

## **Faculty Evaluation at Mason Korea Contract and Promotion Guidelines**



## Table of Contents

1. Purpose .....	1
2. Evaluation of Teaching .....	1
3. Contract Lengths and Review – Full-time Faculty .....	1
4. Contract Lengths and Review – Part-time Faculty .....	3
5. One-Semester Appointments .....	3
6. Appendices .....	3
7. Appendix I: Evaluation of Teaching .....	4
8. Appendix II: Criteria for Evaluating Portfolio Materials .....	5
9. Appendix III: Classroom Observation .....	6
10. Appendix IV: Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty, Rating and Contract Renewal .....	10

# **Term Faculty Evaluation at Mason Korea**

## **Contract and Promotion Guidelines**

### **December 23, 2020**

#### **Purpose**

Mason Korea is committed to supporting faculty excellence in the classroom and providing faculty with a path toward long-term contracts and merit-based promotion. With these development goals in mind, this document describes the process for contract renewal and performance evaluation at Mason Korea.

#### **Evaluation of Teaching**

Performance evaluation is multi-dimensional. It considers the appropriateness and craft of course design and curricular materials, the learning outcomes, assignments, and assessments designed to promote student learning; the students' work and faculty member's feedback on assignments and assessments; peer teaching evaluations, student evaluations of their learning experiences; and the faculty member's participation in pedagogical development activities. It never relies on student evaluations alone.

Faculty performance in yearly evaluations will be judged either Outstanding, Excellent, Good or Unsatisfactory. Faculty evaluated as unsatisfactory will develop a performance improvement plan and will not be eligible for annual raises.

#### **Contract Lengths and Review – Full-time Faculty**

Contracts will be renewed based on teaching performance, curricular need and enrollment demand. Though research and service can bear weight in promotion decisions (see below), for the purposes of contract renewal no amount of strong research or service can substitute for the failure to achieve at least satisfactory teaching ("Good" or above). Faculty members who fail to meet the standard of satisfactory in any annual review should be prepared to create a plan to improve their teaching to the satisfactory level.

Contracts for Mason Korea faculty will be provided according to the following schedule: two 1-year renewable contracts, followed by 3-year renewable contracts. Full term professors are eligible for 5-year contracts.

Mason Korea's approach to teaching evaluation is developmental. If a faculty member has one unsatisfactory review, he or she will be renewed, unless the teaching record fails to demonstrate basic learning, responsibility, ethics, or safety in the classroom. The faculty member will be provided with information and support to improve the areas of concern in the teaching.

If a faculty member has a second unsatisfactory review following the first, he or she will not be renewed. Faculty on one-year contracts who have three unsatisfactory reviews out of five in a five-year period will not be renewed, even if those unsatisfactory reviews are not consecutive.

A 3-year contract will be issued after the faculty member has had at least two consecutive satisfactory annual contract evaluations in a 3-year period. A faculty member who does not have two satisfactory yearly contract reviews will receive 1-year contracts and again become eligible for a 3-year contract after two consecutive satisfactory yearly contract reviews. A set of tables may be of help with regard to

this requirement.

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Satisfactory or above	
2	Satisfactory or above	3-year contract

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Unsatisfactory	
2	Unsatisfactory	Not renewed

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Unsatisfactory	
2	Satisfactory or above	
3	Satisfactory or above	3-year contract

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Satisfactory or above	
2	Unsatisfactory	
3	Satisfactory or above	
4	Satisfactory or above	3-year contract

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Unsatisfactory	
2	Satisfactory or above	
3	Unsatisfactory	
4	Satisfactory or above	
5	Satisfactory or above	3-year contract

Year	Evaluation	Result
1	Unsatisfactory	
2	Satisfactory or above	
3	Unsatisfactory	
4	Satisfactory or above	
5	Unsatisfactory	Not renewed

A faculty member on a 3-year or 5-year contract whose teaching is unsatisfactory three or more times during the length of the contract will not be renewed. Following the first unsatisfactory review, the faculty member will be provided with information and support to improve the areas of concern in the teaching. Two unsatisfactory review during the length of 3-year or 5-year contracts will result in the faculty member being put on a 1-year contract at the time of renewal. Faculty will be returned to their longer contracts (either 3 or 5-year, depending on the contract the faculty member was previously on) according the requirements for new faculty on 1-year contracts, above.

Note that while these schedules are meant to provide probationary or developmental periods for faculty members, George Mason never has the obligation to renew a contract, if the teaching record fails to demonstrate basic learning, responsible or ethical behavior or safety in the classroom. In addition, even where teaching meets the standard of satisfactory or above teaching, a contract may

not be renewed if enrollment demand and curricular needs do not warrant the renewal.

Tenured and tenure-track members of the George Mason University faculty are evaluated by their home departments. Faculty on terminal one-semester appointments may opt out of this scheme but will not be renewed without evaluation of teaching as described above.

### **Contract Lengths and Review – Part-time Faculty**

Contracts will be renewed based on teaching performance, curricular need and enrollment demand.

