Costello College of Business Adjunct Evaluation Process

Overview:

Adjunct evaluation is an important tool to provide feedback to Costello College of Business (CCB) adjuncts to help them grow in their role as teachers. In addition, it serves to help ensure quality course experiences for students. As part of CCB process and also necessary for SACSCOC evaluation, this document outlines the requirements and processes for adjunct evaluation and complies with University Policy 3012.

The evaluation process described is intended to be more holistic than a review of student evaluation of teaching scores. While those are a useful indicator, they should not be the only means of evaluation. Other evaluative elements that can be used include:

- Syllabi and other course materials
- Course structure
- Course content appropriateness and innovations
- Observations of pedagogic practices
- Student engagement
- Student learning and assessments
- Supports provided to assure student success
- Areas for self-improvement

The process described below includes a peer review of at least two of these evaluative elements and an evaluation by the area chair.

Frequency of Evaluations:

- Evaluation for each adjunct must be completed once every 3 years.
- Evaluation of new adjunct faculty must occur within either their first or second semester of teaching. (These semesters may not be contiguous.)
- Approximately 1/3 of existing adjuncts are evaluated each academic year, beginning with the 2020-21 academic year.
- Evaluation of all existing adjunct faculty must be conducted no later than the spring semester of 2023, and then follow the at least once per 3 year cycle.

Performing the evaluation

Areas will determine who will perform adjunct peer reviews of teaching. For example, some areas may have adjunct or course coordinators do this, while other areas may have all faculty participate.

As described in the process below, the peer reviewer should meet/talk with adjunct before the review period to set expectations and understand the course objectives and the particular aspects that will be part of the review. After reviewing, the peer reviewer will write a 1-2 page memo summarizing their observations, including strengths and areas for improvement. The reviewer may choose to use the forms in Appendix A or write their own memo. This will be shared with the adjunct and the area chair.

The area chair will then complete the adjunct evaluation form, including a discussion with the adjunct, providing feedback and suggestions for professional development to support their teaching. The area chair and adjunct will sign the form and return it with the evaluation memo to the Dean's office (msharma9@gmu.edu).

Detailed Process

Pre-observation:

1. Faculty member performing review should contact adjunct to discuss schedules and when an observation could be scheduled and/or other evaluative elements could be shared.
2. Faculty members should meet to discuss the learning objectives for the course and what specific two or more evaluative elements will be covered in the review. Suggested review forms for face-to-face courses, materials review, and online courses can be found in Appendix A.
3. The reviewer should be added to the course Blackboard site as guest.
4. If materials are to be reviewed such as exams or samples of student work that are not on Blackboard, these should be provided to the reviewer.

Review Period Observation and/or Materials Review:

1. Reviewer should enter the Blackboard class site several times across the review period to review syllabus, materials, and student interaction on the site.
2. Reviewers should note strengths, areas of improvement, any concerns. Reviewer should use the recommended forms in the appendix to record any feedback and indicate what was observed during the review period, including specific details that describe the interaction or activity.

Post-observation/review:

1. The completed review form(s) should be used to provide specific information for a 1-2 page peer review letter (or use the forms in Appendix A). The letter should address the following:
    a. Logistics – date, course, number of students, format
    b. Type of review and observations/materials reviewed
    c. Demonstrated teaching and/or materials strengths
        - Include examples of anything that worked well in the class, or that you particularly liked.
    d. Demonstrated teaching and/or materials weaknesses
        - Include examples of anything that did not work well, needs improvement.
2. If there were any major critical concerns, they should be immediately brought to the area chair's attention as well as noted in the letter.
3. The letter should be provided to the adjunct faculty member and the area chair. The reviewer may share any forms utilized with the adjunct faculty member if desired.
4. Area chair should complete the evaluation form (Appendix B), reviewing SET scores, other inputs such as student feedback or course/adjunct coordinator feedback, and the peer letter
5. Area chair should meet with the adjunct, review the evaluation, and discuss any issues and performance development. The adjunct should be provided an opportunity to provide a response if desired.
6. The completed and signed evaluation form, including the peer letter and any response, should be sent to Dean's office.

The Dean's office will maintain documentation of the evaluations of adjunct faculty for at least five years and shall provide that documentation to the Office of the Provost when needed for accreditation or personnel-related matters.

