

# **GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING IN THE FACULTY OF LAND & FOOD SYSTEMS The University of British Columbia**

## **The Goals of Peer Review of Teaching**

The key purposes and benefits of peer review of teaching (PRT) identified by the UBC-V Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching<sup>1</sup> include the following:

- Contribution to reflection on teaching and professional development of faculty members
- Increased awareness of the value of teaching within the university
- Positive impact on 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.)

Peer review of teaching has two main functions - **formative** PRT, which has as its focus the development of teaching through periodic feedback and dialogue with instructors, and **summative** PRT, which provides “judgmental and comparative information for the faculty member about the status of his/her teaching practice, as well as for the purpose of institutional and program accountability, policy and decision-making purposes”,<sup>2</sup> including for assessment of teaching in promotion and tenure cases.

## **Ethics and Guiding Principles**

Accuracy, integrity, confidentiality, transparency, diversity, credibility and usefulness are key guiding principles for summative peer review, and also apply to effective formative peer review.<sup>1</sup> Descriptions of these principles, as recommended by the UBCV Working group, are included in Appendix 1. The peer review process must be ethical and fair, must have explicit criteria for success, must use consistent standards, must be manageable in terms of resources, must make feedback available to the individual, and must incorporate information on student learning as well as the approaches and conduct of the individual’s teaching.<sup>3</sup>

With these goals and principles in mind, this document describes the guidelines for peer review of teaching practices in the Faculty of Land & Food Systems (LFS). The primary emphasis has been placed on describing the critical elements, evidence (data), criteria, standards, ethical principles and engagement sequences for summative PRT. However, it should be noted that many of these guidelines and principles also apply to formative PRT.

## **Critical Elements of A Summative PRT Report in LFS:**

As stated in Article 4.02 of the Collective Agreement:

*“... An individual’s entire teaching contribution shall be assessed. Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students”*

A summative PRT report should therefore summarize all aspects of the candidate’s teaching, including information on the courses taught, supervision or mentoring of students, the candidate’s teaching practices and philosophy, student evaluations as well as peer review of the effectiveness and quality of the candidate’s teaching, role of candidate in course or curriculum design, awards received for teaching, and any other pertinent information.

## Evidence and data used for Peer Review of Teaching

Examples of data sources used in PRT are described below. This list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive.

- **Teaching dossier/portfolio**
  - philosophy of teaching; reflection on teaching, steps taken to improve teaching and student learning including professional development through workshops and courses such as those offered by CTLT (formerly TAG), and through formative PRT; information on the candidate's teaching practices, such as community service learning, experiential learning, use of technology, etc; contributions to the profession or other communities through service related to teaching and education ...
- **Information on courses taught** (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, required, elective) and load of teaching (# of credits, students) relative to the faculty or program norm
  - Note: there is some variation in teaching assignments based on individuals' overall workload for teaching, research or educational leadership, and service. The normal yearly teaching load in LFS for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors is 6 credits at the undergraduate level and 3 credits at the graduate level (9 credits in total); for Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Professors of Teaching it is 15–18 credits; and for 12-month Lecturers it is 18 credits.
- **Information on instruction of courses as provided by the candidate**, including (where applicable):
  - course syllabus, course material, readings, etc
  - use of educational technologies or different activities and approaches to encourage active learning and embrace diverse learning styles
  - tools used for assessment of student learning (projects, essays, reports, exams, ...)
  - grading practices and assessment feedback to students
- **Student Evaluation of Teaching** scores – over the period under review, and in context with comparative scores for other LFS courses of the same “type” (e.g., undergraduate or graduate, class size, required or elective, etc). This information can be requested from the Learning Centre.
- **Information gathered by peer reviewers**, including (where applicable and available):
  - classroom observations
  - observations beyond the classroom, including online courses, problem-based learning, field work, labs, community service learning ...
  - student feedback (e.g. post-class chat with students)
  - evidence of teaching effectiveness (see section on criteria/frameworks for assessing teaching)
- **Information on awards received for teaching**
- **Information on students supervised by candidate \***
  - including numbers of students (graduate, undergraduate) and evidence of quality of mentoring (e.g. awards to students; years to completion; subsequent success in careers; co-authored publications; presentations at conferences; unsolicited letters from past students that are included in the candidate's teaching dossier ...)

\*please note that comments or opinions regarding the candidate's teaching or mentoring should not be actively solicited from students, particularly currently supervised students, by either the candidate or the reviewers.

