



Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Name:

Department:

Rank:

For AY:

This evaluation is to be completed by the department chairperson. All judgments must be documented with supportive evidence, for example, the faculty member's Individual Faculty Report. All judgments indicating "Does Not Meet Expectations" or "Needs Improvement" must be documented with supportive comments and these comments should indicate specific actions in which the faculty member needs to be engaged to bring his/her rating to a higher level. This evaluation must be signed and dated by the chairperson and the faculty member. *(Signature on this evaluation means that the faculty member has seen this document; it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of the evaluation. Faculty may appeal the department chair evaluation by complying with the procedures described under #7 of the [Annual Evaluation Procedures](#) in the PPPM.*

Involvement in student success activities and professional growth and development will be integrated and documented in the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative/Scholarly Activities, and Professional service to the Institution or the Community and evaluated separately.

Common Likert Scale

The following scale with descriptions will be used at each stage and evaluation point of a faculty member's career, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track: annual evaluations, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure. ~~Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale below.~~ Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the common Likert Scale below. (4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems)

Exemplary (5): Rating for faculty whose performance far exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities on a consistent basis. Normally reserved for those few individuals whose performance is outstanding to all.

Exceeds Expectations (4): Rating for faculty whose performance clearly and consistently exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities.

Meets Expectations (3): Rating for faculty whose performance consistently meets requirements in principal professional responsibilities. This rating recognizes satisfactory accomplishment and achievement.

Needs Improvement (2): Rating for faculty whose performance has approached, but not yet met, requirements in principal professional responsibilities. The need for further development is definitely recognizable.

Does Not Meet Expectations (1): Rating for faculty whose performance clearly fails to meet requirements in principal professional responsibilities. Improved performance is expected and required as a condition of continued employment in the position.

I. **Teaching:** (50-70% Institutional Range of Effort)

II. Research/Creative/Scholarly Activities: (10-40%: Institutional Range of Effort)

III. Professional service to the institution or the community: (10-40% Institutional Range of Effort)

Rating Scale: Exemplary
Exceeds Expectations (4)
Meets Expectations (3)
Needs Improvement (2)
Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Not applicable (only applies to non-tenure track faculty)

Teaching:

Research/Creative/Scholarly Activities:

Professional Service:

Student Success: (assessment of overall effort)

Continuous Professional Development: (assessment of overall effort)

<i>Optional</i>			
<u>Area of Evaluation</u>	<u>Weight of Accomplishments</u> (enter as a decimal)	<u>Chair's Evaluation</u> (populates from above)	<u>Weighted Score</u> (calculated automatically)
Teaching			
Research			
Service			

Annual Evaluation Score = Sum of weighted scores

Signature of Department Chair/School Director:

*Once signed, all previous information will be
locked against editing by any party.*

Faculty Member's Comments:

This is to certify that I have read the Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance on my performance. My chairperson and I have conferred on this matter. I _____ responded formally in writing (if so, the response is attached to the Chairperson's Evaluation). I understand that I have the right to review the chairperson's response (if any) to my response, and furthermore, that I may review personnel files kept on me which are used in personnel decisions, and that I have the right to place in these files any information that explains my position on any matter contained in such files.

Signature on this evaluation means that the faculty member has seen this document; it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of the evaluation. Faculty may appeal the department chair evaluation by complying with the procedures described in the [Process for Appeal of Department Chair's Faculty Evaluation](#).

Signature of Faculty Member

This is to certify that I _____ received a response from this faculty member and I responded. I _____ made changes in my evaluation of this faculty member, based on either the response received or from the conference held with him or her.

Signature of department chair

Optional Comments/Description of Changes to Evaluation

This is to certify that I have reviewed the material presented in this faculty review.

Signature of Dean