

# Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Gap Analysis Tool - Identifying Gaps in Teaching Evaluation Systems

October 2020

The following tool is intended to help departments/individuals connect sources of evidence that can be used in teaching evaluation to the seven dimensions of quality teaching outlined by the TQF 2-page Rubric-based Framework (hereafter “Rubric”) found at the end of this document. While there are multiple ways one could approach using this tool, we outline a few steps that could be taken by departments/individuals to use this tool in a gap analysis of their current teaching evaluation systems. Departments/individuals that complete this activity should gain a better understanding of how their current teaching evaluation tools/processes align with the TQF Rubric and gain a broad sense of whether their evaluation system(s) are missing key voices and/or data sources across the rubric dimensions.

At CU Boulder, the Center for Teaching and Learning (<https://www.colorado.edu/center/teaching-learning/>) offers a variety of teaching resources, services, and guidance that may be helpful for departments/individuals engaged in teaching evaluation transformation. COPUS observations (“Visualizing Instructional Practices” (VIPs)) and other services are available via Arts & Sciences Support of Education Through Technology (ASSETT): <https://www.colorado.edu/asset/our-offerings/services>.

The TQF rubric was developed from foundational scholarship, including *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997), and work at the University of Kansas (e.g. [Benchmarks for Teaching Effectiveness](#)).

## Description of components in the TQF Rubric Gap Analysis Tool

- The seven dimensions of quality teaching are described in the leftmost column; more fine-grained examples are included (from the “Professional” proficiency level articulated in the Rubric) to aid understanding of the dimension
- The three key voices that evidence should be drawn from are the voice of the instructor being evaluated (“self”), the instructor’s peers (“peer”), and the students that the instructor mentors, advises, and/or teaches (“student”). “Voice Rank” is the relative importance of a voice for the given rubric construct: 1 = high importance/high weight, 2 = mid importance/mid-weight, 3 = lowest importance/low weight, and NA = not applicable.
- The sources of evidence listed in the rightmost columns by voice are not exhaustive but represent some of the most common/important sources that could be collected from each voice and align with the dimensions of quality teaching.

This resource was developed by the TQF project at CU Boulder, which is supported by NSF (DUE-1725959), the Association of American Universities, and CU Boulder Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Engineering & Applied Science. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF or other funding sources. For more information about the Teaching Quality Framework, please visit our website: [www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework](http://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework). See also <http://teval.net/> for information about the broader NSF-funded multi-institutional teaching evaluation project.

## **Suggested approach to using the TQF Gap Analysis Tool**

Before beginning, it may be helpful to have already reviewed the Rubric (at the end of this document) and be familiar with the seven dimensions of quality teaching. It may also be helpful to pick either annual merit or reappointment/tenure/promotion (RTP) as the evaluation system you want to assess using this tool rather than trying to do both at once (noting that coordinating these in the long term is likely useful). Finally, it may be helpful to have handy any departmental/unit policies and procedures for teaching evaluation and copies of any tools you currently use (e.g., a peer observation protocol, a classroom interview protocol, a list of questions asked on student evaluations of teaching (SETs; known as FCQs at CU), a solicitation you use for getting student letters of support, etc.).

### **Step 1: Identify available sources of evidence in your department**

- Look at the sources of evidence in the three voice columns to the right for the first dimension (Goals, Content, & Alignment) and identify which, if any, tools your department already uses. If your department uses tools / evidence that are not represented, write them in.
- Repeat for the other six dimensions

### **Step 2: Consider caveats**

- For data sources you already use, note whether they are typically required for evaluations or if they're only optional and/or if optional whether they are frequently used or only sporadically. For example: perhaps for peer voice everyone is expected to have a classroom observation on file but while you have access to syllabi/course materials, their review is optional not required and are infrequently included in evaluations.
- Also consider whether the data sources your department has available, as currently specified, would be able to provide evidence for the given dimension of quality teaching. For example: perhaps your department does peer observations but how you do them currently wouldn't allow you to identify from them whether the instructor has well articulated course goals.