## Criteria (Frameworks) for Assessment of Effective Teaching

The CTLT at UBC-V has documented “Effective Teaching Principles and Practices”:

[http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT\\_Resources/Selected\\_TL\\_Topics\\_Evaluation\\_Tools#Effective\\_Teaching\\_Principles\\_and\\_Practices](http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_Resources/Selected_TL_Topics_Evaluation_Tools#Effective_Teaching_Principles_and_Practices)

The seven principles and practices of effective teaching described in this documentation are as follows:

- 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 practices

A “Peer Review” document focussing on similar principles was created by the UBC-O Center for Teaching and Learning:

<http://ctl.ok.ubc.ca/support/peerreview.html>

The potential criteria for peer review observation described in the UBC-O documentation are

- Organization/Structure
- Learning Goals/Outcomes
- Communication and Interaction
- Content
- Indicators of Student Involvement and Engagement
- Teaching Strategies
- Evaluation/Assessment

Appendices 2a and 2b describe criteria framework based on these CTLT and UBC-O documents, which may be used or adapted for use in PRT in the Faculty of LFS.

Examples of templates for recording peer reviewers’ in-class and online course observations for specific criteria can be found in Appendices 3a and 3b, respectively. Please keep in mind that these are sample templates that may be adapted for use in recording observations, and furthermore, that these observations comprise only one piece of the evidence used in assessment of effective teaching.

## Timing and Frequency of Review

Reviews may be initiated

- (a) by schedule (as noted below)
- (b) upon request by the Dean, Associate Dean Academic or Program Directors for various reasons, including when concerns or problems have been identified e.g. from student evaluations of teaching, or when an instructor is being considered for nomination for a teaching award;
- (c) upon request by instructors for formative feedback and professional development

Scheduled reviews:

1) For pre-tenure faculty:

It is recommended to schedule in the first year of teaching a *formative PRT*, which may be led by the faculty member's mentor. A second formative PRT is recommended prior to the *summative PRT* that is required for promotion and tenure decisions and may also be required for reappointment decisions.

2) For tenured faculty:

A review will be conducted at least once every 5 years. For tenured Associate Professors and Senior Instructors, a formative PRT is recommended prior to the *Summative PRT* that is required for promotion. For Full Professors and Professors of teaching, the review may be formative or summative, depending on the faculty member's track record of teaching effectiveness.

3) For sessional and 12-month lecturers:

*Formative PRT* is recommended during the 1st year of teaching, and then every 3 years thereafter. *Summative PRT* is recommended for continuing sessional and 12-month lecturers at least once every 5 years thereafter, or earlier when required.

Note: The summative PRT team should be informed of the timing and frequency of formative review(s) of a Candidate, but will not be provided with details of those formative review(s) except as provided by the Candidate in his/her teaching dossier, or in those cases when formative review was initiated by the Dean, Associate Dean or Program Director

## Engagement sequence and meeting protocol for summative PRT

- The Dean notifies the candidate of the requirement and process for summative PRT
- A PRT team of at least two members is appointed (see Appendix 4).
- Prior to or at the beginning of the term when summative PRT is to occur, the candidate provides the PRT team with the full teaching dossier
- In-class Observations\*:
  - Pre-observation meeting (at least 1 week prior to observations)
    - PRT team meets with candidate to discuss the context, data/evidence, criteria, standards, observation forms, process for the peer review
    - Candidate and PRT team plan the schedule for “in-class” observations (“classes” includes lectures, group activities, PBL sessions, labs, student presentations ...)
    - Candidate provides information on lesson plans, learning objectives, expected outcomes and other relevant information for the specific classes being observed (these may be shared either at the meeting or at another time prior to the observations).
  - Observations
    - At least 2 different classes each by at least two reviewers from PRT team; ideally, a minimum of two observations per reviewer with at least one observation by both reviewers together. The classes and courses to be observed should be representative of the instructor’s breadth of teaching activities, e.g., distinct pedagogical approaches, student audience etc.
    - Peer reviewers record their observations using forms agreed on during the pre-observation meeting (e.g. Appendices 3a or 3b, adapted as required)
    - Candidate and reviewers may meet for a short de-briefing immediately after each observation
  - Post-observation meeting (preferably within ~ 1 week of the last observation)
    - Reviewers jointly prepare a written report based on the recorded observations
    - PRT team meets with candidate to obtain his/her reflections on the classes observed, and to share their observations and constructive feedback

\* for online courses – the same sequence of pre-observation meeting, observations and post-observation meeting is applied. However, the reviewers’ observations over the relevant period will be conducted by monitoring the activities, assignments, discussions etc. in the online course, as observed for example on a wiki page, CONNECT or other Learning Management System.

