

TQF example rubric-based approach to evaluating teaching

[last updated 07/09/2022]

This document is a template your unit may consider adopting. It is rubric-based approach for evaluating teaching for reappointment, promotion, and tenure along the seven dimensions for defining teaching quality (Goals, Content, & Alignment; Preparation for Teaching; Methods & Teaching Practices; Presentation & Student Interaction; Student Outcomes; Mentorship & Advising; and Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service / Scholarship) as specified by the [Teaching Quality Framework Initiative \(TQF\)](#). This is one possible way a scholarly framework (in this case the 2 page rubric found [here](#)) 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 template includes individual assessment rubrics for each dimension of quality 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 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 (see Appendix C for an example). The appendices include suggested guidelines for how primary units might approach adapting this example to meet their needs and blank rubric templates in two formats. There is also a glossary of key terms in Appendix D.

Table of Contents

Evaluation Summary	1
Goals, Content, & Alignment Assessment Rubric	3
Preparation for Teaching Assessment Rubric	5
Methods & Teaching Practices Assessment Rubric	7
Presentation & Student Interaction Assessment Rubric	9
Student Outcomes Assessment Rubric	11
Mentorship & Advising Assessment Rubric	13
Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/Scholarship Assessment Rubric	15
Sample Forms of Evidence (Data Sources)	17
Sample instructions for the instructor submitting their dossier to the review committee	18
Sample instructions for evaluation committee members	18
Sample instructions for mentors / others tasked with ensuring instructors know how they will be evaluated	18
Appendix A: Suggested guidelines for how primary unit teams might approach adapting this example	19
Appendix B: Blank rubric templates in two formats	20
Appendix C: SAMPLE: Levels of Teaching Accomplishment for tenure-line faculty	21
Appendix D: Glossary of Key Terms	23

This resource is part of 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 (A&S) and Engineering & Applied Science (CEAS). This version has been improved based on feedback from faculty and administrators in A&S and CEAS (the original version can be found [here](#)). 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 TQF, please visit our website: www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework. See also <http://teval.net/> for information about the broader NSF-funded multi-institutional teaching evaluation project. Please contact Cynthia Hampton at cynthia.hampton@colorado.edu or Noah Finkelstein at noah.finkelstein@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 the seven dimensions of quality teaching.

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

Dimension of Quality Teaching	Main Sources of Evidence	Demonstrated Proficiency Level	Discussion of Evaluation by Committee
Goals, Content, & Alignment			
Preparation for Teaching			
Methods & Teaching Practices			
Presentation & Student Interaction			
Student Outcomes			
Mentorship & Advising			
Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service / Scholarship			

Overall Rating/Recommendation:

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

Justification:

Goals, Content, & Alignment Assessment Rubric

An instructor's goals for their class and students, and how those goals align with student learning outcomes, content, and student needs. What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals / student learning outcomes appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum? [for alignment of goals/outcomes with activities, see the [Methods & Teaching Practices rubric](#); for alignment with assessment, see the [Student Outcomes rubric](#)]¹

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ²	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Able to justify, in terms of curriculum and student learning, all materials introduced into the classroom³ <input type="checkbox"/> Course goals are explicit and clearly articulated in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Course materials/content are aligned with course goals <input type="checkbox"/> Range and depth of course topics is appropriate for the level of the course <input type="checkbox"/> Courses are kept up-to-date by incorporating new material, when applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a goal to integrate diverse perspectives into their courses <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student learning outcomes are explicit, clearly articulated, and regularly communicated to students <input type="checkbox"/> Course goals/learning outcomes are attentive to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom <input type="checkbox"/> Course content relates to current developments in the field, when appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Course materials/content are appropriately challenging and innovative <input type="checkbox"/> Content intentionally integrates other relevant topics/courses <input type="checkbox"/> Actively integrates diverse perspectives into materials and course content (e.g., course content explores a broad range of diverse contributions to the discipline, images/representations/readings/sources reflect diversity, etc.⁴) <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Utilizes diverse student and instructor experiences and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> SETs (e.g., FCQ Q8) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course management system <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interview report <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment materials (e.g., quizzes, exams) <input type="checkbox"/> Other course materials <input type="checkbox"/> Student letters <input type="checkbox"/> Use of mastery based grading <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion / belonging / anti-racism / accessibility statements in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	

¹ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive Pedagogy and distinctions between Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes

² SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

³ Adapted from [Faculty Professional Rights & Responsibilities](#), which describes the professional standards all CU faculty members are expected to maintain.

