

BME Teaching Effectiveness Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Outstanding	Rating
Data/information about teaching						
(1) 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 tenuous in nature	
(2) Student Data	Overall rating of instructor average on SPOTs instrument is less than 2.	SPOTs satisfies 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 tenuous in nature	
(3) 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 tenuous in nature	
Use of data to inform teaching	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 <i>not clearly</i> 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 <i>somewhat</i> 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 <i>directly</i> 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 <i>directly</i> evident.	
Mentoring and advising	<i>Faculty are not meeting departmental expectations surrounding advising and mentorship of graduate students (e.g. regularly meeting with mentees/advisees, responsiveness to student communications, completing administrative duties related to mentorship/advising in a timely manner).</i>	<i>Faculty minimally meets departmental expectations surrounding advising and mentorship of graduate students.</i>	<i>Faculty meets departmental expectations and keeps students on track for meeting program milestones or providing evidence that they have attempted to do so.</i>	<i>Faculty engage graduate student advisees/mentees in some publishing, scholarship, and/or other forms of scholarship AND Works with their students to identify areas for improvement and supporting them in that process.</i>	<i>Faculty are exceeding departmental expectations by actively engaging with their graduate student mentees/advisees at a level that promotes the development of scholarly partnerships.</i>	
Other consideration						