

Teaching Award Rating Criteria and Possible Indicators

Criterion #1: Application of appropriate pedagogical principles and effective teaching practices in higher education and/or the specific discipline or area being taught.		
<i>Rating Scale</i>		<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0	No explanation is provided for the principles and practices used.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
1	Evidence of teaching principles and practices <i>that align</i> with the educational aims of the specific discipline or area being taught.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in the chair and/or colleague letters. • Citation of guidelines used in the field.
2	Evidence of teaching principles and practices <i>that align in exemplary ways</i> with the specific discipline or area being taught.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in the chair and/or colleague letters. • Comparison to cited guidelines used in the field. • <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary.</i>
3	Evidence of teaching principles and practices <i>that align in truly innovative ways</i> with the educational aims of the specific discipline or area being taught.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in the chair or colleague letters that specifically address the nature of innovation, and explain <u>why</u> it is considered innovative.
4	Evidence that teaching principles and/or practices <i>have influenced the teaching of others</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to practice within a department. • A standard adopted by a school. • Receipt of a national award. • Practice adopted by national association. • Published a peer-reviewed paper, book chapter, lab manual, text book, or other instructional materials.



Criterion #2: Commitment to student learning and adaptation of instructional methods to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.		
Rating Scale		Possible Indicators
0	No evidence of adapting instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
1	Recognition of the instructor's <i>commitment</i> to student learning and evidence of adapting instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments in student evaluations.• Chair, colleague, and/or student comments regarding the adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.
2	Recognition of the instructor's <i>exemplary commitment</i> to student learning and evidence of adapting instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specific comments addressing adaptation in student letters.• Specific comments addressing adaptation in peer and/or chair letters.• Chair, colleague, and/or student comments regarding the exemplary adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary.</i>
3	Evidence of the instructor's <i>truly innovative adaption</i> of instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chair, colleague, and/or student comments regarding the truly innovative adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered truly innovative.</i>
4	Evidence that instructional adaptation to meet student strengths, needs, and differences <i>has influenced the teaching of others.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change to practice within a department.• A standard adopted by a school.• Receipt of a national award that recognizes an instructional adaptation.• Specific example cited by a national association.• Specific example published in a peer-reviewed paper, book chapter, lab manual, text book, or other instructional materials.



Criterion #3: Use of student assignments that reflect high academic standards and expectations for high achievement.		
Rating Scale		Possible Indicators
0	No rationale for the techniques being used to assess students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
1	Evidence of student assignments that <i>align</i> with the learning objectives of the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A course syllabus with clearly stated assignments that are linked to learning objectives.
2	Evidence of student assignments that <i>align in an exemplary way</i> with the learning objectives of the courses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A course syllabus with varied assignments that take into account different learning styles and are linked to learning objectives.• Chair, colleague and/or student comments that indicate assignments that promoted high achievement.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary.</i>
3	Evidence of student assignments that <i>align in a truly innovative way</i> with the learning objectives of the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chair, colleague, and/or student comments that specifically and substantively address the innovative nature of assignments.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered truly innovative.</i>
4	Evidence of student assignments that <i>have influenced the teaching of others</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examples of assignments from other instructors with notes explaining derivation from candidate's assignments.• Specific example published in a peer-reviewed paper, book chapter, lab manual, text book, or other instructional materials.



Criterion #4: Fostering a high level of student involvement and intellectual excitement.		
Rating Scale		Possible Indicators
0	No evidence of fostering student involvement or intellectual excitement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
1	Evidence that suggests <i>average</i> student involvement and intellectual excitement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Average ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students.
2	Evidence that suggests <i>above average</i> student involvement and intellectual excitement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Above average ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered above average.</i>
3	Evidence that suggests <i>exemplary</i> student involvement and intellectual excitement, <i>and includes unique scholarly work or action by the student.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exemplary ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students.• Comments on student statements that specify scholarly work.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary and how the student work is unique.</i>
4	Evidence that suggests <i>exemplary</i> student involvement and intellectual excitement, <i>and includes unique scholarly work or action by the student, only made possible by the instructor's intervention.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exemplary ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students.• Comments on student statements that specify scholarly work prompted by the instructor's intervention.• Publications by the student.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary and how the student work is unique and was only made possible by the instructor's intervention.</i>



Criterion #5: Availability to students outside of regularly scheduled class times.		
Rating Scale		Possible Indicators
0	No evidence of availability to students outside of class time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
1	Evidence that suggests instructor availability <i>meets university guidelines</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statement of standard office hours.
2	Evidence that suggests instructor availability <i>exceeds university guidelines</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student feedback that suggests access beyond typical office hours (time in excess of office hours, email, telephone, skype, group sessions, etc.).• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>how</u> they exceed university guidelines.</i>
3	Evidence that methods of instructor availability <i>have been integrated to enhance instruction</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments from students indicating the instructor's availability outside of class was paramount to their learning.• <i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>how</u> the methods enhanced instruction.</i>
4	Evidence that methods of instructor availability <i>have been adopted by others at GW</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments from peers and/or chair that methods of instructor availability have been adopted by the department.



Criterion #6: Participation in the peer review of teaching.		
Rating Scale	Possible Indicators	
0	No evidence of faculty assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
1	Evidence of completion of <i>standard peer- assessment of teaching</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letter from a colleague who has conducted a peer review of the instructor's teaching.
2	Evidence that completion of peer- assessment of teaching <i>was used to improve the instructor's practice</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specific examples of changes based on peer review.• Documented participation in PRET.
3	Completion of peer reviews <i>for other faculty that were used to improve their practice</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specific examples of peer reviews of others and how those reviews improved their practice.• Documented participation in PRET.
4	<i>Contributions to best practices</i> regarding peer reviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Service on a national/international award committee.• Development and/or publication of a teaching assessment tool or process conducted by peers.