



# Performance Development System

for members of the  
BCIT Faculty and Staff Association

January, 2020

©2020 by

British Columbia Institute of Technology

Burnaby, British Columbia

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form, without permission in writing from BCIT.

**Table of Content**

A. Introduction ..... 1

B. Synopsis ..... 1

C. System Description ..... 2

    Introduction ..... 2

    Applicability..... 2

    System Components ..... 2

        Student Opinion of Instructional Quality ..... 3

        Paper Surveys..... 3

        Online Surveys ..... 4

        Peer Review of Teaching..... 5

        Review of Department-Assigned Tasks & Other Non-Teaching Activities..... 6

        Performance Development Review Meeting..... 6

    New Probationary Instructors ..... 7

    Employee Rights..... 7

    Student’s Rights ..... 7

D. System Overview ..... 8

    System Overview: Standard Four-Year Cycle..... 9

    System Overview: First Probationary Year ..... 10

## A. Introduction

This booklet presents the elements of BCIT's Performance Development System (PDS). The system is the result of long collaboration among members of a joint labour-management working group. The system uses students and peers as sources of information on instructor performance in classroom, laboratory or clinical settings. As well it includes feedback for other FSA members, which includes specialized faculty and staff such as Co-op Education Coordinators, Indigenous Services Advisors, Counsellors, Instructional Development Consultants, Librarians, Medical Services RNs, Program Advisors, and those who work in the Disability Resource Centre, Financial Aid and Awards, Timetabling, ITS and Applied Research.

In effect, the system seeks to provide answers to staff and instructors' question: "How am I doing?" Such feedback provides the insights that drive each member's pursuit of improved performance. Thus, a continuum of improving performance emerges over staff and instructor's time at BCIT. The system is not intended as a course evaluation.

This booklet deals with the PDS as used by instructors in BCIT's day-school programs, as well as by part-time studies (PTS) instructors. The same survey forms are used with differing frequencies. This booklet does not include the grandfathered PDS instruments used for the other Faculty and Staff Association (FSA) members. Specialized faculty and staff groups each have a PDS tailored to reflect their specific roles and duties that they perform in BCIT's diverse settings.

While the overview documents contained within provide the essence of the system, there is much to be gained by careful reading of the complete system description in Section C. Also provided are samples of the system's standard forms.

## B. Synopsis

1. The system is intended to guide a member's development by providing feedback on overall performance. It does not deal with course evaluation.
2. The review system operates on a four-year cycle that starts the year after the member's "probation" time, or more frequently at the member's discretion.
3. Student feedback is gathered each term using standardized surveys. Input from colleagues is based on classroom and other observations.
4. Instructors may ask colleagues for feedback on instructional (peer review), and/or non-instructional activities; examples are duties related to departmental affairs, industry-liaison, curriculum development, etc.

5. Members and their manager meet every four years to discuss system outputs and to agree on future developmental activities. A standard report form verifies the meeting's outcomes. All raw feedback data is retained by the member. A copy of the report is filed with human resources.

## C. System Description

### Introduction

BCIT's Performance Development System (PDS) provides FSA members, which include faculty, specialized faculty, and staff, with a means of monitoring their performance. The system is intended to operate in a context of continuing professional growth during an employee's time at BCIT. In essence, the system uses systematically scheduled surveys that provide feedback from students and colleagues. On the basis of this information, a staff and/or instructor is able to better identify areas where the development of instructional or professional skills might best be pursued.

### Applicability

The PDS is to be used by all probationary, regular faculty and staff in departments which do not have a previously approved assessment system. There are previously approved systems being used in some departments; however these departments may choose to adopt the new PDS by decision of the department and formal notification to the FSA and the human resources department. Note that the PDS establishes minimum levels of usage for its various components. Faculty and staff may opt for more frequent use at their discretion. The system operates on a four-year cycle and is modified for use by new faculty and staff in their first probationary year.

### System Components

The PDS has four components:

- Student Opinion of Instructional Quality
  - Paper Surveys
  - Online Surveys
- Peer Review of Teaching
- Review of Department-Assigned Tasks & Other Non-Teaching Activities
- Performance Development Review Meeting with Manager/Supervisor

### Student Opinion of Instructional Quality

The component gathers student feedback on instructional quality using a standardized paper and/or online form. At their discretion, instructors may request additional comments and questions from students on aspects of instruction which may be selected from a question bank. Instructors will also have the opportunity to prepare their own open ended question. These additional questions and/or invitations to comment provide an opportunity to determine student attitudes toward unique or specialized instructional techniques or activities, such as, for example, computer simulations, group discussions, field trips, etc.

