QTI example rubric-based approach to evaluating teaching

[last updated: 05-11-22; you can access the prior version [here](#)]

This document is a template your unit may consider adopting. It is a rubric-based approach for evaluating teaching along the three dimensions for defining teaching quality (Inclusive, Goal-Oriented, and Scholarly) as specified by the [A&S Quality Teaching Initiative (QTI)](#). This is one possible way a scholarly framework can be adapted into a tool for evaluating teaching in a primary unit. While this example could be adopted mostly as is, it can also be adapted to better fit a unit's needs. This example includes individual assessment rubrics for inclusive, goal-oriented, and scholarly teaching along with an evaluation summary, sample forms of evidence, and sample instructions for instructors, evaluation committee members, and mentors or others tasked with ensuring instructors know how they will be evaluated (in this document "instructor" refers broadly to any person with teaching responsibilities that would be evaluated for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure). Units will need to combine a rubric-based approach such as this with a policy statement on how to apply the rubric ratings to reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions (a sample is included in Appendix D). The appendices also include suggested guidelines for how primary units might approach adapting this example to meet their needs, blank rubric templates in three formats, and an expanded list of possible criteria for each dimension.

Table of Contents

This document is a beta draft - please feel free to make a copy to use / adapt in your unit. Please do not cite or share outside of your unit. Please contact Sarah Andrews at sarah.andrews-1@colorado.edu if you have any questions or would like to share feedback on this document.

Evaluation Summary

To be completed by the evaluation committee after completing and discussing the individual assessment rubrics for Inclusive, Goal-Oriented, and Scholarly Teaching.

Summary Table. Refer to the individual assessment rubrics below for additional details.

Dimension of Quality Teaching	Main Sources of Evidence	Demonstrated Proficiency Level (0-4)	Discussion of Evaluation by Committee
Inclusive			
Goal oriented			
Scholarly			

Overall Rating/Recommendation:

(Based on primary unit-defined criteria for translating rubric ratings into less than meritorious, meritorious, or excellence in teaching; see Appendix D for an example)

Justification:

Inclusive Teaching Assessment Rubric

Inclusive teaching at CU Boulder is designed with an eye toward the wide range of ways in which our students and educators teach and learn. In part, inclusivity means supporting diverse approaches to learning using a variety of teaching practices. Inclusivity also involves sensitivity to and support of diversity of students and faculty from across the range of social, economic, and demographic factors. Frequently, this sensitivity is geared toward initiatives in the classroom but also involves mentorship of students and support of their efforts to achieve their professional and personal goals (from A&S Policies).

Proficiency Level / Evaluation Criteria - Below are examples, see Appendix C for full list.	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
❏ Level 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❏ Level 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. **Basic Criteria:** ❏ Follows expectations of PRR (II.A Teaching) ❏ Creates a supportive environment that gives each student equal access to learning ❏ Active consideration and planning for how diverse learners will engage with activities and content ❏ Methods and practices are informed by a knowledge of the student population *(Scholarly)* ❏ Inclusive pedagogy strategies are used *(Scholarly)* ❏ Classroom climate is consistently respectful, cooperative, and inclusive ❏ Actively supportive of mentees'/advisees' diverse goals and values ❏ Level 2 - All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. **Professional Criteria:** ❏ Methods and practices are informed by a knowledge of the student population (e.g., information on college population from ODA surveys, anonymous pre-surveys to get to know a class as a whole, accommodation requests, etc.) *(Scholarly)* ❏ Inclusive pedagogy strategies are used *(Scholarly)* ❏ Students perceive the instructor strongly values diversity, equity, and inclusion ❏ Mentor/mentee relationships are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through the use of the Graduate School Advising Agreement) ❏ Level 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❏ Level 4 - All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom. **Advanced Criteria:** ❏ Has prepared, and worked to improve, activities to help students overcome common challenges, noting the diverse learners in class (Scholarly) ❏ Very knowledgeable about inclusive teaching pedagogies and methods to support diverse learners and enacts in the classroom (Scholarly) ❏ Actively works to recruit and support student mentees from groups that are historically	**Core:** ❏ Peer Observation Report ❏ Reflective Teaching Statement ❏ Syllabi ❏ FCQs (Q1, Q4, Q5, Q8, Q9, Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15) ❏ FCQ comments (Q17) **Recommended:** ❏ Course/teaching portfolio ❏ Classroom interview report ❏ Student letters ❏ Mentee letters **Supplemental:** ❏ Course Mgmt system ❏ Other course materials ❏ Other student assessments of mentoring / advising (insert brief description) ❏ Student nominated teaching awards ❏ Student nominated mentoring award(s) ❏ Records of participation in pedagogical professional development ❏ Other (insert brief description):	

