

Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Rubric Mapping Tool - Identifying Gaps in Teaching Evaluation Systems

October 2020 Draft

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 in the 2 page framework version of the TQF Rubric (hereafter “2 page Rubric”) found here: <https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/TQFRubric>. 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.

The TQF, in partnership with multiple departments across the CU Boulder campus, have developed a variety of tools (templates and department examples) that can be used to fill gaps; they can be found at: <https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/tools-for-teaching-evaluation>. Additional resources from the University of Kansas and the University of Massachusetts - Amherst can be found at <http://teval.net/>. 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. [The Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Rubric](#)).

Description of components in the TQF Rubric Mapping 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 2 page 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 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 the Teaching Quality Framework, 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.

Suggested approach to using the TQF Rubric Mapping Tool

Before beginning, it may be helpful to have already reviewed the 2 page Rubric 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 Rubric Mapping Tool (1/2)

TQF Rubric Mapping Tool (1/2)			Sample Sources of evidence you could collect		
Dimension of Quality Teaching	Professional (3)	Voice Rank	Self	Peer	Student
Goals, Content, and Alignment <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 Teaching statement Course portfolio	Classroom observation Review of syllabus/course materials Review of portfolio Review of learning objectives	Classroom interviews SETs Student letters
	Course materials/content are aligned with course goal, include high-quality elements	1 1 2			
	Range/depth of course topics is appropriate, integrate other topics/courses	1 1 3			
	Some examples of innovation, connection to current issues, developments in field	1 1 3			
Preparation for Teaching <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 Teaching statement Course portfolio	Classroom observation Review of syllabus/course materials Review of portfolio Faculty interviews	Classroom interviews SETs Student letters
	Activities/innovations to help students overcome common challenges	1 2 NA			
	Teaching practices/methods are attentive to inclusion, particularly for students from historically underrepresented and marginalized groups in the field/academia.	1 2 1			
	Course materials are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments	1 1 2			
Methods and Teaching Practices <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 Teaching statement Course portfolio Inventory (e.g., TPI)	Classroom observation Review of syllabus/course materials Review of portfolio COPUS Inventory (e.g., TBI)	Classroom interviews SETs Student letters Survey/Inventory (e.g., SALG, TBI)
	Activities provide opportunities for practice/ feedback on important skills and concepts	1 1 1			
	Recognizes and incorporates multiple ways of knowing in teaching and learning	1 1 1			
	Students consistently engaged, w/ occasional high levels of engagement	1 1 1			
Presentation and Student Interaction <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 Teaching Statement Course portfolio	Classroom observation Review of portfolio	Classroom interviews SETs Student letters Survey/Inventory (e.g., SALG, TBI)
	Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are positive	3 2 1			
	Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge	3 2 1			
	Instructor gathers student feedback and articulates some lessons learned	3 2 1			

TQF Rubric Mapping Tool (2/2)

TQF Rubric Mapping Tool (2/2)			Sources of evidence you could collect		
Dimension of Quality Teaching	Professional (3)	Voice Rank	Self	Peer	Student
Student (and Other) Outcomes <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	Faculty interview	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)	Review of portfolio	Student surveys (e.g., SALG)
	Some excellent student-related course-level outcomes	1 1 2			
Mentorship and Advising <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			
Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/Scholarship <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		