

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

A Report prepared for the Senate Working Group

Authors: Tanya Forneris, Brendan D'Souza, Christina Hendricks, Sajni Lacey, Jackie Stewart

Date: 27th October, 2021

Background and Executive Summary

UBC highly values teaching and providing high-quality education. As such, one of the goals outlined in UBC's [Strategic plan](#) is to "Inspire and enable students through excellence in transformative teaching, mentoring, advising and the student experience." Thus, evaluation of teaching should be held to the same high-quality standards as other forms of assessment through the use of reliable and valid methods. There have been a number of advancements in how post-secondary institutions approach the evaluation of teaching over the past 10 years. However, it has been a significant period of time since policies related to the evaluation of teaching have been developed or reviewed at UBC, and currently these policies are different across both campuses. The [policy at UBC Vancouver](#) was last revised and approved by Senate in May of 2007. An initial [policy at UBC Okanagan](#) was adopted into its academic calendar in 2005-06 when the campus opened, but it has not been revised since that time. In recent years, the need to review policies and practices related to the evaluation of teaching has been recognized by various stakeholders within UBC.

In the Spring of 2019, a Student Evaluation of Teaching Working Group was formed at UBC with representation from both campuses (please see the [terms of reference](#) for further details). This working group was tasked with re-assessing UBC's approach to the Student Evaluation of Teaching in light of current trends in the field and examining student evaluation data for potential bias. For over a year, the working group consulted extensively with multiple constituencies on both campuses, and presented a [final report](#) that was endorsed by both Senates in May of 2020. The report included sixteen recommendations, some of which extended beyond student evaluations of teaching. This paper focuses on two of the recommendations:

Recommendation 10: Units should be supported to adopt a scholarly and integrative approach to evaluation of teaching.

Recommendation 15: The Vancouver Senate should review the policy on Student Evaluations of Teaching and consider a broader policy on the evaluation of teaching writ large. The Okanagan Senate should develop a similar policy for the Okanagan campus.

A cross-campus working group, sponsored by Senate committees on both campuses, is currently being struck to begin work on revisions to the Senate policies. The purpose of this discussion paper is to provide this Senate working group with an understanding of the state of the field on using an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching with a view towards the development of a broader UBC policy on teaching evaluation. The paper is composed of four sections. The first [section](#) focuses on providing an overview of an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching. Specifically, it discusses how an integrative approach moves beyond just the collection of multiple sources of data by intentionally integrating numerous types and sources of data for a comprehensive interpretation. The second [section](#) provides an overview of how other institutions have moved toward an integrative approach to evaluation of teaching. This overview is based on discussions across multiple interviews with a number

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

of people from a variety of institutions outside of UBC. Included in this section are examples of frameworks developed and/or adapted by other institutions as well as descriptions of how institutions have worked to implement these frameworks. The key take away was that implementation has involved significant on-the-ground work with academic units over time to shift the culture and/or implement new practices with specific tools, templates and protocols that were meaningful and effective for each unit yet supported the high-level integrative framework of the institution. The third [section](#) of the paper provides insight into the current state of teaching evaluation practices at UBC, based on focus group discussions. The focus groups revealed that many units across UBC have practices in place that gather multiple sources of data for evaluating teaching. However, these practices vary significantly across units and a major concern is the emphasis or overreliance on the quantitative data from student evaluations of teaching. Many expressed that this overreliance is partly due to the workload involved in evaluating teaching and this work not being viewed as valuable or as “counting” within merit and/or tenure and promotion processes. The fourth [and final section](#) of the report outlines a number of outcome-oriented and process-oriented recommendations. These recommendations are meant to focus discussions related to priorities and actions to support academic units in adopting a scholarly and integrative approach to evaluating teaching as well as the development of a new cross-campus policy on the evaluation of teaching writ large.

Contents

Overview of Integrative Evaluation of Teaching	5
Overview of Integrative Evaluation of Teaching Practices Elsewhere	6
Summary of Teaching Evaluation Practices at UBC: The Current State	8
UBC policies and guidelines	8
Focus group discussions	10
Recommendations for an Integrative Approach for Evaluation of Teaching at UBC	12
Outcome-Focused Recommendations	12
Process-Focused Recommendations	13
References	15
Appendix A - Additional Resources	17

Overview of Integrative Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching evaluations should be based on a multisource feedback model that stimulates reflection, is linked to faculty development programs, is transparent about purpose and execution, and is connected in part, to building a climate that fosters excellence in teaching and learning amongst all instructors. There are two main types of evaluation which are often applied to the evaluation of teaching in post-secondary institutions. Formative evaluation refers to processes that use timely feedback to allow for adjustments and progressive betterment of teaching skills and knowledge while summative evaluation is used to assess overarching teaching effectiveness, usually at the end of a formal period of evaluation (Eberly, Center, n.d.).