marginalized or underrepresented in the field or society ❏ Develops and shares (locally or beyond) materials supporting inclusive pedagogical practices in the classroom, mentoring experiences, or elsewhere ❏ Supports others (particularly faculty) in the use of inclusive pedagogical practices		

Goal-Oriented Teaching Assessment Rubric

Hallmarks of quality teaching at CU Boulder include teaching that is: (1) guided by clearly articulated learning goals; (2) based on a curriculum designed to prepare, enact, and achieve those goals; and (3) evaluated and responsive to various forms of feedback, including evidence of impacts on learning. Additional elements of goal-oriented teaching may include engaging in efforts to make visible the achievement of specific learning outcomes, as well as to improve and adapt to the needs of diverse learners (from [A&S Policies](#)).

Proficiency Level / Evaluation Criteria- Below are examples, see Appendix C for full list.	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
❏ Level 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❏ Level 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. **Basic Criteria:** ❏ Follows expectations of PRR (II.A Teaching) ❏ Learning goals are explicit, clearly articulated, and regularly communicated to students ❏ Course materials/content are aligned with course goals ❏ Clear, evidence-based approach for evaluating student achievement *(Scholarly)* ❏ Goals for mentee growth are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through use of individual development plans) ❏ Level 2 - All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. **Professional Criteria:** ❏ Students are regularly given feedback on their mastery of important skills and concepts ❏ Consistently works to improve student outcomes and support learning for all students *(Inclusive)* ❏ Assignments are graded using clear and thorough rubrics ❏ Learning goals are attentive to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom *(Inclusive)* ❏ Goals for mentee growth are challenging, developmental, and achievable ❏ Level 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❏ Level 4 - All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom. **Advanced Criteria:** ❏ Course learning goals clearly connect to curricular, programmatic, and departmental goals ❏ Students involved in co-design of course approach, goals, evaluation, outcomes *(Inclusive)*	**Core:** ❏ Peer Observation Report ❏ Reflective Teaching Statement ❏ Syllabi ❏ FCQs (Q3, Q6, Q7, Q10, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q14) ❏ FCQ comments (Q17) **Recommended:** ❏ Course Mgmt system ❏ Assessment materials (e.g., quizzes, exams, projects) ❏ Assessment rubrics ❏ Course/teaching portfolio ❏ Classroom interview report **Supplemental:** ❏ Descriptions of assignments that are evidence-based / high impact practices ❏ Examples of student work with instructor feedback ❏ Other course materials ❏ Summary of pre/post assessment of student learning outcomes or other examples the instructor	

❏ Quality of student learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues) ❏ Goals and practices based on measures of student accomplishment (from current or prior terms and/or external scholarship)	has used to assess student learning outcomes ❏ Student letters ❏ Other (insert brief description):	

Scholarly Teaching Assessment Rubric

Scholarship on teaching and learning and domain-specific studies of education provide clear pictures of effective, evidence-based and often innovative approaches for our CU Boulder educators to draw from and contribute to. These high impact practices may include (and are not limited to): engaging students in classroom settings; challenging them appropriately; providing structured research experiences; experiential learning opportunities; bringing appropriate faculty research or creative work into our classrooms; developing technology-based and innovative teaching methods; individualized mentoring; and nurturing a sense of identity, belonging, and reflection among our students. Scholarly approaches to teaching at CU-B encourage our own continued development as educators and may seek to make our practices and impacts visible through dissemination and peer review (from A&S Policies).

