

# STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION

*Ad Hoc Committee*

Annual Report | May 2026



## Committee Membership

- |                                          |                                    |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Haley Woznyj, <i>Chair</i>            | 5. Christopher Bjornsen            |
| 2. Kat Alves (Sabbatical in Spring 2026) | 6. Gregg Harbaugh-Schattenkirk     |
| 3. Shannon Salley                        | 7. Bob Blaisdell                   |
| 4. Erin Waggoner                         | 8. Deborah Westin (2023-2024 only) |

## Committee Work and Accomplishments

In February 2023, Faculty Senate created an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the usefulness of Longwood University's current Student Assessment of Instruction (i.e., student evaluations) and to align the evaluation process with best practices in higher education. The committee worked on the charge for three years in three different phases.

### Phase 1: Literature Search (2023-2024)

#### *Summary*

All members of the committee searched the literature for the current, peer-reviewed research on the use of student evaluations in evaluating teaching effectiveness. The committee then summarized the literature and identified themes. The general consensus in the literature suggests that student evaluations **do not measure teaching effectiveness**. Specifically, student evaluations are:

1. biased against women, minority, and LGBTQIA+ faculty members
2. easily manipulated with grades and other incentives
3. measure non-teaching related factors, such as student ability, student interest in the course, difficulty of the course, and grades

#### *Policy recommendations*

Using the available peer-reviewed research, the committee developed three evidence-based recommendations:

1. Stop using student evaluations when evaluating faculty for administrative purposes (e.g., promotion and tenure decisions, merit pay raises, or awards) because it can lead to discrimination
2. Continue to collect student feedback, but rename the form to capture student experience
3. Redesign the feedback form and evaluation process to align Longwood University with best practices in higher education, reduce the potential for discrimination, and to increase the utility of student feedback for faculty development.

#### *Accomplishments or outcomes*

In February 2024, the committee reported the findings and recommendations to Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate granted the ad hoc committee a continuance to execute the recommendations.

## Phase 2: Faculty Survey (2024-2025)

### Summary

The committee began work to develop a new form to replace the current student assessment of instruction. To ensure that the form reflected teaching *at Longwood*, the committee solicited input on how to define effective teaching and the elements that should be included in a new form. In November 2024, the committee emailed all Longwood University faculty (on the All faculty ListServ) inviting them to participate in a survey. The survey contained three main sections and included both closed and open-ended questions:

1. Faculty provided their thoughts about how teaching effectiveness is defined at Longwood University, as outlined currently in the FPPM.
2. Faculty rated a list of components that could potentially be included on a student feedback form.
3. Members of promotion and tenure committees provided insight on the faculty evaluation process.

The survey was estimated to take 5-10 minutes to complete. The survey was open for two weeks, and a reminder email was sent after one week. Appendix A contains the results of the survey. The committee used these results in Phase 3 to begin to draft the new form.

### Policy recommendations

In October, 2024, the committee proposed policy changes to the FPPM related to the use of student assessment data in faculty evaluation (e.g., faculty promotion and tenure processes, annual evaluations, faculty awards). Faculty Senate members had a lengthy discussion about the proposed policy changes. During the discussion, faculty presented various ideas to the committee for consideration. Most faculty reported receiving positive feedback from their departments regarding the proposed changes but wanted a clear explanation of what would replace the current student evaluations. The policy recommendations were routed to the appropriate Senate Committees – Faculty Awards Committee, and the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee.

In March of 2025, the Faculty Awards Committee proposed changes to the use of student evaluation data in determining the recipients of faculty awards. The policy removes the requirement to submit student evaluations for the last two years from each class to be considered for faculty awards. Instead of evaluations, nominees can submit up to ten pages of alternative supporting evidence of teaching excellence, which can include course syllabi, letters of recommendation, instructional materials, or related scholarly work. The proposal was approved as submitted on April 10, 2025.