The following evaluations of teaching are primarily identified as **summative evaluations**, which are conducted at or near the end of courses.

#### *Beyond the PDS: Formative evaluation*

There have been numerous studies that acknowledge that **formative evaluations** (not required by the PDS) given part way through the course allows students to give their opinion of how the course is going for them at that time. It also allows instructors to make any changes or modifications based on that feedback to the course if possible. The outcome reveals a marked improvement in final summative evaluations as students feel heard by the instructor.

Formative evaluations require only 3 questions that can be written on the whiteboard and students submit responses on paper. The following are only a sample of what can be asked

1. What is going well in the course?
2. What is not going well in the course?
3. Any changes they'd like to see?

### Paper Surveys

Procedure for use of the student survey is as follows:

1. Each term an instructor selects a cohort/class of students to be surveyed.
2. Ideally the survey will be done later in the term after students have had adequate time to develop informed opinions.
3. On the designated day, the instructor leaves the room and a designated student proctor (usually the class representative) distributes the forms and reads formal instruction to the class.
4. The student proctor emphasizes that student anonymity will be maintained and that survey results will be withheld from the instructor until after the completion of "instructional marks meetings" at the end of the term.
5. When the surveys are complete the student proctor places them into an envelope and dates, signs, and seals it prior to leaving the classroom.

6. The student proctor's duties are completed with the delivery of the sealed envelopes to a specified site for processing.

The sealed envelopes are delivered to "Instructional Assessment and Exams (IA&E)", in the Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC) and after optical scanning, IA&E produces summaries of the data. These summaries include:

- mean and median responses to each survey item,
- mean and median responses to specified item clusters, and
- Histograms showing the response distribution for each cluster.

The original survey forms, plus the summaries, are returned to the instructor as soon as possible after the completion of "marks meetings" at the end of the term. Written student comments are not processed and are intended only for use by the instructor. At the same time, the relevant Associate Dean is provided with a copy of the statistical summary of the item clusters. Questions added to the survey by the instructor are not included in the statistical summaries.

Instructors are required to retain the original of the survey forms for a minimum of 48 months once the report and surveys have been returned to instructor. The purpose of this requirement is to allow the manager to request a review of these forms per Article 13.2.2.

Note that specialized student survey forms are available for use in classroom, laboratory or clinical settings.

### Online Surveys

Instructors will receive a link to allow them to sign into the online survey system. Instructors will be able to decide which class(s) they do not want to be surveyed. They do this by deselecting those class(s) within the system. If an instructor does not choose to deselect any classes, all students in classes they have taught in that term will receive surveys.

Online surveys like paper will be done after the instructor leaves the room.

The survey is made up of 3 parts:

- 13 base institution questions that all students will be asked
- 5 additional faculty/department questions from the question bank to be selected by instructor
- 2 customized course-level open ended questions selected from question bank or created by the instructor (if required)

The base questions as well as the question bank questions were compiled and developed by the PDS Steering Committee and the PDS Network Group. Many of the questions are from the original paper surveys along with new questions that address current teaching practices.

For courses that are taught by two or more instructors, it will be possible for students to individually select each instructor and evaluate each instructor separately during the completion of the single survey. Each instructor will only receive a report for themselves reporting only on their own results

The process for the online surveys is as follows:

1. Two weeks before the end of the term, students will receive a link for each of the courses to have a survey completed.
2. The link to the online surveys will be available through email notification and/or D2L.
3. Only instructors will receive the full report from the surveys once grades have been submitted and approved.
4. Managers and Associate Deans will receive reports of the Likert scale ratings in an aggregated format and not the student comments.

### Peer Review of Teaching

Peer Reviews require that instructors select at least one departmental peer for an in-class observation. If no departmental peer is available, a peer may be drawn from another BCIT teaching department. If additional peer reviews are desired, peers may be selected from an instructor's department, or from another BCIT department. Industry contacts and the instructor's manager are also eligible to participate as reviewers at the instructor's request. The instructor and reviewers arrange a mutually agreeable schedule for the observations.

