



## Examples For Documenting and Evaluating Teaching

*This document was developed in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate and various other groups on campus. Faculty and administrators who read the document were thoughtful in their criticisms and generous with suggestions for improvement. The document, having gone through numerous revisions in response to those suggestions, is now being published as an OAA P&T Resource for easy accessibility to faculty and chairs wishing to consult it. It is up to each department to decide whether or how to adapt these examples to their specific needs.*

### **Purpose**

The attached table is intended to assist IPFW faculty and chairs in establishing departmental standards for evidence and criteria for documenting and evaluating teaching. The categories of evidence, criteria, and rubrics are based on standards defined in current Senate Documents on promotion and tenure. The standards are applicable to the evaluation of teaching for other purposes as well.

The table is not meant to be an exhaustive list of possibilities for documenting teaching effectiveness or teaching excellence; rather, it is a set of examples based on the kinds of evidence customarily seen in IPFW promotion and tenure cases. It should also be clear that no individual is expected to document accomplishments in all the categories, and that there may be multiple routes that could lead to a record of teaching excellence. ***This document is intended to serve as a set of examples of items that might be used to support competence and excellence but is not intended to supersede or set the departmental criteria for competence and excellence.***

### **Sources**

SD 88-25 (“Criteria for Promotion and Tenure”) specifies the criteria for excellence in teaching in Section C (Criteria for Promotion) and Section D (Application of Criteria to Different Ranks). Following the organization of SD 88-25, the attached table divides the criteria into three components--one focusing on teaching performance, one on course/curriculum contributions, and one on documenting external recognition of one’s teaching accomplishments. SD 94-3 (Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) articulates standards that are “applicable to all who hold faculty appointments [at IPFW].”

### **Multiple Methods of Evaluation**

Employing and documenting the results of multiple methods of evaluation is considered a cardinal principle for demonstrating teaching competence and/or excellence.

### **Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness:**

**Satisfactory(Competent) Performance**

SD 94-3 expresses the baseline expectation for all IPFW faculty:

“IPFW faculty are expected to be effective teachers and to have demonstrated a significant commitment to teaching.”

This expectation provides the basis for the criteria and rubrics suggested for satisfactory teaching.

**Excellent Performance**

SD 88-25, Section C.1., defines excellence as follows:

“A candidate who excels in teaching is one who guides and inspires students and stimulates their intellectual interest and enthusiasm; one who displays a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads him/her to develop and strengthen course content in light of developments of the field, as well as to improve methods of presenting material.”

**Promotion to Rank:**

**Promotion to Associate Professor**

SD 88-25, Section D.2, articulates expectations for achievement for promotion to Associate Professor:

“Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon actual performance and the potential for continued professional growth.”

SD 94-3 goes beyond the above by specifying standards for teaching excellence:

“If teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate’s performance should be clearly superior to the standard of acceptability at IPFW and comparable institutions.”

**Promotion to Professor**

SD 88-25, Section D. 3, states the following

“Promotion to Professor is awarded to individuals recognized by professional peers as authorities in their fields. . . . Candidates will be recognized and respected in state, regional, or national educational and professional circles.”

SD 94-3 has a parallel statement specific to teaching:

“[If teaching is] the primary basis for promotion to Professor, the candidate should not only have established a record of excellent teaching but also have contributed to the general improvement of instruction at IPFW or in the discipline.”

Compared to promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor requires increased evidence of depth and growth in teaching documented through multiple methods of evaluation.

The above statements guided the formulation of rubrics in the attached table. That is, the demonstration of “a significant commitment to teaching” is the baseline for a rating of satisfactory/good, and the respective statements about excellence guided the formulation of the rubrics for excellence.

