage of career. Formative reviews may be of particular benefit to faculty members who are new to teaching or new to UBC, within the first two years of appointment. FPRT would also support the development of faculty who may be moving into different ranks, or exploring different teaching contexts. A formative PRT should be organized around the teaching goals and expectations of the instructor and should therefore provide them with new insights into their teaching as well as new ideas on different teaching strategies which can serve to make some effective changes to their courses.

**Protocol, Process and Preparation**

Typically, the Head or the department PRT coordinator would coordinate the formative peer review with the instructor, ask them to provide an abbreviated teaching dossier (consisting of, at minimum, course syllabi, sample assignments for the current term and ideally, access to their Canvas course), and discuss the formative PRT process, expectations, preparation and timeline for the review, and possible internal reviewers.

These reviews may be conducted by a single ***internal*** reviewer on a more informal basis than a summative review. When considering internal reviewers, Heads and Directors may want to reach out to Killam Teaching prize recipients and, more generally, to faculty who are recognized for their excellence in teaching.

Peer Reviewers and reviewees should discuss whether to use the FoA Guidelines for Teaching Assessment/Observation (for Peer Reviewers), designed for the Summative PRT process to provide their feedback on the reviewee’s classroom or online teaching and on the teaching materials (i.e., syllabi, assignments, class website and/or Canvas course) or to opt for a different mode of feedback.

The reviewer will hold a pre-observation meeting with the instructor to learn about their goals and timeline for this review. Following that, they conduct one or two classroom visits, hold a follow-up meeting with the instructor to provide feedback, meet with the instructor for a debrief on the classroom observation and, if preferable, write a brief report to the instructor. The reviewer will also send a separate note to the Head informing them that the FPRT has been completed. With the advance consent of the reviewee, a more detailed report is appropriate in some situations and required if the formative review is conducted in response to a concern.

For their professional development and to enhance their teaching practices, instructors may want to **take a workshop or a program offered by CTLT** (<https://events.ctlt.ubc.ca/>) or by **ART ISIT** (<https://isitworkshops.arts.ubc.ca/>). Other options include **observing an experienced faculty’s class** and meeting with them to discuss their teaching methods. Thelist of resources included in the CTLT Formative PRT page (<https://ctlt.ubc.ca/programs/all-our-programs/peer-review-of-teaching-2/>) provides additional information for formative opportunities.

**Heads’ checklist of tasks to organize a department’s PRT requests**

This checklist can help you plan for and organize your department’s PRT requests. **Once you have confirmed the names of your faculty members** who will need a summative PRT, please check the following:

**General Considerations**

☐ Has your unit decided which faculty member(s) need a PRT?

☐ What is your timeline for their PRT?

☐ Have you identified the **internal reviewer(s)**?

☐ Have you identified the faculty who can serve as **external reviewers** for other units?

☐ Has your unit informed the Dean’s Office (Silva Kraal: [arts.reception@ubc.ca](mailto:arts.reception@ubc.ca)) of your unit’s PRT requests (by July/early August 2022), and provided the following information:

☐ **Name**(s) and **Current Rank**(s) of reviewee(s)

☐ **Purpose** of PRT (i.e., reappointment review or promotion/tenure review)

☐ **Course**(s) to be evaluated

☐ Name(s) and contact info of **internal reviewer**(s)

☐ Name(s) of faculty who can serve as **external reviewers**

☐ Whether your department prefers to have a **joint PRT report or two separate reports**

☐ The names of **faculty members who could be trained** to serve as external reviewers and attend one of the two FoA PRT training sessions (for exact dates contact: arts.reception@ubc.ca)

**For your Communication with Reviewee(s)**

☐ Has the reviewee(s) been informed of the PRT process and the materials they need to provide the internal and the external reviewers? List of required materials is provided below for your convenience:

☐ Statement of Approach to Teaching Practice

☐ Overview of teaching responsibilities (list of courses with student enrollment)

☐ Evidence of Teaching effectiveness (e.g., lesson plans, slides or other accompanying AV materials, assessment methods, course developments based on students’ feedback, class website/Canvas site[[5]](#footnote-5), etc.)

☐ Course Syllabus/Syllabi

The following items are **optional** for research-stream files and **expected** in an educational leadership file:

☐ Development of instructional materials or innovations in teaching or curriculum

☐ Sample Assignments/Exams

☐ Documentation of contributions to course design (new or significantly revised courses) and programs

☐ Does your reviewee prefer to have a **pre-observation meeting** with their reviewers?

