FOM Guide to Summative Peer Review of Teaching
for Department Heads and School Directors

October 16, 2014

The process of generating a Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT) is intended to facilitate the provision of necessary teaching evidence required for promotion and tenure. When completed, a SPROT will be part of the documentation reviewed by the department promotion and tenure (P&TC) committee at the time they vote on a case. The SPROT will also be appended to the Head's Letter of Recommendation to the Dean and will be part of the documentation forwarded to the UBC Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) for their assessment of the teaching component of the file.

Except for the teaching stream ranks (Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Professor of Teaching) the Teaching Dossier should NOT be sent to External Referees – they are asked to assess scholarly and professional activities but are NOT asked to evaluate the teaching component (because teaching expectations vary between institutions). Also, do NOT forward the Teaching Dossier to the Faculty of Medicine Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (FARPTC).

The Summative Peer Review of Teaching Process

1) Selecting Peer Reviewers

How many?

Ideally peer reviews should be done by a team including one person external to the department. However the general practice in the FoM is to assign a single reviewer.

What rank?

A SPROT author should be at a rank above the candidate under review. Although this requirement is not explicitly stated in, for example, the FA/UBC agreement or the *Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC, 2014/15,* the SPROT will be used to assess the merits of a case for promotion/tenure by the department P&TC, FARPTC, and SAC. It would seem therefore that the appropriate rule to follow would be that for voting on P/T cases, where eligible voters must be at the rank above that of the candidate.

Assigning a reviewer

Unless you have already established a procedure in your department for selecting SPROT reviewers it is strongly recommended that you meet with your department head to suggest that, in future, SPROT authors should be selected from those attending the first meeting of your department tenure/promotion committee for each case. Those attending such meetings will be eligible to vote and therefore also eligible to be the author of a SPROT. While a department SPROT rep may be selected by this process to author a SPROT, if someone else is selected, the representative's role will be advisory.

2) Time line for completing a SPROT

External referee's letters are NOT required for a SPROT therefore the process can begin as soon as the reviewer is selected. Candidates for promotion/tenure are required to submit all of the required documents to their heads by September 15 as per the section of the UBC/Faculty Association Collective Agreement. Ideally, the first meeting of the department p/t committee should be soon after this date and, once the author of the SPORT is determined, the process can begin. **In any event, a completed SPROT <u>MUST</u> be available to the department P&TC at the time they meet to vote.**

3) Updating a SPROT if new information is supplied by the candidate.

Only if the additional evidence in support of teaching is substantial should there be a need to update a completed SPROT. In any event, the final version of the SPROT will be the one made available to the department/school P&TC at the time of the final voting meeting. After this time the candidate can supplement his/her file at any time up to the President's final decision.

4) Scope of the Summative Peer Review of Teaching

The Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (2011/12) describes teaching as including *"all activities by which students, whether in degree or non-degree programs sponsored by the University, derive educational benefit. This may include lectures, seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, supervision of individual students' work (undergraduate and graduate), or other means"* (Section 3.2.1). As such, the reviewee's entire teaching contribution at the undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate levels should be reviewed, and this review may include information on the context of teaching (e.g. teaching workload, numbers of students and range of courses taught, etc.), teaching process, outcomes and impact. Section 3.2.3 of the same document also emphasises that *"Evaluation of teaching should be based upon effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, accessibility to students, and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students..."*

Some or all of the following might be appropriate information for the peer review team to assess:

> ➢ Teaching dossier including information such as:
> - Examples of original educational contributions such as the development of instructional materials (web sites, authorship of PBL cases, etc.)
> - Course syllabi
> - Samples of student work
> - Publications in the field of education scholarship
> - Reports from classroom observations by peers
> - Student evaluations of teaching
> - Assignments and examinations including instructor assessment
> - Statements of teaching philosophy
> - Administrative roles in support of education
> - Self assessment (reflective critique) of the reviewee
> - Evidence of learning beyond the classroom
> - Responses to student evaluations

- ➢ Feedback solicited from graduate students
- ➢ Feedback from medical students engaged in clerkships
- ➢ Feedback from residents, attendees of Grand Rounds, CME courses, etc.