⁴ Drawn from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Course Design Rubric from UC Merced found here: <https://teach.ucmerced.edu/pedagogy-guides>

<p>perspectives as resources, and emphasizes the enrichment they bring to the course⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Course goals/learning outcomes explicitly connect to curricular, programmatic, and departmental goals/outcomes ❑ Some student learning outcomes focus on developing skills / understanding of equity / inequities in the discipline 			
---	--	--	--

Preparation for Teaching Assessment Rubric

An instructor's readiness for classroom mechanics and their knowledge of content and pedagogy. 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.).⁵

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance of competence in discipline^{6,7} <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance of currency in pedagogical competence^{6,7} <input type="checkbox"/> Prepares adequately for classes⁶ <input type="checkbox"/> Establish course requirements and policies, grading standards, and other administrative procedures for classes in accordance with campus policies⁶ <input type="checkbox"/> Syllabus and course materials are well-planned <input type="checkbox"/> Class structure and expectations (including grading policies) are clearly explained and communicated to students on the syllabus <input type="checkbox"/> Thorough knowledge of subject matter, including current research and interaction with other topics where relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Plans materials that are accessible and inclusive for all learners in the class <input type="checkbox"/> Course communication (e.g., webpage/LMS/other technology) is used to significantly improve student communication/access to course materials <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Develops support structures towards student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Can identify common challenges with course content <input type="checkbox"/> Active consideration and planning for how diverse learners will engage with activities and content <input type="checkbox"/> Feedback from prior iterations of the course is used to design / adapt / improve current offering⁷ <input type="checkbox"/> Selects teaching resources, materials, activities, and/or methods that are attentive to student success and shown to enable learning (e.g., evidence-based) <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Has prepared, and worked to improve, activities to help 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Syllabi <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course management system <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <input type="checkbox"/> Records of participation in pedagogical professional development (PD) <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interview report <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion / belonging / anti-racism / accessibility statements in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment rubrics <input type="checkbox"/> Descriptions of assignments that are evidence-based / high impact practices <input type="checkbox"/> Other course materials <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	

⁵ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive, Evidence-Based, and High Impact Practices and distinction between Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes

⁶ Adapted from [Faculty Professional Rights & Responsibilities](#), which describes the professional standards all CU faculty members are expected to maintain.

⁷ See also the [Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/Scholarship rubric](#) below for additional items related to teaching professional development and improving teaching based on feedback

<p>students overcome challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Intent to be equitable, inclusive, and to foster students' sense of belonging shapes all aspects of course development and implementation, including course goals, student learning outcomes, assessments of student learning, content, project design, etc. ❑ Is attentive to success of students from historically underrepresented and marginalized groups in the field and academia ❑ Articulates a plan for systematic collection of data on student learning and/or their learning experience ❑ Material choice demonstrates deep knowledge about evidence-based classroom teaching practices 			
--	--	--	--

Methods & Teaching Practices Assessment Rubric

An instructor's teaching strategies and activities and their implementation. 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) [for alignment of goals/outcomes with course content, see [the Goals, Content, and Alignment rubric](#); for alignment with assessment, see the [Student Outcomes rubric](#)]⁸