In April of 2025, the P&T Committee proposed two policy changes related to the use of student assessment data in P&T processes to Faculty Senate. Faculty members raised questions about the wording and aspects of student assessment. The P&T Committee considered the feedback and revised the proposals. The first proposal makes wording changes to allow the use of student assessment of instruction data in P&T evaluations *only when* the information included in them can be supported by other indicators of teaching quality. The second proposal provides additional guidance on allowable use of student assessment of instruction data in the promotion and tenure recommendation process. Faculty Senate members voted on and approved both items on April 24, 2025.

### *Accomplishments or outcomes*

1. Student evaluation data cannot be used without additional corroborating evidence in promotion and tenure decisions.
2. Student evaluation data cannot be used in the evaluation of faculty awards

Together, these outcomes directly address the committee's first recommendation from Phase 1 to stop using student evaluations when evaluating faculty for administrative purposes

### **Phase 3: Instrument Development (2025-2026)**

#### *Summary*

Using the results from the faculty survey in Phase 2, the committee began to draft items for a new student feedback form. This phase directly addresses the committee's second and third recommendations from Phase 1 (rename and redesign the form). The instrument development process as follows:

**STEP 1 – Survey design (Sept. 2025):** students in Dr. Gregg Harbaugh-Schattenkirk's Survey Design course edited the survey with best design practices in mind. The committee made changes accordingly.

**STEP 2 – Focus groups (Nov. 2025):** The committee conducted seven focus groups with faculty across campus – graduate faculty, tenured faculty, untenured faculty, department chairs, and current and former P&T committee members.

Feedback from the focus groups was both positive and constructive. Many participants preferred the flow of the form, as well as the focus on student effort in the new instrument. They raised concerns regarding its length and lack of adaptability for online, hybrid, or clinic-based courses. Participants collectively suggested a number of changes, like a "Not Applicable" option for many items, more standardized response scales, and a standardized, in-person administration window to ensure higher response rates. They also pointed out the need for more clarity in some of the items. Additionally, there was support for adding a strong preamble to the form that explicitly outlines how the data will be used by leadership and addresses the impact of student bias.

The committee made edits to the form in response to the focus group feedback and added in draft instructions and a script to administer the form in-person and online. The committee also named the form the Student Experience and Learning Form (SELF).

**STEP 3 – Initial draft (Feb. 2026):** The committee presented the SELF to Faculty Senate on February 12, 2026 and asked senate members to discuss the form with their departments and provide feedback via an online survey and at subsequent meetings (March 5 and March 26, 2026).

Faculty provided feedback related to the form content and structure – they thought some questions about conduct are better suited for department chairs, questioned the application to graduate level courses, and made suggestions to response options and question wording. They also raised some concerns about the administration of the form (e.g., length of administration in class, the preamble). The committee clarified that only the updated evaluation questions—not the administration process—will enter the official faculty manual. Finally, concerns over the potential for bias and the use of the updated form remained.

**STEP 4 – Additional focus groups (Mar. 2026):** While faculty senate members gathered feedback from their departments, the committee solicited additional input from Graduate Council to ensure the changes addressed graduate faculty’s initial concerns about applicability to online and clinical-based courses. Further, the committee held two additional focus groups – one with graduate students and one with undergraduate students – to gather feedback from the student perspective.

**STEP 5 – Final changes (Apr. 2026):** Based on the student and faculty feedback, the committee made changes to the form. For example, the committee shortened the script, changed item wording to increase clarity, removed an entire section (and merged some questions into remaining sections), made the response options more consistent, and added in a couple of questions that the faculty requested.

### *Policy recommendations*

The committee proposed the final form to Faculty Senate on April 9, 2026. Faculty Senate approved the proposal on April 9, 2026.

### *Accomplishments or outcomes*

1. The Student Experience and Learning Form was adopted to replace the Student Assessment of Instruction form, starting in Fall 2026.

## **Records**

Committee records are in a Box folder. Haley Woznyj is the owner the folder, and all committee members have access to the folder. Haley Woznyj also has additional materials and records kept in personal folders.