5) *Comments relating a SPROT review to department norms.*

SPROT authors should avoid giving a general, sweeping statement such as *"Dr. X meets Departmental expectations,"* unless they can clearly state what that expectation is. If in doubt the author should consult with the head/director of the academic unit.

One possible solution to this is to add a paragraph on department expectations at the end of section 1 of the SPROT template which would be consistent (cut and paste!) with all SPROTs for members of the same department and would only need to be updated periodically. This could be done in consultation with the current head of the unit. The FoM recently underwent an extensive department-by-department review where each unit was required to develop a Policy on Scholarly, Teaching and Service Workloads for Faculty Members. Having done this, the required data may now be readily available.

6) *Obtaining normative data for student evaluations of teaching*

This is the most challenging aspect of a SPROT. For teaching in the MD Undergraduate Program data can be obtained from the one45 system. *In future, an annual report will be prepared each year and made available to heads of unit and department SPROT representatives.*

For all UBC direct entry undergraduate programs, and some others run by various units of the FoM, data from the UBC-wide CourseEval system is available to all Heads of unit. Other data for postgraduate courses should be available from whatever method of evaluation is used (paper, CourseEval, one4 etc.). In the case of CoursEval, the key score is that from Question 6 ("*Overall the instructor was an effective teacher*")

Unfortunately there is less than ideal equivalency of the various student evaluations in terms of the specific questions and the scales used so it will be important to list the scale and narrative explanation of the scale for each course.

Example1 [Mean score for CoursEval Q6 is given followed by the response rate and then comparative data expressed as the mean +/- SD of the scores of 6 other faculty members contributing to the same course]

CourseEval data for Q6,
PHYL 424 2012W   4.6/5 (18/34 respondents) [4.35 +/- 0.62; n=6]
(Additional lines for each year would follow. This should probably be limited to the last 5 years of data except for candidates for promotion/tenure in their 7th year when all years should be included).

Example 2 [Mean score for CoursEval Q6 is given followed by the response rate and then comparative data given as a list of the mean scores of the 6 other faculty members contributing to the same course]

CourseEval data for Q6,
PHYL 424 2012W   4.6/5 (18/34 respondents)   [3.9; 4.1, 4.1, 4.6; 4.8; 4.9]

Note 1: in some cases the comparative data as in Example 1 may be the mean +/- SD scores from all other faculty in EQUIVALENT courses, rather than a single team-taught course. This is the type of data we have from one45 evaluations of PBL, where the mean and SD is generated from student assessment of ALL faculty involved in both year 1 and year 2 PBL sessions for a particular academic year (and for a five year average). In the case of the example course above, the equivalent course would be the four other PHYL lecture courses offered in the 4th year of the program. Lab courses and 3rd year courses would not be equivalent and some courses (e.g. lab courses) may not have an equivalent course for comparison.

Note 2: calculating a value for SD may not be valid in all cases. In example 2, the other instructors may contribute 1-4 lectures so their assessments are not strictly equivalent and probably should not be used to generate a SD.

Note 3: If response rates are available and they would seem to be very low, the SPROT authors should note this in their review, indicating that the low response rates may make the data invalid. As a **rough guide**, published data on the validity of student evaluations based on class size and response rates suggest that classes of 10 students require about a 65-75% response rate; classes of 50 a 30-40% response rate; and classes of 100 an 18-25% response rate.

7) Lack of evaluation data

Where data is simply not available, such as peer reviews (classroom observations) or student evaluations where there are small numbers of students (and anonymity would not be possible), the author of the SPROT should simply state this in the appropriate sections of the SPROT template. In the case of peer reviews it is up the academic unit to do the best they can to ensure that peer reviews are done in time for a promotion/tenure case to proceed. However, if they are not done for any reason, this should NOT stop the candidate's case from going forward.

