

SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

| Type | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Instruction | <p>Incomplete lists of formal instruction</p> <p>Incomplete evidence to interpret load</p> <p>Incomplete information about goals of instruction</p> <p>Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative</p> <p>Incomplete information on learning outcomes</p> <p>Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review</p> <p>Poor performance on many of the above measures</p> | <p>Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes</p> | <p>Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction</p> | <p>Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes;</p> <p>The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy;</p> <p>Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice.</p> |
| Course or Curricular Development | <p>Incomplete evidence of nature of activities or results</p> <p>Incomplete evidence of individual role in outcomes</p> <p>No review by others</p> <p>No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals</p> <p>Poor course or curricular design products</p> | <p>Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness</p> | <p>Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes</p> | <p>In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means.</p> <p>Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence</p> |
| Mentoring and Advising | <p>Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided</p> <p>Comparative load for unit not indicated</p> <p>Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented</p> <p>Poor performance indicated by data</p> | <p>Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized</p> <p>Student satisfaction indicated by evidence</p> <p>Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear</p> | <p>Important impact and student achievement documented</p> | <p>Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach</p> <p>High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor</p> <p>Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented</p> <p>Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students</p> <p>External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Scholarly Activities, including Awards</p> | <p>No teaching awards or other recognition of successful teaching and learning No evidence of dissemination of good practice or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)</p> | <p>Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL Some recognition of teaching efforts</p> | <p>Evidence of regular and significant local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice Recognition of high quality of teaching Grants or awards at the department or campus level (For the lecturer category, this level constitutes excellence)</p> | <p>Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals) Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty.</p> |
| <p>Professional Development Efforts in Teaching</p> | <p>No information about teaching development efforts given Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise No mentoring of colleagues Evidence of ineffective performance in this area</p> | <p>Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading Record of mentoring other teachers Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others</p> | <p>High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence)</p> | <p>Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning Membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level Participation in dissemination of good practice Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area</p> |