



Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Annual Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

Revised and adapted from the following documents:

- *Teaching Faculty Handbook*. Norfolk State University, 2025.
- Arreola, Raoul A. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. 2nd ed., Anker, 2000.
- Presidential Working Group on Faculty Issues, Faculty Evaluation Subcommittee. *Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching Faculty*. Norfolk State University, 2004.

April 6, 2026

Table of Contents

EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING FACULTY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS	3
2.1 Criteria for Evaluation Categories.....	4
2.2 Performance Levels.....	8
2.3 Procedures	9
3.0 SCORING PROCEDURES	12
3.1 Distribution of Weights	13
3.2 Source Weights.....	13
Appendix A	15
Evaluation Instruments.....	15
Appendix B	33
Sample Computation	33
Appendix C	35
Annual Evaluation Calendar Plan	35
Appendix D	36
Sample Table of Contents for Teaching Faculty Annual Evaluation Portfolio	36

EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING FACULTY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Norfolk State University is committed to implementing an annual faculty evaluation process that recognizes and rewards achievement. It is expected that the review will provide feedback that will help faculty identify their strengths and any areas that need improvement for the purpose of enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning. It is also expected that the reviewers will exercise professional judgment, integrity, and ethics in conducting the evaluations so that the standards are applied equitably and fairly to all faculty. Faculty who refuse to participate in the annual evaluations without just cause will be subject to disciplinary action.

The annual review of faculty is conducted for the purposes of contract renewal, promotion, tenure, change in contract type, and post-tenure review. All faculty are required to review and adhere to the evaluation criteria as outlined by the *Teaching Faculty Handbook* and by each department's specific criteria. Annual reviews become a part of the teaching faculty member's permanent personnel file.

The University employs a multi-faceted assessment approach that includes faculty portfolios, student ratings, peer evaluation (departmental evaluation committee), department chair's evaluation, and dean's comments. The data are used to make decisions regarding change of academic status, merit-pay, and retention. Additionally, annual review data serve as feedback for program and faculty improvement and are considered as one measure of institutional effectiveness.

2.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The annual evaluation process for teaching faculty will be initiated by a departmental committee of tenured senior faculty who will forward their report to the chair for review. The review is conducted utilizing the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, which can be found on the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' website. Evaluation committees are expected to adhere to these guidelines to ensure maximum fairness, reliability, and validity. The guiding principle is that performance should be rewarded based upon professional to exemplary levels of performance, achievement, and productivity.

The following procedures should guide academic departments and schools:

- Each faculty member shall receive an annual peer performance review for teaching effectiveness.
- Teaching faculty portfolios are required and must be submitted by the date specified on the annual evaluation calendar.
- Multiple sources to assess teaching effectiveness may be used.
- Student evaluations should be used only when the surveys are statistically valid.

- The department evaluation committee must review the teaching faculty portfolio and supporting documents submitted. Supporting documents may include syllabi, examinations, and other materials required by the school and departments.

Faculty members who do not comply with the faculty evaluation procedures will not be eligible for promotion, tenure, or salary increases. Failure to comply will also trigger a review of untenured faculty members and a post-tenure review of those faculty members holding tenure.

Faculty members should ascertain that all materials provided in their electronic portfolios are accessible to the reviewers. If there are technical issues that prevent the reviewers from accessing the materials within the portfolios due to missing links, invalid links, or links that do not open, the reviewers should alert faculty members so that they can resolve such issues and make the necessary edits within one (1) working day before a full review is conducted.

If there are irreconcilable differences between the reviews of peer faculty and the chair, both evaluations will be forwarded to the dean along with the faculty member's response. Afterwards, the dean submits his/her comments, in addition to the comments by the peer faculty, chair, and faculty member to the College/School Compliance Committee for resolution.

If a faculty member or college or school dean disagrees with a faculty member's annual evaluation by peers, an additional review may be triggered and will be conducted by the College/School Compliance Committee, which has the authority to make a decision. If dissatisfied with the decision of the College/School Compliance Committee, the grievant may appeal to the University Review Committee.

At each stage, the faculty member must be informed of the results within seven (7) business days and permitted to submit a response within seven (7) business days.

2.1 Criteria for Evaluation Categories

The categories for evaluation of faculty are teaching, research (scholarly/creative activity and grantsmanship), and service (professional and University service). These categories comprise the foundation for evaluating the professional performance of teaching faculty at the University. These three categories will be assessed by the departmental evaluation committees and department chairs, with oversight by deans.

Category I: Teaching

Teaching is evaluated in terms of "excellence in teaching," which is defined as a specifically designed teacher-student interaction that enables the student to attain critical thinking and application skills needed to be competitive in the workplace. As such, excellence in teaching requires faculty members

to possess not only expertise in their teaching discipline but also proficiency in instructional delivery, instructional design, student learning outcomes assessment, the design and effective use of instructional materials, and the appropriate and effective use of instructional technology.