8) Student evaluations with very low response rates

If response rates are available and they would seem to be very low the SPROT authors should note this in their review, indicating that the low response rates may make the data invalid. As a rough guide, published data on the validity of student evaluations based on class size and response rates suggest that classes of 10 students require about a 65-75% response rate; classes of 50 a 30-40% response rate; and classes of 100 an 18-25% response rate.

9) Use of narrative comments from undergraduate student evaluations in the SPROT

Inclusion of narrative comments depends upon the practice of the Department/School or Faculty. If they are included the SPROT they should be limited in number (max 5?) and appropriate examples should be selected *that reflect the numerical score* (see also the comments on this issue in Appendix 1 below). SPROT authors will have access to narrative comments included in the candidate's Teaching Dossier (TD).   It is important that narrative comments provided by the candidate in their TD are not "cherry picked". If there is any doubt about this try to obtain the original, complete evaluations from the head of the unit.

10) Use of narrative comments solicited from trainees (graduate students, clerks, residents, summer students, graduating essay students etc..

These need not necessarily be included in a SPROT. The issue here is one of confidentiality. If a candidate has had only a small number of trainees it is likely that the candidate will be able to infer which of their trainees has written particular comments. This would not be acceptable. Other means of evaluating trainee supervision, as stated in the appendix below, are " …. *the students' degree completion, publications, research awards, and subsequent professional success*" where, within the FoM, *students* may be expanded to include clerks and residents. I would also add meeting/conference and other formal presentations by the trainee to the list.

11) Review of a SPROT by the candidate

The Dean has given his approval for candidates in the FoM to be sent a draft of their SPROT with the specific request that they review the document for **FACTUAL ERRORS ONLY**, and be given an appropriate (1 week?) deadline to respond. Representatives from SAC have also endorsed this process. Any changes to the draft version will be entirely at the discretion of the SPROT author.

> Suggested wording:
>
> Dear XXXX
>
> Enclosed is a draft of a Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT) that will be part of the package of material forwarded to the department/school P&TC in regards to your application for {insert: tenure/promotion/ promotion and tenure}. Please review the draft for factual errors and return to me no later than {insert: date}.   OPTIONAL: You may, if you wish, make additional comments about the draft SPROT, other than factual errors, but any alterations to the final SPROT document, based upon these additional comments, will be made entirely at the discretion of the reviewer(s).
>
> Yours sincerely,

12) Signing a SPROT

The document is a peer review and the identity of the peer(s) should be known by their signature(s) appended to the document.

13) Who is eligible to conduct peer reviews in the form of classroom observations?

Clarification from SAC needs to be sought on this issue but it may be one exception to the general rule that reviewers should be at a rank above that of a candidate. Perhaps the most important point is that each unit should have an agreed upon policy on the process of peer review (classroom observations). In such a policy it may be acceptable for faculty of a lower rank to review one of a higher rank. There is also the issue of what part, if any, faculty in the Instructor stream or the Professor of Teaching stream may play in a classroom observation of a faculty member in the Professorial stream.

A good classroom observation process should include, at minimum, the following steps:

a) a pre-meeting with the faculty member to discuss the process
b) observation of a teaching session
c) a second meeting with the faculty member to discuss any issues raised by the observation
d) a second observation of a teaching session
e) a formal report with copies to the head of unit and the candidate (for inclusion in their TD).

In some cases, SPROT reviewers may also serve as classroom observers but this is not a requirement. Many units already have well developed methods for classroom observations but they may need modifying depending upon feedback from SAC. It is important to differentiate this form of Peer Review from the SPROT process. Assessments of classroom observations by peers form only one part of the SPROT process.

14) Attaching peer reviews (classroom observations) to the SPROT.

It is suggested that two peer reviews be attached in full to the SPROT. However, if they are in the format of a standardized form completed by hand please ensure that the written comments are legible! Illegible forms have been submitted to SAC by the FoM in the past.