---

**Susan B. Hannah**  
**Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

**DEFINING, DOCUMENTING, AND EVALUATING TEACHING**

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

**12/03/07**

**EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE**

“A candidate who excels in teaching is one who guides and inspires students and stimulates their intellectual interest and enthusiasm...” (Section C.1., SD 88-25)

“IPFW faculty are expected to be effective teachers and to have demonstrated a significant commitment to teaching.” (Teaching, paragraph 1; SD 94-3)

Category of Evidence	Types of Evidence	Rubrics– satisfactory/good	Rubrics– excellent/outstanding
<b>Evidence of Student Achievement / Student Learning</b>	successful completion of coursework  performance on pre- and post tests  performance in next course in sequence (if applicable)  performance on other learning and/or skills assessments  results from CATs (Classroom Assessment Techniques)  evidence from other evaluation instruments / artifacts / portfolios / evaluations  grad or professional school, employment  scores on national exams proficiency exams, etc.  surveys / statements from alumni (solicited and unsolicited)  other evidence of student achievement	the success rate of the candidate’s students is satisfactory, based on recognized norms, <u>and</u> one or more of the following apply:  satisfactory based on a standard appropriate to the discipline  results document acquisition of content (factual) knowledge and/or skills as appropriate to program level goals for the course  results document individual student development of a deeper understanding or philosophy of practice in their discipline  professors or employers evaluate preparedness as adequate as appropriate to program level goals for the course  at or above passing or expected achievement level  evaluations indicate competency	the success rate of the candidate’s students is satisfactory to excellent based on recognized norms, <u>and</u> one or more of the following apply:  excellent based on a standard appropriate to the discipline  results document acquisition of both factual and conceptual knowledge and/or skills as appropriate to program level goals for the course  results document a deeper understanding or philosophy of practice in their discipline on an individual and collective level  multiple raters (student, student peers, faculty peers, others) document student development  professors or employers evaluate preparedness as excellent  significantly above expected achievement level  evaluations indicate performance that exceeds competency; note faculty member’s significant contributions to personal and professional development

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<p><b>Students' Evaluation of Teaching</b></p>	<p>ratings on key categories</p> <p>student comments that address learning</p> <p>comments that address the faculty member's impact on the student</p>	<p>numerical ratings consistent or improving AND evidence that the professor has used evaluation ratings/comments to improve course design and delivery</p> <p>consistently evaluated as satisfactory per department standards; type of course and course goals must also be taken into account</p> <p>comments are substantive and reflect learning</p> <p>comments are consistent over time</p> <p>comments are substantive and reflect learning</p>	<p>numerical ratings consistent or improving AND evidence that the professor consistently and reflectively uses evaluation ratings/comments to improve course design and delivery</p> <p>consistently evaluated as excellent per department standards; type of course and course goals must also be taken into account</p> <p>comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. substantive, reflect learning beyond the text material, and/or</li> <li>2. reflect the instructor's ability to create a positive learning environment,</li> <li>3. consistent over time, or improve over time</li> <li>4. consistent with the faculty member's teaching goals</li> </ol>
<p><b>Student Advising</b></p>	<p>student evaluations of advising using a standardized and reliable methodology (Example: College of Arts and Sciences Academic Advisor's Evaluation and the Academic Advising Council survey (See <a href="http://www.ipfw.edu/registrar/survey1.htm">http://www.ipfw.edu/registrar/survey1.htm</a> )</p> <p>evaluations from chair or dean</p> <p>contributions to advising practices</p> <p>peer review of advising</p> <p>publications and presentations related to advising</p>	<p>evaluations indicate student satisfaction per departmental standards</p> <p>evaluations indicate competency per departmental standards</p> <p>participates in improving department/school/college advising</p> <p>documents satisfactory impact on student achievement</p> <p>internal reviews of advising practices that document competence</p> <p>publications in peer-reviewed journals, and presentations at peer-reviewed local or regional workshops and conferences related to advising, with evaluations that document dissemination of knowledge that advances the field</p>	<p>evaluations indicate advising exceeds departmental/school/college standards and incorporates a philosophy of advising as teaching</p> <p>leadership role in improving advising at school/campus level or beyond</p> <p>documents noteworthy impact on student achievement</p> <p>internal and external reviews of advising practices that document excellence</p> <p>publications in peer-reviewed journals, and presentations at peer-reviewed state and national /international workshops and conferences related to advising, with evaluations that document dissemination of knowledge that advances the field</p>

