



## **Overview and Purpose**

UBC takes the quality of teaching in its programs seriously, and Vantage College is no exception. Guided by the Reports of the UBC-V Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching (2009 and 2020), Vantage College seeks to support faculty in strengthening their teaching through formative assessments, and decisions about appointment and reappointment are informed by summative assessments of teaching. These guidelines are intended to provide Vantage-specific context to the descriptions provided in the latest Collective Agreement between UBC and the UBC Faculty Association and is intended to be consistent with the criteria therein.

Teaching at UBC is assessed both by student evaluations of teaching and peer-reviews of teaching. The Collective Agreement states, in the “Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion” (Article 4):

Evaluation of teaching shall 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, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. The methods of teaching evaluation may vary; they may include student opinion, assessment by colleagues of performance in university lectures, outside references concerning teaching at other institutions, course material and examinations, the calibre of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations. When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this shall be done through formal procedures. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of the candidate to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

For Sessional Lecturers, the language used to describe “Performance Evaluation” is very similar (Article 8):

Evaluation of teaching shall 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, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. The methods of teaching evaluation may vary; they may include student opinion, assessment by Faculty, including other Sessional Lecturers, of performance in University lectures, course material and examinations, and other relevant considerations. When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this shall be done through formal procedures.

An additional stipulation is that “decisions not to reappoint a Sessional Lecturer cannot be based exclusively on student evaluations.”

UBC faculty members typically participate in both formative and summative peer reviews of teaching (PRT) as part of their career growth and progression:

- **Formative** PRT supports the professional development of teaching through periodic collegial mentoring of instructors by colleagues.
- **Summative** PRT provides information for the Faculty and the University about the effectiveness of faculty members' teaching practices for decision-making purposes, including re-appointment, promotion, and tenure.

Many Programs, Departments and Faculties have their own guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, and if a faculty member teaching at Vantage College has another "home" unit, the teaching evaluation will be coordinated with that unit. Examples of PRT guidelines from other Faculties include:

- <https://science.ubc.ca/faculty/peerreviewteaching>
- <http://www.arts.ubc.ca/files/2015/09/Faculty-of-Arts-PRT-Guide-24Sept2015.pdf>
- <http://ctl2013.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2017/04/Applied-Science-Summative-Peer-Review-of-Teaching-Policy-Guidelines.pdf>

When faculty who teach in the Vantage One program are appointed by another unit, and that unit's teaching evaluation guidelines exceed the Vantage College guidelines, the appointing unit's guidelines will apply. The Vantage College guidelines for peer teaching evaluations are the *minimum* guidelines for faculty who teach in the Vantage One program. The guidelines below apply only to faculty who teach in the Vantage One program.

### **Sessional Lecturers**

As required by Part 7, Article 8.01 of the Collective Agreement, Sessional Lecturers who teach in the Vantage One program for the first time will receive a formative peer review of teaching (PRT) in the first term of teaching. This PRT will be conducted by a non-sessional faculty member who is at arm's length, and who preferably also teaches in the same Vantage curriculum stream (AEP / APSC / ARTS / SCIE); this colleague may be in a different discipline taught within the same program. The PRT will include at least one class observation and review of the course syllabus and sample teaching materials (e.g., class slides, in class or homework tasks for practice) as well as sample course assignments. If serious concerns arise about the quality of teaching, procedures as outlined in Article 7, "Evaluation of Initial Appointment" will be followed.

For returning sessional faculty, a formative review should also take place in Year 3, and a summative review will occur in Year 4 of teaching in the Vantage One program (and thereafter, every three years). If the summative review indicates that the instructor has not met the expected standards of teaching according to the UBC Collective Agreement, then the following should occur in the next teaching term in the Vantage One program: a meeting to discuss teaching expectations, a formative review (if recommended), and a summative review will be repeated.

## **Lecturers**

Lecturers (appointments without review for one, two, three, or five years) who teach in the Vantage One program for the first time will receive a formative PRT in the first term of teaching. In the second term of teaching, there will be a second class observation and review of teaching materials for the purpose of a fuller and summative review. This formative teaching evaluation can be conducted by an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor or (non-Sessional) Lecturer in the same Vantage curriculum stream (AEP / APSC / ARTS / SCIE) and at least one year of teaching experience in the Vantage One program; this colleague may be in a different discipline taught within the same program.

For subsequent years, a formative review should take place in Year 3, and a summative review will occur in Year 4 of teaching in the Vantage One program (and thereafter, every three years). If the summative review indicates that the instructor is not currently meeting the expected standards of teaching for their rank according to the Collective Agreement, then a summative review will be repeated the following term, with another formative review recommended in between.

## **Educational Leadership Stream Faculty**

For Assistant Professors of Teaching, the schedule of reviews follows University guidelines and is coordinated with home departments. Formative reviews should take place in Year 1 (and optionally in Year 3), and summative reviews should take place in Year 2 and Year 4. If a summative review indicates that the instructor is not currently meeting the expected standards of teaching excellence for their rank, then a summative review will be repeated in the next teaching term, with another optional formative review recommended in between.

