University Distinguished Teaching Scholars
The Institute for Learning and Teaching

Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness Task Force

December 30, 2015

1. Introduction

This report offers recommendations from the 2015 University Distinguished Teaching Scholars/TILT Task Force on assessing teaching effectiveness. The Task Force considered how departments at Colorado State University might develop processes for assessing teaching effectiveness. The report builds on the report issued by the 2011 UDTS/TILT Task Force on Assessing Teaching Effectiveness, which offered recommendations regarding the use of teaching portfolios, classroom observations, and reflective statements in the assessment process. This report moves beyond the 2011 recommendations by focusing on the campus-wide adoption of valid, rigorous processes for assessing and rewarding teaching activities. It provides recommendations for departments to consider as they develop processes for defining student learning outcomes, enhancing faculty teaching skills and knowledge, and evaluating faculty within the context of professional and department goals.

This report focuses on evaluating teaching effectiveness in courses. While the members of the task force recognize the important roles played in student learning by advising and mentoring outside of the context of university courses, our focus is on evaluating the teaching that occurs within the context of formal university courses.

The recommendations offered in this report build on the guidelines for evaluating teaching effectiveness found in section E.12.1 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (excerpted below). The University's periodic departmental review process, which now requires departments to establish student-learning outcomes for each of their programs, has also shaped these recommendations.

The recommendations in this report reflect an understanding among the task force members that teaching practices and conditions vary widely across disciplines and that no simple, "one-size-fits-all" approach is likely to be appropriate for all departments. It is clear, however, that several characteristics of effective teaching transcend disciplines and can ground the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in programs across the University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Good teaching should be rewarded. In particular, evaluations of teaching effectiveness should contribute to decisions regarding compensation, promotion, retention, and recognition.

2. Teaching effectiveness should be assessed using evidence-based approaches, such as analysis of data from course management systems, analysis of student work, observation of teaching, and analysis of curricular materials.
3. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should involve the use of multiple sources of evidence and multiple assessment tools.
4. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should involve a peer-review process (defined later in this report) comparable to the process used in assessing research, scholarship, and artistry.
5. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should include peer review of reflective statements from the faculty members who are being evaluated.
6. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should entail the use of evidence-based processes and strategies that are appropriate to and recognized by scholars within a given discipline or profession.
7. Departmental evaluation processes should reward faculty members for engaging in professional development activities related to teaching and learning.
8. CSU should promote the design and implementation of additional professional development resources and scholarly research initiatives related to understanding and enhancing learning and teaching effectiveness across the institution.

2. Assumptions and Rationale

FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES

The recommendations in this report reflect four foundational principles.

We are a community of teachers and scholars.

- As a university community, our teaching practices should be evidence-based. In particular, they should be informed by research on teaching and learning.
- We should value and support the scholarship of teaching and learning, discipline-based educational research, and learning science.
- We should disseminate scholarship on teaching and learning in ways that improve educational practice and student learning.
- We should support innovation in teaching and learning.
- We should recognize teaching excellence.

We should promote student learning and student success.

- Our curricula should incorporate evidence-based, high-impact practices that promote active, engaged teaching and learning.
- Recognizing that traditional forms of assessing student learning outcomes (e.g., grades, standards-based testing) are not necessarily synonymous with learning, we should adopt comprehensive, evidence-based strategies to assess student learning.

- Recognizing the importance of success beyond the classroom, we should gather information from CSU graduates that will help us identify teaching and learning strategies that have contributed to the success of alumni in the workforce and in society.

Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should be conducted within the context of faculty governance.

Section E.12.1 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* provides a framework within which departments and faculty shall work to assess teaching effectiveness. The section states in part:

> Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching, and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes should, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning.

> Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching shall involve multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; appropriate course surveys of teaching; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in particular the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning

Building on the guidance in this section, the University's periodic program review process requires departments to establish student-learning outcomes for each of their programs. These programmatic learning outcomes are expected to inform curricular design, which, in turn, must be considered when assessing teaching effectiveness.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness requires departmental commitment and significant investments of faculty time.

