



THE CITADEL

CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE AND  
INNOVATION IN TEACHING,  
LEARNING, AND DISTANCE  
EDUCATION

# Evaluation Guide for Face-to-Face Adjunct Teaching at The Citadel



## **Policy and Procedures for Face-to-Face Adjunct Faculty Teaching Evaluation**

All adjunct faculty members will be observed once an academic year and will receive a written evaluation from the School Dean, the Department Chair, or the Program Director to which they are assigned. An adjunct faculty member that teaches more than one semester receives one evaluation for the year. If an adjunct is new to The Citadel, he or she will be observed during the first semester of teaching. The School Dean, Department Chair, or Program Director will provide the adjunct faculty member with a written copy of the evaluation during a post-observation conference. The original copy of the completed and signed form will be sent to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs.

School Deans, Department Chairs, or Program Directors will review individual course syllabi to ensure that the course focus is consistent with the course and program objectives. When areas of concern are identified, the School Dean, Department Chair, or Program Director will offer recommendations for change to the adjunct faculty member.

All courses taught by adjunct faculty will be assessed using the end-of-the-semester student evaluation form. This data subsequently will be shared with the adjunct faculty member and also reviewed by the School Dean, Department Chair, or Program Director. When student opinion questionnaires indicate areas of concern, a School Dean, Department Chair, and/or Program Director will conference with the adjunct faculty member.

The information received from the teaching observation, student course evaluations, and syllabi review will complement other assessment data and will be used to make a determination as to whether an adjunct faculty member will be recommended for a continued teaching assignment in the subsequent year/s.

If there are serious concerns about the adjunct faculty's teaching, the adjunct faculty member will not be rehired.

### **Face-to-Face Adjunct Faculty Teaching Evaluation Process**

This face-to-face adjunct faculty evaluation process consists of preparing for the visit, the direct observation of the adjunct faculty member's instruction, and a post-conference.

#### **Step 1: Preparing for the visit**

The evaluator and adjunct faculty member will agree on dates and times to conduct the observation.

The adjunct faculty member will submit to the evaluator a current course syllabus/overview for the class to be observed and a lesson plan. The course syllabus/overview will contain the focus of the course's instructional objectives and expected outcomes.

#### **Step 2: Instructional observation**

For a face-to-face class, the evaluator may ask to talk with the students about their experiences in the class.

#### **Step 3: Post-conference**

The evaluator will hold a post-conference with the adjunct faculty member. For this conference, the evaluator will discuss areas of strength and provide suggestions for improvement. Once the forms are discussed, reviewed, and signed, the evaluator will provide the adjunct faculty member with a copy. The originals will be sent to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs for record keeping.

## FACE-TO-FACE ADJUNCT FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

**Name of Adjunct Faculty Member:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Name of Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Class Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

This adjunct faculty evaluation process consists of a review of a lesson plan, the direct observation of the adjunct faculty member's instruction, and a post-conference. Teaching observation items may vary depending upon the type of teaching setting (face-to-face, clinical, laboratory, or studio). You may wish to use the observation form located in the appendix to provide detailed evidence for each rating.

<b>I. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DELIVERY</b>	Needs Improvement	Met	N/A
1. Lesson is aligned to learning outcomes.			
2. Lesson is coherent and sequenced.			
3. States the objective of the lesson and expectations for learning.			
4. Promotes active learning and student engagement through various instructional strategies.			
5. Instructional activities maximize instructional time.			
6. Uses real world or relatable examples to facilitate student connections to learning.			

<b>II. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND ASSESSMENT</b>	Needs Improvement	Met	N/A
1. Encourages student questions and discussion.			
2. Monitors and addresses student behavior.			
3. Promotes a positive classroom climate.			
4. Adjusts lesson as needed to promote student learning.			
5. Checks for understanding and probes for higher levels of thinking.			
6. Uses formative (i.e., in-class discussion, homework assignments, clicker questions, exit tickets) and/or summative (i.e., major tests, projects, papers) assessments to monitor student learning.			
7. Keeps an active gradebook in Canvas.			

<b>III. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b>	Needs Improvement	Met	N/A
1. Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.			
2. Demonstrates mastery of the content and communicates its importance to students.			

## EVALUATION SUMMARY

Summary of Strengths:

Recommendations:

Adjunct Response:

Conference Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Adjunct Faculty Member's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX**

**FACE-TO-FACE ADJUNCT FACULTY OBSERVATION NOTES  
(OPTIONAL)**

**I. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DELIVERY**

- A. What are the learning outcomes?
  
- B. In what ways did the students demonstrate that they understood what the instructor expected them to learn?
  
- C. How did the instructor help the students connect to the learning?
  
- D. What instructional strategies did the instructor use during the lesson (i.e., direct instruction, group work, active learning, think-pair-share)?
  
- E. In what ways did the instructor maximize—or *fail* to maximize— instructional time?

**II. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND ASSESSMENT**

- A. What was the physical environment of the classroom like? (Ex. students in rows, tables, single desks, etc.)
  
- B. In what ways—and *how effectively*—did the instructor monitor and adjust the lesson to promote student learning?
  
- C. What type of learning climate did the instructor establish for the students?
  
- D. What are the instructor's expectations for student behavior?

### III. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

- A. What evidence suggests that the instructor did—or did *not*—have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the content?
  
- B. How did the instructor explain and/or demonstrate the content to the students?
  
- C. How effective were the content explanations/ demonstrations?

### QUESTIONS FOR THE INSTRUCTOR

*Please list any clarifying questions for the instructor*