## **Recommendations for Continuing Business**

1. The committee suggests that departments update their policies and procedures outline in Section IV (Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Review) of the FPPM. The language in each section should change from “student assessment of instruction” or “student evaluations” to the Student Experience and Learning Form (SELF) to comply with the new form that will be administered. The policies and procedures should also comply with the changes to the P&T processes.
2. The committee suggests that appropriate committees revisit the process by which faculty are evaluated to clarify the dimensions that faculty are evaluated on and the ways in which they can be assessed. Based on the research the committee conducted (including best practices from other universities) and the feedback the committee received in the SELF development process, below are suggestions for the appropriate committees to consider:
  - a. Develop an assessment map or rubric (see Appendix B for a sample from the University of Oregon) to clarify the dimensions that faculty are evaluated on and the sources of evidence that evaluating bodies can use to assess those dimensions
  - b. Develop/update a classroom observation sheet that reflects current best practices in teaching and the dimensions of effective teaching that are important at Longwood University (see Appendix A)
  - c. Ensure classroom observations are unannounced to reduce any observer effects in faculty teaching
  - d. Allow department chairs and P&T committee members access to faculty’s Canvas courses

- e. Remove the use of the SELF entirely from evaluation processes and replace it with other evidence of effective teaching. This will mitigate the concerns that remain about bias in student feedback.
- 3. Provide training to faculty on how use the data from the SELF to improve teaching
- 4. Consider administering the SELF form mid-semester to focus more on continuous improvement in courses

## APPENDIX A

### Results from Faculty Survey

#### Results of perceptions of teaching dimensions outlined in the FPPM, Section III.R.II.A.

| Teaching Dimension                                                                                                                                                                         | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | % favorable | Mean rating | SD   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| A current, sound knowledge base in the discipline reflecting continuous revision that improves course content.                                                                             | 2.63%             | 0.00%             | 0.00%                      | 13.16%         | 84.21%         | 97.37%      | 4.76        | 0.71 |
| Organized course preparation, including clear syllabi detailing objectives and expectations.                                                                                               | 0.88%             | 2.63%             | 2.63%                      | 20.18%         | 73.68%         | 93.86%      | 4.63        | 0.74 |
| Organized preparation for each class, so that the course delivery flows as a cohesive whole.                                                                                               | 0.88%             | 0.88%             | 2.63%                      | 20.18%         | 75.44%         | 95.61%      | 4.68        | 0.66 |
| Employment of a variety of teaching methodologies suited to the characteristics of each course, especially those that encourage discussion, promote skills, and develop critical thinking. | 1.75%             | 1.75%             | 4.39%                      | 33.33%         | 58.77%         | 92.11%      | 4.46        | 0.81 |
| Demonstration of the ability to synthesize and correlate information, and to simplify complex topics.                                                                                      | 1.75%             | 0.88%             | 3.51%                      | 21.05%         | 72.81%         | 93.86%      | 4.62        | 0.76 |
| Demonstration of effective, clear communication skills, and the ability to stimulate these skills in students.                                                                             | 1.75%             | 0.00%             | 5.26%                      | 20.18%         | 72.81%         | 92.98%      | 4.62        | 0.75 |
| Development of evaluation instruments that accurately assess the achievement of stated course objectives.                                                                                  | 0.88%             | 2.63%             | 4.39%                      | 29.82%         | 62.28%         | 92.11%      | 4.50        | 0.78 |
| Consistency in grading, making assignments, and applying rules.                                                                                                                            | 0.88%             | 0.88%             | 3.51%                      | 20.18%         | 74.56%         | 94.74%      | 4.67        | 0.67 |
| Consistency with the time requirements appropriate to the number of credit hours awarded.                                                                                                  | 1.75%             | 3.51%             | 12.28%                     | 32.46%         | 50.00%         | 82.46%      | 4.25        | 0.93 |
| Responsiveness to students in and outside the classroom.                                                                                                                                   | 0.88%             | 0.88%             | 4.42%                      | 26.55%         | 67.26%         | 93.81%      | 4.58        | 0.70 |
| High expectations for student achievement, and the provision of support that helps students meet these expectations.                                                                       | 1.75%             | 0.88%             | 4.39%                      | 29.82%         | 63.16%         | 92.98%      | 4.52        | 0.78 |
| Comprehensive student advising.                                                                                                                                                            | 9.65%             | 10.53%            | 28.07%                     | 25.44%         | 26.32%         | 51.75%      | 3.48        | 1.26 |
| Enthusiasm for the discipline that transmits the excitement and value of learning                                                                                                          | 2.63%             | 0.88%             | 7.89%                      | 25.44%         | 63.16%         | 88.60%      | 4.46        | 0.88 |

n = 113-114; % Favorable refers to the percentage of respondents who selected 'Somewhat agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. Ratings are on a 1-5 scale.

