



The American University of Kurdistan Faculty Evaluation Procedures Policy

Policy Number: HR002
Effective Date: June 15, 2021

I. INTRODUCTION

- a. **Authority:** The Board of Trustees (herein referred to as "Board") at The American University of Kurdistan (herein referred to as "AUK" or "University") is authorized to establish rules and regulations to govern and operate the University and its programs.
- b. **Purpose:** This policy defines criteria and procedures for annual faculty evaluations, aiming to promote excellence in teaching, research, and service, address concerns with professional development plans, and provide data for merit increases and promotions.
- c. **Scope:** This policy applies to all faculty, including full-time and adjunct members.

II. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. **Responsible Executive:** Provost
- b. **Responsible Administrator:** Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs
- c. **Responsible Office:** Office of Provost
- d. **Policy Contact:** Office of Provost

III. FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY STATEMENT

Faculty evaluations at AUK shall adhere to all applicable laws, rules, and regulations governing the duties and responsibilities of all faculty members. These evaluations will be conducted objectively and constructively, aiming to enhance the quality of instruction and support services in alignment with the university's core mission. The primary objective of faculty evaluations is to promote and acknowledge excellence in faculty performance while facilitating regular and consistent performance discussions between faculty members and their supervisors across the institution.

IV. FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA

The faculty evaluation criteria serve as the cornerstone for assessing the performance and contributions of the faculty members. These criteria are designed to provide a comprehensive framework for evaluating faculty across key domains that reflect their multifaceted roles within the academic community. The evaluation process considers the following essential criteria, each with its own weight range in determining a faculty member's overall performance. Weights are to be negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Chair (Dean when there is no Department Chair, and Dean when the faculty member is a Department Chair). See Appendix D.

1. **Teaching Effectiveness (50-80%):** Teaching effectiveness is a foundational aspect in faculty evaluation, underscoring the pivotal role faculty members play in delivering high-quality education to students. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in pedagogy, creating an engaging and inclusive learning environment. Evaluation in this category considers teaching methods, course design, student engagement and interaction, and the continual pursuit

of innovative and effective teaching practices. Also included is instructional development, the continuous growth and enhancement of knowledge, skills, and expertise in pedagogy. It ensures that faculty members remain current in their fields and continually update their curricula and teaching methodologies appropriately.

2. **Research and Scholarship (10-30%):** Scholarly activities and intellectual contributions are integral to faculty evaluation. This criterion emphasizes faculty members' engagement in research, scholarship, and creative endeavors. Evaluation examines research productivity, publications, grants, conference presentations, and contributions to the academic community, all within the context of the faculty member's discipline.
3. **Service and Engagement (5-25%).** This category recognizes the importance of faculty member's contributions to the university's broader community and society. It assesses involvement in committees, leadership roles, outreach initiatives, and collaborations that demonstrate a commitment to service and the university's mission.

V. FACULTY EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

The following general evaluation principles have been established to guide and standardize the faculty evaluation process within the university. These principles are rooted in the commitment to promote professional growth, transparency, and accountability, ensuring that evaluations are conducted with fairness, openness, and a focus on continuous improvement.

1. **Objective of Evaluation:** The primary aim of faculty evaluation is to enhance professional effectiveness. Therefore, evaluations will be conducted openly and candidly, focusing on identifying both strengths and areas for improvement in the faculty member's performance. Scores attained through this process will be used by the University in the distribution of merit pay when such funds are available.
2. **Setting Weights:** Faculty are able to set their annual weights for the categories of evaluation as per teaching load, reassigned time, and research duties. As the AUK is currently a teaching institution, more weight is placed in the category of teaching. (Appendix D)
3. **Rubrics for Evaluation Customized by Discipline/Department/College**
Departments/Colleges will submit their own customized rubrics for evaluation in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service that reflect their disciplinary and/or accreditation standards. These will be reviewed by the Deans and Provost to ensure consistency across the Colleges and that these rubrics fully support the University's faculty role model and are aligned with the Mission of the University. (Appendix C)
4. **Data Accessibility:** All data supporting the completed evaluation document shall be easily accessible to relevant stakeholders, promoting transparency and accountability in the evaluation process.
5. **Timely and Constructive Feedback:** Observations of faculty members' educational activities will be followed promptly by consultation or written communication. Constructive criticisms and suggestions for improvement will be specific and actionable. In cases of significant inadequacies, additional supportive assistance will be provided promptly.
6. **Peer Classroom Visits:** To ensure fair and accurate evaluations, all evaluators shall have the opportunity to visit classrooms or other relevant settings to directly observe faculty members in action.
7. **Student Learning Outcomes:** Faculty evaluation shall include evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes for both individual courses and overall programs. Teaching effectiveness and student success are central evaluation criteria.

