

TEACHING EVALUATION RUBRIC - MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT						
Elements	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Outstanding (5)	Points
Student Data/Feedback	SPOTs data satisfies requirement for student data. Faculty receive less than 2.5 based on SPOTs collection.	SPOTs data satisfies requirement for student data. Faculty should receive at least a 2.5 based on SPOTs collection.	Faculty reported engaging in at least (1) evaluation activity to collect evidence from students in addition to SPOTs Faculty should receive at least a 3 based on SPOTs collection.	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities in addition to SPOTs to collect evidence from students that are more exhaustive* in nature. Faculty should receive at least a 3.5 based on SPOTs collection.	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities in addition to SPOTs OR (1) activity with multiple data , to collect evidence from students that are more exhaustive* in nature. Faculty should receive at least a 3.5 based on SPOTs collection. Excellent gathering, analysis, and use of student source	
Peer Data/Feedback	Faculty did not engage in evaluation activities to collect peer feedback on their teaching.	Faculty reported engaging in at least (1) evaluation activity to collect feedback from a peer/peers.	Faculty reported engaging in at least (1) evaluation activity more exhaustive in nature to collect peer feedback OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . Not very thoughtfully conceived or utilized.	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities to collect peer feedback OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . It is evident that faculty uses data/information gathered from peers to identify way to grow in teaching effectiveness .	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities more exhaustive in nature to collect peer feedback OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . Faculty show highly effective / Highly collaborative evident from results of peer feedback/collaboration.	
Self Data/Feedback	Did not engage in activities to collect self data on their teaching	Faculty reported engaging in at least (1) evaluation activity to collect evidence from self	Faculty reported engaging in at least (1) evaluation activity to collect evidence from self OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . Not very thoughtfully conceived or utilized.	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities to collect evidence from self OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . It is evident that faculty uses data/information gathered from self to identify way to grow in teaching effectiveness .	Faculty reported engaging in (1) or more evaluation activities to collect evidence from self OR engaged in a data collection activity resulting in data from multiple sources . Self data/information collection is ongoing and shows critical awareness of the impact of instructional design on student performance and/or behaviors .	
Course Designs, data collection and Teaching Pillars	No alignment between course design and teaching pillars across all courses.	Alignment between course design, data/information collected and teaching pillars is minimal or somewhat evident, with connections more clearly communicated for some courses than others.	Alignment between course design, data/information collected and teaching pillars is evident across some or all courses taught . Faculty provide a case for the alignment with supporting evidence/examples, to some extent.	Alignment between course design, data/information collected and teaching pillars is strong across more than one courses taught. Faculty clearly connects data/information collected to teaching goals as informed their growth towards, development in, and/or leadership in at least one of the pillars .	Alignment between course design, data/information collected and teaching pillars is strong across more than one courses taught. Faculty clearly connects data/information collected to teaching goals as informed their growth towards, development in, and/or leadership in more than one of the pillars, demonstrates critical self analysis, and connects evaluation to future work .	
Other aspects that the Chair could might take in considerations to add or subtract up to two points. (e.g., additional sources, courses taught, course enrollment, stage of faculty member's career, teaching awards, punctuality, attending office hours, returning student work in a timely manner)					+/- 2	
					TOTAL POINTS (Max. 20)	

* more exhaustive in nature meaning tools or activities were used multiple times during the year and analyze to enhance course, or the the date collected in more complex with a description of the protocol used. Tools, activities or instruments could be used to collect data from different sources (student, peers or self) aligned with one or more pillars.