Teaching evaluations comprised of multiple sources of information such as student evaluations individual reflections and evidence, and peer and/or administrative perspectives is best practice. Specific examples of data include but are not limited to: Student ratings, classroom observations (by peers or administrators), self-evaluation, videos, student interviews, alumni ratings and feedback, employer ratings and reviews, teaching awards, learning outcome measures, teaching portfolios and rubrics with behaviourally-anchored rating scales. Ideally, there are both summative and formative evaluation processes that include both quantitative and qualitative data. Evaluation criteria should be carefully selected to match the purpose of the teaching evaluation (e.g., for tenure and promotion, professional development, mentorship, etc.) through the mapping of a plan within the faculty or department (Berk, 2005; Berk, 2018; Boerboom, et al., 2011; Hornstein, 2017; Lohman, 2021; Shao et al., 2007; Campbell et al., 2010).

An integrative approach moves beyond just the collection of multiple sources of data. It involves bringing together and integrating all the sources of evidence collected as part of the evaluation of one's teaching, including formative and summative as well as qualitative and quantitative for interpretation. One may look to the field of mixed-methods research where quantitative and qualitative forms of evidence are collected and analyzed and then integrated or converged for an overall interpretation and understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Creswell, 2005). There are several advantages of integrating data from different sources, such as being able to use one source or type of data to explain or expand upon the findings of another source or type. Within the field of mixed-methods research several designs exist that could inform future work on an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching. For example, some designs integrate at the methods level where data from one method of data collection informs another, or two methods of data collection are planned to be merged together for interpretation. In the evaluation of teaching, examples include having an instructor reflect on their end-of-course student surveys using the same platform (e.g., once student surveys are collected the instructor is prompted to log in and provide reflective responses to those provided by the students), or the sharing of a teaching dossier to guide the peer review process. Other mixed-method designs have methods and data collection quite separate and then only integrate at the interpretation and reporting stages, either through a data conversion process or a narrative or visual integration (Fetters et al., 2013). In the evaluation of teaching this could mean having instructors and/or heads develop a narrative or portfolio that speaks to the various sources of evidence and integrates them through an institutionally-

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

developed framework. Another possible approach would be for UBC to develop a system guided by a framework that facilitates the integration of the various sources (e.g., an interactive dashboard that permits one to bring together the quantitative and qualitative data from student surveys, formative and summative peer reviews as well as personal reflections).

In sum, working towards adopting an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching begins with the adoption of a holistic system that includes multiple sources of data. Once the sources of data have been decided, work is needed to develop a framework that facilitates the integration of these multiple sources in a meaningful and comprehensive manner. The following section provides insight into how other institutions have adopted and implemented a more integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching that could be helpful in guiding change UBC regarding the evaluation of teaching writ large.

Overview of Integrative Evaluation of Teaching Practices Elsewhere

During the summer of 2021, several meetings were held with other institutions who have either adopted or have made considerable progress in the adoption of an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching. These institutions included University of Colorado Boulder, University of Kansas and University of Massachusetts Amherst (all three are part of the large [TEval project](#) focused on this work in the US), as well as the University of Oregon and Simon Fraser University who have also independently undertaken work in this area. There were a number of common themes that emerged from these meetings.

First, all of the institutions had adopted an approach using the same three sources of evidence.

1. Student voice in the form of end-of-term student evaluation surveys.
2. Peer voice from some form of peer review of teaching (PRT).
3. Instructor voice, typically in the form of personal reflection through a teaching philosophy statement, a dossier and/or specific reflections on a course-by-course basis in response to the end-of-term student evaluations.