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<p><b>Peer Evaluations</b></p>	<p>Summative peer evaluations of teaching performance based on standard procedures such as those developed by CELT (See <a href="http://www.ipfw.edu/celt/insite/peerreview.shtml">http://www.ipfw.edu/celt/insite/peerreview.shtml</a> ). These include but are not limited to:</p> <p>classroom observations</p> <p>reviews of classroom teaching, distance teaching, course syllabi and other teaching materials</p> <p>reviews of teaching approaches and innovations</p> <p>reviews of other innovations (e.g., use of technology, course transformations related to diversity)</p>	<p>content is current and appropriate to level(s)</p> <p>content is purposeful, appropriate to discipline and to learning objectives of course</p> <p>evaluations and internal or external review documents evidence of effectiveness</p>	<p>content reflects ongoing scholarly attention to new research findings and to inclusiveness; internal and external review</p> <p>content is purposeful, appropriate to discipline, aligned with objectives, and have been systematically assessed for effectiveness through internal and external review</p>
<p><b>Supervision of Student Research and / or Other Creative Endeavor</b></p>	<p>independent study/grad or undergraduate research</p> <p>student presentations, publications, projects, initiatives</p> <p>presentations, publications, projects, initiatives co-authored or co-led with a faculty member</p>	<p>student work meets appropriate criteria</p> <p>acknowledged favorably by appropriate audiences, according to standards in the discipline</p>	<p>student work above average or outstanding when compared to relevant standards AND candidate's influence is documented</p> <p>acknowledged favorably by audiences beyond IPFW, according to standards in the discipline</p>
<p><b>Competitions</b></p>	<p>student participation in project-based academic competitions</p>	<p>mentors / advises students in a local or regional competition</p>	<p>mentors / advises students in a state, national or international competition</p> <p>student team achieves award</p>
<p><b>Other Evidence Related to Teaching Performance</b></p>	<p>Quantitative and qualitative information about teaching and learning outcomes</p>		

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<b>EVALUATING CURRICULUM CONTRIBUTIONS</b>			
<p>„one who displays a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads him/her to develop and strengthen course content in light of developments of the field, as well as to improve methods of presenting material.” (Section C.1, SD 88-25)</p> <p>“Teaching includes not only classroom instruction, but all other activities with a direct bearing on student learning.” (“Teaching”, SD 94-3)</p>			
<b>Category of Evidence</b>	<b>Types of Evidence</b>	<b>Rubrics– satisfactory/good</b>	<b>Rubrics– excellent/outstanding</b>
<b>Continuous Improvement of Courses Taught on a Regular Basis</b>	syllabi; course materials; instructor reflection; peer review of materials	evidence of continuing review and reflection on teaching practice in light of student feedback, peer review, and developments in the field	evidence of continuing review, reflection on, and changes in teaching practice in light of student feedback, peer review and developments in the field AND that changes are successful  documents evidence over time, paying particular attention to whether results are consistent with new research and/or theory related to the course innovations
<b>New Courses/ Curriculum / Programs Developed</b>	proposals for new courses, curricula, programs  syllabi, other course materials	curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of outcomes  course, curriculum or program is approved, offered and well received  syllabi, other course materials developed have been peer reviewed	course is integrated into curriculum (dept. major or General Education)  course/curriculum/program attracts new audience  course/curriculum/program helps university meet strategic goals (e.g., diversity; regional needs)  syllabi, other course materials developed have been peer reviewed  dissemination of ideas related to curricular development within the profession
<b>First Year Experience Courses Developed or Transformed</b>	course materials: files (electronic, CD, video, etc.), instructor reflection, peer review	course reflects purposeful incorporation of first year theories AND there is evidence that the course impacts student success	course reflects best practices in first year theory and engagement application AND there is evidence that the course impacts student success