- PRT team members jointly prepare a summative report of all the collected evidence (classroom or online observations, information from teaching dossier, student evaluations of teaching etc... please refer to aforementioned “data” section). The report should clearly indicate whether, in the opinion of the PRT team, the Candidate has demonstrated evidence of effective teaching (please see Appendix 5 for a template that may be used for a summative PRT report). Please consult Appendices 1 and 2 in the SAC guide (<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/files/SAC-Guide.pdf>), particularly for individuals being evaluated for promotion in the Educational Leadership stream .

- The summative PRT report is submitted to the Program Director and the Dean, and a copy is sent to the Candidate at the same time.
- The Program Director meets with the Candidate to discuss the PRT report.
  - In the event of concerns raised by the review, the Candidate is given the opportunity to provide a written response that will be included in his/her dossier.
  - The Program Director and the Candidate should also discuss, in consultation with the PRT team, an action plan to support the candidate's continued teaching development, and for follow-up formative review(s), if necessary.

### **Engagement sequence and meeting protocol for formative PRT**

Formative PRT is intended to provide instructors with feedback that will facilitate reflection of their teaching practices and/or course design, and professional development leading to higher quality of teaching and enhanced student learning. The Peer Review Program at UBC'S CTLT has useful information on formative PRT (see [http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT\\_programs/PRT](http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_programs/PRT)).

Key points which differ in the engagement sequence for formative PRT versus summative PRT are:

- When formative PRT is initiated (requested) by the instructor ("reviewee"), the review may be focussed on particular aspects of the instructor's teaching (e.g. only classroom observations, or only a review of course assignments). The report prepared by the PRT team is shared only with the reviewee, and is not disclosed to anyone else except by the reviewee him/herself.
- When formative PRT is initiated by a scheduled review, or upon the request of the Dean (or delegate), Associate Dean Academic or Program Director, depending on the reasons for the review, the formative PRT may involve the full spectrum of teaching of the instructor, or may be focussed on particular aspects of teaching associated with specific concerns. The resulting formative PRT report is disclosed to the instructor as well as the requestor (Dean, Associate Dean Academic or Program Director), but is held in confidence. As with summative PRT, a meeting is scheduled with the instructor and Program Director (and/or other requestor) to discuss the PRT report, and an action plan to support the candidate's continued teaching development.

### **References**

<sup>1</sup> Report of the UBCV Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching. 2009.  
<http://wiki.ubc.ca/images/c/c3/Ubcprtfinalreport.pdf> (last accessed July 25, 2016)

<sup>2</sup> Hubball, H and Clarke, A. 2011. Scholarly approaches to peer-review of teaching: Emergent frameworks and outcomes in a research-intensive university. *Transformative Dialogues Journal* volume 4, number 3.

<sup>3</sup> UBC Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology.  
[http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT\\_Resources/Selected\\_TL\\_Topics\\_Evaluation\\_Tools#Suggested\\_Principles\\_and\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_the\\_Peer\\_Review\\_of\\_Teaching](http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_Resources/Selected_TL_Topics_Evaluation_Tools#Suggested_Principles_and_Guidelines_for_the_Peer_Review_of_Teaching) (last accessed July 25, 2016)

## Appendix 1 - Principles of Summative Peer Review<sup>a</sup>

### 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 ideally include reviewers who are trained/possess relevant expertise (disciplinary, in peer evaluation and the modality of instruction) 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, use of learning technologies as appropriate, 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. 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, modality of teaching, 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.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Principles of Summative Peer Review from UBCV Working Group (2009), revised in 2013.*  
Quoted from <http://ctl.ubc.ca/files/2010/12/SPRTprinciplesR.pdf>, a file that is accessible from <http://ctl.ubc.ca/resources/isotl/programs-events/ubc-peer-review-of-teaching-initiative/> (last accessed April 18, 2016)

*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.*

## Appendix 2a - Criteria Framework - Sample Template #1

# LFS Criteria Framework for Peer Review of Teaching

(adapted from CTLT Seven Principles)

[http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT\\_Resources/Selected\\_TL\\_Topics\\_Evaluation\\_Tools#Effective\\_Teaching\\_Principles\\_and\\_Practices](http://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:CTLT_Resources/Selected_TL_Topics_Evaluation_Tools#Effective_Teaching_Principles_and_Practices):

This framework is intended to serve as a guide for the criteria that may apply to assess teaching for data sources ranging from classroom observations to course or curriculum design to student mentoring. Both the list of criteria and the exemplary practices described under each heading are not meant to be exhaustive nor rigid. The form may be modified to meet the specific review context.