Second, all of the institutions emphasized the value of having a high-level multidimensional framework that clearly outlines expectations in terms of teaching effectiveness and the incorporation of multiple sources of evidence (e.g., [Benchmarks Framework](#) from University of Kansas and the [Teaching Quality Framework \(TQF\)](#) from the University of Colorado Boulder – See [Appendix A](#) for more resources). These institutions noted that a first critical step is defining what teaching excellence is within the institution, and some spoke at length about how this definition was grounded in the institution's values and/or principles. The challenge faced by many of the institutions was how to integrate the three sources of evidence into something useable by the various individuals who needed to use the evaluation for decision-making (e.g., instructors, unit heads and/or promotion and tenure committees). It was also clear that each institution had worked to either develop or adapt a framework to suit their own context

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

(campuses), particularly on how to integrate the various sources of evidence. The work to develop or adapt a framework across the various institutions was largely informed by the five principles outlined by (Weaver, et al., 2020) in the [TEval project](#).

- **Principle # 1:** Evaluation includes multiple dimensions of teaching (e.g., activities that capture teaching in its totality, including aspects inside and outside the classroom).
- **Principle # 2:** Evaluation includes multiple lenses (e.g., multiple sources and types of data such as various forms of faculty self-report, peer input and student voice).
- **Principle # 3:** Evaluation involves triangulation of data - no measure should be used in isolation.
- **Principle # 4:** Both formative and summative uses of the data are needed to maximize the impact on teaching effectiveness.
- **Principle # 5:** There must be a balance between uniformity across departments and customization to maximize usefulness at the institutional level.

Third, equally noted was the importance of setting up supports and resources via the institution's teaching and learning centre and/or the Provost Office. For example, small teams composed of staff, teaching fellows and/or post-doctoral fellows in teaching and learning. These small teams then work closely with individual academic units to develop and implement practical and efficient tools, protocols, and strategies that could be adapted to the needs of the unit but still held true to the framework the institution had developed (See [Appendix A](#) for examples of tools from the various institutions listed above). Once the framework was developed and adopted, work with each individual academic unit would start (e.g., 2-3 units at a time). As mentioned above, the work with academic units focused on creating and piloting tools, templates and protocols for instructor reflections, portfolio development as well as peer review processes that would work for their specific disciplines/contexts. In addition, support was often provided to heads of the academic unit to help ensure that the processes they implemented adequately reflected the high-level framework or policy.

Fourth, although these institutions have all taken different approaches due to their specific contexts while working on adopting a more integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching, they all discussed the importance of parallel work on high-level policy and on-the-ground change support. For some institutions, a policy that reflected an integrative approach with multiple sources of evidence had been in place for a significant period of time, yet the practices in the evaluation of teaching did not reflect this policy. Thus, work was initiated by those involved in the institutions' centres of teaching and learning to support academic units in evolving their practices to better align with the policy. Other institutions had yet to or were in the process of developing and implementing new policy or university agreements, alongside work to change teaching evaluation practices at the academic unit level.

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

Fifth, it was also noted by these various institutions that significant human and financial resources were needed to shift the culture around the evaluation of teaching to an integrative approach. Thus, careful consideration is needed of how work on policy as well as on how to change practices and processes on the ground with academic units can happen concurrently. Many noted that they had advocated within their institutions to support bringing on board faculty champions who received teaching reduction and recognition for this work and/or funded post-doctoral fellowships in teaching and learning. These individuals often formed small working groups that facilitated the “on-the-ground work” with the individual academic units. As outlined above, institutions shared that a successful approach in their experience is working alongside 2-3 academic units at a time to help shift the culture around the evaluation of teaching and implement newly created or adapted tools, templates and protocols. Thus, this can take significant time.

Finally, these institutions also noted that they struggled with the fact that policies are needed to reflect an integrative approach, but since these are inevitably linked to promotion and/or tenure, this can also inhibit the adoption or embracing of a culture shift that is truly about the advancement of high-quality teaching within the post-secondary environment. On the ground, the goal is to have individuals and units engage with the process intrinsically to improve one’s experience and confidence with teaching. In reality, there are limits to this without a policy and there is a fine balance to be addressed of having policy that helps drive a culture shift without being perceived as a heavy-handed, top-down, or stress-inducing process.

It is believed that the themes identified above will be informative and helpful as UBC embarks on work to action the two recommendations endorsed by Senate on developing and implementing an integrative approach to evaluating teaching. However, equally valuable in this process is an understanding of the current practices within UBC, which are summarized in the next section.

