The Center for Teaching Excellence has developed a framework called Benchmarks for Teaching Effectiveness to support better methods of reviewing, documenting, and evaluating teaching. The framework is organized around a multidimensional rubric for reviewing faculty teaching. Seven rubric dimensions have been designed to capture teaching in its totality. The rubric includes guiding questions, defined expectations, and potential sources of evidence for each dimension (see reverse). Departments are encouraged to adapt the rubric to fit disciplinary expectations and to weight areas most meaningful to the discipline and different instructional roles.

**Benchmarks Goals and Objectives**

1. Help departments and institutions develop common, comprehensive, and transparent expectations for faculty teaching.

2. Encourage the use of multiple sources of information (instructor, peers, and students) to minimize bias in evaluating teaching and to make visible a fuller range of teaching contributions.

3. Improve synthesis and representation of this information at the department or school level.

4. Develop approaches that foster and reward growth and development in teaching.

**EXPLORING APPLICATIONS OF THE FRAMEWORK**

In 2017, leaders in KU’s CTE and colleagues at the University of Colorado, Boulder, the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and Michigan State University received funding from the National Science Foundation for a five-year-project called TEval, which supported department-level adaptation and use of the Benchmarks framework. The rubric provides a good starting point for departments to define the elements of effective teaching and improve their approaches to evaluating teaching. The TEval initiative developed new models and tools for evaluating teaching that can be applied in other departments and institutions and CTE continues to assist departments in improving their approaches.

**WHY WE ARE DOING THIS**

Most evaluations of teaching emphasize results of student surveys or peer observations of a single class. Those approaches provide limited evidence of teaching effectiveness and minimal feedback for improving teaching. The Benchmarks framework provides a comprehensive, balanced view of faculty teaching contributions by broadening the types of activities that are reviewed and the sources of information that are taken into account. In doing so, it makes visible the often hidden intellectual work of effective and inclusive teaching, and the care that excellent instructors put into their interactions with students. Benchmarks aligns with KU policy, which requires multiple sources of evidence in teaching evaluation and specifies students, peers, and the faculty member as required sources in promotion and tenure and progress-toward-tenure processes.
Benchmarks in Brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it looks like</th>
<th>Where to look</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organizes course content and activities around relevant, appropriate, and well-articulated goals | Instructor: Syllabus (course goals), sample materials (rubrics, assignment sheets, readings), instructor narrative  
Peers: Peer review, program or curriculum map or other documentation  
Students: Student survey of teaching, instructor-gathered feedback |
| Uses inclusive and effective teaching practices that support learning in all students | Instructor: Syllabus/schedule, sample class activities, assignments and lesson plans, example feedback on student work, instructor narrative  
Peers: Peer review, COPUS or other observation tool or protocol  
Students: Student survey of teaching, instructor-gathered feedback |
| Creates a motivating and inclusive class climate | Instructor: Sample assessments and rubrics, student work samples, summary or analysis of student performance, instructor narrative  
Peers: Peer observation, Peer review  
Students: Student Survey of Teaching, instructor-gathered feedback |
| Consistently attends to student learning and uses it to inform teaching | Instructor: Syllabi, sample course materials highlighting changes in course, evidence of changes in student achievement, instructor narrative  
Peers: Peer review  
Students: Changes in student feedback |
| Develops teaching over time, in response to student performance, feedback, and professional learning | Instructor: Instructor statement, CV (# of student mentees and status, service on student committees, letters of recommendation or nomination of students for awards, scholarship with student collaborators)  
Students: Letters or surveys from student advisees |
| Demonstrates exceptional quality and time commitment to mentoring and advising | Instructor: CV (internal or external workshops, presentations, articles, media, grants; participation in communities or development opportunities), teaching committees, involvement in experiential learning or co-curricular activities  
Public Artifacts: Publications or other public repositories of teaching practices or results |
| Makes positive contributions to the broader teaching community, both on and off campus | Instructor: CV (internal or external workshops, presentations, articles, media, grants; participation in communities or development opportunities), teaching committees, involvement in experiential learning or co-curricular activities  
Public Artifacts: Publications or other public repositories of teaching practices or results |