APPENDIX A

Classroom Observation Form
GMU Costello College of Business

Instructor: **Observer:**
Purpose: ❑ **Formative Feedback** ❑ **Performance Evaluation**
Date/Time:
Course Number/Title:
Approximate # of students present on observation day:
Class Size:
Location:
Description of classroom set-up (desks/chairs/white boards/technology):

The purpose of this classroom observation is to provide peer-to-peer feedback and generate ideas that may help both faculty members reflect on their teaching or for an evaluative review, which should be established prior to any observation. The peer observation focuses on four areas of instruction: (1) content and organization; (2) classroom environment; (3) development of critical thinkers; and (4) teaching methods. The observer uses this form to indicate what was observed during the class and to jot down specific details that describe the interaction. (Note that items not observed may be present in other aspects/times of the course and this is not a judgment.) The completed form is then used to guide the post-observation conversation and exchange of ideas between participants; it will be only used for evaluation purposes if previously established (unless submitted by the observed faculty member).

PART 1: Content and Organization	**OBSERVED**	**NOT OBSERVED**	**COMMENTS (optional)**
1. Started and ended class on time			
2. Presented overview of class and learning objectives			
3. Presented and defined key concepts			
4. Linked material to relevant and real-world examples			
5. Presented information in an organized manner			
6. Presented material at a level appropriate to students and the course			
7. Made efficient use of class time (pace of activities, use of full class period)			
8. Presented material consistent with class overview and learning objectives (i.e., stayed on task)			
9. Provided engaging conclusion for the class			
PART 2: Creating a Classroom Environment Conducive to Learning			
10. Greeted students at the beginning of class			

11. Maintained a comfortable classroom presence (e.g., moved easily about the room, established eye contact, called on range of students to volunteer, used humor appropriately)			
12. Varied communication style to hold interest (e.g., pace, tone)			
13. Demonstrated enthusiasm for and interest in subject			
14. Responded appropriately to a range of student classroom behaviors (ranging from positive student contributions to distracting/disruptive behaviors)			
15. Ensured that students interacted civilly/respectfully with each other			
16. Listened carefully and respectfully to students' questions			
17. Answered questions appropriately and restated students' questions or comments as necessary			
PART 3: Developing Critical Thinkers			
18. Asked questions that lead to a deeper understanding and questioning of the material			
19. Asked students to apply their learning to authentic problems or scenarios			
20. Asked students to identify and/or question assumptions (e.g., about the field, the text, the material, themselves)			
21. Encouraged students to answer difficult questions by rephrasing or providing cues			
22. Encouraged students to make relevant connections among course ideas, their academic experiences, and their own lives			
PART 4: Teaching Methods			
23. Indicate which teaching methods used (e.g., lecture/case study/pair or small group discussion/hands-on problem-solving/other strategies) NOTE: All strategies not expected to be used.			
24. Students were engaged with learning tasks (participated in activities, appeared to be listening, used laptops/phones for in-class activities, etc.)			
25. Incorporated technology effectively to enhance student learning (e.g., PowerPoint slides, course			

websites, Prezi, online poll, online research, YouTube, blogs, videos, etc.			

STRENGTHS and OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT

Talking points for follow-up conversation and exchange of ideas

Source: This Peer Observation Form was adapted from materials supplied by the George Mason University Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning and is based on the Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing Peer Evaluation Scale (2003), found in Berk, R. A. (2006). *Thirteen strategies to measure college teaching*. Sterling, CA: Stylus Publishing.

Formative Evaluations – These are expected to be confidential and held between the parties involved.

Performance Evaluations – These are for the purposes of performance evaluation and will be shared with the area chair, dean's office, evaluation committees, and promotion and/or tenure committees.

Costello College of Business Adjunct Evaluation Process

College of Business Peer Materials Review Form for Face-to-Face or Hybrid Courses

Instructor: _____ Course Number & Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

The purpose of this form is to guide materials review for evaluation purposes, and to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement. Not all elements must be reviewed, but review of several is encouraged for a holistic review.

Circle the appropriate response and provide additional comments to guide discussion/review memo:

Course Syllabus and Schedule (Stearns Center guidance) Observed Not Observed

Does it have program objectives, course specific learning outcomes, other required elements, is it clear, if Mason Core or WAC, are the relevant elements present etc.?

Comments:

Course Materials: Books/Handouts Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Course Assignments/Exams Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Blackboard Support and Integration Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Examples of Student Work, Feedback, and Rubrics Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Content of Course (appropriate, rigorous) Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Innovations in Materials (if any) Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Overall Preparation and Organization of Course Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Overall Instructor Rating Satisfactory Needs Improvement

Comments:

Please comment on the following, ideally after discussing the items with the faculty member.