To demonstrate “excellence in teaching,” a faculty member must show proficiency in the following areas: 1) Instructional Delivery Skills, 2) Instructional Design Skills, 3) Content Expertise, and 4) Course Management. These areas are defined below.

1. Instructional Delivery Skills are those human interactive skills and characteristics that
 - make for clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes; and
 - promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate learning environment.
2. Instructional Design Skills are those technical skills in
 - designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which induce student learning; and
 - designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes.
3. Content Expertise is that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced education, training, and experience.
4. Course Management embraces those administrative skills in operating and managing a course including, but not limited to,
 - timely grading of examinations,
 - timely completion of drop/add and incomplete grade forms,
 - maintaining published office hours,
 - arranging for and coordinating guest lectures, and
 - generally making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course.

Category II: Research--Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship

Research is defined as studious inquiry or examination aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, analysis of policy, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws.

Research or creative work will be classified in two general areas: published and non- published.

Scholarly Activity may be defined as activity within a faculty member’s specified area of expertise that contributes to the discovery of new knowledge, and/or the dissemination of knowledge within the professional community, and/or the development of personal professional skills and standing within the professional community. Scholarly activities include research, conference presentations, publications, and grantsmanship.

Each department will be responsible for writing a definition of an active scholar in the field. This definition is to be supported by at least three (3) examples of standards of scholarly productivity that peer institutions with similar teaching loads use for annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion. The

College/School Compliance Committee will review each department's rubrics to ensure that the departmental standards are comparable to those of peer institutions.

The following premises should guide academic departments and schools:

- A scholarly publication is a published research or creative work that is refereed or peer reviewed.
- Credit for journal articles can be awarded for either the year of publication or the year of acceptance, but not both.
- All authors on co-authored, peer-reviewed research articles, papers, books, and chapters in books receive full and equal credit, provided that academic integrity standards have been met.
- Articles published in conference proceedings are considered scholarly activities, but will receive less credit than a published, refereed article.
- The value of a non-published, orally delivered research report, paper, or creative work presented at a professional meeting, i.e., a forum, workshop, or conference, will receive less credit than a published, refereed publication.
- Book and journal reviews are considered scholarly activity, but will receive less credit than a published, refereed article.

Grantsmanship is defined as efforts to obtain grants (awards to the University for specific or general purposes). Consideration will be given in two areas: proposals submitted and proposals funded.

Evaluative factors for funded proposals will be developed by academic departments and will include the following:

- The scope and significance of grant(s), including the benefits to students, the department/school, and the University. "Significance" embraces the idea of positive, long-lasting impact.
- Renewal grants should be given the same consideration as the initial submission.
- The value of unfunded proposals submitted to funding agencies should be half that of funded grants.
- Lending "significant assistance" to the author of a funded grant involves making a significant contribution to a funded grant, for example, serving as co-principal investigator (Co-PI) or co-investigator (Co-I) or having intricate involvement in the planning phases of the grant.

Category III: Service and Professional Development

Professional Service is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay.

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and schools should consider the following activities:

- Participation in organizational or professional meetings, symposia, seminars, and colloquia other than those included under Scholarly Activity.
- Leadership in professional organizations to include Executive Boards, Organizational Committees, Panels of Judges, etc. Examples: National Alumni Associations, AAUP, VA Academy of Science, Sigma Xi, American Cancer Society, National Honor Society, Accreditation Commissions, etc.
- Invitations to serve on review committees and boards for peer-reviewing. Examples: Journals, National Science Foundation, U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, etc.
- Professional service contributions to various sources such as print and broadcast media.
- Professional recognition through honors and awards.
- Service as an unpaid consultant in one's areas of expertise.

Within the category of Professional Service, honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.

University Service is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research that contributes to the mission and goals of the University.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and schools:

- Service on University-wide committees (including search and ad-hoc committees) and in the Faculty Senate, Robert C. Nusbaum Honors College, International Programs, Commencement/Convocation, special task forces, etc. with the nature and scope of the task to be considered and weighted accordingly.
- Voluntary participation in support of any departmental, school, or University- approved program or committee.
- Submission of ideas or grant-proposals for external funding that is not included in Scholarly Activity.
- Voluntary participation in activities that enhance student learning and/or enhance professional performance of colleagues.
- Presentations offered by faculty to the University community that are not included in Scholarly Activity.
- Participation in academic advising.

Professional Development is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one's recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one's teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities. For evaluation purposes, academic departments and schools should consider the following activities:

- Attending state/national honors programs, seminars, symposia, workshops, and professional meetings.
- Studying toward a higher degree (e.g., Ph.D.).
- Serving as an unpaid consultant in one's specialized area.
- Completing courses and other training programs.