### **Step 3: Identify gaps**

- Review your work - are there any gaps that stand out to you? For example:
  - Are you completely missing sources of evidence for a whole dimension of quality teaching?
  - Is one particular voice missing across several dimensions?
  - Do you have a lot of caveats for one or more sources, such that you have a source but it doesn't align with the rubric dimensions very well?
- List out these gaps
- Note: be sure to keep in mind the "voice rank" column. Some voices may be more or less important for a given dimension e.g., student voice is not applicable to "Reflection, Development, and Teaching Service/Scholarship" and so not having any student voice for that dimension would not be a gap.

### **Step 4: Discuss gaps and identify the one(s) you will begin working on**

- From the list of identified gaps, which do you think may be easier/harder to tackle in your department? Or, which are you most/least interested in tackling? You may want to prioritize tackling low hanging fruit and/or gaps that you think there would be particular interest in your department for addressing. For example: If you do peer observation and letters are required in your RTP packets but they don't align with the rubric very well and/or aren't particularly structured - Do you think your department would be open to the idea of more structure? If so, the TQF has templates and a variety of department examples that you could get started on right away.
- Make a decision on a tool and/or process that you would like to work on first and outline a plan for other gaps you think you could work on.

TQF Gap Analysis Tool (1/2)			Sample Sources of evidence you could collect		
Dimension of Quality Teaching	Professional (3)	Voice Rank	Self	Peer	Student
<b>Goals, Content, and Alignment</b> <i>What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum?</i>	Learning goals are explicit and regularly communicated to students. Inclusion of all students is a goal.	1 1 2	Self-reflection	Classroom observation	Classroom interviews
	Course materials/content are aligned with course goal, include high-quality elements	1 1 2	Teaching statement	Review of syllabus/course materials	SETs
	Range/depth of course topics is appropriate, integrate other topics/courses	1 1 3	Course portfolio	Review of portfolio	Student letters
	Some examples of innovation, connection to current issues, developments in field	1 1 3		Review of learning objectives	
<b>Preparation for Teaching</b> <i>Content/ Background Knowledge; Pedagogical Knowledge (i.e. teaching generally and teaching subject material); Classroom mechanics preparation (e.g. grading, prepping activities, materials, tech use, etc)</i>	Teaching practices/methods or materials are evidence-based, shown to enable learning	1 1 NA	Self-reflection	Classroom observation	Classroom interviews
	Activities/innovations to help students overcome common challenges	1 2 NA	Teaching statement	Review of syllabus/course materials	SETs
	Teaching practices/methods are attentive to inclusion, particularly for students from historically underrepresented and marginalized groups in the field/academia.	1 2 1	Course portfolio	Review of portfolio	Student letters
	Course materials are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments	1 1 2		Faculty interviews	
<b>Methods and Teaching Practices</b> <i>What assignments, assessments, and activities are implemented? Are methods appropriate for environment and aligned for student population (inclusive ed, course level) and goals (departmental, course, student)</i>	Often uses effective or innovative evidence-based* methods to improve understanding, including inclusive pedagogy techniques *See: NAS Indicators (2018)	1 1 2	Self-reflection	Classroom observation	Classroom interviews
	Activities provide opportunities for practice/ feedback on important skills and concepts	1 1 1	Teaching statement	Review of syllabus/course materials	SETs
	Recognizes and incorporates multiple ways of knowing in teaching and learning	1 1 1	Course portfolio	Review of portfolio	Student letters
	Students consistently engaged, w/ occasional high levels of engagement	1 1 1	Inventory (e.g., TPI)	COPUS	Survey/Inventory (e.g., SALG, TBI)
<b>Presentation and Student Interaction</b> <i>What are the students' views of the the learning experience? How has student feedback informed the teaching? Are methods (#3) implemented effectively? Are students supported (e.g. student/ teacher interaction)?</i>	Inclusive climate, particularly sensitive to and aware of students from under-represented or historically marginalized groups in the field/academia	3 1 1	Self-reflection	Classroom observation	Classroom interviews
	Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are positive	3 2 1	Teaching Statement	Review of portfolio	SETs
	Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge	3 2 1	Course portfolio		Student letters
	Instructor gathers student feedback and articulates some lessons learned	3 2 1			Survey/Inventory (e.g., SALG, TBI)