8. **Student Course Evaluations:** Student course evaluations will be conducted comprehensively, attempting to survey the entire classroom population. The university will facilitate online surveys, with the option for in-class surveys upon request by the instructor.
9. **Explanatory Remarks for Low Ratings:** Any rating below "Meet Expectations (3)" on any evaluation category shall be accompanied by an explanatory remark by the Committee, providing clear justification for the assessment.

VI. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The faculty evaluation procedure is designed to encourage self-assessment, professional development, and collaborative improvement among faculty members. It consists of several key components, including Faculty Self-Evaluation, Peer Evaluation, Student Evaluations, and Committee Evaluation, each contributing to a comprehensive assessment of faculty performance.

1. Faculty Evaluation Form

Faculty members are required to maintain thorough records of their professional activities, encompassing teaching, professional development, research/scholarship, institutional contributions, community involvement, which will collectively identify strengths and areas for improvement. The faculty member completes the first part and submits it along with all supporting documentation to their Department Chair (if applicable) or the Dean by the date cited in the timeline. (Appendix A)

2. Peer Classroom Evaluations

Peer Evaluation supports a collaborative assessment of pedagogy across departments and colleges. The process employs a rubric that ensures fairness and transparency. The rubric is presented in Appendix B. The peer evaluation procedure shall be executed in the following manner:

- a. At the outset of the fall semester, College Deans shall distribute rosters to Department Chairs (as applicable) listing the full-time and adjunct faculty members designated for evaluation. Faculty with AUK teaching service of less than 2 years shall be evaluated each semester; faculty with AUK teaching service of more than 2 years shall be evaluated once per academic year.
- b. The Department Chairs (Deans when there is no Department Chair) shall identify faculty members to serve as peer reviewers and match reviewers to faculty members. In the spirit of collegiality, peer reviewers and faculty members should mutually decide on the dates for observations in order to avoid class sessions with exams or other activities that would limit the reviewer's ability to observe the faculty member's teaching methodology. In rare cases, it may be necessary to identify a peer reviewer from outside of the College due to a limited pool of experienced reviewers within that faculty member's Department/College.

3. Student Evaluations

The faculty evaluation process includes the results of the Student Course Evaluations, a valuable tool for faculty members to assess their teaching effectiveness and methods. Student Course Evaluations shall be executed in the following manner:

- a. The Provost's Office Manager will forward the online student evaluation forms to the College Manager/Admin Assistant, who will be responsible for administering the evaluations to faculty members undergoing evaluation.
- b. Faculty members have the autonomy to select the class session during which student evaluations will be conducted by the College Manager/Admin Assistant.
- c. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (OIEP) will compile and provide summary and statistical findings of the Student Evaluation results. Post-semester, following grade submission, faculty members will have access to the results of evaluation.

- d. The Committee will review the scores and free responses along with the faculty's self-statement and supporting documentation in the assignment of a score for the Teaching Category.

4. College Evaluation Committee Evaluation

The faculty evaluation process encompasses the review of the Peer Classroom Evaluation, Faculty Self-Statement and supporting documents, and the Student Course Evaluation. This is reviewed and evaluated by the College Evaluation Committee.

- a. A College Evaluation Committee is formed within each College and consists of three faculty members, generally composed of a member of each of the College's departments to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines represented within that College. Deans are not eligible to be a member of a College Evaluation Committee. Members will be proposed by the Dean and approved by the Provost. In the case of a College without three departments, the Dean, in consultation with the Provost, shall identify the members of the Committee.
- b. The College Evaluation Committee shall review the Faculty Self-Statement, submitted documents, Peer Classroom Evaluation(s), and Student Course Evaluations. Using the disciplinary guidelines approved by the Provost, the Committee will assign scores to the categories based on the faculty member's performance for the year under review. As outlined, performance will be rated as Meets Expectations, Above Expectations, Outstanding, Below Expectations, or Unsatisfactory. The scores and comments will be recorded on the Faculty Evaluation Form. (Appendix A)

5. Dean Review

After the completion of the Faculty Evaluation Form by the College Evaluation Committee, the form along with all supporting documents is handed to the respective College Dean. The role of the Dean is to ensure fairness and equity in the application of the assessment guidelines. If the Dean has a question as to the scoring by the Committee, s/he arranges a meeting with the Committee to discuss the application of the guidelines and scoring. While the Dean cannot overrule the score of the Committee, s/he can add his/her comments on the scoring to the Faculty Evaluation Form.

