

Department of Medicine

Summative Peer Review of Teaching Policy

Overview

The development of a process for Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT) within the Faculty of Medicine (FOM) arose from the need to better document and recognize the considerable amount of time and energy Faculty members contribute to teaching and educational activities and the subsequent impact that these efforts have on learners across the spectrum of medical education. It is now mandatory for academic Faculty members to undergo a SPROT as part of the promotion and tenure process. In order to best meet the needs of our Faculty members the Department of Medicine (DOM) has developed a specific SPROT process that aims to not only provide comprehensive documentation of educational activities, but to also provide the opportunity for Faculty members to grow as educators through self-reflection and directed feedback.

The Summative Peer Review of Teaching Process

a) Scope:

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

b) Participants:

i) Reviewees:

Initially, each academic Faculty member in the tenure/grant-tenure track within the DOM being put forward for promotion and tenure will be required to complete the SPROT process. Ultimately, the goal is to have every Faculty member in the DOM have a SPROT every 2 years as part of a systematic process for Faculty development and educational quality improvement/assurance.

ii) Reviewers:

The Head or Associate Head, Education within the DOM will select two Faculty members at a rank higher than the current rank of the reviewee to form the peer review team. At least one of the peer reviewers will have expertise/training relevant to peer review and evaluation. Ideally, one of the peer reviewers will be external to the Division of the candidate's appointment; this individual will be considered the primary reviewer.

Individuals considered as having training/expertise relevant to the evaluation of teaching will have completed advanced training in the area. Examples include:

1. Peer review training from the Office of Teaching and Academic Growth (TAG)/UBC Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology
2. UBC program for the Faculty Certificate on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
3. Graduate degree in education (including medical education)

c) Process:

The peer reviewers will be responsible for providing a comprehensive summary of each reviewee's educational contributions. It is the responsibility of the reviewee to ensure that the following documents are submitted and that times for the following sessions are arranged in a timely fashion:

i) Teaching dossier:

- The standard DOM teaching dossier must be submitted by the Reviewee as part of the final promotion package (see Appendix A).

ii) Feedback from learners that was collected as part of an existing process (i.e., summary evaluations of a course, rotation or presentation, etc):

- Faculty members are responsible for collecting copies of all evaluations of their teaching on an ongoing basis; the process of locating old evaluations at the time of promotion or tenure can be extremely challenging.

iii) Direct observation of teaching by peer reviewers:

- The Reviewee will select a mutually convenient time for the peer reviewers to observe them teaching. The format, setting and content covered are all at the discretion of the Reviewee.
- The Reviewers will complete a checklist while observing the session, and will meet with the Reviewee afterwards to provide constructive feedback.

iv) Feedback purposefully solicited from the Reviewee's peers and/or learners for this process:

- The Reviewee will distribute peer review forms (see Appendix B) to a minimum of 6 individuals (colleagues or learners); at least 2 of whom must be colleagues.
- These completed forms are then returned directly to the DOM where results are summarized and presented in anonymous format to the Peer Reviewers.

v) Interview with Reviewee:

- Peer Reviewers and Reviewee will meet to discuss entire educational portfolio and provide feedback/reflection on its contents.

The peer reviewers summarize all of the information gathered as part of the process described above to create a final report (the SPROT letter) that will be provided to the Department Head. The SPROT will be appended to the Head's Letter of Recommendation to the Dean and will be part of the documentation sent to the UBC Senior Appointments Committee for their assessment of the teaching component of the file.

d) Timeline:

What follows is a timeline outlining key steps in the SPROT process for Reviewees and Peer Reviewers.

January (18 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- *Information package* outlining entire process and containing relevant forms distributed from DOM.
- *Documentation:*
 - Ensure that teaching dossier is up-to-date. For more information regarding teaching dossiers, please see Appendix A.
 - Aggregate collected evidence of teaching effectiveness (i.e., previously collected feedback from learners, course evaluations, etc).
 - Identify at least 6 individuals to complete the peer review teaching form. For more information regarding this peer review process, please see Appendix B.