Proficiency Level / Evaluation Criteria- Below are examples, see Appendix C for full list.	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
❏ Level 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❏ Level 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. **Basic Criteria:** ❏ Follows expectations of PRR (II.A Teaching) ❏ Provides a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments, with particular attention to being inclusive and equitable *(Inclusive)* ❏ Regularly supports mentees to become independent learners ❏ Informally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues ❏ Level 2 -All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. **Professional Criteria:** ❏ Selects teaching resources, materials, activities, and/or methods that are shown to enable learning (e.g., evidence-based) ❏ Regularly solicits student feedback, uses this information to improve teaching, and communicates this back to students (Goal-oriented) ❏ Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback from a variety of sources ❏ Draws from evidence-based approaches for effective mentoring, e.g. NASEM recommendations ❏ Level 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❏ Level 4 - All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom. **Advanced Criteria:** ❏ Employs systematic collection of classroom data to iterate on and improve teaching *(Goal-oriented)* ❏ Uses research-validated tools for measuring student understanding (e.g., pre/post tests) ❏ Actively mentors others about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods (e.g., presentations, publications, seminars)	**Core:** ❏ Peer Observation Reports (comparison over time) ❏ FCQs (comparison over time) ❏ Reflective Teaching Statement **Recommended:** ❏ Course/teaching portfolio ❏ Existing records of faculty activities (e.g., FRPA, CV, records of service assignments, records of participation in pedagogical professional development, etc.) **Supplemental:** ❏ Instructor summary/reflection on FCQs, peer observations, or other sources of feedback, over time ❏ Summary of pre/post assessment of student learning outcomes or other examples the instructor has used to assess student learning outcomes ❏ Student assessments of mentoring / advising (insert brief description) ❏ Teaching awards ❏ Other (insert brief description):	

❏ Creates opportunities for self and peers to help others improve teaching or secures resources (e.g., grant funding) for teaching ❏ Develops /innovates and shares new uses of learning technologies		

Sample Forms of Evidence (Data Sources)

(Note this is not an exhaustive list, other evidence is possible)

Core

FCQ scores (list of CU Boulder FCQ items)

Peer Course Observation (example protocols)

Reflective Teaching Statement (example guidelines)

Information on syllabus

Recommended

Existing records of faculty activities (e.g., FRPA, CV, records of service assignments, records of participation in pedagogical professional development, etc.)

Review of course materials and/or course mgmt system created by instructor

Assessment materials (e.g., quizzes, exams, projects)

Rubrics used to assess student work

Teaching or course portfolio

Classroom Interview report (example protocols)

Solicited student letters (example guidelines)

Supplemental

FCQ comments

Instructor summary/reflection on FCQs, peer observations, or other sources of feedback, over time

Unsolicited student letters

Paired Mentor Evaluation

Peer Research Group Observation

Other assessments of mentoring relationships

Descriptions of assignments that are evidence-based / high impact practices

Examples of student work (ideally with instructor feedback) (make sure not violating FERPA)

Teaching and/or mentoring awards (peer nominated)

Teaching and/or mentoring awards (student nominated)

Peer review of a teaching or course portfolio

Summary of pre/post assessment of student learning outcomes or other examples the instructor has used to assess student learning outcomes

Sample instructions for the instructor submitting their dossier to the review committee
- Within **each** assessment rubric (inclusive, goal-oriented, scholarly):
    - Check the boxes for all basic criteria you believe you meet, and, if you are striving for proficiency level 2-4, please check the boxes for professional and/or advanced criteria that you wish to be evaluated on
    - Check the boxes for all sources of evidence you are submitting <u>if you believe they provide evidence for evaluating the given dimension</u>, ensuring that you include a brief description of anything you're submitting as "other"
        - Note there may be some data sources you are not privy to (e.g., solicited student letters) - it will be up to the evaluation committee to mark where these were used
    - Check the box for the proficiency level you believe you are achieving
    - In the Explanation column, include a brief explanation for why you believe you meet the selected proficiency level based on the sources of evidence you are submitting (note that your reflective teaching statement can expand on this)

