![The University of Vermont logo]

College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
Evaluating Teaching Performance Guidelines
April 2024

At the core of the University's mission is the creation of knowledge, and this is most commonly manifested in the teaching of students by faculty. In order to continuously push for improvement in courses and teaching methodologies, ongoing, real-time feedback is necessary for the promotion of faculty reflection and assessment. The following is an articulation of how the College seeks to advance the formative and summative assessments of programs and instructors. It is intended to be a constructive process that celebrates success as much as it encourages improvement.

Governing Principles of Good Metrics to Assess Teaching

- The evaluation system should reflect the complexity of teaching and should include the assessment of relevant domains, such as:
  - The course design elements (e.g., course objectives align with program learning outcomes; alignment with accreditation requirements; effective activities and assignments),
  - The instructional delivery of the course (e.g., engages student participation and facilitates discussion effectively),
  - Grading and assessment of learning outcomes (e.g., appropriate rigor and expectations, monitors progress effectively),
  - Classroom management (e.g., creates learning environments that welcome, challenge, and support all students),
  - Mentoring and advising (e.g., keeps office hours; where appropriate, directs honors theses and individually designed projects; properly organizes co-curricular activities),
  - Professional development and the scholarship of teaching (e.g., incorporates new pedagogical advances and instructional methods)
- Multiple sources should be used in the evaluation of teaching. These sources must include:
  - Assessments by self, students, peers/external evaluators, and chair.
- An evaluation of teaching should include both formative feedback and summative evaluation. Formative feedback fosters individual improvement. The formative feedback should include a discussion of future performance goals and strategies for meeting these goals. Summative evaluations measure the degree to which institutional standards are met and/or surpassed.

CEMS Model of Teaching Performance Evaluation

Departments and programs will use a common template to organize and systematically evaluate teaching performance in their particular units. The evaluation is flexible enough to allow the disciplines in the College to meet their particular needs, goals, teaching methodologies, and desired learning outcomes. The evaluation template is explained below.

Domain indicators: For each teaching domain, the evaluation system must name and describe the "indicators" that assess the domain, as well as the source and method of assessment. In addition, the model should describe the criteria used to determine whether the faculty member *"exceeds expectations", "meets expectations", "below expectations", "unsatisfactory".* The CEMS Evaluation of Teaching Criteria (Appendix) includes specific objectives for teaching excellence and examples for each criterium.

Sources of assessment and evaluation: The evaluation of teaching performance must include input and feedback from students, assessments and evaluations from peers/external evaluators, a comprehensive self-assessment and teaching analysis by the instructor, and the overall evaluation by the chair.

- **Students**
  - Students in all courses taught through CEMS will be surveyed roughly a third of the way into the semester, to provide real-time feedback to empower instructors so that instructors may make mid-semester adjustments to address concerns, if warranted. In the event that concerns or issues are raised in a given class, the program head/department chair and/or the CEMS Dean's Office will discuss mid/semester evaluations with the instructor and may trigger an immediate peer/external review. At the end of the semester, progress on dealing with the issue will be assessed.
  - At the end of the semester, students will be given the opportunity to provide quantitative and qualitative feedback, using standardized forms and methods. The difference between the mid-semester and final course student evaluations will be one piece of evidence of the degree to which mid-semester adjustments were effective.
  - The instrument and method to seek student feedback will be consistent across the College, but flexible enough to assess relevant disciplinary and course-specific feedback, as well as to assess and interpret the input within the appropriate disciplinary context and relevant course characteristics.

- **Peers/External Evaluators**
  - Peers/external evaluators will contribute to the assessment of the appropriateness of the course design and the instructional delivery, including a review of assessment tools and course materials.
  - Departmental policies must specify the process and methods of the various types of peer/external evaluator evaluation.
  - To increase inter-rater reliability and validity, the CEMS leadership team will develop a common rubric for all peer/external evaluator evaluations to follow.

- o **Self**
  - ▪ The faculty member is responsible for providing, in a timely manner, the information required by the departmental teaching evaluation model.
  - ▪ The faculty member or department as a whole may organize any informal peer/external evaluations that are decoupled from RPT. Data from informal observations may be used solely for professional development purposes unless the faculty member chooses to include informal observations in RPT review.
  - ▪ In addition, as part of their annual report, faculty must provide a self-reflective statement that addresses which of the departmental quality teaching indicators have been met or surpassed; e.g., new course development, updates to existing courses to keep them current, modifications to teaching in response to deficiencies indicated by peer/external or student evaluations, new pedagogical approaches they have incorporated, what resources they have sought out to improve their teaching effectiveness (e.g., attending relevant conferences or short courses, utilizing web repositories, books, consultations with CTL), etc.
  - ▪ Based on the above, the self-assessment must include a justifiable self-evaluation as to which of the 4 assessment categories (exceeds, meets, below, unsatisfactory) the faculty member believes his/her teaching warrants.

