

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 course, click on the “Print Reports” button, then print to a PDF.
4. You may choose to submit up to 20 pages of **additional** material per year, such as lesson plans and your feedback on student assignments. If your self-reflection focuses on a specific course or assignment, you may want to include relevant materials. If you discuss changes in your course(s), you may want to include syllabi and assignments from previous years.
5. All materials should be a single Word document or PDF or included in a single folder titled with the course number and title. If student assignments are included in your materials, make sure all identifying information has been removed.

Teaching statement

Reflect on your teaching during the past calendar year. The committee will use your statement as part of the evaluation process. Your reflection should address one or more of the following guiding questions, but you do not have to answer all of the questions. Please limit your response to no more than 2 single spaced pages.

1. How did your courses go in the calendar year for which you are being evaluated? You may wish to comment on achievement of course goals, level of student engagement, student learning outcomes, and anything else that seems important to you. You may want to address aspects of your teaching that proved to be particularly effective or ineffective. You may focus on one course or several courses.
2. Did you introduce changes in your classes or in your teaching during the calendar year for which you are being evaluated? If so, what changes did you introduce, and why? Did you find them effective? Explain why or why not.
 - a. What adjustments did you make in response to prior course feedback (FCQs, peer observation, FTEP observation, surveys)?
 - b. What steps have you taken to develop your knowledge about effective teaching practices, methods, or materials? You may wish to mention any FTEP, ASSETT, or COLTT sessions that you attended; discussions with colleagues; or any reading in pedagogical scholarship. How have these opportunities initiated reflection about your teaching and what concrete changes did they inspire?
 - c. If you made other changes, describe them and explain your rationale.
3. What steps have you taken to evaluate student learning?

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-reflection, peer observation and review of syllabi/course materials should be weighted more heavily than FCQs

Descriptions of evaluative categories

1 = Fails to meet expectations: Teaching methods and materials do not encourage student learning; students have few opportunities to practice relevant skills and knowledge; evaluative methods partially measure student learning; there is little effort to adjust the course in response to student learning; students are not adequately challenged in the course; student feedback extremely negative.

2 = Below expectations: Teaching methods and materials partially enable student learning; students have some but not adequate opportunities to practice relevant skills and knowledge; evaluative methods partially

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 in the course; student feedback is outstandingly positive.

3. Inclusive teaching

Definition: Inclusive teaching supports diverse approaches to learning and is sensitive to and supportive of student and faculty diversity of experience and background within the classroom and may include mentoring efforts beyond classroom instruction.

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 be weighted more heavily than FCQs

Descriptions of evaluative categories

1 = Fails to meet expectations: Class does not create a supportive environment; students do not have equal access to learning; no consideration and planning for how different learners will engage with class activities and content; no knowledge of student learning strengths and weaknesses; classroom is seldom respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagement; student feedback is extremely negative.

2 = Below expectations: Class creates a somewhat supportive environment; students generally have equal access to learning; little consideration and planning for how different learners will engage with class activities and content; little knowledge of student learning strengths and weaknesses; classroom is somewhat respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagement; student feedback points out substantial shortcomings.

3 = Meets expectations: Class creates a generally supportive environment; students have equal access to

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 a consistently supportive environment; students have equal access to learning; substantial consideration and planning for how different learners will engage with class activities and content; substantial knowledge of student learning strengths and weaknesses; classroom is consistently respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagement; active involvement in teaching and/or mentoring practices that enhance inclusivity in the field and/or the university; student feedback is very positive.

5 = Significantly above expectations: Class creates a consistently supportive environment; students have equal access to learning; extensive consideration and planning for how different learners will engage with class activities and content; exhaustive knowledge of student learning strengths and weaknesses; classroom is consistently respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagement; substantial involvement in teaching and/or mentoring practices that enhance inclusivity in the field and/or the university; student feedback is outstandingly positive.

4. Departmental teaching

Definition: Departmental teaching makes substantial contributions to the departmental curricula by, for example, teaching widely across the curriculum, or large-enrollment course(s), or “service” courses required for undergraduate or graduate programs, or significant supervision/mentorship of students.

Evidence to review: Reflective teaching statement

Descriptions of evaluative categories

1 = Fails to meet expectations: Does not contribute to departmental curricula or student mentorship.

2 = Below expectations: Does not contribute meaningfully to departmental curricula or student mentorship.

3 = Meets expectations: Contributes meaningfully to departmental curricula or student mentorship.

4 = Above expectations: Contributes positively in multiple ways to departmental curricula and student mentorship.

5 = Significantly above expectations: Contributes outstandingly in multiple ways to departmental curricula and student mentorship.

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.

Procedure for Classroom Observations/Interviews

1. Prior to the observation, instructors should provide their observer with the course syllabus and other materials they deem relevant, including lesson plans, assessment materials, or outlines explaining the pedagogical goals of classroom activities.
2. Observers may observe class, or conduct student interviews, or both, by common agreement with the instructor.
3. If the instructor or observer has concerns or questions, the observer should meet with the observed faculty member after the classroom observation and prior to submitting the report.
4. The observer should submit the observation report to the observed faculty member to make sure that there are no factual errors. Any factual errors should be corrected before submitting the final report.
5. A final copy of the report should be submitted to the Department Chair, observed faculty member, and Program Assistant within two weeks of the classroom observation.
6. An observed faculty member may write a response to the report; this response should be submitted to the Department Chair and Program Assistant, who will file the report in the faculty member's personnel file.
7. The peer observations should be done in a way that promotes improvement. If the observed class doesn't meet an acceptable standard, the report should be written and the Department Chair will

schedule a follow-up classroom observation and consultation. The second observation can be conducted by the same or different faculty member; this will be decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the observed faculty member and the observer.

Peer observation reports

Reports should include basic information: the instructor's name, the name of the course, its course number and section, the date, time, and location, the number of students who are enrolled and who attended, and the name of the observer. If classroom interviews are conducted, please list the questions posed to the students.

You may wish to address some of the following in your report:

1. Does the syllabus clearly describe expectations and requirements for the course?
2. Are formal assessments consistent with instructional objectives?
3. Do classroom activities make good use of time and were they well-organized?
4. Does the instructor select tools and resources that are accurate and that contribute to student learning?
5. Are the learning goals of the lesson clear?
6. Has the instructor established a classroom environment that gives all students the opportunity to participate fully? Does the instructor create a learning environment in which students are on task using a variety of skills and actively engaged in learning?
7. Does the instructor employ learning strategies appropriate for the size and structure of the class?
8. Do the instructional strategies and activities help students make connections to, and build upon, prior knowledge?
9. Does the instructor deliver content and answer questions in a way that is consistent with a deep knowledge of the subject matter?
10. Does the instructor encourage critical thinking?
11. If classroom interviews were conducted, what are common themes and takeaways?
12. What suggestions do you have to improve the instructor's teaching?

Approved May 2, 2022