Teaching Portfolio Rubric
Note: Criteria may be customized for each department.

Improvement required to meet expectations	Meets expectations as an effective teacher	Meets criteria for teaching excellence
CA1. Strong content knowledge		
❑ No evidence that content has changed commensurate with changes in the discipline. ❑ Peer reviewers express concern about content knowledge	❑ Provides evidence that content has been updated if the course has been taught over several years. ❑ Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio]	❑ Explains sources of content knowledge for courses, as described in syllabi ❑ Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio] ❑ Explains and shows evidence of inquiry into how students master content knowledge
CA2. Growing knowledge of teaching/learning practice		
❑ Attended no teaching-professional development activities (e.g., CTE, NMEL, professional organization .	❑ Attended at least one teaching-professional development activity (e.g., CTE, NMEL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction	❑ Attended two or more teaching-professional development activities (e.g., CTE, NMEL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction ❑ Facilitated a teaching-professional development event for other faculty/TAs ❑ Published at least one paper on teaching in their discipline ❑ Awarded at least one grant to improve teaching or training of students.
CA3. Adapting/revising to needs of learners		
❑ Shows no evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges	❑ Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges	❑ Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on multiple inputs from students and observations of student learning challenges (e.g., SGID, surveys, classroom assessment techniques; frequent formative assessment)
CA4. Engage students to learn in the real/virtual classroom		
❑ Shows no evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)	❑ Explains and shows evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)	❑ Explains and shows evidence for using and assessing the impact of multiple interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)

CA5. Can explain and support choices in content, pedagogy, assessment		
❑ Offers no explanation of choices in content, pedagogy or assessment	❑ Explains choices in content based on disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. ❑ Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students	❑ Explains choices in content based on more than one of: disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. ❑ Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of more than one of: developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. ❑ Explains specific choices of assessment methods.
CA6. Mentoring/Advising undergraduate, graduate, professional student scholars		
❑ No evidence of mentoring or advising students	❑ Evidence of mentoring of lower division, upper division, graduate or professional students ❑ Mentoring activities have occurred over several years.	❑ Evidence of mentoring more than one level of student (e.g. more than one of lower vision, upper division, graduate, or professional students) ❑ Description of outcomes of mentoring. ❑ Consistent mentoring activity over several years.
CA7. Tracking learning outcomes for improvement		
❑ Provides no student learning outcomes for their courses. ❑ Shows no assessment of student learning.	❑ Student learning outcomes (SLO's) developed for all courses and listed on syllabi. ❑ Explains and provides evidence for assessing student learning outcomes revising curriculum or instruction to improve learning	❑ Matches course SLO's to degree-program SLO's ❑ Matches course SLO's to university core curriculum SLO's/competencies (if applicable) ❑ Serves as coordinator for development, assessment and discussion of departmental SLO's
CA8. Fit of teaching activities within curriculum		
❑ Provides no explanation of fit of their courses into the curriculum of the department or university.	❑ Explains where courses fits within departmental degree requirements	❑ Connects course goals and content to other courses within the department and across the university ❑ Explains fit of the course within students' educational programs within the university