UBC SCHOOL OF KINESIOLOGY

PEER MENTORING PROGRAM

PEER MENTORING OF TEACHING

MENTORS HANDBOOK

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Benefits of a Mentoring Program

- Provide a forum for sharing wisdom and experience among faculty members.
- Facilitate a team approach to successful development of junior faculty.
- Develop skills in mentees and other junior faculty to enable them to become future mentors.
- Experience professional and personal growth and renewal

Benefits to the Mentee

- Expand their view of the University
- Receive honest and informal feedback
- Receive advice on how to balance teaching, research, and other responsibilities and set professional priorities
- Obtain knowledge of informal rules for advancement (as well as political and substantive pitfalls to be avoided)
- Understand how to build a circle of friends and contacts both within and outside one's department or team
- Provide a perspective on long-term career planning
- Increase communication about what is happening in other areas of the University
- Expand professional and personal growth …. competence, identity, and effectiveness as a professional
- Provide an outlet to discuss concerns
- Increase their value to the university
- Provide a successful and productive integration to the University

Role of the Teaching Mentor

- In a professional, supportive and collegial manner, provide constructive feedback and assistance in a variety of issues related to TEACHING. These include; the design of course materials (course outlines, graded assignments, evaluation and grading, curriculum development), and may also include observation of lessons and other pedagogical formats and activities for formative (developmental) purposes
- Assist in the production of a positive teaching report (teaching portfolio/dossier) which may eventually be used in regards to contract renewal, promotion and tenure
- Assist the new faculty member in orienting to the School and University policies related to teaching
- Be willing to meet with mentees a minimum of three times per term to discuss progress and problem areas
- Document meetings and file in mentee's file;
- Maintain confidentiality regarding shared information
- Provide information on Faculty/University programs in support of professional development in education and teaching. e.g. TAG and orient mentees with available resources related to teaching
- Acquaint mentee with University and school policies related to teaching (e.g. exams, invigilation, grade submission).

Responsibility and Expectations of Mentees

1. Accept personal responsibility for career development
2. Be open to suggestions, advice, feedback;
3. Listen and ask questions;
4. Be open about thoughts and feelings, provide feedback on what works and what doesn't;
5. Undertake honest self-assessment regularly;
6. Share mistakes and perceived areas for improvement;
7. Identify barriers to goal achievement and provide potential solutions
8. Maintain confidentiality of relationship; and commit time and energy to mentor/mentee relationship
9. Meet regularly with the mentor
10. Ask for and give feedback
11. Take responsibility for own growth and success
12. Follow through on referrals from mentor to appropriate office for specific information
13. Ask your mentor for guidance and assistance whenever it is needed
14. Present needs in an articulate way

Characteristics (Qualifications) of Teaching Mentors in the School of Kinesiology

- Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, Senior Instructor
- Interested in being a mentor;
- Not in a position to evaluate the mentee
- Understand departmental and faculty organization, academic procedures and possible sources of external support;
- Aware of, and knowledgeable about resources that will assist new faculty
- Willing to make time for mentoring endeavour (minimum 3 meetings per year);
- Approachable, empathic, non-judgmental, and supportive.
- Able to provide appraisal and formative feedback;
- Able to advocate for mentee, as appropriate
- Ideally, to be aware of, and knowledgeable about, the content area of the mentees assigned courses

Goals of the School of Kinesiology Peer Mentoring of Teaching Program[1]

Peer reviews of teaching are intended to provide a professional and collegial perspective to continually improve the *quality of instruction,* which is highly valued in the School of Kinesiology. They are part of ongoing professional development in teaching that supplement instructor orientations, student evaluations (SCETs), teaching dossiers, teaching mentoring, Teaching and Academics Growth (TAG) programs, and related activities. The peer reviews are designed to: i) provide constructive feedback to instructors on their teaching (formative evaluation), and ii) lay the groundwork for a positive teaching report for purposes of contract renewal and promotion and tenure as set out in the 2006-2010 UBC Collective Agreement (summative evaluation). *Course content* is best considered by other means such as evaluations of teaching dossiers and curriculum reviews.

[1] Approved: School Meeting, November 5, 2007; Amendment approved to expand Section 3. Course Materials, p. 2: School Meeting, November 15, 2007.

Best practices

The peer review of teaching evaluation is informed by best practices in teaching, while recognizing variation in successful teaching styles, contexts, and modes of delivery, especially given the varied course content in the School of Kinesiology. According to TAG, best practices include: clarity in learning outcomes, linking learning outcomes to assessment, introducing the relevance of class material, effectively organizing and presenting it, ensuring students understand it, encouraging student engagement, using audio-visual materials effectively, demonstrating concern for student learning, managing the classroom, and summarizing major points. The instructor and peer evaluators may identify additional best practices to be considered given the unique nature of the class being observed. [1]

Components of either type of review may include course materials, student evaluations, course portfolios, teaching portfolios, documentation of teaching philosophy, teacher self-assessments, classroom observations, and other activities which may be appropriate to a discipline. *Formative evaluation* describes activities that are to provide teachers with information that they can use to improve their teaching. The information is intended for their personal use, rather than public inspection. As a result, formative evaluation frequently is less formal, focuses on specific aspects of teaching, is ongoing, and includes a wide range of activities. It is a basis for the development of effective teaching throughout a career.

