Teaching Evaluation Criteria document overview

In accordance with the [August 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)](#) and [February 2020 amendment](#) between the University of Oregon and United Academics, evaluators will determine whether or not the teaching done during the faculty member's review period meets, exceeds, or does not meet expectations in alignment with UO's definition of teaching quality. This will be accomplished by evaluating the faculty member's teaching against specific standards outlined in the MOU. Beginning Fall 2021, evaluators should use this **Teaching Evaluation Criteria document (below)** unless or until they have a modified criteria document approved by their dean and the Office of the Provost according to the process defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Oregon and United Academics (see Article 4, Section 4; Article 19, Section 2; Article 20, Section 3).

Instructions for modification

Modifications to the Teaching Evaluation Criteria document must be consistent with the MOU standards and conditions.
Modifications considered consistent with the standards include:

- language that reflects the unique disciplinary or professional culture of the unit;
- additions to the standards;
- greater specificity about what meets, exceeds, or does not meet expectations;
- qualifying language to account for differences in teaching context (e.g.: large classes; performance courses).

Units wanting to modify the criteria document should revise the document using track changes in Word and submit their desired modified Teaching Evaluation Criteria document to their dean or designee for approval. The dean or designee should submit dean-approved documents to the Office of the Provost by September 1st 2021. Once approved, these modifications, like the MOU standards, replace without further action on the part of the unit the teaching standards across the applicable unit-level policies that touch on teaching evaluation.

More information regarding teaching evaluation changes and the policy revision process can be found on the Office of the Provost webpage:
https://provost.uoregon.edu/teaching-evaluation-changes-frequently-asked-questions
https://provost.uoregon.edu/policy-development

Teaching Evaluation Criteria Document

This Teaching Evaluation Criteria document allows academic units to perform teaching evaluations based on the standards and conditions named in the 2019 MOU between the University and United Academics. The Office of the Provost will provide each unit with data for the faculty member's review period collected from pre-Fall 2019 Course Evaluations, end-of-course Student Experience Surveys, and Instructor Reflection surveys. In addition, the unit head or personnel committee will consider supplementary materials provided in the dossier such as the CV, teaching statement, syllabi, course assignments, etc., while evaluating the faculty member using this Teaching Evaluation Criteria document. Evaluators should consider all courses taught in the review period and determine whether an instructor meets, does not meet, or excels with respect to each condition and overall.

Guide for implementation:

Teaching Quality Conditions	Data Sources	Does not meet the condition	Meets the condition	Excels
Bulleted teaching quality condition from the MOU is listed.	**From the MOU (sec. 6)**: Evaluations of faculty teaching for any review that considers teaching (including tenure, promotion, contract renewal, and merit) must consider <u>at minimum</u>: - **Comments from Course Evaluations** (for so long as Course Evaluations are considered during a review) - **Student Experience Surveys** - **Instructor Reflections** and/or **teaching statements** - **peer reviews**	**Pattern of concern** based on evidence provided from students, the faculty member, and/or peer review.	Meets the condition **consistently** or shows a **pattern of improvement** during the review window. **From the MOU (sec. 9):** "Teaching will meet expectations for purposes of underlying reviews required by the CBA when the following bulleted conditions are met across a faculty member's collective teaching in the review window (a successful teacher might not meet them in each and every course)."	Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.

MOU conditions related to **Professional Teaching**	**Data Sources**	**Does not meet the condition**	**Meets the condition**	**Excels**

1. "Readily available, coherently organized, and high quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading and class policy expectations."	**From Students:**
	Student Experience Survey
	  Organization of the course
	  Quality of the course materials
	
	Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations
	  Q3 How well organized was this course?
	
	Evidence from the Instructor
	  Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.
	
	Peer Review
		***Pattern of concern** based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition **consistently** or shows a **pattern of improvement** during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

2. "Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback."	**From Students:**
	Student Experience Survey
	  Instructor Communication
	
	Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations
	Q5 How available was the instructor for communication outside of class?
	
	Evidence from the Instructor
	  Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.
	
	Peer Review
		***Pattern of concern** based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition **consistently** or shows a **pattern of improvement** during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

3. "Students' activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning.	**From Students:**
	Student Experience Survey
	  Assignment and Projects
	
	Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations
	  Q4 How effective was the instructor's use of class time?
	  Q7 The amount that I learned in this course was:
	
	Evidence from the Instructor
	  Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.
	
	Peer Review
		***Pattern of concern** based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition **consistently** or shows a **pattern of improvement** during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

MOU conditions related to **Inclusive Teaching**	**Data Sources**	**Does not meet the condition**	**Meets the condition**	**Excels**
1. "Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation is valued."	**From Students:** Student Experience Survey Inclusiveness of the course Accessibility of the course Number of student interactions with the instructor outside of class **Evidence from the Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition* **consistently** *or shows a* **pattern of improvement** *during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*
2. "The content of the course reflects the diversity of the field's practitioners, the contested and evolving status of knowledge, the value of academic questions beyond the academy and of lived experience as evidence, and/or other efforts to help students see themselves in the work of the course." N.B. If an instructor is not empowered by the department to make changes to the content of their courses, this standard may not apply.	**From Students:** Student Experience Survey Relevance of the course content **Evidence from Instructor:** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition* **consistently** *or shows a* **pattern of improvement** *during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

MOU conditions related to **Engaged Teaching**	Data Sources	Does not meet the condition	Meets the condition	Excels
1. "Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of courses in content and pedagogy."	**Evidence from Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, CVs, teaching statement, etc.	Limited evidence of meaningful reflection and change over time.	Consistent evidence of meaningful reflection and change over time.	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

MOU conditions related to **Research-informed Teaching**	**Data Sources**	**Does not meet the condition**	**Meets the condition**	**Excels**
1. "Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise."	**Evidence from Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*
2. "Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; these goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students."	**From Students:** <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Clarity of assignment instructions and grading <u>Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations</u> Q6 How clear were the guidelines for evaluating students' work in this course? **Evidence from Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*
3. "Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course."	**From Students:** <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Feedback **Evidence from Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*
4. "Instruction designed to engage, challenge and support students."	**From Students:** <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Challenge of the course Level of support Degree of active learning **Evidence from Instructor** Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc. **Peer Review**	*Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.*	*Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.*	*Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.*

From the MOU, other positive factors can be considered
These are not required for an evaluation of "exceeds expectations," but in some cases may improve an evaluation from "meets expectations" to "exceeds expectations."
These include, but are not limited to:
a. participation in professional teaching development, and/or engagement in campus or national discussions about quality pedagogy and curricula
b. development of new courses (Note: Simply developing a new course is not necessarily noteworthy, but developing an exemplar course that uses innovative and evidence-based teaching practices may be)
c. facilitation of productive student interaction and peer learning
d. contribution to student learning outside the classroom as demonstrated by, for example, the development of co-curricular activities or community-engaged projects, or a coherent approach to academic coaching and skill-building in office hours
e. contribution of teaching to the Clark Honors College, departmental honors, first-year experiences, or other educational excellence and student success initiatives
f. grants, fellowship or other awards for teaching excellence and innovation
g. supervision of student research/creative activity of graduate and undergraduate students beyond the mentoring expected as part of one's professional responsibilities such as joint conference presentations, co-authorship of research articles, creative production and other work, and teaching independent study, research, and readings courses
h. serving on a higher than average number of graduate student committees