Methods for evaluating teaching effectiveness vary widely across departments. In some cases, departments have established strong processes that are consistent with the guidance provided in Section E.12.1 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.* The members of this task force are aware, however, that significant barriers exist to wider adoptions of these kinds of evaluation processes. In most cases, this reflects a simple calculus: effective and fair evaluation requires significant investments of faculty time and effort. In the face of a reward system that provides significant incentives for productivity in the areas of research, scholarship, and artistry, we anticipate that many faculty members will find it difficult to justify participation in evaluation activities that reduce the time they can invest in research, scholarship, or artistry. If we are to make progress in the development of fair and effective processes for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, our reward structures – at the department, college, and university levels – must provide incentives for participation in those processes. Those incentives might include allocating time for participation in evaluation activities and viewing participation as an important part of the activities considered during merit, promotion, and tenure evaluations.

RATIONALE FOR SUBSTANTIVE EVALUATION

Developing effective departmental practices for evaluating teaching effectiveness will make important contributions to the University's efforts to improve teaching, learning, student retention, and student success. We offer three reasons for the necessity of substantive evaluation of teaching effectiveness:

1. Substantive evaluation of teaching effectiveness is fundamental to improving student learning, one of CSU's primary missions.
2. Substantive evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a necessary first step to improving teaching effectiveness, a primary responsibility of most faculty members.
3. Substantive evaluation of teaching effectiveness should inform key review processes in a far more meaningful manner than it presently does, including those linked to salary increases, retention of faculty, tenure and promotion decisions, and consideration for recognitions (e.g., teaching awards and prestigious fellowships) within and beyond the University.

3. Observations

Ensuring the rigor and disciplinary appropriateness of processes for evaluating teaching effectiveness is essential to making these processes fair and constructive. Achieving rigor is likely to be both time consuming and challenging. Ensuring disciplinary appropriateness will require a capacious evaluation structure that respects disciplinary differences and priorities. To frame the recommendations that are provided later in this document, and to shed light on some of the complexities associated with developing fair and constructive departmental practices for assessing teaching effectiveness, we offer the following observations.

A SHARED DEFINITION OF "TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS" IS ESSENTIAL TO ITS EVALUATION

The authors of the 2011 Task Force report on assessing teaching effectiveness observed:

> Teaching is bound up tightly with learning, yet it is clear that learning outcomes—what students take away from a course in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities—are not

synonymous with teaching effectiveness. Although they are closely linked, it is possible (albeit rare) to teach a course well without necessarily achieving the learning outcomes associated with course goals. Student attitudes and motivations (or the lack thereof), demands on student time that reduce the attention and effort they can devote to a course, and a range of environmental variables (such as problems with a course management system used in an online course or poor acoustics in a lecture hall) can affect learning outcomes in a course that is taught "effectively." With that in mind, we concluded that any evaluation of teaching effectiveness must take into account not only what is learned by students but also, and importantly, the manner in which a course is designed, content is selected and delivered, and students are engaged in learning activities, among other issues. In addition, we conclude that any assessment of teaching effectiveness must consider the conditions under which a course is taught, for example as its role in the AUCC core or in a particular major or minor, the technology used to support the course, the physical setting in which the course is taught, and the students who typically enroll in the course, etc.

The members of this task force endorse this approach to understanding and evaluating teaching effectiveness.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND STUDENT LEARNING ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS

The assessment of teaching effectiveness and the assessment of learning are distinct, yet closely connected. In many cases, effective assessments of learning are still being developed. In such cases, assessments of student learning cannot be used to ground assessments of instructors' teaching effectiveness. As we emphasize throughout this report, rigorous evaluation of teaching effectiveness cannot rely simply on single outcomes or single "data points" (the common practice of relying on student course evaluations alone, for example, is wholly inappropriate, both as a direct method of assessment and as a lone method of evaluating teaching effectiveness); additional measures of teaching effectiveness must be used. As noted below, meaningful evaluations can include methods as wide ranging as peer review of teaching portfolios, peer observation of classroom instruction, peer mentoring, instructor application of research-based techniques, reflection on available evidence of teaching effectiveness (including course survey responses), and the use of those reflections to improve course design and instructional delivery.