TQF Gap Analysis Tool (2/2)			Sources of evidence you could collect		
Dimension of Quality Teaching	Professional (3)	Voice Rank	Self	Peer	Student
<b>Student (and Other) Outcomes</b> <i>What impact do these courses have on learners? What evidence shows the level of student understanding? Are measures of learning (shift in student performance as a result of class/instruction) aligned with goals?</i>	Evidence-based/innovative standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; consistently works to improve student outcomes	1 1 2	Self-reflection	Classroom observation	Classroom interviews
	Provide a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments, with attention to being inclusive and equitable	1 1 2	Teaching statement	Review of syllabus/course materials	SETs
	Awareness of places where bias may enter assessment and attempts to mitigate those biases		Course portfolio	Review of portfolio	Student letters
	Above-average student learning outcomes; course is appropriately challenging and high levels of student learning are expected and generally achieved	1 1 2	Pre/post measures of learning (report of doing and/or analysis)	Faculty interview	Student surveys (e.g., SALG)
	Some excellent student-related course-level outcomes	1 1 2			
<b>Mentorship and Advising</b> <i>How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?</i>	Consistent evidence of effective advising and mentoring	1 2 1	Self-reflection	Faculty interview	Student interviews
	Well-defined, evidence-based goals/scope, with input from mentees/advisees	1 2 1	Teaching statement	Review of statements/activities	Student letters
	Attentive to how to best support students from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field/academia	1 2 1	Self-report of student awards, activities, etc.		
	Demonstrates understanding/interest in students' identities	1 2 1			
	Actively supportive of students' diverse goals and values	1 2 1			
<b>Reflection, Development, &amp; Teaching Service/Scholarship</b> <i>How has the faculty member's teaching changed over time? To what extent has the teacher reflected on and improved their own teaching, sought out opportunities for development, and contributed to the broader teaching community, both on and off campus?</i>	Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback	1 1 NA	Self-reflection	Review of course portfolio	
	Reflection informed by student feedback beyond FCQs (e.g., mid-course surveys, student performance measures)	1 1 NA	Teaching Statement	Letters	
	Regular attendance at teaching PD activities and/or regular discussions w/ peers re: teaching, including culturally responsive teaching or inclusive pedagogy	1 1 NA	Course portfolio		
	Actively mentors others about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods (e.g., presentations, publications)	1 1 NA	Self report of PD/activities		
			Pedagogical publications		

## Teaching Quality Framework 2-page Rubric-based Framework

The Teaching Quality Framework 2-page Rubric-based Framework is a tool for considering different dimensions of quality teaching and what various levels of proficiency in each of those dimensions may look like. The dimensions of quality teaching presented here are founded on the scholarship on teaching and teaching evaluation, and in particular are adapted from the work of Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997 and that of Follmer Greenhoot, Ward, and Bernstein, 2017.

The dimensions of quality teaching included here are:

- **Goals, Content, and Alignment** - an instructor's goals for their class and students, and how those goals align with class activities and student needs
- **Preparation for Teaching** - an instructor's readiness for classroom mechanics and their knowledge of content and pedagogy
- **Methods and Teaching Practices** - an instructor's teaching strategies and activities and their implementation
- **Presentation and Student Interaction** - an instructor's engagement with their students and student feedback
- **Student (and Other) Outcomes** - an instructor's and their course's impact on students and their measures of student understanding
- **Mentorship and Advising** - an instructor's support of students in mentoring contexts outside the classroom
- **Reflection, Development & Teaching Service/Scholarship** - an instructor's engagement with and contribution to local or external teaching communities

In the TQF Rubric-based Framework on the following pages, guiding questions for considering each dimension of quality teaching are provided, in addition to examples of what different levels of proficiency in each dimension may look like, ranging from “entry to teaching” to “advanced”. An instructor's attention to issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) and their implementation of strategies that support diverse learners and an inclusive classroom climate are included across all seven of the dimensions of quality teaching.<sup>[1]</sup>

Please note that the examples provided for each proficiency level are exemplars, and are not intended to comprise exhaustive lists, complete descriptions, or to be fully generalizable across teaching contexts. In addition, it is assumed that an instructor with an advanced level of proficiency demonstrates not only the characteristics in the “advanced” column, but also demonstrates the positive characteristics of the less proficient levels as well.