Sample instructions for evaluation committee members
- Individually:
    - Review the instructor's self-evaluation and submitted materials. Do you agree/disagree with their self-assessed proficiency level for each dimension of quality teaching (inclusive, goal-oriented, scholarly)? What is your rationale based on the available sources of evidence for why you agree/disagree?
    - Within **each** assessment rubric:
        - Check the boxes for all basic, professional, and advanced criteria the instructor meets based on your review of the evidence
        - Check the box for the proficiency level the instructor meets based on your review of the evidence
        - Check the boxes for all sources of evidence you reviewed to evaluate the instructors proficiency level for this dimension
        - In the Explanation column, include a brief explanation for why you believe the instructor meets the selected proficiency level based on the sources of evidence submitted/reviewed
- Collectively
    - Discuss your respective evaluations and resolve discrepancies
    - Complete the Evaluation Summary table
    - Assign an overall rating / recommendation (based on your unit's policy that converts proficiency levels to meritorious or excellence in teaching for different faculty ranks/roles - see Appendix D below for an example)
    - Write a justification narrative for your overall rating / recommendation based on the assessment rubrics / evaluation summary

Sample instructions for mentors and/or others tasked with ensuring instructors know how they will be evaluated
Mentors, and/or others in [unit] who are responsible for ensuring new instructors/junior faculty are informed about standards for how they will be evaluated on teaching, should set up a meeting with their mentee within the first semester they are hired to review this rubric and the associated policy / standards for how the overall rating translates to meritorious and excellence in teaching for their role/rank. The goals of the meeting should be at least twofold - 1) ensure the mentee understands the process for which they will be evaluated and answer any questions they may have, and 2) work with their mentee on a plan for how they will approach their first review. Are there any basic criteria they think they might need to work on before review? Which professional and/or advanced criteria do they want to be evaluated on? What forms of evidence will they want to be attentive to and plan to include? Prior to their first formal review, it is recommended that the mentee do at least one self-evaluation using the assessment rubrics for inclusive, goal-oriented, and inclusive teaching and meet with their mentor to discuss progress.

Appendix A: Suggested guidelines for how primary unit teams might approach adapting this example

While the example approach outlined above could be adopted mostly as is, it can also be adapted as needed to better fit a unit's needs. Below are some possible guiding questions for how a working group within your unit might approach reviewing / discussing this document.

- Examine the forms of evidence list above - which of these do you already use and/or would you like to be able to include? Are there any that your unit will absolutely not use? Are there any forms of teaching evidence that your unit uses/would like to use that are missing from the list? Revise the list as needed, ensuring that at least three key voices are included (peers, students, and the voice of the instructor being evaluated)
- Would the overall structure of the assessment rubrics for each dimension above (inclusive, goal-oriented, and scholarly) and the evaluation summary above fit your unit's needs?
    - See Appendix B below for rubric templates with slight variations in structure
    - Note: it is not a requirement of QTI to have separate rubrics for the three dimensions as long as the evaluation allows a unit to assess all three
    - If your unit would like to explore alternative rubric forms, other examples include:
        - University of Massachusetts Teaching Evaluation Rubric; University of Kansas Benchmarks for Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Form (link automatically downloads a docx); University of Oregon Evaluation of Teaching Criteria; see also the GSLL annual teaching evaluation rubric (CU Boulder) for an example used in annual merit.
- For each assessment rubric above (Inclusive, Goal-Oriented, and Scholarly):
    - Review the basic and professional/advanced criteria
        - Are they clear/easy to understand? Are they appropriate for your discipline? Do they span the space of teaching and mentoring activities for your unit? Is anything missing? Is the split between what counts as basic and what counts as professional/advanced appropriate for your unit (i.e., are there any "basic" items you would want to move to "professional/advanced" or vice versa?)
            - If your unit is interested in including additional or alternative criteria, we recommend checking the expanded list of criteria within each dimension below in Appendix C as a first step
            - Note that many criteria are relevant across more than one dimension; in such cases, we placed the criterium in a single dimension and indicated other relevant dimensions in italicized parentheses - these criteria could be moved to a different dimension, though we do not recommend duplicating them in more than one dimension.
    - Review the proficiency level descriptions
        - Does this example include the right number of proficiency levels? Are the levels as specified appropriate for your unit or would you want to modify them?
    - Review the suggested core, recommended, and supplemental sources of evidence
        - Adjust as needed based on any changes you made to the full list of forms of evidence. If you removed, added, or altered any of the evaluation criteria and/or sources of evidence, and based on the specific sources of evidence you have / will have access to, consider whether or not the sources of evidence will collectively allow a reviewer to assess the basic and professional/advanced criteria to determine a proficiency level
- Think about weighting, e.g., should all 3 dimensions be equally weighted or would you weight some dimensions heavier than others? Should different forms of evidence or different voices (peer, student, self) be weighed the same?

