When preparing to write your Faculty Statement on Teaching for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, we recommend reflecting on the following components of effective teaching and incorporating them into your statement. When writing your statement, think about the most relevant/important/interesting components and tailor your statement to those items. For tenure review, a typical statement is four pages. Not every statement is expected to address every component. While these components are based on foundational scholarship, this guide is in the early stages of development and we welcome your feedback!***

As you think about turning your reflections into your written statement, keep in mind that you want the structure and language to engage the reader. For every level of review there are generally two people assigned to evaluate your dossier, each of whom will thoroughly read all components - it is important to remember that these reviewers may not be in your discipline. In particular, consider ensuring that:

- The statement has a guiding structure and/or theme.
- Jargon is avoided and teaching terms (e.g., critical thinking) are given specific definitions that apply to the instructor’s disciplinary context.
- Specific examples from multiple courses are used to bolster statements. It may be helpful to synthesize across courses rather than describe each course separately.
- Consider sharing your statement with a colleague for friendly review before submission.
- Consider this as a framework for more frequent reflections

**Goals for student learning**

- What knowledge, skills, and attitudes are important for student success in your discipline?
- Are course goals clearly articulated and shared with the students?
- Are course goals appropriately challenging for the level of the course?
- What are you preparing students for?
- What are key challenges in the teaching-learning process?

**Preparation for teaching**

- What preparation have you done to acquire deep knowledge of the subject or build topics into your courses?
- What have you done to learn about best pedagogical practices in your discipline? To what extent have you sought out opportunities for development?
- How do you identify student challenges?
- How has student and peer feedback informed your teaching?
- What efforts have you made to design your courses, syllabi, and/or materials that show a commitment to meaningful assignments (e.g., that connect to real world applications, prior knowledge, and/or future course applications)?
- How do you prepare for all aspects of classroom mechanics (e.g., grading, use of technology, prepping activities, lectures, demonstrations, etc.)?

***Please share any feedback on this guide with Jean Hertzberg (jean.hertzberg@colorado.edu).
Methods and teaching practices
● What teaching methods do you use? What assignments, assessments, and learning activities are implemented in and out of the classroom?
● How do these methods contribute to your goals for students?
● Why are these methods appropriate for use in your discipline? For the classroom environment (e.g., lecture, lab)? For the course level?
● In what ways do you incorporate evidence-based teaching practices into your courses?
● How do you work to overcome student challenges or address them when they arise?

Creating an inclusive learning environment
● How do you create a positive and inclusive learning environment that is respectful, cooperative, and encourages motivation and engagement?
● How do your own and your students’ identities (e.g., race, gender, class), background, experience, and levels of privilege affect the classroom in general? Affect function of small groups?
● What efforts do you make to construct inclusive groups?
● What steps have you taken to become aware of your own implicit biases?
● How do you integrate diverse perspectives into your teaching?
● How do you overcome issues of equity within the discipline?
● In what ways do you support your students in developing their professional identities as engineers?
● In what way(s) do you make yourself accessible to students?

Assessment of goals (measuring student learning)
● How do you know your goals for students are being met?
● What sorts of assessment tools do you use (e.g., tests, papers, surveys, portfolios, journals), and why? How did you develop or find these tools? Are they aligned with your course goals?
● How do these assessments contribute to student learning?
● How do these assessments communicate disciplinary priorities?
● How do you use assessment results to make course adjustments?

Mentorship and Advising
● What are your aims/goals for working with students in your research group?
● How have you worked with your advisees/mentees in defining appropriately challenging goals?
● How do you measure your students’ progress and help your students measure their own progress?
● What regular advising practices do you employ when working with your undergraduate and/or graduate research students?
● What efforts have you made to create a supportive and inclusive environment for student success?
● In what ways have you helped to prepare your advisees/mentees for graduation and future career goals?

Teaching Service and Scholarship
● What contributions have you made to the broader teaching community on campus (e.g., conversations with colleagues about teaching, mentoring others about teaching, participating in Practice Oriented Discussions (PODs), etc.)?
● What efforts have you made to disseminate your teaching contributions to the external teaching community (e.g., public presentations/seminars, peer-reviewed publications, published curricula/textbooks, etc.)? What impact have these efforts had?
● In what ways have you contributed to educational outreach in your discipline (e.g., K-12, museums, social media, etc.)?
Notes

1 Adapted from the *Rubric for Statements of Teaching Philosophy* by Matt Kaplan, Chris O’Neal, Debbie Meizlish, Rosario Carillo, and Diana Kardia (http://www.crt.umich.edu/sites/default/files/resource_files/TeachingPhilosophyRubric.pdf) and the *Teaching Quality Framework Assessment Rubric*, which draws on 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*). Developed by the MCEN Departmental Action Team (Jean Hertzberg, Jana Milford, and Daniel Knight) in partnership with the Teaching Quality Framework Initiative (https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/) with sponsorship by the National Science Foundation (DUE-1725959) - 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.

2 University of Colorado Boulder resources on implicit bias and discrimination can be found here: https://www.colorado.edu/odece/diversity-plan/resources/implicit-bias-discrimination

3 Harvard’s Project Implicit has a series of Implicit Association Tests (IATs) that you can participate in here: https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html