For each criterion, **(i)** indicate whether this element is very evident, mostly evident, partially evident, or not evident in the observations of the instructor's teaching practice, and **(ii)** provide comments describing the evidence to justify the assessment.

### 1. Sets Clear Goals and Intellectual Challenges for Student Learning

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- demonstrates and communicates a clear vision of intellectual goals and learning outcomes for the class
- identifies key concepts or ideas in the field and helps students to understand and apply them
- integrates current research and conceptual approaches into learning activities
- identifies key steps in achieving learning goals
- actively helps students to accomplish goals and meet challenges as defined in the course outline
- sets high, yet reasonable, expectations of students' learning

### 2. Employs Appropriate Teaching Methods and Strategies that Actively Involve Learners

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- shows awareness in teaching activities, that learning is a process which transforms and changes learners
- encourages appropriate student participation organizes effective learning experiences to meet intellectual goals and learning outcomes, both in the classroom and (as possible) beyond
- evaluates and assesses learning in a manner consistent with established goals and learning outcomes
- integrates appropriate teaching methods and technologies, tailored to course goals and learning outcomes, and facilitates student participation
- encourages and assists students to participate in self-directed learning activities

### 3. Communicates and Interacts Effectively with Students

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- expresses goals, intended outcomes, and expectations clearly and effectively and discusses these with students
- balances collaborative and individual student learning to reflect the course aims and outcomes
- attends to classroom dynamics that enhance or inhibit learning
- engenders enthusiasm and interest in subject matter
- uses fair and reasonable methods of evaluating learning

#### **4. Attends to Intellectual Growth of Students**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- provides, and discusses with students, explicit criteria for assessing learning
- acquires regular and varied feedback on students' intellectual accomplishments
- reviews students' progress in achieving intellectual goals and learning outcomes
- provides advanced learning opportunities for those students who seek them

#### **5. Respects Diverse Talents & Learning Styles of Students**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- promotes a stimulating learning environment
- recognizes and accommodates different learning styles
- demonstrates sensitivity to intellectual and cultural issues

#### **6. Incorporates Learning Beyond the Classroom**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- encourages appropriate student-faculty interaction
- helps students connect their learning experience to the world outside the classroom (both within and outside of the University)
- helps students to apply their learning in a variety of ways

#### **7. Reflects on, Monitors and Improves Teaching Practices**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Examples of evidence of exemplary practices for this criterion:

- seeks regular student feedback on teaching effectiveness
- reflects on teaching practice through creation of a teaching dossier or other self-reflection activity
- seeks peer feedback to enhance teaching
- regularly revises and updates course content, format, teaching strategies, and assignments
- takes advantage of opportunities to enhance teaching by attending professional development activities

#### **8. Open Stem:**

What are some particularly effective or ineffective aspects of the instructor's teaching practice, course content, or student's learning?

## Appendix 2b - Criteria Framework - Sample Template #2

### LFS Criteria Framework for Peer Review of Teaching

(headings adapted from UBC-O criteria suggestions  
<http://ctl.ok.ubc.ca/support/peerreview.html>):

This framework is intended to serve as a guide for the criteria that may apply to assess teaching for data sources ranging from classroom observations to course or curriculum design to student mentoring. Both the list of criteria and the questions illustrating exemplary practices described under each heading are not meant to be exhaustive nor rigid. The form may be modified to meet the specific review context.

For each criterion, **(i)** indicate whether teaching effectiveness is very evident, mostly evident, partially evident, or not evident in the observations of this criterion in the instructor's teaching practice, and **(ii)** provide comments describing the evidence to justify the assessment.

#### **1. Organization/Structure:**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Does the organization or structure of the course provide an effective learning environment for students? Are specific objectives and learning outcomes clearly communicated? Does the structure of the course material and delivery respect diversity in learning styles?

#### **2. Learning Goals/Outcomes:**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

The learning goals/outcomes are appropriate for the course and encompass acceptable academic rigor. Clear, high expectations are communicated.

#### **3. Content:**

**Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

The course material is of high quality with respect to currency, relevancy, appropriate breadth and depth of content matter. It builds on prior knowledge and provides for coherence in learning experiences and ongoing practice of learned skills.

