Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (COST)

Through results of a survey administered by the university to faculty and to student focus groups, Tarleton State University has identified the following characteristics that exemplify effective teaching:

- Content knowledge - Current, deep, broad, experienced
- Effective instructional skills - Creative, varied, active learning, promotes application
- Clarity of expectations - Clear student learning objectives, organization
- Professionalism - Integrity, civil, respectful, prepared, consistent, attends class, maintains office hours
- Engaging/Enthusiasm/Effective communication

The College of Science & Technology (COST) values great teaching and efforts by faculty members to promote continual improvement of teaching, both personally and collectively. COST encourages each faculty member to document and highlight his or her teaching activities and accomplishments each year for the annual performance review. For tenure-track or tenured faculty, this information will allow you to present a comprehensive overview of your teaching when applying for tenure and/or promotion.

Important areas of focus for each faculty member to consider each year are the following:
- An overview/summary of your teaching and teaching-related activities
- Reflections and assessments on your teaching, including reflections of student evaluations
- A commitment to continual improvement over time

Teaching activities and accomplishments should be documented and recorded in Digital Measures. In addition, COST recommends that each faculty member collect and display supplemental artifacts in support of your Digital Measure entries in a teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio could be a collection of artifacts in a binder or in an electronic portfolio such as *Portfolium*, that could be delivered to your supervisor during annual performance reviews and/or to a tenure and promotion committee. Please note that artifacts should be in digital format (e.g., a pdf addendum) for convenient delivery to the tenure and promotion committee. To maintain flexibility of expression, teaching portfolios have the requirement of including only three specific items, one from each of three major categories of evaluation: student evaluation, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation (see below). ***In addition to these basic requirements, a second form of peer review chosen by the faculty member is strongly recommended.*** Supplemental artifacts are optional, but strongly encouraged to better demonstrate adherence to institutional teaching characteristics established above. COST is **<u>NOT</u>** outlining a point system or requiring a minimum number of supplemental entries from any category. Each faculty member should decide how best to tell his or her story concerning teaching.

Table of potential teaching portfolio elements, including required and supplemental artifacts (list is not exhaustive for supplemental artifacts).

Artifacts	Student Evaluation	Self-Evaluation	Peer Evaluation*
Required	University Course Evaluations	Completed Sections in Digital Measures: • Professional Development • Licenses / certifications • Curriculum development • Teaching Innovation	Department Head Evaluations
Supplemental	• Faculty created student evaluation instruments • Letters of support • Student ratings / comments • Student conference / group interview feedback • Honors from student organizations • Other	• Teaching goals (year by year) with notes on progress • Response or reflection on student and peer evaluations • Examples of assessment / grading • Documented student improvement on course level SLOs based on changed instructional strategy • Course management (supplemental materials and / or instruction) • Teaching philosophy • Teaching support to colleagues • Support of student programs (ALEs, student internships, service learning, etc.) • Other	• Peer evaluation of teaching/classroom observation • Peer review of student evaluations • Feedback from CII Course Redesign with implementation • Peer evaluation of syllabus and class materials / grading criteria • Letters of support • Evaluations from former department heads • Other

Two or more items are strongly recommended.

Sources:
While crafting this recommendation, the committee investigated ways that other institutions evaluate good teaching. The following sites contributed to the ideas in this recommendation. The links are included here so that you, as a faculty member, might read more if you are interested.

- University of Michigan – Center for Research on Teaching and Learning
  - http://www.crlt.umich.edu/resources/evaluation-teaching
  - http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines
- University of Dayton – Learning Teaching Center
  - https://www.udayton.edu/ltc/_resources/writing/assessment_resources/Teaching_Portfolios.pdf
- Rice – Center for Teaching Excellence
  - http://cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2015/07/09/studentevaluations
- Michigan State University – Academic Advancement Network
  - http://fod.msu.edu/oir/evaluating-teaching-effectiveness

Additional Resources for Faculty:

Instructions for Accessing Student Evaluations
- login to Ducktrax
- select "Faculty Services"
- then, "Faculty Detail Schedule"
- choose desired term
- select "Course Evaluation Report"
- a list of courses will then be displayed with student evaluation reports

Digital Measures Help
Each year, the Center for Instructional Innovation (CII) sponsors a session on how to use Digital Measures more effectively. Watch your Tarleton email for dates and times, or contact CII for more information.

***Portfolium* Help**
If you choose to explore options for presenting supplemental artifacts in digital format using *Portfolium*, please contact the Center for Instructional Innovation (CII) for more information.