March-May (16-14 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- Deadline to *confirm intent* to proceed with promotion and tenure process with Division Head and DOM.
- *Reviewers assigned.* Primary reviewer will make contact in order to discuss the upcoming process and select dates for observation of teaching. Reviewers will be assigned as early as January if a Reviewee has already confirmed their intent by that time.

March-August (16-11 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- *Final updates to teaching dossier*
- *Distribute peer review teaching forms* to six individuals
- *Have peer review team directly observe teaching session*
- *Determine date for interview* with peer review team (which must take place by September or October)

September (10 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- *Ensure documentation will be submitted* to DOM by end of the month (teaching dossier, evidence of teaching effectiveness, peer review forms by six individuals, direct observation forms by peer review team)

September 30th:

- *Final deadline for submission of all Reviewee's documentation* to DOM.

October (9 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- *Deadline for interview* with peer review team to review documentation, observations and provide feedback (may occur in advance if all documentation submitted early)
- Reviewers *draft SPROT letter*. For more information regarding the format and content of the final report, please see Appendix C.

October 31st:

- *Final deadline for submission of SPROT letter* to the Department Head.

November (8 months prior to anticipated promotion date):

- Reviewee has opportunity to read SPROT letter and respond should they wish to do so.

Each time a Faculty member goes forward for promotion and tenure, the above process will need to be undertaken.

e) Ethics & Professionalism

Ethical conduct and confidentiality of reviewers' assessments will be maintained. If a faculty member has any concerns regarding this process, they should be brought to the attention of the Reviewers, the Department Head, or the Associate Head, Education.

Appendix A: Teaching Dossier

UBC Department of Medicine Teaching Dossier Overview

The Teaching Dossier is an important component of the promotion/reappointment process. It allows the Department's Academic Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure (AARPT) Committee to see, at a glance, your contribution to the educational program(s) within the UBC Department of Medicine. It is meant to summarize your teaching accomplishments *without* replacing the teaching component of your CV.

1. Teaching Dossier

This is where you provide the description of your teaching activities and responsibilities – the courses you taught, the lectures you've given, the students and/or residents you've supervised, etc. Please document all levels of your teaching (undergraduate, postgraduate, continuing professional development lectures/courses you have given, or teaching other health care professionals) and be as detailed as possible.

2. Teaching Evaluations

Evaluations allow the AARPT committee to assess your teaching effectiveness. Ideally, we will have 3 or more evaluations for each area of your teaching. Evaluations must be appended to your Teaching Summary.

a) Preferred sources for evaluations

Collection of this information is much easier if done in a continuous manner rather than waiting until the time at which a promotion/review package needs to be put together. It is the responsibility of the reviewee to ensure that teaching evaluations are collected and aggregated for his/her teaching dossier.

b) Supplemental evaluation request form

We have provided a supplemental evaluation form you can use to obtain teaching evaluations from your peers and/or former students/residents/fellows, which will be forwarded on your behalf.

Once you have completed your teaching dossier, please send it to your contact in the Department of Medicine Human Resources Team before the deadline you have been given. Queries on the preparation of the teaching dossier can be emailed to jane.zhang9@vch.ca.

TEACHING DOSSIER

University of British Columbia
 10th Floor – 2775 Laurel Street
 Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 1M9
 Phone 604-875-4107
 Fax 604-875-4886

Candidate Name: _____
 Division: _____
 Date Completed: _____

areas shaded in gray are to
 be completed only for
 academic rank promotions
 and appointments - ie:
 NOT clinical faculty ranks.

It is very important that the contributions listed here match those listed on your cv to ensure your file is consistent.

