

Instructions for Faculty Members

The following documents (see below) should be gathered together and provided to the Department Chair on an annual basis as part of the annual merit review process. These documents are for internal department use only; they will be kept on file and can be used by faculty members for promotion and tenure processes.

1. Submit a syllabus as well as major assignments (exams and essay prompts) for ONE course.
2. Submit your teaching statement (see below).
3. Submit your FCQs. Go to <https://colorado.campuslabs.com/faculty>, and for each individual

4. Describe the teaching accomplishment(s) from the past year that you value the most.
5. If your syllabi do not contain learning goals or lack other categories necessary to obtain high merit ratings based on the rubric, describe your course learning goals and how they relate to course assignments, activities, and assessments.
6. What teaching contributions, challenges, or concerns would you like to share?

Instructions for committee members:

For each of the categories, you should assign a score of 1 to 5 where 1 = significantly below expectations (unsatisfactory), 2 = below expectations, 3 = meets expectations, 4 = above expectations, and 5 = significantly above expectations. Your score for each category should take all available data sources into consideration; however, if there are discrepancies between data sources, consider the weight (e.g., relative importance) of each data source, as indicated in the rubrics.

Evaluation of teaching

Teaching will be evaluated in four categories as listed and described below. For each category, a score of 1 to 5 will be assigned and a brief comment shall be added to explain the score. The four scores will be averaged and rounded to the nearest integer; that rounded number represents the cumulative evaluative score.

This rubric is not a checklist, but rather describes qualitatively the qualities associated with each level of evaluation with respect to each of the four categories of quality teaching. The text under each category (meets expectations, above expectations, significantly above expectations) represents examples of the types of activities that the department associates with each level of achievement but each type is not required for each score. Teaching should rather be evaluated holistically, taking into account the context of each teaching activity within the broader curricula taught by the department. Note too that there is some overlap between the different categories.

Categories

1. Goal-oriented teaching

Definition: Goal-oriented teaching is characterized by clearly articulated learning objectives that are in alignment with curricular goals; it is also responsive to relevant feedback.

Evidence to review: Reflective teaching statement, peer observation reports, FCQs, syllabi and course materials

Relative weight of sources: Self-reflection, peer observation and review of syllabi/course materials should all be weighted more heavily than FCQs

Descriptions of evaluative categories

1 = Fails to meet expectations: Course goals absent or do not fit with any curricular goals; course materials fail to align with expected course goals; student achievement poorly evaluated; critical peer observations for learning goals and prior knowledge; student feedback is extremely negative.

2 = Below expectations: Course goals not well articulated or are poorly adapted to curricular goals; course materials do not align well with course goals; evaluation of student achievement has some shortcomings; peer observations note some shortcomings with respect to learning goals and prior knowledge; student feedback points out significant shortcomings.

3 = Meets expectations: Syllabi include some course goals, or self-reflection articulates course goals; standard, intellectually sound course materials and content aligned with course goals; student achievement is evaluated clearly and using sound methods; generally positive peer observations for learning goals and prior knowledge; student feedback is generally positive.

4 = Above expectations: Syllabi include well-articulated course goals; range and depth of course materials and content is appropriate for the course level; very positive peer observations for learning goals and prior knowledge; student feedback is very positive.

5 = Significantly above expectations: Syllabi include clear course goals; content and materials are challenging and thoughtful, and content connects to developments in the field and/or current issues; excellent peer observations for learning goals and prior knowledge; student feedback is outstandingly positive.

2. Scholarly teaching

Definition: Scholarly teaching makes use of effective methods (whether traditional or innovative) that encourage learning; it evaluates how successful student learning is; it challenges students intellectually; it is intellectually rigorous and accurate; it brings current research into the classroom where appropriate; it is also responsive to relevant feedback.

Evidence to review: Reflective teaching statement, peer observation reports, FCQs, syllabi and course materials

Relative weight of sources: Self

measure student learning; there is little effort to adjust the course in response to student learning; students are not adequately challenged in all aspects of the course; student feedback point out significant shortcomings.

3 = Meets expectations: Teaching methods and materials enable student learning; students have adequate opportunities to practice relevant skills and knowledge; evaluative methods adequately measure student learning; there is some effort to adjust the course in response to student learning; students are appropriately challenged in the course; student feedback is generally positive.

4 = Above expectations: Teaching methods and materials positively affect student learning; students have multiple and/or various opportunities to practice relevant skills and knowledge; evaluative methods effectively measure student learning and encourage some further learning; there is significant effort to adjust the course in response to student learning; students are effectively challenged in the course; student feedback is very positive.

5 = Significantly above expectations: Teaching methods and materials affect student learning in exemplary fashion; students have ample and various opportunities to practice relevant skills and knowledge; evaluative methods productively measure student learning and develop much additional learning; there is systematic effort to adjust the course in response to student learning; students are productively challenged

learning; consideration and planning for how different learners will engage with class activities and content; some knowledge of student learning strengths and weaknesses; classroom is generally respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagement; student feedback is generally positive.

4 = Above expectations: Class creates

Peer evaluation procedures

Frequency of Observation

1. Every assistant professor should be observed once per semester for the first 3 years and thereafter once per year; observations across years should be made by more than one person. Classroom interviews with students should also be conducted, either at the same time as the peer observations or in lieu of a classroom observation.
2. Every instructor and senior instructor should be observed once per year. Classroom interviews with students may also be conducted, either at the same time as the peer observations or in lieu of a classroom observation.
3. Every associate professor should be observed once per year. Classroom interviews with students may also be conducted, either at the same time as the peer observations or in lieu of a classroom observation.
4. Every full professor should be observed once every other year.
5. Every lecturer should be observed once per year.
6. Every visiting assistant professor and visiting instructor shall be observed at least once in their first semester and after that at the discretion of the department chair.

Selection of Observers

The department chair will appoint faculty to conduct observations. Full professors will be observed by other full professors. Faculty members may notify the chair if they prefer not to be observed by a specific colleague. However, in order to balance workload, schedules, etc., the department chair will have final say in the selection of observers.

schedule a follow