[1] In this Rubric, we use the language “students from groups that are historically underrepresented or marginalized in the field/academia”. We recognize that this language does not adequately identify and name the groups in question on their own terms. We have used this language to keep this document general, because the groups that are underrepresented and marginalized vary in each discipline. We encourage anyone using this Rubric to learn who is underrepresented, marginalized, or excluded in your field, and to use the names of those specific groups (e.g., Black, Native American /Indigenous, Latinx, women, LGBTQ+ ) when using this Rubric.

## TQF 2-page Rubric-based Framework (1 of 2)

Dimensions of Quality Teaching	Entry into Teaching	Basic Skill	Professional	Advanced
	<i>Requires Improvement (1)</i>	<i>Competent (2)</i>	<i>Professional (3)</i>	<i>Advanced (4)</i>
<b>1) Goals, Content, and Alignment</b>  <i>What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some goals/content are not clearly aligned with curriculum or institutional expectations, or are unclear or inappropriate</li> <li>- Some materials/content are outdated or unsuitable for students in the courses</li> <li>- Range/depth or treatment of course topics is often too narrow or too broad</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most goals/content are articulated and appropriate for topic, students, and curriculum</li> <li>- Inclusion of all students is a goal</li> <li>- Standard, intellectually-sound course materials/content</li> <li>- Range/depth or treatment of course topics is appropriate for level/type of course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning goals are explicit, relevant to all students, and regularly communicated</li> <li>- Course materials/content are aligned with course goal, include high-quality elements</li> <li>- Range/depth of course topics is appropriate, integrate other topics/courses</li> <li>- Some examples of innovation, connection to current issues, developments in field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goals/content also clearly connect to curricular, programmatic, departmental goals</li> <li>- Goals include advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field</li> <li>- Content is consistently challenging and innovative, and related to current issues and developments in field</li> <li>- Content comes from diverse perspectives</li> </ul>
<b>2) Preparation for Teaching</b>  <i>Content/Background Knowledge; Pedagogical Knowledge (i.e. teaching generally and teaching subject material); Classroom mechanics preparation (e.g. grading, prepping activities, materials, tech use, etc)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited content knowledge; unable to satisfactorily answer questions</li> <li>- Knowledge of classroom teaching practices/methods or materials are inadequate to enable learning</li> <li>- Limited skill in identifying/resolving challenges with course-specific content</li> <li>- Limited knowledge of inclusive pedagogy</li> <li>- Insufficient preparation of syllabus, materials, or course material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standard understanding of content; satisfactorily answers most questions</li> <li>- Knowledge of teaching practices/methods or materials generally adequate for learning</li> <li>- Can identify some common student challenges with content</li> <li>- Awareness of inclusive pedagogy</li> <li>- "Standard" or satisfactory preparation of syllabus, materials, and course material</li> <li>- Adequate classroom mechanics (grading, tech, prepping activities, demonstrations, etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching practices/methods/materials are evidence-based or shown to enable learning</li> <li>- Activities/innovations to help students overcome common challenges</li> <li>- Teaching practices/methods are attentive to inclusion, particularly for students from historically underrepresented and marginalized groups in the field/academia.</li> <li>- Course materials are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knows subject on deep level, including current research, interaction with other topics</li> <li>- Very knowledgeable about classroom teaching practices, methods, or materials</li> <li>- Employs classroom data/experiences to iterate on and improve teaching</li> <li>- Extensive knowledge of inclusive teaching pedagogies and methods to support diverse learners</li> </ul>
