

Faculty of Science Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching and Summative Assessment

A. BACKGROUND.....	2
B. GOALS.....	2
C. OVERVIEW.....	2
D. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES.....	3
1. Frequency and Timing of Peer Review.....	3
2. Committee Options for Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	4
3. Peer Review of Teaching Protocols.....	5
4. Classroom Teaching Session Review.....	5
5. Peer review of teaching report.....	6
E. PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING TOOLKIT.....	7
Appendix 1: Departmental Protocol Guidelines.....	8
Appendix 2: Teaching Dossier Guidelines.....	11
Appendix 3: Teaching Evaluation Worksheet.....	12
Appendix 4: Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching Report.....	14
Appendix 5: Guidelines for the Summative Assessment of Teaching.....	15

A. BACKGROUND.

The following guidelines were developed as part of on-going Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) Initiative at UBC, which aims to improve and clarify the processes that underlie peer review of teaching. This initiative will allow the Faculty of Science to emphasize the importance of good teaching to the success of undergraduate and graduate programs. In addition this initiative will allow the teaching review process to be fair, accurate and transparent for all faculty members when they undergo periodic review during reappointment, promotion and tenure. This initiative will also enable the Faculty to provide the Senior Appointments Committee with clear and accurate assessments of teaching performance of faculty members. A further outcome of peer review of teaching is the fostering of a network of instructors within each department that welcome the discussion of teaching related issues.

B. GOALS.

Peer review of teaching serves two fundamental purposes:

- 1) **Summative evaluation** is required as part of the collection of evidence for career advancement. This evaluation provides evidence of the overall impact of a faculty member's teaching for periodic reviews such as reappointment, promotion and tenure.
 - 2) **Formative or mentoring reviews** can provide constructive feedback to faculty members to facilitate the development and improvement of a faculty member's teaching skills.
-

C. OVERVIEW

Guidelines have been developed that incorporate best practices from across the Faculty of Science. These general guidelines are provided to assist each department in implementing peer review of teaching as a component of the required summative assessment to fulfill the expectations of the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) (outlined in Appendix 3 of the SAC guidelines).

These guidelines are intended to facilitate the peer review of teaching and have been developed with a "tool-kit" approach. Departments are encouraged to adapt any of the guidelines and worksheets in the tool-kit to develop a peer evaluation procedure to suit their specific teaching and learning environment(s). The aim of these guidelines and template worksheets is to promote rigorous peer review that is equitable across units and transparent for the candidates.

This tool kit includes:

Appendix 1: Departmental Protocol Guidelines

Appendix 2: Teaching Dossier Guidelines

Appendix 3: Teaching Evaluation Worksheet

Appendix 4: Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching Report

Appendix 5: Guidelines for the Summative Assessment of Teaching Report

D. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES

1. Frequency and Timing of Peer Review

Assistant Professor and Instructor I

Formal summative peer evaluation for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure is required by the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty. Formative peer evaluations or mentoring reviews of teaching are highly recommended on an annual basis by the teaching committee or by the faculty member's mentors or mentoring committee. Prescribed schedules for summative peer evaluation and suggested mentoring reviews are given below:

Assistant Professor

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Years 5 - 7
		Reappointment		Periodic review or reappointment
Mentoring review	Mentoring review	Summative Peer Evaluation for reappointment	Mentoring review	Summative Peer Evaluation for promotion and tenure OR reappointment

Instructor I

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Reappointment		Reappointment	Periodic review
Mentoring review	Summative Peer Evaluation for reappointment	Mentoring review	Summative Peer Evaluation for reappointment	Summative Peer Evaluation for promotion and tenure

Associate Professor and Senior Instructor: At least one mentoring review evaluation is recommended for faculty in this rank before being formally reviewed for promotion (and/or tenure in the case of a term appointment). The formal teaching evaluation for promotion (and/or tenure) must be for the most current teaching term possible.

Professor: For term appointments in this rank, at least one mentoring review is recommended before being formally reviewed for tenure. The formal teaching evaluation for tenure must be for the most current teaching term possible. The *UBCV Peer Review Working Group* recommends that all Full Professors undergo peer review every 5 years.

Sessional and 12-Month Lecturers: Although lecturers are not reviewed for tenure or promotion, where possible regular formative evaluations/mentoring reviews are recommended. Peer review of for continuing sessional and 12-month lecturers is recommended.