- Review the example instructions above for instructors, evaluation committee members, and mentors. Are these appropriate groups that would need instructions? Does the language make sense for your unit?

Appendix B: Blank rubric templates in three formats

Format A (this matches the rubric style in the example above):

Proficiency Level / Evaluation Criteria	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
❑ Level 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❑ Level 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. **Basic Criteria:** ❑ ❑ Level 2 - All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. **Professional Criteria:** ❑ ❑ Level 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❑ Level 4 -All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom. **Advanced Criteria:** ❑	**Core:** ❑ **Recommended:** ❑ **Supplemental:** ❑	

Format B (slight variation on A in where the criteria appear):

Evaluation Criteria / Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
Basic Criteria: ❑ ❑ Level 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❑ Level 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. **Professional Criteria:** ❑ **Advanced Criteria:** ❑ ❑ Level 2 - All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. ❑ Level 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❑ Level 4 - All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including	**Core:** ❑ **Recommended:** ❑ **Supplemental:** ❑	

demonstrated impact beyond the classroom.		

Format C (Proficiency levels appear in a column separate from criteria)

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
Basic Criteria: ❑ ❑ Professional Criteria: ❑ ❑ Advanced Criteria: ❑ ❑	❑ 0 - Only select elements of basic, even if some professional or advanced are met. ❑ 1 - Meets **all** basic criteria. ❑ 2 - All basic and some professional and/or advanced criteria are met. ❑ 3 - All basic, most professional, and some advanced criteria are met. ❑ 4 - All basic, most professional, and most advanced criteria are met, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom.	Core: ❑ Recommended: ❑ Supplemental: ❑	

Appendix C: Expanded list of criteria for each QTI dimension

Expanded list of <u>Inclusive Teaching</u> Criteria (bold items are included in the sample rubric above)

Inclusive teaching at CU Boulder is designed with an eye toward the wide range of ways in which our students and educators teach and learn. In part, inclusivity means supporting diverse approaches to learning using a variety of teaching practices. Inclusivity also involves sensitivity to and support of diversity of students and faculty from across the range of social, economic, and demographic factors. Frequently, this sensitivity is geared toward initiatives in the classroom but also involves mentorship of students and support of their efforts to achieve their professional and personal goals (from [A&S Policies](#)).

Basic:
- **Follows expectations of [PRR](#) (II.A Teaching)**
- **Creates a supportive environment that gives each student equal access to learning**
- Course materials/content include diverse perspectives *(Goal-oriented)*
- **Active consideration and planning for how diverse learners will engage with activities and content**
- **Classroom climate is consistently respectful, cooperative, and inclusive**
- Instructor encourages motivation and engagement
- Clear and accessible presentation of materials
- Instructor is accessible and treats students with dignity & respect
- Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are positive
- **Actively supportive of mentees'/advisees' diverse goals and values**

Professional:
- Can identify common student challenges
- Attentive to how to best support mentees/advisees from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field/academia
- Students consistently show high levels of engagement
- **Methods and practices are informed by a knowledge of the student population (e.g., information on college population from ODA surveys, anonymous pre-surveys to get to know a class as a whole, accommodation requests, etc.)** *(Scholarly)*
- **Inclusive pedagogy strategies are used** *(Scholarly)*
- **Students perceive the instructor strongly values diversity, equity, and inclusion**
- Course materials represent the diversity of the student body, field, and society wherever possible
- Demonstrates an awareness of power dynamics with students
- Demonstrates awareness of places where bias may enter assessment, and attempt to mitigate those biases *(Scholarly)*
- Demonstrates understanding of mentees'/advisees' (intersecting) identities
- **Mentor/mentee relationships are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through the use of the Graduate School Advising Agreement)**

