



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.	None
1: Evidence of teaching principles and practices <i>that align</i> with the educational aims of the specific discipline or area being taught.	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.	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.	Comments in the chair or colleague letter 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>	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.	
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0: No evidence of adapting instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	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.	<p>Comments in student evaluations.</p> <p>Chair colleague, and/or student comments regarding the adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.</p>
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.	<p>Specific comments addressing adaptation in student letters.</p> <p>Specific comments addressing adaptation in peer and/or chair letters.</p> <p>Chair colleague, and/or student comments regarding the exemplary adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.</p> <p><i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered exemplary.</i></p>
3: Evidence of the instructor's <i>truly innovative adaption</i> of instruction to differing students' strengths, needs, and differences.	<p>Chair colleague, and/or student comments regarding the truly innovative adaptation of instruction to accommodate student differences.</p> <p><i>For any indicators discussed or submitted, specifically explain <u>why</u> they are considered truly innovative.</i></p>
4: Evidence that instructional adaptation to meet student strengths, needs, and differences <i>has influenced the teaching of others.</i>	<p>Change to practice within a department.</p> <p>A standard adopted by a school.</p> <p>Receipt of a national award that recognizes an instructional adaptation.</p> <p>Specific example cited by a national association.</p> <p>Specific example published in a peer-reviewed paper, book chapter, lab manual, text book, or other instructional materials.</p>

Criterion #3: Use of student assignments that reflect high academic standards and expectations for high achievement.	
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0: No rationale for the techniques being used to assess students.	None
1: Evidence of student assignments that <i>align</i> with the learning objectives of the course.	A course syllabus with clearly stated assignment(s) 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.	A course syllabus with varied assignments that take into account different learning styles, and are linked to learning objectives. Chair, college 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.	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> .	Examples of assignments from other instructors with notes explaining derivation from candidates 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.	
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0: No evidence of fostering student involvement or intellectual excitement.	None
1: Evidence that suggests <i>average</i> student involvement and intellectual excitement.	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.	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>	Exemplary ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students. Comments on student letters 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>	Exemplary ratings on questions related to student engagement on course evaluations by students. Comments on student letters 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 instructors intervention.</i>

Criterion #5: Availability to students outside of regularly scheduled class times.	
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0: No evidence of availability to students outside of class time.	None
1: Evidence that suggests instructor availability <i>meets university guidelines</i> .	Statement of standard office hours.
2: Evidence that suggests instructor availability <i>exceeds university guidelines</i> .	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> .	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> .	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.	
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Possible Indicators</i>
0: No evidence of faculty assessments.	None
1: Evidence of completion of <i>standard peer-assessment of teaching</i> .	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> .	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> .	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.	Service on a national/international award committee. Development and/or publication of a teaching assessment tool or process conducted by peers.