



Complementary Teaching Assessment Project Team (CTAPT)
Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)
Details and Report Template

February 8, 2023

CTAPT Members:

Donna Ellis, Director, Centre for Teaching Excellence

Denise Marigold, Associate Professor, Chair, Social Development Studies, Renison University College

John (Jay) Michela, Associate Professor, Psychology

Elena Neiterman, Continuing Lecturer, School of Public Health Sciences

Cynthia Richard, Clinical Lecturer; Associate Director, Curriculum, Pharmacy

Manoj Sachdev, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Su-Yin Tan, Lecturer, School of Planning

Ian VanderBurgh, Centre for Education in Mathematics and Computing (Chair)

Pia Zeni, Learning Design Manager, Centre for Extended Learning

CTAPT PRT Details

Version 8, 2022.02.10

Frequency

- Summary
 - Pre-tenure/pre-continuing = 1 PRT every 2 years on average
 - Tenured/continuing = 1 PRT every 8 years on average (could be done more frequently in some units or by request)
- Pre-tenure/pre-continuing (assuming typical 6 years window)
 - Year 1 or Year 2: formative (1 review)
 - Year 3 or Year 4: summative (1 review); could also be used for T&P
 - Possible additional in Year 5 or Year 6 for inclusion in T&P package
- Post-tenure/post-continuing
 - Initially, faculty randomly assigned into 4 two-year windows (e.g. 2023/2024, 2025/2026, 2027/2028, 2029/2030); assignments done within Faculty (for example, faculty members assigned to 2023/2024 window are designated to have peer review done during that two-year window)
 - 1 summative review done in that two-year window
 - Newly tenured/continuing faculty assigned on a rolling basis to furthest cohort post-tenure
 - In consultation, at time of review, Chair & Dean can waive PRT for up to 10% of faculty in given cohort in a given Faculty for reasons of extenuating circumstances, significant reductions in teaching, etc.
 - In consultation, at time of review, Chair & Dean can request a second summative PRT for up to 5% of faculty in given cohort in a given Faculty
 - In consultation, faculty member and Chair can request a second summative PRT

Administrative support

- Could be in Office of Teaching Assessment Processes (part of a staff position)
- Tracking eligible and trained peer reviewers
- Tracking windows assigned to individual faculty members
- List provided to Chair by beginning of year/window including all who need
- List provided to Faculty of terms ending as reviewers
- Investigate possibilities of online tools to automate and/or make data tracking and collection more efficient
- Filing completed PRT documentation in Faculty

Selection of pool of peer reviewers

- Must be Continuing Lecturer, Associate Professor, Professor (Staff members with strong teaching records might be appropriate in some Faculties)
- Must be recognized for demonstrated commitment to teaching
- Must be seen as collegial
- Peer reviewers appointed for 3 years, ideally without predictable interruptions (e.g. sabbatical)
- Nominations by self or by colleagues to Chair; new reviewers chosen at Faculty level (light-weight mechanism, possibly including Teaching Fellows in selection process) to ensure diversity of pool, variety of perspectives, commitment to teaching, collegiality, balance of ranks

Credit for peer reviewers

- **Service or Teaching credit given?** [Note: In many ways, doing peer review might be more suitable as “Professional Development” under teaching, but with minimum 20% Service, crediting as Teaching might be problematic for Assoc Prof / Prof without teaching release or service reduction].
- Each reviewer does 6 to 8 PRT per year
- Expected hours per year per reviewer: 80 (= 5% of FTE)
- Office of TAP to provide some minimal oversight of peer reviewers [Note: difficult to provide feedback on peer reviewers without breaching anonymity or incentivizing only very positive reviews; could do spot-checking of reports]

Selection of specific peer reviewer(s) from pool

- Administration coordination by Office of TAP
- Reviewer normally chosen from inside Faculty outside unit; PRT Coordinator provides list of a handful of possible appropriate reviewers, asks faculty member for any exclusions from list, then chooses reviewer
- Faculty member can choose to have reviewer from outside Faculty in consultation with Chair