Advanced:
- **Has prepared, and worked to improve, activities to help students overcome common challenges, noting the diverse learners in class** *(Scholarly)*
- Diversity, equity and inclusion shape all aspects of course development and implementation, including course goals, content, project design, etc.
- Integrates a wide variety of inclusive teaching and learning approaches that are easily apparent in teaching practices and designed to respond to the diverse

experiences of students in their classes *(Scholarly)*
- Clear efforts to support learning for students historically underrepresented or marginalized in the field, academia and/or society
- **Very knowledgeable about inclusive teaching pedagogies and methods to support diverse learners and enacts in the classroom** *(Scholarly)*
- Recognizes multiple ways of knowing and incorporates multiple ways of knowing into teaching and learning practice *(Scholarly)*
- Teaches students how to engage across diverse groups of learners and experiences
- Classroom climate is particularly sensitive to/aware of students from under-represented and/or historically marginalized populations in the field and academia
- Makes space for students to discuss inequity and exclusion they may be experiencing in the classroom and discipline
- Actively works to disrupt inequities in the discipline and classroom
- **Actively works to recruit and support student mentees from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field or society**
- Proactively supports mentees/advisees from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field, academia, and/or society in navigating exclusive and inequitable environments
- Works on curricular change efforts to integrate a value for diversity, inclusion and equity as an important influence on teaching *(Scholarly)*
- **Develops and shares (locally or beyond) materials supporting inclusive pedagogical practices in the classroom, mentoring experiences, or elsewhere**
- **Supports others (particularly faculty) in the use of inclusive pedagogical practices**

Expanded list of Goal-Oriented Teaching Criteria (bold items are included in the sample rubric above)

Hallmarks of quality teaching at CU Boulder include teaching that is: (1) guided by clearly articulated learning goals; (2) based on a curriculum designed to prepare, enact, and achieve those goals; and (3) evaluated and responsive to various forms of feedback, including evidence of impacts on learning. Additional elements of goal-oriented teaching may include engaging in efforts to make visible the achievement of specific learning outcomes, as well as to improve and adapt to the needs of diverse learners (from A&S Policies).

Basic:
- **Follows expectations of PRR (II.A Teaching)**
- **Learning goals are explicit, clearly articulated, and regularly communicated to students**
- **Course materials/content are aligned with course goals**
- Range/depth of course topics is appropriate
- Course content relates to current developments in field
- Syllabus, materials, and course material are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments
- **Clear, evidence-based approach for evaluating student achievement** *(Scholarly)*
- Activities provide regular opportunities for students to practice important skills and concepts that are aligned with course goals
- Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge
- High levels of student learning are expected and generally achieved
- Articulates achievable goals and expectations for mentoring / individual project based work
- **Goals for mentee growth are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through use of individual development plans)**

Professional
- **Students are regularly given feedback on their mastery of important skills and concepts**

- Consistently works to improve student outcomes and support learning for all students *(Inclusive)*
- **Assignments are graded using clear and thorough rubrics**
- Course webpage/LMS/other technology is used to significantly improve student communication/access to course materials
- **Learning goals are attentive to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom** *(Inclusive)*
- Course goals include advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field *(Inclusive)*
- Uses scholarly measures of student learning outcomes and student development over the course *(Scholarly)*
- Course materials/content are appropriately challenging and innovative
- Content integrates other topics/courses
- **Goals for mentee growth are challenging, developmental, and achievable**

