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Preamble

The Undergraduate Medical Education (UGME) program requires that all teachers are assessed and receive feedback on their teaching. This policy applies to all teaching faculty, clinical faculty, full- or part-time academic faculty and residents who teach. A “teacher” in this Policy refers to anyone who teaches in a large group, small group or clinical environment (e.g. a tutor, an advisor, a coach, an instructor, a preceptor, and a lecturer).

This Policy covers learner assessment of each teacher in the learning environment with respect to that teacher’s skills as an academic and/or health professional. Depending on the learning experience, Assessment of Teachers by Learners could occur after learners have spent a certain amount of time with a teacher, e.g., after each teaching session, or according to a predetermined assessment schedule. Concerns of potential personal mistreatment of the learner by the teacher are beyond the scope of this policy, as learners are directed to the UBC Faculty of Medicine Mistreatment Help website.

The UBC Faculty of Medicine Policy and Procedures for Assessment of Teachers by Learners is guided by the principles for Student Evaluation of Teaching articulated in the UBC Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SEOT). The SEOT states that the evaluation of teaching should be learner-focused and that the products of evaluations should be used to improve the learning experience. The requirement for teacher assessment by learners is included in the Policy on Clinical Faculty Appointments; “student opinion” sought through formal procedures is listed as a method of “teaching evaluation” in the Collective Agreement between UBC and the Faculty Association of UBC. Additionally, the MD Undergraduate Program (MDUP) seeks to comply with standards on faculty feedback and the use of learner evaluation data in program improvement, set by the Committee on the Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS)1

---

1 4.4 Feedback to Faculty: A medical school faculty member receives regularly scheduled and timely feedback from departmental and/or other programmatic or institutional leaders on his or her academic performance and progress toward promotion and, when applicable, tenure.

8.5 Use of Student Evaluation Data in Program Improvement: In evaluating medical education program quality, a medical school has formal
The UGME Program strives to provide faculty and teachers with constructive feedback from learners on the teaching experiences they provide. Students are providing their feedback and opinions on their learning experience rather than the teacher’s performance; therefore, faculty are encouraged to seek other forms of assessment such as peer assessment for feedback on teaching competencies and pedagogy.

Teacher assessment data comprise numerical ratings and written comments submitted by learners.

Generated automatically by one45 system when a learner disagrees or strongly disagrees with the standard global rating statement: “Overall, the Instructor is an effective teacher”. LPFs are shared with the instructor’s Educational Lead for that course or rotation. See Appendix 1.

See Mistreatment Help for categories of mistreatment (general, sexual, racial/ethnic, sexual orientation/gender identity) as defined by the American Association of Medical Colleges. Please also see “What is Mistreatment” for definition by UBC Faculty of Medicine’s Respectful Environments, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (REDI) office.

The set of attitudes, behaviours and characteristics deemed desirable in members of a profession and which define the profession and its relationship to its members and to society – see Professional Standards for Learners and Faculty Members in the Faculties of Medicine & Dentistry at UBC.

An educational unit that is required of a student in order to complete the medical education program. These educational units are usually associated with a university course code and appear on the student’s transcript. (CACMS lexicon 2021-22)

This includes course leads who have oversight to a particular course/clerkship, and medical school leadership who have oversight regarding teachers and learners. May include provincial course/pillar leads and/or site (local) lead including Portfolio/ CS/ CBL etc. (Years 1 & 2), RADs or designates, Department/Division Heads, departmental undergraduate education directors and/or distributed site leads/directors (Year 3 & 4) as applicable.
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Policy

1. Teachers will be regularly assessed by learners on their teaching at the end of a required learning experience.
2. Individual teacher assessment reports will be distributed to teachers twice per year, unless there are insufficient teacher assessment data. Individualized teacher assessment reports may be accessed by the Regional Associate Deans (RADS) or designates, Department/Division Heads, and Educational Leads, as deemed necessary. The Associate Dean, UGME may be granted access in cases of learning environment issues or student mistreatment, or where necessary to review or address other specific concerns or complaints brought to the Associate Dean, UGME.
3. Aggregated anonymized teacher assessment data will be made available to the Office of Faculty Development, Evaluation Studies Unit, and other relevant program areas, for program improvement. Upon request, this data will be made available to the University of British Columbia as directed in the SEOT policy.

