Annual Teaching Evaluation

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE)
College of Engineering and Computing
Dr. Armin Mehrabi, Dr. Amal Elawady, and Dr. Mohammed Hadi

FIU is committed to enhancing the processes of evaluating teaching on a regular basis annually and at critical milestones. The university has recently initiated the Evaluating Teaching project to determine the current practice of teaching evaluation in all colleges and among different departments and to develop plans for improvement to this process. The project aims to encourage faculty collaboration, learning, and growth toward learning-centered, evidence-based and culturally responsive teaching; and to provide academic leaders with more and better data for summative decision-making. In spring 2018, six FIU departments worked with the project team to develop proposals to update evaluating teaching practices and policies. The project continued in the Fall of 2018 to develop department-specific evaluating teaching processes. The Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) department, among others, was identified as a collaborating department this semester. The collaborative effort has worked to lay the foundation for a disciplinary perspective on this comprehensive, university-wide initiative. This proposal is the product of work performed by three representatives from CEE department. The goal is to begin implementing the new evaluation process on a trial basis in Fall 2019, and potentially migrate the teaching evaluating to the new process in Fall 2020. The goal is for the faculty to start the trial process in 2019 by implementing at least one of the three input sources (Students, Peer, Self).   It is envisioned that the faculty themselves will gather the information and synthesize the outcomes of the student, self, and/or peer activities they choose to engage in, and post these summaries in Panther 180 that will be only available to the Department Chair.

1. Context

The purpose of this section is to introduce the Evaluating Teaching project; specifically, to describe why the proposal includes three sources of evidence (i.e. peer, student, and self), and present FIU's vision of teaching excellence.

 Teaching, which is defined based on the relationship between the teacher and the student and the choices that we make in our course design and in our physical and virtual classrooms, have a powerful effect on our students. We often say that we want to teach students to become life-long (sic) learners. Traditionally, it has been the student's voice at the end of the semester which has been the guide in most cases on how instructors rethink the vision of the course for the future. Current research indicates that while students are able to assess certain aspects of the teaching style and efficiency based on their experience, their evaluations can be problematic because they lack the macro perspective in the field of study and may be biased against gender, ethnicity, appearance, etc. Although the student's voice remains highly valuable, a more inclusive approach has proved to be effective and complementary by also inscribing the voice of peers and the self into the evaluation dialogue. Peer and self-evaluation can provide comprehensive teaching evaluation perspective that include items that students will not consider in their

evaluation such as, among others, student engagement, active learning activities, class accommodation for different types of students including those with disabilities or different learning capabilities.

FIU's vision of teaching emphasizes explicitly incorporating the three pillars of teaching excellence: i.e., Learning Centered, Evidence Based, and Culturally Responsive to our students. This prescribes to the notion of learning (as opposed to the 'teaching' model), the use of evidence collected in our own classrooms, literature, as well as in the broader teaching community, and being responsive to diverse culture in the classroom, inclusion, encouragement and engagement. More details are provided in Section 4 "Rationale for the Changes".

2. Current Practices

The purpose of this section is to examine current practices of teaching evaluation, and to ensure that the proposed new process reflects the strengths and limitations of our department's current practices for evaluating teaching.

The following is the team's understanding of current process of teaching evaluation in the CEE department:

- **Faculty Teaching Evaluation forms one segment of the Annual Faculty Evaluation by the Chair of the Department.**
- **The results from Student Perceptions of Teaching Survey (SPOT) is presented in a table format within the annual evaluation showing # of students in class, # of students responded, and average rating by students.**
- **The Department average rating is also included in this table for comparison.**
- **The results are interpreted by the Chair in the annual evaluation under "Teaching" title.**
- **The evaluation results are summarized in a table titled "Overall Summary" in the annual evaluation under one of three possible rating of "Below Expectation", "At Expectation", and "Above Expectation."**
- **Other teaching activities such as MS and Ph.D. supervision are also considered in the evaluation.**

Based on evaluation of current process in accordance with current literature on teaching excellence, the following are the inferred strengths and weaknesses/limitations:

