|  |
| --- |
| **Sample 1 - General alignment with pillars and includes SPOTs as data point**  |
| **Points** |
|   | **Unsatisfactory (1)**  | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Outstanding (5)** | **Rating (1-5 for each row)** |
| **Alignment\* with the pillars of Excellent Teaching at FIU: Learning-Centered, Evidence-Based, and/or Inclusive Teaching**  | Alignment is not addressed or the use of data is misaligned with the pillars (ie data collected would not reasonably inform any of the pillars). | The data/information collected from all three (3) sources would reasonably inform a faculty's efforts in at least one of the pillars.  | Faculty explicitly articluates how data/information collected from the data sources has informed their growth towards, development in, and/or leadership in at least one of the pillars. | Faculty has a cohesive evaluation plan that is aligned withat least one of the pillars and is indicative of transformative practices. Faculty clearly connects data/information collected to teaching goals and changes in and/or sharing of instructional practice(s) to at least one of the pillars. | Faculty has a comprehensive evaluation plan that is aligned with more than one of the pillars and can/does serve as a model of a reflective teaching practioner. Connection to more than one pillar is evident in identifying important goal(s), the use of mulitple perspectives/data sources to inform progress toward the goal(s), demonstrates critical self analysis, and connects evaluation to future work.  |   |
|
|
| **Peer source** | No use of peer source | Pro forma use of peer source | Peer source used but with limited reported impact / Not very thoughtfully conceived or utilized | Faculty uses data collected from peer to explore teaching and/or change instructional design/practice | Highly effective / Highly collaborative / High mutuality evident from results of peer feedback/collaboration |   |
| **Student source** | Reports only SPOTs data with no evaluative commentary/analysis | Pro forma use of student source.  | Information from student source gathered, but not thoughtfully analyzed / used to inform teaching decisions | Faculty uses data collected from students to explore teaching and/or change instructional design/practice | Excellent gathering, analysis, and use of student source |   |
| **Self as data source** | No self data | Pro forma reflection with no or limited supporting information. | Self data/information limited to reflective narrative at end of semester/year. Reflection thoughtful and structured around pillars and data sources  | Self data/information is indicative of systematic effort to explore instructional design through critical self analysis. It is evident that faculty uses data/information gathered from self to identify ways to grow in teaching effectiveness | Self data/information collection is ongoing and shows critical awareness of the impact of instructional design on student performance and/or behaviors. It is evident that data/information collected from self is a key tool in structuring learning environments and/or creating/modifying course content. |   |
| **SPOTs relative to GPA**Note: In the course of making changes to course content and/or instructional design, faculty may see no change or actually see decrease in performance. This is a part of the growth process and should be recognized as such during annual review. | Unsatisfactory SPOTs | Poor SPOTs | Good SPOTs | SPOTs very good and GPA within expected range, or explanation for deviation. | SPOTs excellent and GPA within expected range, or explanation for deviation |   |
| **Other considerations (e.g., additional sources, courses taught, course enrollment, stage of faculty member's career)** | The chair may choose to add or subtract up to two points to the subtotal to account for special circumstances.When the chair exercises this option, they will inform the faculty and provide the reason for the adjustment.  |   |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Average** |   |
| *\*Alignment with one or more of the pillars refers to the extent to which faculty address/highlight how the data they have collected from students, peers, and/or themselves informs their progress and/or leadership in instructional practices that are:*  |  |  |  |
|   | Learning-centered | Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in *learning-centered teaching* are working to improve student learning outcomes. This is frequently characterized by targeting particularly challenging or commonly misunderstood concepts/behaviors, adjusting teaching & learning strategies to target learning in that area, and measuring learning outcomes to gauge improvement over time or to compare to other groups. |  |  |
|   | Evidence-based | Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in *evidence-based teaching* are building a teaching practice that uses data/information to make decisions about instructional design and/or practices. This can include using practices supported by the education research literatrure but also includes faculty using data from their own classrooms. A common challege for faculty is the acquisition of enough quality information to confidently make decisions about instruction. However, one-of pieces of information can provide crucial insight for positive change. How faculty interpret and then use data/information can also be informed by the literature on teaching and learning. |  |  |
|   | Inclusive | Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in *inclusive* teaching are working to establish learning environments in which students' identities are recognized and respected and, in the best scenarios, used as a resource in the learning process. Inclusive teaching, which includes culturally responsive teaching, can be characterized by an asset view of students and their experiences; challenging cooperative learning tasks; clear expectations and criteria for performance; assignments that highlight personal, community, and/or career relevance; and/or opportunities for students to help each other learn.  |  |  |