## Results of ratings on potential components of to be included on a student feedback form

|                                                                                                                                                                                         | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | % favorable | Mean rating | SD   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| <b>Course Components</b>                                                                                                                                                                |                   |                   |                            |                |                |             |             |      |
| Perceptions of the organization of the course                                                                                                                                           | 4.04%             | 10.10%            | 28.28%                     | 33.33%         | 24.24%         | 57.58%      | 3.64        | 1.08 |
| Perceptions of the quality of the course materials                                                                                                                                      | 7.07%             | 11.11%            | 32.32%                     | 33.33%         | 16.16%         | 49.49%      | 3.40        | 1.11 |
| Perceptions about particular assignments and projects assigned in the course                                                                                                            | 6.06%             | 7.07%             | 22.22%                     | 31.31%         | 33.33%         | 64.65%      | 3.79        | 1.16 |
| Perceptions of the relevance of the course content to the overall learning objectives                                                                                                   | 6.06%             | 22.22%            | 27.27%                     | 28.28%         | 16.16%         | 44.44%      | 3.26        | 1.16 |
| Perceptions of the clarity of assignment instructions                                                                                                                                   | 0.00%             | 10.10%            | 12.12%                     | 42.42%         | 35.35%         | 77.78%      | 4.03        | 0.94 |
| Perceptions of feedback on assignments and grading                                                                                                                                      | 4.04%             | 11.11%            | 14.14%                     | 40.40%         | 30.30%         | 70.71%      | 3.82        | 1.11 |
| Perceptions of the degree of active learning in the course                                                                                                                              | 8.08%             | 15.15%            | 19.19%                     | 29.29%         | 28.28%         | 57.58%      | 3.55        | 1.27 |
| Perceptions of specific pedagogical techniques (e.g., lectures, discussions, videos)                                                                                                    | 10.10%            | 20.20%            | 17.17%                     | 28.28%         | 24.24%         | 52.53%      | 3.36        | 1.32 |
| <b>Course Atmosphere</b>                                                                                                                                                                |                   |                   |                            |                |                |             |             |      |
| Perceptions of inclusiveness of the course                                                                                                                                              | 6.06%             | 8.08%             | 25.25%                     | 30.30%         | 30.30%         | 60.61%      | 3.71        | 1.16 |
| Perceptions of accessibility of the course                                                                                                                                              | 6.06%             | 6.06%             | 26.26%                     | 32.32%         | 27.27%         | 59.60%      | 3.70        | 1.13 |
| Perceptions of communication from the instructor                                                                                                                                        | 2.02%             | 10.10%            | 17.17%                     | 30.30%         | 40.40%         | 70.71%      | 3.97        | 1.08 |
| Perceptions of the level of challenge or difficulty in the course                                                                                                                       | 9.09%             | 18.18%            | 22.22%                     | 30.30%         | 20.20%         | 50.51%      | 3.34        | 1.25 |
| Perceptions of the level of support from the faculty member                                                                                                                             | 1.01%             | 11.11%            | 15.15%                     | 29.29%         | 43.43%         | 72.73%      | 4.03        | 1.06 |
| Perceptions of fairness                                                                                                                                                                 | 8.08%             | 12.12%            | 24.24%                     | 28.28%         | 27.27%         | 55.56%      | 3.55        | 1.24 |
| <b>Student Effort</b>                                                                                                                                                                   |                   |                   |                            |                |                |             |             |      |
| Time spent preparing for class (e.g., completing readings, assignments)                                                                                                                 | 9.09%             | 17.17%            | 28.28%                     | 22.22%         | 23.23%         | 45.45%      | 3.33        | 1.26 |
| Activities students used to enhance their own learning (e.g., reading assigned content, making flashcards, taking notes, asking the instructor for info or assistance outside of class) | 7.07%             | 12.12%            | 21.21%                     | 28.28%         | 31.31%         | 59.60%      | 3.65        | 1.24 |
| Class attendance                                                                                                                                                                        | 5.05%             | 14.14%            | 28.28%                     | 25.25%         | 27.27%         | 52.53%      | 3.56        | 1.18 |
| Active engagement in class (e.g., paying attention)                                                                                                                                     | 3.03%             | 6.06%             | 24.24%                     | 29.29%         | 37.37%         | 66.67%      | 3.92        | 1.07 |
| Participation in class discussions and activities                                                                                                                                       | 2.02%             | 6.06%             | 21.21%                     | 33.33%         | 37.37%         | 70.71%      | 3.98        | 1.01 |
| Technology distractions (e.g., phone, laptop)                                                                                                                                           | 7.07%             | 14.14%            | 21.21%                     | 28.28%         | 29.29%         | 57.58%      | 3.59        | 1.25 |