Strengths:
- **The SPOT evaluation gives the Chair one of the tools necessary to evaluate teaching.**
- **This process provides opportunity for additional input by the Chair.**
- **SPOT evaluation provides feedback to faculty that could be used to improve the process and content to the extent possible by the scope of the questions.**

Weakness:
- **Includes only input from one source of evidence. Does not have direct input from other sources of evidence. e.g., peers, chair, and alumni.**

- **The SPOT questions are very generic and not necessarily suited to each specific discipline/field.**
- **SPOT evaluation can be affected by factors not directly related to teaching excellence such as grades given in the course. It can be biased by factors such as gender, personality, etc.**
- **SPOT evaluation does not cover the skills and knowledge expected to be taught by the course that are not known to the students.**
- **The questions in the SPOT evaluation are not detailed or specific enough to point to specific problems in delivery, content and conduct of the course.**

3. Proposed Practices

The purpose of this section is to provide our colleagues with concrete examples of activities they might engage in to collect data based on the required three sources of evidence (i.e. peer, student, and self) and work toward the vision of evidence-based, learning-centered, and culturally responsive teaching.

Note: While the intent is not to ask that faculty work toward all three pillars of excellence every year, it asks that every faculty member include evidence from the perspectives of Peer, Student, and Self every year. The Panther180 teaching section will be updated to align with this project and expectations. It will include three text boxes, one per source.

During the academic year, faculty are asked to engage in one or more of the proposed new (or refined) evaluation activities, at least one per data source: peer, student, self. Then, during the annual review, faculty will themselves synthesize the outcomes of the student, self, and peer activities they chose to engage in and post these summaries in Panther 180, together with any supplemental documents they wish to upload. This annual summary is a separate activity from engaging in the new/refined teaching evaluation activities during the academic year. In this document, the term "throughout the academic year" is to describe the activities to be engaged in throughout the year and "one per academic year" to describe this annual summary.

3.1 Proposed Practices: Peer Perspective

In the CEE department, there is not much interaction on the teaching side. More collaboration is happening on the research side among small groups of faculty in the department (3-5 faculty on each research area). An idea is to advance this collaboration and extend it to teaching activities. The following are the proposed activities, faculty can perform throughout the year as well as once a year in relation with peer evidences. Peer feedback in our department is limited to personal conversation between faculty on students learning background, level and success in implementing specific evaluation tools (exams, HW, and quizzes), and sometimes sharing syllabus. Based on current literature, the following count as peers;

1. Colleague as collaborator (working on a shared project such as designing a new assignment)

2. Colleague as co-learner (of teaching scholarship, a new instructional practice or tool, etc.)
3. Colleague as student (offering possible student reactions to course materials, exercises)
4. Colleague as questioner (asking about pedagogical beliefs or course policies, for ex.)
5. Colleague as critic (constructively disagreeing, identifying practices that may limit learning)
6. Colleague as advocate (speaking publicly about policies that enhance or compromise learning)
7. Colleague as confidant (listening to one's joys and struggles)

3.1.1 Throughout the Academic Year. (For more details and descriptions refer to
https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-professor-blog/peer-review-strategies-better-teaching/*)*

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Classroom Visit: Dispense with all thoughts of what's done for the promotion and tenure review. Instead, truly observe and experience what it's like to be in one another's classroom, and then have follow-up conversations after each visit.	**Evidence-based:** ● Peers can identify and even record what students are doing in your class while you are focused on teaching such as what types of questions they ask, which students are engaged and which ones are not, etc. ● A critical friend can tell you what it is like to sit through one of your classes in a way that is honest and supportive. ● The visitor might seek evidence of the instructor helping students organize course concepts to build appropriate understanding of the material. **Learning-centeredness:** ● Since "the one who does the work does the learning," a peer can focus on who is doing the work and make suggestions re: shifting the workload to students. ● Classroom visitors who are also experts in the content area can provide subject matter expertise on the presentation of the content with regard to level of rigor, accuracy,	**Evidence/records you can collect:** ● Field observation protocols for student engagement ● Observation notes on a specific element of the class such as how much wait time is allotted for a question or at what point in the class do students appear most engaged. ● Class notes annotated for content delivery. **How you might share it:** ● If you engage peer observations more than once you can report improvements in areas you targeted based on the original observation ● General description of findings/ observations from peer with explanation of new