2.2 Performance Levels

Faculty will be rated using a 5-point scale. The descriptors associated with the ratings are as follows:

EP	=	Exemplary Performance	=	4
PL	=	Professional Level Performance	=	3
S	=	Satisfactory Performance	=	2
IR	=	Improvement Required	=	1
UN	=	Unsatisfactory	=	0

For evaluation purposes, these are defined below.

EP = Exemplary Performance

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution, making significant contributions to their department, college, academic field, and society.

PL = Professional Level Performance

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the institution's mission, goals, and objectives depends.

S = Satisfactory Performance

This rating is given to those individuals whose performance has been acceptable according to University standards, but not particularly distinguished.

IR = Improvement Required

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating must be given with the following:

- Specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met.
- Suggestions for improvement.
- A written commitment to assist the individual in accessing resources required for improvement.

Improvement in performance is required within the next evaluation period.

UN = Unsatisfactory (Unacceptable)

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any one of the following ways will result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory":

- Received an "IR" rating for the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required.
- Consistently violated one or more of the institution's standards of professional performance.

2.3 Procedures

Teaching Faculty Portfolio

Each faculty member is required to submit a portfolio that adheres to the guidelines indicated below. Portfolios must be submitted during the February period as specified in the annual faculty evaluation calendar (see Appendix D).

1. Portfolio documentation should be provided for the previous calendar year (January-December).
2. All forms and accompanying narrative information and supporting documentation must be submitted by the date and time specified in the annual faculty evaluation calendar.
3. All portfolios should include vitae and course syllabi along with other documentation to support all of the categories of the evaluation form.
4. Documentation should be labeled according to category and item number.
5. Documentation should demonstrate evidence of good communication skills.
6. Portfolio organization should be clear and easy to follow. A table of contents must be included with a section corresponding to each evaluation category. A sample table of contents is presented in Appendix E.
7. Any discrete activity cannot be used in more than one category.
8. A faculty member must submit a portfolio and submit it on time; otherwise, the departmental evaluation committee will be forced to complete an evaluation for that particular faculty

member with whatever information is available.

9. Once the entire evaluation process is complete, supervisors shall return the annual portfolios to the faculty members by May 1st.

Student Course Ratings

Student ratings of courses are employed as one of the sources in the annual review process of teaching faculty. The student evaluation process will be administered by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The surveys will be distributed each semester to students enrolled in all classes taught. The results are made accessible to deans, department chairs, and individual teaching faculty members. Faculty shall include their student course ratings in the teaching portfolio submitted for review. During the annual review process, the departmental evaluation committee can access student ratings through the department chair. Any student survey results that are not representative of the class enrollment or otherwise not statistically valid should not be included in the calculations.

Departmental Evaluation Committee

Peer evaluation is conducted by the departmental evaluation committee. The departmental evaluation committee is comprised of no fewer than three (3), but not more than seven (7), tenured faculty members in the department who are chosen according to the following order:

1. Highest professional rank.
2. Length of tenured service at the University.
3. Total years of service at the University.

Members of the departmental evaluation committee shall be announced in departments by October 1 of the Fall Semester. The committee will select a chair who will be responsible for the deliberations of the committee. Terms of service for committee members shall not exceed two consecutive years, with staggered appointment to ensure continuity.

The committee will review all teaching faculty portfolios and student course ratings during the evaluation period. All portfolio materials are to remain on site. The teaching faculty portfolio and student course ratings of each faculty member will be reviewed by no fewer than three (3) committee members. The committee will jointly complete an individual peer evaluation form (Teaching Faculty Evaluation Form for Peers) for each teaching faculty member in order to obtain the faculty member's evaluation rating for the annual review period. A copy of this form will be reviewed and signed by the faculty member to indicate that the review has occurred. At this time, the faculty member may choose to submit written comments before the evaluation process is concluded. The report and comments will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and a copy forwarded to the faculty member.

Copies of any approved supplemental evaluative instruments and procedures, with due dates attached, shall be made available to all faculty members within the department by October 15 prior to the year in which performance will be evaluated. The departmental evaluation committee shall be prohibited from using evaluative instruments not duly approved and distributed as described.

Department Chair's (Dean's) Evaluation of Peers

The department chair shall evaluate the teaching faculty portfolios and student ratings submitted during the review period in accordance with the faculty evaluation guidelines. The department chair will separately evaluate the faculty member on his/her adherence to their departmental responsibilities.

The dean of the school shall be responsible, in the absence of the department chair, for evaluating teaching faculty. The department chair or dean shall utilize the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Form for Department Chair to provide a rating for each teaching faculty member being evaluated.

The departmental evaluation committee members and department chairs (or deans) should be knowledgeable concerning the evaluation, interpretation, and use of the data gathered from the various evaluation sources.