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ⁹	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates students fairly and equitably in a timely manner appropriate to the course and its goals (e.g., rubrics are applied uniformly to all students in the course and rubric criteria are directly reflective of student performance)¹⁰ <input type="checkbox"/> Activities provide opportunities for students to practice important skills and concepts that are aligned with course goals <input type="checkbox"/> Keeps course workload appropriate to credit hours <input type="checkbox"/> Ensures students have adequate time and resources to complete assignments, including working with student accommodations in a timely manner <input type="checkbox"/> Uses methods to introduce students to one another and build classroom community (e.g., icebreakers) <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled use of basic teaching technologies <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Activities are aligned with student learning outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Uses high impact, evidence-based, and/or inclusive teaching pedagogies / methods to improve student understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Students show high levels of engagement in courses <input type="checkbox"/> 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 services, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Gives students an opportunity to focus on their interests by allowing them to select from a predefined list of class activities or assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> SET scores (e.g., FCQ Q2, Q4, Q12, Q14, Q16) <input type="checkbox"/> SET comments (e.g., FCQ Q17) <input type="checkbox"/> Syllabi <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interview report <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <input type="checkbox"/> Course Mgmt system <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Mid-semester surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Student letters <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment rubrics <input type="checkbox"/> Descriptions of assignments that are evidence-based / high impact practices <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of assessments (exams, quizzes) <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of student work with instructor feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Other course materials 	

⁸ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive, Evidence-Based, and High Impact Practices, Ways of Knowing, and distinction between Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes

⁹ SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

¹⁰ Adapted from [Faculty Professional Rights & Responsibilities](#), which describes the professional standards all CU faculty members are expected to maintain.

<p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Offers opportunities for students to interact with non-instructors/students (e.g., from industry, non-profits, K-12, etc.), as appropriate to the class <input type="checkbox"/> Integrates a 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes multiple ways of knowing and incorporates multiple ways of knowing into teaching and learning practice <input type="checkbox"/> Invites or encourages students to co-create some of the class activities <input type="checkbox"/> Invites or encourages students to co-create some student learning outcomes 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student nominated teaching awards <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	
--	--	--	--

Presentation & Student Interaction Assessment Rubric

An instructor's engagement with their students and student feedback. 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)?¹¹

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ¹²	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Students are treated with understanding, dignity, and respect¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance of professional classroom decorum¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Creates climate that fosters inquiry, cooperation, learning, and inclusivity in the class¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Makes clear to students the expectations faculty have for receiving or giving aid in examinations and other graded assignments¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates and reports assessment of the work of students in a timely manner so that students are able to correct and learn¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Students perceive that they have positive interactions with instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Office hours are posted and explained to students⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Available for posted office hours or other related time outside of the classroom <input type="checkbox"/> Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an awareness of power dynamics with students (e.g., between faculty and students and between students and their peers) <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provides opportunities for students to share feedback on aspects of teaching that were most and least effective in helping them learn <input type="checkbox"/> Uses student feedback to improve teaching and communicates this back to students <input type="checkbox"/> Trains students to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish and meet team goals, plan tasks, (where applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> SET scores (e.g., FCQ Q1, Q3, Q5, Q8, Q9, Q15) <input type="checkbox"/> SET comments (e.g., FCQ Q17) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interview report <input type="checkbox"/> Student letters <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student nominated teaching awards <input type="checkbox"/> Use of mastery based grading <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion / belonging / anti-racism / accessibility statements in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Attitude/affect surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	

¹¹ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive Pedagogy

¹² SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

¹³ Adapted from [Faculty Professional Rights & Responsibilities](#), which describes the professional standards all CU faculty members are expected to maintain.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Demonstrates a basic understanding of how inequity in the discipline and classroom can impact learning experiences ❑ Shares information about mitigating, addressing, and handling bias in the class and has a plan in place for addressing any possible microaggressions and implementing microaffirmations in class¹⁴ <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Teaches students how to engage across diverse groups of learners and experiences ❑ 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 ❑ Uses instructional design for peer learning and regular direct communication between students and faculty to foster a sense of belonging ❑ Students perceive the instructor values diversity, equity, and inclusion, both within the classroom and the discipline 			
---	--	--	--