A preliminary meeting with their reviewers can help reviewees convey any additional information about their teaching context, the design of their course, content and any other useful information.

**For your Communication with Reviewers**

Have the reviewers been informed of the following:

☐ timeline of your unit’s PRTs

☐ name(s) and contact information of internal and external reviewers

☐ date to access the reviewee’s teaching materials

☐ whether they are expected to have a preliminary meeting with the reviewee or whether they will be provided with written answers to Questions to Considered

☐ dates and times of the **TWO** classes to be reviewed

☐ whether they are expected to write a joint or a separate report.

**Other Considerations to support your P&T Procedures**

* Consider appointing a PRT coordinator for your unit, particularly if you are new to the FoA PRT process or if you have more than one PRT request to plan for.
* Date for the submission of the entire reappointment, tenure or promotion package depends on **SAC deadlines.  Advance planning is important**, especially if the candidate will not be teaching during the review year!
* Heads should discuss the results of the review with the instructor, and provide them with a copy of the summative report.
* PRT requests should be submitted in July. We understand however, that you may need to submit PRT requests later in the year due to changes to your PRT needs.

Feel free to provide the name and contact information of the PRT Coordinator (Luisa Canuto, luisa.canuto@ubc.ca) in case reviewees have any questions about the PRT process.

**GUIDELINES and ASSESSMENT FORMS for Peer Reviewers**

Reviewers (both internal and external) are expected to provide departments with a single team-written or as two separate reports, depending on the preference of each unit. The report should also include the Cover Sheet.

1. **Guidelines for Peer Reviewers**
2. **Guidance for Assessing Key Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness**
3. **Guidance for Rating Teaching Effectiveness**
4. **FORMS**
   1. **Cover Sheet**
   2. **Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**
   3. **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness**
5. **Guiding Questions for Optional Pre-Observation Meeting**

**GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING YOUR PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**General Considerations**

Expert assessments by an instructor’s peers are uniquely informative and helpful—especially when peer review assessments directly address those criteria specified in the Collective Agreement.

The Collective Agreement (Article 4.02) states: “*Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the faculty member, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students.*”

Other sources of evidence (e.g., students’ ratings of their instructional experience) might provide some information bearing on some of those criteria, but those other sources of evidence are limited in their evidentiary value. Student Experience of Instruction (SEoI) surveys are included in files for Promotion and Tenure, but are not part of the separate *Peer* Review of Teaching process.

Your peer review will inform everybody involved in adjudicating the particular case for promotion / tenure / reappointment. The information contained within peer reviews are incorporated into the comprehensive summary reports on teaching that are typically prepared by Heads and Directors. Peer reviews also become part of the casefile itself. Your assessment will be included in the casefile that is reviewed by the Dean, and by members of the Dean’s Advisory Committee on promotion and tenure, and by members of the Senior Appointments Committee that advises the President. These folks attend carefully to the criteria specified in the Collective Agreement, and will be looking to your peer review to obtain credible information bearing on those criteria.

In order to serve this purpose, **your assessment should take into consideration all the information that has been made available to you**. Your class observation is just one piece of information that should inform your assessment: it may be especially useful for evaluating some, but, most likely, not all of the reviewee’s teaching skills. In order to provide a useful peer review, it is therefore important that you carefully consider other course materials too.

Your peer review will be most useful if it is extensive and detailed, and if it evaluates the instructor in a way that can be transparently compared against the relevant standards of excellence. Most peer reviews are 2 to 3 pages in length and provide examples and other information to support their evaluative comments.

To serve these goals, it is highly recommended that you provide your narrative assessment on the **Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness form,** and also provide evaluative ratings on the **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness form**.

These Guidelines include the two forms mentioned above, the **Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness form,** and the **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness form** as well as the **Cover Sheet** that goes with your peer review. Right before the forms, or from page 2 to 5, we provided you with some guidance for assessing the dimensions and the rating of Teaching Effectiveness.

If you instead compose your peer review in a different format, please make sure that it still attends to the key dimensions of teaching effectiveness that are identified on those forms.

**Guidance for Assessing Key Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness**

Both of the attached forms, the **Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness form** and the **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness form**, ask you to assess teaching effectiveness on a set of dimensions that are informed by the criteria identified in the Collective Agreement: *Command over subject matter*; *Course design and structure*; *Preparedness for classes*; *Teaching methods and strategies*; *Communication and accessibility*; and *Impact on scholarly development*.

