DRAFT- December 2016

Department Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Rubric

This rubric is intended as a guide to providing a richer, more complete evaluation of teaching. It is designed to structure department evaluation of faculty members' teaching, including contributions to individual courses and to the department's curriculum. The goal is to help departments integrate information from three sources:

 ➢ **The faculty member** (including course materials, evidence of student learning, and reflections on student learning)
 ➢ **Peers** (including class visits, observations from team teaching, evaluations of course materials, and formal discussions about the faculty member's approach to teaching)
 ➢ **Students** (primarily course evaluations)

The rubric can easily be adapted by departments to fit particular disciplinary expectations and to weight areas in ways most meaningful to the discipline. It is intended to guide evaluation of faculty members in the promotion and tenure process.

When completing the rubric, evaluators should consider several factors, including:

 ➢ **Types of courses taught** (required or elective, major or non-major, lecture or discussion, team taught or individual, size and level of class).
 ➢ **Stage of the faculty member's career** (tenure track, tenured, instructor, adjunct)

Departments may focus on various facets of the rubric at various stages in a faculty member's career, but at all times, evidence of student learning should be paramount.

How to use this rubric:

1. After department members review the form, what modifications do they suggest to make it appropriate for their department?
2. What weights should be assigned to each category?
3. Has the department come to a consensus about the questions and criteria outlined in each category? (e.g., in some departments, advising responsibilities have been under articulated, so faculty members should clarify expectations for their department)
4. Have sources of evidence been identified for each category? This should include a framework for how to read student evaluations of teaching and where they will be used as evidence within the rubric.

Rubric for Department Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

—To be modified as needed by department—

	Below Expectations: 1 - 2 *Poor (1): Consistently at this level* *Marginal (2): Some teaching at this level*	Meets Expectations: 3 *Competent*	Exceeds Expectations: 4 - 5 *Professional (4): Some teaching at this level* *Advanced (5): Consistently at this level*
Goals, content, and alignment *What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum?*	• Course goals are unclear, inappropriate, or marginally related to curriculum • Content and materials are outdated or unsuitable for students in the courses • Range of course topics is too narrow or too broad • Content is not clearly aligned with curriculum or institutional expectations	• Course goals are articulated and appropriate for curriculum • Content is current and appropriate for topic, students, and curriculum • Course topics include an appropriate range • Standard, intellectually sound materials	• Course goals are well-articulated, high quality, and clearly connected to program or curricular goals • Content is challenging and innovative or related to current issues and developments in field • Course topics include appropriate range and depth, with integration across topics • Materials are high quality and well-aligned with content and course goals
Teaching practices *How is in-class and out-of-class time used? What assignments, assessments, and learning activities are implemented to help students learn?*	• Teaching practices are not sufficiently planned or organized, or are poorly implemented • Practices are not well executed; little development in methods despite evidence of need • Students lack opportunities to practice the skills embedded in course goals • Student engagement is variable	• Teaching practices are well planned and organized • Standard course practices carried out; follows conventions within discipline and institution • Students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals • Students consistently engaged	• Activities are well planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to providing meaningful assignments and assessments • Uses effective, high-impact or innovative methods to improve understanding • In- and out-of-class activities provide opportunities for practice and feedback on important skills and concepts • Students show high levels of engagement
Achievement of learning outcomes *What impact do these courses have on learners? What evidence shows the level of student understanding?*	• Insufficient attention to student learning – quality of student learning is not described or analyzed with clear standards • Evidence of poor student learning; low level of skill/understanding is required or achieved without clear attempts to improve	• Clear standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding • Typical student achievement for courses at these levels	• Standards for evaluating student understanding are connected to program or curriculum expectations, or use authentic assessments • Efforts to support learning in all students • Quality of learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues), or is increasing over successive offerings

	Below Expectations: 1 - 2 *Poor (1): Consistently at this level* *Marginal (2): Some teaching at this level*	Meets Expectations: 3 *Competent*	Exceeds Expectations: 4 - 5 *Professional (4): Some teaching at this level* *Advanced (5): Consistently at this level*
Classroom climate and student perceptions *What are the students' views of their learning experience? How has student feedback informed the faculty member's teaching?*	• Classroom climate does not promote civility or discourages student motivation and engagement • Consistently negative student reports of teacher accessibility, interaction skills • Poor sense of learning among students • Little attempt to address concerns voiced by students	• Classroom climate promotes civility • No consistently negative student ratings of teacher accessibility, interaction skills • Most students indicate progress with their learning • Instructor articulates some lessons learned through student feedback	• Evidence that classroom climate is respectful, cooperative, and encourages student motivation and engagement • Student feedback on teacher accessibility, interaction skills is generally positive • Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge • Instructor is responsive to student feedback in short- and long-term
Reflection and iterative growth *How has the faculty member's teaching changed over time? How has this been informed by evidence of student learning?*	• No indication of having reflected upon or learned from prior teaching or feedback	• Continued competent teaching, possibly with minor reflection based on input from peers and/or students • Articulates some lessons learned from prior teaching and feedback	• Regularly makes adjustments to teaching based on reflections about student learning (within or across semesters) • Examines student performance following adjustments • Reports improved student achievement of learning goals based on past course modifications
Mentoring and advising *How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?*	• No indication of effective mentoring or advising students (but expected in department)	• Some evidence of effective advising and mentoring *(define as appropriate for discipline)*	• Evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to advising and mentoring *(define as appropriate for discipline)*
Involvement in teaching service, scholarship, or community *In what ways has the instructor contributed to the broader teaching community, both on and off campus?*	• No interaction with broader community about teaching, including involvement with teaching-related committees • No evidence of keeping up with reports on effective teaching • Practices and results of teaching are not shared with others • Actions have negative impact on teaching culture in department or institution	• Some involvement in teaching-related committees, or engagement with peers on teaching (e.g., teaching-related presentations or workshops) • Participates in department-level curriculum decisions	• Regular involvement in teaching-related committees, engagement with peers on teaching (e.g., teaching-related presentations or workshops) • Occasional (or more) local or external presentations or publications to share practices or results of teaching • Contributes to department or university curricular planning or assessment • Advanced—Scholarly publications or grant applications related to teaching