n = 99; % Favorable refers to the percentage of respondents who 'Somewhat agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. Ratings are on a 1-5 scale

## Qualitative Themes from Open-Ended Responses

Below is a summary of the themes that emerged from the analysis of the open-ended responses. The analysis suggests that respondents are seeking to clarify and add some boundaries to the dimensions already included in the FPPM. Below, we list the dimensions that received the most feedback and summarize the comments related to them.

1. **A current, sound knowledge base in the discipline reflecting continuous revision that improves course content.** Overall, respondents mentioned that having a current and comprehensive knowledge of the discipline profession as well as staying up to date with pedagogical best practices is important. They suggested that professional development and continuing education activities are important to achieving those goals. The need to stay current in the discipline is particularly important for certain licensure fields (e.g., nursing, education) – respondents from these disciplines discussed staying active in the field and keeping credentials up to date to ensure students were getting the best education to prepare them for the clinical field. The respondents also suggested that faculty should continuously make revisions and improvements to their courses.
2. **Employment of a variety of teaching methodologies suited to the characteristics of each course, especially those that encourage discussion, promote skills, and develop critical thinking.** Respondents noted the need for pedagogical differentiation. From a more general pedagogical perspective, they noted that course content should be accessible to students, classes should be interactive, and faculty should effectively use the LMS system in their courses. Further, many noted that student learning was a primary outcome.
3. **Consistency in grading, making assignments, and applying rules.** Respondents noted that faculty should give feedback on assignments to students and in a timely manner. This is particularly important if students for scaffolded assignments where need feedback before completing subsequent assignments. There were also some concerns about grade inflation.
4. **Consistency with the time requirements appropriate to the number of credit hours awarded.** Several respondents noted that they were unsure what this dimension meant and were therefore unsure how to implement it. As such, it should be clarified and/or better defined. Some responses offered suggestions to quantify this in a more objective way, such as ‘Class meets every session, begins and ends on time, and is not canceled on a whim.’
5. **Responsiveness to students in and outside the classroom.** Respondents suggested that the term responsiveness needs to be defined. As currently written, the vagueness may lead students and faculty to have different expectations about what it means to be responsive, particularly outside of the classroom. Students may expect a response to emails within an hour, whereas faculty may think 24-48 hours is reasonable. There was a general consensus that faculty should be approachable and promptly reply to student communication. However, there was sizeable number of responses that suggest faculty should not be expected to be available 24/7, and that more reasonable expectations should be outlined (e.g., students can expect a response within 24 hours, during working hours, excluding weekends). Although mentioned above, faculty availability in the classroom is contingent on faculty attending classes as scheduled, which emerged as a prominent theme in the responses.
6. **Comprehensive student advising.** The most commonly recurring comment in the open-ended responses was that advising should not be considered a teaching dimension. It should be removed from the list of effective teaching dimensions because it is a service responsibility and the professor in a particular course might not be a students’ advisor.
7. **Enthusiasm for the discipline that transmits the excitement and value of learning (e.g., developing new courses, more effective measures of student learning, more effective**



**methodologies of content delivery, directing student research projects and internships).** In the responses, there was some concern that faculty enthusiasm for a discipline is difficult to quantify, particularly for students. Further, this particular term could be gendered or not inclusive of neurodivergent faculty or even certain personalities. Also, there were concerns that the examples listed as evidence of enthusiasm are actually extra-role behaviors that require work outside the typical duties of a professor.