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<p><b>Distance Learning (DL) Transformation of Course(s)</b> for DL or new course developed for DL</p>	<p>Pedagogical practices: course materials: files (electronic, CD, video, virtual labs, etc.), instructor reflection, peer review</p>	<p>course or hybrid components reflect purposeful use of technology to support learning goals AND there is evidence that the course positively impacts student success</p> <p>If this is a distance learning transformation, student success in course is equal to that in traditional courses</p>	<p>course or hybrid components reflects best practices in DL teaching per appropriate standards AND significant positive impact on student learning is documented</p> <p>Using distance learning or hybrid pedagogy to provide learning and student outcome benefits that are unavailable in face-to-face instruction.</p> <p>If this is a distance learning transformation, student success in course is equal to or exceeds that of traditional courses</p> <p>course is a model for others, as evidenced by internal and external peer evaluation and dissemination of outcomes</p>
<p><b>Diversity Transformation of Course(s)</b></p>	<p>course materials: files (manual, electronic, CD, video, etc.), instructor reflection, peer review</p>	<p>course reflects change and purposeful incorporation of diversity to support learning goals</p> <p>Positive impact on student learning is documented</p>	<p>course reflects best practices in diversity engagement</p> <p>Significant positive impact on student learning is documented</p> <p>course is a model for others, as evidenced by internal/external peer review and dissemination of outcomes</p>
<p><b>Teaching Methods/ Pedagogical Practices</b></p>	<p>methods used consistently</p> <p>new methods developed and/or applied</p> <p>integration of technology</p> <p>active learning techniques (e.g., projects, case method, group/team learning, hands-on, etc.)</p> <p>service learning or other experiential learning</p>	<p>favorably received by students, favorably reviewed by peers</p> <p>(same as above, as appropriate;)</p> <p>new methods are successfully used by colleagues on campus</p> <p>use of technology is aligned with learning goals</p> <p>techniques are appropriate to course, level, discipline, and linked to learning outcomes</p> <p>activity is appropriate to course, relevant to service agency or other environment, and linked to learning outcomes</p>	<p>methods are selected by a reflective process</p> <p>evidence that multiple methods have been incorporated or attempted</p> <p>evidence that methods are innovative and effective as evidenced by outcome measures and internal/external peer review</p> <p>new methods are successfully used by peers beyond IPFW</p> <p>evidence that use of technology is effective in achieving goals</p> <p>technique meets criteria for "satisfactory" and demonstrates positive impact on learning</p> <p>activity meets criteria for "satisfactory" and demonstrates positive impact on learning</p>

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<b>Assessment of Student Learning</b>	syllabi and assessment instruments; instructor reflection; peer review	clear link between assessment methods and learning objectives	use of assessment results for continuous improvement of student learning
<b>Program Assessment</b>	development of assessment activities  professional development workshops and conferences  implementation of assessment activities	participation in the development of effective program assessment activities  participation in on or off campus assessment professional development opportunities  implementation of departmental assessment activities	leadership in the development of effective program assessment activities  presentation in on or off campus assessment conferences  analysis and use of results of assessment to improve student learning
<b>Professional Development</b>	conferences, workshops attended	participation in activity  record of participation in, reflection of, and pursuit of knowledge related to teaching and learning  peer assessment of activity	extensive record of participation in, reflection of, and pursuit of knowledge related to teaching and learning  evidence of impact on one's teaching  peer assessment of activity
<b>Mentoring of Colleagues</b>	peer review of colleagues' teaching  mentors colleagues new to a particular course  peer evaluation of colleagues' teaching-related products  developing/ conducting training workshops	has contributed to understanding and application of peer review as a means of improving teaching  active participation as a peer reviewer (if mentoring process was confidential, no data are available)  (see above)  workshops favorably received by colleagues, as documented by evaluations  colleagues report favorable impact on their teaching	has demonstrated leadership in understanding and application of peer review as a means of improving teaching    evidence of impact  independent evidence that workshops were effective, as evidenced by evaluations / peer review

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<b>Non-credit courses, trainings or significant workshops and certifications programs taught/developed</b>	course syllabi, training materials, instructor reflection	courses are well received by participants and they acknowledge course meets a need or personal / program objective	effectiveness of courses is acknowledged by other evaluators as appropriate (chair, curriculum committee, etc.)
<b>Program Accreditation</b>	review documents; report from accreditors	participates in accreditation process (committee member; contributes to activities of review)	leadership role in the accreditation process
<b>Other Evidence of Contributions to Course/Curriculum Development</b>			