Prior to the in-class observation, the instructor provides the reviewer with a portfolio of the following materials:

- The course outline, as circulated to students
- A copy of the final exam and other evaluation materials. (If the final exam is not available at the time of the review, the previous final exam may be used.)
- Where applicable, representative examples of marked assignments (where student identifying information has been removed) that demonstrate the range of performance levels of students in the class, and a copy of the textbook, if requested by the observer.

The Peer Review of Teaching form focuses on in-class observations and the assessment of the instructor's portfolio of course outlines and instructional materials. Assessments are made using ratings of "Aspects done well", "Aspects that could be improved upon" and "Suggested action(s)". The form provides space in which a reviewer may include explanatory marks in respect to a rating of "aspects done well". Any rating other than "aspects done well" must be accompanied by a brief statement that explains the reason for the rating. In the event that a peer review identifies areas as "suggested action(s)" or "aspects that could be improved upon", a follow-up observation may be required. It should be scheduled to allow sufficient time for

the instructor to consider the feedback and make appropriate adjustments to improve performance.

After completion of the Peer Review, the completed forms are retained by the instructor for the Performance Development Review meeting. The Peer Review of Teaching is scheduled at least once in each four (4) year PDS cycle.

#### Review of Department-Assigned Tasks & Other Non-Teaching Activities

This component of the PDS is optional at the discretion of the instructor. It provides feedback from a group of reviewers familiar with the instructor's non-teaching work. A minimum of one departmental peer and up to four additional peers are selected by the instructor. Additional reviews may be selected from the instructor's department, from other areas of the institute, from among colleagues in clinical and other field settings, or from among peers familiar with the instructor's non-teaching activities. An instructor's manager may also be chosen as a reviewer.

To clearly identify the activities to be assessed, the instructor completes the "Assigned Tasks and Other Activities" section of this component's survey. The form is then distributed to reviewer who use it to guide their review. Reviewers return the completed forms to the instructor who retains them for use at the PD review meeting.

#### Performance Development Review Meeting

Once in each four-year cycle, an instructor and manager meet for a Performance Development Review (PDR). The meeting provides an opportunity to review feedback from previous terms and to discuss the instructor's performance development plans for the next four years.

Prior to the meeting, the instructor provides the manager with copies of the outputs from the various system components for the preceding four years. As well, the instructor may choose to complete the informational sections of the performance development review meeting form to ensure that manager is fully aware of the instructor's activities and accomplishments during the period under review. This information may include a summary of teaching assignments, special responsibilities for course development and review, curricular work, development of instructional programs, work associated with institute governance, contributions to departmental and student life, work with industry groups, text-book and other technology-related writing, research, and any other achievements related to the instructor's work at BCIT.

At the PDR meeting, the instructor and manager complete the review report which outlines the instructor's development objectives for the following cycle. At the completion of the meeting, the manager initials the report, indicating agreement with the development plan and support for the stated development activities, such as applications for leave or funding. Support for a development plan may be subject to the decisions of institute leave committees, departmental

decisions concerning work load, assignment of duties and funding availability. The instructor may make comments in the appropriate space on the form.

Completion of the review report, signed by both the instructor and the manager, signifies the conclusion of the system's four-year cycle.

A copy of the completed and signed review report is sent to human resources for retention in the instructor's personnel file. A copy may be retained in the manager's files. The original review report, together with all other output material is returned to the instructor.

### New Probationary Instructors

In the first year of regular employment, instructors are assessed according to a department's normal probationary system (refer to the FSA Collective Agreement for details). To assist a new instructor's development, in the year following the probationary period, use of the PDS components is modified. During that year, students are surveyed in every course in every term. A peer review is done and a performance development review meeting is held with the manager. A review of non-teaching activities may be done at the instructor's discretion. Following the first year, the new instructor shifts to the four-year cycle of the standard system.

### Employee Rights

All BCIT staff involved in the handling or processing of student survey forms and related documentation are under a positive duty to maintain student and instructor confidentiality. This is a paramount issue in the BCIT PDS. Should any breach of confidentiality occur, use of any material involved is nullified unless specifically authorized by the instructor.