While many of the procedures and techniques involved in Formative mentoring can also be applied to Summative Peer Reviews of teaching, it is essential that Teaching Mentors recognize the differences and carry out their roles accordingly.
Formative reviews of teaching do NOT involve evaluation, they are NOT hierarchical , in the sense that the mentor is not in a superior relationship to the mentee.Formative peer reviews are NOT USED for issues related to Promotion and Tenure.

Rather, the mentor serves as a person to facilitate, help, support, and encourage the mentee in order to improve teaching skills and other issues related to teaching. The relationship should be one of equality and collaboration in which the mentee plays a critical role in determining, in collaboration with the Mentor, the focus and the methodology involved in the observations of teaching.

In Summative Reviews, in which Promotion and Tenure are major considerations, the Teacher is evaluated, the criteria and the tools used to evaluate teaching must be consistent and these reviews must involve more than one reviewer.

In summary, both Teaching Mentors and Mentees must be clear about the purposes of teaching reviews. Faculty involved in Peer Summative Reviews should read carefully the University and School guidelines contained in Appendix 4 of this handbook.

Review of Course Materials

For formative (developmental) reviews, reading any course materials can enable the reviewer or mentor to see the instructor's teaching philosophy in action. Reviewing materials is unobtrusive, can take place at a time and place suitable to the schedule of the reviewer, and the amount of information that can be gained is significant. The instructor may request that specific items are reviewed for specific reasons or a general approach may be taken. Some examples of the use of course materials are listed below:

- Tests and exams - level of learning goals

- Graded tests, written work, or projects - level of learning goals, achievement of learning goals, and how the instructor provides feedback
- Syllabus - logical organization, content, rigor, and expectations, links between learning outcomes and assessment tools
- Appropriateness of course objectives and instructional materials
- Appropriate methodology for teaching specific sections of courses
- Course organization
- Student achievement based on exams, projects, presentations, and reports
- Homework assignments, textbooks, and handouts

Criteria for Effective Teaching

Effective Teaching: Principles and Practice
(Report of the UBC Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Teaching Quality, Effectiveness and Evaluation, May 1999)

- Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning
- Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners
- Communicates and interacts effectively with students
- Attends to intellectual growth of students
- Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students
- Incorporates learning beyond the classroom
- Reflects on, monitors and improves teaching practice

General Guidelines for Peer Teaching Mentors

- Peer Reviewers should attempt to develop observational skills prior to observing a class
- A single classroom observation by one rater is not a reliable indicator of teaching quality,
- Pre-observation information is essential to provide contextual information,
- Observers should try to be as unobtrusive as possible
- The observer should complete post observation notes, forms, or other reports while the information is fresh
- Observing over a substantial amount of time is needed to allow the teacher and the students to relax

Conducting Classroom Observations

All Peer reviews of teaching should include a Pre-observation meeting and a Post-observation meeting. Prior to the pre-observation meeting, mentees should provide observers with a current course syllabus and an outline of the class to be observed. This information will be helpful in understanding the focus of the class, the instructional objectives being delivered and the expected student outcomes.

When to Observe

Decisions about dates for classroom visits should be made jointly by the mentor and the mentee as early in the semester as possible in order to avoid scheduling conflicts later. Two visits per term -- one early and one late in the semester -- are ideal so that development can be tracked. If video cameras will be present in classrooms at any point, both mentor and mentee should agree to the use of video and the mentee should be assured that the tape will not be used to evaluate them in any way.

The Pre-Observation Meeting should occur in close proximity to the actual observation date. During the pre-conference, the mentee and the mentor will discuss the purpose of the observation, the overall process of the observation, the instructional objective(s) for the instructional session to be observed, the strategies used to accomplish the objective(s), and the criteria that will be used during the observation.

Examples of Pre-Observation questions/discussion

- Where are you in the course (syllabus and/or class outline submitted)?
- What is/are your objective(s) for the lesson to be observed?
- What teaching methods do you plan to use?
- What student outcomes are you teaching for in this class?
- Are there any particular teaching/learning behaviors that you especially want me to focus on?
- How are you going to know if the students have learned the objective(s)?
- What special characteristics of the students do you want me to be aware of?

The Observer's Role during the Classroom Visit

The mentor is expected to spend at least 50 minutes observing. On the day of the classroom visit, the mentor should arrive early to see if the mentee has any last-minute thoughts, questions, or ideas about what she or he would like the observer to focus on during the visit.

Mentors should explain to mentees what they will be doing during the classroom visit. Most faculty prefer that the observer remain as unobtrusive as possible, sitting quietly to one side and taking notes to draw upon later. Where appropriate, the mentee should publicly note the presence of the visitor and encourage students to carry on as usual.

Many mentors de-mystify the process by creating, together with the mentee, a checklist of the most important skills needed for effective teaching. If a jointly-created checklist is used over repeated observations, the list can be reviewed by the mentor and the mentee teacher before each observation. However, it is important to determine, and agree upon, how the checklist will be "used" (i.e. simply as a reminder of the important teaching categories, or as an actual rating sheet). Actual "ratings" should be rendered only when agreed upon by both parties. An alternative to ratings is to have the mentee identify two or three main teaching areas or questions on which they would like the observation to focus. Another alternative is for the observer to take narrative notes on the class, transcribing as accurately as possible what is said and done. This narrative can then be used in much the same way as a videotape might. -During the observation, a variety of approaches can be used to focus the observation from checklist to open ended questions. In the case of Summative Peer Reviews in the School of Kinesiology, reviewers should use the criteria as listed in the School of Kinesiology Peer Review of Teaching Form and Criteria as approved by the School at the November 07 2007 School Meeting. (see Appendix). Pratt(2009) recommends that Peer Summative reviews should focus more on the substantive aspects of teaching such as command over subject matter, familiarity with developments in the field and the relationship between goals and the assessment of learning. *Whether the observer is*

conductive a formative or a summative review, the mentee can ask the observer to focus on and provide feedback on any aspect of their teaching that they choose.

Analyzing the Results and Preparing for the Post-Observation Meeting

As soon as possible after the observation, it is suggested that evaluators code the information contained in their notes. Identify data that corresponds to the criteria used during the observation. While information from the mentee will be important to consider before finalizing the report, the mentor should have specific comments concerning the criteria prepared prior to the Post Observation meeting.

The Post-Observation Conference

Debriefing sessions should be conducted as soon after the classroom visit as possible. If it is not possible to meet immediately after the section, a time for the follow-up session should be arranged and the observer should offer the mentee a few words of praise before leaving. When the mentor and the mentee do sit down to review the session, the mentee should always be allowed to offer their first impressions. Where possible a socratic approach should be used to direct the discussion Self-assessment is the primary means through which improvement takes place. After the self-assessment, the observer may then offer his or her feedback. During the post-conference, the goal is not just to report to the faculty member your observations, but it can also be used to structure a dialogue about teaching and learning. Observers should describe what they saw, taking care to avoid critical or evaluative language and limiting constructive criticism to the two or three most salient areas. If a second classroom visit is scheduled for later in the semester, the observer and mentee should identify two or three areas that the mentee will track and work on during the term and follow up on these areas during the later visit. It is important that that the discussion focus on the areas of focus as identified in the Pre-Observation Conference. Other aspects of the lesson should only be discussed if the mentee asks for feedback on other aspects of the lesson.

Examples and suggestions for post-observation discussion[2]

Part I: Teacher Reflection

1. In light of your instructional objectives, how do you think the class went?
2. Did the students learn what you wanted them to? How do you know?
3. Were the choices of teaching methods or strategies effective? How do you know?
4. Were the materials you used helpful? How do you know?
5. If you could teach this lesson over again to the same class:
    a. What would you do differently? Why?
    b. What would you do the same? Why?
6. Did the lesson proceed in the way you had planned? Why?
7. Did the students react to the lesson in the way you thought they would?
8. During the lesson, did you feel confident and enthusiastic? Why?
9. Do you think the students learned all that you wanted them to learn in this session? What brings you to that conclusion?
10. What did you do to encourage the students to actively participate in the lesson?
11. What did you learn about teaching from this class?
12. What did you learn about student learning from this class?
13. What targets for improvement have you set yourself for this class, and are they realistic?

Reflecting on the Class as a Whole

1. What are the objectives of this class? How are the students made aware of these objectives? To what extent do you think the objectives are met?
2. What do you think are the students' attitudes about the class or particular activities? How are these attitudes made apparent?
3. What evidence of student learning can be noted in this class?
4. What did you like best about this class? Why did it go so well? What was most disappointing about the class? Why?
5. What one or two things about this class seem to support student learning?
6. What one or two things about this class seem to interfere with student learning?
7. What one or two things would you change about this class?

Reflecting on Presentation Skills

1. What is done to inform students about the sequence of content/activities?
2. What does the instructor do to help students recognize important ideas/concepts?
3. Note the examples used during the presentation. Do they help clarify the concept? Why or why not? Will they help students remember the concept?
4. What does the instructor do to help students appreciate the relevance of the content/skills they are learning?
5. What is being done to engage the students in the presentation?

