The Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) is leading a campus-wide initiative to implement a Teaching Effectiveness Framework to define, evaluate, and reward teaching excellence. Leveraging decades of scholarship, the framework uses seven rubric dimensions to define effective teaching across all disciplines, levels, and modalities. Learn more about this initiative [here](#).

### Developing (1) vs. Proficient (2) vs. Expert (3)

#### Class Climate
What sort of climate for learning does the instructor create?

- Class climate does not promote respect or sense of belonging among all students
- Class climate discourages student motivation or self-efficacy
- Consistently negative student reports of teacher accessibility or interaction skills
- Little attempt to address concerns voiced by students

Proficient:

- Class climate is inclusive and promotes respect
- Class climate encourages student motivation
- No consistently negative student ratings of teacher accessibility or interaction skills
- Instructor articulates some lessons learned through student feedback

Expert:

- Class climate is respectful, open, and inclusive; promotes both student-student and student-teacher dialogue.
- Climate fosters motivation, self-efficacy, ownership of learning
- Instructor models inclusive language and behavior
- Instructor seeks and is responsive to student feedback

#### Mentoring and Advising
How effectively has the instructor worked individually with UG or grad students?

- No indication of effective advising or mentoring (but expected in department)

Proficient:

- Some evidence of effective advising and mentoring (define as appropriate for discipline)

Expert:

- Evidence of exceptional quality and time commitment to advising and mentoring (define as appropriate for discipline)

#### Goals, Content, and Alignment
What are students expected to learn? Are course goals appropriately challenging?

- Course goals are not articulated, or are unclear, inappropriate or marginally related to curriculum
- Content and materials are outdated or unsuitable for students in the course
- Content is not clearly aligned with curriculum or institutional expectations
- Content does not reflect diverse perspectives

Proficient:

- Course goals are articulated and appropriate for curriculum
- Content is current and appropriate for topic, students, and curriculum
- Course topics have appropriate range
- Standard, intellectually sound materials
- Course materials reflect diverse perspectives

Expert:

- Course goals are well-articulated, high quality, relevant to all students, and clearly connected to program or curricular goals
- Content is challenging and innovative or related to current issues and developments in field
- High-quality materials, well-aligned with course goals
- Course materials reflect diverse perspectives and promote critical reflection on these diverse perspectives

#### Teaching Practices
How is in-class and out-of-class time used?

- Courses are not sufficiently planned or organized
- Practices are not well-executed and show little development over time
- Students lack opportunities to practice critical skills embedded in course goals
- Student engagement is generally low
- Assessments and assignments are at inappropriate difficulty level or not well-aligned with course goals

Proficient:

- Courses are well-planned and organized
- Standard course practices; follows conventions of discipline and institution
- Students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals
- Students are consistently engaged
- Assessments/assignments are appropriately challenging and tied to course goals

Expert:

- Courses are well-planned and integrated, and reflect commitment to providing meaningful assignments and assessments
- Uses inclusive and effective or innovative methods to support learning in all students
- In- and out-of-class activities provide opportunities for practice and feedback on important skills and concepts
- Students show high levels of engagement
- Assessments and assignments are varied and allow students to demonstrate knowledge through multiple modalities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement of Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Insufficient attention to student understanding; quality of learning is not described or analyzed with clear standards</th>
<th>Standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding are clear</th>
<th>Standards for evaluating understanding are clear and connected to program, curriculum, or professional expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of inadequate learning or inequities in learning without clear attempts to improve</td>
<td>Student learning meets dept. expectations</td>
<td>Consistently attends to student learning, uses it to inform teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of learning is insufficient to support success in other contexts</td>
<td>Some use of evidence of student learning to inform teaching</td>
<td>Quality of learning supports success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or relevant non-classroom venues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of learning is not a barrier to success in other contexts</td>
<td>Efforts to support learning in all students by examining possible inequities in performance across groups and making adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection and Iterative Growth</th>
<th>Little or no indication of having reflected upon or learned from prior teaching, evidence of student learning, or peer or student feedback</th>
<th>Continued competent teaching, possibly with minor reflection based on input from peers and/or students</th>
<th>Regularly adjusts teaching based on reflection on student learning, within or across semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no indication of efforts to develop as a teacher despite evidence of need</td>
<td>Articulates some lessons learned or changes informed by prior teaching, student learning, or feedback</td>
<td>Examines student performance following adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the instructor’s teaching changed over time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports improved student achievement of learning goals and/or improved equity in outcomes based on past course modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has this been informed by student learning evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Service, Scholarship, or Community</th>
<th>Little or no evidence of positive contributions to teaching and learning culture in department or institution</th>
<th>Some positive contributions to teaching and learning culture in department or institution</th>
<th>Consistently positive contributions to teaching and learning culture in department or institution (e.g., curriculum committees, program assessment, co-curricular activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no interaction with teaching community</td>
<td>Some engagement with peers on teaching</td>
<td>Regular engagement with peers on teaching (e.g., teaching-related presentations or workshops, peer reviews of teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices and results of teaching are not shared with others</td>
<td>Has shared teaching practices or results with others (e.g., presentation, workshop, essay)</td>
<td>Presentations or publications to share practices or results of teaching with multiple audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly publications or grant applications related to teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How has the instructor contributed to the broader teaching community, both on and off campus?