

Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-tenure Review (formerly Annual Review)

CI PPS No. 04.02.10

Effective Date: October 1, 2025

Review Cycle: E5Y

Next Review Date: October 1, 2030

Sr. Reviewer: Department Chair

01. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this document, the following definitions apply:

1. The department Personnel Committee (PC) for Annual Review includes tenured faculty members and non-tenure line faculty members at the associate and professor rank.

01.02 The Department's recommendation includes the recommendations of both the Personnel Committee and the Chair.

01.03 Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to provide:

- a. Each faculty member with information about their strengths and growth areas that may be used for continuous professional development,
- b. The Department Chair and the Personnel Committee with information that will be used in awarding merit raises, faculty retention, promotion and tenure recommendations.

01.04 In evaluating performance, the Personnel Committee and Chair will consider the faculty member's contributions in the context of Departmental, College, and institutional needs, as well as the faculty member's past performance and career path.

01.05 Merit is defined as additional salary adjustments in recognition of performance that is clearly exceptional during the preceding merit evaluation period. Merit salary adjustments are made when funds are available. Merit salary adjustments are based on a faculty member's annual evaluations for the period defined by the President.

02. PURPOSE AND CORRESPONDING POLICIES

02.01 The Department of Curriculum and Instruction (CI) Policy and Procedure Statement sets forth criteria and guidelines for annual evaluation in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. These criteria are based on the following sources:

- a. [AA/PPS 04.01.50 Faculty Merit and Retention Salary Adjustments](#)
- b. [AA/PPS 04.01.20 Faculty Qualifications, Responsibilities, and Titles](#)
- c. [AA/PPS 04.02.10 Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure Review](#)
- d. [AA/PPS 04.02.20 Tenure-Line Faculty Tenure and Promotion Review](#)
- e. [AA/PPS 04.02.21 Non-Tenure Line Faculty Promotion Review](#)
- f. [Faculty Handbook, Texas State University](#)
- g. [CI PPS Tenure and Promotion Policy](#)
- h. CI PPS 04.02.21 Promotion Policy for Instructional Faculty

02.02 The primary method for awarding salary raises at Texas State is based upon the annual evaluation for merit salary adjustments (AA/PPS 04.01.50). In addition, reappointment decisions for faculty both non-tenure line and tenure-track are informed by annual evaluations.

03. CANDIDATES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

03.01 All continuing faculty employed at 50% or more are evaluated annually and required to complete an annual evaluation.

Continuing faculty include tenure-line faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track), lecturers and senior lecturers, faculty of practice, clinical faculty, research faculty, and instructional faculty at all ranks, and 50 percent+ FTE program faculty. Annual reviews for these faculty will be completed each academic year. Academic administrators who hold a faculty appointment but serve in staff positions will be reviewed on their assigned duties and responsibilities, commensurate with their staff position.

03.02 All faculty employed as full-time faculty are eligible for performance and merit raises awarded through this process.

03.03 All continuing percentage-contract faculty are eligible for merit raises awarded through this process.

03.04 Because all per course faculty (including graduate teaching assistants) are hired for one semester at a time, they do not

complete an annual evaluation, nor are they eligible for merit. Instead, they are evaluated at the end of each semester.

04. ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT

04.01 The Annual Activity Report is based on the previous calendar year's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service (**as determined by workload**).

04.02 Faculty will complete the Annual Activity Report by uploading the following into the faculty qualifications system:

- a. **An Annual Plan Narrative**, which concisely sets goals for the following year in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and includes a reflection and self-evaluation of the year under consideration, providing ratings in each area (i.e., exemplary, exceeds expectations, meets, does not meet, N/A);
- b. A **Teaching Narrative**, which includes comments on teaching for the year under review and a summary of Student Course Evaluations.
- c. An updated **Texas State Vita** (AA/PPS 04.02.20); and
- d. A copy of each **Student Course Evaluation** for courses taught in the year under review(quantitative and qualitative feedback).
- e. A record of activities and products in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for the year under review.

04.03 The Annual Activity Report provides faculty the opportunity to report their contributions in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service during the past year, self-evaluate, and establish goals for next year.

04.04 The Annual Activity Report should document achievements that only apply to the time period (previous calendar year) of the annual evaluation. In the first year of employment, the Personnel Committee will examine the materials from the time of hire onward.

04.05 Faculty should concisely summarize evidence and provide additional documentation that supports quality of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service in their Annual Activity Report.

