|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SAMPLE 3 - Criteria based on number of activities** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
|  | **Unsatisfactory (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (3)** | **Outstanding (5)** | **Rating** |
| **Alignment\* between evaluation activities with one or more of the teaching pillars as reported by faculty** | No alignment between selection of evaluation activities and the teaching pillars across all three data sources | Alignment between evaluation activities and teaching pillars is minimal or somewhat evident, with connections more clearly communicated for some data sources than others | Alignment between evaluation activities and teaching pillars is evident across all three data sources. Faculty provide connections between the pillars and the evalulation activities they engaged in, to some extent for all three data sources. | Alignment between evaluation activities and teaching pillars is clearly evident across all three data sources. For **at least one** of the data sources, faculty provide a strong case for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples. | Alignment between evaluation activities and teaching pillars is strong across all three data sources. For **all three** data sources, faculty provide a powerful argument for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples. |  |
|
|
| **Peer Data** | Faculty **did not** report engaging in evaluation activities to collect peer feedback **OR** engaged in activities that are not included in the department's teaching evaluation guidelines **OR** previously approved by the department | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers | Faculty reported engaging in **more than 1** evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers | Faculty reported engaging in **more than 2** evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers that was more comprehensive in nature |  |
| **Student Data** | Overall rating of instructor average on SPOTs instrument is less than 2. | SPOTs satifies this requirement. All faculty should receive at least a 2 | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect student data in addition to SPOTs | Faculty reported engaging in **more than 1** evaluation activity to collect student data in addition to SPOTs | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect student data in addition to SPOTs that was more comprehensive in nature |  |
| **Self Data** | Faculty **did not** report engaging in evaluation activities to collect self data **OR** engaged in activities that are not included in the department's teaching evaluation guidelines **OR** previously approved by the department | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect self data | Faculty reported engaging in **more than 1** evaluation activity to collect self data | Faculty reported engaging in **more than 2** evaluation activity to collect self data | Faculty reported engaging in **at least 1** evaluation activity to collect self data that was more comprehensive in nature |  |
| **Instructional Planning** | Faculty failed to make any connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to outcomes in their course and/or describe any changes they could potentially make to their course(s) based on that evidence. | Faculty made loose connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to general outcomes in their course(s) and/or describe some broad changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with the teaching pillars is *not clearly* evident. | Faculty made explicit connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to general outcomes in their course(s) and/or describe broad changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with **at least one** of the teaching pillars is *somewhat* evident. | Faculty made explicit connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to specific outcomes in their course(s) and/or outline distinct changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with **at least one** of the teaching pillars is *directly* evident. | Faculty made explicit and systematic connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to specific outcomes in their course(s) and/or outline distinct changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with **more than one** of the teaching pillars is *directly* evident. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |
| **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 |  |