¹⁴ Drawn from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Course Design Rubric from UC Merced found here: <https://teach.ucmerced.edu/pedagogy-guides>

Student Outcomes Assessment Rubric

An instructor's and their course's impact on students and their measures of student understanding. What impact do these courses have on learners? What evidence shows the level of student understanding? Are measures of learning (shifts in student performance as a result of class/instruction) aligned with course goals/student learning outcomes? [for alignment of goals/outcomes with course content, see [the Goals, Content, and Alignment rubric](#); for alignment with activities, see the [Methods & Teaching Practices rubric](#)]¹⁵

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ¹⁶	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student learning outcomes are clearly mapped to assessments (e.g., quizzes, exams, etc.) and rubrics <input type="checkbox"/> Clear, evidence-based approach for evaluating student achievement <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments <input type="checkbox"/> High but reasonable expectations for what all students can achieve <input type="checkbox"/> Works to improve student outcomes and support learning for all students <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of student learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent / post-requisite courses or non-classroom venues) <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> High levels of student learning are generally achieved or shows growth in how well students are performing (in relation to defined outcomes) <input type="checkbox"/> Collects some evidence of student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Clear efforts to support learning for students historically underrepresented or marginalized in the field, academia, and/or society <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates awareness of places where bias may enter assessment, and attempts to mitigate those biases <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for evaluating students are in line with departmental/programmatic standards/practices <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explicit attention to and description of a broad definition of “success” for a diverse array of learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> SET scores (e.g., FCQ Q6, Q7, Q10, Q11, Q13) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student letters <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment rubrics <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment materials (e.g., quizzes, exams) <input type="checkbox"/> Other course materials <input type="checkbox"/> Summary of pre/post assessment of student learning outcomes (e.g., concept inventories) or other examples the instructor has used to assess student learning outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Use of mastery based grading <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Attitude/affect surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	

¹⁵ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive, Evidence-Based, and High Impact Practices and distinction between Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes

¹⁶ SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Enacts mechanisms for systematic collection of classroom data ❑ Uses research-validated tools for measuring student understanding (e.g., pre/post tests) ❑ Teaches students how to reflect on their learning in relation to meeting course learning outcomes (e.g., metacognitive approaches) ❑ Expected student outcomes are updated as needed to reflect authentic, current practices and advances in the field, technology, etc. 			
--	--	--	--

Mentorship & Advising Assessment Rubric

An instructor's support of students in mentoring contexts outside the classroom. How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?¹⁷

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ¹⁸	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates student's/mentee's complete performance fairly and equitably in a timely manner when providing a professional reference¹⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Respectful and supportive of students' / mentees' diverse goals and values <input type="checkbox"/> Supports mentees to become independent learners <input type="checkbox"/> Attentive to how to best support mentees/advisees from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field/academia <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates sensitivity to student wellness / wellbeing / mental health (e.g., has a basic grasp of campus resources & referral services) <input type="checkbox"/> Considers student experience / development and incorporates this in setting goals for mentee growth <p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Goals for mentee growth are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through use of individual development plans) <input type="checkbox"/> Successful navigation of mentees to complete their degree (retention) <input type="checkbox"/> Goals for mentee growth are appropriately challenging <input type="checkbox"/> Goals for the mentor/mentee relationship are mutually defined in collaboration with the mentee (e.g., through the use of the Graduate School Advising Agreement) <input type="checkbox"/> Actively works to recruit and support student mentees from groups that are historically marginalized or underrepresented in the field or society <input type="checkbox"/> Draws from evidence-based approaches for effective mentoring, e.g. NASEM recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Builds capacities of mentees to mentor others in effective and productive manners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching or Research Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Existing records of faculty mentoring/advising activities (e.g., FRPA, CV) <input type="checkbox"/> Mentee Letters (current or former) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student nominated mentoring award(s) (e.g., dept grad student mentoring award, grad school) <input type="checkbox"/> Other student assessments of mentoring / advising (insert brief description): <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Paired Mentor Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Research Group Observation / Focus Group <input type="checkbox"/> Individual development plans (with student permission) (or record / description of practice) <input type="checkbox"/> Advising agreements (with student permission (or record / description of 	

¹⁷ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive, Evidence-Based, and High Impact Practices

¹⁸ SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

¹⁹ Adapted from [Faculty Professional Rights & Responsibilities](#), which describes the professional standards all CU faculty members are expected to maintain.

