

## **Botany Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching and Summative Assessment**

### **A. BACKGROUND and GOALS.**

The following guidelines are based on the on-going Peer Review of Teaching Initiative at UBC and the Faculty of Science June 2011 guidelines for Peer Review, which aim to improve and clarify the processes that underlie peer review of teaching. This goal is to build a community of teachers, who work together to support and develop good teaching practices for the undergraduate and graduate programs. In addition, these guidelines will allow the teaching review process to be fair, accurate and transparent for all faculty members when they undergo periodic review during reappointment, promotion and tenure.

### **B. TYPES of ASSESSMENT**

There are two interrelated parts of the peer review of teaching -

- 1) Formative or mentoring reviews provide constructive feedback to faculty members. The aim is to support the development of faculty members teaching with the aim to enhance and facilitate the development of teaching skills.
- 2) Summative evaluation is the required collection of evidence of teaching effectiveness for career advancement. This evaluation provides evidence for the overall impact of a faculty member's teaching for periodic reviews such as reappointment, promotion and tenure. These guidelines will enable the department to provide the Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion, Appointment and Tenure (DACOPAT) and the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) with clear and accurate assessments of teaching performance of faculty members.

### **C. OVERVIEW**

#### **1. Frequency and Timing of Peer Evaluations and Mentor Visits**

##### **Assistant Professor and Instructor I**

Formative peer reviews for untenured faculty are recommended on an annual basis by the teaching committee or by the faculty member's mentors. Faculty members will have a formal summative peer evaluation for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure in Year 3 and at least once in Years 5-7 of their appointment. Suggested schedules for summative peer evaluation and mentoring reviews are given below:

##### **Assistant Professor**

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

### Instructor I

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

**Associate Professor:** At least one summative peer evaluation should be performed for faculty in this rank before being reviewed for promotion (and/or tenure in the case of a term appointment). Whenever possible, the latest peer evaluation should be performed during the term prior to the review for promotion (and/or tenure).

**Professor:** The *UBCV Peer Review Working Group* recommends that Full Professors undergo peer review every 5 years.

**Returning Sessional and 12-Month Lecturers:** Although lecturers are not reviewed for tenure or promotion, where possible regular peer evaluations and mentoring activities are recommended.

**Additional Peer review:** When a faculty member's teaching evaluations fall below the expected norm for the department, additional peer and/or mentoring visits will be arranged at the discretion of the Head. Additional peer evaluations may be scheduled at the request of the faculty member.

## 2. Peer Evaluation Committee

### Formative Review

A new faculty member will consult with the department head/teaching committee coordinator by the middle of the first year of appointment and jointly agree on who the formative peer evaluation committee should be. The committee should be chosen keeping in mind that for the future summative review, the review committee should include reviewers of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being evaluated. The department head will appoint three of these colleagues to form a peer evaluation of teaching committee and designate one of its members to serve as chairperson.

Instructors may also take advantage of the Peer Teaching Network (<http://www.skylight.science.ubc.ca/PTN>) or participate in the Peer Review Program ([http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT\\_programs/PRT](http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_programs/PRT)) for informal assessment of teaching. Feedback from these voluntary mentorship programs is provided directly to the visited faculty member and is not to be used by the formal summative peer evaluation process.

### Summative Review for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure:

For a summative assessment, the assigned peer reviewers will be of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being evaluated. Until the full integration of the new Professor of Teaching rank, Senior Instructors will be considered senior faculty. The review committee should consist of a minimum of two evaluators both of whom have the necessary expertise relevant to the evaluation of

the disciplinary content and teaching. For the summative assessment, an additional ‘arms-length’ reviewer from outside the discipline group will be appointed by the Head, to join the on-going formative peer review group.

Faculty members in Botany are encouraged to join the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology’s peer review community of practice, to undergo specific training to become ‘specialists’ in the peer reviews of teaching. However, all faculty conducting visits should be familiar with the Botany peer review process, be clear on the goals of the review (formative or summative) and be accomplished teachers with knowledge of sound principles of teaching and learning.