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
	flow, accessibility, speed, representation, etc. **Cultural responsiveness:** ● If you partner with someone from a different background (discipline, gender, nationality, ethnicity), they will likely notice elements of your teaching or interaction with students invisible to you. ● A peer may look for patterns in terms of student groups not or less engaged during the session (or in online forums). Learning who is not engaged in your class may reveal implicit biases that, once uncovered, can be addressed. ● Consider: What evidence did you observe of the class climate being a good fit for students' social, emotional, or intellectual needs? What active engagement among students did you see?	practices you want to try ● Summary and analysis*
Canvas Review -- Whether it's a face-to-face, hybrid, or fully online course, colleagues can be added as guests to your Canvas course to examine the course content, instructional design, student responses to discussion	**Learning-centeredness:** ● Use the learning-centered syllabus checklist 🖻 ● Review of discussion board questions for clarity, depth and meaning can ensure high quality discussions that encourage students to challenge their own ideas as well as others'. ● In web-assisted or fully online domains, we cannot depend on nonverbal cues to mitigate words that may trigger unintended reactions. Have a peer check a Canvas course for tone. **Evidence-based practice:**	**Evidence/records you can collect:** ● Annotated syllabus checklist ● Peer evaluation of student responses to discussion board ● Annotated QM rubric **How you might share it:** ● Before and after screenshot of Canvas homepage with description and brief rationale for changes

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
questions, etc. Because there are no clear boundaries on a class period and so many possible components to review, it is crucial to discuss the instructor's desired scope and aims.	● Use the QM rubric for online courses, as it is based on research on instructional design **Cultural responsiveness:** Evaluate online/hybrid tasks using the TILT model outlined in row two of this table	● Summary of how your discussion board questions evolved after peer feedback along with samples of improved discussion threads. This may include changes in how boards were managed. ● Summary and analysis*
Syllabus Exchange – Read your colleague's syllabus carefully, noting what you' conclude about the course and the instructor if this was the first introduction to both. Then exchange reactions. "If I was taking this course, here's the questions I'd have." "After looking at this, here's what I'd think about the instructor and how he/she will be conducting the course."	**Learning-centeredness:** ● Use the learning-centered syllabus checklist to identify strengths and areas for refinement. ● Focusing on the 1) course learning goals, 2) description of the assessments, and 3) main learning activities, consider the level of consistency and alignment among the three areas. **Evidence-based practice:** ● Use the list of "Identified Best Practices for Evidence-Based Teaching" to look for markers in the syllabus related to these best practices, e.g. a syllabus might explicitly discuss plans for timely and targeted feedback. **Cultural responsiveness:** Consider: Does the course description communicate what students will learn and why the course is important (e.g. relevance to future coursework, career, and civic life), written in student-friendly language? Personal relevance is particularly important for	**Evidence/records you can collect:** ● Completed and/or annotated checklist ● A table that delineates the alignment between goals, assessments, and activities with comments suggestions places with strong alignment and others where the alignment is not clear. ● Peer provided list matching best practices to parts of the syllabus with suggestions for refinement ● Peer friendly critique of course description in syllabus focusing on one or two elements such as student-friendly language or

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
	students from traditionally underserved groups, as it increases the resonance of the learning experience and helps engender self-efficacy.	relevance to future coursework ● Notes from the review process **How you might share it:** ● List of areas on the syllabus that were modified, how they were modified, and rationale for modification. ● A brief description of rationale for getting peer feedback on syllabus (students do not read it, desire for it to be a learning tool, etc), general statement of recommendation from peer, and changes made. ● Summary and analysis*
Jointly Implement Something New – It doesn't have to be a highly innovative approach or something that requires lots of extra preparation. For example, the two of you may decide you'd like to try a different approach to quizzing. Pay attention to what	**Evidence-based practice:** ● Being able to support the decision to use a promising practice, citing education research, requires familiarity with current trends and learning principles. ● Working with a peer to consider and cite what others have done and then agreeing upon modifications requires understanding of why an innovation might work for your teaching needs and our student body. ● Building on the work of others is a cornerstone of the academy. **Learning-centeredness:**	**Evidence/records you can collect:** Work together with your partner to produce any/all of the following: ● A rationale for testing a practice along with annotated citations ● Reviewer notes from education research or content area expert ● Observations of each other's classrooms while implementing new practice.