05. REVIEW PROCESS

05.01 Annually, the Chair will notify all faculty of the required materials to be submitted and the due date for submission.

- 05.02 The Personnel Committee and the Chair will make independent and separate recommendations on each faculty member for merit salary adjustments, taking a variety of contextualized factors into account.
- 05.03 After the Annual Activity Reports are due, the Personnel Committee will have two weeks to review each faculty member's annual activity report, to evaluate teaching, scholarship/creativity activity, and service, and to make evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development.
- 05.04 Faculty will be given an opportunity to review preliminary recommendations made by both the Chair and the Personnel Committee prior to the recommendations being forwarded to the Dean. Specifically, before making final merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that specific faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that specific faculty member. At that time, faculty have the opportunity to add written comments to their own annual evaluation. After receiving the Personnel Committee and Chair's preliminary recommendations, faculty who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the Chair. At this meeting, the Chair shall explain the reasons for preliminary recommendations, and the faculty member may ask the Chair to reconsider the preliminary decision on the basis of accomplishments or achievements that may have been initially overlooked or undervalued. The Chair may also request additional Personnel Committee members to evaluate the faculty member's annual accomplishments. After reconsidering the accomplishments of all faculty who have requested a review of their activities, the Chair will make final merit recommendations to the Dean.

06. PROCEDURES FOR FAILURE OF NON-TENURED FACULTY TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

- 06.01 Not meeting expectations in an annual evaluation generally involves receiving evaluations of "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one or more categories that are not compensated for by performance ratings in other categories.
- 06.02 See [AA/PPS 04.02.10.06.01](#) for procedures if a faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and/or service.

07. PROCEDURES FOR FAILURE OF TENURED FACULTY TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

- 07.01 Not meeting expectations in an annual evaluation generally involves receiving evaluations of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or more categories that are not compensated for by performance ratings in other categories.
- 07.02 See [AA/PPS 04.02.10.07](#) for procedures if a faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and/or service.

08. PROCEDURES FOR THE CREATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS

- 08.01 See [AA/PPS 04.02.10.08.01](#) for procedures for the creation and implementation of a professional development plan and subsequent actions.

09. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

- 09.01 Faculty performance in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction is evaluated on documentation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Collegial contributions to the University community by the candidates are also important. Collegial faculty members are expected to contribute to the positive functioning of their respective program, department and the university.
- 09.02 Faculty are assigned different workloads based on several factors, including their year of employment, their scholarly productivity, and their administrative responsibilities (for more information, refer to Curriculum and Instruction PPS 04.01.40). Because faculty are assigned different workloads, the workload should be considered when evaluating teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. For each area (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service), faculty will be evaluated on multiple criteria as described in the Curriculum and Instruction Evaluation Rubrics (see Appendix A). Faculty’s score for each area will be the average of criteria ratings using the following scale:
- 1 point = Does Not Meet Expectations
 - 2 points = Meets Expectations
 - 3 points = Exceeds Expectations
 - 4 points = Exemplary Performance

09.03 The following are general guidelines for merit recommendations:

a. Faculty who are evaluated in only one area will receive the following:

- Does not meet expectations — no merit
- Meets expectations — low merit
- Exceeds expectations — medium merit
- Exemplary performance — high merit

b. Faculty who are evaluated in two areas will receive:

- Does not meet expectations in one area — no merit
- Exceeds expectations in one area and meets expectations in one area— low merit
- Exceeds expectations in two areas — medium merit
- Exceeds expectations in one area and exemplary performance in the other area— high merit

c. Faculty who are evaluated in all three areas will receive:

- Does not meet expectations in one area — no merit
- Exceeds expectations in one area and meets expectations in other two areas — low merit
- Exceeds expectations in two areas and meets expectations in the other area — medium merit
- Exemplary in one area and meets or exceeds expectations in the other two areas— medium merit
- Exceeds expectations in all three areas – high merit
- Exemplary in two areas and meets or exceeds expectations in the other area —high merit
- Exemplary in all three areas – high merit

Evaluation Scenario	No Merit	Low Merit	Medium Merit	High Merit
One Area Evaluated	Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Exemplary performance
Two Areas Evaluated	Does not meet expectations in one area and any level in the other area	Exceeds expectations in one area and meets expectations in the other area	Exceeds expectations in both areas	Exceeds expectations in one area and exemplary performance in the other area

