

## Teaching Quality Framework Rubric - Oct 2020

The Teaching Quality Framework Rubric 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 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> Since these components are new additions to the TQF Rubric as of September 2020 (and updated in July 2022), those interested in looking specifically at changes made to the Rubric and/or focus on DEIB elements in particular may find the DEIB Supplement helpful. This two page framework can also be adapted into a tool for assessing teaching. Both the DEIB supplement and a model of an assessment version of the rubric can be found here: <https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/TQFRubric>.

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.

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 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 TQF, 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.

**TQF Rubric - Oct 2020**

| <b>Dimensions of Quality Teaching</b>   | <b>Entry into Teaching</b>  | <b>Basic Skill</b>  | <b>Professional</b>  | <b>Advanced</b>  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
|   | <i>Requires Improvement (1)</i>   | <i>Competent (2)</i>  | <i>Professional (3)</i>  | <i>Advanced (4)</i>  |
| <p><b>1) Goals, Content, and Alignment</b></p> <p><i>What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum?</i></p>   | <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>  |
| <p><b>2) Preparation for Teaching</b></p> <p><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></p>                                      | <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>  |
| <p><b>3) Methods and Teaching Practices</b></p> <p><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></p> | <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> |
| <p><b>4) Presentation and Student Interaction</b></p> <p><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></p>                       | <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 Rubric, Oct 2020, cont.

| 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>   |
| <p><b>5) Student (and Other) Outcomes</b></p> <p><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></p>   | <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>  |
| <p><b>6) Mentorship and Advising</b></p> <p><i>How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?</i></p>  | <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>   |
| <p><b>7) Reflection, Development, &amp; Teaching Service/Scholarship</b></p> <p><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></p> | <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> |