6. Provost Review

The Dean shall forward all documentation of the Faculty Evaluations to the Provost. The Provost ensures fairness, transparency and completeness in the application of the procedures. In cases where there is a discrepancy in scoring between the Committee and Dean, the Provost shall review these cases and make a final determination as to the faculty member's score.

7. Conclusion of Faculty Evaluation and Development Process

In alignment with AUK's commitment to faculty growth and excellence, the University places significant emphasis on the culmination of the faculty evaluation process through the following guidelines:

- a. The Department Chair (and in the absence of one, the College Dean) will schedule a meeting with each faculty member to conduct a comprehensive discussion of the overall evaluation, encompassing areas of achievement and areas that may benefit from improvement.
- b. The faculty member, along with the Department Chair/Dean will collaboratively plan for professional development activities tailored to individual needs and goals.
- c. When areas are scored as Below Expectations or Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will need to submit a portfolio specific to that area by the end of the following semester for review by the Department Chair/Dean. If the portfolio does not demonstrate improvement in the cited area, then the faculty member will need to again submit a portfolio at the end of another semester, thereby providing the faculty member with one full year to demonstrate growth and the ability to meet expectations or perform above expectations.

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION TIMELINE

The faculty evaluation process is well-defined and structured, conducted annually. This timeline delineates crucial activities, encompassing faculty activity report and self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation, and administrative evaluation, thereby promoting transparency and fostering continuous professional development among faculty members. As the scores resulting from the process may be used in the calculation of merit pay, when such funds are available, the entire process needs to be completed concurrently with renewal decisions and the drafting of employment contracts for the upcoming year.

Note: In order for the faculty member to have time to assemble the documentation for two full semesters and the Committee, Dean, and Provost to review prior to the renewal procedure, the evaluation will be for a calendar year – spring, summer, and fall.

Month	Activities
January	Faculty members receive communication regarding the upcoming evaluation process and meet with their Department Chair/Dean to set weights in the required categories. Faculty members prepare for self-evaluation and start gathering relevant documentation.
January	As the semester begins, faculty members prepare for the process and start gathering relevant documentation. The Department Chair/Dean begins the process of identifying faculty for peer classroom visitations and identifying the peer reviewers.
February	Peer Classroom Evaluations continue.
April-May	Student Course evaluations are conducted for spring semester courses.
June	Faculty receive the results of the Student Course Evaluations.
Summer	Faculty teaching summer courses will collect documentation from those courses.
September	Faculty members prepare for self-evaluation and start gathering relevant information from fall courses.
November	Student course evaluations are conducted for fall semester courses.
January	Faculty members receive their fall Student Course Evaluation results. Faculty members complete their Faculty Self-Evaluation and organize their supporting documentation, including reflections on the spring, summer, and fall semesters.
February	Faculty submit their portfolios for the previous calendar year by February 1. They are delivered to their respective College Manager. The Dean, in consultation with the Provost, establishes their respective College Evaluation Committee by February 1. The College Evaluation Committee reviews the portfolios and meets to assign scores by the end of February.
March	The portfolios and evaluations by the Committee are forwarded to the Dean by March 10. The Dean reviews the portfolios and evaluations by March 20.

	If there is need for any discussions with the Committee, the Dean conducts those discussions by March 31.
April	<p>The Dean forwards the portfolios and evaluations to the Provost by April 1.</p> <p>The Provost reviews, and addresses any questions/concerns that may arise.</p> <p>The Provost signs off on the evaluations and writes an executive summary of the process by April 15.</p> <p>The assessments are shared with the faculty members by April 15.</p> <p>Results and the executive summary are shared with the President and HR by April 30.</p>

VIII. FACULTY EVALUATION APPEAL PROCEDURES

The purpose of the appeal process is to provide faculty members with a fair and transparent mechanism to challenge evaluation results or processes when they believe there is a legitimate basis for appeal.

1. Informal Resolution

Faculty members who wish to appeal their evaluation results are encouraged to first engage in an informal discussion with their Department Chair/Dean to seek clarification, submit additional documentation, and/or resolve concerns.