Kenneth G. Baimbridge PhD
Professor
October 16, 2014

Excerpt from the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC 2014/15

APPENDIX 2 - TEACHING EVIDENCE –DOSSIER FOR REVIEW BY SAC AND THE PRESIDENT   (coloured highlighting added by KGB)

It is important that all recommendations for initial appointments, promotion, or tenure be supported by detailed evidence about the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching. The amount of evidence will vary according to the circumstances of an individual case (e.g. the extent to which a recommendation rests on the teaching record), but there is a minimum necessary for all cases. There needs to be enough evidence so that committees beyond the Department can be confident that the University's standards for teaching performance have been met. Note that in the case of Senior Instructors, the standard for teaching performance is excellence. In the case of Professors of Teaching, the higher standard of outstanding achievement in teaching, learning and educational leadership is required.

The complete teaching dossier is often an important factor in assessment for promotion and tenure by a candidate's Department, School or Faculty, and by the external referees. However, the complete teaching dossier is less useful to the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) because SAC lacks discipline specific expertise, and knowledge of each academic unit's standards and expectations with respect to teaching for those in the professorial ranks. Full teaching dossiers **should not** be forwarded to SAC.

For cases in the **Professor of Teaching stream** involving reviews for promotion (with tenure) to the rank of Senior Instructor or promotion to Professor of Teaching, where more evidence is required in order to demonstrate the candidate has met the requisite standard of excellence or outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership the full teaching dossier, less the following material, can be submitted to SAC:

- Course outlines/syllabi
- Assignments and handouts
- Full sets of students evaluations

See Appendix 1 for more information regarding the composition of the complete teaching dossier for a candidate being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching. It is necessary that reviewers with discipline-specific expertise receive the full teaching dossier (as outlined in Appendix 1). The condensed teaching dossier that will be reviewed by SAC should contain all the information recommended in Appendix 1 except for the information listed above.

For cases in the **Professoriate stream**, SAC requests that, instead of a complete teaching dossier, each candidate's file include a summative assessment (normally completed by the Head) of the teaching dossier and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator. Typically 2-3 pages in length, the assessment **(included as a separate document or as part of the Head's letter of recommendation)** should include:

- A quantitative summary of the amount of teaching of all kinds performed by the candidate at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, and a statement regarding how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms of the Department, School or

Faculty. If the amount of teaching in one or more particular areas does not meet the expected norms, an explanatory statement or comment should also be included.

- A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations, and a statement regarding how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department, School or Faculty. In particular, SAC is interested in overall instructor effectiveness scores (Q 6 of the on-line student evaluations). This information should be provided, if possible, for all levels and formats in which the candidate teaches. If the candidate's student evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the expected norms, a comment or explanatory statement should also be included.

- Whether student comments are included in the file as part of the student evaluations depends upon the practice of the Department, School, or Faculty. The candidate has the right to add the student comments to the file providing they were obtained through formal procedures (see Article 4.02). If the student comments are added, it must be a comprehensive set that is representative of students taught (rather than a selection by the candidate). Ideally, peer review committee members will review these data and summarize their findings in their report.

- A summary of summative peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, and a statement regarding how these assessments compare to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty. If the candidate's peer evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the normally expected standard, a comment or explanatory statement should also be included. Charts may be helpful in setting out the summary, for example, giving average percentile rankings. Information about summative peer evaluations is provided by the **Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology**.

- A statement regarding the candidate's performance as a graduate student supervisor in terms of the students' degree completion, publications, research awards, and subsequent professional success.

- 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 to the Department, School or Faculty. Included should be such activities as curriculum development, program or course direction, or development of instructional materials or websites.

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

- A list and brief description of any special or remedial efforts undertaken by the candidate to improve teaching performance.

- A summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching. This might include, for example, national professional accreditation

of a training program the candidate directs or recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field.

- An overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university teacher and educator, and a statement describing how this compares to the expected norm for the Department, School or Faculty.