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
happened and then get together to talk about the results and their implications.	- Measure learning gains associated with content, affective, or skill objective(s) that the new approach is designed to target. - Adjusting what students are doing and checking to see if it increases learning outcomes, is by definition, learning-centered. **Cultural responsiveness:** Select a new approach (perhaps from the ones described in the Overview of Culturally Responsive Teaching) that is explicitly culturally-responsive, e.g. building relevance into the curriculum. Making connections to future coursework, professional skills/knowledge, and/or future decision making increases student motivation, time-on-task, and learning.	- Assessment of learning instrument validity - Evidence of learning gains: data, analysis and conclusions **How you might share it:** - A report of the innovation project with outcomes and implications for future iterations - Presentation of the innovation, outcomes, and implications. Can be at FISSS, DBER (Links to an external site.)Links to an external site., department meeting, or local conference - A paired reflection on the innovation process with focus on the collaboration - Summary and analysis*.

3.1.2 Once per Academic Year.

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Summarize and Analyze Peer Activities.	Align evaluation with all 3 aspects of Learner-based, Evidence-based, and Culturally Responsive Teaching.	Collect Analysis Results in the form of written summary, charts, and tables. Share Summary with Chair.

3.2. Proposed Practices: Student Perspective

Using evidence from students for teaching evaluation aims to expand the notion of what counts as evidence from students, beyond SPOTs, that can inform our evaluation of teaching.

3.2.1   Throughout the Academic Year

The following are the proposed activities, in addition to SPOT or Modified SPOT.

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Student Focus Groups - Instructors can convene a small group of students (ideally 5-8) to answer specific questions related to their teaching and course design. Both Martin, Dennehy, & Morgan (2013) (Links to an	**Evidence-based practice:** ● The process of using student feedback to make adjustments to curriculum and/or instructional design is a form of evidence-based practice. See the overview of evidence-based practice in Session 1. **Cultural responsiveness:** Use information from focus groups to gain deeper understanding of SPOTs results, both quantitative and qualitative. Students will share in focus groups what they would otherwise not provide	**Evidence/records you can collect:** ● Notes/quotes from the focus group session(s) with names and identifying features deleted. ● Analysis and/or report from the person guiding the focus groups ● Video of the focus group (if permission

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
external site.)Links to an external site.) and Fife (2007) outline important factors to consider when structuring student focus groups, and provide suggestions for conducting them effectively.	in survey questionnaires (Brits & du Plessis, 2007)	has been granted by all of the participants). ● Transcript analysis for themes. **How you might share it:** ● Excerpts from the group conversation and the facilitator's notes/report. ● Written synopsis of themes and/or areas for improvement along with plans adjustments to instructional design. ● Summary and analysis*
Classroom Assessment/Quizzes, Graded or Ungraded, written or verbal	**Learning Centered-** Students can form groups and have the chance to learn from the process and each other, with input from instructor **Evidence-based** Results can provide evidence of learning **Culturally Responsive** Students involvement and interaction will encourage inclusion and assertiveness	**Evidence/Records** Assessment results can be collected for evaluation **How you might share** The results can be evaluated with previous periods and average increases in grades can be shared as progress toward learning
Group Projects and Presentations	**Learning Centered-** Students form groups and have the chance to learn from the process and each other, with input from instructor **Evidence-based** Results can provide evidence of learning **Culturally Responsive** Students involvement and interaction will encourage inclusion and assertiveness	**Evidence/Records** Assessment results can be collected for evaluation **How you might share** The results can be evaluated and shared as average progress toward learning

3.2.2   Once per Academic Year.

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Summarize and Analyze Student Input throughout the year	Align evaluation with all 3 aspects of Learner-based, Evidence-based, and Culturally Responsive Teaching	Collect Analysis Results in the form of written summary, charts, and tables Share Summary with Chair

3.3 Proposed Practices: Self-Reflection & Reporting:

The followings are methods for collecting self-assessment data that aligns with the three pillars of FIU's Vision of Teaching Excellence, as well as examples of ways we might document and report the findings are presented
.