2. Formal Appeal Process

If the matter remains unresolved after the discussion with the Department Chair/Dean, then faculty member may submit a written appeal to the Provost within 30 days of receiving the evaluation results.

a. **Grounds for Appeal:** The appeal should clearly state the grounds for the appeal, which may include:

- Procedural irregularities in the evaluation process.
- Misapplication or misinterpretation of evaluation criteria.
- Substantial and verifiable factual inaccuracies in the evaluation report.
- Evidence of bias or unfair treatment.

b. **Faculty Appeals Committee:** An impartial Appeals Committee, composed of faculty members and administrators not involved in the original evaluation, will be convened to consider the appeal. This Committee should consist of individuals with expertise in faculty evaluation and should reflect diversity and fairness. Membership on the appeals committee will be determined by the President.

c. **Evidence Submission:** The faculty member, the College Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, and/or Dean may submit relevant documents and evidence to support their respective positions.

d. **Optional Formal Hearing:** If necessary, a formal hearing may be conducted by the Appeals Committee where parties have an opportunity to present their cases, provide evidence, and respond to questions from the review panel or committee.

e. **Decision:** The Appeals Committee will issue a written decision, including findings and recommendations, within two weeks of receipt of the appeal. This decision should be communicated to the faculty member, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost.

3. Confidentiality and Non-Retaliation

- a. **Confidentiality:** All parties involved in the appeal process, including the appeals committee members, are expected to maintain strict confidentiality to protect the privacy and rights of those involved.
- b. **Non-Retaliation:** Faculty members appealing their evaluations should be protected from retaliation or adverse actions based on their decision to appeal.

IX. POLICY HISTORY

a. **Approved by:** Board of Trustees

b. **Adopted:** June 14, 2021

c. **Reviewed:** June 1, 2025

Appendix A

Faculty Evaluation Form

Faculty's Name:

Faculty Rank:

Department, College:

Start Date at AUK:

Date of Evaluation

Submission:

Faculty's Self Evaluation

Full-time and part-time faculty members are required to fill out the sections regarding the three areas of review: 1. Teaching and Instructional Development, 2. Service, and 3.

Research/Scholarship. Adjuncts are required to complete the first criterion and have the option to complete additional criteria if they are relevant or applicable to their situation.

1a. Teaching

Please provide the list of courses you have delivered during current academic year.

Semester	Course Code	Course Title	Credits	Number of Students	Delivery Method	Student Feedback Score
Spring						
Summer						
Fall						
Total Credits						

1b. Instructional Development

Please provide a record of the training workshops and seminars you have participated in to enhance your pedagogical and instructional methods.

Title	Type	Period	Role	Comment

2. Service

Please provide a record of the committees you have been a part of and specify the tasks you have undertaken in service to the university or the community.

<i>Committee/Task</i>	<i>University/Community</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Role</i>	<i>Comment</i>

3. Research/Scholarship

Please provide a record of your discipline-related scholarly activities, including listing published research, attended conferences, seminars, workshops, or any other relevant engagements.

<i>Item/Title</i>	<i>Publication/Activity</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Role</i>	<i>Comment</i>

Note: Please include supporting evidence for the three areas of review with this form. Submit to the College Manager as per the timeline in the Policy.

Committee Evaluation

Please evaluate the faculty member's performance in the following areas using the scale:

1: Unsatisfactory; 2: Doesn't Meet Expectations; 3: Meets Expectations; 4: Exceeds Expectations; 5: Outstanding.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Teaching & Instructional Development	Clarity of course objectives and materials; Student engagement and interaction; Use of effective teaching methods; Efforts towards continuous improvement; Participation in faculty development; Pursuit of advanced degrees or certifications						
Research and Scholarship	Quality and impact of research publications; Research collaborations and networking; Involvement in external grants/funding						
Service	Participation in departmental/college committees; Student advising and mentorship; Community engagement and outreach						

Committee Comments and Recommendations: Provide detailed comments on the faculty member's strengths, areas for improvement, and suggestions for professional growth. Please provide an action plan with implementation timeline if needed.

Department/Chair Comments and Recommendations: Provide detailed comments on the faculty member's strengths, areas for improvement, and suggestions for professional growth. Please provide an action plan with implementation timeline if needed.

Faculty Member's Response: The faculty member's acknowledgment of the evaluation and an opportunity for their response or additional comments.