## APPENDIX B

### Sample Assessment Map/Teaching Evaluation Rubric from the University of Oregon

| Professional Teaching                                                                                                                                                                 | Data Sources                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Does not meet                                                                                      | Meets                                                                                                      | Exceeds                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. "Readily available, coherently organized, and high quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading and class policy expectations." | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/>           Organization of the course<br/>           Quality of the course materials</p> <p><b>Evidence from the Instructor</b><br/>           Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p>                                                                                                | <b>Pattern of concern</b><br>based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |
| 2. "Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback."                               | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/>           Instructor Communication</p> <p><u>Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations</u><br/>           Q5 How available was the instructor for communication outside of class?</p> <p><b>Evidence from the Instructor</b><br/>           Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p> | <b>Pattern of concern</b><br>based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |
| 3. "Students' activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning."                                                                                | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/>           Assignment and Projects</p> <p><b>Evidence from the Instructor</b><br/>           Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p>                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>Pattern of concern</b><br>based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |

|  |                    |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------|--|--|--|
|  | <b>Peer Review</b> |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------|--|--|--|

| Inclusive Teaching                                                                                                           | Data Sources                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Does not meet                                                                                                             | Meets                                                                                                                                       | Exceeds                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. "Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation is valued." | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/>           Inclusiveness of the course<br/>           Accessibility of the course</p> <p>Number of student interactions with the instructor outside of class</p> <p><b>Evidence from the Instructor</b><br/>           Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p> | <p><b><i>Pattern of concern</i></b><br/> <i>based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.</i></p> | <p><i>Meets the condition</i><br/> <b><i>consistently</i></b> or shows a <b><i>pattern of improvement</i></b> during the review window.</p> | <p><i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i></p> |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>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.”</p> <p>N.B. If an instructor is not empowered by the department to make changes to the content of their courses, this standard may not apply.</p> | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/> Relevance of the course content</p> <p><b>Evidence from Instructor:</b><br/> Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p> | <p><b><i>Pattern of concern</i></b><br/> <i>based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.</i></p> | <p><i>Meets the condition</i><br/> <b><i>consistently</i></b> or shows a <b><i>pattern of improvement</i></b> during the review window.</p> | <p><i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i></p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Engaged Teaching                                                                                                           | Data Sources                                                                                             | Does not meet                                                   | Meets                                                              | Exceeds                                                                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. “Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of courses in content and pedagogy.” | <b>Evidence from Instructor</b><br>Sources include Instructor Reflections, CVs, teaching statement, etc. | Limited evidence of meaningful reflection and change over time. | Consistent evidence of meaningful reflection and change over time. | <i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i> |

| Research-informed Teaching                                                                                        | Data Sources                                                                                                                  | Does not meet                                                                        | Meets                                                                                                                    | Exceeds                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. “Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.” | <b>Evidence from Instructor</b><br>Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.<br><br><b>Peer Review</b> | <b><i>Pattern of concern</i></b> based on evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b><i>consistently</i></b> or shows a <b><i>pattern of improvement</i></b> during the review window. | <i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i> |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                 |                                                                                                            |                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. "Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; these goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students." | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/> Clarity of assignment instructions and grading</p> <p><b>Evidence from Instructor</b><br/> Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p>                               | <b>Pattern of concern</b> based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |
| 3. "Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course."                                                                                                                       | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/> Feedback</p> <p><b>Evidence from Instructor</b><br/> Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p>                                                                     | <b>Pattern of concern</b> based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |
| 4. "Instruction designed to engage, challenge and support students."                                                                                                                                                                 | <p><b>From Students:</b><br/> <u>Student Experience Survey</u><br/> Challenge of the course<br/> Level of support<br/> Degree of active learning</p> <p><b>Evidence from Instructor</b><br/> Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p><b>Peer Review</b></p> | <b>Pattern of concern</b> based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review. | Meets the condition <b>consistently</b> or shows a <b>pattern of improvement</b> during the review window. | Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition. |