Nonetheless, much research reveals a consensus regarding key factors in how people learn. For example, active learning approaches, learning with understanding rather than by rote memorization, and the ability to explain and apply one's understanding of key concepts or criteria governing their use all contribute to mastering various types of knowledge. In addition, such research shows that learning is complex; it often entails mastering conceptual, procedural, and conditional knowledge, sometimes in complicated relationships with one another. As a result, learning happens in an iterative, rather than a linear, process. When a research-based consensus on how people learn exists, this consensus should inform the development and use of teaching and student assessment practices.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND TEACHING EXCELLENCE ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS

Teaching effectiveness, as noted above, involves elements that include quality of curriculum design, quality of instructional materials (including assessments and their degree of fit with course objectives), incorporation of new methods in classroom teaching; achievement of student learning outcomes, effectiveness at presenting information, effectiveness at managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to students and their work. Teaching excellence, means delivering on the elements that constitute effective teaching *with excellence* (as judged by the multi-method evaluation process this task force promotes). Effective teaching *begins* with the recognition and application of those elements that best stimulate student learning; teaching becomes excellent through effort, through iterative adaptations of and improvements in curricular material, through honest self-reflection, through the solicitation of substantive feedback from colleagues and students, and through a spirit of humility and a willingness to continue to approach teaching creatively. Colorado State University should expect effectiveness from *all* its instructors. Excellent teaching goes beyond effective teaching and requires continual effort to modify course materials, presentation, and activities to achieve as much student learning as possible.

STUDENT MOTIVATION, MATURITY, INTEREST, AND PREPARATION AFFECT EFFORTS TO TEACH EFFECTIVELY

Student preparation, interest, and motivation affect instructors in important ways. It is far easier to teach an upper level or graduate course that is highly relevant to the students' programs of study than to reach a class of first semester students in an entry level AUCC course. For example, students in a capstone course in their major might be more knowledgeable, mature, interested, and motivated than students fulfilling a general education requirement in a discipline not directly in their majors. Such variance affects student learning, as well as the challenges instructors face in motivating students and demonstrating the relevance of course material. Similarly, differences in students' preparation levels can result in substantially greater challenges for instructors in some courses. Such differences can and should be considered seriously in *any evaluation* of teaching effectiveness. In particular, evaluations should consider these questions:

- Does the instructor show evidence of attempting to ascertain students' levels of preparation, motivation, and interest near the beginning of a course?
- Does the instructor show evidence of efforts to adapt content and delivery in ways appropriate to students' preparation, motivation, and interest levels?
- Does the instructor show evidence of seeking resources to assist in such efforts, as needed?

A WIDE RANGE OF METRICS AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS CAN BE USED TO ASSESS TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

We believe – and research and scholarship as well as our collective experience suggests – that any complex behavior is best understood through the use of multiple methods. Our recommendations are based on assumptions about the value of examining teaching effectiveness through the lens of curriculum development, instructional delivery, response and feedback, student performance, and

efforts to improve courses over time. We recognize that the effort required to implement some methods effectively is greater than the effort required to do so with others. We also recognize that significant problems arise when a single method – such as responses to a student course survey – is used as the basis for evaluation and when methods designed to promote feedback for self-improvement, rather than direct assessment (such as the course survey), are used for summative assessment. Our expectation is that departments will find value in implementing multiple methods to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