---

[2] Adapted from: Killen, R. (1995) "Improving Teaching Through Reflective Partnerships." *To Improve the Academy*

Reflecting on Interaction and Rapport

1. How would you describe the instructor/student relationship? What incidents support that description?
2. What is done to encourage/discourage participation? Consider some of the following: verbal and nonverbal reinforcement given by instructor and/or students, amount and kind of guidance provided for activities, amount of wait time after questions, wording of questions.
3. What questions were asked (or which activities were provided) to monitor student progress?
4. What questions were asked (or which activities were provided) to stimulate thinking and discussion?
5. What is the general interaction pattern? (e.g., Instructor-student? Student-instructor? Student-student? Instructor-group?)
6. What is the ratio of teacher talk to student talk?
7. Which students are participating? (Try charting participation for a class period. Create a seating chart and mark each time an individual participates in the class. At the end of the class use the chart to answer the following questions: Which individual participated the most? What percentage of the overall participation was done by that individual? What percentage of the overall participation was done by the three or four most verbally active participants? What percentage of students did not participate at all? Can any generalizations be made about the nonparticipants?)

Examples of Constructive, Discipline-Specific Feedback

1. Your use of humor, as when you told the "see me after class" joke to illustrate the importance of context, created a relaxed atmosphere.
2. Students participated eagerly. In fact, fifteen hands shot up when you asked for a definition of "aerobic threshold."
3. Your contrast between closed and open skills using two specific demonstrations helped students appreciate the difference in these concepts .
4. Your discussion of field work methods vs. survey research seemed unfocused until you gave three concrete illustrations.

Example of Concrete Suggestions for Improvement

1. I could not see your illustration of a hasse diagram clearly from the back of the room. Perhaps you could consider a larger drawing, an overhead projector, or a handout.
2. Do you think that the students seemed unusually tense during the questions related to constructivist and behavioural methodology?. Have you thought about using U tube or other tools to illustrate the difference in these approaches
3. Some students seemed uncertain about the material when you discussed quantitative and qualitative research designs. Some examples from the work of current Hkin faculty or grad students might facilitate student comprehension of these designs.

APPENDIX 1: Sample Topics For Discussion

Sample Topics for Faculty Mentors to discuss with New Faculty regarding Issues Related to Teaching

Library, Bookstore, Information Technology

1. Which list serves should I belong to (and URL bookmarks)?
2. What library resources are there? How do I get the library to order materials? To whom do I complain if my journal is cancelled? How soon must I order reserve materials? [What services are provided by the library ?
3. Who is the library liaison for the faculty?
4. How do I order texts from the bookstore?
5. How do I get e-mail/internet?
6. Who is the IT contact person?
7. What is a UBC card, why do I need it, and how do I get it?
8. Who do I talk to regarding course web sites

Issues related to School of Kinesiology Courses

1. Where do I find information regarding the KIN core, program streams?
2. How do I know if I have transfer students in my class and what year, programs, or faculties students are registered in?
3. How do I access my course list
4. Who can tell me about grading policies?
5. Is there a special format for course outlines?
6. Who can I ask to help me develop my course, design graded work such as assignments and exams?
7. Does the School have a special contact person in the library and in the bookstore?
8. How do I order text books and Custom Course Packages?
9. What are the polices of the advising office? Where is it?
10. What are the regulations regarding copyright?
11. What are the university policies regarding plagiarism and cheating?
12. With whom do I discuss student behaviour issues?
13. What is the Access to Diversity Centre?
14. Do I have to teach summer courses?
15. What resources are available to help me develop my teaching skills?
16. How is my teaching evaluated? By students? By administrators?

APPENDIX 2: Teaching Resources

Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth (TAG)
http://www.tag.ubc.ca/

Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth –Guide for New Faculty
www.tag.ubc.ca/programs/documents/**NewFacultyGuide**_Final.pdf

Preparing Teaching Dossiers and Teaching Portfolios
www.tag.ubc.ca/resources/teachingportfolios/dossiers/ -

Web CT and E Learning

Tom Neville School of Kinesiology tom.neville@ubc.ca
UBC http://www.elearning.ubc.ca

School of Kinesiology Instructor Resources
http://www.kin.educ.ubc.ca/instructor-resources

Libraries and Library Support
www.libraray.ubc.ca

Access Diversity
www. students.ubc.ca/access/drc.cfm

APPENDIX 3: Evaluation criteria

SCHOOL OF KINESIOLOGY

(SUMMATIVE) PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM & AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM

Name and Rank of Instructor:	Course Name and Number:
Name and Rank of Evaluator:	Date of Peer Review :
Selection of Evaluator: [ ] Evaluator Chosen by Instructor [ ] Evaluator appointed by Director	Class Location:
Nature of Peer Review: [ ] New faculty members and sessionals – 1st year of teaching [ ] Sessionals – teaching a new course after 1st year of teaching [ ] New faculty members – 3 year review [ ] New faculty members – 5 year review [ ] New faculty members – tenure and promotion [ ] Tenured faculty members – promotion to Associate or Full Professor [ ] Other: _____	Nature of Presentation Observed (e.g., lecture, tutorial, discussion groups, performance analysis, graduate seminar, etc.). Please describe:
Class Size: # enrolled: # in attendance:	Duration of Class:
Describe materials provided by the instructor prior to the peer review:	Signatures indicate the instructor and evaluator have met to discuss this peer review of teaching: Instructor: Evaluator: Date:

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM

Instructions:

- The peer evaluator should fill out one form per class visit.
- The instructor should introduce the peer evaluator and briefly explain that class visits are done by colleagues because the School highly values teaching. Students should be informed that they will have an opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor on the SCET forms at another time.

Note:

- The scales for items 1-10 are the same as the SCET student evaluation form scales used in the Faculty of Education.
- TAG will offer workshops on peer reviews of teaching to academic units upon request.
- Examples are provided below under each-sub-heading that illustrate each *peer evaluation criteria.* Additional examples can be added by the instructor or peer evaluators by specifying them in "other".

Peer Evaluation Criteria

1. The course materials are appropriate.

- Course outline contains clear learning objectives, appropriate assigned readings, evaluation procedures, and policies (e.g., regarding late assignments).
- Course materials are appropriate for the level of the class.
- Assignments and exams effectively assess stated learning objectives and indicate how feedback will be provided to students.
- Materials provided in other formats are effective (e.g., WebCT).
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

2. The instructor gave an appropriate opening or introduction to the class.

- The instructor explained how today's topic fits into the course.
- The instructor provided a clear overview of what students were expected to learn during the class period.
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

3. The class was well organized and planned.

- The instructor was well prepared and well organized
- Any examples, diagrams, demonstrations, etc. were helpful.
- Any hand-outs (downloadable or hard copies) were clear.
- The material was provided in a clear, logical sequence.
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

4. Class material was effectively presented.

- The level of teaching was appropriate to the students' abilities/background and the level of the course.
- The instructor was able to elaborate when necessary to increase students' comprehension of material (e.g., when asked questions).
- The instructor's voice was clear, loud enough, the tone was varied, and eye contact was made with the class.
- The instructor presented the material in an intellectually stimulating manner.
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

5. The instructor enhanced student engagement.

- Questions or comments were encouraged to promote student-instructor interactions.
- The instructor clearly phrased questions to foster critical thinking.
- Methods of student participation were used to enrich educational experiences (e.g., small groups discussions, presentations, problems solving, hands on learning, performance analysis, etc.).
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

6. Audio-visual materials were effective.

- The instructor used audio-visual aids that complemented session content.
- Prepared slides and overheads were effective.
- The writing on the overhead/chalk board was clear and large enough.
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

7. The instructor demonstrates concern for student learning.

- The instructor acknowledged or praised student responses in a non-intimidating manner.
- The instructor checked occasionally to ensure students understand class material.
- A wide range of opinions were given respectful consideration.
- Other (please specify):_____

Rating:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

8. Classroom management.

- The instructor effectively dealt with any problems that arose that could adversely affect learning

(e.g., inappropriate student behaviour).

- Sufficient time was provided to students to respond to questions asked.
- Ground rules set at the beginning of the term were enforced as needed (e.g., use of cell phones, talking or interrupting at inappropriate times).
- The class started and finished on time.
- Other (please specify): _____

Rating:							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

9.The instructor concluded the session effectively.

- Major points were summarized by the instructor or students.
- The closing was appropriate (e.g., referred to next class or upcoming assignments, etc.).
- Other (please specify): _____

Rating:							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	Disagree Very Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Very Strongly

Comments that explain the rating:

10. Overall rating of the *quality of instruction* observed:

[ ] Excellent
[ ] Very Good
[ ] Good
[ ] Adequate
[ ] Less than adequate
[ ] Poor
[ ] Very Poor

Comments that explain the overall rating:

APPENDIX 4: Process for Summative Evaluation

Approved: School Meeting, November 5, 2007; Amendment approved to expand Section 3. Course Materials, p. 2: School Meeting, November 15, 2007.

1. Peer Evaluators. As stipulated in the UBC Guide to Promotion & Tenure Procedures (2007/08, p. 8), i) peer evaluators should be familiar with the instructional content area, and ii) peer evaluations will normally consist of reports from at least two colleagues who have each attended at least two lectures or other teaching activities (deviations from this should be explained in the Head's P&T letter). Normally, the Director will assign one peer evaluator per course when an instructor is being peer reviewed.

