

***Proposed revised text for the Criteria for Promotion and Tenure/Assigned Duties (Teaching) sub-section of the [OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#):***

**Teaching:** The teaching of students is central to the mission of Oregon State University. Most faculty have significant responsibilities in instruction:

- in presenting resident credit courses, international programs, for-credit distance learning programs;
- in directing undergraduate and graduate research or projects, internships, and theses, and serving on master and doctoral committees;
- in collaborating with and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral associates.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching and student success are essential for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in the teaching role.

The [Quality Teaching \(QT\) Framework](#), endorsed by the Faculty Senate in 2021, provides the OSU community with the foundation for a multifaceted evaluation of teaching, and serves as a guide and organizational tool for considering teaching effectiveness as part of the promotion and tenure process. As described in the [Framework](#), an instructional faculty member engaged in quality teaching is one who

- (1) champions a culture of diverse, equitable, and inclusive learning,
- (2) practices teaching as a discipline, and
- (3) mentors and advises students.

As quality teachers, faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to promote student success. How faculty members enact principles of the Quality Teaching Framework will vary by context and discipline. See the [list of examples](#) for ways faculty can demonstrate principles and sub-principles of the framework, providing evidence of a faculty member's particular commitment to effective and quality teaching.

Note: See separate "Extension" section below for instructions on evaluation of extension non-credit education for dossier preparation.

In addition to the **Candidate Statement**, which addresses teaching within assigned duties, evaluation of instruction is based on a combination of systematic and on-going mechanisms: (1) **peer review of teaching evaluations**; (2) tabulated responses from learners or participants of courses taught by the candidate as represented through the **Student Learning Experience (SLE) survey responses**; (3) a **reflective statement** contextualizing one's teaching; and (4) a **student committee evaluation letter** summarizing solicited student letters of evaluation of teaching.

- 1) **Peer review of teaching evaluations** should apply the principles and subprinciples of the Quality Teaching Framework to a) observations of classroom and/or learning management system content (as relevant to teaching modality), and b) review of course syllabi and learning materials (e.g., assignments, readings, examinations, and synchronous or asynchronous student engagement activities). Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning and meeting the learning outcomes specified by the course syllabus. Candidates should also follow college and unit guidelines for peer review of teaching evaluations, consistent with evidence-based best practices. Guidance

and resources for peer review of teaching evaluations are also provided by the [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#).

2) The [Student Learning Experience survey \(SLE\)](#) was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in 2021 and provides important student feedback aligned with the principles of the Quality Teaching Framework. While data from the SLEs should be included in a candidate’s dossier, and can be reviewed to document improvement over time, data from the SLEs *should not be used for comparison* of faculty, and reviewers should be aware that there are inherent biases in student feedback. Candidates should include a summary table that includes the QT sub-scores (see example below and **guidance for finding QT Sub-score data**).

Questions 1 and 2 from the eSET were retained as part of the SLE through spring term 2026. Beginning in summer term 2026, the SLE survey will not include questions 1 and 2 from the eSET.

*Example SLE Summary Table (for courses taught fall 2021 and later)*

Course Information			QT Sub-scores			Overall score
Academic Term and Year	Course Name and Number	Class Size/ Responses	Inclusive and Meaningful Learning Community	Teaching as a Discipline	Mentors and Advises Learners	Course and Instructor
Spring 2025	CORE 100	35/10	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.7

3) Candidates may, if they choose, include a **reflective statement** that provides additional context for the evaluation of their instruction. The statement should be brief (one-page maximum, single-spaced, 12-point font, one-inch margins), should be written by the candidate, and should contextualize and augment other forms of teaching evidence in the dossier (i.e., peer review of teaching evaluations, SLE survey responses, student committee evaluation letter, and the candidate statement). The statement may draw from quantitative and qualitative SLE data, providing an opportunity for candidates to situate SLE scores within a broader context. When applicable, the reflective statement may explain efforts the candidate is making to improve or enhance the effectiveness of their teaching and students’ learning. Examples of these efforts include, but are not limited to, pedagogical professional development, changes to course design or readings, incorporating inclusive learning practices, conducting scholarly inquiries into one’s teaching, etc.

4) As detailed in the [Procedural Guidelines](#), students will be invited to write a **student committee evaluation letter** based on a summary of student perspectives of the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher, mentor, and advisor. Other dossier materials documenting the evaluation of instructor (i.e., peer review of teaching evaluations, SLE survey responses, and candidate’s reflective statement) will not be accessible to the student committee.