

Costello College of Business Teaching Evaluation Criteria
January 1, 2023
Revised October 30, 2025. Effective as of January 1, 2026.

This document defines teaching standards in the Costello College of Business. The standards are split into six criteria, which are generally applicable to courses offered in different modalities, including face-to-face, hybrid, fully online, or field/clinical supervision. This document provides requirements central to each criteria and suggests possible evidence that a faculty might use to demonstrate their meeting each criteria.

Standards for High Competence (all faculty): Evidence of meeting criteria #1, #2, and #3

Standards for Genuine Excellence for Instructional Term Faculty: Evidence of meeting criteria #1, #2, #3 *and* at least one additional criteria (#4, #5, or #6)

Standards for Genuine Excellence for Instructional Tenured or Tenure-track Faculty: Evidence of meeting criteria #1, #2, #3, #6, *and* at least one additional criteria (#4 or #5)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FACULTY SEEKING PROMOTION

Faculty candidates seeking promotion will construct a **teaching portfolio**. The portfolio must include **recent and consistent evidence** for each of the relevant criteria (depending on the standard listed above). A candidate may choose to include any past material as evidentiary basis for meeting a criterion. Faculty candidates may choose which possible indicators of evidence to use (from the column on the right) to meet the requirements for each criteria (from the column on the left), and may present evidence not on the list. The breadth and depth of evidence is evaluated in a holistic way when assessing the criteria. The promotion committees will weigh the substance and impact of the evidence provided, not the quantity. As such, faculty candidates do not have to provide **every** indicator of possible evidence, nor does providing any indicator of possible evidence ensure the meeting of a criterion requirement.

Each teaching portfolio should include the following sections:

- 1) Teaching statement (up to 4 pages) that includes:
 - a. Cover letter that outlines one's teaching philosophy and a general description of one's recent teaching record (courses taught / mode of offering). The cover letter is also an opportunity for the candidate to explain any discrepancies, challenges, or obstacles that impeded the meeting of one or more criteria associated with high competence in teaching (1-2 pages).
 - b. Summary of the evidence presented for each relevant criteria (300-500 words for each criteria). This can be presented in bulleted form. *Note: the table below shows a **sampling** of possible evidence candidates may submit as evidence for each criteria.*
- 2) A spreadsheet (see template) with the following columns: Course name, course level, whether course was a new prep, course modality (online, hybrid, ftf), # of students, average GPA, course evaluation data, and course evaluation response rate.
- 3) One representative syllabus from each prepared course (e.g., one from ACCT 330; one from ACCT 331).
- 4) If *not* already present in the syllabi, representative assignments that best reflect the learning objectives from each course.
- 5) Selected screenshots from one representative, recent course website that reflect aspects of teaching and course design that are not reflected elsewhere (e.g., rubrics, weekly schedules, announcements, etc.).
- 6) At least one substantive peer evaluation of teaching by a faculty member outside one's supervisory chain (e.g., area chair; assistant area chair; dean's office).
- 7) Any additional evidence for the relevant criteria **not already captured** by the required documentation

(e.g., conference presentations; designed curricula; pedagogical publications, etc.)