#### **4. Teaching Strategies:**

##### **Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

The teaching strategy matches the content and objectives. The instructor uses a variety of strategies to address the diversity of learning styles, and to encourage active learning and critical thinking. The delivery is effective in facilitating attainment of learning outcomes by students. Time on task is adequate.

#### **5. Communication & Interaction:**

##### **Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

The instructor establishes effective communication, interactions and rapport with the students. He/she encourages questions and suggestions. He/she conveys enthusiasm for the subject matter. Does he/she show concern for students' learning?

#### **6. Indicators of Student Involvement and Engagement:**

##### **Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Are students engaged in active learning, participation, note-taking, discussions, or other activities? Is collaborative/team learning encouraged?

#### **7. Evaluation/Assessment:**

##### **Very evident / Mostly evident / Partially evident / Not evident**

Does the assessment of learning match the learning objectives? Does the evaluation provide evidence of student learning? Is timely formative feedback provided?

#### **8. Open Stem:**

What are some particularly effective or ineffective aspects of the instructor's teaching practice, course content, or student's learning?

Appendix 3a - Observations - Sample Template #1

**Faculty of Land & Food Systems**  
**Peer Review of Teaching: In-Class Observations**  
(adapted from UBC-O criteria and Botany's Peer Evaluation Worksheet)

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Class size (enrolled/estimated attendance) : \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Class Location: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Class (circle one): Lecture    Laboratory    PBL session    Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(please specify)

Materials provided by the instructor prior to the observations

The following signatures indicate that the instructor and peer reviewer did/did not meet for debriefing following the in-class observation

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Peer reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

*Directions: Below is a list of criteria that may be used for the review. Some of these apply to lecture-based teaching and some to small group, PBL or lab teaching. Please use it as a guide for recording your observations, not as a list of required characteristics, and feel free to adapt this form as appropriate for the designated teaching mode.*

*Circle or highlight the rating or number at the right that best represents your observation, as follows:  
 N/O = not observed but expected; 1 = not observed at all (not evident) ... 5 = very evident; N/A = not applicable.  
 Use the comment space below each section to provide specific examples and additional feedback.*

**1. Organization and Flow:**

Clearly states learning objectives and outcomes of the lesson .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Presents overview of lesson .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Relates lesson to previously covered material .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Presents material in a logical sequence .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Summarizes major points of lesson .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

**2. Instructional Materials and Content:**

Learning goals/outcomes are appropriate for the course and have acceptable academic rigor .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Prepares students for lesson with assigned readings/handouts.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Presents appropriate amount of material .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Material is current and includes recent developments in the field.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Uses diverse resources to address different learning styles .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

### 3. Communication and Clarity:

Speaks with appropriate pace, intonation and volume.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Conveys enthusiasm for subject .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Demonstrates command over subject matter .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Provides varied explanations for unfamiliar terms and complex concepts .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Uses a variety of instructional resources effectively .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

### 4. Student Involvement and Engagement:

Maintains student attention.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Encourages student questions and discussion .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Asks questions to monitor student progress.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Responds appropriately to student questions.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Facilitates active learning .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

## 5. Small Group /PBL

Purpose and goals of the session are clear.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Procedures are clear .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Keeps session well-paced and keeps groups on target.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Allows learners to solve problems.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Provides timely and effective feedback.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Encourages interaction and participation of and respect for all group members ..	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Ensures summarization of content at end of session.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

## 6. Laboratory

Explains purpose, goals, and organization of the lab.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Checks to see that information is understood.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Demonstrates new tasks or procedures .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Keeps session well-paced and keeps groups on target .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Allows learners to solve problems.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Provides timely and effective feedback .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Ensures participation from all group members .....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Treats learners respectfully.....	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

## 7. Open Questions:

- 1) What are some particularly effective or ineffective aspects of the instructor's teaching practice, course content, or student's learning?
- 2) What were the instructor's major strengths, as demonstrated during this session?
- 3) What suggestions do you have for improving upon this instructor's skills?

Appendix 3b - Observations - Sample Template #2 <sup>a</sup>

**Faculty of Land & Food Systems  
Peer Review of Teaching: Online Course Observations**

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Class size (enrolled/estimated attendance) : \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

This review includes items in **four major areas: Website Design, Course and Content Implementation, Quality of Interactions, and Assessment**<sup>1</sup>. The items are based on best practices for the design and implementation of online courses. If any of the items are not evident in your review of the course, you can ask about them in your post-review meeting.