Summary Composite Rating

The departmental evaluation committee chair and department chair (or, in lieu of the department chair the dean) will meet and jointly provide a summary composite rating for each teaching faculty member. The summary composite rating determined for each teaching faculty member is documented on the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Summary Rating Form.

Teaching faculty meet with the departmental evaluation committee chair and department chair (or dean) to review and sign the summary rating form. A teaching faculty member may attach to his or her summary rating form comments regarding the rating. All teaching faculty shall be given a copy of their Faculty Evaluation Summary Rating Form for the review period.

Copies of the Faculty Evaluation Summary Rating Forms for all teaching faculty in the department are to be filed in the department. In addition, the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall receive the original Faculty Evaluation Summary Forms with all required signatures for all teaching faculty reviewed during the evaluation period.

College or School Compliance Committee

The establishment of a compliance committee process in each college or school to assess the adherence to the guidelines noted in the *Teaching Faculty Handbook* is imperative and should be a major responsibility of each college or school dean. These committees will be established in the

month of August prior to the evaluation process. The members of the compliance committee will be elected by the faculty of the respective departments and will include one tenured faculty (excluding the chair) from each department in the college or school. Members of each committee will select the chair. Members' terms will be two years.

Compliance committees will have the following responsibilities:

- Review the evaluation criteria of each department in order to assure fairness, consistency, and equivalence in evaluation procedures within the college or school.
- Oversight of the evaluation cycle.
- Random review of selected evaluations from each department to ascertain compliance with the guidelines.
- Consideration of evaluation appeals from faculty.
- Recommendations for improvements to the evaluation process.

Compliance issues will be forwarded to the college or school compliance committee by anyone in the college or school with faculty rank.

Appeal Process

Prior to the evaluation cycle by the preceding October 15, the deans shall notify the faculty of the nature and schedule of the appeal process. If the faculty member does not accept the departmental evaluation committee results, the next stage of the process will be to request a compliance review by the College/School Compliance Committee, which serves as the appeals committee.

The College/School Compliance Committee will select its chair. The chair of the departmental evaluation committee and the concerned faculty member will be invited to appear before the College/School Compliance Committee, and no additional documentation can be placed in the faculty member's portfolio. After the college/school appeal, the faculty member has the right of appeal to the University Review Committee (URC). The URC chair will forward its recommendations to the Provost, whose decision will be final.

3.0 SCORING PROCEDURES

In order to give University-wide consistency to the faculty evaluation process, minimum weights are established for the standard categories. The Department will determine the exact weights within each category. The range of possible weights includes 15% and 10% discretionary assignments for the department and the faculty member, respectively. The 25% distribution must be allocated in increments of five (5) percentage points.

3.1 Distribution of Weights

The distribution of weights must comply with the criteria listed in the Table 1 below.

Category	Range of Possible Weights
I. Teaching	40% - 65%
II. Scholarly Activity	15% - 40%
III. Service and Professional Development	20% - 45%

Table 1. Distribution of Weights

The total weight for each category is the sum of the pre-determined minimum weight, the allocation of the departmental committee, and the faculty member's allocation. This table weight is not to exceed the upper limit of the range for that category. The maximum weight for each line item within the category is the sum of the departmental distribution and the faculty member's distribution. The departmental committee will designate its minimum weight for each line item. Faculty members will then allocate weights to line items from their 10% distributions. For example, suppose Professor Drake's academic department allocates its 15% discretionary weight as 10% for scholarly activity and 5% for service and professional development, while Professor Drake allocates his entire discretionary assignment to the teaching category. The weight distributions that will be used for Professor Drake are illustrated in Table 2.

Category	Minimum Weights	Professor Drake's Discretionary Weight	Department's Discretionary Weight	Professor Drake's Actual Weights
I. Teaching	40%	10%		50%
II. Scholarly Activity	15%		10%	25%
III. Service and Professional Development	20%		5%	25%

Table 2. Distribution of Weights for Professor Drake

3.2 Source Weights

Faculty evaluations will be based on assessments by students, departmental committees, and department chairs. Department chairs will be evaluated by students, departmental committees, and deans. As indicated by faculty evaluation expert, Dr. Raoul Arreola, weights allocated to each source are determined by judging "the opportunity that the source has to be a first-hand observer of the

performance in question.” The source weights are presented in Table 3 below.

Category	Sources		
I. Teaching			
Role Components	Students	Departmental Committee	Department Chair/Dean
Instructional Delivery Skills	100%	0%	0%
Instructional Design Skills	25%	50%	25%
Content Expertise	0%	80%	20%
Course Management	0%	0%	100%
II. Scholarly Activity	0%	70%	30%
III. Professional Development and Service	0%	70%	30%

Table 3. Source Weights for Evaluation Categories

Release Time

Teaching faculty members released from teaching as a result of research grants or special assignments shall have the weight assigned to the teaching category reduced proportionally, and the weight of the evaluation category for which release time is given shall be increased.

