

New Mexico State University

Rubric for Scholarly Teaching

	No Evidence	Some Elements Apparent	Clearly Apparent	Highly Developed
Discipline Knowledge	No evidence of the faculty member's own knowledge or scholarly activity within the discipline is evident in the curriculum, process or method, and the practice or application of the discipline is not reflected in the learning activities of students.	Some evidence of the faculty member's own knowledge or scholarly activity within the discipline is evident in the curriculum, process or method, or the practice or application of the discipline is marginally reflected in the learning activities of students.	Consistent evidence of the faculty member's own knowledge or scholarly activity within the discipline is evident in the curriculum, process or method, and the practice or application of the discipline is clearly reflected in the learning activities of students.	Evidence of the faculty member's own knowledge or scholarly activity within the discipline is inherent in the curriculum, process and method, as is the practice and application of the discipline in the learning activities of students.
Course Development & Planning	There is no evidence that the course has been developed to achieve specific learning goals/objectives/outcomes, or that effort has been made to construct the course in a way that best supports learning.	At least some learning goals, objectives or outcomes have been identified, and there is some evidence that effort has been made to construct the course in a way that supports the achievement of the learning goals/objectives/ outcomes.	The course has clearly defined goals, objectives and/or outcomes; outcomes are in terms of direct student learning and are measureable and relevant; and learning activities appear to support achievement of learning outcomes.	The course has clearly defined goals, objectives and outcomes; outcomes are in terms of direct student learning and are measureable and relevant; and learning activities are specifically aligned and clearly structured to support achievement of learning outcomes.
Focus on Student Learning	Evidence suggests that course construction is driven by the perceived need to cover content, and not by the learning needs of students. Course construct is primarily faculty-oriented.	The faculty member demonstrates a desire to respond to student needs for learning as essential to the discipline, but interprets student learning needs from measures such as grades (rather than performance on specific learning outcomes), anecdote, general impressions, and/or student surveys/ opinions. Course construct may be faculty-oriented.	The faculty member uses a range of mechanisms to assess the extent to which student learning of essential knowledge, skills and values is achieved; is demonstrably invested in understanding how students approach learning in the subject/discipline; and uses the practice and application of the discipline to engage students. Course construct is primarily student-centered.	In addition to using a range of mechanisms to continually assess the extent to which students are acquiring essential knowledge, skills and values and how students approach learning in the discipline, the faculty member develops their own learning needs in an effort to improve learning. Course construct is clearly student-centered.
Grounded in Inquiry & Research	There is no evidence the faculty member inquires into prior student learning and current expectations, or the degree to which learning outcomes are achieved; nor is there evidence the faculty member has done any research in teaching and learning in the discipline or in higher education generally.	The faculty member demonstrates curiosity about student learning and there is some evidence that he/she has either attempted to measure success in student learning or has done some investigation of teaching and learning in the discipline or in higher education generally.	There is clear evidence the faculty member inquires into prior student learning and current expectations and the degree to which learning outcomes are achieved; is invested in answering questions about student learning in a systematic way; and provides evidence of research in teaching and learning in the discipline or in higher education generally.	There is clear evidence the faculty member systematically inquires into prior student learning and current expectation, and the degree to which learning outcomes are achieved; is invested in answering questions about student learning in a systematic way; and provides evidence of research in teaching and learning in the discipline or in higher education generally.
Reflective Response in Practice	There is no evidence the faculty member is reflective in their approach to teaching or learning.	There is circumstantial evidence the faculty member has done some reflection on teaching and learning and has adjusted teaching strategies in an effort to bring about improved learning, but changes are not clearly linked to systematic evaluation, assessment or research; there is no documentation of impact of changes on learning; faculty member may or may not have articulated a teaching philosophy.	There is clear evidence the faculty member consistently reflects on teaching on learning and continuously reevaluates aims and objectives; systematically uses findings from assessment and reflective processes to improve learning; engages in activities for professional development; and has articulated a teaching philosophy.	There is clear evidence the faculty member consistently reflects on teaching on learning and continuously reevaluates aims and objectives; systematically uses findings from assessment and reflective processes to improve learning; engages in activities for professional development, particularly in their own areas of limited understanding; engages students in reflective learning processes; and has a well-developed teaching philosophy.
Document	There is no documentation of faculty engagement in scholarly teaching activities.	There is minimal documentation of the FM's engagement in scholarly teaching activities, or documentation is insufficient or unclear in its alignment to improved teaching and learning.	There is clear and sufficient evidence the faculty member has engaged in scholarly teaching: evidence may include prepared course materials, articles, reflective journals, teaching notes/journal, monitored curricular changes, plan for own learning, generalized/recorded information of student experiences, documented assessment, peer reviews, actions from inquiry, etc.	The faculty member has a portfolio of scholarly teaching that provides clear and sufficient evidence they have engaged in effective scholarly teaching practices; faculty member clearly aligns scholarly teaching practices to discipline and higher education learning, and clearly demonstrates that highly developed and intentional inquiry is what drives the process of scholarly teaching.
Peer Engagement & Making it Public	There is no evidence the faculty member has engaged peers in developing or improving their teaching practices, nor is there evidence the faculty member has shared information or experiences with peers (formally or informally) either internally or externally.	Evidence the faculty member has shared experiences or information about teaching and learning with peers through discussions or peer reviews is primarily self-reported, informal and local; there is no evidence he/she has engaged in documented or formal exchanges of information and/or discussion on teaching and learning; it is not evident that he/she has contributed to finding ways to illuminate the discipline for students, to improve teaching in the discipline, or to provoke new questions about teaching and learning in the discipline.	There is clear and reliable evidence the faculty member has engaged in sharing information and ideas about scholarly teaching with peers either internally or externally; primary mode of sharing may be formal or informal; the faculty member has contributed to the local culture of scholarly teaching through discussion groups, peer reviews, mentoring, and/or leading a more formal discussion, presentation or paper.	There is clear and reliable evidence the faculty member has engaged in sharing information and ideas with peers both internally and externally; primary mode of sharing may be formal or informal, but both have ensued; the faculty member has contributed to the local culture of scholarly teaching through discussion groups, peer reviews, mentoring, and/or leading a more formal discussion, presentation or paper; and there is evidence the faculty member has contributed to the development of scholarly teaching at the college, university, discipline or wider academic community level.