BCIT and the Faculty and Staff Association (FSA) agree that the data and outputs from any components of the PDS may not be used in either discipline (Article 19) or non-regular performance appraisal (Article 13.4). BCIT and the FSA further agree that the original SOIQS questionnaires may be made available to the manager only in conjunction with formally constituted performance appraisal when instituted by the manager as specified in Articles 13.2.2 and 13.3. A Memorandum of Agreement (#04FSA06) governs use of the PDS for part-time studies instructors.

Except for the manager's summaries and the PDR report, all of the data and outputs of the PDS remain the confidential property of the instructor.

### Student's Rights

Surveys are strictly confidential and anonymous and instructors must communicate this to students.

## D. System Overview

The following two pages present “snap-shot” overviews of the PDS. For each component of the system, one can quickly identify its principal features: what is involved, timing and frequency of use, the process followed, the people involved and the basic outcome. Note that the first page presents the standard system that applies to most instructors. The second page reflects the system used by instructors in their first, post-probationary year. The key difference between the two is the increased frequency of use in the first post-probationary year, when it is hoped more feedback can help to reduce the steepness of the new instructor’s learning curve.

## System Overview: Standard Four-Year Cycle

	IAO / Student Opinion of Instructional Quality	Peer Review of Teaching	Review of Non-Instructional Activities	Instructor/Manager Meeting
CONTENT	Standard form (paper or online) with opportunity for instructor to add questions.	Standard form with opportunity for instructor being reviewed to add questions.	Standard form relating to department activities other than instruction.	Standard form that summarizes component outputs. Additional relevant data included at instructor's discretion.
FREQUENCY	At least one student group each term; two different groups annually; more groups at instructor's discretion.	At least once during each four-year cycle.	Optional at instructor's discretion.	Once in each four-year cycle.
PROCESS	For IAO, students are notified and complete the survey via a link email or D2L link. For paper, a proctor (typically the set rep) distributes the survey forms. Students complete forms. Proctor collects completed forms and delivers them for scanning.	Colleague(s) observers a classroom session.	Selected colleague(s) complete the form and return it to the instructor.	Instructor assembles and submits relevant system outputs to manager. At meeting, instructor and manager discuss, finalize and sign the report.
THOSE INVOLVED	Students in each selected course.	Colleague(s) selected by instructor.	At least one department colleague and up to four additional departmental or non-departmental respondents selected by instructor.	Instructor and Manager.
OUTPUT	Raw data, mean, and median for items and clusters, with cluster histograms in a report. Instructors receive a full report including comments. Assoc. Deans receive an aggregate of the Likert ratings and no comments	One report for each in-class visit is submitted to instructor being reviewed.	Completed reports from each respondent are submitted to instructor being reviewed	Review report goes to Personnel file in HR; instructor retains all feedback documentation and original report. Manager may retain a copy of the report

## System Overview: First Probationary Year

	IAO / Student Opinion of Instructional Quality	Peer Review of Teaching	Review of Non-Instructional Activities	Instructor/Manager Meeting
CONTENT	Standard form with opportunity for instructor to add questions.	Standard form with opportunity for instructor to add questions.	Standard form relating to department activities other than instruction.	Standard form that summarizes component outputs. Additional relevant data included at instructor's discretion.
FREQUENCY	Every course, every term of the first probationary year.	At least once during the first probationary year.	Optional at instructor's discretion.	Once in the first probationary year.
PROCESS	For IAO, students are notified and complete the survey via a link email or D2L link. For paper, a proctor (typically the set rep) distributes the survey forms. Students complete forms. Proctor collects completed forms and delivers them for scanning.	Colleague(s) observers a classroom session.	Colleague(s) complete the form and return it to the instructor.	Instructor assembles and submits relevant system outputs to manager. At meeting, instructor and manager discuss, finalize and sign the report.
THOSE INVOLVED	Students in each selected course.	Colleague(s) selected by instructor.	Colleague(s) selected by instructor.	Instructor and Manager.
OUTPUT	Raw data, mean, and median for items and clusters, with cluster histograms in a report. Instructors receive a full report including comments. Assoc. Deans receive an aggregate of the Likert ratings and no comments	One report for each in-class visit is submitted to instructor being reviewed.	Completed reports from each respondent are submitted to instructor being reviewed	Review report goes to Personnel file in HR; instructor retains all feedback documentation and original report. Manager may retain a copy of the report

This overview presents the one year cycle that applies to instructors in their first probationary year.

