

Teacher Evaluation Appeals Process (Undergraduate Medical Education) – Terms of Reference

Approved by: Undergraduate Medical Education Executive Committee

Date of original adoption: 21 January 2014

Date of last review: 21 January 2014

Date of next scheduled review: 21 January 2018

In consideration of appeal requests to review teacher evaluations, the following, subject to revision, outlines the policies concerning appellants' responsibilities, the general set of guidelines for adjudication, and the reporting process.

Appellant Responsibilities:

1. Appeal requests are to be directed to the attention of the Evaluation Coordinator for the Undergraduate Medical Education, Office of Evaluations, by email and copied to the appellant's Clinical Chief and Departmental Chair/Divisional Head, and the Course Director.
2. Notices of such requests are to provide a rationale for such request.

Process & Reporting:

1. Teacher Evaluation records are compiled by the Evaluation Coordinator for review by the three member Appeals Committee, which is Chaired by a Senior Educator appointed by the Vice-Dean, UMPE and includes both a faculty and student representative. This Committee convenes annually if required.
2. Reviews are limited to appeal requests submitted by the given deadline and which pertain to teaching within the immediately preceding academic year unless more than one year of data was required in order to reach an aggregate of three evaluations
3. All outcomes are considered final and are reported to the appellant and copied to the appellants' respective Clinical Chief and Departmental Chair /Divisional Head as either supported or denied, with an appended copy of the then current Terms of Reference.
4. Students will not normally be notified when an appeal is made, nor will they be notified regarding the outcome of the appeal.
5. A summary of all appeals and their outcomes will be provided to the Vice-Dean of Undergraduate Medical Professions Education

Standards & Guiding Principles:

In order to ensure uniformity and fairness, the Committee relies on standards in its adjudication process that may include:

1. Face validity:
 - a. A presentation of reasonably refuting evidence.
 - b. Undue influence of a statistically atypical evaluation(s).
 - c. Whether an evaluation(s) is (are) program or teacher oriented.
 - d. Obvious transposition of scale ratings.
2. For evaluations in question, additional considerations may include:
 - a. Whether there is evidence supporting apparent retribution by a trainee.
 - b. Whether or not a trainee(s) has (have) substantiated their ratings in narrative form.
 - c. Whether the degree of contact between teacher and trainee is reasonable for purposes of rendering an evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
3. In circumstances where arguments for and against upholding an appeal are balanced, the resolution will be to favour the appellant.