**Rating Sheet for Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching**

**Instructions:** Complete the table below, citing the key evidence found in the 5-page summary for each required criterion. Indicate in the Rating column whether each criterion has been met or not.

The primary criterion is skill in teaching. Additionally, consideration is also given to sound scholarship (usually demonstrated through publications or artistic productions), outstanding service to students, as well as service to the State University and to the campus.

| **Criterion** | **Key Evidence from 5-page Summary** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Teaching Techniques and Representative Materials*** | | |
| There must be positive evidence that the candidate **performs superbly in the classroom**. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| The nominee must maintain a **flexible instructional policy** that adapts readily to student needs, interests and problems. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| **Mastery of teaching techniques** must be demonstrated and substantiated. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| Consideration is to be given to the **number of substantially different courses** taught, the **number of students per course**, and the different **teaching techniques employed** in the various courses. |  |  |
| ***Scholarship and Professional Growth*** | | |
| Candidates must be teacher/scholars who **keep abreast** of their own field… |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| ...and who **use the relevant contemporary data** from that field and related disciplines **in teaching**. *Evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to, publications, grants, presentations at conferences, artistic productions, etc.* |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| ***Student Services*** | | |
| In relating to students, candidates must be **generous with personal time, easily accessible**, |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| and must demonstrate a **continual concern for the intellectual growth of individual students**. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| The focus here is the **accessibility of the nominee to students outside of class;** e.g., office hours, conferences, special meetings, and the nominee's responsibility in terms of student advisement. |  |  |
| ***Academic Standards and Requirements, and Evaluation of Student Performance*** | | |
| Candidates must set **high standards for students** and **help them attain academic excellence**. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| **Quantity and quality of work that is more than average for the subject** must be required of the students. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| Candidates must **work actively with individual students to help them improve** their scholarly or artistic performance. This individual interaction is an important source of information that indicates the nature and level of instruction offered by the nominee. Consideration is to be given to the **quality, quantity, and difficulty of the tasks** or work assigned to students. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |
| Candidates’ **evaluations of students’ work** must be strongly supported by evidence. Candidates must be **willing to give greater weight to each student’s final level of competence** than to the performance at the beginning of the course. Since expert teachers enable students to achieve high levels of scholarship, it is possible that the candidates’ marking records may be somewhat above average. There must also be evidence that candidates **do not hesitate to give low evaluations** to students who do poorly. For this category, consideration should be given to grading patterns, particularly grade distributions for all courses in at least two recent years. Evidence in support of student performance may also be assessed by the accomplishments of students, including placement and achievement levels. |  | Exceeded  Met  Not Met |