Overview of PRT Processes

Summative PRT Process

- Faculty member determines course to be reviewed (with advice that best to choose a course in which significant Design contributions were made); consideration given to timing in APR/BPR cycle to ensure sufficient timing to complete and submit materials
- Reviewer assigned
- Reviewer and instructor pre-review meeting (30 minutes)
- Reviewer given access to appropriate platforms (e.g. LEARN, Piazza, Slack, Crowdmark)
- Reviewer uses Faculty PRT Report Template plus additional direction from instructor (gives instructor opportunity/agency to highlight specific positive things as well as to ask for feedback on specific things)
- Reviewer reviews materials (including, but not limited to, course outline, asynchronous learning materials, assessments, communication), usually (but not always) including synchronous component(s) (3 to 5 hours)
- Reviewer writes preliminary report (2 to 3 hours)
- Reviewer and instructor post-review meeting (30 minutes); reviewer gives specific formative feedback, asks for clarification on items for report
- Reviewer finalizes report (1 hour)
- Report should be explicit about dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness that couldn't be addressed
- Reviewer submits report to faculty member, Chair, PRT Coordinator
- Instructor has 30 days to write a response to be attached to official PRT; based on response, Chair and Dean in consultation can delete the review if sufficiently problematic and decide in consultation with instructor whether to have a new review done or wait until the next designated window
- Two peer reviewers could be assigned to do the PRT together in specific "high stakes" situations

Formative PRT Process

- Model #1: Reciprocal pairs
 - Done more informally using same Faculty PRT Report Template
 - "Light" training to be done
 - Value for both instructors
- Model #2: Teaching triangles or squares
 - Existing program at CTE
 - Three or four instructors collaborate on observation and discussion
- Other models developed at Faculty level in consultation with CTE and Office for Teaching Assessment Processes
- In every model, no expectation of written report, but pre- and post-review meetings should happen; involvement of both/all parties should be documented in APR/BPR report
- Involvement in Formative PRT should be looked on positively at APR/BPR time via "Professional Development" category of Teaching Effectiveness
- Encourage to be used more often for faculty with higher teaching loads because of additional contact with students (as opposed to doing more summative for such faculty).

Training

- For peer reviewers
 - Including issues of pedagogical bias
 - Includes mock review, possible “tag along” review with a more experienced reviewer
 - Collegiality and power dynamics
 - Dimensions of teaching effectiveness and how to observe these
- For APR/BPR committees
 - How to understand and interpret peer reviews and teaching dossiers, and triangulate information (review committees)

Reporting

Faculty-Specific PRT Report Template

- CTAPT assembles model PRT Report Template
- Faculties adapt Template in consultation with Office of Teaching Assessment Processes
- Template needs to be tied to framework for teaching effectiveness
- Better Template hopefully means less need for training and more consistency
- Template should encourage balance of positive comments and constructive comments
- Reviewer produces a qualitative report not a quantitative summary
 - Meaningful comments most useful to instructors for improving teaching
 - “Score” left to APR/BPR committee which is trained to look at whole picture
 - Less awkward on collegiality if reviewer doesn’t produce score, and more likely to get honest comments

Incorporation into APR/BPR

- Recommended mechanism for APR/BPR committees to convert qualitative information to quantitative score to be determined in 2022 by another body (not CTAPT)
- Might be differences between Faculties
- Transparency is important

Miscellaneous

- Language in Policy 77 will need to be updated
- Faculties encouraged to use summative PRT mechanism when useful for assessing sessional instructors, grad students / postdocs for whom having a formal peer review from a faculty colleague would be useful for future employment (in addition to what CTE does); system should have some additional capacity for this

Data on PRT time requirements

- Assume tenured/continuing have 1 review every 8 years
- Assume pre-tenure/DTL have 1 review every 2 years
- Projected APR/BPR reviews by Faculty per year
 - Health = 25
 - Arts = 75
 - Engineering = 85
 - Environment = 25
 - Math = 80
 - Science = 50 (**includes Optometry and Pharmacy)
 - TOTAL = 340
- Estimate of total # of hours for PRT = 3400 hours (+ Admin + Review Committee)
- 1 FTE = 1610 hours
- # of Peer Reviewers needed (extra for pool diversity in small Faculties)
 - Health = 5
 - Arts = 15
 - Engineering = 15
 - Environment = 5
 - Math = 15
 - Science = 10
 - TOTAL = 65
- Goal: 8 PRTs per reviewer per year (7 in 1st year to allow for training time)
- Estimate time per peer reviewer per year = 80 hours (5% of FTE)
- 3400 hours of PRT time is *extra* work for existing people and so their Service tasks will need to be re-arranged, by giving to other faculty or to staff; each Faculty will want to develop a plan at the Faculty level as to how to handle this
- Estimate 1 hour per peer review in administrative overhead per year on Peer Review Coordinator (likely staff time) (either in Office of Teaching Assessment Practices or at Faculty level)
- Estimate 20 minutes per peer review in Chair (or delegate) overhead per year on peer review (for unit with 30 faculty members, estimate 1 to 2 hours per year, recognizing “context switching” that Chairs are required to do takes extra time)
- Estimate 1 additional hour per peer review at APR/BPR time (2 committee members each spending 30 minutes)
- Estimate 4 to 6 hours of training for new peer reviewer
- Additional time for sessional/PDF/grad student teaching PRT = ??