As indicated in Table 4, if Professor Drake is given 50% release time from teaching for research activities, then the weight of the teaching category is reduced to 25%, and the weight on Scholarly Activities should be increased to 50%.

Category	General Distribution	Distribution with Release Time
Teaching	50%	25%
Scholarly Activity	25%	50%
Service and Professional Development	25%	25%

Table 4. Weights for Professor Drake with 50% Release Time from Teaching for Research

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation Scoring Sheets for

- **STUDENTS**
- **DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN**
- **PEERS**
- **SUMMARY FORMS**

EVALUATION SCORING SHEET, CATEGORY I: TEACHING

Source: Students

Face-to-Face Sample

Item #	Statements	Design	Delivery	
1	During the first week of class the instructor provided and explained the syllabus.	3.75		
2	The course materials (textual and/or web based), assignments, exams, class discussions, activities, projects and/or papers in this class have increased my understanding of the	3.50		
3	The instructor has utilized a variety of teaching techniques and methods.		3.75	
4	The instructor has created a climate for students' participation in class or online.		3.75	
5	The instructor has provided feedback to improve my learning.		3.25	
6	The instructor's presentations have been informative regarding the subject matter of the		3.50	
7	The instructor has been successful in communicating the subject matter of the course.		3.50	
8	The instructor has met classes consistently and generally has been punctual.		3.50	
9	The instructor has been available for consultation during scheduled office hours, by		3.75	
10	The instructor has shown consideration and respect.		3.75	
11	All things considered, the instructor has been an effective teacher.		3.75	
12	All things considered, the course has been a positive learning experience.	3.25		
Averages		3.50	3.61	3.56

Online Sample

Item #	Statements	Design	Delivery	
1	During the first week of class the instructor provided and explained the syllabus.	3.75		
1a	The instructor was consistent in following the syllabus.		3.75	
2	The course materials (textual and/or web based), assignments, exams, class discussions, activities, projects and/or papers in this class have increased my understanding of the subject.	3.75		
3	The instructor has utilized a variety of teaching techniques.		3.75	
4	The instructor has created a format to increase students' accessibility online.	3.75		
5	The instructor has provided feedback to improve my learning.		3.25	
6	The minimum amounts of time per week needed for online interactions, study and homework assignments were clearly stated in the syllabus.	3.50		
7	The presentations and required text have been informative regarding the subject matter of the course.	3.50		
8	The instructor has been successful in communicating the subject matter of the course.		3.50	
9	The instructor has consistently facilitated discussions.		3.50	
10	The instructor has been available for consultation during scheduled office hours and/or by appointment.		3.25	
11	The instructor has been professional and shown consideration and respect.		3.50	
12	The instructor has regularly communicated in the class via electronic means (e.g., emails, announcements, discussions boards, etc.).		3.75	
13	All things considered, the instructor has been an effective instructor.		3.50	
14	I have logged in and participated fully in the course as instructed in the syllabus.		3.75	
15	I would enroll in another online course.		3.50	
Averages		3.65	3.55	3.60



Teaching Faculty Evaluation Forms for Department Chair/Dean

Faculty Name: _____ ID Number: _____

Department: _____

College/School: _____

Rank: _____ Tenure: Yes ____ No ____

Date Began Service: _____

Today's Date: _____

CATEGORY I: TEACHING

Instructions: For the items below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. <u>All items in the Teaching Category must be evaluated.</u> For each of the teaching roles A, B and C, an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write these averages in the “Averages Column” for each respective teaching role.	Item Ratings Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory Performance = 2 Improvement Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages Column</u>
A. Instructional Design The extent to which the faculty member:		
1. Has syllabi which follow University Guidelines.		
2. Creates assignments, projects, and/or exams related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
3. Designs instructional activities clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
4. Identifies course materials, including textbook, which are clearly related to course outcome(s).		
5. Employs instructional materials appropriate for the target student population.		
6. Uses “up-to-date” course materials.		
7. Prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.		
Instructional Design Rating		
B. Content Expertise The extent to which the faculty member:		
1. Demonstrates knowledge of discipline.		
2. Demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.		
3. Uses instructional technology which is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
4. Uses instructional technology to promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.		
Content Expertise Rating		
C. Course Management The extent to which the faculty member:		
1. Submits required reports and documents as directed.		
2. Is available to students outside class.		
Course Management Rating		

CATEGORY II: RESEARCH—SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND GRANTSMANSHIP