Evaluation Scenario	No Merit	Low Merit	Medium Merit	High Merit
Three Areas Evaluated	Does not meet expectations in one area and any level in the other two areas	Exceeds expectations in one area and meets expectations in the other two areas	Exceeds expectations in two areas and meets expectations in the other area Exemplary performance in one area and meets or exceeds expectations in the other two areas	Exceeds expectations in all three areas Exemplary performance in two areas and meets or exceeds expectations in the other area Exemplary performance in all three areas

09.04 Annual merit awards are based on a rolling three-year performance assessment. Tenure track and tenured faculty **must have an average of at least one peer-reviewed published scholarly product per year in each rolling three-year period to qualify for merit.**

09.05 Before making final merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that faculty member (e.g., high, medium, low).

10. TEACHING

10.01 The Department of Curriculum and Instruction values a wide range of teaching pedagogies and practices and recognizes that it is difficult to capture the efficacy of an instructor's practice by means of a quantitative score alone. Faculty will explain in their Teaching Narrative how they have met the expectations of teaching that include more than this quantitative measure.

10.02 **Documentation of Teaching Performance.** Effective teachers bring the challenge of new, innovative, and/or engaging ideas to students to help them increase their critical thinking skills and motivate them toward independent scholarly/creative activity. Evidence of teaching performance can be established through consideration of formative and summative teaching documentation. Teaching effectiveness is partially informed by summative student evaluations. Teaching effect and quality will be established through

evidence presented in a teaching narrative. The teaching narrative should contextualize factors such as class size, response rate, and other mitigating factors that may have influenced the quantitative score.

- 10.03 Faculty may draw on items from the lists of **Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators**(Appendix B) that demonstrate a more detailed portrait of their teaching practice when constructing this narrative. The Department recognizes that there is a relationship among a faculty member's epistemological stance, ontology, and teaching practice. And, in enacting a stance, a faculty member may face a more strident critique from students. Given this reality, it is important that the Personnel Committee supports diverse ways of knowing, thinking, teaching, and enacting pedagogical practice and reflects that in their peer evaluations. This recognition is particularly pressing for faculty from historically marginalized communities and those who enact a pedagogy that pushes students to consider and critique institutional practices, or those seeking to disrupt an accepted teaching discourse.
- 10.04 Annual evaluation of teaching quality and effectiveness focuses on courses taught during the previous calendar year. Supervision of individualized student learning experiences, including internship, practicum, clinical experience, field experience, independent study, comprehensive exam and thesis are a part of teaching. Courses taught beyond assigned workload may be included in faculty annual reports; however, because these courses are taught on a separate contract, inclusion is not required.
- 10.05 **Criteria for Teaching Evaluation.** Faculty's annual teaching performance will be evaluated using the **Annual Review Rubric** (Appendix A). In the teaching narrative (no more than 500 words) all faculty must report teaching goals, the year's mean of student evaluations for all courses, currency/methodology, instructional modality, and individualized student learning activities. In addition to the Teaching Narrative, the full student evaluation report for each section taught (with both quantitative scores and qualitative comments) must be included in the annual review documentation.

11. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY CRITERIA

- 11.01 Scholarly/creative activity is among the primary functions of the university. A faculty member's contribution will vary from one academic or professional field to another, or even within a field, given differences in research paradigms and researchers' communities of practice. The general criteria to be applied are that

the faculty member shows evidence of engagement in sustained, high-quality scholarly/creative activity. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction values consistency in one's line of research. This is understood as the ability to maintain a continued and steady effort to complete research and scholarly/creative work over the evaluation period, with the potential to include new and innovative ways of exploring questions within one's field.

11.02 The Personnel Committee values scholarly collaboration as well as individual initiative and leadership in the scholar's field. Faculty will explain in narrative form (no more than 250 words) how they have met the expectations of scholarly/creative activity within the year under review.

11.03 The Department of Curriculum and Instruction recognizes the importance of a diversity of theoretical, philosophical, creative, basic, applied, and pedagogical activities. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction equally values different forms of inquiry, including but not limited to qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. In addition, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction values conceptual, theoretical, and philosophical work. Public forms of scholarship growing out of the candidate's field of knowledge and aimed at informing and engaging educators and the broader public are also valued. Faculty should discuss their contributions in written form, such as illustrating the value of their scholarship in the narrative.