Summative peer reviews of teaching for the purposes of tenure and promotion should be conducted by a committee of two peer reviewers, at least one of whom should be a tenured Educational Leadership stream faculty member within the same Vantage stream (AEP / APSC / ARTS / SCIE) and at least one year of teaching experience in the Vantage One program. This colleague may be in a different discipline taught within the same program.

For Associate Professors of Teaching at least one formative peer evaluation is recommended for faculty in this rank before being formally reviewed for promotion. The summative evaluation for promotion (and/or tenure) must include information from the current or most recent teaching term.

For Professors of Teaching, at least one summative peer evaluation every 5 years is recommended but not required. Formative peer evaluations will be initiated when performance falls below the standards expected in the Vantage One program.

## **Research Stream Faculty**

For Assistant Professors, the schedule of reviews follows University guidelines and is coordinated with home departments. Formative reviews should take place in Year 1 (and

optionally in Year 3), and summative reviews must take place in Year 2 and in Year 4. If a summative review indicates that the instructor is not currently meeting the expected standards of teaching excellence for their rank, then a summative review will be repeated the next teaching term, with another formative review recommended in between.

Summative peer reviews of teaching for the purposes of tenure and promotion should be conducted by a committee of two peer reviewers, at least one of whom should be a tenured Research stream faculty member within the same Vantage stream (AEP / APSC / ARTS / SCIE) and at least one year of teaching experience in the Vantage One program. This colleague may be in a different discipline taught within the same program.

For Associate Professors, at least one formative peer evaluation is recommended before being formally reviewed for promotion. The summative evaluation for promotion (and/or tenure) must include information from the current or most recent teaching term.

For Professors, one summative peer evaluation every 5 years is recommended but not required. Formative peer evaluations will be initiated when performance falls below the standards expected in the Vantage One program.

### **Review processes**

Formative teaching reviews for lecturers, tenure-stream faculty, and summative teaching reviews for new Sessional Lecturers:

- 1 pre-observation meeting to discuss the review process and goals
- 1 class observation of min. 1 hour
- review of course syllabus (including assignment descriptions, sample assignment instructions, and assessment criteria) and other teaching materials relevant to the class observed
- 1 post-observation debriefing meeting
- brief written report (1-2 pages) composed by the PRT reviewer sent to the Academic Director and, in the case of AEP faculty, also sent to the Director of the AEP Program; if the appointment is in another unit, a copy will also go to the head of that unit

Summative teaching reviews for Lecturers and tenure-stream faculty:

- 1 pre-observation meeting to discuss the review process and goals
- 1 class observation of min. 1 hour, done by 2 different colleagues (i.e., a total of 2 class observations)
- review of course syllabi (including assignment descriptions, sample assignment instructions, and assessment criteria), statement of teaching philosophy, and other teaching materials relevant to the classes observed (e.g., student experience of instruction scores, lesson plan, hand-outs, slides, assignment instructions)
- 1 post-observation debriefing meeting

- written report by the PRT reviewers sent to Academic Director and, in the case of AEP faculty, also sent to the Director of the AEP Program, using the PRT template; if the appointment is in another unit, a copy will also go to the head of that unit

The Chairs of the Curriculum Committees and the AEP Director work with the Academic Director to coordinate peer reviews of teaching for faculty in their stream, ensuring a distribution of review tasks among potential reviewers. All faculty involved in the PRT process will be required to familiarize themselves with this policy and corresponding materials (e.g., knowing how to complete the PRT forms) and seek out relevant training (i.e., ideally PRTs are to be done by faculty who have themselves already gone through the PRT process, and who have also completed workshops or some form of training, for example, through CTLT or at Vantage). The faculty member in charge of organizing PRTs is responsible for ensuring this is the case.

Tenure-track faculty undergoing summative peer review of teaching should follow the teaching dossier requirements as outlined in the *Collective Agreement* (<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/>) and the *Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC* (<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/files/SAC-Guide.pdf>). Depending on the nature and stage of the candidate's appointment, the candidate may wish to include the following materials for PRT:

- summary of current teaching responsibilities: course numbers, number of sections, enrolment figures, student experience of instruction scores, directed readings, teaching at other institutions;
- rubrics and assessment practices;
- samples of graded student work (either anonymized or provided with students' permission);
- other instructional materials (e.g. PowerPoint slides, link to course website, links to electronic materials, handouts, sample examinations).

The peer reviewers will not be tasked with gathering evidence for summative peer review apart from the meetings with the candidate and the teaching observation. Peer reviewers are to treat all materials from and information about the instructor obtained during the review process with confidentiality.

### **Meetings and classroom observation**

In summative reviews for Lecturers and tenure-stream faculty, peer reviewers will meet with the faculty member twice: before and after the classroom observations. In advance of the pre-meeting and class visit, the peer reviewers will review the teaching materials submitted by the faculty member.