<p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding and awareness of the depth of students'/mentees'/advisees' (intersecting) identities <input type="checkbox"/> Proactively supports mentees/advisees in navigating exclusive and inequitable environments and intervenes where needed on their behalf <input type="checkbox"/> Creates mentoring guidelines / programs that are used by others <input type="checkbox"/> Support of research dissemination by mentees (publications, presentations, posters, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership in mentoring at national level (e.g., publications, awards, invited talks etc. in mentoring) <input type="checkbox"/> Supports students in leadership in mentoring at national level <input type="checkbox"/> Recognition of student achievements / research (e.g., poster awards, division awards, fellowships, etc). 		<p>practice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Training grants (running, participating) <input type="checkbox"/> Longitudinal surveys (post grad) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	
---	--	---	--

Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/Scholarship Assessment Rubric

*An instructor's engagement with and contribution to local or external teaching communities. 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?*²⁰

Evaluation Criteria ²¹	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence ²¹	Explanation
<p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reflection on teaching is informed by multiple sources of evidence/feedback (e.g., students, peers, literature on teaching and learning, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> The instructor reflects on course design, course delivery, student evaluations, and other student learning data connected with diversity, equity and inclusion in order to make improvements in practice²² <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates awareness of local, campus-based DEI and teaching centers that offer consultation, events, and resources to support reflection on, and infusion of, DEI strategies and perspectives in course design and teaching²² <input type="checkbox"/> Adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback from a variety of sources <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones (provided you have the opportunity / responsibility to do so) <input type="checkbox"/> Shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues <p>Professional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Participates in PD opportunities that advance understanding of field / subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Participates in PD opportunities that advance understanding of teaching and learning practices (e.g., inclusive and equitable pedagogy, evidence-based practices, open pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching and mentoring, and/or other up-to-date scholarship on teaching and learning) <input type="checkbox"/> Regular involvement in departmental teaching-related committees and decisions and/or participation in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom 	<p>Core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective Teaching Statement <input type="checkbox"/> SET (e.g., FCQ) scores/comments (comparison over time) <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Observation Reports (comparison over time) <input type="checkbox"/> Existing records of faculty activities (e.g., FRPA, CV, records of service assignments, records of participation in pedagogical PD, etc.) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course/teaching portfolio <p>Supplemental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor summary /reflection on FCQ scores/comments, peer observations, or other sources of feedback, over time <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching awards <input type="checkbox"/> Other (insert brief description): 	

²⁰ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Inclusive, Evidence-Based, and High Impact Practices

²¹ SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ); PD = professional development - e.g., programs through CTL, Faculty Affairs, etc.

²² Drawn from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Course Design Rubric from UC Merced found here: <https://teach.ucmerced.edu/pedagogy-guides>

<p>institutional teaching-related committees and decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Implements knowledge learned from PD into teaching practices <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Connects effective approaches learned from PD activities to peers and/or departmental activities <input type="checkbox"/> Actively mentors other faculty about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods (e.g., presentations, publications, seminars) <input type="checkbox"/> Works on curricular change efforts to integrate a value for diversity, inclusion and equity as an important influence on teaching in classes <input type="checkbox"/> Creates opportunities for self and peers to help others improve teaching or secures resources (e.g., grant funding) for teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Recognized leadership role in significantly improving teaching on campus, system-wide, state-wide, nationally or internationally (e.g., with respect to curricular planning, assessment) <input type="checkbox"/> Recognized teaching accomplishment with awards <input type="checkbox"/> National or international impact on improving education, such as in the development of textbooks or other teaching materials used by others or in the presentation and publication of educational advances cited by others <input type="checkbox"/> Develops novel evidence-based materials drawing from and contributing to others beyond the institution <input type="checkbox"/> Develops /innovates and shares new uses of learning technologies <input type="checkbox"/> Develops and shares (locally or beyond) materials supporting inclusive pedagogical practices in the classroom, mentoring experiences, or elsewhere <input type="checkbox"/> Supports others (particularly faculty) in the use of inclusive pedagogical practices 			
--	--	--	--

