**Teaching portfolio rubric – Draft, University of New Mexico\***

*Note:* Criteria may be customized for each department.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Improvement required to meet expectations* | *Meets expectations as an effective teacher* | *Meets criteria for teaching excellence* |
| CA1. Strong content knowledge |
| * No evidence that content has changed commensurate with changes in the discipline.
* Peer reviewers express concern about content knowledge
 | * Provides evidence that content has been updated if the course has been taught over several years.
* Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio]
 | * Explains sources of content knowledge for courses, as described in syllabi
* Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio]
* Explains and shows evidence of inquiry into how students master content knowledge
 |
| CA2. Growing knowledge of teaching/learning practice |
| * Attended no teaching-professional development activities
 | * Attended at least one teaching-professional development activity and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction
 | * Attended two or more teaching-professional development activities and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction
* Facilitated a teaching-professional development event for other faculty/TAs
* Published at least one paper on teaching in their discipline
* Awarded at least one grant to improve teaching or training of students.
 |
| CA3. Adapting/revising to needs of learners |
| * Shows no evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges
 | * Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges
 | * Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on multiple inputs from students and observations of student learning challenges (e.g., midterm feedback, surveys, classroom assessment techniques; frequent formative assessment)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| CA4. Engage students to learn in the real/virtual classroom |
| * Shows no evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers.)
 | * Explains and shows evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g. discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)
 | * Explains and shows evidence for using and assessing the impact of multiple interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)
 |
| CA5. Can explain and support choices in content, pedagogy, assessment |
| * Offers no explanation of choices in content, pedagogy or assessment
 | * Explains choices in content based on disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of students.
* Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of students
 | * Explains choices in content based on more than one of: disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of students.
* Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of more than one of: developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of students.
* Explains specific choices of assessment methods.
 |
| CA6. Mentoring/Advising undergraduate, graduate, professional student scholars |
| * No evidence of mentoring or advising students
 | * Evidence of mentoring of lower division, upper division, graduate or professional students
* Mentoring activities have occurred over several years.
 | * Evidence of mentoring more than one level of student (e.g. more than one of lower vision, upper division, graduate, or professional students)
* Description of outcomes of mentoring.
* Consistent mentoring activity over several years.
 |
| CA7. Tracking learning outcomes for improvement |
| * Provides no student learning outcomes for their courses.
* Shows no assessment of student learning.
 | * Student learning outcomes (SLO’s) developed for all courses and listed on syllabi.
* Explains and provides evidence for assessing student learning outcomes revising curriculum or instruction to improve learning
 | * Matches course SLO’s to degree-program SLO’s
* Matches course SLO’s to university core curriculum SLO’s/competencies (if applicable)
* Serves as coordinator for development, assessment and discussion of departmental SLO’s
 |
| CA8. Fit of teaching activities within curriculum |
| * Provides no explanation of fit of their courses into the curriculum of the department or university
 | * Explains where courses fits within departmental degree requirements
 | * Connects course goals and content to other courses within the department and across the university
* Explains fit of the course within students’ educational programs within the university
 |
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