

# Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Assessment Rubric

*Preliminary Draft – Aug. 2018*

	<b>Entry into Teaching</b> <i>Requires Improvement (1)</i>	<b>Basic Skill</b> <i>Competent (2)</i>	<b>Professional</b> <i>Professional (3)</i>	<b>Advanced</b> <i>Advanced (4)</i>
<p><b>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>	<p>Some goals/content are not clearly aligned with curriculum or institutional expectations, or are unclear or inappropriate</p> <p>Some materials/content are outdated or unsuitable for students in the courses</p> <p>Range/depth or treatment of course topics is often too narrow or too broad</p>	<p>Most goals/content are articulated &amp; appropriate for topic/students/curriculum</p> <p>Standard, intellectually-sound course materials/content</p> <p>Range/depth or treatment of course topics is generally appropriate for level/type of course</p>	<p>Goals/content are well-articulated, high quality, up-to-date, and appropriate</p> <p>Course materials/content are aligned with course goal, include high-quality elements</p> <p>Range/depth of course topics is appropriate, integrate other topics/courses</p> <p>Some examples of innovation, connection to current issues, developments in field</p>	<p>Goals/content also clearly connect to curricular, programmatic, departmental goals</p> <p>Range/depth or treatment of course topics also integrate other topics/courses</p> <p>Content is challenging and innovative, and relate to current developments in field</p>
<p><b>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>	<p>Limited content knowledge; unable to satisfactorily answer questions</p> <p>Knowledge of classroom teaching practices/methods or materials are inadequate to enable learning</p> <p>Limited skill in identifying/resolving challenges with course-specific content</p> <p>Insufficient preparation of syllabus, materials, or course material</p> <p>Inadequate classroom mechanics</p>	<p>Standard understanding of content; satisfactorily answers most questions</p> <p>Knowledge of teaching practices/methods or materials generally adequate for learning</p> <p>Can identify some common student challenges with content</p> <p>"Standard" or satisfactory preparation of syllabus, materials, and course material</p> <p>Adequate classroom mechanics (grading, tech, prepping activities/demonstrations, etc)</p>	<p>Knows subject on deep level, including current research, interaction with other topics</p> <p>Teaching practices/methods or materials are evidence-based, shown to enable learning</p> <p>Can identify most common student challenges; activities/innovations to help students overcome common challenges</p> <p>Syllabus, materials, and course material are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments</p>	<p>Knows subject on deep level, including current research, interaction with other topics</p> <p>Very knowledgeable about classroom teaching practices, methods, or materials</p> <p>Employs classroom data/experiences to iterate on and improve teaching</p> <p>Has prepared, and worked to improve, activities to help resolve common challenges</p> <p>Advanced classroom mechanics (detail in grading, advanced activity prep, etc)</p>
<p><b>Methods and Teaching Practices</b></p> <p><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></p>	<p>No apparent rationale for teaching methods; no instructional design</p> <p>Practices are not well executed; little development of methods despite need</p> <p>Students lack opportunities to practice the skills embedded in course goals</p> <p>Student engagement is variable or absent</p>	<p>Follows the conventions of teaching practices within its discipline and institution</p> <p>Standard course practices carried out</p> <p>Students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals</p> <p>Students consistently engaged</p> <p>Some inconsistency in quality of implementation of teaching practices</p>	<p>Often uses effective or innovative evidence-based* methods to improve understanding *See: NAS Indicators</p> <p>Activities provide opportunities for practice/feedback on important skills and concepts</p> <p>Regular opportunities to practice skills</p> <p>Students consistently engaged, w/ occasional high levels of engagement</p> <p>Implementation is high-quality/consistent</p>	<p>Consistently uses effective, high-impact or innovative evidence-based methods to improve understanding</p> <p>Activities consistently provide opportunities for practice/feedback on important skills/concepts</p> <p>Students frequently practice skills and define some of the class activities</p> <p>Consistent high levels of engagement</p>
<p><b>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>	<p>Classroom climate does not promote civility or discourages student motivation and engagement</p> <p>Consistently negative student reports of instructor accessibility or interaction skills</p> <p>Poor sense of learning among students</p> <p>Little attempt by instructor to address feedback voiced by students</p>	<p>Classroom climate supports civility, student motivation, and engagement</p> <p>Students report good instructor accessibility and interaction skills</p> <p>Most students perceive they are progressing with their learning</p> <p>Instructor responds to student feedback</p>	<p>Evidence that classroom climate is respectful, cooperative, and encourages motivation and engagement</p> <p>Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are positive</p> <p>Students perceive that they are learning important skills or knowledge</p> <p>Instructor gathers student feedback and articulates some lessons learned</p>	<p>Strong evidence that classroom climate is consistently respectful, cooperative, and encourages motivation and engagement</p> <p>Reports of instructor accessibility and interaction are strongly/consistently positive</p> <p>Strong sense among students that they are learning important skills or knowledge</p> <p>Instructor gathers student feedback and is responsive in the short- and long-term</p>