Sample Forms of Evidence (Data Sources)

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

Core²³

SET 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, or other records of teaching-related 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

SET/FCQ comments

Instructor summary/reflection on SET/FCQ scores/comments, peer observations, or other sources of feedback, over time

Unsolicited student letters

Assessments of mentoring relationships (see annotated list [here](#))

Descriptions of assignments that are evidence-based / high impact practices²⁴

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)

Teaching or course portfolio

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 outcomes²⁴

²³ SETs are Student Evaluations of Teaching. At CU Boulder the official SET is the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)

²⁴ See [Glossary of Key Terms](#) for more information on Evidence-Based and High Impact Practices and Student Learning Outcomes

Sample instructions for the instructor submitting their dossier to the review committee

- Within **each** assessment rubric (Goals, Content, & Alignment; Preparation for Teaching; Methods & Teaching Practices; Presentation & Student Interaction; Student Outcomes; Mentorship & Advising; and Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service / Scholarship):
 - Check the boxes for all basic criteria you believe you meet, and, if you are striving for proficiency levels 2-4, please check the boxes for the professional and/or advanced criteria that you wish to be evaluated on
 - Check the boxes for all sources of evidence you are submitting if you believe they provide evidence for evaluating the given dimension, 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 of the seven dimensions of quality teaching? 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 instructor's 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 example in Appendix C)
 - Write a justification narrative for your overall rating / recommendation based on the assessment rubrics / evaluation summary

Sample instructions for mentors / 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. For example, would they plan to just meet the basic expectations or would they strive for proficiency level 3 or 4? Are there any basic criteria they think they might need to work on before review? If they want to achieve proficiency level 3 or 4, which professional and/or advanced criteria do they want to be evaluated on? What forms of evidence will they want to be attentive to / 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 the three dimensions of quality 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 team 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) (note: for non-CU institutions, FCQ = faculty course questionnaire, the CU version of end-of-semester student evaluations (SETs))
- Would the overall structure of the assessment rubrics for each dimension above ([Goals, Content, & Alignment](#); [Preparation for Teaching](#); [Methods & Teaching Practices](#); [Presentation & Student Interaction](#); [Student Outcomes](#); [Mentorship & Advising](#); and [Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/Scholarship](#)) and the [evaluation summary](#) above fit your unit's needs?
 - See [Appendix B](#) below for rubric templates with slight variations in structure
 - 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 [GSSL annual teaching evaluation rubric](#) (CU Boulder) for an example used in annual merit.
 - An alternative structure condensed into three dimensions of quality teaching (Inclusive, Goal-Oriented, and Scholarly) can be found on the [A&S Quality Teaching Initiative \(QTI\)](#) resources page [here](#) (scroll to "Sample Rubric")
- For each assessment rubric above:
 - Review the basic, professional, and 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, professional and advanced appropriate for your unit (i.e., are there any "professional" items you would want to move to "basic" or "advanced"? Or any "advanced" items that should move to "professional" or "basic"?)
 - Note - we recommend ensuring at least one equity / inclusion related criteria be specified as "basic" for each 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 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 or will have access to, consider whether or not the sources of evidence will collectively allow a reviewer to assess the basic, professional, and advanced criteria to determine a proficiency level
- Think about weighting, e.g., should all seven dimensions be equally weighted or would you weigh some dimensions heavier than others? Should different forms of evidence or different voices (peer, student, self) be weighed the same? Should some criteria or dimensions be weighted differently for tenure track faculty versus teaching faculty?
- 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? Is the process of instructor self-assessment appropriate for your unit?

