

Moss Department of Construction Management

Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty member:

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Outstanding (5)	Rating
<p>Data/information about teaching (33.33%) (student, peer, self)</p>	Data/information is not collected or not reported	Faculty report evaluation activity(ies) but make little or no connection to teaching practice	Reported evaluation activity(ies) is accompanied by explanation of how the data/information was/will be used to modify an instructional practice, assignment, or learning environment.	Faculty clearly connect reported evaluation activity(ies) to teaching goals that are aligned with learning-centered, evidence-based, or inclusive teaching practice. AND Reported evaluation activity is accompanied by explanation of how the data/information was/will be used to modify an instructional practice, assignment, or learning environment.	Faculty clearly connect reported evaluation activity(ies) to teaching goals that are explicitly aligned with learning-centered, evidence-based, or inclusive teaching practice. AND Reported evaluation activity is accompanied by explanation of how the data/information was/will be used to modify an instructional practice, assignment, or learning environment. AND Evaluation activity(ies) and the manner in which data is used to inform practice are indicative of a comprehensive	
<p>Use of Data to Improve Teaching (33.33%)</p>	No connections between the evidence collected from students, peers, and self to outcomes in 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 evident</i> .	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 evident</i> .	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>explicit</i> .	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>explicit</i> .	
<p>Other considerations (e.g., additional sources, courses taught, course enrollment, stage of faculty member's career, knowledge privy to the chair, etc) (33.33%)</p>	Chair receives significant negative feedback about the faculty member from more than one source outside the traditional panther180 system and the SPOTS.	Chair receives negative feedback about the faculty member from one source outside the traditional panther180 system and the SPOTS.	Chair does not receive negative or positive feedback about the faculty member from any source outside the traditional panther180 system and the SPOTS.	Chair receives positive feedback about the faculty member from one source outside the traditional panther180 system and the SPOTS.	Chair receives significant positive feedback about the faculty member from more than one source outside the traditional panther180 system and the SPOTS.	
Average						