11.04 Faculty members submit their scholarly/creative work for publication through many venues and formats. A record of national/international peer-reviewed publications is expected, and an annual effort to contribute to this record (through manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published) is expected. Submissions to national/international peer-reviewed works are emphasized over regional publications. Only accepted, forthcoming, or published manuscripts, or funded external grant proposals may be counted as scholarly/creative products. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction values first or sole authorship, collaboration of scholarly publications (possibly including across institutions, across research sites, or across historical lines of scholarship), and publications with students, early-career, and non-tenured faculty.

11.05 **Scholarly/creative products** take many forms, including but not limited to, the following:

- funded external grant/contract to support research, teaching, or leadership/service

- refereed or invited refereed journal articles (generally considered in this order: international, national, regional, state)
- refereed or invited refereed books or monographs (may count for two years – to be justified in the narrative)
- refereed or invited refereed edited books
- refereed or invited refereed book chapters
- refereed or invited refereed proceedings of professional presentations

11.06 **Scholarly/creative process** may also be demonstrated through a variety of supplemental scholarly activities. Scholarly/creative processes include, but are not limited to, the following:

- submitted, unfunded external grant/contract research proposals
- submitted scholarly/creative product
- funded internal grant/contract to support research, teaching, or leadership/service
- refereed presentations at national/international/state/regional/local meetings
- published abstracts and translations of professional presentations
- tests or assessment instruments developed
- software, multimedia, or other electronic products developed
- technical reports published
- published book reviews
- alternative contributions to important conversations (such as “public pedagogy”)
- non-refereed journal articles, books, monographs, edited books, book chapters published
- non-refereed proceedings of professional presentations at national/international/state/regional/local meetings

11.08. **Quality and quantity.** The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is committed to evaluating scholarly work in ways that honor both quantitative and qualitative disciplinary standards, recognizing the value of diverse scholarly contributions such as books and journal articles. We will consider each scholar’s career goals, disciplinary norms, and the time required to achieve significant scholarly milestones in all evaluations. The quality of a specific work is ultimately more important than a particular publication venue. Single authorship and collaboration with colleagues and students are viewed as means of enhancing scholarly/creative products. Effective collaboration occurs when all parties make a significant contribution to scholarly/creative products. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction values a mix of sole, first-author, collaborative, and multi-authored

publications. The faculty member should demonstrate an ability to lead when participating in collaborative research, and/or conduct sole-author research that contributes to that faculty member's field. With the understanding that contextual factors will inform the assessment of scholarly/creative work.

The quality of each endeavor must be carefully documented. Quality refers to the insights, significance, and importance of the work, which might be indicated by, for example, its design, methodological rigor, and scholarly or professional influence. The quantity of published material is not sufficient evidence of scholarly/creative activity. While we do value quality, there is a quantity expectation as well. Venues that require authors to "pay to publish" (beyond open-source fees), promise publication in exchange for participating in a specific conference, and other questionable practices are considered less rigorous than other publications. Additionally, faculty who use outside resources (e.g., developmental editors, copy editors, AI) to create their manuscripts are expected to disclose such usage, and the degree of usage. Tenure track and tenured faculty must have an average of one published scholarly product per year in each rolling three-year period to meet expectations in this area.

11.09 Criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity Evaluation. Faculty's annual scholarly and creative performance will be evaluated using the **Annual Review Rubric** (Appendix A).

12. SERVICE

12.01 In addition to excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, faculty have a commitment to the University and their professions through participation in service activities. Such participation may take several different forms, including but are not limited to, the following:

- leadership/service to the Institution (leadership/service on committees charged by the Faculty Senate or by an administrator at the Dean level or higher)
- leadership/service to the College (leadership/service on a committee charged by the Dean of the College of Education)
- leadership/service to the Department (leadership/service on a committee charged by the Chair of the Department)
- leadership/service to the profession or to higher education in general (leadership/service appointments made by officials representing professional organizations, public schools, cities, states, or the nation and/or elected positions to the same).

12.02 Faculty members are expected to participate in the conduct of their program, department, college, and university, in appropriate

professional organizations in their field including professional service to schools, colleges, universities, and other agencies in the community. Although service activity is expected of each faculty member, leadership/service shall not substitute for expectations in teaching or in scholarly/creative activity.

12.03 Service expectations will vary among ranks, as noted in the evaluation rubric. Modification of these criteria will be considered for new faculty members who have been on staff less than a year at the time of culmination of the first annual evaluation cycle since their hire.