<sup>a</sup> Template designed by M.-C. Fortin, E.C.Y. Li-Chan, and C.A. Rideout ( July 2015), with information adapted from Arizona Board of Regents OIA online course review tool (2014), MacEwen Checklist for Online Interactive Learning, and Blackboard Exemplary Course Program Rubric (2014).

## Scoring Guidelines

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Very evident throughout the course	Mostly evident	Partially evident	Not evident

### A. Website Design

	Score
1. The website is well organized and navigation is intuitive. The menu is clear, relatively succinct and, the site offers easy access to the course syllabus, schedule, assessment methods, content and participation expectations.	
2. Design elements (colour, fonts, eye-catching elements) increase clarity and promote engagement.	
3. Materials are in formats appropriate for the online environment i.e. a variety of formats is used to present the material. Examples could include voice over PowerPoint presentations, streaming video, audio or video recordings, case studies, e-books, podcasts, online UBC library links, screencasts, etc.	
4. The role of the instructor and the expectations for student involvement are explained in a section designed to be read in the first week of the course.	
5. Clear instructions for contacting the instructor on an individual basis are provided in a section designed to be read in the first week of the course.	
6. The menu includes a clear item indicating where students are to begin.	
7. Link for technical support is easy to find.	
8. Link for the UBC Library's course reserve is easy to find, if applicable.	
9. Course content is presented in manageable units or lessons which are logically sequenced.	
10. Course content within each unit or lesson is organized in subunits or chapters to avoid long pages and minimize scrolling. The subunits have informative titles for students to retrieve content or return to a specific subject with ease.	
11. The website includes clear explanations for the execution and submission of assignments.	
12. The discussion board is divided in forums which are named with informative keywords for easy navigation and retrieval of information.	

#### Comments regarding Website Design:

## Scoring Guidelines

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Very evident throughout the course	Mostly evident	Partially evident	Not evident

## B. Course and Content Implementation

	Score
13. The instructor contacts students at the beginning of the term to provide information on how to access the course and begin on the first week of class.	
14. Unit-level learning outcomes and learning activities are aligned with course-level outcomes.	
15. The academic rigour, scope and depth of content of the instructional materials are appropriate for the course level and are sufficiently comprehensive for students to meet the learning outcomes.	
16. There is evidence of regular updating of content, materials and hyperlinks by the instructor and/or of collaboration with CTLT IT staff.	
17. Materials provided and downloading pdf copies of articles are in accordance with the Canadian copyright law and are sourced from the UBC Library unless they have been developed at UBC.	
18. Instructor troubleshoots technological difficulties and appears to have good knowledge of the learning platform.	
19. Course assignments provide students with opportunities to practice and apply concepts and skills in ways that reinforce learning outcomes.	
20. Ample opportunities are available for interactions, honest dialogue and sharing understanding of course content	
21. The instructor uses well-labelled spaces in the discussion board for discussing content which are separate from spaces for the discussion of process (special announcements, questions on assignments etc. ).	
22. The naming of discussion forums, discussion threads within discussion forums, subject lines within discussion threads make navigation and the retrieval of information easy.	
23. Discussions align with learning units	
24. Discussion forums that are dedicated to content dominate the discussion board and address important and/or difficult topics, promote critical thinking and/or address topics seen in the required readings/viewings/audios.	
25. The instructor intervenes regularly to advance the discussions on content and/or push the debate further if necessary. The instructor uses key learning opportunities to facilitate construction of knowledge and critical thinking.	

### Comments regarding Course and Content Implementation:

## Scoring Guidelines

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Very evident throughout the course	Mostly evident	Partially evident	Not evident

### C. Quality of Interactions

	Score
26. Instructor provides learning activities at the beginning of the course to help students get used to the website.	
27. Instructor introduces him/herself and also asks students to introduce themselves at the beginning of the course, in order to establish a sense of community.	
28. Instructor creates social interaction through group collaboration, when appropriate.	
29. Instructor clearly models a positive communication style. Instructor monitors activities for respectfulness.	
30. Instructor provides clear and appropriate guidance, supportive feedback and a safe and nurturing online environment especially when a correction has to be made in the discussions.	
31. Instructor is able to formulate questions in a way that limits or prevents quick searches on google as the way to find answers. If such evidence is presented, the instructor reviews it thoroughly to model proper critical assessment of sources gathered in this way. Alternatively, a request to avoid quick searches is evident..	
32. Instructor posts responses to frequently asked questions from one-on-one communications for everyone to see.	
33. Instructor emphasizes the importance of good study skills and time management throughout the course.	
34. Instructor demonstrates command of subject matter and conveys enthusiasm for subject	
35. Students actively participate in online activities, actively seek guidance on course content from instructor (as needed), seem engaged and appear to appreciate their learning experience.	
36. The website provides opportunities for students to anonymously provide midterm feedback about the course and instructor and the instructor offers relevant and appropriate responses to the survey	