### **3. Botany Peer Review of Teaching Protocol**

#### **1. Initial meeting**

The chair of the teaching committee will set up a meeting to outline the procedures to be followed in the review. This should be done early in the teaching term, in order to allow enough time for discussion and classroom observation. At the initial meeting, instructors will provide course materials, including schedules, syllabi and lab manuals (where applicable). The instructor may choose to circulate their Teaching Philosophy statement (see Appendix 1, Teaching Dossier) to the committee prior to the meeting. This meeting is the opportunity for the instructor to discuss their instructional goals, identifying strengths, concerns, special considerations relevant to the course, and areas that the instructor would like to improve. At this meeting, the peer evaluation committee will review all relevant course materials and set up a strategy for classroom visits.

#### **2. Classroom visits**

The peer evaluation committee will observe at least 3 classes. In the case where more than one course is being taught, the committee will visit each course at least twice. In the case where laboratory instruction or design is a component of the instructor’s teaching, at least one visit will be to the lab. The instructor should be informed of the period over which they may expect in-class visits. The instructor should inform the committee of any days on which a classroom visit would be inappropriate (e.g., midterm exam or guest lecturer scheduled).

An optional observation worksheet (Appendix 2) can be used in both mentoring reviews and summative peer evaluation of teaching as well as award adjudication. The list of criteria on the worksheet is intended to focus the attention of the observer and help set the basis for comments during the teaching session. The worksheet can help to summarize and provide evidence to support an assessment of the teaching session and in the writing of the teaching report.

After at least one class in each course, a member of the committee will interview the class as a group for no more than 10 minutes, without the instructor present. In the case of lab faculty, the interview will take place in the lab. The committee member conducting the interview will state that the committee is interested in the students’ views of the instructor and the course, and that no student names will be recorded.

The committee will interview the students as a group using prompt questions such as:

- 1) “How does this instructor help you to learn?”
- 2) “Are there areas in which you would suggest improvement?”

The interview is to be conducted in an open-ended spirit. After the classroom visits, the committee or a subset of the committee meets with the instructor to provide informal feedback.

### **3. Graduate students**

The committee will conduct a confidential interview with the graduate students of the instructor being evaluated. The point of the interview is to determine the quality of instruction and support being provided. In the case of appointment to Senior Instructor, if laboratory instruction is the primary responsibility, the committee will interview the TAs involved in the lab and/or directed studies students

### **4. The report**

The committee will prepare a draft of the report. The final report should not contain attribution of comments to any specific reviewer but rather represent the opinion of the committee. The peer review report should describe the means of obtaining information about the faculty members teaching, identify the sources of data and provide a qualitative assessment of teaching. The goal of the report is to document the instructor's strengths and challenges with specific observations from the classroom visits and student interviews, graduate student comments and the Faculty of Science student evaluation of teaching. The committee will send a draft copy of the report to the instructor, with a request to review it and to send comments to the committee by a certain date. If the instructor submits comments, then the comments will be considered by the committee. If the committee agrees with the comments, then the report is modified to reflect them. If the committee does not agree with the comments, the instructor's comments are included as an addendum to the report. In the case of a summative evaluation, the report should address those criteria stipulated in the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (Appendix 3) and submitted to the head.

---

## **Appendix 1: Teaching dossier guidelines**

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

### **Statement of Teaching Philosophy**

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

### **Teaching Activities**

Identify number of courses taught, indicating level, format and size.

#### **Course Syllabi**

- Include course logistical information
- Outlines course goals, objectives or learning outcomes
- Outlines methods of student assessment and grading policies

Examples of student assessment linked to learning outcomes

- Assignments
- Exams
- Examples of feedback to students

### **Evidence of teaching effectiveness:**

## Botany Department: Peer Review of Teaching

Student evaluations and summary of student feedback, including comments

Summary of student evaluations

- Description of trends
- Explanation of anomalies
- Examples of incorporating feedback from students, peers

### **Other contributions/innovations**

Web site development

Curriculum, course/lab development

Publications at conferences, peer reviewed journals, etc.

Outreach activities (High Schools, Science Fair, etc.)