Guiding Principles

1. Anonymize Learners: In Assessment of Teachers by Learners, the anonymity of a learner is the overriding principle. Learner anonymity must be protected. All teacher assessments by learners must be anonymous. In instances of one-on-one or small group teaching where fewer than four (4) learners have assessed a teacher, care must be taken to ensure that learners’ identities are protected. In these cases, individualized teacher assessments by learners will only be released to the teacher when the learner or group of learners are no longer in the sphere of influence of the teacher (e.g., through the continuum of undergraduate and postgraduate training), as verified by the Educational Leads and/or program staff.
2. Centralized Assessment System: There is a centralized online system in place to collect, disseminate, and store teacher assessment data securely, to protect teachers’ privacy and confidentiality. This centralized online system will be the sole repository of data for Assessment of Teachers by Learners. Setup, collection and retrieval processes will be automated in accordance with the platform’s capabilities.
3. Secure data and protect confidentiality: As per the principles of the Acceptable Use and Security of UBC Electronic Information and Systems Policy, teacher assessment data will be protected from unauthorized access, corruption, and any detrimental actions. Teacher assessment data and reports will only be distributed by the Teacher Assessment Support Team through secure electronic platforms within UBC, to protect teachers’ confidentiality. All recipients of teacher assessment data should follow the principles outlined in the above-mentioned policy.
4. Accessibility for Educational Leads: Access to individual identifiable teacher assessment data will be granted to the RADS or designates and Department/Division Heads (regularly and upon request, for their site or department/division), and Educational Leads (regularly and upon request, for their course/clerkship) through a secure electronic platform, to protect teachers’ privacy and confidentiality. The Associate Dean UGME may be granted access in cases of learning environment issues or student mistreatment or other cases where they are reviewing or investigating complaints or concerns.
5. Standardized processes and instruments: Assessment of Teachers by Learners will be performed using standardized instruments across uniform learning environments (Clinical, Academic/Large and Small Group Forms). Teachers will receive their individualized report(s) within the guidelines that protect learners’ anonymity.
6. Promote Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and Faculty Development: Utilize aggregated anonymized teacher assessment data to inform and support CQI activities and faculty development initiatives. Adopting a CQI model could aid in the development of strategies that accommodate changing program needs, technology changes, and life-long learning principles for teachers.
7. Promote a Culture of Constructive Feedback: Feedback that aligns with the tenets of constructive feedback is valuable and shouldn’t be removed, as a default. Constructive feedback may sometimes be difficult to hear or discuss. It is also complex; what may be great teaching for one student may not be as
effective for another. Both can be true at the same time due to different learning needs and styles, lived experiences and perspectives. Similarly, what may be seen as a harmless (or not even noticed) comment by one student, may be offensive or discriminatory for another student. There is no universal aim for homogeneity in the feedback and comments for any one teacher. Inclusion of as many constructive feedback perspectives is valuable and necessary, to ensure that we are not inadvertently minimizing or removing differing perspectives of some students (especially those from non-dominant or marginalized groups).

**Procedure**

**Learners**
1. All learners will receive an orientation by the Director, Teacher Assessment, and Teacher Assessment Support Manager, that addresses the purpose of Assessment of Teachers by Learners, the use of collected data, the provision of constructive feedback, and the avoidance of malicious feedback.
2. All learners are required to complete teacher assessments after completion of a required learning experience, as prompted by the Teacher Assessment Support Team.