<b>3) Methods and Teaching Practices</b>  <i>What assignments, assessments, and learning activities are implemented? Are methods appropriate for environment (lecture, labs) and aligned for student population (inclusive ed, course level) and goals (departmental, course, student)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No apparent rationale for teaching methods is used; no instructional design.</li> <li>- Practices are not well executed; little development in methods despite evidence of need</li> <li>- Students lack opportunities to practice the skills embedded in course goals</li> <li>- Methods not informed by a knowledge of the student population or inclusive pedagogy</li> <li>- Student engagement is variable or absent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standard course practices carried out</li> <li>- Students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals</li> <li>- Students consistently engaged</li> <li>- Methods and practices are informed by a knowledge of the student population.</li> <li>- Some inconsistency in quality of implementation of teaching practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Often uses effective or innovative evidence-based* methods to improve understanding, including inclusive pedagogy techniques *See: NAS Indicators (2018).</li> <li>- Activities regularly provide opportunities for practice/ feedback on important skills and concepts</li> <li>- Recognizes and incorporates multiple ways of knowing in teaching and learning</li> <li>- Implementation is high-quality and consistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistently uses effective, high-impact or innovative evidence-based methods to improve understanding</li> <li>- Activities consistently provide opportunities for practice/feedback on important skills and concepts and some are student-defined</li> <li>- Evidence of a strong value for diversity, inclusion, and equity is apparent in teaching practices, and is made explicit to students</li> <li>- Students consistently show high levels of engagement</li> </ul>
<b>4) Presentation and Student Interaction</b>  <i>What are the students' views of the learning experience? How has student feedback informed the teaching? Are methods (#3) implemented effectively? Are students supported (e.g. student/teacher interaction)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Classroom climate does not promote respect and inclusion or discourages student motivation and engagement</li> <li>- Consistently negative student reports of instructor accessibility or interaction skills</li> <li>- Poor sense of learning among students</li> <li>- Little attempt by instructor to address feedback voiced by students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Classroom climate supports respect and inclusion, motivation, and engagement</li> <li>- Teaches students how to engage across diverse groups of learners and experiences</li> <li>- Students report good instructor accessibility and interaction skills</li> <li>- Most students perceive they are learning</li> <li>- Instructor responds to student feedback</li> <li>- Instructor values the contributions of diverse learners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusive climate, particularly sensitive to and aware of students from under-represented or historically marginalized groups in the field/academia</li> <li>- Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are positive</li> <li>- Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge</li> <li>- Instructor gathers student feedback and articulates some lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actively works to disrupt inequities in the discipline and classroom</li> <li>- Makes space for students to discuss inequity or exclusion they may be experiencing</li> <li>- Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are strongly and consistently positive</li> <li>- Gathers student feedback and is responsive in the short- and long-term</li> </ul>