CTAPT PRT Report Template

Version 4, 2022.01.14

INSTRUCTIONS / GUIDELINES

- One to two pages
- Guidelines for reviewer
- Guidelines for reviewee
- Structure for pre- and post-observation meetings

INSTRUCTOR INPUT [still to be fleshed out]

- One to two page form
- Course information
- Where to look
- What to look for
- Specific requests / goals

Instructors are encouraged to draw on information/feedback that they have (e.g. self-reflection, previous PRT reports, SCP numerical results and comments). If instructors feel that sharing such source information with the reviewer is helpful, they should feel free to do so; if instructors would prefer to not share the source information, this is also completely acceptable.

NOTE-TAKING TEMPLATE

Guidelines for Reviewers

- The following three pages include possible actions to look for during your review of materials and of teaching sessions. Reviewers are encouraged to focus on a small number of these actions in their review and report, rather than trying to observe as many of these as possible. Be sure to do the review with the instructor's goals or specific requests for feedback in mind so you are able to comment on these.
- Use the various items as a guide of what you might see, but make sure to consider the review holistically rather than focussing too much on these lists.
- Identify a small number of items on each of the three pages that you feel that the instructor is doing well. Check them off or number them, and make rough notes that you can later flesh out in your report.
- Identify a small number of items on each of the three pages that you feel that the instructor could improve upon, or that are missing entirely. Check them off or number them, and make rough notes that you can later flesh out in your report. (There may be items that are less important in the context that you are reviewing, or that are impossible to observe; you should ignore these rather than treat them as needing improvement.)

IMPLEMENTATION

- _____ Describes and explains material clearly using a pace appropriate to the context
- _____ Demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject
- _____ Uses technology, media or other teaching tools effectively
- _____ Promotes student participation, peer interactions, or other active engagement with course content
- _____ Uses teaching/learning strategies that encourage student engagement and deep approaches to learning
- _____ Adapts to evolving classroom contexts
- _____ Adopts a variety of instructional practices, content types, and assessments that recognize diversity of learners
- _____ Communicates clear expectations and instructions for assessments
- _____ Communicates course-level and activity-level objectives/outcomes as well as teaching/learning approach and rationale to students
- _____ Enables students to prepare for assessments through instructional practices

SPACE FOR NOTES

LEARNING EXPERIENCE

- _____ Fosters a supportive learning environment
- _____ Establishes a climate of intellectual openness
- _____ Shows concern for students' success and wellbeing
- _____ Interacts professionally and respectfully with students
- _____ Promotes inclusion and diversity by acknowledging variety of experiences, viewpoints, and backgrounds
- _____ Generates and maintains student interest
- _____ Provides sufficient opportunities for student contact inside and outside of class
- _____ Fosters students' intrinsic motivation and responsibility for their own learning

SPACE FOR NOTES

DESIGN

- _____ Builds course around one or more overarching themes, stories and/or questions
- _____ Clearly defines course-level and activity-level learning objectives/outcomes
- _____ Includes learning material that reflects current scholarship from the field or that is clearly relevant
- _____ Structures material in a logical and coherent order
- _____ Sets pacing, workload and performance standards appropriate for the course level and topic
- _____ Includes experiential components, professional connections, or practical applications, when possible.
- _____ Plans a variety of teaching/learning strategies to promote student engagement and deep approaches to learning
- _____ Incorporates a diversity of experiences, viewpoints, and backgrounds in course materials
- _____ Adheres learning materials, activities, and assessments to University accessibility policies
- _____ Aligns course learning objectives/outcomes with course content and delivery
- _____ Develops fair and equitable assessment methods that align with course learning objectives/outcomes

SPACE FOR NOTES

REPORT TEMPLATE

Guidelines for Reviewers

- Your goal is to produce a written report that is roughly one to two pages in length.
- Your report should include enough detail so that a third-party (not you or the instructor) can read and understand it.

Items to include in Report

- Contextual information about your review: course, term, timeline, unusual circumstances (if any), etc.
- (Optional) Your positionality – what you do and do not feel qualified to comment upon
- List of course components observed
- List of specific things on which the instructor requested input
- Strengths observed (drawn from Implementation, Learning Experience and/or Design)
- Areas for growth (drawn from Implementation, Learning Experience and/or Design)
- Overall comments

Responsibilities of Reviewee

- Assist in correction of factual issues during post-observation meeting (after draft report written, before submission of final report)
- Optional reflective response to accompany final report, including clarifications and new goals for teaching