

## Merit criteria for evaluating teaching

- The criteria for evaluating teaching are related to the level of effort that the instructor devotes to assigned teaching and the quality of the effort. On a scale of 1-9, an instructor, who does a good job of teaching courses agreed to during their yearly planning meeting, will receive a 5. Faculty earning a score of 5 have met criteria and no merit is attached. Instructors involved in courses with high student enrollments, courses with labs, which the instructor teaches, or courses that fulfill the University of Delaware's writing goals will receive a meritorious evaluation, since these courses demand a higher level of effort than a normal 3 credit lecture course. Instructional improvement activities such as the submission of instructional grants, attendance at education meetings, participation in workshops, or mentoring younger faculty in how to teach represent a higher level of effort and are also considered for merit.

Evidence of the quality of the teaching, however, is essential for receiving meritorious evaluations. Such things as teaching award nominations or awards received, excellent teaching evaluations given by students **and** peers, competitive instructional improvement grants, or successful mentoring of students participating in independent study (senior thesis or advanced degrees awarded) are evidence of quality. Quality teaching also requires a significant self reflection, which may take the form of a teaching portfolio.

- The rubric for awarding merit, which was passed by the Biology faculty in 2005, is presented below. The number of points in the table far exceeds the number of points needed to earn the maximum merit award. This allows faculty to focus effort in different instructional areas. However, if a faculty member is advised at a yearly evaluation to improve their instruction by carrying out a specific activity and doesn't, the points below can be negative, indicating that the faculty member falls below criteria.

Exceeded workload assigned to teaching (0.5 or 1 point)

Student and peer evaluations (0.5 or 1 point)

Undergraduate and graduate research mentoring beyond assigned workload (0.5 and 1 point). [*For graduate students this is limited to the semester in which the student defends a thesis or dissertation.*]

Teaching nominations (0.5), awards (1)

Instructional Improvement

Significant documented changes (0.5 or 1 point)

Initiation of a new course (1)

Courses requiring a higher level of effort

Upper division laboratory courses (1)

Courses that incorporate a significant level of assigned writing (0.5-1)

Department's second writing courses (e.g., BISC498) (1)

Instructional Grants

External competitive instructional grants submitted, awarded (0.5-1.5 points)

Non-competitive (0.5) or University grants submitted (0.5), awarded (1.0)  
Attendance at national education (1.0) or UD (0.5) workshops or meetings  
Presentations at these meetings (1.0)  
In depth self evaluation of courses taught (0.5 or 1.0 points)