Advising including undergraduates, graduates and other instructors/faculty

Supervision of graduate students, undergraduate research projects

### **Teaching Awards**

Examples of awards and other recognition

### **Professional development**

Examples of professional development including conferences, courses, workshops

---

### **Further resources:**

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

Ohio State UCAT: [http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching\\_portfolio/teaching\\_port.html](http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html)

## Appendix 2: Teaching Evaluation Worksheet

<b>Name of Instructor:</b>	<b>Course Title:</b>
<b>Course:</b>	<b>Section:</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Day:</b>
<b>Visitor's Name:</b>	<b>Signature:</b>

---

### 1. Clarity and Organization

- Clearly states purpose / objectives of the lesson
- Presents clearly defined learning goals
- Presented overview of lesson
- Relates lesson to previously covered material
- Presents material in a logical sequence
- Paces lesson appropriately
- Summarizes major points of lesson

*How did the instructor demonstrate organization of the subject matter?*

## **2. Effective Communication**

- Projects voice, with intonation; easily heard
- Demonstrates and stimulates enthusiasm for subject
- Varied explanations for complex and difficult material, using examples to clarify points
- Defines unfamiliar terms, concepts and principles
- Uses humor appropriately to maintain attention and strengthen retention
- Listens to students' questions and comments

*What were the most and least helpful things the instructor did to communicate effectively?*

---

## **3. Interaction with Students**

- Maintains student attention
- Responds to nonverbal cues of confusion, boredom and curiosity
- Encourages student questions or discussion
- Asks questions to monitor student progress
- Listens to students' questions and comments
- Gives satisfactory answers to student questions
- Uses appropriate techniques to engage students

*How did the instructor show interest in the students and their learning?*

#### **4. Instructional Materials**

- Prepares students for lesson with appropriate assigned reading
- Presentation follows handout / syllabus
- Present appropriate amount of material at suitable level of complexity; material up-to-date
- Presents helpful audiovisual materials to support lesson organization and major points
- Has prepared helpful written materials (syllabi and objectives, handouts) to reinforce key points

*Did the instructor incorporate various instructional methods appropriate for the material presented? What other methods would be effective?*

---

#### **5. Content Knowledge and Relevance**

- Material is relevant to education of a science student
- Material appropriate for student level
- Demonstrates command of subject matter; information up-to-date

*What content appeared to be the most important component of the lesson?*

**Small Group / Lab** (if appropriate)

- Explains purpose, goals of the session
- Explains how session is organized, or will be conducted; student role is made clear
- Keeps session well-paced & keeps group on target
- Facilitates, rather than directs, discussion. Allows learners to solve problems
- Accommodates different learning styles
- Demonstrates new tasks, procedures
- Checks to see that information is understood
- Provides effective feedback
- Encourages group interaction; ensures participation from all members of the group
- Treats learners and colleagues, team members respectfully
- Ensures summarization of content at end of session

*What aspect of the small group session was most effective in enhancing student engagement?*

**OVERALL SUMMARY**

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

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

### **Appendix 3: Guidelines for the Summative Assessment of Teaching**

The Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) requests that each candidate's file include a summative assessment of the entire teaching portfolio and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator. Typically this is written by the Head or the Chair of the Promotion/Tenure committee and is 2-3 pages in length. The peer evaluation of teaching report forms the basis for many sections of the summative assessment for SAC. The assessment should include:

#### **1. Description of the procedure:**

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

#### **2. Teaching load:**

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

#### **3. Student evaluations:**

A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations, and how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department. Charts may be helpful in setting out the summary and with the evaluation of any changes to performance. 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.

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

#### **4. Peer evaluations:**

A summary of qualitative 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.

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

#### **5. Graduate (Undergraduate Research) Supervision:**

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

In some departments the promotion and tenure committee or the department head will also conduct a confidential interview with current or previous graduate students of the faculty member being evaluated. The point of the interview is to determine the quality of instruction and support being provided such as accessibility, feedback on work, career support and any concerns. In the case of appointment to Senior Instructor, if laboratory instruction is the primary responsibility, the committee could interview the TAs involved in the lab and/or directed studies students.

**6. Other teaching or educational activities:**

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

**7. Awards:**

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

**8. Professional Development:**

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

**9. Other evidence:**

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. Examples could also include conference presentations or publications on the scholarship of teaching.

**10. Overall summary:**

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.