Summary of Teaching Evaluation Practices at UBC: The Current State

UBC policies and guidelines

Summative evaluation of teaching at UBC is governed by the [Collective Agreement](#) (CA) between the University and the Faculty Association, with the *Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) [Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure](#)* providing more specific guidance within the broader Collective Agreement framework. Teaching evaluation is an essential aspect in the process of promotion and tenure in the tenure-track streams (CA Part 4, Sections 3.04-3.09), and demonstration of excellence in teaching is required for reappointment for lecturers (CA Part 4, Section 2.02). In addition, the teaching performance of sessional lecturers is to be evaluated on a “regular basis” (Part 7, Section 8.01).

The Collective Agreement Part 4, Section 4.02 lays out a list of criteria on which judgments of teaching effectiveness shall be based:

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the faculty member, 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.

Those reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to do so in light of these requirements. In the same section, the CA also lists possible types of evidence that could be used for evaluation of teaching, though without requiring any source specifically:

The methods of teaching evaluation may vary; they may include student opinion, assessment by colleagues of performance in university lectures, outside references concerning teaching at other institutions, course material and examinations, the caliber of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations. When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this shall be done through formal procedures. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of the candidate to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

The *SAC Guide* provides more detailed suggestions on sources of evidence for summative evaluations of teaching:

The methods of teaching evaluation may vary in face-to-face, online and blended formats, but will normally include Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT – UBCV) or scores from the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ – UBCO) and a Summative Peer Review of Teaching. The summative review will normally be based on an examination of the following: quantitative Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT) – the University module questions, and in particular Q6 (UBCV) or Q20 (UBCO), with comparative Departmental/Faculty norms; qualitative comments from SEoTs about classroom teaching practices; the candidate's course materials, assignments and grading practices; the caliber of supervised essays and theses; peer reviews of teaching; and other relevant considerations. (Section 3.2.4)

Appendix 2 of the *SAC Guide* notes that a summative review of teaching should be included when a candidate's file is considered by the Senior Appointments Committee, usually written by the Head or Director, or the Chair of a summative peer review of teaching committee in the unit. Data sources that should be summarized in this report, according to the *SAC Guide*, include: student experience of instruction results, peer review of teaching reports and highlights from them, contributions to graduate or professional training, contributions to educational leadership (required for educational leadership faculty), and a summary of other qualitative evidence of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (such as professional development undertaken, awards or other recognition for teaching). This summative assessment of teaching could be a place to integrate these various sources of evidence, as well as summarize them, though the *SAC Guide* does not provide guidance on how this might be accomplished. It simply lists which kinds of evidence should be included and summarized in the report.

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

Notably, there is particular emphasis in the *SAC Guide* on student evaluations of teaching scores, and a limited subset of them at that. Appendix 2 of the *SAC Guide* states that the summative review of teaching report should include a table of scores from student evaluations of teaching focusing on questions about “overall effectiveness” (Q6 at UBCV, Q20 at UBCO). Scores from additional questions could also be included if they “provide particularly useful evidence about the candidate's teaching record” (*SAC Guide*, Appendix 2). A sample of student comments from the end-of-course surveys could also be included (optionally) if they are selected by the person writing the summative report, rather than by the candidate. This emphasis on student evaluations of teaching scores in evaluating teaching, particularly on one number, is a source of concern for many across campus, as noted below.

Peer review of teaching practices (PRT), both formative and summative, are governed by policies and procedures at the Faculty or unit level. Examples from some Faculties who have agreed to share are posted on the [Summative Peer Review of Teaching](#) section of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology website at UBCV. A few other examples of Faculty-level guidelines were shared with us in support of writing this paper. From reviewing these documents we found that summative PRT practices vary across the institution, including differences in number of reviewers and whether any must be from outside the unit, number of classes visited, number of meetings with the candidate (before and/or after the class visit, or not at all), whether the peer review of teaching report is shared with the candidate or not, and more. This variation may be due to differing approaches to teaching, and criteria for evaluating such approaches, between disciplines and contexts.

Still, amongst the units whose PRT practices were reviewed, many adhere to a set of [Principles of Summative Peer Review](#) put together by a UBCV working group on peer review of teaching, including: having more than one reviewer; using a set of clearly-defined criteria consistent across a Faculty, program, or unit; and paying attention not only to class visits but to other aspects of teaching such as course materials, course design, use of learning technology as appropriate.