Advanced:
- **Course learning goals clearly connect to curricular, programmatic, and departmental goals**
- Development of course goals has a significant impact on department-wide teaching practice for this course (e.g., how it connects to departmental goals)
- Coaches others on writing course goals that relate to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field *(Inclusive)*
- Students have voice in determining learning goals /objectives *(Inclusive)*
- **Students involved in co-design of course approach, goals, evaluation, outcomes** *(Inclusive)*
- Explicit attention to and description of a broad definition of "success" for a diverse array of learners *(Inclusive)*
- Student learning outcomes are designed with equity in mind *(Inclusive)*
- Some student learning outcomes focus on developing skills/understanding of equity / inequities in the discipline *(Inclusive)*
- **Quality of student learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues)**
- **Goals and practices based on measures of student accomplishment (from current or prior terms and/or external scholarship)**
- Expected student outcomes are updated as needed to reflect authentic, current practices and advances in field, technology, etc.

Expanded list of Scholarly Teaching Criteria (bold items are included in the sample rubric above)

Scholarship on teaching and learning and domain-specific studies of education provide clear pictures of effective, evidence-based and often innovative approaches for our CU Boulder educators to draw from and contribute to. These high impact practices may include (and are not limited to): engaging students in classroom settings; challenging them appropriately; providing structured research experiences; experiential learning opportunities; bringing appropriate faculty research or creative work into our classrooms; developing technology-based and innovative teaching methods; individualized mentoring; and nurturing a sense of identity, belonging, and reflection among our students. Scholarly approaches to teaching at CU-B encourage our own continued development as educators and may seek to make our practices and impacts visible through dissemination and peer review (from [A&S Policies](#)).

Basic:
- Follows expectations of [PRR](#) (II.A Teaching)
- Skilled use of basic teaching technologies
- Knows subject on deep level, including current research and interaction with other topics
- **Provides a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments** *(Inclusive)*
- **Regularly supports mentees to become independent learners**

- Reflection on teaching is informed by multiple sources of evidence/feedback (e.g., students, peers, literature on teaching and learning, PD opportunities)
- **Informally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues**

Professional:
- **Selects teaching resources, materials, activities, and/or methods that are shown to enable learning (e.g., evidence-based)**
- Uses high-impact and/or evidence-based methods to improve student understanding
- Attentive to inequity in the discipline and classroom *(Inclusive)*
- **Regularly solicits student feedback, uses this information to improve teaching, and communicates this back to students** *(Goal-oriented)*
- **Draws from evidence-based approaches for effective mentoring, e.g. NASEM recommendations**
- **Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback from a variety of sources**
- Occasional participation in PD opportunities that advance understanding of field / subject matter and of teaching and learning
- Frequent involvement in departmental teaching-related committees and decisions and/or regular participation in institutional teaching-related committees and decisions
- Builds capacities of mentees to mentor others in effective and productive manners
- Collects evidence of student learning

Advanced:
- Very knowledgeable about evidence-based classroom teaching practices and enacts in the classroom
- **Employs systematic collection of classroom data to iterate on and improve teaching** *(Goal-oriented)*
- **Uses research-validated tools for measuring student understanding (e.g., pre/post tests)**
- Standards for evaluating student understanding are connected to program/curriculum expectations *(Goal-oriented)*
- Creates mentoring guidelines / programs that can be used by others
- Regular attendance at teaching PD activities that advance understanding of field / subject matter and of teaching and learning
- Participation in teaching PD activities includes those related to culturally responsive teaching and/or diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching
- Connects effective approaches learned from PD activities to peers and/or departmental activities
- **Actively mentors others about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods (e.g., presentations, publications, seminars)**
- **Creates opportunities for self and peers to help others improve teaching or secures resources (e.g., grant funding) for teaching**
- Recognized leadership role in significantly improving teaching on campus and beyond (e.g., with respect to curricular planning, assessment)
- Recognized teaching accomplishment with awards
- **Develops /innovates and shares new uses of learning technologies**
- Develops and shares new pedagogical approaches

Appendix D: SAMPLE: Levels of Teaching Accomplishment (merit and excellence)
for tenure-line faculty

The following are *guidelines* to be used by the departmental PUEC in evaluating the level of teaching accomplishment for faculty being considered for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The PUEC is to use these along with policies and procedures of the department, college, campus and regents in exercising its professional judgment to determine the level of accomplishment in teaching for a given faculty member under review.