- o **Guiding Principles for Evaluation Protocols and Frequency**
  - ▪ The College and Departments will develop teaching mentoring and evaluation protocols that are not overly cumbersome, and to design the schedule of peer/external evaluation strategically and selectively, according to the following guiding principles.
  - • Departments will be responsible for providing new faculty members with some form of role-modeling and/or mentoring by faculty known to be excellent teachers (e.g., through attending and observing their mentors' classes and course materials, seeking their mentors' advice on course development or pedagogy, co-teaching where appropriate, etc.) and new faculty will be encouraged to participate in short courses related to teaching offered by CTL or other external sources (e.g., ExCEEd, ASEE, or other professional education societies), as available.
  - • Peer/external evaluator observations will occur regularly to ensure sufficient documentation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) review and continued professional improvement in teaching. Junior faculty and lecturers will be reviewed annually leading up to a reappointment or promotion. Tenured faculty should be evaluated annually toward continued professional development Mid-semester evaluations or other evidence indicating teaching is less than satisfactory or insufficiently rigorous may trigger an immediate peer/external review.
  - • The CEMS Leadership Team (with Faculty input) will design student evaluations to be concise and easy to complete, in order to improve response rate.
  - • The CEMS Leadership Team will design a concise mid-semester student evaluation form.
  - • The Chair is responsible for organizing peer/external evaluations for those evaluations that will formally contribute to a faculty member's RPT portfolio in a

given year, per the departmental protocol.

- o When considering student evaluation data for individual faculty members, the chair is responsible for assessing performance against statistical metrics that are established by the CEMS Dean's Office and relevant to the specific course at hand.

- The Chair must consider all sources and types of assessed evidence and provide a written summative evaluation of the degree to which institutional standards have been met and/or surpassed. The summative evaluation should be provided in writing as part of the faculty annual evaluation.

- The department will provide formative feedback in the case of junior faculty and/or in cases where evidence of deficiencies has been identified. This should include a face-to-face discussion with either their mentor(s) and/or the Chair (at the Chair's discretion) about future performance goals and strategies for meeting these goals. The substance and the outcomes of this discussion should be recorded in writing, provided to the faculty and their chair, and kept in the faculty member's departmental file.

APPENDIX

Evaluation of Teaching Criteria

1. To achieve the rating "*consistently exceeds expectations*" there should be substantial evidence of quality and rigor based on the following indicators. These are not listed in order of importance. Also, this is not an exhaustive list; *additional* indicators of excellence can be considered if appropriated. As much as possible, any one of the criteria below (including student evaluations) should be used to help assess the overall quality and educational effectiveness of the instructor's courses, keeping in mind that each of these criteria comprises just one component of the overall assessment. In evaluating teaching, the chair will also consider mitigating factors beyond the control of the faculty member, such as the times and the physical support for lectures (e.g., location of a class, class size, performance of hardware, whether the course is a required service course for another major, teaching assistant support, etc.). The faculty member who consistently exceeds expectations will exhibit many of the following indicators:

Criteria	Specific objectives / examples
Course / Curriculum Design and Assessment	1. Develops effective student learning outcomes, assessments, and course materials, appropriate to the course and needs of the program;
	2. Consults with the chair and faculty to ensure consistent delivery of curriculum within program;
	3. Proactively collects, assesses, and submits accreditation-related data as needed;
Student Engagement	4. Uses evidence-based teaching approaches to consistently engage students and deepen learning;
	5. Encourages independent and creative student thinking, discovery, and learning;
	6. Supports and cultivates a respectful classroom setting and rapport with students;
Feedback and Accessibility	7. Provides timely feedback to students with opportunities for practice or revision;
	8. Is accessible to students outside of class, during posted student hours or otherwise;
Academic Standards	9. Maintains high standards for the amount, level, and quality of work expected from students, and as appropriate to the course being taught;
Versatility and Creativity	10. Teaches a range of courses, new or existing, by level or topic, as needed;
	11. Takes on additional teaching responsibilities when the need or opportunity arises;
	12. Finds creative and innovative ways to share course materials, engage students, and/or assess learning;
Continuous Improvement	13. Is receptive to constructive feedback from students and peers on teaching;
	14. Regularly attempts to improve teaching, evidenced by timely updates to course materials and pedagogy;
Professional Development	15. Attends seminars, workshops, professional meetings on teaching and learning;
	16. Applies professional development experiences and/or scholarly evidence in course development and teaching;
Teaching Scholarship	17. Leads or participates in scholarship of teaching and learning projects;
	18. Presents findings at local or external meetings / conferences;
	19. Publications related to teaching and learning