**** PLEASE INCLUDE DATA SINCE YOUR LAST PROMOTION (OR WHEN YOU ENTERED THIS RANK)**

SCHEDULED UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

Class Details: *Please list the details for each item under this category*

Class Type <i>(ie: PBL, clinical skills, lecture, lab etc)</i>	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students Per Class	# Evaluations Received for the course <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>

Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:

UNSCHEDULED UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

Class Details: *Please list the details for each item under this category*

Class Type <i>(ie: PBL, clinical skills, lecture, lab etc)</i>	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students Per Class	# Evaluations <i>Received</i> for the course <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>

Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:

SCHEDULED POSTGRADUATE TEACHING

Class Details: *Please list the details for each item under this category*

Class Type	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students	# Evaluations <i>Received</i> for the course <i>(if available)</i> <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>

Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:

UNSCHEDULED POSTGRADUATE TEACHING						
Class Details: <i>Please list the details for each item under this category</i>						
Class Type	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students	# Evaluations Received for the course (if available) <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation (typically 5.0)
Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:						

GRADUATE STUDIES / EXPERIMENTAL MEDICINE / MD/PhD PROGRAM						
Class Details: <i>Please list the details for each item under this category</i>						
Class Type / Student Name	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students	# Evaluations Received for the course (if available) <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation (typically 5.0)
Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:						

OTHER HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS:

Class Details: *Please list the details for each item under this category*

Class Type	Dates you did this teaching <i>(years, months)</i>	Calculate Hours Per Year Spent on this item	# Students	# Evaluations Received for the course (if available) <i>(ie: how many completed the eval)</i>	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>

Please calculate the Average Hours Per Year you spend on this activity:

MEDICAL ROUNDS:

	Average Number Presented Each Year	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>
Grand Rounds:			
Sub-specialty:			

CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION:

	Average Number Presented Each Year	Average Teaching Rating Score Received for those Evaluations	Highest Rating Possible for the evaluation <i>(typically 5.0)</i>
CME:			

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM &/OR CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT:
Please list contributions to education programming - be specific

Contribution Name	Date(s) / Date Range



TEACHING AWARDS: (please list)		
Award Name	Awarding Body	Date Received

Teaching:

Scheduled teaching is defined as 'didactic teaching', teaching that is scheduled, for example, by the MD Undergraduate Program, Postgraduate Program and/or the UBC Department of Medicine. Examples include:

Undergraduate

Year 1

- Orientation
- DPAS (Doctor, Patient and Society)
- PBL:
 - Principles of Human Biology
 - HDI (Host Defenses & Infection)
 - Cardiovascular
 - Pulmonary
 - FERGU (Fluid Electrolytes & Renal & GU)
- Clinical Skills
- OSCE Examiner

Year 2

- DPAS (Doctor, Patient and Society)
- PBL:
 - GI
 - Blood & Lymphatics
 - Musculoskeletal & Locomotor
 - Endocrine & Metabolism
 - Integument
 - Brain & Behaviour
 - Reproduction
 - Growth & Development
- Clinical Skills (including 2nd year Bedside Teaching sessions)
- OSCE Examiner

Year 3

- Orientation Week
- Academic Half-Day (Sub-Specialty Specific)
- Bedside Clinical (Oral) Examiner
- Neurology Bedside Teaching
- OSCE Examiner

Year 4

- Preparation for Medical Practice
- OSCE Examiner

Postgraduate

- Academic Half-Day – Core Internal Medicine Residents and/or Sub-Specialty Residents
- Journal Club
- Noon Rounds
- Seminar Series and/or Lecture(s)

Unscheduled Teaching

Unscheduled teaching is defined as 'teaching combined with patient care', teaching that occurs on a Clinical Teaching Unit (CTU), in a clinic office, and/or on a ward. Examples include:

Clinical supervision and case review of 3rd, 4th year and out-of-province undergraduate medical students, core internal medicine residents, sub-specialty residents, and fellows, while on service in/on the:

- CTU or other ward attending clinical role
- In-patient consult service
- Clinic
- Private office

You can also include project supervision and mentorship in this category, including that of any summer or research students, and any ad hoc teaching contributed to the teaching of any program's trainees where this is not already captured.

The following sections list additional areas of teaching that should be included in one's teaching dossier along with examples of activities that might reside within each section.

