

AEI FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS

Ratified: June 22, 2017

Updated: October 3, 2017

UPDATED: Submitted March, 2019, reviewed September 2019, promotion added December 2019.

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost June 19, 2020

FACULTY REVIEW

The following is the proposed Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Review policy based on what is required contractually and institutionally by the United Academics CBA and Office of the Provost and feedback from AEI faculty. It utilizes and aligns with tools, instruments and processes created and recommended or mandated by the UO. These documents will be used for the purpose of forming a basis for the conversation with the Executive Director and are designed to help NTTF bargaining unit members grow as scholars, researchers, and educators, identify areas of strength, and identify areas that need improvement about a faculty's performance during the contract period (United Academics CBA Article 19 Section 3).

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 19 of the CBA. To the extent there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, CBA Article 19 controls for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

For NTTF holding joint or multiple appointments, a memorandum will be completed at time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units. Information from the review and promotion process will be used by the Executive Director in making personnel decisions, such as hiring, merit raises, and in cases of renewal/non-renewal.

The standards required for faculty review, contract renewal, and merit are separate from those used for promotion. Faculty members planning on going up for promotion should be familiar with the promotion criteria and process.

CAREER NTTF PROCEDURES

1. These documents will be used for the purpose of forming a basis for the conversation with the Executive Director and are designed to help NTTF bargaining unit members grow as scholars, researchers, and educators, identify areas of strength, and identify areas that need improvement about a faculty's performance during the contract period.
2. Career NTTF will be reviewed in each contract period for consideration for renewal, or once every three academic years, whichever is sooner. The review will consider the faculty member's performance since the last review.
3. If a faculty member seeks promotion in a year when a contract renewal review is due, only the promotion file must be completed. However, the contract renewal decision must be made independently of the promotion decision. Contract renewal is a college decision and depends upon teaching needs and budgets, not only on performance.
4. If review or promotion procedures change during the course of a faculty member's employment, they may elect between current criteria and those in effect during the six years prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.

CONTRACT RENEWAL

1. To comply with the May 1st contract renewal notification, Career NTTF will be notified of their contract renewal status by the first day of the term in which their contract review will occur. The process must be completed according to CAS and UO timelines.
2. For contract renewal reviews, the faculty member will submit the pieces of the Faculty Review as outlined in Faculty Review #4 below by Monday of the third week of the term in which the review will occur.
3. The review for renewal will be conducted by the Executive Director-~~department head~~ based on the materials submitted. Decisions will be made based on the following (in order):
 - a. Contract renewal date
 - b. Rank in the department
 - c. Program need
 - d. Faculty Review documents

FACULTY REVIEW

1. Career NTTF will be evaluated only by the approved criteria and procedures. If evaluation criteria change during course of employment, NTTF members may elect between current criteria and those in effect for the six years prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.
2. Career NTTF will be evaluated on the quality of their teaching, their performance in their administrative role(s) (if applicable), and on their service/professional development/scholarship in proportion to the FTE afforded to those aspects in their position description.
3. Service and professional development contributions are included in the Teaching Excellence Checklist, the CV, and may be included in the Instructor Reflection. These documents reflect the 90%-10% (Teaching – PD & Service) appointments of Career Track Faculty in AEI.
4. By Monday of Week 1 in the winter term after the calendar year to be reviewed, the faculty will submit the following to AEI Human Resources for the Faculty Review Process:
 - a. **Updated and signed CV using the template** (annually) due During the first of December. Date determined by CAS. *Faculty submit to AEI Human Resources.*
 - b. **Instructor Reflection** (once per contract period)

Meaningful instructor reflection on changes and growth over this contract period. This can be a collection of unrelated paragraphs completed each term or for a few to several of the terms during the contract period, or a prose style narrative of the entire contract period, or a bulleted list, or a completed [TELL self-reflection](#) with brief write-up. Pick a style that works for you.

Purpose = to incentivize the best teaching practice of self-reflection on instructional choices and practices

Process = upload word document to your OneDrive HR folder once per contract period; under one page.
 - c. **Peer Observation** (once per contract period)

The Peer Observation may be done face-to-face or via a video recording of a class. If a video recording is used, it will be shared with an official observer afterward. A Peer Observation requires an observation of your

own teaching done by a trained AEI faculty coordinator. Observing someone else doesn't replace this requirement.

Purpose = honest reflection for growth in teaching; to receive formative and meaningful, substantive feedback to help faculty develop more effective teaching. Honesty and a focus on growth and improvement are expected. Perfection is not expected.

Process = use one of the following observation instruments:

- Current AEI summative observation instrument (sample at the end of this document)
- Current AEI online summative observation instrument (sample at the end of this document)
- [Teaching Engagement Program's Peer Teaching Observation Guide](#)
- [Teacher Effectiveness for Language Learning Full Class Observation Feedback Tool](#)

Observee fills out the chosen instrument before the observation (or video recording of the class). Observer attends class (or watches video recording of class) and fills out the same chosen instrument. Finally, Observer and Observee meet to discuss what was observed, based on the items on the chosen instrument; **Observers are AEI faculty coordinators (IEP or AEIS) and need to be trained**; Observee turns in instrument and comments to personal folder on OneDrive that HR sets up. Documentation must include the Observer's signature.

d. Teaching Excellence Checklist (once per contract period) (sample at the end of this policy):

Bullet point list of highlights regarding how you meet the definition of Teaching Excellence (<https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence>) created by UO's Teaching Engagement Program.

Purpose = To determine the degree to which a faculty member has met the criteria of teaching excellence. Forms the basis for conversation between faculty member and Executive Director and subsequent letter sent to CAS and also as input for contract renewal and merit.

Process = once per contract period; Involves completing a PDF that is standardized and fillable (online document to be created by AEI HR; forthcoming) so that everyone is using the same format; if less than 1.0FTE, the items will be prorated in the Engaged Teaching & Service section as indicated on the document.

e. Student Experience Surveys (by December 31 of the calendar year to be reviewed by *AEI Human Resources*):

Current qualitative UO Student Experience Surveys.

Purpose = required by UO & gives teacher feedback about teaching aligned with evidence-based feedback from students.

Process = automatic via Canvas /Qualtrics for IEP

Pro Tem Review: Pro tem will be reviewed each term. The review will consist of the Peer Observation portion of the Faculty Review process.

Faculty Admin Review:

Faculty who serve in an administrative role will be subject to an annual Qualtrics review. The questions asked are tailored to each administrative role and are collected by HR via a link that the ED (supervisor) cannot see. The supervisor receives an anonymous report summarizing the feedback to share with to the faculty administrator. This occurs as part of the faculty review conversation with the Executive Director.

(optional) Faculty Feedback to Administrators Forms completed by submitting faculty member as a peer critique of faculty with administrative duties (forms located in AEI Network/Annual Review Materials/1-FAC and Admin Feedback Forms)

(optional) Administrators Feedback to Faculty Forms completed by submitting faculty member as a peer critique of faculty with teaching administrative duties (forms located in AEI Network/Annual Review Materials/1-FAC and Admin Feedback Forms)

PROMOTION

Timeline

See [NTTF Promotion Overview](#) on the Office of the Provost's website for actual dates. Please refer to CBA Article 19 for promotion eligibility standards. Guidelines and criteria for promotion are below.

Considerations for Promotion

Promotion Review to Senior I and Senior II rank entails a holistic measure. The candidate's responsibility is to prove that they are performing at or above the level defined by the criteria described in the promotion section of this document. Candidates wishing to go up for promotion to Senior I or Senior II before the normal six years at the previous rank must refer to the Collective Bargaining Agreement's guidelines.

Split appointments

It is understood that faculty who have split appointments between teaching/administrative/project work may not necessarily fulfill all the criteria for all three categories. It is incumbent on the candidate to explain any gaps due to split appointments or in-depth specialization.

External Reviewers

The committee decides whether internal and/or external reviews (over and above supervisors' evaluations) will be used in a given promotion case. The use of such reviewers and the process for their selection will be discussed with the candidate in advance of solicitation of reviewers. External reviewers will be selected using standard University guidelines and recommendations and consistent with the general expectations enumerated in Article 20, Section 14 of the CBA.

Promotion to Senior Instructor I

Successful candidates for Senior I are expected to submit the items described in the "Preparing your Promotion File," referring to the "Promotion to Senior I and Senior II Metric" for criteria.

Promotion to Senior Instructor II

Successful candidates for Senior II are expected to submit the items described in the "Preparing your Promotion File," referring to the "Promotion to Senior I and Senior II Metric" for criteria. Only evidence during the time at Senior I rank should be included in the promotion file. As a part of this promotion file, successful candidates for Senior II are also expected to describe in their personal statement and provide evidence in their portfolios of outstanding service, the internally and externally recognized versatility, creativity, innovation, collaboration and leadership required for effective operation of a language program in the areas of mentoring, administration, university academic activities, and/or other services to the AEI. The Senior II candidate must demonstrate how they have significantly raised the AEI profile on and off campus.

Preparing your Promotion File

American English Institute Faculty Review Policy and Procedure

Created by Faculty Review Policy Revision Committee, Winter 2019. Last updated: May, 2019.

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost June 19, 2020

The personal statement and CV are the primary guiding documents for the promotion committee. The portfolios provide supporting documentation and evidence of the candidate's qualities and achievements.

1. Include standardized CV according to the provided template.
2. In your personal statement (3-6 pages), include (in prose):
 - a. a focus on your key accomplishments in teaching, project work and/or administration, professional development and service during the official period of review
 - b. a brief statement about your contributions to UO's mission of equity and inclusion (e.g. tailoring classroom materials and practices for diverse learners; providing tools for students to engage with people from other cultures, encouraging students to engage in the community outside of class; teacher training for teachers from around the world; working with people from low-resource areas of the world; working with international GEs to improve their abilities to communicate, the Inclusive section of the Teaching Excellence Checklist, etc.)
 - c. a brief summary of future goals and how they tie into your current career trajectory.
3. Teaching/Admin/Project Portfolio - the focus should be on quality over quantity. Materials should be original, created by you. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example and explain how it relates to your personal statement (a few sentences). Maximum 25 pages.
4. Professional Development Portfolio - the focus should be on quality over quantity. Materials should be original and created by you. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example and explain how it relates to your personal statement (a few sentences). Maximum 25 pages.
5. Service – The focus should be on quality over quantity. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example and explain how it relates to your personal statement (a few sentences). Maximum 15 pages.

Promotion to Senior I and Senior II Metric

| <p style="text-align: center;">Criteria for Teaching</p> <p>A successful candidate will include all of the following that are applicable. If any item is not applicable, the candidate will explain why. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)</p> |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Evidence that faculty/admin look to this person as having expertise in a given area (niche) or versatility across programs and skills (evidence could include letters of support from supervisors and/or mentors, being asked to lead a course, leading a project, presenting to the faculty or LTS students, requests from faculty mentors to allow formative observations by other faculty, requests from faculty mentors to observe other instructors as a “master” teacher, etc.)</p> | |
| <p>2. Consistent evidence that excellent materials adhere to and enhance curriculum and lead to stated student learning outcomes</p> | |
| <p>3. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others (sharing of materials, curricular coordination, norming, etc.)</p> | |
| <p>4. Evidence of innovation and creativity in course, curriculum, or materials design</p> | |
| <p>5. Evidence of consistently exceeding in the three areas listed on the Faculty Review Teaching Excellence Checklist.</p> | |
| <p>6. Evidence that continual expansion of teaching skills/knowledge is applied to classroom teaching.</p> | |

| <p style="text-align: center;">Criteria for Administration</p> <p>A successful candidate will include all of the following that are applicable. If any item is not applicable, the candidate will explain why. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)</p> |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Evidence of effective and excellent leadership in an admin role (letters from supervisors, feedback from administration and faculty, etc.)</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2. Evidence that faculty/admin look to this person as having expertise in a given area (niche) or versatility: letters of support from supervisors, serving as an expert/consultant for other units on campus or in the field, feedback from faculty or administrators, lead on a project, presentations to staff, faculty or other units, cross-program collaborations, etc. | |
| 3. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others | |
| 4. Evidence of innovation and creativity in program development and practices | |
| 5. Evidence of adherence to the AEI mission and internal and external policies and standards | |
| 6. Evidence of continual expansion of skills/knowledge (how is professional development applied to the administrative position?) | |

| Criteria for Project Work A successful candidate will include all of the following that are applicable. If any item is not applicable, the candidate will explain why. Quality of work in these areas will be considered. | Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee) |
|---|---|
| 1. Evidence of engagement in research to ensure best practices | |
| 2. Evidence of consistent meeting of stated project outcomes | |
| 3. In the case of team projects, evidence of the candidate's contribution of ideas, resources, and original materials | |
| 4. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others | |
| 5. Evidence of production of high-quality work that demonstrates creativity and innovation | |
| 6. Evidence that project work raises the AEI profile or improves internal processes | |
| 7. Evidence of continual expansion of skills/knowledge | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Criteria for Professional Development</p> <p>A successful candidate will include all of the following that are applicable. If any item is not applicable, the candidate will explain why. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.</p> | <p>Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee) The Senior II candidate must demonstrate how they have significantly raised the AEI profile on and off campus.</p> |
| <p>1. Evidence of how the following influenced your professional growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. attendance at in-house, local, regional, and/or international conferences and webinars b. or reading of professional research (annotated bibliography) | |
| <p>2. Evidence of ongoing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. in-house and local/regional presentations or publications b. national and/or international presentations, webinars and/or workshops c. or peer-reviewed or major commercial publications d. or leadership in a professional organization | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Criteria for Service</p> <p>A successful candidate will include all of the following that are applicable. If any item is not applicable, the candidate will explain why. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.</p> | <p>Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee) The Senior II candidate must demonstrate how they have significantly raised the AEI profile on and off campus.</p> |
| <p>1. Evidence of ongoing, active, and productive participation in service-related activities to the academic department, college, university, profession, and/or community. (Evidence may include letters from others</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| related to service, documents created by committees, emails thanking for contributions, etc.) | |
|---|--|

Teaching Excellence Checklist

Purpose = To determine the degree to which a faculty member has met the criteria of teaching excellence. Forms the basis for conversation between faculty member and Executive Director and subsequent letter sent to CAS and also as input for contract renewal and merit.

Process = This needs to be completed and submitted once per contract period by each faculty member; PDF that is standardized and fillable (online document to be created by AEI HR; forthcoming.) so that everyone is using the same format; if less than 1.0FTE on average for the contract period, the items will be prorated in the Engaged Teaching & Service section.

Source = Based on UO's Teaching Engagement Program & Senate Task Force Teaching Excellence Criteria and customized for AEI's departmental needs.

<https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence>

1. Inclusive Teaching

Inclusive teaching is defined by the following teaching behaviors:

- A. conveying that each student matters and brings valuable assets to the class ("yes" is enough)
- B. ensuring that the course materials reflect racial, ethnic and gender diversity (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- C. recognition and inclusion of the contested and evolving status of knowledge in the discipline (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- D. knowing students' goals for their learning and finding ways to explicitly link the coursework to students' own interests and concerns (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- E. maximizing student motivation by ensuring students are both challenged and supported ("yes")
- F. using student's preferred names ("yes")
- G. using multiple modes of communication (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- H. showing sensitivity to cultural backgrounds (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- I. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for four or fewer of the described inclusive teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for five or more of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Exceeds Expectation: There is evidence for all of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in almost every course regardless of class size and content area.

2. Engaged Teaching & Service

American English Institute Faculty Review Policy and Procedure

Created by Faculty Review Policy Revision Committee, Winter 2019. Last updated: May, 2019.

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost June 19, 2020

Engaged teaching is defined by the following behaviors:

- A. inviting and responding to a Midterm Student Experience Survey or (yes)
- B. completing Instructor Reflection (yes- This is the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #2)
- C. attending a workshop or presentation about teaching (list all or the most impactful)
- D. serving as a teaching mentor for a junior faculty or graduate student (explain)
- E. hosting classroom observers (who/when)
- F. performing a peer evaluation for another's class (who/when)
- G. inviting additional peer evaluation of your class beyond minimum expected (who/when)
- H. Self-evaluation of teaching using a video recording of your class (when-- This could be the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #3)
- I. participation in teaching related journal club, book club, lesson study, or other group (list all or the most impactful)
- J. serving as an active member of the Provost's Teaching Academy or TEP faculty learning community fellow (specify which)
- K. new course development, or conversion of face to face class to hybrid or online experience (specify)
- L. curriculum development or renewal (specify)
- M. provided campus, national, or international workshop or presentation of current teaching practices (specify)
- N. involved in publishing scholarship of teaching and Learning (SoTL) or discipline-based education research (DBER) (specify)
- O. participation on unit or university committee, or involvement in professional organization (list all or the most impactful)
- P. teaching over 12 hours in a term without compensation (which term)
- Q. teaching more than two preps in a term (which term and which preps)
- R. teaching more than three new preps over the course of the academic year (which new preps)
- S. grant writing (list all or the most impactful)
- T. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for the following number of described engaged teaching & service behaviors per contract period:

@ .1-.49FTE, below 2

@ .5-.67FTE, below 3

@ .68-1.0FTE, below 4

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for four of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period.

@ .1-.49FTE, 2 would meet

@ .5-.67FTE, 3 would meet

@ .68-1.0FTE, 4 would meet

Exceeds Expectations: There is evidence for six or more of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period, or participation in the equivalent of a 5-day intensive teaching development program.

@ .1-.49FTE, 3 would exceed

@ .5-.67FTE, 5 would exceed

@ .68-1.0FTE, 6 would exceed

3. Research-led Teaching

Research-led teaching is defined by the following behaviors:

- A. communicating compelling goals for student learning and designing courses tightly aligned with those goals (backward design) (yes)
- B. clearly conveying the compelling purpose, process for completion, and criteria for evaluation of class assignments before students begin work (transparency) (yes)
- C. building occasions for student reflection about their own learning process, challenges, and growth (metacognition) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- D. infusing the course with your own experience as a scholar and cutting-edge research (applying current research findings to your classroom) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- E. engaging students in a course-based research experience
- F. using students' time in and out of class strategically by (check off which of the following you use)
 - i. assigning preparatory work to get more out of class time
 - ii. using class time to harness the power and energy of the peer community to share demonstrations, real-time experiences, new scenarios, problems, artifacts, and complications that put students' knowledge and skills to the test
 - iii. following class with opportunities for reinforcement and reflection
 - iv. giving students simple, helpful feedback on low-stakes practice
- G. helping students understand the process of inquiry and expert thought through think-aloud protocols (modeling your own thought processes for students) (yes)
- H. redesigning aspects of courses based on evidence of student learning (yes)
- I. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for four or fewer of the described research-led teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for five of the described research-led teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Exceeds Expectation: There is evidence for six or more of the described research-led teaching behaviors.

Peer Observation Report

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Teacher: | Observation Date: |
| Class: | Observer: |

1. Preparation and organization (3 standards)

1A Lesson preparedness: Clear and observable evidence exists to show that the teacher prepared the lesson ahead of time and came to the classroom ready to deliver a well-organized lesson.

1B Lesson organization: The organization of the lesson is clear from the lesson plan provided, and the observed instruction is appropriately consistent with the lesson plan and moves students toward the course's student learning outcomes (SLOs).

1C Knowledge of material: Lesson delivery demonstrates clearly that the instructor has relevant and necessary knowledge of the content to teach the course effectively.

Preparation and organization overall notes:

2. Classroom Procedures (5 standards)

2A. Class time and pacing: Class time is utilized effectively and class begins and ends on time. The timing and pace of the class are appropriate to student needs and facilitate the achievement of the learning objectives for the lesson.

2B: Instructions and explanations: The teacher provides clear and sufficient explanations for all in-class tasks and activities. It is clear that students understand and can follow these explanations.

2C: Feedback to students: The teacher gives task-specific feedback that supports students' efforts to complete activities and helps them meet learning objectives for the class.

2D: Use of tools, materials, tasks and instruction: Various course tools and materials (e.g. whiteboard, document camera, computer, handouts, etc.), in-class activities, and/or instructional techniques are effectively managed and integrated throughout the lesson to meet the diverse needs of the students in the classroom.

2E: Instructional design: Instruction, tasks, and activities are designed to be cognitively engaging and move students toward lesson objectives in a way that is appropriate to their level and needs.

Classroom procedures overall notes:

3. Interaction and Social Climate (3 standards)

3A Interaction between instructor and students: There is a balance of teacher-talk time and student-talk time that is appropriate for the lesson. Teacher uses a variety of questioning strategies, not just call and response/general elicitation.

3B Interaction among students: Teacher enables and facilitates interaction such that students interact with each other as expected (on-task, use of L2 as appropriate to the learning context). This includes actively and effectively monitoring student interactions to keep students on track without excessive intervention that keeps students from completing tasks.

3C Individual student needs: Teacher is able to monitor student comprehension and address individual questions and needs while making sure students stay on-task and move toward objectives in a timely way. Class time is not lost due to needs of a few students.

Interaction and social climate overall notes:

4. Teaching Qualities (4 standards)

4A Patience and supportiveness: Teacher remains patient and supportive throughout the lesson. If needed, teacher redirects student frustration or negative situations.

4B Confidence and Rapport: Teacher demonstrates confidence in the classroom and shows that a positive rapport has been established through student willingness to participate, an understanding of expectations and a mutually positive and helpful atmosphere.

4C Voice (volume, clarity, speed) and use of language: Teacher speaks in a way that is appropriate for and comprehensible to the level of the students while at the same time modeling natural syntax, pronunciation and speaking speed.

4D Use of classroom space: Teacher's monitoring of students and use of available classroom space contribute to a positive classroom atmosphere and learning environment rather than

distracting from the lesson or indicating lack of involvement in the lesson (such as only sitting behind the desk during group work).

~~4D Physical presence, movement and body language: Teacher's gestures, movement through the classroom, and use of available classroom space contribute to a positive classroom atmosphere and learning environment rather than distracting from the lesson or indicating lack of involvement in the lesson (such as only sitting behind the desk during group work).~~

Teaching qualities overall notes:

Overall notes:

Observation Date: _____ Class observed _____

Observer name: _____

Observer signature _____ Date signed: _____

Instructor name: _____

Instructor signature: _____ Date signed: _____

- Instructor, check this box if you are attaching a response to the observer's qualitative measure of your instruction and/or explanation thereof (optional).

Peer Observation Standards: eLearning

1. Preparation and Organization (3 standards)

1A Lesson preparedness: Clear and observable evidence exists to show that the teacher prepared course materials ahead of time and began the week with a well-organized lesson.

1B Lesson organization: The organization of the lesson clearly moves participants toward the course's student learning outcomes (SLOs), and the observed instruction is appropriately consistent with the organizational plan.

1C Knowledge of material: Lesson delivery demonstrates clearly that the instructor has relevant and necessary knowledge of the content to teach the course effectively.

Preparation and organization overall notes:

2. Instruction Procedures (5 standards)

2A Efficiency and pacing: The lesson sets participants up for efficient use of their time. Course materials are made available on time, and the instructor uses deadlines and the timing of material availability to facilitate active participation and interaction. The timing and pace of the class are appropriate to participants' needs and facilitate the achievement of the learning objectives for the lesson.

2B Instructions and explanations: The teacher provides clear and sufficient explanations for all tasks and activities. It is clear that participants understand and can follow these explanations.

2C Feedback to participants: The teacher gives sufficient, timely, task-specific feedback that supports participants' efforts to complete activities and helps them meet learning objectives for the class. The instructor is responsive to participants' questions and/or misconceptions.

2D Use of tools, materials, tasks and instruction: Various course tools and materials (e.g., discussion boards, recordings, external links, readings, etc.), activities, and/or instructional techniques are effectively managed and integrated throughout the lesson to meet the diverse needs of the participants in the classroom.

2E Instructional design: Instruction, tasks, and activities are designed to be cognitively engaging and move participants toward lesson objectives in a way that is appropriate to their level and needs.

Instruction procedures overall notes:

3. Interaction and Social Climate (3 standards)

3A Interaction between instructor and participants: There is a balance of teacher and participant input and feedback that is appropriate for the lesson. The teacher offers guidance when needed, but does not dominate unnecessarily. Teacher's tone is polite, respectful, and appropriate for the audience. When possible, teacher's comments encourage learning rather than just simple correction. Interaction is appropriately contextualized.

3B Interaction among participants: Teacher enables and facilitates interaction such that participants interact with each other as expected (on-task, appropriate length, content, and quality). This includes actively and effectively monitoring participant interactions to keep participants on track without excessive intervention that keeps participants from completing tasks.

3C Individual participant needs: Teacher is able to monitor participant comprehension and address individual questions and needs while making sure participants stay on-task and move toward objectives in a timely way. The teacher clearly controls the direction of the class rather than letting participants misdirect it, while also encouraging autonomy when possible. Checklists, models, and help/support resources are available to participants at all times.

Interaction and social climate overall notes:

4. Teaching Qualities (3 standards)

4A Patience and supportiveness: Teacher remains patient and supportive throughout the lesson. If needed, teacher redirects participant frustration or negative situations.

4B Confidence and Rapport: Teacher demonstrates confidence and shows that a positive rapport has been established through participant willingness to participate, an understanding of expectations and a mutually positive and helpful atmosphere.

4C Use of language: Teacher interacts in a way that is appropriate for and comprehensible to the level of the participants while at the same time modeling natural syntax and word choice. If voice or video recordings are used, the voice clarity, speed, pronunciation, syntax, and lexicon are appropriate. Text and media materials are formatted in such a way as to be as accessible as possible to students of all abilities.

Teaching qualities overall notes:

Overall comments:

Observation Date: _____ Class observed _____

Observer name: _____

Observer signature _____ Date signed: _____

Instructor name: _____

Instructor signature: _____ Date signed: _____

- Instructor, check this box if you are attaching a response to the observer's qualitative measure of your instruction and/or explanation thereof (optional).

AEI Teaching Excellence Checklist

Purpose = To determine the degree to which a faculty member has met the criteria of teaching excellence. Forms the basis for conversation between faculty member and Executive Director and subsequent letter sent to CAS and also as input for contract renewal and merit.

Process = This needs to be completed and submitted once per contract period by each faculty member; PDF that is standardized and fillable (online document to be created by AEI HR; forthcoming.) so that everyone is using the same format; if less than 1.0FTE on average for the contract period, the items will be prorated in the Engaged Teaching & Service section.

Source = Based on UO's Teaching Engagement Program & Senate Task Force Teaching Excellence Criteria and customized for AEI's departmental needs.

<https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence>

1. Inclusive Teaching

Inclusive teaching is defined by the following teaching behaviors:

- J. conveying that each student matters and brings valuable assets to the class ("yes" is enough)
- K. ensuring that the course materials reflect racial, ethnic and gender diversity (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- L. recognition and inclusion of the contested and evolving status of knowledge in the discipline (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- M. knowing students' goals for their learning and finding ways to explicitly link the coursework to students' own interests and concerns (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- N. maximizing student motivation by ensuring students are both challenged and supported ("yes")
- O. using student's preferred names ("yes")
- P. using multiple modes of communication (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- Q. showing sensitivity to cultural backgrounds (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- R. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for four or fewer of the described inclusive teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for five or more of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Exceeds Expectation: There is evidence for all of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in almost every course regardless of class size and content area.

2. Engaged Teaching & Service

Engaged teaching is defined by the following behaviors:

- U. inviting and responding to a Midterm Student Experience Survey or (yes)
- V. completing Instructor Reflection (yes- This is the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #2)
- W. attending a workshop or presentation about teaching (list all or the most impactful)
- X. serving as a teaching mentor for a junior faculty or graduate student (explain)
- Y. hosting classroom observers (who/when)

- Z. performing a peer evaluation for another's class (who/when)
- AA. inviting additional peer evaluation of your class beyond minimum expected (who/when)
- BB. Self-evaluation of teaching using a video recording of your class (when-- This could be the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #3)
- CC. participation in teaching related journal club, book club, lesson study, or other group (list all or the most impactful)
- DD. serving as an active member of the Provost's Teaching Academy or TEP faculty learning community fellow (specify which)
- EE. new course development, or conversion of face to face class to hybrid or online experience (specify)
- FF. curriculum development or renewal (specify)
- GG. provided campus, national, or international workshop or presentation of current teaching practices (specify)
- HH. involved in publishing scholarship of teaching and Learning (SoTL) or discipline-based education research (DBER) (specify)
- II. participation on unit or university committee, or involvement in professional organization (list all or the most impactful)
- JJ. teaching over 12 hours in a term without compensation (which term)
- KK. teaching more than two preps in a term (which term and which preps)
- LL. teaching more than three new preps over the course of the academic year (which new preps)
- MM. grant writing (list all or the most impactful)
- NN. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for the following number of described engaged teaching & service behaviors per contract period:

- @ .1-.49FTE, below 2
- @ .5-.67FTE, below 3
- @ .68-1.0FTE, below 4

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for four of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period.

- @ .1-.49FTE, 2 would meet
- @ .5-.67FTE, 3 would meet
- @ .68-1.0FTE, 4 would meet

Exceeds Expectations: There is evidence for six or more of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period, or participation in the equivalent of a 5-day intensive teaching development program.

- @ .1-.49FTE, 3 would exceed
- @ .5-.67FTE, 5 would exceed
- @ .68-1.0FTE, 6 would exceed

3. Research-led Teaching

Research-led teaching is defined by the following behaviors:

- J. communicating compelling goals for student learning and designing courses tightly aligned with those goals (backward design) (yes)
- K. clearly conveying the compelling purpose, process for completion, and criteria for evaluation of class assignments before students begin work (transparency) (yes)
- L. building occasions for student reflection about their own learning process, challenges, and growth (metacognition) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)

- M. infusing the course with your own experience as a scholar and cutting-edge research (applying current research findings to your classroom) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- N. engaging students in a course-based research experience (yes)
- O. using students' time in and out of class strategically by (check off which of the following you use)
 - i. assigning preparatory work to get more out of class time
 - ii. using class time to harness the power and energy of the peer community to share demonstrations, real-time experiences, new scenarios, problems, artifacts, and complications that put students' knowledge and skills to the test
 - iii. following class with opportunities for reinforcement and reflection
 - iv. giving students simple, helpful feedback on low-stakes practice
- P. helping students understand the process of inquiry and expert thought through think-aloud protocols (modeling your own thought processes for students) (yes)
- Q. redesigning aspects of courses based on evidence of student learning (yes)
- R. other

Criteria for evaluation:

Below Expectations: There is evidence for four or fewer of the described research-led teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Meets Expectations: There is evidence for five of the described research-led teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

Exceeds Expectation: There is evidence for six or more of the described research-led teaching behaviors.