Adjunct faculty who teach a single semester for Mason Korea may opt out of evaluation, but will not be renewed for future semesters without a teaching evaluation.

Part-time faculty who teach or will teach for Mason Korea for more than one semester must be evaluated on an annual basis. Though such review does not imply the awarding of any full-time or multiyear contracts, this review will be structured in the same manner as for full-time faculty with respect to both renewal and the schedule for peer class evaluation. Thus, for example, a part-time faculty member whose teaching is found unsatisfactory for two consecutive years will not be renewed. However, a part-time faculty member who was evaluated as satisfactory or above for two or more years would not be eligible for a three or five-year contract.

### **One-Semester Appointments**

As noted above, faculty on terminal one-semester appointments may opt out of evaluation but will not be renewed without evaluation of teaching as described above. Though not required, Mason Korea recommends that such faculty do participate in the evaluation process, both for the inherent value in the process and also so that there will be an evaluation available in case there were interest in teaching past one semester.

## **Appendices**

1. See Appendix I for a description of the Teaching Evaluation Portfolio.
2. See Appendix II for a description of the criteria used to evaluate the portfolio.
3. See Appendix III for a description of the process for classroom observation.
4. See Appendix IV for procedures for evaluation and rating of faculty

## Appendix I: Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty on 4-4 teaching loads will be evaluated primarily on their teaching; evidence of professional development activities related to teaching may also be submitted for consideration. For these faculty, the evaluation will be weighted at 80% teaching and 20% service. Faculty who receive release time for research or extra service will be evaluated as well on those activities, according to percentages established in advance (e.g., 60% teaching, 20% research, 20% service) with the associate dean for academic affairs. Faculty who do not receive release time for teaching or service may also establish alternative percentages, agreed upon in advance, with the associate dean for academic affairs. These percentages may vary from the 80%/20% split, but should nonetheless reflect the significant amount of the faculty member's effort assigned to instruction.

The remainder of this document focuses on the evaluation of teaching and service. Faculty who will also be evaluated on research and/or extra service should consult with the associate dean for academic affairs to discuss the materials to be provided for that part of the evaluation.

Portfolios for evaluation are due on July 15 of each calendar year, or the Monday after the 15<sup>th</sup> if the 15<sup>th</sup> falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

The teaching evaluation takes into consideration the quality of the faculty member's classroom teaching and the quality and appropriateness of related classroom materials.

The faculty member's teaching evaluation portfolio should include the following documents:

- A. Framing letter (list of courses taught, and any key teaching achievements, new pedagogical initiatives, or unusual circumstances you would like to point out).
- B. A current c.v.
- C. Complete sets of student evaluations from the previous semester or the previous year's classes (i.e., all available student evaluations that were not used in an earlier evaluation cycle). Qualitative comments can be included as well, but if any comments from a class are included, the whole set of comments from that class must also be included.
- D. Include one syllabus for each different course you teach (if you are teaching two sections of the same class, only one syllabus is needed—unless the two sections differ substantially from each other).
- E. Samples of assignments and exercises from your current semester's classes. You may wish to include *brief* (two or three sentence) notes about why you included these particular items; however this is not a requirement.
- F. Scanned or electronically graded copies of graded student work. Please include at least two or three examples selected to show how you respond to the work, and briefly explain your reasons for the selection.
- G. Class visit reports, if applicable.

## **Appendix II: Criteria for Evaluating Portfolio Materials**

1. Do syllabi for students clearly describe the course requirements, procedures, course grading policies and university policies (required: statement on disabilities; see others recommended at <https://stearnscenter.gmu.edu/knowledge-center/designing-your-syllabus/>)?
2. Do the portfolio materials demonstrate that courses taught are clearly organized and incorporate appropriate approaches to student learning?
3. Do assignment prompts clearly explain the parameters, goals, and evaluation criteria for the assignment?
4. Are assignments appropriate to the course level, course content, and course goals?
5. Do responses to student work address issues of substance in the work, rather than only technical points or mechanics?
6. Does the portfolio offer evidence that the faculty member is engaged in ongoing pedagogical self-development, e.g. by developing new kinds of assignments, trying out new approaches to teaching a subject, or participating in professional development related to his or her teaching? The portfolio can offer evidence for this self-development through the teaching statement and/or through inclusion of relevant materials with some description of how they are new and what they tried to achieve.
7. What levels of student satisfaction are indicated by recent evaluation forms?
8. Have all required materials been updated and included in the portfolio?

## Appendix III: Classroom Observation

Classroom observations may be conducted by the program coordinator a designee for the coordinator approved by coordinator and the associate dean for academic affairs, or a member of the Fairfax faculty approved by the associate dean and the program coordinator. For review of faculty in disciplines without a program coordinator, a designee will be determined by the associate dean for academic affairs in consultation with main campus counterparts. The class observer submits a written report. There is an example rubric below that we think will help evaluators with their report. The rubric, however, is not required, and can be modified or not used, as the evaluator finds appropriate. Once the faculty receives the class observation report (which should be within two weeks of the observation), the faculty member is free to respond to the report in an addendum letter. The report (along with any response) will become part of the material for evaluation, as discussed above.