Focus group discussions

During the summer of 2021, several focus groups were held with individuals from UBCO and UBCV, including Associate Deans of some Faculties and faculty members who have served as peer reviewers, to gather information on what they felt is working well or could use improvement in teaching evaluation practices. However, not all Faculties or units on both campuses were represented, and thus this section should not be taken to be a comprehensive review of teaching evaluation practices at the institution. Instead, it is meant to provide an overview of some of these practices as well as perceived challenges, as a way to contextualize the recommendations made later in this paper.

There was general consensus in the focus groups that multiple data sources should be used for teaching evaluation, and many Faculties and units do so by including student end-of-course surveys, peer reviews of teaching, reflective summaries of teaching practices by faculty members, sample teaching materials, and other evidence in teaching dossiers as part of summative teaching evaluation. One challenge that emerged in discussion, though, is that while abridged teaching dossiers for educational leadership stream faculty may be sent forward to the Senior Appointments Committee, this is not the case for

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

faculty in the research and teaching stream (see the [SAC Guide](#) Appendix 2). It is not clear why there should be this difference since teaching quality is an important part of evaluations for promotion and tenure for both faculty streams. Though the Collective Agreement requires that faculty reach different levels of teaching quality in order to be promoted to a higher rank (e.g., promotion to Associate Professor requires “successful” teaching, while promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching requires “excellence” in teaching), this does not mean there should be a difference in the type of evidence provided or considered at the level of the Senior Appointments Committee.

Another concern expressed by some focus group participants is that there tends to be too much reliance on quantitative results from the student experience of instruction (SEI) surveys in summative teaching evaluation for reappointment, tenure and promotion processes, particularly on the single number from the question about overall quality of teaching (as suggested in the *SAC Guide*, quoted above). This may be in part because the quantitative data is relatively simple, easy to scan and understand quickly, and easy to use for comparisons across courses or time periods.

Some focus group participants also pointed out that this overreliance on quantitative SEI results is likely because summative peer review of teaching reports tend to be mostly or wholly positive. This may be because they are so high stakes that including criticism is viewed as potentially jeopardizing a case for tenure and/or promotion. However, if there are few to no critical comments or constructive suggestions, these reports may not provide a great deal of information as components of *evaluating* teaching, and it is easy to fall back on SEI results because they seem to provide clearer ways to differentiate amongst levels of teaching quality.

Over the past few years, a group of faculty and staff from multiple faculties and units at UBC Vancouver created a [summative peer review of teaching rubric](#) that was meant to, among other things, try to address the issue of summative PRT reports being nearly uniformly positive. The rubric includes seven levels, many of them tied to descriptors in the faculty Collective Agreement, with sample descriptors of the levels and examples of the kinds of practices an educator at that level might exhibit. The hope was to show that not everyone needs to be at the very top level, and that very good teaching could be at somewhat “lower” levels and still be both high-quality enough to fulfill the criteria in the Collective Agreement and yet include possible room for improvement. The rubric is open to any unit in the institution to revise and use as they wish.

Another theme that emerged in relation to PRT was that it, and practices of evaluating teaching more broadly, seem to be mostly focused on tenure and promotion processes, rather than on improvement of teaching at various stages in one’s career. Several focus group participants noted that there is not as much emphasis placed on evaluation of teaching post-tenure or promotion. One suggestion was to consider instituting more formative peer reviews of teaching where feasible, from early on in one’s career (while teaching habits are being formed) to every few years for all faculty, even after tenure. Another suggestion was to do more to celebrate and promote excellent teaching within units as something all faculty should be striving for, such as through regular faculty-led sessions devoted to sharing ideas and good practices with their colleagues.

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

Focus group participants also discussed, however, that PRT takes a great deal of time, so instituting more formative PRT in addition to summative is challenging, particularly in smaller faculties or units with fewer peer reviewers available. This work needs to be resourced, including training for reviewers. Another challenge is with recognizing/rewarding peer review activities: given the amount of time and effort it takes to do well, doing peer reviews should be recognized as a significant part of one's service work. One participant in the focus groups noted that in their unit if someone is the PRT representative for their unit and doing quite a few PRTs then they are provided a course release.

