

**University of British Columbia  
Faculty of Medicine  
Summative Peer Review of Teaching**

**Template for Reviewers  
October 16, 2014**

**1. Description of the Teaching Activities, Opportunities and Methods of the Academic Unit**

(i.e. undergraduate, graduate or postgraduates; lectures (small and large), PBL, residents, CME, etc.).

If possible include a paragraph here on department expectations. This should 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 (i.e. expectations with respect to teaching duties) may now be readily available.

**2) Description of Procedures**

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

**3) Summary of Teaching Contributions**

*(Note: Please provide a **narrative summary** including the information described below. Do not replicate tables of teaching activities already provided in the reviewee's CV).*

***a) Quantitative summary of scheduled teaching***

Summarize the total annual contact hours of formally scheduled teaching of all kinds and describe the format of class instructions, the numbers of students involved, and material prepared for the class (handouts and on-line information). Include continuing medical education and grand rounds presentations given by the reviewee. Also describe out-of-class contributions such as exam setting, marking and invigilation, development of new material for the course, student advising/mentoring, leadership roles (e.g. week and/or block captains, education committee memberships and roles, etc.).

***b) Unscheduled teaching***

Describe the nature of any teaching that is not formally scheduled. This may include the supervision of graduate students, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year clerkships, residents or clinical fellows. If possible, estimate the time commitment for any unscheduled teaching.

***c) Expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty***

SPROT authors should avoid giving a general, sweeping statement such as “*Dr. X meets Departmental expectations,*” unless these are clearly known to them or are included in section 1, above. If in doubt, the author should consult with the head/director of the academic unit.

If the expected norms are available to the author then describe how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms. For example, “*The amount of teaching by Dr. X is comparable/not comparable to other colleagues in the Department at the same rank.*”

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. For example, “*The amount of teaching is not comparable due to Dr. X’s higher administrative load during the period X to Y.*”

#### 4) Summary of Student Evaluations

*(Note 1: The source of student evaluation data in most cases can be found in the candidate’s Teaching Dossier, but, as noted below, it may be necessary to obtain original data, likely from the Head/Directortor or his/her delegate)*

*Note 2: 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 this or other appropriate sections of this template.)*

- a. A quantitative summary for levels and formats in which the candidate teaches, including the rating scales used.

If response rates for student evaluations are available and they would seem to be very low, the SPROT author(s) 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.

- b. A qualitative assessment for levels and formats in which the reviewee teaches. Include representative narrative comments by the students.

It is suggested that:

First, the author start with a clear statement to indicate that the narrative comments have been selected by the author and not by the candidate.

Second, the narrative comments should reflect the numerical scores.

Third, where there is any suspicion that the narrative comments provided by the candidate in their Teaching Dossier are “cherry picked” the SPROT author should seek the help of the unit head/director in finding original sources of data.

- c. A statement regarding how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department, School or Faculty.
- d. 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.

For each of the above consider the following:

- Are there any trends over time?
- Are there any recurring themes?
- Are there any key messages?

e. If available, comment upon the response of the reviewee to his/her student evaluations. This information may be provided by the candidate in their Teaching Dossier.

### **5) Summary of Classroom Observations by Peers**

- a. A summary of qualitative peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels. Include representative narrative comments by the peer observers.
- b. A statement regarding how these assessments compare to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty.
- c. 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.
- d. If available, comment upon the response of the reviewee to these observations.

Include (**LEGIBLE !**) copies of at least 2 classroom observations by peers. **Refer to our peer review of teaching tools. See: <http://med.ubc.ca/faculty-staff/faculty-development/teaching-resources/assessment-and-feedback/>**

### **6) Evaluation of Trainee Supervision**

- a. Describe the nature and number of the trainees (graduate students, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year clerkships, residents, clinical fellows, postdoctoral fellows, etc.) supervised by the reviewee. For graduate students, discuss the time taken to completion of the degree, awards obtained by the trainees, publications by the trainee, and for those that have graduated, their current position. For clinical trainees indicate the success or otherwise of the trainees and, if relevant, their current position.
- b. Discuss feedback from the trainees and describe how it was obtained (meetings or correspondence with the trainees soliciting their feedback, formal evaluation procedures that are part of the program, etc.). For example, trainees could be asked to comment on the following:
  - 1. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s availability/accessibility to them;
  - 2. His/Her feedback on their work;
  - 3. His/Her provision of direction and/or support;
  - 4. Ways in which Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ helped them progress;
  - 5. Concerns they have about his/her supervision.

You may include representative comments by trainees but note that appropriate confidentiality should be maintained.

c. Provide a statement regarding how the amount of supervision compares to the expected norms of the Department or School.

### **7) Additional teaching and learning activities**

Provide a description of any other major teaching or educational activities performed by the candidate, along with statements supported by summarized evidence regarding the reviewee's effectiveness and the importance of these activities to the Department, School or Faculty. Included should be such activities as curriculum development, programme or course direction, or development of instructional materials and/or websites.

### **8) Awards for Teaching**

A summary of any awards or other recognition of teaching excellence the reviewee has received.

### **9) Participation in Education Training**

A list and brief description of any special or remedial efforts undertaken by the candidate to improve teaching performance (such as TAG/CTLT courses).

### **10) Other Evidence of Teaching**

Provide a summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching. For example, this might include national professional accreditation of a training programme the candidate directs or recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field.

### **11) Concluding Statement**

Provide an overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university teacher and educator together with any recommendations. Include a statement describing how this compares to the expected norm for the Department or School.