



THE CITADEL

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

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



Policy and Procedures for Face-to-Face Faculty Teaching Evaluation

All 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. A faculty member that teaches more than one semester receives one evaluation for the year. If the faculty member 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 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 faculty member.

All courses taught by faculty members will be assessed using the end-of-the-semester student evaluation form. This data subsequently will be shared with the 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 a faculty member will be recommended for a continued teaching assignment in the subsequent year/s.

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

Face-to-Face Faculty Teaching Evaluation Process

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

Step 1: Preparing for the visit

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

The 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 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 FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

Name of Faculty Member:
Class Reviewed:

Name of Evaluator:
Date:

This faculty evaluation process consists of a review of a lesson plan, the direct observation of the 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.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DELIVERY	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.			
7. Keeps an active gradebook in Canvas.			

II. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND ASSESSMENT	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.			

III. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	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:

Faculty Member Response:

Conference Date: _____

Evaluator's Signature: _____

Faculty Member's Signature: _____

A faculty member's signature does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that the complete report has been read and a copy received.

**FACE-TO-FACE 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