CONTEXT MATTERS

We should recognize that faculty members have different degrees of preparation for and experiences in teaching, that the preponderance of new faculty members lack experience in teaching, that faculty roles vary widely and do not necessarily encourage a focus on teaching, and that instructional contexts vary widely even within a given department. Efforts to evaluate teaching effectiveness should take into account differences in:

   a. Discipline
   b. Career trajectory (rank, years in rank, type of appointment)
   c. Faculty role (researcher, artist, instructor, department chair, and so on)
   d. Course type (seminars, labs, large or small lecture, *practica*)
   e. Course role and purpose (foundational, service, gateway, core, major, capstone, undergraduate, graduate)
   f. Students in a course (majors, non-majors, undergraduates, graduates, native and non-native speakers of English, and so on)

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES EXIST TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROCESSES FOR EVALUATING TEACHING EVALUATION

We recognize the existence of a rich array of university, college, and department resources supporting efforts to teach effectively. TILT offers instructional guides and tips as well as professional development programs such as the PDI, MTI, and Summer Conference. Other resources are available in spaces as diverse as department websites and CSU Online's teaching blogs. We make recommendations about expanding these resources in the next section.

4. Recommendations

1. GOOD TEACHING SHOULD BE REWARDED. IN PARTICULAR, EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO DECISIONS REGARDING COMPENSATION, PROMOTION, RETENTION, AND RECOGNITION.

   Teaching is central to the mission of a university and high levels of teaching effectiveness should be encouraged and rewarded. Meaningful assessments of teaching effectiveness should contribute to the calculation of merit-based salary increases, promotion and tenure decisions, retention of faculty, and consideration for teaching awards within and beyond the university.

Review processes for salary, retention of untenured instructors, and tenure/promotion should include the explicitly stated, and administratively supported, expectations that departments will use valid practices for assessing teaching effectiveness and that individual faculty members will demonstrate substantive participation in such practices. To ensure that this occurs:

- Evaluations of teaching effectiveness – using methods and tools as detailed in recommendations 2 through 6 – should contribute to the calculation of salary increases (and decreases).
- Differential performance must be recognized. If evaluations of teaching occupy a narrow range, or if most evaluations fall within the same range because, for example, no meaningful evaluation is applied by department chairs, the differential contribution of those evaluations will be small and other evaluations, such as evaluation of scholarly and research productivity, will exert a larger influence on the overall salary increase. Therefore, department chairs should use meaningful evaluations of teaching effectiveness to identify and reward teaching accomplishments.
- Participation in professional development activities and the application of knowledge gained through those activities should be considered in evaluations of teaching effectiveness.
- Involvement in curricular design activities should be counted toward teaching, not service, in annual performance evaluations.

2. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD BE EVALUATED USING EVIDENCE-BASED APPROACHES.

Colorado State University should make a range of evidence-based approaches to teaching assessment easily available to departments and colleges. These approaches should include, but not be limited to, analysis of data from learning management systems, analysis of student work, observation of teaching, and peer review of curricular materials. Evaluations can draw on direct and indirect measures, qualitative and quantitative data, and the exploration of relationships between measures and student learning behaviors.

3. EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD INVOLVE THE USE OF MULTIPLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MULTIPLE TOOLS.

No single method should be viewed as sufficient in and of itself. In particular, student course surveys *should not serve* either as a direct or primary means of determining teaching effectiveness. Although these surveys can be valuable in formative assessments, they have not proven to be a valid means of assessing teaching effectiveness. Using them for this purpose can promote ineffective teaching, as demonstrated by recent research (Beleche, Farris, & Marks, 2012; Braga, Paccagnella, & Pellizzari, 2014; Carrell & West, 2010; Langbein, 2008; Stark & Freishtat, 2014; Weinberg, Hashimoto, & Fleisher, 2009).