Additional Peer review: Regardless of rank, when a faculty member's teaching evaluations fall below the expected standard for the faculty and department, peer mentoring visits will be arranged. The purpose of this formative or mentoring review is to help the faculty improve their teaching skills and approaches in a supportive and constructive manner.

Faculty of Science: Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines

- a. For all instructors whose evaluations on Question 6 (Effectiveness of Teaching) fall below 3.0 once or consistently fall below 3.5 (three out of five years):
- a letter is sent to the Head of Department informing them of this evaluation
 - the Head is required to initiate a program of formative/mentoring review of teaching in the subsequent year. This includes:
 - classroom visits and review of teaching methods by a committee of peers
 - generation of a formative/mentoring teaching report to be discussed with the instructor either by the Head or the peer reviewers in an informal meeting
 - suggested professional development through workshops available through CTLT or similar programs
 - the Head will then provide a letter to the Dean outlining the specifics of the measures taken
- b. For all instructors whose evaluations on Question 6 (Effectiveness of Teaching) fall above 3.0 and below 3.5:
- a list is sent to the Head of Department informing them of this evaluation
 - the Head will judge this evaluation within the context of the course as specific courses have historically had lower evaluations regardless of the instructor
 - it is suggested that the Head initiate a program of formative/mentoring review of teaching for all faculty who will teach in subsequent years. This includes:
 - classroom visits and review of teaching by a committee of peers
 - discussions with the instructor on teaching performance as reviewed by peers
 - suggested professional development through workshops available through CTLT

Additional peer evaluations may be scheduled at the request of the faculty member.

2. Committee Options for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Summative Review for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure:

Option 1 (Recommended): Standing Teaching Peer Review Committee

A Teaching Committee is responsible for organizing all peer reviews in the unit and reports to the Head and/or Ad Hoc Review Committee in preparation for considering faculty members for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

Option 2: Ad Hoc Committee

An ad hoc review committee is struck to consider a faculty member for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. This committee is responsible for organizing peer review of teaching and the preparation of a teaching report that forms the basis of a summative assessment of teaching, a critical component of the promotion/tenure package.

For summative assessment assigned peer reviewers of teaching should be of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being evaluated. The teaching review committee should consist of a minimum of three evaluators (preferably four) who have the necessary expertise relevant to the evaluation of the disciplinary content and teaching. At a minimum one of the reviewers should be considered "arms length" to the candidate and external to the unit or group within the department.

Faculty of Science: Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines

The department may wish to designate specific faculty members as peer review specialists to undergo specific training to help conduct the peer review of teaching (please contact ctltp.eerreview@ubc.ca). However, all faculty conducting visits should be appropriately prepared for the peer review process and be accomplished teachers with knowledge of sound principles of teaching and learning.

Mentoring review:

Based on department's mentoring guidelines, either individual mentors or mentoring committees should be assigned within the first year for each new faculty member. Review of teaching by mentors or other peers on an annual basis for new faculty is strongly recommended. Instructors are encouraged to participate in the Peer Review Program (http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_programs/PRT) for informal assessment of teaching. Feedback from the mentor is provided directly to the visited faculty member and is not to be used by the formal summative peer evaluation process.

3. Peer Review of Teaching Protocols

Each department should provide to the candidate and reviewers a description of the protocol underlying the peer review of teaching including: details on the frequency, committee structure, initial meetings, classroom visits, the form of feedback to the candidate and the writing of the report (examples of protocols are provided Appendix 1). The aim is to make the peer review process and writing of the summative report as equitable, consistent and transparent as possible for periodic review such as reappointment, promotion and tenure.

4. Classroom Teaching Session Review

Prior to visiting the teaching session, members of the peer review of teaching committee or class observers should meet with the candidate and be provided with a course syllabus, the context of the lesson within the course, relevant course materials, the teaching dossier and the concerns of the instructor identified. The instructor should be informed of the period over which they may expect in-class visits with some departments choosing to disclose the specific schedule of classroom visits. The instructor should inform the committee of any days on which a classroom visit would be inappropriate (e.g., midterm exam or guest lecturer scheduled). This initial meeting with the instructor is strongly recommended.