3.3.1 Throughout the Academic Year.

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Post-class (or module) self-check: After a teaching session or online course module, take 5 minutes or so to jot down thoughts on: What went well? What could I have done differently? How will I modify my instruction in the future?	**Learning-centeredness:** ● Focus your self-check on how much progress students are making toward the learning goals **Evidence-based practice:** ● Note how many evidence-based practices you used or new ones you might try to address challenges **Cultural responsiveness:** Focus your log on the class climate, the extent to which all parties feel respected by and connected to one another; and/or your ability to connect with students whose identities differ from yours	**Evidence/records you can collect:** Keep a log (text , video, or audio) to track your progress and improvement over time . **How you might share it:** ● Quotes or excerpts from your log ● Summary and analysis

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Journaling – "If we want to learn from experience, then we must reflect on it," writes Weimer, adding that reflection works by integrating, taking stock, and by helping continue our learning as well as our teaching (Links to an external site.)Links to an external site..	In general, journaling can include responding to guiding questions related to each of the pillars. Here are examples for each: **Learning-centeredness:** ● Have I planned educational experiences to promote student learning and engagement, provided students with timely feedback and with reflection opportunities, and used effective processes and tools to assess students? **Evidence-based practice:** ● Have I examined quantitative or qualitative evidence of my students' learning? Do I have sufficient, up-to-date knowledge of the scholarship of teaching and learning/education research in my field? **Cultural responsiveness:** Have I cultivated an inclusive environment conducive to learning, one in which all parties feel respected by and connected to one another? Do teaching/learning experiences include student perspectives and values, and harness students' knowledge, abilities, and strengths?	**Evidence/records you can collect:** The journal itself is a form of record-keeping. **How you might share it:** ● Excerpts from your journal ● Responses to select guiding questions ● Summary and analysis*

3.3.2 Once per Academic Year

Evaluation Activity	Alignment/Sample Ways to Align with FIU Vision of Excellence	Examples of Evidence and/or Records of Activities
Summarize your through the year evaluations and analyze	**Align evaluation with all 3 aspects of Learner-based, Evidence-based, and Culturally Responsive Teaching**	Collect Analysis Results in the form of written summary, charts, and tables Share Summary with Chair

4. Rationale for the Changes

This section argues the rationale behind the proposed changes to the teaching evaluating processes. The proposed process attempts to align the evaluation with three pillars of teaching excellence: learner centered, evidence based, and culturally responsive. This should incorporate evidences from the three sources (students, peers, and self) to support the conclusions and findings on effectiveness of the teaching. The process is intended to use the resources available in the department with optimal efforts. The following subsections discuss the effectiveness of learner-centered, evidence-based, and culturally responsive teaching.

4.1 Learner Centered Teaching

Learner-centered teaching is based on the understanding that who does the work is who learns. This signifies active learning advantages against passive learning where most of the work is done by the teacher. Doing the work, which is thinking, analyzing, and experimenting for solutions, helps developing new neural connections and network that is used for a long time and forms established memory and learning.

Example of this in Engineering Education can be achieved by inviting and motivating students to do the work which could be included in the process of:

- Discussing the basic theoretical background with students in advance. This process involves engaging students in active discussions.
- Presenting the students with the main objective of the lecture, guide them to think and then ask them if they know what the problem is and associated solutions. Guide them to evaluate their solution.
- Motivating students with practical examples and actual problems related to the engineering subject.
- Consolidating students' input and providing critique in light of theory and practice.
- Reinforcing the activity with class quizzes, homework, and class projects.

4.2 Evidence-Based Teaching

The benefit patterns of Education Research and evidence-based teaching can be:

A- Educational Research (External):

    - Learning from others proven methods for better learning.

    - Having proven evidence for methods that do work.

B- Collected Evidence (Internal and evidence collected while teaching):

    - Verification of the effectiveness of the current methods for better learning.

    - Determining areas where students have challenge in learning.