**Teachers**
1. All teachers can expect to be assessed by learners.
2. Individual teacher assessment reports will be distributed to teachers up to twice per year, unless there is insufficient teacher assessment data. To protect learners’ anonymity, teachers will only receive their individualized reports when a minimum of four (4) learners have assessed them. Relevant Educational Leads will receive individualized teacher assessment reports four weeks prior to the individual teacher for review.
3. Upon request, individual teachers will have access to their own historical individual teacher assessment reports for their individual use.
4. Upon request, Educational Leads (or their designate) will have access to relevant historical individual teacher assessment reports for their course/department.
5. Low Performance Flags or assessments of teachers will be flagged to the relevant Educational Leads, the RADs or designates as applicable, and the Director, Teacher Assessment; to protect learner anonymity, feedback will be provided at the discretion of the Educational Lead(s), as outlined in Appendix 1. The Associate Dean, UGME may be granted access in cases of learning environment issues or student mistreatment, or in other cases where they are involved in a review or investigation of concerns or complaints.
6. Faculty development will be made available to teachers.
7. All teachers must have a profile in the central assessment system.

**Program / Department**
1. The Director, Teacher Assessment will oversee teacher assessment, the privacy and confidentiality of the data collected, and the aggregation and analysis of the data.
2. If a Low Performance Flag is generated by one45, the assessment is reviewed by the Educational Lead. If the comments are found to be not in keeping with the tenets of constructive feedback, a particular phrase may be requested to be removed, or as a last resort, the entire form is removed from the teacher’s report. Please see Appendix 1 for the “Approach to LPF Framework”.
3. Annually, the RADs, Department/Division Heads, and Educational Leads will receive individualized (identifiable) summary reports for teachers of their designated site, department/division, or course/clerkship.
4. Aggregated anonymized teacher assessment reports will be provided upon request to RADs or designate, Department/Division Heads, the Associate Dean, UGME, the Associate Dean, Faculty Development, Evaluation Studies Unit, and other relevant program areas, up to annually for program improvement. UGMEC will receive and review reports as a standing annual item on the UGMEC agenda.
5. Data access requests by The Office of REDI must first be approved by the RADs or designate.

6. Program and departmental staff along with the Teacher Assessment Support Team will manage the administrative logistics of assessing teachers (set-up of teacher assessment send outs, follow up with learners on teacher assessment completion etc.). Training and system support will be provided by the Teacher Assessment Support Team to departments to manage the new processes. Teacher assessment reports will only be managed and distributed by the Teacher Assessment Support Team.

7. Program and departmental staff may identify teachers without assessments so that they are actively targeted for teacher assessment in a timely manner and system alerts are reviewed and escalated as necessary.
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APPENDIX 1: APPROACH TO LOW PERFORMANCE FLAGS

Low Performance Flag (LPF) received in One45 with a 1 or 2 rating for question: “Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher”

The Teacher Assessment and Support (TAS) team creates a student feedback report of the last 2 years* for the relevant teacher in that course along with the flagged form.
**Sends to Education Lead to review, respond/action along with Provincial Pillar/Course Lead as applicable.
***Regional Associate Dean (RAD), RAD designates as applicable, and Director of Teacher Assessment are cc’d on above.

After review of above documents, *Education Lead determines course of action for the LPF teacher and form in question by replying all to above.

---

**NO FURTHER ACTION WITH TEACHER REQUIRED**
Form is retained and will be sent to teacher in a combined report once 4 or more forms are received for the teacher.

Please state why:
- a) constructive feedback with no concerning pattern or egregious behaviour described; minor and not time sensitive so can wait for report to be sent out when n>4 forms (should be majority of LPFs),
- b) related to issues outside of teacher’s control

---

**FURTHER ACTION WITH TEACHER REQUIRED**
Due to concerning pattern, action that would benefit from coaching or egregious behaviour described (including oppression as described by learner),
Form is retained and will be sent to teacher in a combined report once 4 or more forms are received for the teacher.

Please state what action taken and plan:
- ie. coffee chat with preceptor, resources and follow-up plan as applicable, teacher will no longer be recruited for this course (in consultation with RAD).

This single LPF report cannot be shared directly with the preceptor to protect student anonymity.

---

**REQUEST TO REMOVE SPECIFIC COMMENT FROM FORM**
RAD must be consulted & agree with this decision
No edits or paraphrasing of the comments; only the removal of words or comments.
Likert scale ratings will remain to be aggregated in anonymous report when n>4 reports received.
Please identify the exact words/phrase/sentence you would like removed and why:
- a) about systemic, systematic or programmatic issues,
- b) discriminatory language or personal attack towards the teacher,
- c) inconsistent with tenets of constructive feedback,
- d) other (please provide a brief reason, if possible, to help develop new categories)

---

**REQUEST TO REMOVE ENTIRE ASSESSMENT FORM**
RAD must be consulted & agree with this decision
Editing of a form is preferable to removing entire form, as removing a form skews individual data.