Each reviewer should attend two different classes each and complete separate observation forms for each visit; the reviewers should consult with the instructor to ensure that the classes are representative of various levels and contexts (e.g. large lectures, tutorials, labs etc.).

Departments are encouraged to develop a teaching observation worksheet (an example is provided in Appendix 3). The observation worksheet could be appropriate for use in both mentoring reviews and summative peer evaluation of teaching as well as award adjudication. The list of criteria on the worksheet is intended to focus the attention of the observer and help set the basis for comments during the teaching session. The worksheet can document evidence to support an assessment of the teaching session and help in the writing of the teaching report.

Some departments also choose to interview undergraduate students in an observed class. A member of the committee will interview the class or lab as a group for 10 minutes, without the instructor present. The interview is confidential and no student names will be recorded.

5. Peer review of teaching report

The teaching report can be used for both formative/mentoring reviews or summative reviews for promotion and tenure. The report should be a summary of observations from the classroom visits, student interviews, and review of supporting teaching materials.

Summative teaching report for promotion and tenure: In the case of a summative evaluation, the report should address those criteria stipulated in the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (a template is provided in Section E: Appendix 4).

SAC guidelines: "Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: 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. 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."

The peer review of teaching report should identify the sources and describe the means of obtaining information about the faculty members teaching and provide a qualitative assessment of teaching. The report must document the quantity of teaching of all kinds and descriptions of other major teaching activities. For each course taught include a quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of student evaluations, a summary of peer classroom observations and interviews with students. The final report should not contain attribution of comments to any specific reviewer but rather represent the opinion of the committee.

The peer evaluations should consist of a minimum of three peers preferably four who have each attended at least two lectures or other teaching activity.

The peer review of teaching report will constitute part of the overall of the summative assessment of teaching report necessary for promotion and tenure.

E. PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING TOOLKIT

Appendix 1: Departmental Protocol Guidelines

Appendix 2: Teaching Dossier Guidelines

Appendix 3: Teaching Evaluation Worksheet

Appendix 4: Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching Report

Appendix 5: Guidelines for the Summative Assessment of Teaching

Appendix 1: Departmental Protocol Guidelines

Aim: To clearly explain to the candidate the protocol and steps involved in generating a teaching report for the summative assessment of teaching needed for periodic review such as reappointment, promotion and tenure. Each section specifies topics to be discussed with the candidate and provides examples taken from different departments. A simplified protocol could be developed for mentoring reviews of teaching.

1. Frequency

Explain the timing of the summative reviews.

2. Committee/Review Team

Explain the nature of the peer review committee (departmental or ad hoc teaching/peer review committee).

Example 1: A faculty member that is new to the department, applying for reappointment, promotion or tenure will meet with the department head to determine the appropriate schedule for peer evaluation of teaching. In consultation with the faculty member the Department Head will appoint three colleagues to form a peer evaluation committee. The Head will designate one of its members to serve as chairperson.

Example 2: Peer reviews should be conducted by teams of at least two peer reviewers, at least one of who has some expertise/training in peer review evaluation. The Head might provide the instructor with a list of potential internal peer reviewers from which the instructor may select several as agreeable. One of the peer reviewers should be external to the unit or group within the department. The peer reviewers will normally be of the same or higher rank as the candidate.

3. Initial meeting

Outline the protocol for an initial meeting with the faculty member.

Example: The chair of the teaching committee will set up a meeting to outline the procedures to be followed in the review. This should be done within the first month of the teaching term, in order to allow enough time for discussion and classroom observation. At the initial meeting, instructors will provide course materials, including schedules, syllabi and lab manuals (where applicable). Having a complete teaching dossier (or portfolio) available for this meeting is strongly recommended. This meeting is an opportunity for the instructor to discuss their instructional goals, identifying strengths, concerns, special considerations relevant to the course, and areas that the instructor would like to improve. At this meeting, the peer evaluation committee will review all relevant course materials and set up a strategy for classroom visits.

4. Classroom observation

Outline the protocol for the classroom observations.

Example: Each member of the peer evaluation committee will observe at least 1 teaching session of each course taught. For instance, a committee consisting of 3 members will observe at least 3 classes. In the case where more than one course is being taught, the committee will visit each course at least twice. In the case where laboratory instruction is a component of the instructor's teaching, the reviewers will be advised by the candidate what portion of the lab session is most appropriate for observation. The departmental classroom observation form will be used to help structure and standardize the evaluation of the Instructor's classroom performance. An example of this form is attached.