In summary, a number of units already include multiple sources of data when evaluating teaching, and the *SAC Guide* instructs heads of units to do so in summative reports on teaching. Student experience of instruction (SEI) questionnaires, peer observations, and teaching dossiers are standard practices to varying degrees. However, the extent to which the various forms of evidence are brought together in an integrative fashion is not entirely clear, and an overreliance on quantitative SEI scores is a significant concern. In addition, there are a variety of practices of peer review of teaching across the institution, but no concerns about this variation were raised amongst the focus group participants, and we do not draw any conclusions about it here. A number of challenges with practices of teaching evaluation, including the workload involved, were noted amongst focus group participants and warrant further investigation and discussion.

Recommendations for an Integrative Approach for Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

This section outlines both outcome-focused and process-focused recommendations. It is hoped that the outcome-focused recommendations can help guide the "what is needed" discussions around changes to the evaluation of teaching writ large at UBC while the process-focused recommendations help guide discussions on "how" these outcome-focused recommendations may be implemented and/or achieved effectively.

Outcome-Focused Recommendations

- As a first step in developing an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching, UBC needs to establish a working definition of teaching effectiveness to define what teaching effectiveness is within our own context or institution. Establishing such a definition was recognized as a necessary first step by all institutions that we met with. The process involved in establishing such a definition was best exemplified by the University of Oregon and the University of Massachusetts (Amherst). The University of Oregon established a definition of "teaching quality" within the context of the values of the university. These values were agreed upon by various stakeholders including the Faculty Union. In the case of the University of Massachusetts (Amherst), the working group that was tasked with developing a "multi-faceted approach" to teaching evaluation established a definition of "teaching quality" based on the views of different

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

departments on teaching quality as well as on "emerging" definitions of quality from the literature. This in turn led to establishment of aspects/dimensions of teaching that can be evaluated and adopted university-wide with individual departments having autonomy over defining different levels of achievement (developing, proficient and expert) for each aspect/dimension of teaching.

- UBC also needs to develop a high-level framework that clearly outlines what constitutes an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching at UBC. This framework should be grounded in the values, principles, and definition (discussed in the above recommendation). Based on reviewing frameworks developed and adopted by other institutions it should clearly identify the different aspects/dimensions of teaching being evaluated, the sources (multiple) of evidence used to evaluate each dimension, the extent of achievement of the dimension of teaching and how these are to be integrated. Finally, having this framework reflected in the new policy would be valuable as it would foster consistency in the adoption of an integrative approach across units while recognizing that the specific tools, templates and/or protocols adopted by individual units can and should be adaptable to meet the needs of different disciplines and contexts.

Process-Focused Recommendations

- To adopt an integrative approach, UBC should establish a centralized system with personnel trained to support individual academic units or faculty members with transitioning to an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching. This work will require a multi-year commitment and change management process and cannot be downloaded to individual units or faculty members without such centralized supports. As outlined above, other institutions engaged in these change processes have had success with smaller working groups composed of staff from their centres of teaching working with faculty teaching fellows with teaching release and/or post-doctoral fellowships in teaching and learning who work progressively with the academic units (2-3 units at a time) to identify, develop and/or adapt a repertoire of tools that can be used to collect multiple types of data across the institution to support the change process.
- To effectively sustain an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching, there is a need to recognize the adoption of these practices as an important and valued part of faculty workload. As outlined above, units have been successful in implementing both formative and summative peer review of teaching when that work is recognized as valued service contributions, or considered in teaching workloads, teaching award criteria and/or merit processes.
- Those working on policy should connect regularly with those that will be working on the ground to supporting the academic units and instructors with this change. One option would be to have representation from the CTL and CTLT from both campuses as members of this Senate-endorsed working group. Inclusion of such roles would allow for the higher-level policy and framework

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

development to work in tandem with on-the-ground implementation and adoption of new practices and tools designed to collect and integrate multiple sources of data.

- Careful attention is needed on how policy implementation and on-the-ground work can nurture a shift away from an anxiety, stress and/or remiss culture to one that fosters a real aspiration and support for excellence in teaching and learning at UBC. Fostering culture change throughout the process may be best accomplished by engaging and empowering instructors to contribute to the development of the new processes and frameworks. On-the-ground support from units such as the CTL, CTLT and/or teaching fellows could strengthen this cultural shift. The institutions consulted to date shared that it was on-the-ground support that often-helped instructors feel supported, capable, and invested in change practices around the evaluation of teaching.
- Finally, it is recognized that this discussion paper serves as an initial foundation for this work. Further engagement with the university community on both campuses is needed to provide more comprehensive information about current teaching evaluation practices within units, including current challenges and successful practices. Regular engagement and consultation with faculty, students, staff, and academic leaders throughout the process of developing, adopting, and implementing an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching will be critical.