Instructions: Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S”. Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the marked items below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Research Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Scholarly Activity Rating.”	Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)	Item Ratings Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory Performance = 2 Improvement Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages Column</u>
1. Publishes papers in journals and conference proceedings within teaching field or area of specialization.			
2. Writes books or chapters in books in teaching field or area of specialization.			
3. Presents papers in the teaching or related field for delivery at professional meetings.			
4. Devises, produces, or performs creative works related to one’s teaching or allied field.			
5. Designs, constructs, or produces technical applications or policy reports related to one’s teaching or allied field.			
6. Submits through University channels a grant proposal.			
7. Acquires funding for grants.			
8. Lends significant assistance to the author of a funded grant.			
9. Receives renewal of grants at the expected level.			
10. Serves as a paid consultant in one’s specialized area.			
11. Supervises research projects.			
12. Reviews manuscripts, books, journals and articles.			
13. Receives awards or recognition in one’s area of expertise.			
Scholarly Activity Rating			

CATEGORY III: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICE

Instructions: Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the marked items below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Service and Professional Development Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Service and Professional Development Rating.”	Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)	Item Ratings Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory Performance = 2 Improvement Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages Column</u>
A. Professional Development is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one’s recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one’s teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities. Professional Service* is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay. For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:			
1. Participates in meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia and attends enhancement courses on or off campus.			
2. Studies towards a higher degree or acquires additional training.			
3. Receives fellowships related specifically to professional field.			
4. Assists in organizing meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia.			
5. Holds membership in professional organizations.			
6. Holds leadership position(s) in professional organizations.			
7. Reviews grant proposals.			
8. Renders professional assistance (in one’s area of expertise) to educational or other agencies.			
9. Receives professional recognition through awards and honors.			

B. **University Service** is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research that contributes to the mission and goals of the university.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

10. Participates in departmental committees.			
11. Participates in college/school committees.			
12. Participates in university-wide committees.			
13. Submits concept papers or proposals for student, faculty, and curriculum enhancement.			
14. Assists with university-sponsored activities.			
15. Cooperates with colleagues and supervisors.			
16. Attends required meetings associated with one's department.			
17. Attends required meetings associated with one's college/school.			
18. Attends required meetings associated with the University.			
19. Procures resources for the University.			
20. Participates in student recruitment activities.			
21. Advises student organization(s) or mentors students or group(s) of students to enhance the quality of campus life.			
22. Provides or plans lectures or workshops.			
23. Receives awards or honors.			
*Within the category of Service and Professional Development , honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.			
Service and Professional Development Rating			

DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN COMPOSITE ROLE RATINGS (CRR)

Faculty Name: _____ ID Number: _____

Category	Ratings (CRR)
I. Teaching	
A. Instructional Design	
B. Content Expertise	
C. Course Management	
II. Research—Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship	
III. Service and Professional Development	

Department Chair/Dean Evaluation

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

Department Chair's/Dean's Name

Signature (Department Chair/Dean)

Date



Teaching Faculty Evaluation Forms for Peers (Committee)

Faculty Name: _____ ID Number: _____

Department: _____

College/School: _____

Rank: _____ Tenure: Yes _____ No _____

Date Began Service: _____

Today's Date: _____

CATEGORY I: TEACHING

Instructions: For the items below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. <u>All items in the Teaching Category must be evaluated.</u> For each of the teaching roles A and B, an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write these averages in the “Averages Column” for each respective teaching role.	Item Ratings Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory Performance = 2 Improvement Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages Column</u>
A. Instructional Design The extent to which the faculty member:		
1. Has syllabi which follow University Guidelines.		
2. Creates assignments, projects, and/or exams related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
3. Designs instructional activities clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
4. Identifies course materials, including textbook, which are clearly related to course outcome(s).		
5. Employs instructional materials appropriate for the target student population.		
6. Uses “up-to-date” course materials.		
7. Prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.		
Instructional Design Rating		
B. Content Expertise The extent to which the faculty member:		
1. Demonstrates knowledge of discipline.		
2. Demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.		
3. Uses instructional technology which is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.		
4. Uses instructional technology to promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.		
Content Expertise Rating		

CATEGORY II: RESEARCH—SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND GRANTSMANSHIP

Instructions: Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the marked items below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Research Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Scholarly Activity Rating.”	Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)	<u>Item Ratings</u> Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory Performance = 2 Improvement Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages</u> <u>Column</u>
1. Publishes papers in journals and conference proceedings within teaching field or area of specialization.			
2. Writes books or chapters in books in teaching field or area of specialization.			
3. Presents papers in the teaching or related field for delivery at professional meetings.			
4. Devises, produces, or performs creative works related to one’s teaching or allied field.			
5. Designs, constructs, or produces technical applications or policy reports related to one’s teaching or allied field.			
6. Submits through University channels a grant proposal.			
7. Acquires funding for grants.			
8. Lends significant assistance to the author of a funded grant.			
9. Receives renewal of grants at the expected level.			
10. Serves as a paid consultant in one’s specialized area.			
11. Supervises research projects.			
12. Reviews manuscripts, books, journals and articles.			
13. Receives awards or recognition in one’s area of expertise.			
Scholarly Activity Rating			

