

SUCCEED Annual Teaching Evaluation

Overview: The purpose of this evaluation is to provide you an opportunity to synthesize and reflect on data collected within your courses over the last academic year and to use this reflection to facilitate a discussion about your teaching with the Director. The narrative you develop annually can be used to create your teaching narrative for future tenure and promotion reviews.

For this evaluation, prepare a two- to four-page narrative that summarizes your teaching over the past academic year. If you require additional space to present data from your evaluation activities, you may submit up to six pages of appendices.

Instructions: Prepare a narrative that includes the following three sections. Attach the narrative in Panther180 “Additional Documents: Supplemental Materials” section and include short summaries (less than 500 characters) in the Teaching Innovation section as appropriate.

- Section I: Overview of courses taught. Provide a paragraph per course that highlights the major course outcomes, critical components of the course design (e.g., pedagogical techniques used, major course activities), any changes made to the course as compared with previous semesters, and how the course design is supported by one of the three pillars (i.e., inclusive, evidence-based, and learner-centered). *For the courses that you do not reference in Section II and III, include an additional paragraph that summarizes the overall outcomes of your evaluation of your course. Include relevant data as appropriate (e.g., course evaluations, course outcomes).*
- Section II: Present data sources, evaluation activities and results of those activities for one of your courses. Describe what data you collected from peers, your students, as well as yourself to evaluate the effectiveness of the course design in achieving course outcomes. In your explanation, connect the evaluation activities with the three pillars using supporting evidence and examples as appropriate. Please also describe the frequency with which each data source was collected (e.g., once or twice a semester). Please be sure to also summarize the data that you collected from peers, students, and yourself.
- Section III: Reflect on the evaluation activity results for course from Section II. Make connections between the evidence collected from the data sources and the outcomes of the course, as well as intended changes for future courses (this one or others). Be sure to explain how the intended changes align with the teaching pillars as appropriate.

Definitions: Alignment with one or more of the pillars refers to the extent to which faculty address/highlight how the data they have collected from students, peers, and/or themselves informs their progress and/or leadership in instructional practices that are:

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.
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.

Data Sources: This list is not inclusive of all possible data sources. Additional data sources will be added each year and should be shared among the faculty to support the use of creative and diverse methods of course evaluation. Please feel free to include anecdotal data/data in the form of emails or conversations from other stakeholders, such as students, faculty, or staff on campus.

Data Type	Examples
Student Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identity/Disposition Survey - Mid-semester Feedback - Pre- / Post-test Assessment - SPOTs* (this will always be available, but faculty may want to have other sources of information from about students) - Other activity to collect information from/about students.
Peer Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Syllabus exchange - Collaboration on Course Redesign - Classroom Visit/Observation by Peer or Center for Advancement of Teaching staff - Learning Community participation (focused on course) - Teaching mentor meetings - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning presentation with feedback - Other activity to collect information from peer(s).
Self Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post-class (or module) self-check - SPOTs Self Completion - Journaling/Blog - Other activity faculty may use to critically explore own teaching.

Evaluation Rubric Overview: Teaching will be evaluated based on four criteria, equally weighted as shown in the rubric that follows: (1) Alignment between course design and the teaching pillars, (2) Evaluation Design, (3) Evaluation Outcomes, and (4) Reflective Practice. Overall averages above 2.0 will be rounded to nearest integer to determine final rating. If the overall average is below a 2.0, the overall rating will be “Unsatisfactory (1)”. Please note additional data gathered from peers and students as well as trends from previous years’ evaluations may be used in this evaluation by the Chair or Director as appropriate.

SUCCEED Teaching Evaluation Rubric

		Outstanding (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Alignment (From Section 1)	Course Designs and Teaching Pillars Alignment	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is strong across all courses taught. For all courses taught, faculty provide a powerful argument for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples.	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is strong across all courses taught. For at least one of the courses, faculty provide a strong case for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples.	Alignment between course design 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 and teaching pillars is minimal or somewhat evident, with connections more clearly communicated for some courses than others.	No alignment between course design and teaching pillars across all courses.
Evaluation Design (Average score of all three rows)	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.
	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.
	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 data.	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.
Evaluation Outcomes	Results of Data Collection Across All Courses	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were very positive, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. <i>This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.</i>	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were positive overall, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. <i>This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.</i>	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were mostly positive, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. <i>This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.</i>	One or more of the courses taught resulted in student outcomes that were concerning and/or student evaluations that were negative overall. This could include SPOT evaluations below a 3 and/or at or below 15% percentile among all CEC faculty.	One or more of the courses taught resulted in student outcomes that were very concerning and/or student evaluations that were negative overall. This could include SPOT evaluations below a 2 and/or at or below 10% percentile among all CEC faculty.
Reflective Practice	Synthesis of Data Collected and Plans for Future Courses	Faculty made explicit and systematic connections between the evidence they collected 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.	Faculty made explicit connections between the evidence they collected 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 connections between the evidence they collected 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 loose connections between the evidence they collected 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 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.