12.04 **Documentation of Criteria for Effective Service.** Faculty should document institutional service, service to professional organizations and journals, community service, and service recognition or awards. All faculty must report institutional service and professional service; reporting of additional criteria is at the discretion of individual faculty.

- **Institutional service** refers to service to the program, departmental, college, or university that contributes to program, department, college, or university function and goals
- **Professional service** refers to contribution to advancement of faculty's field of study beyond the university at the state, national, or international level, including, but not limited to, serving as a reviewer for scholarly publications or serving as a leader or on a committee
- **Community service** refers to service to the community related to the faculty's field of study.

12.05 **Quality.** Leadership/service involves working with others so that professional knowledge has an impact. The impact of leadership/service typically is of critical importance in evaluating quality of leadership/service. Added value should be given for committees with significant impact and/or significant time commitments.

12.06 **Criteria for Service Evaluation.** Faculty's annual service performance score will be evaluated using the **Annual Review Rubric** (Appendix A).

13. FACULTY WITH REASSIGNED TIME

13.01 Administrative Reassignment refers to institutional responsibilities in an administrative role, including servicing as a program

coordinator, department chair, or serving in other institutional offices within the University with reassigned time.

13.02 Faculty on 100% reassigned time will be evaluated based on fulfillment of the terms of the release contract. Evaluation will be made in consultation with the office overseeing the contract. Judgment on the criteria for research will be made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with interpretation of the contract. Judgment on the criteria for service will be based on criteria stated in Section 12. Merit will be awarded according to the rubric.

13.03 Faculty on administrative reassigned time will be evaluated proportionally as determined by the workload assigned. Merit will be awarded according to the rubric.

14. ANNUAL REVIEW NARRATIVE

14.01 In the Annual Review Narrative, faculty will submit a self-evaluation of each area in which they are evaluated for the calendar year. Specifically, they provide context for each area of annual review evaluation in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service, as assigned and discuss goals for the upcoming calendar year.

15. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANNUAL REVIEW AND TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW

15.01 Successful candidates for consideration of tenure and promotion typically exceed expectations or higher during annual reviews.

16. ELIGIBILITY FOR MERIT

16.01 A merit raise (if available) shall be defined as an additional salary to be awarded as described in Section 09.03.

16.02 Each full-time faculty member is evaluated by at least three (3) members of the Personnel Committee. The assigned Personnel Committee members will:

- a) score teaching, scholarship, and service based on the criteria stated in the evaluation rubrics in the Appendices; and
- b) write evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development.

16.03 The Chair will independently score teaching, scholarship, and service based on the criteria stated above and then carefully review the Personnel Committee's summary.

17. EVALUATION OF PER COURSE FACULTY

17.01 The Department of Curriculum and Instruction currently employs many per-course faculty. To ensure that the teaching performance of the per-course faculty conforms to the Department's standards of teaching quality, per-course faculty will be evaluated by the Department Chair. At the end of the semester, students of per-course faculty will complete course evaluations on the faculty member's teaching. These evaluations will be reviewed by both the Department Chair and shared with the appropriate Program Coordinator.

18. REVIEWERS OF THIS PPS

18.01 Reviewers of this PPS include the following:

Position	Date
Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction	10/1/2025
Personnel Committee	9/26/2025
Dean, College of Education	TBD

19. CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This PPS has been approved by the following individuals in their official capacities and represents Texas State Department of Curriculum and Instruction policy and procedure from the date of this document until superseded.

Appendix A – Annual Review Rubric

Category	1 - Does Not Meet Expectations	2 - Meets Expectations	3 - Exceeds Expectations	4 - Exemplary Performance
Teaching	Fails to meet minimum departmental expectations -Required documentation not included (teaching narrative, student evaluations, etc.) -Student evaluations average less than 3.5	Teaching narrative briefly describes teaching practices and curriculum contributions. -Provides and reflects on quantitative student evaluation data (typically in the range of 3.5–3.99). -Identifies selected qualitative student feedback, noting strengths and areas for improvement.	Teaching narrative provides context, illustrating evolution of teaching practice in response to feedback from student evaluations. -Engages in systematic analysis of student evaluations (both comments and quantitative scores, typically in the range of 4.0–4.49). -Articulates specific responses to student feedback.	Teaching narrative deeply integrates analysis of both quantitative scores (typically 4.5+) and qualitative themes from student evaluations -Demonstrates evidence of sustained reflection and serves as a model through reflective, data-informed teaching practice.