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #1: Course Design and Teaching Materials	
• Course websites are accessible, complete, and organized. • Expectations (learning outcomes) for course are transparent to learners. Learning outcomes are clear and measurable. • Course is aligned with stated departmental, program, accreditor, and/or institutional goals (e.g., Writing Intensive, Research and Scholarship Intensive, Mason Core). • Assignments, exams, and other assessments are appropriate for the course, discipline, and course-level learning outcomes. • Activities and assignments are prepared with explicit instructions for how to participate, deadlines for student work, and how the activities are assessed. • Assignments promote critical thinking and problem solving relevant to the course and level. • Course design and teaching materials incorporate a broad spectrum of viewpoints and perspectives from the discipline.	<i>Syllabus</i> • Follows College of Business syllabus standards • Includes policy statements that are clear and comprehensive • Includes calendar or schedule of assignments with due dates and timeframes • Includes syllabus statements regarding AI policies. • Evidence of course frameworks and policies, which are consistent with CCB and University policies • Course design that makes expectations transparent and ensures that all resources and assignments are fully accessible <i>Course Website</i> • Screenshots of course website that demonstrate clear organization, ease of navigation, and thoroughness of materials/resources • Screenshots of course website that familiarizes students with the learning management system, course navigation & overview • Demonstrates quality indicators and standards for online teaching excellence, such as those developed by Online Learning Consortium (OLC), Quality Matters (QM) and other recognized online quality rubrics <i>Course Materials</i> • Examples of tutorials, materials or resources created and/or provided to support student learning • Evidence of universal design: online videos that are captioned, documents that are fully accessible, use of color that is ADA appropriate, other visual elements that meet ADA standards • Course content that includes examples, cases, or texts by a variety of experts <i>Learning Activities</i> • Grading rubrics or checklists that provide clear expectations • Evidence of an appropriate balance of formative (practice) and summative (evaluative) assignments • Peer review of course materials and/or peer evaluation of

	teaching • Evidence that student workload is appropriate for the level and topic, well-paced, and evenly distributed throughout the course • Descriptions or prompts that show how assignments are scaffolded to provide students with practice and feedback throughout the process • Examples that demonstrate a variety of methods to assess student learning and student mastery of content • Instructor-created videos, lecture outlines, resource guides, or informational handouts • Evidence of course content that is interactive, personalized or gamified • Evidence of course content, course assignments, and/or activities that challenge students and help them identify, wrestle with, and productively address controversial and/or significant issues in the field or subject matter • Evidence of course assignments or exams that invite differing viewpoints, perspectives, and/or opinions • Evidence of using the Transparency in Learning and Teaching Method <i>Student Course Evaluations</i> • Item 10: I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g., assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided. • Item 18: The course organization supported my learning. • Item 19: The instructor clearly communicated course requirements to students. • Item 20: The instructor clearly presented the course content.
--	--

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #2: Teaching Strategies that Support and Engage Students	
• Uses instructional strategies that are appropriate given current practice in the discipline, the course level, and the course goals. • Gives appropriate emphasis to student learning and engagement. • Provides regular and effective feedback and assessment. • Is accessible and available to students for questions or assistance; there is good instructor presence. • Demonstrates concern for all student learners by fostering a classroom climate that is welcoming and actively promotes respectful discourse.	<i>Student Management, Support, and Engagement</i> • Evidence of active-learning practices / flipped classroom / discussion-based learning • Evidence of effective practices for teaching in Active Learning Classrooms (ALCs) • Evidence of frequent and regular instructor communication, presence, and engagement • Evidence of tool use within course website to facilitate the learning experience in an effective manner • Examples of resources or activities intended to build a sense of community (e.g., Icebreaker, Introductions) • Unsolicited student and alumni feedback • Peer evaluation of teaching • Evidence of effective communication using welcome message, announcements, and timely feedback • Evidence of guest speakers recruited and their contributions to the class • Course activities that invite contributions from students with differing backgrounds, viewpoints, perspectives, and opinions. <i>Other Indicators of Effectiveness</i> • Nominated for or winning of faculty teaching awards • Awards won by students directly related to faculty member's instruction • Acknowledgements by students under the Stearns Center "Thank-a-Teacher" program • Assurance of learning data <i>Student Course Evaluations</i> • Item 9: I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course. • Item 11: I found the instructor's feedback helpful for learning. • Item 12: I learned due to the instructor's teaching methods / style • Item 13: The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content. • Item 16: The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours. • Item 17: The instructor used technologies and/or resources / tools that increased my engagement with course content.