CATEGORY III: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICE

Instructions: Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the <u>marked items</u> below rate the faculty member from 0 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Service and Professional Development Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Service and Professional Development Rating.”	Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)	<u>Item Ratings</u> Exemplary = 4 Professional = 3 Satisfactory = 2 Performance = 2 Improvement = 1 Required = 1 Unsatisfactory = 0	<u>Averages</u> <u>Column</u>
A. Professional Development is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one’s recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one’s teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities. Professional Service* is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay. For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:			
1. Participates in meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia and attends enhancement courses on or off campus.			
2. Studies towards a higher degree or acquires additional training.			
3. Receives fellowships related specifically to professional field.			
4. Assists in organizing meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia.			
5. Holds membership in professional organizations.			
6. Holds leadership position(s) in professional organizations.			
7. Reviews grant proposals.			
8. Renders professional assistance (in one’s area of expertise) to educational or other agencies.			
9. Receives professional recognition through awards and honors.			

B. **University Service** is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research that contributes to the mission and goals of the university.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

10. Participates in departmental committees.		
11. Participates in college/school committees.		
12. Participates in university-wide committees.		
13. Submits concept papers or proposals for student, faculty, and curriculum enhancement.		
14. Assists with university-sponsored activities.		
15. Cooperates with colleagues and supervisors.		
16. Attends required meetings associated with one's department.		
17. Attends required meetings associated with one's college/school.		
18. Attends required meetings associated with the University.		
19. Procures resources for the University.		
20. Participates in student recruitment activities.		
21. Advises student organization(s) or mentors students or group(s) of students to enhance the quality of campus life.		
22. Provides or plans lectures or workshops.		
23. Receives awards or honors.		
*Within the category of Professional Development and Service , honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.		

Service and Professional Development Rating

PEERS (COMMITTEE) COMPOSITE ROLE RATINGS (CRR)

Faculty Name: _____ ID Number: _____

Category	Ratings (CRR)
I. Teaching:	
A. Instructional Design	
B. Content Expertise	
II. Research: Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship	
III. Service and Professional Development	

Peer (Committee) Evaluation

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

Signature (Peer Facilitator) _____
Title _____
Date

Signature (Peer) _____
Title _____
Date

Signature (Peer) _____
Title _____
Date

Signature (Peer) _____
Title _____
Date

Signature (Peer) _____
Title _____
Date



Teaching Faculty Evaluation Summary Forms

Faculty Name: _____ ID Number: _____

Department: _____

College/School: _____

Rank: _____ Tenure: Yes _____ No _____

Date Began Service: _____

Today's Date: _____

Teaching	Students	Peers	Department Chair	Weighted Ratings
Instructional Delivery Skills	30% X []			
Instructional Design Skills	10% X []	20% X []	10% X []	
Content Expertise		20% X []	5% X []	
Course Management				5% X []
COMPOSITE ROLE RATING (CRR) FOR TEACHING				

Table 1: Composite Role Rating for Teaching

Category	Minimum Weights	Department's Discretionary Weight	Faculty's Discretionary Weight	Faculty's Category Weights (Without Release Time)
Teaching	40%			
Scholarly Activity	15%			
Professional Development and Service	20%			

Table 2: Category Weights

Category	Faculty's Category Weights (without Release Time)	Release Time	Final Distribution Weights (with Release Time)
Teaching			
Scholarly Activity			
Professional Development and Service			

Table 3: Distribution Weights with Release Time

Category	Final Distributions	Composite Role Rating	Weighted Rating
Teaching			
Scholarly Activity			
Professional Development and Service			
Evaluation Rating			

Table 4: Final Evaluation Rating Computation

Comments by Department Chair and Peers (Committee):

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

<i>Signature (Department Chair)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
-------------------------------------	--------------	-------------

<i>Signature (Committee)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
------------------------------	--------------	-------------

<i>Signature (Committee)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
------------------------------	--------------	-------------

<i>Signature (Committee)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
------------------------------	--------------	-------------

<i>Signature (Faculty)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
----------------------------	--------------	-------------

Comments by Faculty Member:

Signature below acknowledges that the Department Chair and a representative from my Peers (Committee) have reviewed this completed Teaching Faculty Evaluation as of the date indicated.

<i>Signature (Faculty)</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
----------------------------	--------------	-------------

APPENDIX B

Sample Computation

Consider Professor Drake, who was evaluated by the three sources with the following ratings:

Students:	A. Instructional Delivery	4
	B. Instructional Design	3
Peers:	A. Instructional Design	3
	B. Content Expertise	4
Dept. Chair:	A. Instructional Design	3
	B. Content Expertise	3
	C. Course Management	2

Substituting the above ratings into the formula sheet, as shown in Table 5 below, will result in a Composite Role Rating (CRR) for Professor Drake of 3.45 for teaching.