Some resources for evidenced-based teaching in the CEE field are:

    - Experiences of other faculty (internal evidence).

    - American Society for Engineering Education (external evidence).

    - FIU Teaching Center of Excellence (internal evidence).

    - General literature about evidence-based teaching from references provided here in this course (external evidence).

    - Evaluation of students learning based on previous prerequisite courses (internal evidence).

4.3 Culturally responsive teaching

Culturally responsive teaching should satisfy the following 4 areas:

1- Establishing inclusion- Introduction to the class is very important- Turning the task of taking attendance into practice of knowing names, eye contact, showing respect, conveying teacher's openness, respect and warm attitude, etc.

2- Developing attitude- Bringing examples of real life situations, problems that relates to the wide spectrum of cultures, and keeping students involved by invoking participation from all corners of the class, referencing back some of the inputs received to show valuation of student input, bolster student attention by meaningful examples, creative solutions, etc.

3- Enhancing meaning- Engaging students to provide input, encouraging participation of all, value student input by building upon their input to explain the problems, widening the discussion to outline what comes next, allowing students to express their view, provide positive feedback to what students have achieved throughout the class to build confidence, etc.

4- Engendering Competence- Convey the progress students have made in their learning, present actual and practical problems they can address with their learning, and highlight the difference in their knowledge and learning from beginning to the present to boost their confidence and competence.

As related to engineering in general, all 4 areas of culturally responsive teaching and related matters can be addressed and is addressed effectively in the class. Engineering courses are by nature global and relevant to all cultures and backgrounds, and as long as the requirements of addressing the quadrants are met at the class, they can be all covered.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Form and Rubrics

			Assessment* (Points) with Rationale
Elements	Summary of Reported Data	Notable Accomplishments/Contributions	Unsatisfactory (1) Satisfactory (2) Good (3) Very Good (4) Outstanding (5)
Data from Student	Examples of activities to be evaluated include;** - SPOT or Modified SPOT - Mid-semester Feedback - Pre- / Post-test Assessment - Classroom assessment/quizzes, graded or not, written or verbal - Group projects/presentations - Once a year summarize and analyze		
Data from Peer	Examples of activities to be evaluated include;** - Classroom Visit/Observation by Peer or Center for Advancement of Teaching staff - Canvas review - Syllabus exchange - Collaboration on Course Redesign - Learning Community participation (focused on course) - Teaching mentor meetings - Scholarship of Teaching & Learning presentation with feedback - Once a year summarize and analyze		
Data from Self	Examples of activities to be evaluated include;** - Post-class self-check - SPOTs Self Completion - Journaling - Review literature and compare - Continuing education courses/workshops - Once a year summarize and analyze		
Other considerations (e.g., additional sources, courses taught, course enrollment, stage of faculty member's career, knowledge privy to the chair, etc) Note: Other considerations can be detailed in the space to the left with additional points added or subtracted from the overall total.			
		Average	

		Outstanding (5)	Very Good (4)	Good	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Evaluation Design (Average score of all three rows)	**Student Data**	Faculty reported **at least 1** student- focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities (beyond SPOTs).	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activities 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	SPOTs satisfies this requirement. All faculty should receive at least a 2 in every course taught.	Overall rating of instructor average on SPOTs instrument is less than 2 in any course.
	Peer Data	Faculty reported **at least 1** peer-focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 2 evaluation activities to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty reported engaging in at least 1 evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty did not report engaging in peer-focused evaluation activities as previously defined by departmental guidelines.
	Self Data	Faculty reported **at least 1** self-focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 2 evaluation activities to collect self dat.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activity to collect self data.	Faculty reported engaging in at least 1 evaluation activity to collect self data.	Faculty did not report engaging in evaluation activities to collect self data OR engaged in activities that were not previously approved by the department.

*Rating and evaluation should also consider alignment with one or more of the pillars of teaching excellence as described below, and how the data collected from students, peers, and/or themselves	
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 literature but also includes faculty using data from their own classrooms. A common challenge 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.

** For more information on activities, ways they align with the vision of teaching excellence, and examples of records and evidences please see CEE Annual Teaching Evaluation process.