During the last 10 minutes, for one class in each course, a member of the committee will interview the class as a group, without the instructor present. In the case of lab instructors, the interview will take place in the lab. The committee member conducting the interview will state that the committee is interested in the students' views of the instructor effectiveness in the course, and that no student names will be recorded. The committee will ask the following questions:

“How does this instructor help you to learn?”

“Are there areas in which you would suggest improvement?”

5. Feedback to faculty member

Outline the protocol if necessary for any informal feedback to instructors.

Example: After the classroom visits, the committee or a subset of the committee meets with the instructor to provide informal feedback.

6. Peer Review of Teaching report

Outline the protocol for writing the teaching report. For most cases the teaching report becomes part of the summative assessment of teaching needed for promotion and tenure decisions.

Guidelines for developing a Peer Review of Teaching Report are outlined in Appendix 4.

Example 1: The committee will prepare a draft of the teaching report, which will be a summary of observations from the classroom visits, student interviews, the Faculty of Science student evaluations of teaching and supporting teaching materials. The report should address those criteria stipulated in the SAC Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC. The summative report needs to document the quantity of teaching of all kinds, a quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of student evaluations, a summary of peer evaluations, and a description of other major teaching activities.

The committee will send a draft copy of the teaching report to the instructor, with a request to review it and to send comments to the committee by a certain date. If the instructor submits comments, the committee will consider them. If the committee agrees with the comments, the report is modified to reflect them. If the committee does not agree with the comments, the instructor's comments are included as an addendum to the report. The final report will be submitted to the Head and to the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

Faculty of Science: Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines

Example 2: A final summative report (suggested two pages) should be written by the chair of the committee or the external reviewer based on the contributions of all reviewers and the criteria stipulated above. The other reviewers must sign off on the report indicating approval before being submitted to the Head. The final report would not contain attribution of comments to any specific reviewers, and any dissenting views from a consensus could be recorded. Instructors will have access to the final summative report, subject to the Head's discretion to protect confidentiality including that of students. The Head will arrange for a meeting with the instructor to discuss the results of the review, provide the instructor with the opportunity to respond and determine any follow-up if and as appropriate.

7. Protocol for Joint Appointments

Outline the protocol for faculty members who have joint appointments

Example: Instructors with joint appointments will be assessed by a committee made up of members from both departments (at least one member from each) appointed in consultation with the instructor and both department heads.

Appendix 2: Teaching Dossier Guidelines

A teaching dossier or portfolio is prepared to describe an instructor's educational values, practices and impact on students. Each dossier will be a unique document and can serve as evidence of teaching accomplishments. Some common components are listed below.

Statement of Teaching Philosophy

- Description of personal goals in teaching
- Explanation of the choice of teaching strategies
- Identification of teaching activities that support learning goals

Teaching Activities

- Identify number of courses taught, indicating level, format and size.
- Course Syllabi
 - Include course logistical information
 - Outlines course goals, objectives or learning outcomes
 - Outlines methods of student assessment and grading policies
- Examples of student assessment linked to learning outcomes
 - Assignments
 - Exams
 - Examples of feedback to students

Evidence of teaching effectiveness:

- Student evaluations and summary of student feedback, including comments
- Summary of student evaluations
 - Description of trends
 - Explanation of anomalies
 - Examples of incorporating feedback from students, peers

Other contributions/innovations

- Web site development
- Curriculum, course/lab development
- Publications at conferences, peer reviewed journals, etc.
- Outreach activities (High Schools, Science Fair, etc.)
- Advising including undergraduates, graduates and other instructors/faculty
- Supervision of graduate students, undergraduate research projects

Teaching Awards

- Examples of awards and other recognition

Professional development

- Examples of professional development including conferences, courses, workshops

Further resources:

CTLT UBC: <http://ctl.t.ubc.ca/resources/teaching/portfolios/>

Ohio State UCAT: http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html

Appendix 3: Teaching Evaluation Worksheet

Name of Instructor:	Course Number and Section:	Date:
----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------

Use this list of criteria as you are making notes on your observations.