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #3: Faculty Growth, Continuous Course Improvement, and Reflective Teaching Practice	
- Engages in regular, significant, and effective course revisions in response to demonstrated student or LAU needs. - Demonstrates continuous learning and development of teaching skills. - Is flexible and responsive to feedback on teaching.	<i>Growth Activities</i> - Documented improvement in pedagogy resulting from participation in <i>Innovations in Teaching and Learning (ITL)</i> Conference or other similar conferences - Documented improvement in pedagogy resulting from participation in formal professional and/or curricular development efforts (e.g., within LAU, at Mason, nationally) - Certificates of completion for professional development (e.g., Online Course Development, Course ReDesign Academy) <i>Faculty Improvement</i> - Evidence of improvement based on peer evaluation of teaching - Demonstration of deliberate self-improvement around curriculum, teaching approaches, and/or course materials (e.g., goal setting, steps taken, results) - Evidence of reflective practice: self-study, annotated syllabus, teaching journals - Explores new, creative, and innovative strategies, tools, and technologies, guided by learning outcomes <i>Student Course Evaluations</i> - Item 15: The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #4: Working with Students Beyond the Classroom	
- Engages with students beyond the classroom environment in mentoring, advising, or other capacity. - Provides opportunities for students to connect with the real world.	<i>Mentoring</i> - Evidence of extensive and impactful student mentoring beyond the classroom (e.g., OSCAR mentorships; supervising students in field-based learning activities; supervising independent studies) - Evidence of advising student organizations and/or clubs, organizing student seminars and events - Examples of extensive impact on student careers and/or degree advising (e.g., unsolicited student letters, alumni letters, nominations for or winning Career Connection Faculty award) - Student career and degree advising activities beyond one's assigned tasks - Nominated for or winning of faculty student mentoring awards <i>Extending the Classroom</i> - Examples of assignments / learning activities that reach beyond the classroom - Examples of community-engaged course syllabi or assignments, and/or documentation of relationship-building with organizations to support students - Examples of transformative experiences created via study abroad - Examples of student work submitted that shows impact beyond the classroom - Clinical and/or field supervision of students beyond one's expected teaching assignment - Designing opportunities for civic engagement, including service-learning

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #5: Pedagogical and Curricular Leadership	
• Leadership over curricular design and other pedagogical innovations. • Extensive sharing of knowledge of teaching practices.	<i>Curricular Design</i> • Evidence of extensive curriculum design work directly related to one's one teaching and/or research expertise • Successful development and growth of new programs, concentrations, minors, and/or certificates as evidenced by relevant metrics (e.g., approval, enrollment, retention, graduation rate, net revenue, etc.) • Successful development of executive education programs as evidenced by relevant metrics (e.g., sales, enrollment, net revenue, etc.) • Evidence of securing grants to engage in curriculum design work directly related to one's teaching and/or research expertise (e.g., External grants, Mason Impact, Scholarship Development Grants, SCHEV, ADVANCE) <i>Knowledge Sharing</i> • Evidence of significant participation in <i>Innovations in Teaching and Learning (ITL)</i> and/or similar teaching-focused conferences • Evidence of leading university or LAU faculty development efforts to improve teaching (e.g., workshops, website guides, orientations) • Appointment as Distinguished Mentoring Fellow at the university • Evidence of extensive peer mentoring related to teaching (e.g., conducting peer observations, workshops for peers, etc.) • Evidence of connecting one's teaching success and pedagogical expertise to those at the regional, state, national, or international level

Requirements	Possible Evidence
Criteria #6: Pedagogical Scholarship	
• Being a demonstrated international thought leader that has significant impact on pedagogy and/or curriculum development. • Having a significant external presence beyond Mason that connects to teaching and learning success.	<i>Thought Leadership</i> • Extensive publication history that has broad impact on pedagogy as evidenced by key metrics (e.g., units sold, downloads, citations, citation index, etc.): ○ Business textbooks ○ Business-oriented journal articles (e.g., <i>Harvard Business Review</i>) ○ Business case studies ○ Business-oriented books ○ Academic articles on pedagogy in highly ranked pedagogical journals • Acquisition of significant grants related to research on pedagogy • Creating significant impact on pedagogy through work as an editor of a highly ranked pedagogical journal <i>External Presence</i> • Podcast or creation of other media that furthers one's reputation as demonstrated thought leader in business (provide data on downloads) • Extensive refereed and/or invited conference presentations, workshops, performances, and/or exhibitions related to pedagogy