MD/PhD PROGRAM

- Co-Supervisor of Respiratory Therapist's Master's Project
- Field Placement Supervisor for PhD student in Health Care and Epidemiology
- Member and Secondary Advisor, PhD Thesis Committee
- Member, Thesis Committee of two doctoral candidates

GRADUATE STUDIES/EXPERIMENTAL MEDICINE

- Chair, Thesis Defense for MD/PhD student in Experimental Medicine, including report preparation
- Primary supervisor of graduate student, including experimental design, data and literature review, manuscript preparation – 7 hours/week
- Primary supervisor of Master of Science students: Committee Meetings – 10 hours/year; Teaching – 10 hours/year; Defence Committee – 5 hours/year
- Primary supervisor of Master's student in Experimental Medicine – 2 hours/month
- Principal Supervisor of Master's in Health Sciences Candidate
- Project Sponsor of Master of Arts in Leadership and Training (MALT) Candidates – facilitating research and reviewing final paper

OTHER HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

- Annual lecture to UBC OT/PT program on osteoarthritis
- BC Cancer Program Radiation Therapists' Program - lecture on medical oncology with follow up email answers.
- BC Nephrology Days for nurses, dieticians, and social workers
- BCIT Cardiac Science technical students in pacemaker lab – ½ day clinical mentoring, 2-3/year
- BCIT ECG and Echocardiography technicians – ¼ hour/day of teaching, year round, as part of their

practicum

- Clinical supervision, concurrent review: HIV clinic for dental residents - 60 hours/year
- CME for dialysis nurses
- CME for nurse practitioners – 2 days/month for 2 months
- Hypertension talks (e.g. Introduction to Blood Pressure) to nurses in CCU, ICU, CTU, etc. – 1 every 2 years
- ICU inservice training for respiratory therapists and ICU nurses
- Inservice Teaching – several hours/year
- Journal Club with Respiratory Therapists – 8 hours/year
- Lecture to Family Physicians on Nephrology topics
- Lecture to Nursing Laboratory Technicians – 2 hours/year
- Lecture to Respiratory Therapists – 2 hours/year
- Lectures on headache, UBC School of Nursing
- Lectures, BC GI Nurses' Program
- Nursing students' orientation to inpatient GI practice – 2-3 hours/month
- Office case-based in-service for physiotherapists – 1 hr/week, 48 weeks/year
- Presented at the 15th Annual Conference for the Canadian Association for Nurses in HIV Care
- Private Laboratory Technicians' CME – 1 morning lecture/year
- Program Speaker, Science World Scientists and Innovators in Schools
- Talk on Liver Disease delivered to Nursing Staff and General Practitioners – 3 hours every 3 months
- Updates on GI topics for nursing staff

MEDICAL ROUNDS

Grand Rounds

- Department/Division-specific Grand Rounds (e.g. Department of Surgery Grand Rounds; Medical Oncology Grand Rounds, etc.)
- Local hospital Grand Rounds (e.g. Richmond Hospital Grand Rounds, Surrey Memorial Hospital Grand Rounds, Fort St. John Hospital Grand Rounds, etc.)
- St. Paul's Grand Rounds
- VGH Grand Rounds

Sub-specialty Rounds

Note: These are division-specific rounds that you presented at. E.g.:

- AIDS Care Rounds
- Citywide rounds (e.g. City-Wide Endocrine Journal Club, Citywide Rheumatology rounds, etc.)
- Division-specific rounds (e.g. Rheumatology Rounds, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Rounds, etc.)
- Intracity Noon Rounds
- Journal Club
- Wednesday Hematology/BMT Noon Rounds

CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION

Please give the number of CME presentations that you *presented* (not attended) per year.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM &/OR CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT

This is where you list any involvement you have in the development of education products, educational administration and service, etc. (e.g., involvement in case writing, local education committees, Program Directorships, Course Chairs etc – see guide for further details)