1. Course Organization (from review of materials before observation)

- ◆ Learning goals and objectives are clearly defined and provided to the students
- ◆ Course expectations are clearly communicated to students
- ◆ Methods of assessment are outlined for students
- ◆ Learning goals, class activities, and assessments are aligned

How do the course materials demonstrate effective course organization? What could be improved?

2. Communication Skills

- ◆ Projects voice, with intonation; easily heard
- ◆ Demonstrates and stimulates enthusiasm for subject
- ◆ Provides varied explanations for complex and difficult material, using examples to clarify
- ◆ Defines unfamiliar terms, concepts and principles
- ◆ Uses humor appropriately

What did the instructor do that was most effective in communicating to the students? Did the instructor display a behavior that detracted from effective communication?

3. Interaction with Students

- ◆ Students are engaged in the lesson
- ◆ Instructor uses strategies to motivate students
- ◆ Instructor encourages student participation and questions
- ◆ Instructor responds to nonverbal cues of confusion, boredom and curiosity
- ◆ Instructor asks questions to monitor student progress
- ◆ Instructor responds appropriately to students' questions and comments
- ◆ Instructor is respectful in interactions with students
- ◆ Uses appropriate techniques to engage students

How did the instructor promote student engagement? How could student engagement be improved?

4. Class organization and Management

- ◆ Lesson relates to previous course material
- ◆ Lesson has appropriate introduction or bridge
- ◆ Lesson has a logical sequence
- ◆ Lesson is paced appropriately
- ◆ Instructor ensures a summary at end of lesson

How did the instructor demonstrate effective class organization and management? How could these be improved?

5. Instructional Materials

- ◆ Provides appropriate pre-class and/or follow up homework
- ◆ Provides appropriate amount of material for students to master
- ◆ Material is relevant to students
- ◆ Material is at a suitable level
- ◆ Material is current
- ◆ Instructor demonstrates command of subject matter

How do the materials provided support student learning? In what ways could they be more effective?

6. Feedback (from discussion with the instructor)

- ◆ Instructor provides appropriate feedback to students in class
- ◆ Instructor provides timely and useful feedback to students on homework or exams
- ◆ Instructor solicits feedback from students (e.g., informal or formal surveys)

What is the nature of feedback in the course? How could feedback mechanisms be improved?

OVERALL SUMMARY

1. What were the Instructor's major strengths demonstrated during this teaching session?

2. If applicable, identify aspects of the Instructor's teaching skills that could be improved? Provide suggestions on means of improving these skills.

Appendix 4: Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching Report

The Report should stand on its own and include:

- a description of procedures followed in gathering evidence
- a summary assessment of observations and other evidence
e.g., classroom visits, student interviews, student evaluations of teaching, teaching materials.

Summative Assessment Report: If the report is to be used for summative assessment for promotion and tenure the report should address those criteria stipulated in the SAC Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC.

SAC guidelines: "Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: 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. 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."

The summative report needs to be more specific in documenting:

- the quantity of teaching of all kinds,
- a description of other major teaching activities
- a review/assessment of the teaching dossier
- a quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of student evaluations,
- a summary of peer evaluations (of observations, interviews and materials, as above).

The report should be written by the chair of the teaching or peer review committee or the external reviewer based on the contributions of all reviewers and the criteria stipulated above. The final report should not contain attribution of comments to any specific reviewers, and any dissenting views from a consensus could be recorded. The other reviewers must sign off on the report indicating approval before being submitted to the Head.

Appendix 5: Guidelines for the Summative Assessment of Teaching

The Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) and Dean of Science requests that each candidate's file includes a summative assessment of the teaching dossier or portfolio and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator. Please note that individual letters summarizing the classroom visits by peer reviewers are no longer accepted by themselves; rather, a summary of these reports must be included within the body of the summative assessment or as a separate peer teaching report. The peer evaluations should consist of a minimum of three peers preferably four who have each attended at least two lectures or other teaching activity. The teaching report or summary must be an assessment of the most current teaching term possible. Typically, the Associate Head of Faculty Affairs, the chair of the Promotion/Tenure committee or the Teaching Evaluation committee with the input of the peer reviewers writes this assessment. The assessment should include the following sections (descriptions are provided in italics) and is normally 2-3 pages in length.

1. Description of the procedure:

Describe the nature of the review process in terms of who conducted the review, when and how the review took place and what material the reviewers evaluated.