When considering evidence bearing on these key dimensions of teaching effectiveness, it may be helpful to look for specific kinds of information within the materials available to you. Here are a few illustrative examples of the kinds of questions that might usefully inform your assessments on specific dimensions of teaching effectiveness.

**Command over subject matter**

* Are readings and other course materials appropriate to the aims of the course?
* Do course materials reveal depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject matter?
* Do course materials reveal familiarity with recent developments in the field?
* Does the instructor demonstrate relevant knowledge when responding to questions from students?
* Is course design informed by current discipline-appropriate pedagogies?

**Course design and structure**

* Are course materials and assessment methods appropriate to the aims of the course?
* Is the course structured in such a way that new material builds sensibly upon material that students have already learned?
* Does the syllabus provide a clear description of course goals, learning objectives, and structure?
* Are course goals clearly defined, measurable, and aligned to learning activities and assessments?
* Are instructions for activities and assignments clear and precise?
* Are course expectations and grading criteria presented transparently to students?
* Is there a sensible balance between what and how students can learn outside of class time and during class time?
* If included, is the class website (e.g., on Canvas) well organized and easy to navigate?

**Preparedness for classes**

* Is class time used in a way that was appropriate and clearly related to the goals of the course?
* Is the amount of material presented / discussed sensibly calibrated to the time available?
* Is class session well planned and organized and its objectives and key points clearly emphasized at the start and/or as a summary at the end of the session?
* Is course material and/or activities presented to students in way that made it clear why the material / activities relate to the broader goals of the course?

**Teaching methods and strategies**

* Does the instructor use methods and strategies that reflect sound pedagogy?
* Does the instructor use methods and strategies that inspires student interest and engagement?
* Does the instructor situate new material (especially if complex) in a context that assists understanding?
* Does the instructor use visuals, analogies, demonstrations, and examples in a way that helps support student learning and engagement?
* Does the instructor use methods and strategies that offer opportunities for student interaction, constructive collaborations, or other forms of active learning?
* If recorded material is provided to students, is it well prepared and useful in meeting course objectives?

**Communication and accessibility**

* Do course materials clearly communicate roles and expectations?
* Does the instructor employ communication methods that invites students’ questions and other forms of active student participation?
* Is the instructor available to students outside of class (e.g., during regularly scheduled office hours and/or through other readily-accessible avenues of communication)?
* Does the instructor deal effectively with any problems that arose that could adversely affect learning?
* Do course materials (e.g., syllabus) includes guidelines to inform students about appropriately respectful ways to communicate with each other and with the instructor?
* Is the instructor sensitive to the diverse needs and experiences of students?
* Does the instructor demonstrate sensitivity to cultural differences and to issues of equity and inclusion?

**Impact on scholarly development**

* Does the instructor set clear goals and intellectual challenges or other appropriate means of stimulating intellectual engagement and scholarly development?
* Does the instructor set high yet reasonable expectations of learning that are appropriate for the level of the course and/or its place in the broader curriculum?
* Are assignments and other methods of assessment designed in a way that is intellectually stimulating or that otherwise promote scholarly development?
* Does the instructor incorporate experiential learning methods (e.g., internships, study abroad, community service learning, etc.) into the course design, as appropriate?

**Guidance for Rating Teaching Effectiveness**

The **Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness form** asks you to rate the effectiveness on each of those dimensions, on a rating scale that contains the following options: “Poor,” “Successful,” “High Quality,” “Excellent,” and “Outstanding.” Those options correspond to specific standards that must be met for different kinds of appointment / promotion, as summarized in the UBC Collective Agreement:

***Faculty in the Research stream:***

* Assistant Professor (appointment): potential for successful teaching
* Associate Professor (new appointment or promotion): successful teaching
* Professor (new appointment or promotion): high quality in teaching

***Faculty in the Educational Leadership Research stream:***

* Assistant Professor of Teaching (appointment): ability and commitment to teaching
* Associate Professor of Teaching (new appointment or promotion): excellence in teaching
* Professor of Teaching (new appointment or promotion): outstanding achievement in teaching

One useful perspective on how to interpret these various options, and how to distinguish between them, is provided in a Rubric for Summative Peer Review of Teaching (developed in 2018-19 by an ad hoc working group organized by UBC’s Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology) that can be found at this link: <https://ctlt.ubc.ca/programs/all-our-programs/ubc-peer-review-of-teaching-initiative/>.

