**Template for the “Evaluation of Teaching” section of the Personnel Committee or Department Head Review and Recommendation Letter (optional)**

Teaching was evaluated using the Teaching Quality Criteria document which articulates the conditions to meet expectations in alignment with the August 2019 Memorandum of Understanding between United Academics and the University, which modifies the CBA. The section below will describe the evidence used to determine whether [Name] met, exceeded or did not meet expectations for each of the Teaching Quality Standards: professional, inclusive, engaged or research-informed teaching. The data that informed these decisions included Course Evaluation data from 20XX-19, Student Experience Survey data from 2019-XX, Peer Reviews of Teaching, the faculty member’s Personal Statement, and teaching-related materials included in the supplemental portion of the dossier.

**Professional Teaching Standard**

Conditions:

1. Readily available, coherently organized, and high quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading and class policy expectations.

2. Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback.

3. Students’ activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning.

**Evaluation: [Meets/does not meet/exceeds] conditions**

*[If meets: Meets the condition* ***consistently*** *or shows a* ***pattern of improvement*** *during the review window.*

*If exceeds: Provide evidence the instructor* ***excels*** *with respect to this condition.*

*If does not meet:* **Pattern of concern** based on evidence provided.]

There is evidence from [student feedback; peer review; teaching statement; dossier] indicating that…[provide a few sentences with evidence related to each of the conditions above].

**Inclusive Teaching Standard**

Conditions

1. Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation is valued.

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.

**Evaluation: [Meets/does not meet/exceeds] conditions**

*[If meets: Meets the condition* ***consistently*** *or shows a* ***pattern of improvement*** *during the review window.*

*If exceeds: Provide evidence the instructor* ***excels*** *with respect to this condition.*

*If does not meet:* **Pattern of concern** based on evidence provided.]

There is evidence from [student feedback; peer review; teaching statement; dossier] indicating that…[provide a few sentences with evidence related to each of the conditions above].

**Engaged Teaching Standard**

Conditions

1. Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of course content and pedagogy.

**Evaluation: [Meets/does not meet/exceeds] conditions**

*[If meets: Meets the condition* ***consistently*** *or shows a* ***pattern of improvement*** *during the review window.*

*If exceeds: Provide evidence the instructor* ***excels*** *with respect to this condition.*

*If does not meet:* **Pattern of concern** based on evidence provided.]

There is evidence from [student feedback; peer review; teaching statement; dossier] indicating that…[provide a few sentences with evidence related to each of the conditions above].

**Research-Informed Teaching**

Conditions:

1. Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.

2. Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; the goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students.

3. Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course.

4. Instruction engages, challenges, and supports students.

**Evaluation: [Meets/does not meet/exceeds] conditions**

*[If meets: Meets the condition* ***consistently*** *or shows a* ***pattern of improvement*** *during the review window.*

*If exceeds: Provide evidence the instructor* ***excels*** *with respect to this condition.*

*If does not meet:* **Pattern of concern** based on evidence provided.]

There is evidence from [student feedback; peer review; teaching statement; dossier] indicating that…[provide a few sentences with evidence related to each of the conditions above].

As outlined by the MOU, additional positive factors can contribute to a teaching evaluation. **Additional Positive factors can be included here or in alignment with other criteria above as appropriate.**

These factors include, but are not limited to:

* participation in professional teaching development, and/or engagement in campus or national discussions about quality pedagogy and curricula;
* development of new courses;
* facilitation of productive student interaction and peer learning;
* 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 skill­building in office hours;
* contribution of teaching to the Clark Honors College, departmental honors, first-year experiences, or other educational excellence and student success initiatives;
* grants, fellowships or other awards for teaching excellence and innovation;
* supervision of 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;
* serving on a higher than average number of graduate student committees.

**My evaluation of [Name]’s teaching, based on the Teaching Evaluation Criteria and specific conditions in alignment with the 2019 MOU, has [met/not met/exceeding the expectations] for [promotion] to [promoted rank] by [meeting/not meeting/exceeding in X standard], and [meeting/not meeting/exceeding in X standard] and [meeting/not meeting/exceeding in X standard].**