#### Pre-meeting

The reviewers will request a meeting, before the classroom observations, to discuss the following: expectations regarding the summative PRT goals and processes in order to establish a shared understanding between the reviewer and reviewee; the reviewee's teaching practices;

and any additional information the faculty member would like to share about the teaching context that is not in the materials supplied.

### Classroom observation

A class visit should occur far enough into the term that the faculty member has had the opportunity to develop a comfort level with the class. While the classroom observation needs to be at a time that works for both the reviewee and the reviewer, normally the reviewee takes the lead in identifying options for class observations, and then the reviewer chooses from these options. The peer reviewer will arrive on time and stay for a minimum of one hour, but preferably for the duration of the class. The two reviewers will review separate classes rather than attending the same one.

### Post-meeting

Upon completion of the classroom observations and before the PRT report is written, the reviewers and reviewee will meet to discuss what they each perceived to be the areas of strength and those in need of improvement. The goal is not consensus but accuracy and a consideration of one another's views. The reviewee can ask for another classroom observation, and the reviewer can consider whether or not to meet this request.

### **Reporting**

After the meeting, the reviewers will work together to draft the report, and send it to the reviewee for an opportunity to respond in writing to the reviewers' feedback. The reviewers will then revise and submit the report to the Academic Director. The final PRT report should include class observation reports prepared separately by each reviewer.

The Academic Director will ensure that the instructor has received a copy of the final summative report. The Academic Director or, in the case of AEP faculty, the AEP Director, will arrange for a meeting with the reviewee within one month to discuss the results of the review, provide the instructor with the opportunity to respond, and determine any follow-up if and as appropriate (e.g., recommend a follow-up formative review and/or require a follow-up summative review). Following this meeting, the faculty member will then respond to the report, reflecting on what they have learned from the process for their teaching practice and outlining a plan for strengthening their teaching. The instructor will either sign the report, indicating general assent, or write a reply identifying any perceived problems with the report.

In the case where the faculty member has a home department other than Vantage College, a copy of any peer review of teaching reports will be shared with the home unit. The Academic Director of Vantage will reach out to departments to ensure that at least one reviewer from Vantage is included in any summative peer review of teaching processes. For summative reports, Vantage will coordinate input into departmental reports and include these full summative reports in materials for re-appointment, promotion and tenure, as encouraged by SAC.

As outlined in the collective agreement (Article 5.04(c)), the Academic Director of Vantage will be invited to participate in departmental standing committee meetings convened for the purpose pursuant to Article 5.04 and 5.06 in 'Part 4: Conditions of Appointment for Faculty' for all faculty members who are anticipated to perform duties in Vantage College in their pretenure appointment or for reappointment, promotion or tenure reviews of faculty members who have performed duties within Vantage College in the period subject to review.

**CLASS OBSERVATION TEMPLATE**

<b>Name and rank of faculty member:</b>	<b>Name and rank of reviewer:</b>
<b>Nature of peer review (tick one):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Sessional lecturer <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer (1/2/3/5 year) <input type="checkbox"/> TT faculty member – reappointment <input type="checkbox"/> TT faculty member – tenure and promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Tenured faculty member – promotion to Professor (of Teaching) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<b>Course name and number:</b>
<b>Date of observation:</b>	<b>Class location:</b>
<b>Nature of class observed (e.g., lecture, tutorial, lab, graduate seminar, etc.).</b>	<b>Class size:</b> # enrolled: ... # in attendance: ...
<b>Duration of class:</b>	<b>Describe materials provided by the faculty member prior to the class observation:</b>

**Context** (e.g., how far into the course was the class you observed?)

**A – Observation:** describe what you observed, including topics covered, pedagogical approaches and technologies used, etc.

**B – Evaluation:** assess what you observed, including (as relevant): appropriateness of assigned materials and assessments; clarity of explanations and instructions; instructor preparedness, organization, and time management; class tone, climate, and inclusivity; responsiveness to questions; use of learning technology; creativity and connection to current affairs.

**Signatures** indicate the reviewer and reviewee have met to discuss this class observation as part of a peer review of teaching:

Faculty member being reviewed:

Reviewer:

Date:



**PRT REPORT TEMPLATE** (for summative review of lecturers and tenure-stream faculty only)

1. Introduction (“Over the past [x] months, we have reviewed [reviewee’s] teaching activities, including ...” etc.)
2. Major teaching contributions (highlights such as teaching awards, teaching award nominations, courses developed or redesigned, courses with very high SET scores)
3. Student Experience of Instruction scores for all courses taught (table)
4. Undergraduate and graduate student supervision, if applicable (including a synthesis of students’ feedback solicited by the reviewers)
5. Summary of meetings with the candidate
6. Overall summary and signatures (“To summarize, [reviewee] clearly meets the standards of teaching at Vantage College. We particularly appreciated ...” etc.)
7. Appendix I(a): First class observation (using template above)
8. Appendix I(b): Second class observation (using template above)