

Teaching Effectiveness Vocabulary	Evidence-based teaching strategies*  *See references	Relevance in <i>Clemson's Faculty Manual</i>  Teaching Practices, Chapter VI, Section (§) F, pp. 72-76	Suggested items of evidence  From OTEI, informed by the Clemson Faculty Manual
Academic Expectations	Establish appropriately high level of expectations	Statement of Teaching/Advising Philosophy (§§ 2, k. i. (4), p. 75)	<p><b>Syllabus review</b> (goals and objectives, pathways to assessments)</p> <p><b>Canvas review</b> (use of syllabus page and use of feedback activities)</p> <p><b>Peer observation of teaching</b> (class session structure; use of feedback activities)</p>
	Set goals and learning outcomes and establish learning value; also align with program goals	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	
	Provide clear pathways to success and support all students to get there	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75)	
	Communicate and provide formative feedback	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	
	Employ (“activate”) student prior knowledge	Pre-post-test evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75)	
	Align course goals with course assessments	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	
Rapport	Build ways for faculty-student contact	Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	<p><b>Syllabus review</b> (statement on office hours, accessible hours; inclusivity statements)</p>

	Means of motivation provided for all students	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75)	<b>Canvas review</b> (use of Canvas Announcements)  <b>Peer observation of teaching</b> (of inclusive practices, building rapport)  <b>Student Surveys</b>
	Create positive and supportive climate	Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	
	Foundation of learning is relational: build and facilitate relationships	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	
	Demonstrate care for students	In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	
Clarity	Clarity in communication about course concepts	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	<b>Peer observation of teaching</b> (of clear communication, use of use of multiple means of communication in instruction, through equitable facilitation skills for group dialogue)  <b>Assignment / test design review</b>  <b>Canvas review</b> (use of Canvas for formative, summative assessments, use of gradebook, use of comments in
	Clarity in feedback (summative and formative)	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	
	Clarity in organization	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	

	Inclusive communication and accessible materials	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75)	speedgrader)  <b>Syllabus and course review</b> (use of universal design, such as multiple communication means)  <b>Student Surveys</b>
Transparency	Exams and assignments are of quality, equitable, fair, frequent	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	<b>Peer observation of teaching</b>  <b>Assignment / test design review</b> (using learning-centered assignment design)  <b>Canvas review</b> (use of Canvas for formative, summative assessments, use of gradebook, use of comments in speedgrader)  <b>Course review</b> (use of universal design, such as multiple means of communication)
	Purpose of student work is transparent	Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75)	
	Formative and summative assessments are frequent and productive	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	
	Clear criteria and clear paths to success, scaffolded as needed, for assignments	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75)	
	Check for student understanding and use student feedback	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	
Learning Science	Use of active learning	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	<b>Peer observation of teaching</b> Lesson review

	Peer-to-peer learning incorporated	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	<b>Course review / Canvas review</b>  (Manage the learning environment to foster learning, using knowledge about student learning and using group management skills, developing student group skills, and using technologies to enhance communication and learning. Offer students multiple means to engage—UDL practices)
	Student self-reflection prompted	Evidence of student learning (§§ 2, k. i. (1), p. 75) Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) Exit interviews of graduates/alums (§§ 2, k. i. (5), p. 75) Statement of how student ratings used in course improvements (§§ 2, k. i. (7), p. 75)	
	Share learning strategies and prompt metacognition	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75) In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75) Statement of Teaching/Advising Philosophy (§§ 2, k. i. (4), p. 75)	
	Materials provided are accessible to all students	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	
	Clear instructions (verbal and written), deadlines and support (all UDL aspects) as an inclusivity practice	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	
Inclusivity	Learning is social and multi-faceted	In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75) Statement of Teaching/Advising Philosophy (§§ 2, k. i. (4), p. 75)	<b>Peer observation of teaching</b> (inclusion of students in learning process, engagement)
	Universal design supports all students but especially new majority students	Peer evaluation of program materials (§§ 2, k. i. (2), p. 75)	<b>Course review/ Canvas review</b> (Canvas elements supporting

	Supporting all students through inclusivity of teaching and learning practices and understanding students' social contexts	In-class peer observations (§§ 2, k. i. (3), p. 75)	UDL)  <b>Assignment / test design review</b>
--	--	---	--

Guides for review process:

- [Learning-Focused Assignment Guide](#). This holistic guide can help you assess the alignment, transparency, and inclusivity of your assignments, in terms of development, use, and revision of assignments.
- [Learning-Focused Assignment Rubric](#). This rubric preceded the creation of the assignment guide and uses a point-scoring system. From the Universities of Virginia and George Mason.
- [Learning-Focused Test Guide](#). This guide helps you assess the alignment, transparency, and inclusivity of your tests, both development and deployment.
- [Test Blueprint Guide](#). This guide walks you through the process of creating a simple blueprint to evaluate your test questions and check on alignment with learning outcomes.
- [Diversity & Inclusion Syllabus Statements](#). This resource lists a series of examples of statements from various institutions, compiled by the Clemson Faculty Learning Community “Dive In”.
- Faculty may also self-evaluate teaching practices and course materials with regards to diversity and inclusion, using the resources on the [OTEI Diversity, Equity and Inclusion page](#).
- [A Guide to Assessing the Focus of Syllabi](#). This article provides an overview and instructions for using a “valid and reliable syllabus rubric” from the University of Virginia.
- [A Guide to Peer Observation: Observing Teaching in Higher Education \(OTEI\)](#). This guide provides an overview of teaching observations in higher education today, a suggested approach and schedule, and sample documentation.
- [A Checklist of Teacher Behaviors for a Class Session](#) drawn from Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006; OTEI Seven Teaching Competencies; Teaching Dimensions Observation Protocol (TDOP) © 2010, 2014 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, and other sources.

References: Elements of effectiveness pulled from a cross-analysis of the following resources:

- Abdous, M. (2011). A process-oriented framework for acquiring online teaching competencies. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 23(1), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-010-9040-5>
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Harvard University Press.
- Boysen, G. A., Gurung, R. A. R., & Richmond, A. S. (2020). Stability and intercorrelations among model teaching criteria. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000237>
- CAST (2018). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. Retrieved from <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>.
- Chalmers, D. (2007). *A review of Australian and international quality systems and indicators of learning and teaching*. Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Retrieved from [http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/T&L\\_Quality\\_Systems\\_and\\_Indicators.pdf](http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/T&L_Quality_Systems_and_Indicators.pdf)
- Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3(March), 2–6. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf>
- Dolinsky, R. (2015). *Faculty Collaboratives : National Landscape Analysis of Student Learning Initiatives and Faculty Engagement 1 Key Findings*. AACU.
- Gates Foundation. (2015). *U.S. Postsecondary Faculty in 2015: Diversity in people, goals and methods, but focused on students*. FTI Consulting. Retrieved from <http://postsecondary.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/US-Postsecondary-Faculty-in-2015.pdf>
- Gurung, R. A. R., Richmond, A. S., & Boysen, G. A. (2018). Studying excellence in teaching: The story so far. In B. Buskist & J. Keeley (Eds.), *Habits and practices of master teachers: International perspectives on excellent teaching* (pp. 11-20). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hattie, J. (2015). The applicability of Visible Learning to higher education. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(1), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000021>
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Oxon, England: Routledge.

- Henard, F. (2010). Learning our lesson: Review of quality teaching in higher education. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/1807261/Learning\\_our\\_lessons\\_quality\\_teaching\\_in\\_higher\\_education](https://www.academia.edu/1807261/Learning_our_lessons_quality_teaching_in_higher_education)
- Higher Education Academy, Guild HE, & Universities UK. (2011). The UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education. *Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf>
- Kite, M. E. (2013). Effective Evaluation of Teaching: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 110(1), ii-91. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aes563>
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 217–251. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163195?origin=JSTOR-pdf>
- Mayhew, M. J., Rockenbach, A. N., Bowman, N. A., Seifert, T. A. D., Wolniak, G. C., Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2016). *How college affects students: 21st century evidence that higher education works*. ProQuest Ebook Central <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- National Research Council. (2012). *Understanding and Improving Learning in Undergraduate Science and Engineering*. (S. R. Singer, N. R. Nielsen, & H. Schweingruber, Eds.). National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20030>
- National Research Council. (2015). *Reaching Students: What Research Says About Effective Instruction in Undergraduate Science and Engineering*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18687>
- Nilson, L. B. (2016). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: Vol. 2. A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Richmond, A. S., Boysen, G. A., & Gurung, R. A. R. (2016). *An Evidence-based Guide to College and University Teaching: Developing the Model Teacher*. New York: Routledge
- Roseveare, D., Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Fostering Quality Teaching in Higher Education : Policies and Practices*. Oecd, (September), 54.
- Tigelaar, D., Dolmans, D. H., Wolfhagen, H. a., & van der Vleuten, C. P. (2004). *The development and validation of a framework for teaching*. *Higher Education*, 48, 253–268. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000034318.74275.e4>
- Yeh, Y. F., Hsu, Y. S., Wu, H. K., Hwang, F. K., & Lin, T. C. (2014). Developing and validating technological pedagogical content knowledge-practical (TPACK-practical) through the Delphi survey technique. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(4), 707–722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12078>
- OTEI: Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation. T. Olsen. 2021.