Signatures

Faculty Member:

Signature: Date:

Evaluation Committee Representative:

Signature: Date:

Dean:

Signature: Date:

Provost:

Signature: Date:

Appendix B
Peer Classroom Observation Form

Faculty's Name:

Course Title:

Department:

Date & Time of Visit:

Observer's Name:

Visit#:

Please comment on the faculty member's performance in the following areas.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Classroom Dynamics	The faculty encourages student participation	
	The faculty treats students ethically and courteously	
	The faculty demonstrates effective classroom management skills	
Teaching Strategies and Technique	The faculty presents information that is accurate and coherently presented	
	The faculty follows the course outline/syllabus	
	The faculty promotes learning and critical thinking	
	Supplemental resources and materials are appropriate to course	
	The faculty utilizes effective pedagogical techniques to promote learning and critical thinking	

Comments by Peer Reviewer:

Comments by Faculty Member observed: (optional)

Signatures:

Peer

Date:

Reviewer:

Faculty:

Date:

Appendix C
Template for Departmental Guidelines for
Assessment of Faculty Performance

Name of Department _____

Teaching

Instructional Design and Development

To receive a 3.0 (Meets Expectations) a faculty member must complete **all** of the following:

Course Materials and Course Syllabus

- Course materials should be appropriate, current, and supportive of course goals and objectives.
 - Examinations, quizzes, assignments, and portfolio evaluations allow students to demonstrate achievement of course objectives and are appropriate, current and supportive of the goals of the BFA.
 - Texts, audio-visual aids, handouts, and other significant materials or equipment used reflect current technology
 - Course content is current and appropriate for the classes
- Course syllabus should conform to following requirements as stated in the Handbook:
 - course title, number, section, and semester
 - name, office, telephone, office hours
 - course description as stated in the catalog
 - goals/ objectives/ major concepts
 - texts and other required/recommended materials.
 - policy statements

Examples of Instructional Development activities rated as 4.0 (Above Expectations):

- Presented evidence that course materials, assessment instruments, and/or supplemental materials reflect the development of the course through experimentation and/or through attendance at course/discipline related or scholarly workshops.
- Presented evidence that course materials, assessment instruments, and supplemental materials reflect the development of pedagogical skills through attendance at curricular or assessment related workshops.
- Development of specialized curriculum
- Development of new course.
- _____

If a faculty member has 3 or more of those listed under 4.0, his/her rating will be a 5.0.

Examples of activities that rate a 5.0 (Outstanding) are:

- Presented evidence that scholarly activities (i.e. attending National/International workshops, seminars) in pedagogy have led to the enhancement of teaching methods by the faculty member
- _____

Instructional Development

To receive a 3.0 (Meets Expectations) a faculty member must complete **all** of the following:

- Specified course objectives and provided a reasonable opportunity for students' achievement of those objectives
- Demonstrated evidence of planning and ability to carry through
- Demonstrated knowledge of and respect for the subject matter
- Presented course assignment and material clearly
- Encouraged students' questions and expressions of ideas
- Demonstrated respect for the student as an individual
- Reasonably adhered to the syllabus or to a change in the syllabus that was provided in a timely manner
- Posted and maintained those office hours which are expected of all faculty members
- Demonstrated evidence of accurate and timely advising to assigned advisees, and mentorship of students in the faculty member's focus area

Feedback to Students (all required)

- Returned tests, portfolios and papers in a reasonable amount of time
- Provided students with periodic summaries of performance
- Provided evaluative remarks on the content, logic, organization, clarity, and grammatical correctness of all written papers, such as essays, research papers, and projects.

Advising (as applicable)

- Was accessible during Office Hours
- Exhibited concern for students
- Provided information on the program
- Provided information on the Gen Ed Program
- Provided accurate information.

Below are examples of a 4.0 (Above Expectations) rating:

- Faculty as continual self-assessor. Is self-critical in regard to teaching methods and curriculum. Sets high standards for self and students.
- Faculty as life-long learner recognizes that classes represent a learning experience for both students and faculty and demonstrates enthusiasm toward students, the profession, and the subject matter. Motivates students to pursue study beyond normal course and degree expectations.
- Has classes which are rated as challenging by students, in which grades are awarded competitively, but which continue to be sought out by students
- Mentors students through on-campus activities, i.e. workshops, guest lecturers, that facilitate individual student's academic and professional development by providing out-of-class time to students above and beyond what is expected
- Provides venues for additional instruction, locally or abroad (i.e. taking students to off-campus and/or regional sites for learning supplemental to basic course curricula.)
- Performs above institutional workload expectations in regard to instructional load, number of preparations.
- Performs above institutional expectations in maintaining and advancing classroom and campus facilities.
- Mentoring for student has led to student's entrance into an international conference, adjudicated exhibition, obtaining a grant or scholarship or acceptance into a graduate program.
- _____

If a faculty member has 3 or more of those in the 4.0 category, their rating will be a 5.0.