**DOCUMENTING EXTERNAL RECOGNITION**

“If teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidates performance should be clearly superior to the standard of acceptability at IPFW” (“Teaching”, SD 94-3)

“Promotion to Professor is awarded to individuals recognized by professional peers as authorities in their fields” (Section D.3., SD 88-25)

<b>Category of Evidence</b>	<b>Types of Evidence</b>	<b>Rubrics– good/satisfactory</b>	<b>Rubrics– excellent/outstanding</b>
<b>Instructional / Content Publications and Works</b>  Includes papers/presentations, etc. that provide content for courses or are used as references by practitioners in the field	Peer reviewed textbooks, articles, edited volumes, workbooks, CDs, digital works, manuals, distance and virtual materials	Evaluated as satisfactory by knowledgeable peers on campus or within the profession according to recognized standards  Disseminated internally	Evaluated as excellent by knowledgeable peers internally, externally and within the profession according to recognized standards  Disseminated internally and externally
<b>Pedagogical Publications</b> Includes papers / presentations that are informed by teaching or about teaching methods	Peer-reviewed articles, publications, presentations	presented at local or regional conferences, workshops	published and presented at state, national or international conferences  outside reviewers identify work as advancing the field

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<p><b>Pedagogical Research</b> Includes papers / presentations that are informed by teaching or about teaching methods and are based on primary or secondary research</p> <p><i>*Generally, pedagogical publications that have a conceptual/theoretical orientation and that provide evidence that the efficacy of the pedagogy has been systematically studied and evaluated may be cross-referenced under research (OAA Memorandum 99-1)</i></p>	<p>peer reviewed publications, presentations</p>	<p>presented at local or regional conferences, workshops</p>	<p>published and presented at state, national or international conferences</p> <p>outside reviewers identify work as advancing the field</p>
<p><b>Program Accreditation</b></p>	<p>review documents; report from accreditors</p>	<p>participates in accreditation process (committee member; contributes to activities of review)</p>	<p>leadership role in the accreditation process</p>
<p><b>Teaching Awards</b></p>	<p>peer reviewed award</p>	<p>nominated for award but did not receive</p>	<p>received award (department, school/college, IPFW system, state, regional, national)</p> <p>selectivity of award</p>
<p><b>Grants for course/curriculum transformation or innovation</b></p>	<p>peer reviewed grant proposal</p>	<p>proposal submitted but not funded (peer reviewed)</p> <p>grant received from local / regional funders</p> <p>project successfully completed</p>	<p>grant received from state / national funders</p> <p>project successfully completed</p> <p>evidence of significance from outside reviewers</p>

**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS P&T RESOURCES**

**August 8, 2003**

**Revised 12/3/07**

<p><b>Involvement in Professional Organizations Devoted to Teaching</b></p>	<p>officer in the organization</p> <p>editor of pedagogical journal or newsletter</p> <p>reviewer for refereed pedagogical journals, conference; textbook reviewer, etc.</p> <p>organizer of conferences or conference sessions</p> <p>manage electronic discussion forum related to teaching</p> <p>member of task force</p>	<p>review of performance by peers</p> <p>quality and quantity of issues edited</p> <p>invitation to review materials</p> <p>success of events; quality of resulting products</p> <p>peers who participate in forum find it useful, user-friendly</p> <p>significance of role (chair? responsible for major part?), etc.</p> <p>significance of outcome</p>	<p>impact of the individual's contributions on the goals of the organizations</p> <p>quality and quantity, plus impact</p> <p>reviewer activities are ongoing and serve multiple venues</p> <p>success and quality, plus impact</p> <p>peer responses, plus impact</p> <p>significance of role, plus impact</p> <p>significance of outcome, plus impact</p>
<p><b>Other evidence of teaching accomplishments recognized by peers</b></p>	<p><b>Teaching artifacts</b></p>	<p><b>local</b></p>	<p><b>regional; national; international</b></p>