Potential sources of evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness might include:

- Curriculum development and course materials, including course proposals, course syllabi, assignments, lesson plans, handouts, Web-based materials, courseware, and assessments (exams, quizzes, writing projects), among others

- Evidence of dissemination of course materials
- Evidence of integration of critical thinking activities into courses
- Evidence of effective technology use in teaching and learning,
- Evidence of innovations in courses (e.g., improvements on past practices or efforts to incorporate new knowledge and processes within the discipline)
- Teaching awards
- Evidence of participation in professional development activities related to teaching and learning

4. EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD INVOLVE A PEER-REVIEW PROCESS (DEFINED LATER IN THIS REPORT) COMPARABLE TO THE PROCESS USED IN ASSESSING RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND ARTISTRY.

Peer review is an essential element of evaluation processes that are central to tenure, promotion, compensation, recognition, and retention of faculty members. It is widely used in assessment of scholarly, research, and artistic productivity and in assessments of contributions to service, outreach, and engagement. Although the peer review processes used for these purposes share key similarities across disciplines, elements of the processes can vary significantly. A useful set of guidelines has been developed by the Teaching Academy of the Consortium of West Region Colleges of Veterinary Medicine. They can be found in the appendix to this report.

Although a number of departments currently use peer review processes in their evaluations of teaching effectiveness, many departments do not. We recommend that all departments use peer evaluation for instructors at all levels (temporary, non-tenure track, tenure-track, tenured).

The development of peer review processes (or the improvement of existing processes) should be informed by the following considerations:

- Peer review should draw on multiple forms of information, including but not limited to curricular materials, observations of teaching performance, and examples of student performance. For example, although observation of teaching performance is an important element of peer-review processes, it should not serve as the only source of information for an evaluation.
- Peer review should be rooted in discussions of evidence regarding both the impact of teaching on students and the instructor's use of evidence of those impacts to improve instructional effectiveness and pursue curricular goals.
- Curricular materials offered for review can include, but should not be limited to,
    - course syllabi (including course goals, course outlines, and course policies),
    - student assessments (e.g., exams, writing assignments, projects, and presentations),
    - in-class activities developed and deployed (student presentations, group activities, group discussion), and
    - materials that support student learning outside the classroom (e.g., homework, reflection assignments, group study).

Review of curricular materials is best served by the development and maintenance of an electronic teaching portfolio (critical and part of the 2011 recommendations), which can show development over the course of several years, curricular development, reflective statements on teaching, and more. To be meaningful, materials should be reviewed by more than one faculty colleague and reviews should provide feedback about the materials.

- Classroom observation offers benefits to both the observer and observed instructor. Tools to help the observer focus on important components of the class can facilitate the process. These include pre-observations summaries of the goals and activities for the class, department-designed observation forms, and prompts guiding the development of an observation report. To be most useful, classroom observations must be followed by debriefing and discussion between the observer and instructor. This debriefing and discussion should address observed strategies and techniques, strengths, weaknesses, and recommended modifications. Classroom observation that involves repeated and regular observations by the same colleague best serves the long-term development of effective teaching. Ideally, more than one colleague will serve as an observer and provide feedback.

- Student performance can be assessed through review of student work, observation of engagement during class sessions, and analysis of data provided through various learning analytics tools. The latter can include information from a learning management system, information provided by university reporting systems, and information from the various learning tools made available by the department, college, or more generally at CSU. Examples include data from YouSeeU, ALEKS, MyLabs, and other commercial systems.

Peer review should result in a report suitable for annual review. Peer review should be documented in a way that allows department chairs the opportunity to easily assess teaching effectiveness and excellence. For new instructors, effective peer review can also support the development of a long term mentor/mentee relationship in which a faculty colleague serves as a peer reviewer over the course of several years, and not simply as a one-time visitor to complete a classroom peer observation.

We recommend that CSU provide as many resources as possible to facilitate the peer review process. These resources should be made available through a central portal, perhaps on the TILT website or on the Provost's website. See recommendation 8, below.

5. EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD INCLUDE PEER REVIEW OF REFLECTIVE STATEMENTS FROM THE FACULTY MEMBERS WHO ARE BEING EVALUATED.