References

- Benton, S.L., & Young, S. (2018). Best practices in the evaluation of teaching: IDEA paper #69. IDEA Center, Inc. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED588352>
- Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International journal of teaching and learning in higher education*, 17(1), 48-62. <https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE8.pdf>
- Berk, R. A. (2018). Start spreading the news: Use multiple sources of evidence to evaluate teaching. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 32(1), 73-81. https://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/pdf/UseMultipleSourcesSRs_Berk_JFacDev1-11-2018.pdf
- Boerboom, T. B., Jaarsma, D., Dolmans, D. H., Scherpbier, A. J., Mastenbroek, N. J., & Van Beukelen, P. (2011). Peer group reflection helps clinical teachers to critically reflect on their teaching. *Medical teacher*, 33(11), e615-e623. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2011.610840>
- Campbell, N., Wozniak, H., Philip, R. L., & Damarell, R. A. (2019). Peer-supported faculty development and workplace teaching: An integrative review. *Medical Education*, 53(10), 978-988. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13896>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research: Developments, debates, and dilemmas. In R.A. Swanson and E.F. Halton III (Eds.), *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*, (pp. 315-326). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Eberly, Center, Carnegie Mellon University. (n.d.). What is the difference between formative and summative assessment? <https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/assessment/basics/formative-summative.html>
- Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. *Health services research*, 48(6pt2), 2134-2156. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
- Hornstein, H. A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1304016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1304016>
- Lohman, L. (2021). Evaluation of university teaching as sound performance appraisal. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101008>

Moving Towards an Integrative Approach to the Evaluation of Teaching at UBC

Shao, L. P., Anderson, L. P., & Newsome, M. (2007). Evaluating teaching effectiveness: Where we are and where we should be. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(3), 355-371.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801886>

Weaver, G. C., Austin, A. E., Greenhoot, A. F., & Finkelstein, N. D. (2020). Establishing a better approach for evaluating teaching: The TEval Project. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52(3), 25-31.

<https://go.exlibris.link/W5K1YfF4>

Appendix A - Additional Resources

The TEval Project (Transforming Higher Education – Multidimensional Evaluation of Teaching)

The TEval project is a multi-institutional initiative that works to advance how teaching is evaluated within post-secondary institutions. Below are three links to provide further context and examples of work as many of the institutions met with in the writing of this paper are part of this larger project.

- Overview of the TEval project: <https://teval.net/index.html>
- Weaver, G. C., Austin, A. E., Greenhoot, A. F., & Finkelstein, N. D. (2020). Establishing a better approach for evaluating teaching: The TEval Project. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52(3), 25-31. UBC Permalink: <https://go.exlibris.link/W5K1YfF4>
- Examples of Frameworks, Rubrics & Tools: <https://teval.net/resources.html>

Below are further examples of institutions working under the larger TEval project and the frameworks, rubrics, tools, and/or processes developed and implemented.

- **University of Kansas** - Framework, Rubric & Tools developed by the KU Center for Teaching Excellence <https://cte.ku.edu/benchmarks-teaching-effectiveness-project>
- **University of Colorado Boulder** - Framework, Rubrics & Tools: <https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/resources>
- **University of Massachusetts Amherst** - Summary of the work at UMass regarding the process of adopting and implementing changes to transforming how teaching is evaluated: <http://www.umass.edu/oapa/program-assessment/instructional-innovation-assessment/evaluation-teaching-new-approach>

University of Oregon

The University of Oregon has also embarked on this work but the work has been a joint project between the Provost's office and University Senate.

- Background: <https://provost.uoregon.edu/revising-uos-teaching-evaluations>
- Definition and Principles of Teaching Excellence: [U of O Principles of Teaching Excellence](#)
- Framework & Resources: <https://teaching.uoregon.edu/resources/teaching-evaluation>

Simon Fraser University

SFU has also initiated work to develop and implement a multi-dimensional teaching assessment and the information and resources are available here: <https://www.sfu.ca/cee/services/assessment.html>