Please state the reason:
- a) posted in error (usually picked up by TAS team),
- b) wholly unrelated to teacher,
- c) about systemic, systematic or programmatic issues,
- d) discriminatory or personal attack towards the teacher,
- e) inconsistent with tenets of constructive feedback
The vast majority of all completed teacher assessment forms by learners (including LPFs) will not require further action by Educational Leads and can be retained in its original state and released to the teacher for their own review and reflection once at least 4 assessment forms have been received.

Key points to LPF management (please see Assessment of Teachers by Learner Policy 022):

- Student anonymity is our overriding principle and all reports are anonymized. If a student who submitted a low performance flag is somehow inadvertently able to be identified, there should be no contact with the student as this will be in contravention of policy.
- Once there are at least 4 assessment forms for this teacher, an anonymized and aggregated report can be provided to them with this feedback included. Depending on the regularity of teaching, this can take months up to years for a specific teacher.
- Feedback that is malicious, egregiously offensive or oppressive (i.e. oppressive comments about—not limited to—race, gender, gender expression and identity, sexual orientation, ability, language (skills), religious or cultural beliefs and practices, socioeconomic status, education level, country of origin, citizenship) towards the teacher will be actioned upon by the Educational Leads in a systematic and timely manner in striving towards an equitable, inclusive and non-oppressive environment for our teachers.
- Likewise, feedback that expresses a learner’s concern that a discriminatory, egregious or oppressive action (i.e. oppressive comments about—not limited to—race, gender, gender expression and identity, sexual orientation, ability, language (skills), religious or cultural beliefs and practices, socioeconomic status, education level, country of origin, citizenship) occurred during the learning experience will also be actioned upon by Educational Leads in a systematic and timely manner in striving towards an equitable, inclusive and non-oppressive environment for our learners.
- Feedback that aligns with the tenets of constructive feedback is valuable and shouldn’t be removed, as a default. All teachers can improve in their teaching skills, including creating a more equitable and non-oppressive learning experience, as part of life-long learning.
- There is no universal aim for homogeneity in the feedback and comments for any one teacher, and this should not be the basis for removing narrative comments or assessment forms. Inclusion of as many constructive feedback perspectives is valuable and necessary, to ensure that we are not inadvertently minimizing or removing differing perspectives of some students (especially those from non-dominant or marginalized groups).
- Constructive feedback may sometimes be difficult to hear or discuss. It is also complex; what may be great teaching for one student may not be as effective for another. Both can be true at the same time due to different learning needs and styles, lived experiences and perspectives. Similarly, what may be seen as a harmless (or not even noticed) comment by one student, may be offensive or discriminatory for another student. We want to support a culture where receiving helpful, constructive feedback is encouraged.
- Requests for editing the form by removing part of the comments is preferred over removal of the entire form for reason e) inconsistent with tenets of constructive feedback. Removal of an entire form for reason e) should be seen as a last resort used rarely.

*If there is no student feedback on teaching in the last 2 years, the TAS Team will check the last 5 years.

**Education Leads may include provincial course and pillar leads and/or site (local) lead including Portfolio/CS/CBL etc. (Years 1 & 2), Department/Division Heads, UG Directors and/or distributed site leads/directors (Year 3 & 4) as applicable. These roles and responsibilities for who will be the point person for the LPFs can be negotiated at the beginning of the academic year when the Teacher Assessment team is notified of who the correct contacts are, or this can be negotiated by replying all once a specific LPF is sent out.

***RADs are included in every LPF for their site, to be able to collaborate with the Education Leads as appropriate, including but not limited to decisions to edit or remove forms, or not recruit a teacher for a course. The Director, Teacher Assessment is included in every LPF sent in order to assist in implementation or interpretation of Policy 022.