## TQF Assessment Rubric, Draft Aug. 2018, continued

	<b>Entry into Teaching</b> <i>Requires Improvement (1)</i>	<b>Basic Skill</b> <i>Competent (2)</i>	<b>Professional</b> <i>Professional (3)</i>	<b>Advanced</b> <i>Advanced (4)</i>
<p><b>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>	<p>Quality of student learning is not described or analyzed with clear standards</p> <p>No measure of student learning or assessment methods do not match goals; little evidence of attempts to improve student learning</p> <p>Evidence of poor student learning; low level of skill/understanding is required</p> <p>Poor student-related course-level outcomes (e.g. retention in major/college/ university, re-enrollment in course, interest in course/ability to offer repeatedly)</p>	<p>Standard attention to student achievement for courses at these levels</p> <p>Clear standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; sporadic attempts to improve student outcomes</p> <p>Standard student learning outcomes; typical level of skill is required and achieved</p> <p>Standard student-related course-level outcomes</p>	<p>Clear efforts to support learning in all students</p> <p>Evidence-based/innovative standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; consistently works to improve student outcomes</p> <p>Above-average student learning outcomes; course is appropriately challenging and high levels of student learning are expected and generally achieved</p> <p>Some excellent course-level outcomes for students</p>	<p>Exceptional efforts to support learning in all students</p> <p>Evidence-based/innovative standards for evaluating student understanding are connected to program/curriculum expectations or use authentic assessments</p> <p>Exceptional student learning outcomes; quality of learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues)</p> <p>Excellent course-level outcomes for students</p>
<p><b>Mentorship and Advising</b></p> <p><i>How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?</i></p>	<p>No indication of effective mentoring or advising students</p> <p>Discourages student engagement in independent work</p> <p>Does not attend to best practices of inclusive pedagogy and mentoring</p> <p>Not well-prepared/does not create a supportive environment for student success</p> <p>Mentor doesn't define goals/scope for mentees/advisees</p>	<p>Minimal evidence of effective advising and mentoring</p> <p>Participates occasionally in supporting students in independent work</p> <p>Mentor minimally defines goals/scope for mentees/advisees</p>	<p>Consistent evidence of effective advising and mentoring</p> <p>Regularly supports students in independent work</p> <p>Well-defined, evidence-based goals/scope, with input from mentees/advisees</p>	<p>Overwhelming evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to advising and mentoring</p> <p>Regularly supports a large number of students in independent work</p> <p>Goals/scope is challenging and mutually-defined in collaboration with mentees/advisees</p>
<p><b>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>	<p>No indication of having reflected upon or learned from prior teaching or feedback</p> <p>No attempt to engage in professional development (PD) around teaching</p> <p>Does not share teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues</p> <p>Does not engage with teaching at the level expected by the department or institution and/or engages in a way that negatively impacts teaching</p>	<p>Some indication that teaching has been informed by reflection on and lessons learned from prior teaching and feedback.</p> <p>Reflection on teaching is informed only by FCQs</p> <p>Sporadic attendance at teaching PD activities on campus and/or some attempt to learn about teaching from departmental peers</p> <p>Informally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods with colleagues in order to help improve their teaching</p> <p>Some involvement in departmental teaching-related committees and/or department-level curricular decisions</p>	<p>Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback</p> <p>Reflection on teaching informed by student feedback beyond FCQs (e.g., mid-course surveys, student performance measures)</p> <p>Regular attendance at teaching PD activities or regular discussions w/ peers re: teaching</p> <p>Actively mentors others about teaching and/or formally shares teaching ideas, examples, materials, or methods (e.g., presentations, publications, seminars)</p> <p>Frequent involvement in departmental teaching-related committees and decisions and/or regular participation in institutional teaching-related committees and decisions</p>	<p>Continuously adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback</p> <p>Reflection on teaching is informed by multiple sources of feedback (e.g., students, faculty peers, literature on teaching and learning, PD opportunities)</p> <p>Frequent attendance at teaching PD activities and discussion with peers about teaching in a wide variety of contexts</p> <p>Creates opportunities for self and peers to help others improve teaching or secures resources (e.g., grant funding) for teaching</p> <p>Recognized leadership role in significantly improving teaching on campus (e.g., with respect to curricular planning, assessment)</p>

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](#)), and with sponsorship from the National Science Foundation (DUE-1725959).

For more information about the Teaching Quality Framework, please visit our website: [www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework](http://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework)