**Pro Tem Teaching Evaluation Template**

<DATE>

First and Last Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Rank: Choose an item.

Department: Click or tap here to enter text.

Review Period: Click or tap to enter a date. - Click or tap to enter a date.

Supervisor: Click or tap here to enter text.

**Introduction**

<FULL NAME> has served as a pro tem instructor in the <UNIT> since <DATE>. In their current appointment, they teach <NUMBER> courses per <PERIOD>, per our unit’s workload policy.

Discuss your unit’s performance review process for pro tem instructors.

**Teaching Evaluation**

The data that informed these decisions included <list any that apply in your unit policy>: Course Evaluation data from <period>, supervisor comments, Student Experience Survey data from <period>, Instructor Reflections, peer reviews of teaching, and a candidate’s statement of teaching.

*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

Does Not Meet Conditions

Meets Conditions

Comment.

*Inclusive Teaching Standard*

Conditions

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

Does Not Meet Conditions

Meets Conditions

Comment.

*Engaged Teaching Standard*

Condition

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

Evaluation

Does Not Meet Condition

Meets Condition

Comment.

*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

Does Not Meet Conditions

Meets Conditions

Comment.

My evaluation of <Name>’s teaching, based on the standards above, is that they have <not met/met> our expectations by <not meeting expectations, meeting conditions in all areas, OR meeting in ## conditions>.

Overall Rating: Meets Expectations Does Not Meet Expectations

Signatures indicate the parties below have reviewed the evaluation and had an opportunity to discuss its contents.

Pro Tem Faculty Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_