

**Appendix 6: Rubric for Evaluating Departmental Teaching Quality
Self-Assessment of Teaching Quality in the NSCS Program.**

Indicate the self-assessment rating with a brief rationale in the appropriate cell.			
Exemplary	Developing	Needs Development	Criteria for Assessing Teaching Quality
		X	<p style="text-align: center;">Expectations for Teaching Quality</p> <p><u>Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a rubric to convey to faculty at all levels expectations regarding teaching quality, including demonstration of effective teaching practices.
	X		<p style="text-align: center;">Support for Teaching Development</p> <p><u>Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty receive support for designing and improving courses through UCATT including classroom observations and assessment tools. Faculty are members of Faculty Learning Communities discussing evidence-based learning/flipped classrooms. Faculty are recipients of teaching awards. Faculty are involved in federal and foundation supported development of laboratory courses. <p><u>Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty will be encouraged to attend teaching workshops on and off campus. Attendance of at least one workshop every three years is expected of all teaching faculty and should be included in the annual review by the Neuroscience Dept Head or the Director of the Program in Cognitive Science. Faculty will be encouraged to complete MENTOR institute training to incorporate teaching practices.
	X		<p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation of Teaching</p> <p><u>Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty are evaluated annually through SCS reports by the Neuroscience Dept Head or Director of the Program in Cognitive Science as part of their annual performance review that includes peer assessments of teaching for in person classes using UCATT rubrics involving classroom observation by their peers and UCATT, review of materials, and meetings between instructor and evaluator. For Arizona online where teaching is not live, peer evaluations would involve review of course materials and discussion with the instructor. <p><u>Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We propose to require a peer teaching observation evaluation done every three years for all tenured/tenure-track, career track, and continuing status faculty who actively teach NSCS courses.
		X	<p style="text-align: center;">Applying Findings to Teaching Improvements</p> <p><u>Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether implementing the action items listed in the sections above result in noticeable improvements, as evidenced through SCS reports and peer observation of teaching. Incorporate successful strategies in Program curriculum and strategic plans for teaching