Wherever possible, classroom observations will be conducted face-to-face but may be conducted remotely in the absence of a suitable local option. Faculty teaching Distance Education (DE) classes should provide the faculty observer with administrator access to the course website and arrange to discuss the course with the faculty observer.

### ***Class evaluation schedule***

- A. Class visits according the following schedule:

1 visit	First semester of teaching
1 visit	Second semester of teaching
1 visit	Second year of teaching
1 visit	Every three years starting year three

Mason Korea reserves the right to conduct additional classroom observations if the need arises.

### ***Procedures for Observing Teaching***

1. The observer will get in touch with the person to be observed and work out a mutually agreeable time to for the class visit. The faculty member should give the observer a copy of the course syllabus and copies of any handouts relevant to the day's activities. The observer and the faculty member should briefly discuss (whether in person or over email) the faculty member's plans and objectives for that day before the observer attends the class.
2. After the class visit, the observer and faculty member briefly discuss their reactions to the class: what were the perceptions of each about how the class went? This is also an opportunity for the observer to ask any questions about class activities.
3. The observer then writes a report on the class. A copy of the report should be sent to the faculty member and the original submitted to the associate dean for academic affairs to be placed in the faculty member's file.

4. The faculty member has the opportunity to write a response letter, also to be included in the file, if he or she disagrees with the letter or thinks that additional information is needed.

### Sample Classroom Observation Rubric

This is a sample rubric that class observers may use. Rubrics may vary depending upon prevailing standards in main campus academic units.

#### Classroom Observation

Evaluator:

Instructor:

Date of Evaluation:

Course # and Name:

Total Length of Your  
Observation: \_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

How many students were present  
when class started? \_\_\_\_\_

How many students arrived  
late? \_\_\_\_\_

Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Unsatisfactory

<b>Lesson Plan:</b> began class on time and in a way that drew student's attention; expressed the purpose or objectives of the lesson; the lesson plan was sensitive to student needs; used effective organization (efficient, clear transitions and a conclusion that summarized the lesson and looked forward to future learning); overall, used time wisely.				
<b>Teaching Strategies:</b> used classroom space and technology effectively; used an appropriate range of teaching activities (for example, lecture, student writing, collaborative groups); used materials appropriate for the situation and writing task; enhanced instruction with examples, practice,				

and feedback; when appropriate, revised the lesson to reinforce learning.				
<b>Content Knowledge:</b> demonstrated command of the lesson's content by citing authorities, materials, disciplinary knowledge or experience to support the instruction.				
<b>Effective Communication:</b> used voice and body language effectively (e.g., eye contact) and explained concepts clearly; gave clear and timely instructions for student tasks.				
<b>Discussion:</b> asked engaging questions and waited for answers; listened to student comments and responded effectively with follow-up questions, clarifications, or encouragement; managed dissent effectively; responded to nonverbal cues such as confusion, boredom, or curiosity.				
<b>Relationship with Students:</b> overall, maintained a professional but approachable tone. Used humor or goodwill to strengthen interest; expressed concern for student learning and well-being.				
<b>Student Engagement:</b> Most students participated in class or group discussions by asking questions and making comments.				
<b>English Language:</b> the class was conducted in English.				
<b>Assessment:</b> routinely checked the students' learning by asking questions, assigning reflective writing, or inviting groups to report on their learning; circulated among groups; demonstrated understanding of student concerns and progress.				

What I Observed

What I Thought You Did Well	What I Think You Could Do to Improve

## **Appendix IV: Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty, Rating and Contract Renewal**

1. The faculty member will ensure that all required materials are present and updated in their file by the specified deadline.
2. The faculty evaluation committee, the associate dean for academic affairs, and a representative from the faculty member's relevant department at Mason Fairfax will review and discuss these materials.
3. Drawing from this discussion, the program coordinator will draft a letter that includes the following:
  - a. A paragraph evaluating the contents of the portfolio and noting its strengths and challenges,
  - b. A paragraph summarizing the class observation report (if included), including strengths and challenges, judged according to the criteria established by the committee.
  - c. A recommended rating of the faculty member's performance.
  - d. A recommendation on contract renewal, if applicable.
4. The faculty evaluation committee, associate dean for academic affairs, and the Mason Fairfax representative will approve the final version of the letter. However, all evaluations and decisions on contracts are advisory to the campus dean. In the matter of contract renewals, the campus dean must consult with the home department if he or she reaches a decision different from that of the home department.
5. One approved by the campus dean, a copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member and another will be placed in their file.
6. Members of the faculty review committee also review one another's teaching portfolios with the same process, with the committee member under review excluded from all deliberations of the remainder of the committee.

Date of Last Revision: 9-04-2020