One peer evaluator will be selected by the Director. The instructor will provide two names and the Director will select a second evaluator from this list (based on availability, workload, content fit, etc.) The peer evaluators will normally be of the same or higher rank and may consist of instructors within and outside the School. In cases of contract and tenure and promotion reviews, junior faculty members are not expected to review senior faculty members. Following University policy, Senior Instructors are considered senior faculty.

2. Courses and classes to be peer reviewed. The Director will inform the instructor and peer evaluator at the start of the term in which peer reviews are to take place and provide them with copies of the Peer Review of Teaching Procedures and Evaluation Form. The instructor will select the courses (e.g., large required undergraduate courses, graduate seminars, performance analysis) and classes (e.g., lectures, tutorials, labs) *that are representative of diverse types of teaching done*, for approval by the Director.

3. Course materials. At the beginning of the term when a peer review is to occur, the instructor will provide the peer evaluator with background information including a course outline, assessment tools, reading list, and any other information deemed relevant. [Added November 15, 2007] If applicable, the instructor should provide the peer evaluator with access to the course WebCT site and inform him/her of materials on the site that are relevant to the peer review process, including power point presentations, assignments, and so forth.

4. Scheduling peer reviews and follow-up meetings. The peer evaluator will review the course materials and contact the instructor to arrange i) two visits to class, and ii) a follow-up two-way meeting to discuss the peer evaluation. The peer evaluator and/or instructor may request a meeting before the class visits to seek clarification and additional information, as required. For example, instructors may have specific areas that they would like constructive feedback (e.g., small group discussions may not be working as well as expected).

Normally, the class visits and follow-up meeting should occur during weeks 4-8 of the academic term, or in weeks 3-4 for half term courses (to allow instructors time to develop a comfort level with the class and receive feedback from colleagues before the term ends). The instructor will be provided with copies of the completed Peer Review of Teaching Forms (one per visit) at least 48 hours prior to the follow-up two-way meeting and can seek clarification, request further information, and respond to the evaluation at that time.

5. Signatures and Instructor response. The instructor and peer evaluator will date and sign the Peer Review of Teaching Form to indicate they have met to discuss it. Within 2 weeks of the follow-up meeting, the instructor will provide a written response to the Director outlining their action plan for ongoing instructional professional development (normally one page max). The peer reviews and action plans will be reviewed by the Personnel Committee and/or the Director and additional feedback may be given to the instructor at that time.

Report of the UBCV Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching April 17th, 2009

Peer review of teaching is a well established practice in many educational settings, including UBC. It is often used in conjunction with other forms of assessment of teaching effectiveness to inform practice and support administrative decision-making. It is widely recognized that peer review has important formative value; it also can support effective summative evaluation of teaching. Peer reviews, both formative and summative, have been conducted at UBC for a long time but the process has not been guided by a clearly articulated set of principles that would ensure a desired level of consistency across the university[1]. This document outlines such principles to guide development of unit-specific procedures and practices of peer review and includes implementation guidelines that provide some detail on what these process and practices may entail.

In September 2008, a Peer Review Working Group[2] was established with a mandate to formulate a set of principles/guidelines for peer review at UBC Vancouver that would acknowledge and respect the diversity of teaching and learning contexts and cultures of different Faculties while introducing a greater degree of consistency in the approaches to peer review and related procedures across the university.

The Group identified the following key purposes and benefits of peer review of teaching:

- Contribution to reflection on teaching and professional development of faculty members.
- Increased awareness of the value of teaching within the university.
- Positively impact the quality of teaching and student learning experience.
- Identification of teaching development needs of faculty members.
- Enhanced evidence to support assessment of teaching for decision-making purposes (regarding tenure, promotion, career progress, merit, PSA, teaching awards, etc.).

The Working Group acknowledged the paramount value of formative peer review and peer mentoring, especially towards the achievement of the professional development goals and resulting gains in the quality of teaching at UBC V. Consequently, it strongly endorsed them as aspects of academic culture that should be encouraged and permeate all academic units across the university. The Group acknowledged the value in academic units developing or adopting formative peer review practices and models of peer mentoring that build on best practice within their disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts. It identified a role for the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth in providing advice and support to units, as necessary, in implementing effective formative peer review and mentoring approaches.

Recognizing that when colleagues' review and feedback are used in the context of decision-making about re-appointment, tenure or promotion, the process must be fair and equitable across

---

[1] "the university" refers in this document to UBC Vancouver

[2] For Group membership please see Appendix 1

the university (UBCV), the Group's work focused on the Summative Peer Review. The UBC Faculty Collective Agreement makes a reference to "assessment by colleagues" and calls for implementation of "formal procedures" whenever "opinions of ...colleagues are sought" relevant to one's teaching[3]. The UBCV Senate Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (May 2007) also calls for "an overall teaching evaluation system" that includes different forms of assessment, such as regular peer review, to be considered alongside evaluations performed by the students. In this context, the Group proceeded with discussions informed by examples of current practice and research findings on effective peer review to formulate the following set of Principles of Summative Peer Review recommended for adoption at UBCV.