Teaching Score: _____

Research & Scholarship

Below are **some** examples of activities that rate 3.0 (Meets Expectations) in the areas of Research and Scholarship:

- Participation in professional organizations/meetings/conference
- Serving in capacities, such as adjudicator, reviewer, or session moderator, to a local professional organization
- Participating in a publisher's text review
- Sharing expertise within the discipline (locally or regionally)
- Acting as a journal reviewer
- Evidence of ongoing scholarship/artistic creation in preparation for professional presentation/exhibition
- Continuing certification in discipline
- Contributing to the development of instructional materials for K-12
- _____
- _____

A faculty member may receive a 4.0 (Above Expectations) for accomplishing 3 or more of the above activities.

Examples of individual activities that rate a 4.0:

- Published article in non-peer reviewed journal or publication
- Published article in not ranked journal
- Organization of a major regional conference
- Wrote/Initiated grant proposal(s) for self-development
- Serving in capacities, such as adjudicator, reviewer, or session moderator, to a regional professional organization

A faculty member may receive a 5.0 (Outstanding) for accomplishing three or more of the activities listed under the category of 4.0.

Examples of individual activities that rate a 5.0:

- Lead role or paper presentation at a high ranked international conference
- Production of a publication, performance, workshop, or artistic creation that has received some form of favorable peer review and has received at least national or international recognition
- Organization of a major national or international conference
- Refereed articles in top level international journals
- Successful award of grant for self-development
- Published refereed scholarly books or texts
- Undertook a series of courses, workshops, and the like which lead to a substantial development of a new or renewed area of expertise
- _____
- _____

Research & Scholarship Score: _____

Service

Minimum service occurs at department and college levels, earning the faculty member a rating of 3.0. Required service includes:

- Regular attendance at and participation in department/college/university meetings and activities
- Fulfillment of normal committee assignments
- Serving locally as an AUK representative in a professional context
- Participation in Capstone and Thesis Reviews

Additional service (beyond regular departmental duties) may earn faculty a 4.0 (Above Expectations) and include:

- Service on Senate or Administrative ad hoc committees or task forces
- Service on a University Committee
- Steering initiatives that will bring monetary benefits or regional recognition to the department/college/university
- Making a substantive contribution to the community in a manner that clearly impacts positively on the community, in a role that requires a high level of involvement and time, and in a manner that is clearly related to faculty member's professional role
- Substantial lab development without reassigned time
- Chairing a university-level committee
- _____
- _____

A 5.0 rating may be obtained by achieving 3 or more in the 4.0 category. Additional service (beyond regular department/college duties) to earn faculty a 5.0 rating include:

- Active service on Faculty Senate
- Steering major university curricular initiatives
- Steering initiatives that bring substantial monetary benefits or national recognition to the department/college/university (\$10,000 or more)

Service Score: _____

APPENDIX D
Faculty Evaluation Category Weights

Faculty Member: _____

Evaluation Year: _____

Faculty Member Status

- Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- Interim Evaluation for faculty needing to resubmit

Reassigned-Time from Teaching (if applicable)

Title: _____

Amount Released: _____ (1/8th, 2/8th, etc. of full teaching load)

Negotiated weights must add up to 100%.

A. Teaching Effectiveness (TE) (50% to 80%)

Negotiated Weight = _____ - Reassigned time _____ =

%

B. Research and Scholarship (RS) (10% to 30%)

Negotiated Weight =

%

C. Service and Engagement (SE) (5% to 25%)

Negotiated Weight =

%

D. Reassigned Time (RT)

Negotiated Weight =

%

The overall score will be calculated as follows (see sample):

Category	Negotiated Weight (percentage to decimal)	Score (scale of 1 to 5)	Score per Category (Weight X Score)
TE (50%-80%)	0.80	4	3.2
RE (10%-30%)	0.1	4	0.4
SE (5%-25%)	0.1	4	0.4
RT			
Overall Score			4

Dean _____ Date _____

Faculty Member _____ Date _____