Here, for example, are summary statements that this Rubric provides as descriptions of instruction that might be rated as either “Poor,” “Successful,” “High Quality,” “Excellent,” or “Outstanding.”

**NOTE**: For each level above “Successful,” the rubric is cumulative, i.e., it is assumed that the educator has already successfully met the requirements of the previous level. It is also assumed that the educator has built upon their skills from the previous level and can demonstrate their growth.

**Poor**: “An educator who falls short of the expectations of teaching quality, for reasons of either commitment and/or ability. Teaching raises serious concerns in relation to one or more of the following: professionalism, organization and preparation; the ability to engage students; the knowledge of subject matter; the lack of coherence between goals, assessments and activities.”

**Successful**: “A competent educator, as judged by experience and achievement, with a sincere, collegial commitment to the teaching and learning mandate of the discipline. A consistently professional educator, who sets clear expectations and shows concern for student progress and success, creates an engaging environment conducive to learning, demonstrates expertise with subject matter by adopting discipline-appropriate pedagogies and uses student-centered approaches and learning strategies and is attentive to diversity of students’ needs/abilities.”

**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. A highly effective teacher who demonstrates broad command of subject matter and employs discipline-appropriate student-centered learning strategies. Effectively engages students in appropriate ways to support their learning, and demonstrates alignments between course goals, assessment methods and learning activities.”

**Excellent**: “An expert educator within their discipline, recognized as such by their peers. Commitment to and engagement in the enhancement of teaching and learning. An expert teacher who can consistently both use and adapt discipline-appropriate, student-centered learning strategies to various contexts drawing on contemporary disciplinary practices to make regular enhancements and improvements. Consistent focus on methods and approaches to improve engagement of students to deepen and enhance their learning.”

**Outstanding**: “A distinctive educator, recognized by peers for the quality of their teaching. Displays a strong and evident commitment to teaching and learning and continuously employs innovative approaches in course that are based on sound pedagogical practices and promote student learning and intellectual growth. Articulates approach to design in a sophisticated way and makes strong links to effective discipline-appropriate pedagogies. Teaching demonstrates a balance of support for and challenge of students in an expertly effective manner, with consistently excellent engagement and outcomes.”

Summative Peer Review of Teaching Report:

COVER SHEET

**Name of instructor being reviewed:**

**Current Rank:**

**Academic unit(s):**

**Purpose for PRT:** 🞎 Reappointment review

🞎 Promotion / tenure review

🞎 Other (please specify)

**Materials reviewed for the Summative Peer Review of Teaching:**

**Required (all streams):**

🞎 Approach to teaching practice

🞎 Overview of teaching responsibilities

🞎 Course syllabi

🞎 Other materials [e.g.: class website / Canvas platform, lesson plan, slides, other AV materials]

**Optional** (one or more of these items would be expected in an Educational Leadership file):

🞎 Sample assignments / exams

🞎 Documentation of contributions to course design

🞎 Evidence of teaching recognition

**Classroom observation(s):**

Provide details regarding classroom observations that informed your assessment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course number and name** | **Course type**  (e.g., lecture, lab seminar, tutorial) | **Class size/Attendance**  Students enrolled/  Students attending | **Date**  When visited or recorded |
|  |  |  |  |

**Peer Reviewer**

Name:

Rank / Dept:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Summative Peer Review of Teaching Report:**

**NARRATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

When completing a Summative Peer Review of Teaching, reviewers are expected to attend carefully to guidance provided by the Collective Agreement (Article 4.02): “*Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the faculty member, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students.”* Your assessment should take into **consideration all available information bearing on the criteria identified below.**

1. **Command over subject matter.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor demonstrates command over the subject matter being taught (and, if applicable, the extent to which the instructor demonstrates familiarity with recent developments in the field). Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
2. **Course design and structure.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor has effectively organized and outlined the overall (face-to-face OR online) course design and content of their course(s). Has the instructor prepared, designed and structured their course(s) in a manner that facilitates effective learning, scholarly development, and a positive student experience? Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
3. **Preparedness for classes.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor demonstrates preparedness when planning class presentations and activities (whether synchronous or asynchronous, face to face or remote). Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
4. **Teaching methods, materials, and strategies.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor employs teaching methods and strategies and methods that are appropriate to the subject matter, engaging to students, and effective. Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
5. **Communication and accessibility.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor communicates effectively with students, is available to students, is sensitive to diverse student needs and experiences, and creates a positive and respectful learning environment. Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
6. **Impact on scholarly development.** Provide your assessment of the extent to which the instructor demonstrates a positive influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. Provide examples or other details to support your assessment.
7. **Overall assessment of teaching effectiveness.** Provide a summary assessment of instructor’s overall performance and effectiveness as an instructor of university students.

