

Principles of Summative Peer Review¹

Originally developed by for Report of the UBC-V Working Group on Peer Review of Teaching
April 17th, 2009

Revised by UBC-V Faculty Representatives group to enhance applicability for distance and
blended learning environments, May 2013.

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;

¹ 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.

- 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.

Appendix: Change log

April 2009: Principles developed by UBC-V working group

May 2013: Minor revisions to 3 principles, as detailed below (additions in italics)

Accuracy

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

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.)