### Comments regarding Quality of Interactions:

## Scoring Guidelines

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Very evident throughout the course	Mostly evident	Partially evident	Not evident

## D. Assessment

	Score
37. The course includes periodic formative assessments to determine whether students are keeping current with the class and learning the content.	
38. The course includes appropriate summative assessments to determine whether students are meeting the course learning outcomes.	
39. Assessments are varied in format (e.g., journals, essays, quizzes, projects, exams, etc.).	
40. Assessments are aligned with learning outcomes and are appropriate in scope and rigour	
41. Clear rubrics are provided for grading of assignments and evaluating participation in online discussions.	
42. The instructor provides personalized and constructive feedback on assignments within timeframes stated in the syllabus.	
43. The instructor provides information concerning the final exam, suggestions for review, and/or review questions.	

### Comments regarding Assessment:

## E. Overall comments:

- 4) What are some particularly effective or ineffective aspects of the instructor's teaching practice, course content, or student's learning?
- 5) What were the instructor's major strengths, as demonstrated from these observations?
- 6) What suggestions do you have for improving upon this instructor's teaching?

## Appendix 4

# Faculty of Land & Food Systems LFS Peer Review of Teaching Standing Committee and Peer Reviewers

### Faculty of Land & Food Systems Peer Review of Teaching Standing Committee

The purpose of the Faculty of Land & Food Systems Peer Review of Teaching Standing Committee (“**LFS-PRT Standing Committee**”) is to assist instructors in our Faculty to attain a high standard of teaching excellence, by fostering a scholarly approach to the formative and summative peer review of teaching.

The objectives of the Committee are to (1) promote a culture of peer review of teaching (PRT) in LFS, (2) provide ongoing guidance to improve the procedures and protocols for PRT in LFS, and (3) serve as peer reviewers for summative and formative reviews of LFS instructors.

The LFS PRT Standing Committee is comprised of:

- 8-10 members, each serving for a specific term and preferably for at least 3 years.
- instructors representing the scope of diversity in LFS – including gender, rank and disciplinary expertise, as well as varying interests and experiences with modes of teaching such as CSL, PBL, flexible learning, online course delivery, social networking tools etc.
- instructors who are familiar with the guiding principles of PRT and enthusiastic in contributing to a culture of peer review in the LFS Faculty as a means to enhance teaching and student learning, and who have or are willing to participate in training for PRT.

Membership on the Standing Committee may be through self-nomination or nomination by peers, the Program Director or the Dean, and is considered as an important “service” contribution to the Faculty. All tenure-track faculty members in LFS can be called on to serve on this Standing Committee.

### Selection of PRT team members for peer review of LFS instructors

For **summative** PRT, the Candidate may provide a list of up to four names of LFS or other faculty members to serve as his/her peer reviewer(s). If he/she so wishes, the Candidate may also indicate name(s) that he/she wishes to exclude as a peer reviewer.

The Dean (or Delegate) selects a minimum of two peer reviewers to serve on the Summative PRT team. If the Candidate has provided suggestions for reviewers, the PRT team must always contain either the same number or more reviewers from the Candidate’s list than from the Dean’s list. At least one reviewer must be familiar with the discipline/area of the Candidate, and at least one reviewer must be an “external” reviewer, i.e. not from the same program as the Candidate. If no external reviewer is suggested by the Candidate, the Dean may solicit assistance of the LFS PRT Standing Committee to identify an appropriate external reviewer. Peer reviewers must commit to familiarizing themselves with the guiding principles of PRT, and the PRT team should ideally have knowledge of particular pedagogy or delivery modes (e.g. CBEL, PBL, flexible learning, online course) that are core to the Candidate’s teaching.

Peer reviewers for **summative** PRT are usually at the same or higher rank as the individual being reviewed. In cases of reviews required for decisions on contract, re-appointment, tenure and/or promotion, junior faculty are not expected to review senior faculty. Senior Instructors are considered senior faculty.