A central recommendation in the 2011 task force report was the "production and review of reflective statements on teaching." We recommend that these reflective statements be a required part of any evaluation of teaching effectiveness. This statement would allow the instructor to reflect on their work as an instructor during the review period. It would also allow them to address their strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and explore areas for future improvement. In addition, it would allow them to identify key contributions they've made to teaching efforts within their

departments, college, university, and profession. Ideally, the reflective statement would be linked closely to the contents of a teaching portfolio.

Like the 2011 task force, we also support the design and implementation of professional development initiatives related to this recommendation.

6. EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD ENTAIL THE USE OF PROCESSES AND STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO AND RECOGNIZED BY SCHOLARS WITHIN A GIVEN DISCIPLINE OR PROFESSION.

Research and scholarship on the evaluation of teaching effectiveness – and more generally on teaching and learning – should inform the processes used by departments to evaluate teaching effectiveness. During the development of evaluation processes, department faculty should consult scholarship on teaching and learning, discipline-based educational research, and work in learning science. Because knowledge types, subject matter, and disciplinary values and conventional practices play a key role in determining which teaching approaches are effective in a given course, teaching assessment practices must be adapted to fit discipline-specific needs.

The authors of the 2011 Task Force Report note:

> Any attempt to assess teaching effectiveness must take into account institutional and disciplinary culture. Simply put, the agreed upon "best practices" in one discipline might be viewed with suspicion in another, most often because of long-standing agreements within a group about methods but also, and perhaps more importantly, because of genuine differences in content and methods across disciplines. As a result, we believe that teaching effectiveness is best assessed within a disciplinary or departmental context. This implies the central role of peer review within any assessment process and our recommendations are founded on the assumption that assessment must be grounded in agreed-upon standards that are likely to vary widely across the University.

Colorado State University should help faculty find the information pertinent to teaching in their disciplines. TILT should make a rich variety of the following resources easily available at a central repository on its website. CSU faculty with knowledge and expertise in the disciplines should assist by providing materials for the TILT website.

7. DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PROCESSES SHOULD REWARD FACULTY MEMBERS FOR ENGAGING IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TEACHING AND LEARNING.

Instructors improve most when they take advantage of resources that support improvement in teaching performance. Resources range from informal conversations with colleagues to structured professional development opportunities. Departments are encouraged to provide access to mentoring and encourage participation in mentoring programs and to encourage participation in professional development programs offered by TILT, CSU Online, and the Provost's Office. Departments are also encouraged to identify potential professional development opportunities offered through professional organizations and at conferences.

8. CSU SHOULD PROMOTE THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES AND SCHOLARLY INITIATIVES RELATED TO UNDERSTANDING AND ENHANCING LEARNING AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS ACROSS THE INSTITUTION.

A wide range of resources currently exists on websites sponsored by departments, the Office of the Vice President for Research, TILT, and CSU Online, among others. We encourage the University to make additional investments in professional development resources and scholarly initiatives related to teaching effectiveness. These might include:

- Expanding the PDI and TILT Summer Conference to include greater attention to the scholarship of teaching and learning, learning science, and disciplinary based educational research
- Tools that support peer review of teaching, such as observation forms and report templates
- Tools that prompt faculty reflection on teaching effectiveness
- Models of best practices for classroom instruction
- Models of best practices for online instruction
- Examples of teaching portfolios
- Examples of department processes for assessing teaching effectiveness

At the department level, we recommend that departments support and recognize scholarly work related to teaching effectiveness. Departments should include discipline-based research on teaching and learning in its evaluations of faculty and support such work within and across disciplines.

Conveners: Matt Hickey and Mike Palmquist

Task Force Members: Meena Balgopal, Stephanie Clemons, Gwen Gorzelsky, Nancy E. Levinger, Michele Marquitz, Charles W. Miller, Benjamin F. Miller, John Moore, Erica Suchman

Report Submitted: December 30, 2015