Principles of Summative Peer Review[4]

1. **Accuracy**
   a) Process and criteria for peer review are appropriately selected, clearly articulated, and consistently implemented;
   b) Criteria for peer review are consistent with other performance review requirements so that rigorous and credible peer reviews may serve multiple purposes;
   c) Peer review teams should include reviewers who are trained/possess relevant expertise (both disciplinary and in peer evaluation) to offer reliable and valid assessments;
   d) Adequate attention is given to all relevant facets of teaching (including but not limited to observation of classroom instruction, development of curriculum materials, innovation in pedagogy, etc.) and a representative sampling of the relevant evidence is ensured;
   e) Criteria are established to define what constitutes evidence of effective teaching and that evidence is adequately documented.

2. **Integrity**:
   a) More than one reviewer is involved in peer review;
   b) Roles of formative mentor and summative reviewer are separated;
   c) Independent observation/assessments are conducted by the reviewers, but a team approach is adopted when writing the final peer review report;
   d) Sources of bias are identified and mitigated against, as much as possible (e.g., through involvement of arms-length reviewers; team approach; etc.);
   e) Integrity can be enhanced by involvement of an external reviewer charged with drafting the peer review report based on the input of all assessors;
   f) The report is reviewed and ideally agreed on by all the reviewers; dissenting views are clearly recorded;
   g) Confidentiality of individual reviewer's assessments and comments is maintained;
   h) Reviewers are bound to ethical conduct while performing peer reviews;
   i) Consistency of peer review practice within the unit (Faculty/School/Department) is ensured.

---

[3] *Collective Agreement between the University of British Columbia and Faculty Association of the University of British Columbia, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2010*, Art. 4.02, p.72

[4] It should be noted that many of these principles also apply to effective formative peer review and their consideration in the development of formative peer review practices within the units is strongly encouraged.

3. **Transparency**:
   a) Every academic unit should develop or adopt clearly articulated policies and procedures for peer review that are consistent with the principles outlined in this document. Such policies and procedures should be readily available to faculty members in the unit;
   b) The process of peer review should be communicated to the faculty member at the onset of each summative peer review cycle;
   c) Department/Unit Head is required to provide feedback to the faculty member on his/her review results;
   d) Faculty members are to have access to the summary peer review report in the same way they would have access to external peer assessments of research;
   e) The evidence relied upon should be well documented.

4. **Diversity**:
   a) These principles and implementation guidelines should be implemented with sensitivity to the unit (Faculty/School/Department) academic/disciplinary culture and teaching contexts (i.e., type of course, discipline-relevant pedagogy, etc.);
   b) The review team will take into consideration gender, ethnicity, and other such factors which might influence the review. If a faculty member has concerns about such factors, he or she should identify the concerns to the review team.

5. **Credibility**:
   a) Accuracy, integrity, and respect for diversity contribute to credibility of peer reviews;
   b) Consistency of implementation of peer reviews within academic units as well as adherence to the principles/guidelines university-wide (UBC V) help ensure credibility of peer reviews.
   c) Peer reviews must be based on rigorous evidence and conclusions should follow logically from the evidence presented.
   d) Peer reviews should be conducted and completed in a timely manner.

6. **Usefulness:**
   a) Every summative peer review should be reviewed by the Department/Unit Head and by the faculty member being reviewed and strategies devised, as appropriate, to support faculty member's teaching development;
   b) Should the summative peer review trigger a concern, the faculty member and/or the Department/Unit Head should have an opportunity to request a follow-up formative review(s).
   c) Consistent with related UBC policies, summative peer reviews of teaching should be considered in decision-making related to re-appointment, tenure, promotion, career progress, merit, PSA, and other opportunities for recognition within the unit (Faculty/School/Department) and/or the University.

Implementation Guidelines for Summative Peer Review:

1. Summative peer reviews should complement, rather than replace, ongoing faculty mentoring and formative peer reviews.
2. The summative peer review team should consist of no fewer than two evaluators, at least one of whom has training/expertise relevant to the evaluation of teaching.
3. A pool of trained/expert reviewers in peer evaluation will need to be developed within Faculties. These reviewers should be paired with assessors from individual units to support the process and make it more feasible, especially for small departments. Large departments may develop their own pools of reviewers with both disciplinary and peer review expertise.
4. Normally, the frequency of peer review for tenured faculty should be every five years and at least two reviews should be performed for pre-tenured faculty and for those seeking promotion. Additional periodic formative reviews within a mentoring framework should be encouraged.
5. The peer review process has to be appropriately resourced. In particular, faculty reviewers' time and training costs have to be addressed.
6. Support for reviewer training needs to be provided by the university through the Office of Teaching and Academic Growth (TAG).
7. Each Faculty or department, as appropriate, needs to develop its own peer review procedure/protocol reflective of the culture of the Faculty/School/Department, based on "best practice" within the field and consistent with the university guidelines.
8. It is the responsibility of the Dean or Principal to ensure that the process is implemented within the Faculty and it is the responsibility of the Department/Unit Head or Director to administer the process within his/her unit.
9. Each summative review process should be concluded in a timely fashion
10. Results of summative peer review should be integrated into a broader teaching performance assessment. Peer reviewers should not be asked to provide recommendations regarding tenure, promotion, merit, PSA, etc. as part of their report.
11. A more complete and thorough review of teaching performance and materials that results in a narrative report should be used for promotion and tenure review, reporting for merit consideration, and/or for teaching award nomination.
12. Unit (Faculty/School/Department)-based policies and procedures should be shared and periodically reviewed, as appropriate.

Appendix 1
Peer Review of Teaching Working Group Membership

Name	Title
Dr. Ian Cavers	Associate Dean, Science
Dr. Simon Ellis	Program Director, Wood Science Dept., Forestry
Dr. David Fielding (Alt. for R. Sindelar)	Associate Dean, Academic, Pharmaceutical Sciences
Dr. Karen Gardner	Clinical Assistant Professor, Dentistry
Dr. Robert Hall	Associate Dean, Engineering Students Mining Engineering, Applied Science
Dr. Anna Kindler (Chair)	Vice Provost & AVP Academic Affairs
Dr. Dominic Lopes	Associate Dean, Philosophy Dept., Arts
Dr. Louise Nasmith	Principal, College of Health Disciplines
Dr. Linda Peterson	Interim Director, Div. of Educational Support & Development, Medicine
Dr. Gary Poole	Director, Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth
Dr. Dan Pratt	Professor, Department of Educational Studies
Dr. Thomas Ross	Sr. Associate Dean, Professor of Business Economics, Sauder
Dr. Robert Sindelar	Dean, Pharmaceutical Sciences
Dr. Robert Tierney	Dean, Faculty of Education
Ms. Fran Watters	Director, Faculty Relations
Dr. Claire Young	Sr. Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, Faculty of Law

REFERENCES

Chism, Nancy Van Note *(1999)* Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook Anker Publishing, Bolton MA.

Lee Adrian, Dennis Carina, Campbell Philip (2007) Nature. Nature's Guide for Mentors, Vol.447/14 p 791-797.

Linse Angela R. (2006) Faculty Peer Review of Teaching, Winter Teaching and Learning Conference Temple University

Pratt, Dan (based on work by Lee Shulman and Patricia Hutchings) Peer Review of Teaching, presentation to UBC Faculty Association, May, 2009.

Seldin, Peter and Associates, (2000), Changing Practices in Evaluating Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improved Faculty Performance and Promotion and Tenure Decisions.

University of British Columbia (2009). Report of the UBCV Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching

University of British Columbia, School of Human Kinetics (2008) Guidelines for Peer Reviews of In-Class Teaching (approved at School meeting November 05, 2007 and amended at School Meeting November 15, 2007.

ON LINE REFERENCES

Connecticut Community College Conducting Classroom Observation Module 3.2
www.commnet.edu/emprel/trng/tm_3_2calsobs.html

University of Minnesota Classroom Observation Instruments
www.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/instruments/index.html

North Carolina State University Peer Review of Teaching
www.nscu.edu/provost/peer-review/formativeobserve.htm

North Carolina State University Peer Review of Teaching
www.nscu.edu/provost/peer-review/summativebserve.htm

Truman State University, Library Sources for Peer review of Teaching
www.tctl.truman.edu/resources/Peer Guidelines/Peer ReviewTeach.asp

University of British Columbia, Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth -Resources
www.tag.ubc.ca/resources/evaluation/guidelines.php

University of British Columbia, Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth –Guidelines for New Faculty www.tag.ubc.ca/resources/evaluation/guidelines.php

University of British Columbia, Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth-Teaching Dossiers
www.tag.ubc.ca

University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine Mentoring Program
www.med/ubc.ca/mentoring

University of Minnesota Center for Teaching and Learning, Conducting Classroom Observations, retrieved from www.l.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/supervisor/resources/observations/index.html September 15,2009

University of Lincoln Nebraska Peer Review of Teaching Project, Course Portfolios
www.coursepotfolio.org

University of Western Ontario Teaching Support Center, Faculty Mentor Program
www.uwo.ca/tsc/faculty_mentor.html

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Oshkosh Faculty Mentoring Resources
www.uwosh.edu/mentoring/faculty/procee.html

Wilfred Laurier University, Mentor Program for New Faculty
www.wlu.ca/page.php?grp_id=333&p=3318 October 03,2008