For **formative** PRT, the instructor selects (or may consult with the LFS PRT Standing Committee Chair to select) one or two peer reviewer(s) with experience in peer review of teaching and/or familiarity with the discipline/area of the instructor. Junior faculty may serve as peer reviewers for formative PRT.

## Faculty of Land and Food Systems

### SAMPLE TEMPLATE FOR SUMMATIVE PRT REPORT <sup>a</sup>

Date [XX]

Dr. [YY], Dean of the Faculty of Land & Food Systems  
Dr. [ZZ], [APBI/FNH ..] Program Director  
Faculty of Land & Food Systems

Dear Dean [YY] and Dr. [ZZ],

We have conducted a summative review of [*Candidate Dr. A's*] teaching following the principles and guidelines for peer review of teaching in the Faculty of Land & Food Systems, which are accessible to all instructors on our Faculty's "MyLandFood" intranet website.

In conducting our review, we have kept in mind Article 4.02 of the Collective Agreement, which states that "... *An individual's entire teaching contribution shall be assessed. Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students*". Therefore, in compiling this report, we have drawn on the following data sources ([see footnote 1](#)) for evidence of Dr. A's teaching contributions and effectiveness:

- Dr Y's teaching dossier or portfolio, including teaching philosophy and reflections on teaching effectiveness and on student learning outcomes, professional development, and description of action taken in response to formative peer reviews ...
- His/her course syllabi, course material, readings
- His/her use of educational technologies and approaches to encourage active learning (e.g., Community Service Learning, Problem-Based Learning, Experiential learning ...)
- His/her approaches for assessing student learning (assignments, projects, essays, reports, exams)
- His/her grading practices and feedback to students
- Peer observations of Dr. A's teaching in the classroom/lab/field (indicate # and dates of observations)
- Our pre-observation and post-observation meeting discussions with Dr. A
- Information on courses taught by Dr. A (undergraduate or graduate, required or elective) and load of teaching (# of credits, students) relative to the faculty or program norm over the period being reviewed
- SEoT (student evaluation of teaching) numerical scores over the period under review and in context with comparative scores for other LFS courses of the same "type"; SEoT open-ended student comments
- Awards received by Dr. A for teaching
- Students supervised by Dr Y (numbers of graduate/undergraduate students, evidence of quality of mentoring including awards, completion rate and time to completion; subsequent success in careers; co-authored publications; conference presentations; unsolicited letters from students including input from past students)

This report summarizes the results of our assessment of the effectiveness of Dr. A’s teaching using the criteria described in the LFS guidelines for peer review of teaching.

Dr. A’s teaches in the area of [abcxyz], including ... undergraduate courses in ... and graduate courses in ... Compared to the Faculty norm, Dr Y has an [average/above average/below average] teaching load. ... Describe and comment on SEoT scores and student comments.

In addition to teaching courses, since [20xx year], Dr. A has mentored [# of] graduate and undergraduate students. ....Comment (here or as part of the next section) on quality of mentoring...including mentoring of Teaching Assistants.

Below, we summarize the evidence for effective teaching by Dr. A based on the following criteria: (see footnote 2)

...

### Summary

In conclusion, the data that we have examined during our review indicate [clear evidence/evidence/some evidence/little evidence] of effective teaching by Dr. A.

We [commend] Dr. A for his/her [exemplary] teaching practices and valuable contributions to the [APBI/FNH] undergraduate program and [name] graduate program in the Faculty of Land & Food Systems. (see footnote 3)

Respectfully submitted,

Name #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
[rank, program affiliation]

Name #2 \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
[rank, program affiliation]

Cc: Candidate

---

**footnote 1:** Not all of these may apply. The list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive, but illustrates the type of information that should be listed.

**footnote 2:** In the context of and with reference to the particular criteria (e.g., from those listed in Appendix 2a or Appendix 2b) used in this assessment of Dr. Y’s teaching, please describe specific examples from the data listed in the first page of the report (i.e., Dr Y’s teaching dossier, in-class or online observations, SEoT, awards ... etc), that illustrate whether evidence of Dr Y’s teaching effectiveness is present for each criterion. This section comprises the core assessment of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, and would typically be at least 2-3 pages long.

**footnote 3:** Could include additional or other information, if there are serious concerns, regarding suggestions for professional development & follow-up formative review. On the other hand, could also include a statement specifically highlighting Dr A’s exemplary practices.

<sup>a</sup> Please consult Appendices 1 and 2 in the SAC guide (<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/files/SAC-Guide.pdf>), particularly for individuals being evaluated for promotion in the Educational Leadership stream .