Currently, these provide guidance for our tenure-line faculty under review, and while draft recommendations are included for teaching professors, these are left for future development.

The teaching package provided to the PUEC should include the three-dimensional teaching evaluation rubric, along with the supporting data and analyses. Based on these data and analyses, proficiency ratings of 0 - 4 are provided in each of the three dimensions of teaching evaluation. Notably, each of the dimensions of teaching are not necessarily equivalent and must be dealt with on individual cases; however, singular achievement in one category (e.g., scholarly teaching) cannot make up for deficiencies in another (e.g., inclusive teaching).

For tenure-line faculty comprehensive review (4th year), the campus (office of faculty affairs) standard is *"making adequate progress toward tenure"*. In the department, with regard to teaching evaluation:

> Adequate progress towards a rating of 'meritorious' in teaching for tenure could be proficiency levels of all 1's or higher, noting there can be modest missing elements (some level 0), provided there are no egregious missing elements that violate campus and legal standards or elements that are not able to be developed in the coming years.

> Adequate progress towards a rating of 'excellence' in teaching for tenure would be a predominance of categories with ratings of 3 or 4, with particular accomplishments in teaching that go beyond the classroom.

For tenure-line faculty promotion to associate professor and tenure, the campus standard is :

> *"Excellent" in either Scholarly Work (Research) or Teaching, and "Meritorious" in the other 2 categories (including service).*

In the department, with regard to teaching evaluation:

> A rating of "less than meritorious" (not tenurable), would be indicated by one of the three dimensions of teaching evaluation with a rating of 0, or many / all categories with a borderline case of proficiency rating of 1.

> A rating of "meritorious" could be indicated by all three dimensions of teaching being rated with proficiency levels of 1 or 2, even with occasional 3's or 4's.

> A rating of "excellence" may be indicated by mostly proficiency level ratings of 4, noting that many of these dimensions include evidence of going beyond classroom practice. A further framing of "excellence" in teaching is provided below.

For tenure-line faculty promotion to full professor, the campus and regential standards are:

(1) A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; and

(2) A record of significant contribution to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and

(3) A record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching or librarianship, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service."

To that end, indication of significant contributions to graduate and/or undergraduate education in the department and a record or substantial / significant growth in teaching could include proficiency ratings of 2 or higher, in general with some 3's or 4's, and/or an improvement of proficiency ratings over those demonstrated at the point of tenure and promotion.

For teaching professor line faculty, the department should consider establishing parallel standards. Those might draw from the following. Notably there is no expectation of research.

Assistant teaching professors who are promoted to associate teaching professor could have proficiency ratings of all 2's or 3's across the dimensions (with the exception that expectations for mentoring may differ).

Those promoted from associate teaching professor to full teaching professor will be expected to have ratings of 3's and 4's across all three dimensions and may include evidence of educational impacts going beyond the classroom.

A Note on achieving a rating of excellence in teaching, for tenure line faculty

Excellence is a sustained level of achievement over time and is inclusive of, but goes beyond traditional classroom teaching.

Excellence in teaching is commensurate with excellence in research or creative work in scale and impact. E.g. on par with the efforts to produce the numbers of peer reviewed articles in leading journals, grant funding, and impact that we expect for excellence in research.

A pathway to excellence in teaching ought to be defined and achievable for faculty choosing to pursue such routes and develop such expertise.

Examples of the sort of work that may lead one to a record of excellence may include multiple of the following:
- Sustained recognition of accomplishment through multiple high level campus and national awards in education.

- Production of multiple peer reviewed works on teaching and scholarship of teaching and learning (n.b. this is not discipline-based education research or research on the nature of teaching and learning, which would fall under research, not teaching)
- Curriculum design and innovation, including textbooks or the equivalent resources impacting CU, national and international audience
- Sustained grants or funding in support of developing, enacting and sustaining effective educational programs
- Programmatic development, such as the creation of a new pathway or program in the field that positively impacts those at University of Colorado and serves (and is taken up) as a national model.