**Template for Departmental Annual Review of Adjuncts**

In this document we have outlined some ideas that departments might wish to consider as they develop their plans for the required annual evaluation of part-time faculty. The template has three parts:

* Suggestions for the types of evidence or criteria to consider from the adjunct
* Possible models of a grid to use to compile the results of review of the adjunct’s evidence
* Possible models of evaluation rubrics for the individual criteria or evidence provided by the adjunct

**I. Materials or Criteria for Review**

The adjunct instructor provides materials to assist the department in its evaluation of the adjunct’s teaching effectiveness. These materials or criteria for review may include some or all of the following:

 Course syllabi

 Descriptions of course assignments

Samples of exams, quizzes

 Samples of student work across a range of grades with instructor feedback

 SCEQ results

 Feedback from observation of teaching

 Examples of other service to the department or students (optional)

Departments also have the option of asking the adjunct to submit a concise teaching statement (1-2 pages) that describes: 1) the instructor’s goals for student learning and how the activities and assessments used relate to the goals, and 2) how the evidence provided documents these ideas.

**II. Sample Review Grids**

For each *individual* criterion above, faculty determine how well the work of the adjunct meets the department expectations based on a shared rubric (samples provided in section III). Faculty then enter each of these individual criterion ratings into a review grid that is used to calculate the *overall* rating of teaching effectiveness.

The department may rank each criterion equally in the overall review, or it may weight criteria differently depending on their relative importance to the department in the review process. Examples of overall review grids for each approach are shown below.

1) Below is an **example** of a simple review grid in which all evidence or criteria of teaching effectiveness are weighted equally. Faculty use a separate rubric to guide their rating for each criterion reviewed (samples provided in section III), and they enter the rating into the grid that best reflects their overall evaluation of each aspect of teaching effectiveness reviewed. They then calculate the overall rating by averaging the ratings over all criteria. Notable contributions or accomplishments may be described in the column provided as a record to use should the adjunct wish to be considered for promotion to Adjunct II at a future time.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Above expectations**  | **Meets expectations**  | **Below expectations**  | **Notable contributions** |
| Course materials (syllabi, assignments) | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| SCEQ results | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Teaching observation  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Service to dept. or students (optional) | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |

**Overall Average Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

2) Below is an **example** of a weighted review grid using a hypothetical **example case** when different criteria have different rankings based on importance. This difference is reflected in the weight given to that criterion in the average score:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Rating\*** | **Weighted rating** | **Notable contributions** |
| Course materials (syllabi, assignments) | 25% | 3 | 0.75 |  |
| SCEQ results | 45% | 2 | 0.9 |  |
| Teaching observation  | 30% | 3 | 0.9 |  |
| Service to dept. or students (optional) | Above percentages should be adjusted if this criterion is used. |  |  |  |
| **Overall Average Rating** |  |  | **2.55** |  |

\*Each criterion is rated using the following scale:

Above expectations 3

Meets expectations 2

Below expectations 1

The rating scale could be adjusted to that of 1-5 as the following example illustrates.

3) Below is an **example** grid based on a rating scale of 1-5 with all criteria weighted equally. The same descriptions of ratings could be used in a review grid that has weighted criteria as well.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceeds expectations in all respects** | **Meets expectations in all respects** | **Meets expectations in most respects** | **Meets expectations in some respects** | **Meets expectations in few or no respects** | **Notable contributions** |
| Course materials (syllabi, assignments) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| SCEQ results | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Teaching observation | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Service to department or students (optional) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |

**Overall Average Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**III. Sample Evaluation Rubrics**

The next four pages show example rubrics to use if the department decides that the evaluation should include observing a class, reviewing course materials, or reviewing student work. These rubrics may be adapted (with attribution to the original source) to align with department expectations and priorities.

Table 1

Class Observation Checklist

Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Circle your responses to each of the questions and then add comments below the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Exceeds expectations in all respects | Meets expectations in all respects | Meets expectations in most respects | Meets expectations in some respects | Meets expectations in few or no respects |
| 1. | Was well prepared for class | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Was knowledgeable about the subject matter | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | Was enthusiastic about the subject matter | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Spoke clearly, audibly, and confidently | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | Used a variety of relevant illustrations/examples | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. | Made effective use of the board and/or visual aids | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. | Asked stimulating and challenging questions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. | Effectively held class’s attention | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. | Achieved active student involvement | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. | Treated students with respect | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

What worked well in the class?

What could have been improved?

*Rebecca Brent and Richard Felder*

*Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition*

*Copyright ©2004, American Society for Engineering Education*

Table 2

Course Material Checklist

Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Circle your responses to each of the questions and then add comments below the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Exceeds expectations in all respects | Meets expectations in all respects | Meets expectations in most respects | Meets expectations in some respects | Meets expectations in few or no respects |
| 1. | Course content includes the appropriate topics | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Course content reflects the current state of the field | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | Lecture notes are well organized and clearly written | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. | Supplementary handouts and web pages are well organized and clearly written | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. | Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. | Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. | Tests are clearly written and reasonable in length | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. | Student products demonstrate satisfaction of learning objectives | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

What are the strengths of the course materials?

What could have been improved?

*Rebecca Brent and Richard Felder*

*Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition*

*Copyright ©2004, American Society for Engineering Education*

**Evaluation Rubric for Review of Teaching Materials**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Below Expectations | Meets Expectations | Comments |
| Overall course goals and learning outcomes are clearly stated in syllabi |  |  |  |
| Learning outcomes are consistent with the official course description and overall goals |  |  |  |
| Each class assignment has stated purpose and clear linkage to learning outcome(s) |  |  |  |
| Grading standard for each assignment is fully developed and is ready for students |  |  |  |
| Teaching materials, collectively, convey mastery of course contents and faculty’s purposeful/mindful planning |  |  |  |

Source: Columbia College Chicago

**Evaluation Rubric for Samples of Student Work**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Below Expectations | Meets Expectations | Comments |
| Purpose(s) of assignment and learning outcomes were clearly stated and communicated to students |  |  |  |
| Stated purpose and learning outcomes were (clearly) relevant to the overall goals of the course |  |  |  |
| Assignment's grading standards were fully developed and communicated to students |  |  |  |
| Evaluator could clearly differentiate ‘exceptional,’ ‘average,’ and ‘inadequate’ levels of student work  |  |  |  |

Source: Columbia College Chicago