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. A class visit assessment (or, in some cases, assessment of a recorded classroom session) is but one component of the summative peer review.

This document is designed to provide Faculty guidance for implementing the principles of Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) as indicated in the 2009 UBC Peer Review of Teaching Working Group Report (hereafter 2009 PRT Report). It outlines exemplary elements and practices of formative and 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 mentoring (formative PTR), reappointment, promotion and/or tenure (summative PRT).

2. Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching

The goal of this 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 benefits 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 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 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 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. This document and 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. Peer reviewers are required to treat all materials and information with confidentiality.

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 is reviewed, 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, based on the Head’s request.
4. When selecting internal reviewers, Heads should consider a balance of substantive disciplinary expertise and experience as a peer reviewer. Reviewers who do not already have some PRT experience or training in peer evaluation are encouraged to attend one of the PRT training workshops, which are offered periodically by the Faculty of Arts PRT Coordinator and by the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT).
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. Participation as external reviewers is to be recognized as a valuable service for the Faculty.
6. 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 an internal reviewer.
7. For summative reviews, untenured faculty members do not review other faculty members.
8. Heads must ensure that peer reviewers are at “arm’s length” to the extent that they are not in conflict of interest, such as would be the case with close collaborators.
9. PRT reviewers and Heads are asked to reflect on the potential that gender, ethnicity or other such factors that 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. External reviewers are to honour the unit’s PRT procedures.

3b. Preparation

Heads and instructors will discuss timing of PRT reviews during their annual meeting/5.02 meeting. Well in advance of the period in which the summative peer review is to take place, 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.
The instructor being reviewed will provide the Head with the teaching dossier (see section 3c below.) All information is confidential and must be disposed of in a secure manner on completion of the review (as applicable: hardcopy material should be returned to the Head and electronic material should be deleted).

The peer reviewers will review the teaching dossier and other data gathered, and depending upon the model of PRT adopted by the unit, they or the instructor may request a preliminary meeting to convey any additional information about teaching context not in the dossier. In the absence of a pre-meeting between the instructor and the peer reviewer, the instructor should provide the peer reviewer with a paragraph or two about learning objectives of the classes that will be observed. Alternatively, to convey any such information and if the reviewers are to be anonymous, the instructor and reviewers will have separate meetings with Heads.

3c. 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 and in preparation for a class visit, all faculty members must prepare a teaching dossier, which would include at least: statement of teaching philosophy/approach to teaching practice; overview of teaching responsibilities (list of courses with student enrollment; assessment practices; teaching objectives and methods); and course syllabus/syllabi.¹

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

**NOTE:** If student comments are to be included, it must be a comprehensive set that is obtained through formal procedures (i.e., the University’s online student evaluation surveys) and that is representative of students taught; for example, student comments might be included for one large lecture course and a smaller seminar. The selection must be made by a third party (i.e., the Head or internal PRT reviewer) rather than a selection made by the instructor.

3d. Class visit(s)

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 as representative of various levels and diverse types of teaching (e.g., large lectures, tutorials, labs, performances, field trips, etc.). Please consider that where insufficient evidence is obtained in a single teaching session to draw and substantiate conclusions as to observed teaching effectiveness, it would be advisable to schedule additional observations. Subsequent observations may be of the same or a different course and/or at a later time during the academic year.

¹ 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.).
The class visits should occur after the instructor has been able to develop a comfort level with the class, (typically from week five onwards). The instructor must be given advance warning about the time range in which the in-class visits will occur.

Where appropriate and desired, reviews of videotaped teaching sessions may substitute for direct in-class observation. The Head or departmental peer review coordinator/internal peer reviewer should arrange for videotaping of sessions with Arts ISIT as needed. Instructor acknowledgment and student consent must be attained before videotaping classes. (The consent forms are provided in the Appendix to this document.)

Reviewers will not normally meet with, or take comments from, individual students. Reviewers may use the Guidelines for Teaching Assessment/Observation, which are included in this Guide.

**IMPORTANT FOR FACULTY MEMBERS BEING REVIEWED:**
The instructor will inform students ahead of time of a class visit by a colleague. If the class is to be recorded in lieu of a visit, the instructor will circulate the consent form provided in Appendix B, “Audience Consent to Recording of Classes for Peer Review of Teaching.” The instructor is asked to sign the form provided in Appendix C, “Acknowledgement of Videotaping for Peer Review of Teaching.”

### 3e. 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 final summative 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.

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.
4. Formative Peer Review of Teaching

A formative peer review of teaching has as its focus the professional development of teaching through periodic collegial mentoring of all faculty, 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. It would also support the development of faculty who may be moving into different ranks, or exploring different teaching contexts.

It may be conducted by a single departmental reviewer, on a more informal basis than a summative review. Formative Peer Reviewers may choose to use the Guidelines for Teaching Assessment/Observation designed for the Summative PRT process.

Typically, the Head or the department PRT coordinator would schedule the formative peer review, appoint the reviewer, and ask the instructor to provide an abbreviated teaching dossier (consisting of, at minimum, course syllabi and sample assignments for the current term). The reviewer holds a discussion with the instructor about teaching methods, conducts a classroom visit, holds a follow-up meeting with the instructor to provide feedback, and writes a brief report to the Head (with a copy to the instructor).

This brief report serves to document the fact that the instructor has undergone a formative review as evidence of their professional development in teaching, and as an acknowledged form of department service for those conducting formative reviews.

A more detailed report is appropriate in some situations and required if the formative review is conducted in response to a concern (e.g., a concern raised after a summative review). The Faculty of Arts PRT Working Group is starting to think about developing a Formative Peer Review of Teaching program, which would better serve the professional development needs of all faculty.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment or Promotion to Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor</th>
<th>Appointment or Promotion to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;judged principally on performance in...teaching&quot; 4.01 (a); &quot;evidence of ability in teaching&quot;; &quot;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&quot; 3.05(a)</td>
<td>&quot;have maintained a high standard of performance in meeting the criteria [of teaching, scholarly activity and service] ... and show promise of continuing to do so&quot; 4.01(a)</td>
<td>&quot;evidence of successful teaching... beyond that expected of an Assistant Professor&quot; 3.06 (a); &quot;teaching as defined in Article 4.02&quot;; &quot;ability to direct graduate students&quot; 3.06(a)</td>
<td>&quot;contributions judged by the criteria set out in Article 4) are considered outstanding&quot;; &quot;appropriate standards of excellence&quot;; &quot;high quality in teaching&quot; 3.07(a)(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor of Teaching Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment to Instructor</th>
<th>Promotion to and Tenure as Senior Instructor (or Appointment to Senior Instructor)</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor of Teaching (or Appointment to Professor of Teaching with Tenure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “Normally requires completion of academic qualifications, evidence of ability and commitment to teaching” 3.02</td>
<td>• “Requires evidence of excellence in teaching” 3.04</td>
<td>• “Requires evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching” 3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Judged principally on performance in teaching” 4.01 (b)</td>
<td>• Tenure: “Granted to individuals who have maintained a high standard of performance in meeting the criteria”... (of teaching, educational leadership, and service)... “and show promise of continuing to do so” 4.01 (a)</td>
<td>• “Requires evidence of... distinction in field of teaching and learning” 3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

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."
Appendix C

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF VIDEOTAPING
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]