

Teaching Excellence Guidelines for Tenure Track Faculty **Mid-Tenure Review**

Beginning Fall 2016

Teaching Excellence Definition

Excellence in teaching elicits students learning that makes sustained, substantial and positive improvement in students' ability to demonstrate content knowledge, engage in critical thinking, and apply skills in work settings.

Teaching Excellence Components

Input of Standards:

- Aligned with discipline related standards
- Aligned with SACS & university standards

Teaching Process and Strategies:

- Discipline Expertise (content knowledge and skills knowledge)
- Curriculum Design and Development (Syllabi , rubrics, learning activities)
- Teaching instructional practices and performance (teaching methods and assessment instruction)
- Learning and Teaching environment (leadership style, interpersonal communication)
- Reflective practice (instructor reflection)
- Professional Development in discipline and pedagogy

Outcome:

- Student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes (documents)
- Peer-reviewed achievements
- Field supervisor feedback and student accomplishments

Recognizing that each faculty member has strengths in different areas, the following rubric is intended to give latitude for faculty members to provide evidence for various items. In other words, faculty members are NOT expected to provide evidence for each item listed. Rather, faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence for their self-selected items in each category. It is recognized that evidence will vary based on assigned courses, programs, etc.

Ratings:

- **Excellence in Teaching** = Excellent in most categories but not all with no category below expectations
- **Meets Expectations in Teaching** = Meets expectations in most categories with no category below expectations
- **Below Expectations in Teaching** = Does not achieve rating of meets expectations in teaching or better in all 5 categories.

CATEGORY Required	Excellence	Meets Expectations (Improvement Needed)	Below Expectations (Unacceptable)
1. Curriculum Improvement and Teaching Related Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Curriculum and course improvement including syllabi aligned with standards, rubrics, learning activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited evidence of course improvement• Limited evidence of effective advising or mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of evidence for Curriculum improvement and Teaching Related Service

<p>Describe your progress and achievements in the areas to the right over the course of the last three years:</p>	<p>AND UNT Dallas Mission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising or mentoring • Successful teaching innovation that led to improved student learning • Extensive feedback in Writing Intensive Courses, if applicable • New Course development • Experiential, including service learning • Scholarly activities with students (e.g. Independent Studies, co-authored scholarship; co-presentation at conference), Service Learning • Other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evidence of innovation and of a positive impact on learning • Incomplete feedback • Limited inclusion of experiential learning 	
<p>2. Teaching Evaluations from Supervisor and Peers and Self Evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent Teaching Evaluations of <u>4.0</u> or above on a 5 point scale or justification for a lower score • Peer teaching evaluation of <u>4.0</u> or above on a 5 point scale or justification for a lower score • Other types of peer-evaluation of teaching activity • Other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most recent Teaching Evaluation of <u>3.0</u> to 3.9 on a 5 point scale or justification for a lower score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most recent Teaching Evaluation <u>below 3.0</u> on a 5 point scale
<p>3. Student Evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoursEval scores trend above 3.5 on a 4 point scale or justification for lower score (e.g. grade distribution, content, delivery method, non-elective) • Trend of positive student comments on CoursEval over the past few years • No pattern of substantiated formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoursEval scores trend toward <u>3.0</u> on a 4 point scale or justification for lower score (e.g. grade distribution, content, delivery method, non-elective) • Limited positive student comments on CoursEval • A few substantiated formal student complaints to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoursEval scores trend <u>below 2.5</u> on a 4 point scale or • Lacking positive student comments on CoursEval • Numerous substantiated formal student complaints to the Chair

	student complaints to the program coordinator or dean	Chair, but corrective action was taken	
4. Professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly articulated teaching philosophy statement appropriate for discipline Scholarly-based reformation of classes Attendance at teaching workshops leading to successful pedagogical innovations Other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited professional development and/or limited evidence of its application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence for Academic preparation and ongoing professional development
5. Outcome based Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated Student achievement (i.e. student documents demonstrating SLO improvement; standardized test scores if applicable; student awards, student conference presentations, or achievements as result of course) Documented student awareness and skills Field supervisors' or employers' feedback is consistently positive Other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evidence of SLO outcome assessment and/or application of results to subsequent teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence

Teaching Narrative

1. Discuss your Curriculum Improvement and Teaching Related Service (Hyperlink documents)

2. Discuss your Teaching Observations (Supervisor and/or Peer) and Self Evaluations (Hyperlink documents)

3. Discuss your Student feedback (Hyperlink documents)

4. Discuss your professional development. Include your teaching philosophy appropriate for your discipline. (Hyperlink documents)

5. Discuss your Outcome based Evidence (Hyperlink documents)