Category	1 - Does Not Meet Expectations	2 - Meets Expectations	3 - Exceeds Expectations	4 - Exemplary Performance
Scholarship (Tenure Lines only)	- Fails to meet minimum departmental expectations	Narrative provides evidence of: - Yearly scholarly/creative processes - At least one peer-reviewed scholarly product per year (accepted/in-press, published) in rolling 3-year period	Narrative provides evidence of: - More than one yearly scholarly/creative processes - At least one peer-reviewed scholarly product per year (accepted/in-press, published) in rolling 3-year period	Narrative provides evidence of: - More than one yearly scholarly/creative processes - Multiple (4+) peer-reviewed scholarly products accepted/in press/published in rolling 3-year review period - Consistent record of high-quality, peer-reviewed publications - Leadership such as: first/sole author, publications with students, significant external grant activity, or awards for scholarship

Category	1 - Does Not Meet Expectations	2 - Meets Expectations	3 - Exceeds Expectations	4 - Exemplary Performance
Service	- Fails to meet minimum departmental expectations	- Participation in program, department, college, university, or professional level service - Fulfills assigned committee/service duties - Some professional or community service	- Evidence of service beyond minimum (e.g., organizing events, mentoring, significant community engagement) - Leadership appropriate for rank at several levels (program, department, college, university, professional)	- Evidence of service appropriate for rank at multiple levels (program, department, college, university, professional) - Leadership appropriate for rank at multiple levels

APPENDIX B – Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators

The PC supports diverse ways of knowing, thinking, teaching, and enacting one's pedagogical practice and that this is reflected when evaluating one another. The lists below contain suggestions of items that might be included in the teaching narrative.

Teaching Effect includes evidence of teaching performance such as the following:

1. **Syllabus alignment** with course objectives, standards, or student learning outcomes.
2. **Examples of student learning.**
3. **Evidence of student evaluations** that assess learning throughout the course of the semester, that appropriately reflect the level of the course (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate).
4. **Unsolicited letters of recognition** related to teaching and learning.
5. **Evidence of current scholarly/creative activity** reflected in both the content and pedagogy of instruction.
6. **Maintaining currency**, significance, and relevance of course content.
7. Participation in course, Program, and departmental **curriculum planning and development.**
8. **Innovations that support instruction and enhance student learning.**
9. Evidence that instructor draws on a **diversity of pedagogical styles and a variety of methods** in course and lesson organization to enhance student learning.
10. Indications that course planning and lessons are **relevant, well organized, and sequenced** and that they use practices for excellence in teaching and learning.
11. **Invited Guest** teaching (invited for expertise in a certain area).

Teaching Quality includes evidence of the following:

1. **Research-based practices** (as understood within the faculty member's field or scholarly paradigm) embedded in course content and delivery.
2. **Planning and pedagogical practice** (e.g., planning course assignments that are relevant, meaningful, employing a diversity of styles and methods to enhance and assess learning, drawing on technology, multimedia, etc.).
3. **Reflection on ways to improve teaching practice** (e.g., modifications in an assignment, reflection about pedagogical decisions, course alignment, etc.).
4. **Evidence of efforts to enhance teaching quality**, including participation in professional development, conference sessions, or scholarly work related to quality teaching.
5. **Acquisition of instructional grants** (e.g. technology grants, multicultural institute grants, research enhancement program grants, online/hybrid course redesign grants, academic computing grants, book clubs, etc.).
6. **Peer evaluations** (e.g., by faculty mentors, program coordinators, PC members).
7. **Collaborative efforts** to pilot new pedagogical practices or refine current practices.
8. Evidence of **teaching awards or recognition** (local, state, national).
9. **Participation or presentation in professional development** such as workshops on effective teaching, active learning, creating motivating online courses.
10. Provides opportunities for **out-of-class application, field work, or service learning.**
11. **Development of instructional materials** used by teachers and students.

The PC supports diverse ways of knowing, thinking, teaching, and enacting one's pedagogical practice and that this is reflected when evaluating one another. The lists below contain suggestions of items that might be included in the teaching narrative.

12. Evidence of pedagogy that appropriately supports a diversity of learning and learners.
13. Evidence of course content that addresses equity.

12. **Cooperative scholarship** with students, including publications and presentations.
13. **Other evidence** of applicable formal or informal instruction.