2. Teaching load:

Include a quantitative summary of the amount of teaching performed by the candidate and how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms of the Department. If the amount of teaching in one or more particular areas does not meet the expected standards, an explanation should be included.

3. Student evaluations:

A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations is to be included.

Summary Table of Student Evaluations:

The template provided below should be used to present a summary with evaluations in teaching performance. The period covered should be since the candidate's appointment or last promotion. Please do not include the "bubble charts" as the table below takes the place of these. In addition, do not include the responses to the Faculty of Science Module (Questions 8-12).

Begin Table Template -->

The instructor was evaluated in the following courses using the Course Evaluation Teaching Questionnaire in which students rate instructors on the following attributes on scale of 1-5, and also provide written comments.

1. The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.
2. The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively
3. The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter
4. Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations etc.) was fair.
5. The instructor showed concern for student learning.
6. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

Faculty of Science: Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines

The average score (+/- standard deviation) for each of these attributes (Q1 to Q6 columns) are given below. Also provided is the Q6 average (+/- standard deviation) across all sections of the course taught in the previous three years and the number of such sections (Q6 Section Average). The overall Q6 average (+/- standard deviation) for courses taught at that level in the program (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th year or graduate level) is provided (Q6 Program Average).

Course	Session	Responses (Enrolled)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q6 Section Average (# sections)	Q6 Program Average (# courses)
BIOL 201	2012 W	45 (60)	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3 (10)	4.2 +/- 0.3 (32)

=====
 <--End Table Template

Student Comments:

The candidate has the right to add student comments to the file providing they were obtained through formal procedures. If the student comments are added, it must be a balanced and comprehensive set (rather than a selection by the candidate).

Assessment of Student Evaluations

A qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations will be included, and a description of how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department. If the candidate's student evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the expected standards, a comment or explanatory statement should be included.

4. Peer evaluations:

The summative peer evaluation should be from the most current teaching term possible.

A summary of qualitative peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels needs to be included as well as a statement regarding how these assessments compare to the expected standards of the Department. As an alternative, it is recommended that a separate peer evaluation of teaching report be attached and the overall summary stated in this section. Please see the Faculty of Science Peer Review of Teaching guidelines.

Overall, this section or an attached peer teaching report should summarize observations from the classroom visits (including strengths and weaknesses), student interviews (if carried out), and supporting teaching materials such as the teaching dossier. If the candidate's peer evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the normally expected standard, an explanation should be included.

5. Graduate (Undergraduate Research) Supervision:

A statement regarding the candidate's performance as a graduate student supervisor in terms of the student's degree completion, time to completion, publications with students, research awards, and subsequent professional success of trainees. This section can also include supervision of undergraduate research such as B.Sc. directed research and Honours theses. For Instructors and Senior Instructors, professional mentoring of TAs could be included along with membership on thesis committees.

Some departments choose the option of including confidential interviews with current or previous graduate students of the faculty member being evaluated. The promotion and tenure committee or the Department Head will the confidential interview to determine the quality of instruction and support being provided such as accessibility, feedback on work, career support and any concerns. In the case of appointment to Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching, if laboratory instruction is the primary responsibility, the committee could interview the TAs involved in the lab.

6. Other teaching or educational activities:

A description of any other major teaching or educational activities performed by the candidate, along with statements supported by summarized evidence regarding the candidate's effectiveness and the importance of these activities may be included. In addition, such activities as curriculum development, program or course direction, development of instructional materials (textbooks, course packages) or websites, and successful grant applications for course development can be identified, as well as examples of leadership in course/instructional or curriculum development. Outreach and/or courses taught outside of UBC should be listed including the institutions and the impact. This section could also include advising activities including undergraduates, graduates and other instructors.

7. Awards:

A list and brief description of any teaching and mentorship awards or other recognition of teaching excellence the candidate has received.

8. Professional Development:

A list and brief description of any special efforts undertaken to improve teaching performance through UBC (such as TAG, CTLT) or outside programs, such as participation in teaching conferences or workshops.

9. Other evidence:

Include a summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching. Examples might include: leadership in teaching initiatives within UBC and outside of UBC, national professional accreditation of a training program the candidate directs; recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field; conference presentations; or publications on the scholarship of teaching.

10. Overall summary:

Provide an overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university teacher and educator and describe how this compares to the expected norm for the Department.