**Summative Peer Review of Teaching Report:**

**RATINGS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

This rating form is designed to complement the Narrative Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness. For each of the teaching effectiveness dimensions listed below (which match those on the Narrative Assessment form), please select the descriptor (“Poor”, “Successful,” “High Quality,” “Excellent,” or “Outstanding”) that most accurately conveys the instructor’s level of performance.

Refer to the different standards that must be met for different kinds of appointment / promotion, as summarized in the UBC Collective Agreement:

**Faculty in the Research stream:**

* Assistant Professor (appointment): potential for successful teaching
* Associate Professor (new appointment or promotion): successful teaching
* Professor (new appointment or promotion): high quality in teaching

**Faculty in the Educational Leadership stream:**

* Assistant Professor of Teaching (appointment): ability and commitment to teaching
* Associate Professor of Teaching (new appointment or promotion): excellence in teaching
* Professor of Teaching (new appointment or promotion): outstanding achievement in teaching

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Rating** | | | | | |
| **1. Command over subject matter** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **2. Course design and structure** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **3. Preparedness for classes** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **4. Teaching methods and strategies** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **5. Communication and accessibility** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **6. Impact on scholarly development** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |
| **7. Overall assessment** | | Poor | Successful | High Quality | Excellent | Outstanding |

**GUIDING QUESTIONS to Consider for the Preliminary Meeting\***

A preliminary meeting provides an opportunity for the instructor to discuss both the context of their course and their teaching and learning goals. During a preliminary meeting, reviewers are encouraged to ask questions about different teaching and learning dimensions, such as the course design, content, development and other points, as suggested in the Guiding Questions listed below. In the absence of a preliminary 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 below.

A preliminary meeting is an **optional component** of a Summative PRT and can take place depending upon the model of PRT adopted by the unit.

1. **Course design**: which pedagogical practices did you consider when designing your course? Was your course 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?
2. **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?
3. **Creating Community and Motivating students**: 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. Explain strategies you use to encourage students to take responsibility for their learning.
4. **Communication and Responsiveness:** Discuss your approach to responding to student concerns and course-related issues. How do you clarify expectations for students (e.g. rubrics, checklists, other)? How do you design assessment activities that are meaningful and relevant to your students.? Describe your approach to delivering timely and appropriate constructive feedback.
5. **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>

**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 at 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 cameras 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 and recorded voice 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 and Equity in the Faculty of Arts. We appreciate your cooperation and consent to such recording."

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECORDING**

**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.

Date [Insert name of faculty member being reviewed]

1. The 2021-22 PRT Committee included Associate Dean, Faculty Janice Stewart, Assistant Professor of Teaching and PRT Coordinator Luisa Canuto (FHIS), Professor Stephan Heatley (Theatre and Film), Professor Annabel Lyon (Creative Writing), Professor of Teaching Tiffany Potter (English), Associate Professor Hotze Rullman (Linguistics), Professor Mark Schaller (Psychology), Associate Professor of Teaching Qian Wang (Asian Studies). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Instructors may choose whether or not to grant access to their Canvas Course(s), depending on whether they believe such access would provide any meaningful information on their course for the purpose of the review of their teaching. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The 2021-22 PRT Committee recommends that Student Experience of Instruction (SEoI) should **not** be included in the reviewee’s Teaching Dossier **for the purpose of a PRT evaluation** and encourages reviewers to focus on the evaluation of teaching and teaching materials only. Under the current system, student feedback is included in the promotion and tenure process at a different phase and **SEoIs are still expected to be part of the reviewee’s complete file to be submitted to their department for reappointment, promotion or tenure.**  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Please refer to UBC V-130 Senate policy on Content and Distribution of Course Syllabi to confirm which elements should be included in the Syllabus. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Instructors may choose whether or not to grant access to their Canvas Course(s), depending on whether they believe such access would provide any meaningful information on their course for the purpose of the review of their teaching. Access to their Canvas Course site will be allowed only for a limited amount of time. Reviewers will NOT be given access to student data. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)