## TQF 2-page Rubric-based Framework, cont. (2/2)

Dimensions of Quality Teaching	Entry into Teaching	Basic Skill	Professional	Advanced
	<i>Requires Improvement (1)</i>	<i>Competent (2)</i>	<i>Professional (3)</i>	<i>Advanced (4)</i>
<b>5) Student (and Other) Outcomes</b>  <i>What impact do these courses have on learners? What evidence shows the level of student understanding? Are measures of learning (shift in student performance as a result of class/instruction) aligned with goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No measure of student learning or assessment methods do not match goals</li> <li>- Creates disproportionately negative outcomes for students from groups that are historically underrepresented or marginalized in the field/academia, or doesn't know if they did</li> <li>- Forms of assessment are biased and/or grading standards are inequitably applied</li> <li>- Evidence of poor student learning; low level of skill/understanding is required</li> <li>- Poor student-related course-level outcomes (e.g. re-enrollment in course)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports all students to achieve outcomes</li> <li>- Standard attention to student achievement for courses at these levels</li> <li>- Clear standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; sporadic attempts to improve student outcomes</li> <li>- Awareness of places where bias may enter assessment and attempts to mitigate those biases</li> <li>- Standard student learning outcomes; typical level of skill is required and achieved</li> <li>- Standard student-related course-level outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence-based/innovative standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding</li> <li>- Provide a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments, with attention to being inclusive and equitable</li> <li>- Above-average student learning outcomes; course is appropriately challenging and high levels of student learning are generally achieved</li> <li>- Some excellent student-related course-level outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exceptional efforts to support learning in all students, especially those from groups that are underrepresented or marginalized in the field/academia</li> <li>- Evidence-based standards for evaluating student understanding are connected to program/curriculum expectations</li> <li>- Explicit attention to a broad definition of "success" for a diverse array of learners</li> <li>- Exceptional student learning outcomes; quality of learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues)</li> </ul>
<b>6) Mentorship and Advising</b>  <i>How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No indication of effective mentoring or advising students</li> <li>- Discourages student engagement in independent work</li> <li>- Does not attend to best practices of inclusive pedagogy and mentoring</li> <li>- Is well prepared / creates supportive environment for student success</li> <li>- Mentor doesn't define goals/scope for mentees/advisees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence of some effective advising and mentoring</li> <li>- Participates occasionally in supporting students in independent work</li> <li>- Mentor minimally defines goals/scope for mentees/advisees</li> <li>- Regularly supports students in independent work</li> <li>- Evidence that instructor consistently supports students from groups that are historically marginalized by and/or underrepresented in the field and/or society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistent evidence of effective advising and mentoring</li> <li>- Well-defined, evidence-based goals and scope, with input from mentees/advisees</li> <li>- Supports students from groups that are historically marginalized/underrepresented in the field/academia in navigating exclusive and inequitable environments.</li> <li>- Demonstrates understanding of students' (intersecting) identities</li> <li>- Actively supportive of students' diverse goals and values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overwhelming evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to advising and mentoring</li> <li>- Proactively recruits and supports advisees/mentees from groups that are historically underrepresented or marginalized in the field/academia</li> <li>- Creates mentoring guidelines / programs that can be used by others</li> </ul>
<b>7) Reflection, Development, &amp; Teaching Service/Scholarship</b>  <i>How has the faculty member's teaching changed over time? To what extent has the teacher reflected on and improved their own teaching, sought out opportunities for development, and contributed to the broader teaching community, both on and off campus?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No indication of having reflected upon or learned from prior teaching or feedback</li> <li>-No attempt to engage in professional development (PD) around teaching</li> <li>-Does not share teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues</li> <li>-Does not engage with teaching at the scale of the department or institution and/or engages in a way that negatively impacts teaching in the department or institution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teaching has been informed by reflection on prior teaching and feedback (but is informed only by student ratings (e.g. FCQs)</li> <li>-Sporadic attendance at teaching PD activities on campus and/or some attempt to learn about teaching from peers</li> <li>-Informally shares teaching ideas or materials with colleagues to help improve their teaching</li> <li>- Participation in diversity, equity, inclusive pedagogy, etc. work or PD</li> <li>-Some involvement in departmental teaching-related committees and/or department-level curricular decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback</li> <li>-Reflection informed by student feedback beyond student ratings (FCQs)</li> <li>-Regular attendance at teaching PD activities and/or discussions with peers about teaching, including culturally responsive teaching or inclusive pedagogy</li> <li>-Mentors others about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas or materials (e.g., presentations, publications)</li> <li>- Work on curricular change efforts to integrate a value for diversity, inclusion and equity as an important influence on teaching.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reflection on teaching is informed by multiple sources of feedback (e.g., students, faculty peers, literature on teaching and learning, PD opportunities)</li> <li>-Frequent attendance at teaching PD activities and discussion with peers about teaching in a wide variety of contexts</li> <li>-Creates opportunities for self and peers to help others improve their teaching and/or secures resources (e.g., grant funding) related to teaching</li> <li>-Recognized leadership role in improving teaching in department or on campus (e.g., with respect to curricular planning)</li> </ul>