Appendix B: Blank rubric templates in two formats

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

Evaluation Criteria	Proficiency Level	Sources of Evidence	Explanation
Basic: <input type="checkbox"/> Professional: <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Only select criteria of basic, even if some are professional or advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - All of basic <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - All of basic, some professional and/or advanced criteria <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - All of basic, most of professional, some of advanced <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - All of basic, most of professional and most of advanced, including demonstrated impact beyond the classroom	Core: <input type="checkbox"/> Recommended: <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental: <input type="checkbox"/>	

Format B (where Evaluation Criteria and Proficiency Levels are combined in one column):

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

Appendix C: SAMPLE: Levels of Teaching Accomplishment for tenure-line faculty

Below is an example of an academic unit's justification on levels of teaching accomplishment for tenure-line faculty (i.e., how a unit might connect the individual rubrics above to an overall rating on teaching accomplishment):

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 seven-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 seven 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., mentoring) cannot make up for deficiencies in another (e.g., student outcomes).

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 seven 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 seven 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 of 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 the 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.

Appendix D: Glossary of Key Terms

Evidence-Based Practices (EBP). Also referred to as Evidence-Based Instructional Practices (EBIP) or Evidence-Based Teaching (EBT) are practices that support students' development of long term conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills. These practices have evidence through formal studies or research of producing improvements in student outcomes. [Groccia and Busket \(2011\)](#) define EBT as “the conscientious, explicit, and judicious integration of best available research on teaching technique and expertise within the context of student, teacher, department, college, university, and community characteristics.” Examples of these practices can be found at <https://www.colorado.edu/csl/resources/instructional-innovations>

High-Impact Practices (HIP). These teaching and learning practices that evidence shows increase rates of student engagement and retention; aspects of HIP include intentionality, interaction, and reflection (Kuh, 2008) and can include capstone courses and projects, first-year seminars, and undergraduate research as examples. More information on HIP can be found at <https://www.colorado.edu/odece/high-impact-practices>

Inclusive Pedagogy. According to [Dewsbury \(2017\)](#), inclusive pedagogy is a “philosophy of teaching that provides equal opportunities for all students to have a successful learning experience”. The [Center for Teaching and Learning at CU Boulder](#) has a range of resources available for growth in this area. See also the TQF DEIB supplement to the rubric [here](#), which pulls out all criteria from this full rubric that are related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and sense of belonging and includes additional resources and references related to inclusive pedagogy.

Learning Goals. While these are often used interchangeably with **Learning Outcomes**, in this document “learning goals...describe what an instructor, program, or institution aims to do.” In contrast, learning outcomes are described in terms of what a “student is able to do as a result of completing a learning experience.” (more on Learning Outcomes below). Essentially, the difference hinges upon who will be performing the activities.
<https://resources.depaul.edu/teaching-commons/teaching-guides/course-design/Pages/course-objectives-learning-outcomes.aspx>

Learning Outcomes. While Learning Outcomes are often used interchangeably with **Learning Goals** or Learning Objectives, in this document Learning Outcomes refer to “specific statements of what students will be able to do when they successfully complete a learning experience.” While the learning experience can be at different scales (e.g., Program, Course, Module/Activity, Unit, or Week), “they are always written in a student-centered, measurable fashion that is concise, meaningful, and achievable.”
<https://resources.depaul.edu/teaching-commons/teaching-guides/course-design/Pages/course-objectives-learning-outcomes.aspx>

Ways of Knowing. Essentially how we know what we know, e.g., through our sensory perceptions, logic & reasoning, authority, and intuition ([Ehman 2000](#)). Beliefs around how we obtain knowledge (epistemological beliefs, [Hofer & Pintrich 1997](#)) can influence instruction, learning, motivation, and achievement.