1. **Learning Objectives for the Course -Appropriate, Assessed in Assignments/Exams**
   Observed Not Observed

Comments:

2. **Student Workload for the Course:** Heavy Moderate Light

Comments:

3. **Expectations of the Course from Students:** High Low

Comments:

4. **Grading and Grade Distribution Philosophy** Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Reviewer Signature: _____ **Date Completed:** _____

Please feel free to attach extra pages with additional comments.

Costello College of Business Adjunct Evaluation Process

College of Business Peer Materials Review Form for Online Courses

Instructor: Course Number & Name:
Reviewer: _____ Course Format: Asynchronous Synchronous

The purpose of this form is to guide materials review for evaluation purposes, and to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement. Not all elements must be reviewed, but review of several is encouraged for a holistic review. For additional information on online course design and quality, please visit https://stearnscenter.gmu.edu/knowledge-center/online-teaching/.

Circle the appropriate response and provide additional comments to guide discussion/review memo:

Course Overview, Calendar, and Navigation Observed Not Observed
Includes clear instructions on how to get started and where to find various course components; has logical and consistent navigation, clear layout, consistent color scheme, and self-evident titles; includes course information, course calendar/schedule (including learning outcomes, assignments, readings, grading policy, other policies, due dates), and relevant elements if Mason Core or WAC

Comments: _____

Learner Support Observed Not Observed
Includes information list, links for online learner resources, support for online students (e.g., Library, Writing Center, Disability Services), technology requirements, IT support contacts, and academic integrity policy

Comments: _____

Accessibility Observed Not Observed
Employs accessible technologies or strategies (e.g., alt text, transcripts, close captioning, etc.).

Comments: _____

Course Materials: Books/Handouts Observed Not Observed
Are appropriate and relevant to learning outcomes; are appropriate level

Comments: _____

Course Materials: Videos, Interactive Materials Observed Not Observed
Are appropriate and relevant to learning outcomes; available in manageable segments

Comments: _____

Course Assignments/Exams Observed Not Observed

Allow students to demonstrate learning outcomes; provides opportunities for students to engage in active learning, higher-order thinking, critical reasoning, and/or critical thinking, aligning with learning outcomes; are appropriate in level, rigor, and quantity

Comments: _____

_____

Instructor Presence and Communication

Provides contact information; includes office hours and/or offers meetings; demonstrates instructor present in course through various means and interactions

Comments: _____

_____

Examples of Student Work, Feedback, and Rubrics Observed Not Observed

Explains grading criteria for assignments and/or provides rubrics; provides clear participation expectations, demonstrates timely grading and feedback

Comments: _____

_____

Innovations in Materials (if any) Observed Not Observed

Comments: _____

_____

Overall Preparation and Organization of Course Observed Not Observed

Comments: _____

_____

Overall Instructor Rating Satisfactory Needs Improvement

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

Please comment on the following, ideally after discussing the items with the faculty member.

Learning Outcomes for the Course

Provide program and course learning outcomes; are appropriate, clear, and measurable; are assessed in Assignments/Exam; provide explicit expectations for student learning

Comments: _____

_____

Student Workload for the Course: Heavy Moderate Light

Comments:

Expectations of the Course from Students: High Low

Comments:

Grading and Grade Distribution Philosophy Observed Not Observed

Comments:

Reviewer Signature: _____ **Date Completed:** _____

Please feel free to attach extra pages with additional comments.

APPENDIX B

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form

Name (Last, First):	**Date:**
Area:	**Courses Taught:**

1. Teaching Evaluation Memo should be attached.

2. SET Scores
   Please attach the student evaluation of teaching results from the last three years for all questions.

3. Overall summary of teaching performance (since last evaluation) utilizing 1 and 2. Please include other teaching activities such as course development, materials development, etc.

4. Brief description of teaching strengths and weaknesses:

5. Performance goals/plan, including training and professional development:

6. Performance Level
   _____ Exceeds expectations

   _____ Meets expectations

   _____ Does not meet expectation

Area Chair Signature _____ **Date (MM/DD/YYYY)** _____

Faculty Signature _____ **Date (MM/DD/YYYY)** _____

Please attach teaching evaluation memo and submit to Dean's Office.

Faculty Response (if any) should be signed, dated, and attached and included in submission to Dean's Office.