- Chair, weekly clinical case rounds
- Content Advisor in redevelopment of PBL angina case and associated components
- Contributor, Neurogenetics Talks (Series) for Neurology Postgraduate Training Program
- Director, Research Mentorship Program
- Director, Nephrology Residence Program
- Member, Education Committee for the Division
- Site Coordinator and Director of Postgraduate Training, Fraser Valley Cancer Centre
- Undergraduate Education Representative for the Division
- Week Chair, PBL Blood & Lymphatics
- Co-developed Nephrology component of 3rd Year Academic Half-Day curriculum
- Co-developed curriculum goals and objectives of Internal Medicine for CanMEDS
- Co-wrote a peer-reviewed paper on training medical residents in research that was published in Academic Medicine
- Developed a 15-module didactic curriculum for Clinical Associates in Medical Oncology
- Developed and invigilated Neurology OSCE Ethics Station
- Developed parallel research training program for Endocrine Fellows
- Developed Transplant Nephrology Training Program
- Initiated and organizes weekly inpatient service Journal Club
- Organized and administers Nuclear Cardiology city-wide rotations
- Participated in the Royal College of Physicians & Surgeons (RCPS) review of the Medical Oncology training program in British Columbia

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEES

- Canadian Cardiovascular Society Primary Panel for Heart Failure and Cardiology Intervention
- Faculty advisor to national student committees
- Membership on the Royal College Examination Board
- National GI Committee
- RCPS Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation Committee
- RCPS Infectious Diseases Residency Training Committee
- Regional representative at national committees

CONFERENCES ARRANGED

Please list the conferences where you were a keynote speaker or had an administrative or organizational capacity.

Possible roles:

- Organizer
- Director
- Coordinator
- Chair
- Co-chair
- Member of Administrative Committees (e.g. Advisory, abstract selection, peer-review, etc)
- Moderator

- Panel speaker
- Keynote speaker
- Course organizer

TEACHING AWARDS AND/OR NOMINATIONS

- BC Innovations Awards in Educational Technology – Leadership Award presented by the BC Educational Technology User Group and BC Campus
- Donald M. Whitelaw Award for Most Outstanding Grand Rounds – Department of Medicine
- Duncan Murray Teaching Award, Division of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
- The Fay R. Dirks Award for Excellence in Teaching, St. Paul’s Hospital, Department of Medicine
- The Graeme Copland Clinician Teacher Award
- Hoffman-LaRoche Award – Outstanding faculty lecture – UBC Gastroenterology Academic Session
- Howard Stein Master Teaching Award, St. Paul’s Hospital
- Medical Oncology Residents’ Recognition of Teaching
- Most Outstanding Clinical Teacher, awarded by Medical Residents
- Shelley Naiman Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching
- Teacher of the year Award, St. Paul’s Hospital Family Practice and Royal College Residents
- UBC Postgraduate Program in Cardiology Teaching Award for “Best Teacher during a clinical rotation”
- UBC Roche Oncology Award for “Excellent in Clinical Teaching Skills”

ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES RELATED TO EDUCATION

- Program Director
- Course Chair
- RCPSC

POSSIBLE APPENDICES

- Student/Resident Evaluations or Feedback
- Letters from Colleagues and Peers
- Examples of original educational contributions such as the development of instructional materials (web sites, authorship of PBL cases, etc.)
- Course Syllabi
- Evidence of Student or Resident Learning
- Course/Seminar/Workshop Materials Developed
- Examples of Student or Resident Work

Appendix B: Peer Review of Teaching Feedback Form

Department of Medicine Peer Review of Teaching Feedback Form

The Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT) process aims to provide a comprehensive summary of Faculty members' educational activities and effectiveness. While the information obtained by the peer review team through direct observation of a Faculty member is extremely valuable, it only reflects performance during a single session. Therefore, the Peer Review of Teaching Feedback Form was developed to ensure the SPROT included the broader perspective of learners and peers on the teaching skill of Faculty members over time and in different contexts.