Teaching	Students	Peers	Department Chair	Weighted Ratings
Instructional Delivery Skills	30% X [4]			1.20
Instructional Design Skills	10% X [3]	20% X [3]	10% X [3]	1.20
Content Expertise		20% X [4]	5% X [3]	0.95
Course Management			5% X [2]	0.10
COMPOSITE ROLE RATING (CRR) FOR TEACHING				3.45

Table 5: Composite Role Rating for Teaching: Professor Drake

Professor Drake was evaluated in categories II and III with the following composite ratings:

Peers:	II. Scholarly Activity	3.0
	III. Service and Professional Development	4.0
Dept. Chair:	II. Scholarly Activity	3.0
	III. Service and Professional Development	3.0

Substituting the above ratings into the formula sheet, as shown in Table 6 below, will result in a Composite Role Rating (CRR) for Professor Drake of 3.00 for scholarly activity and 3.70 for service and professional development.

Category	Students	Peers	Dept. Chair	Composite Rating
II. Scholarly Activity		70% X [3]	30% X [3]	3.00
III. Service and Professional Development		70% X [4]	30% X [3]	3.70

Table 6: Composite Role Rating for Professor Drake

The actual evaluation rating for Professor Drake would be based on the weight distributions a school or department and the faculty member (allocating his 15%) assign to the various categories. For example, given the following distributions:

I.	Teaching	50%
II.	Scholarly Activity	25%
III.	Service and Professional Development	25%

Professor Drake's rating is computed as follows:

$$50\% \times [3.45] + 25\% \times [3.00] + 25\% \times [3.70] = \mathbf{3.40}$$

APPENDIX C

Annual Evaluation Calendar Plan

EVALUATION YEAR: JANUARY 1 – DECEMBER 31

Action	Responsible Person(s)	Due Date
1. Establishment of College/School Process Compliance Committee	Dean Faculty	October 1
2. Announcement of Departmental Evaluation Committee	Department Chair Faculty	October 1
3. Dissemination of evaluation packet with due dates to faculty	Dean Department Chair	October 15
4. Departmental distribution of weights to categories of the evaluation	Departmental Faculty	October 15
5. Notification of the nature and schedule of the appeal process	Dean Department Chair	October 15
6. Electronic distribution of Student Course Evaluations	OIT/Academic Affairs	Last third of each semester
7. Completion of Student Course Evaluations	Students	Last third of each semester
8. Distribution of results of student course evaluations for spring/fall semesters	OIT/Academic Affairs Department Chair Dean	January 15
9. Submission of portfolios	Faculty	February 1
10. Completion of Peer evaluation (including evaluation of department chair in the Teaching, Research, Service and Professional Development Categories)	Departmental Evaluation Committee	February 15
11. Completion of faculty evaluations by department chair	Department Chair	February 20
12. Completion of department chair evaluation by full-time faculty in the department (Administrative Skills Category only)	Full-Time Faculty Departmental Evaluation Committee Dean	February 25
13. Tabulation of composite score for faculty evaluation	Departmental Evaluation Committee	February 25
14. Conference with individual faculty members	Chairperson of the Departmental Evaluation Committee	March 1
15. Submission of departmental report and recommendations to the Dean	Chairperson of the Departmental Evaluation Committee	March 10
16. Completion of Dean evaluation by full-time faculty in the college/school (Administrative Skills Category only)	Full-Time Faculty Provost	March 15
17. Submission of college/school report and recommendations to the Provost	Dean	March 20

APPENDIX D

Sample Table of Contents for Teaching Faculty Annual Evaluation Portfolio

INTRODUCTION

1. Narrative, Goals, and Objectives
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Workload Summary or Descriptions

CATEGORY I: TEACHING

I.A. Instructional Design

- I.A.1. Syllabi that follow University guidelines
- I.A.2. Assignments, projects, and/or exams related to the outcome(s) identified for the course
- II.2.3. Assignments, handouts, exams, and activities to promote student interest and enhance learning

I.B. Content Expertise

- I.B.1. Instructional technology to promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course

I.C. Course Management (for evaluation by department chair)

- I.C.1. Required reports and documents submitted as directed
- I.C.2. Availability to students outside class (Office Hours)

I.D. Student Course Evaluations

- I.D.1. Spring Semester Course Evaluations
- I.D.2. Fall Semester Course Evaluations

CATEGORY II: RESEARCH - SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND GRANTSMANSHIP

- II.A. Scholarship (related to one's teaching field or allied field)
- II.B. Grantsmanship (related to one's teaching field or allied field)
- II.C. Creative Works (related to one's teaching field or allied field)

CATEGORY III: SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- III.A. Professional Development
- III.B. University Service