As further outlined in the SPROT policy document, the Peer Review of Teaching Feedback Form will be operationalized in the following way:

- You will be asked to identify 6 individuals who have a good appreciation of your skills and effectiveness as a teacher. They can be students, residents, staff or faculty members that have been a learner or an observer during one or more of your teaching sessions. At least 2 of these 6 individuals must be colleagues, however, rather than learners.
- Any teaching session that involves one or more learners in real-time is eligible for consideration (including but not limited to lecture, small group, ward, outpatient and online).
- Once the individuals have been identified, you will distribute the forms to them for completion along with instruction to return them directly to the appointed administrative support person in the Department of Medicine.
- You should make a concerted effort to select individuals that are representative of each of the different groups of learners with whom you are involved. These groups may include, but are not limited to, members of the multidisciplinary healthcare team, medical students, graduate students, residents and faculty members.
- Once completed, the individuals will return the forms directly to Jane Zhang in the Department of Medicine.
- The feedback from the forms will be collated and reviewed by the peer review team. The results will be discussed with you during your interview with the team and will be included in summary format in the final report submitted to the Department Head.

Department of Medicine Peer Review of Teaching Feedback Form

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

PART I: THE CANDIDATE – To be filled out by the candidate.

Re: **Select option below of Dr. Candidate Name**

Dear Recipient name,

Dr. **Candidate Name** is currently being considered for **Select option below Select rank** and is requesting an evaluation of his teaching from you, particularly with regard to **Select option below**. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it **DIRECTLY** to the Faculty Hires and Promotions Coordinator via fax (604-875-4886) or email (jane.zhang9@vch.ca) as soon as possible.

** Please note: the information from this evaluation will be included (in anonymous format) as part of the Faculty member's Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT). All evaluations will be presented in summary format, with the anonymity of the evaluators guaranteed.

PART II: THE EVALUATION – To be filled out by the evaluator.

I have been exposed to the candidate's teaching in the following capacity: .

For each of the descriptors below, please select the most appropriate value from the following scale:

1=poor; 2=fair; 3= good; 4=very good; 5=excellent

When teaching, the candidate:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| is clear and organized (stresses important concepts) | Select an option |
| is enthusiastic and stimulating (enjoys teaching/presenting & is dynamic & energetic) | Select an option |
| establishes rapport | Select an option |
| actively involves learners (stimulates thought, asks challenging questions) | Select an option |
| is knowledgeable and analytical (with regard to breadth, analysis & synthesis of ideas) | Select an option |
| demonstrates clinical skills | Select an option |
| provides constructive feedback | Select an option |
| is professional in manner (is self-assured, open to opinions of others, responsible & respectful) | Select an option |
| addresses the designated instructional objectives of the course | Select an option |
| is overall, an effective teacher | Select an option |

Please provide any additional comments that you may have (continue evaluation on another page if necessary):

Appendix C: SPROT Template for Reviewers

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

Template for Reviewers

A two-three page (suggested maximum) *final summative report* should be drafted and agreed upon by the reviewers; any dissenting views should be recorded. A copy of this report will be submitted to the Department Head with a copy to the reviewee. The content outlined below should be included in this report.

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.).

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 or teaching dossier).

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, 3rd and 4th 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

Describe how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms as provided to the reviewers by the Head/Director. 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 X.*”

3) Summary of Student Evaluations

(Note: All student evaluation data should be provided by the Head/Director or his/her delegate).

- a. A quantitative summary for levels and formats in which the candidate teaches, including the rating scales used.
- b. A qualitative assessment for levels and formats in which the reviewee teaches. Include representative narrative comments by the students.
- 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.

4) 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 copies of at least 2 classroom observations by peers. **Refer to our peer review of teaching forms.**

5) Evaluation of Trainee Supervision

- a. Describe the nature and number of the trainees (graduate students, 3rd and 4th 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 who have graduated, 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.

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.

6) 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.

7) Awards for Teaching

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

8) 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).

9) 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.

10) 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.