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**Department Evaluation Committee1 Performance Review and Faculty Evaluation Form**

Faculty Member: Date of Review:

Department: Philosophy Semester(s) Reviewed:

EVALUATION: "The Committee's evaluation shall be based on student evaluations, peer evaluations, an

updated copy of the Faculty member’s vita, any other pertinent data that the Faculty member wishes to

submit and any other data which the department evaluation committee may deem pertinent," [Collective

Bargaining Agreement, Article XII, C, 1, b].

Each of the three specific evaluation areas to be covered should be handled in two ways: (1) Selecting one of the four categories describing the evaluee's performance. Each of the categories is intended to serve a carefully defined function, discussed below. (2) Including a thorough narrative explanation justifying the selection. Mere selection of an objective description does not constitute evaluation and is unacceptable. Evidence must be cited in support of judgments. Use additional space as needed.

Does Not Meet Professional Standards. This description should be reserved for rare cases where an individual is mismatched with his job or is simply incompetent.

Improvement Needed. This comment should be used frequently and without hesitation. It means simply that there appear to be aspects of the evaluee's performance which could be improved. It should only rarely, and then in obvious cases, be considered pejorative. For example, beginning faculty or experienced persons taking on new assignments, should frequently be expected to need improvement in their performance.

Meets Professional Standards. This designation will probably be used to describe a majority of the cases that are considered. It is specifically intended as a means of avoiding narrow "grading" of personnel. Qualitative differences should emerge from the narrative explanation section of the evaluation.

Distinguished. This description should almost never be used. It should be reserved as a means of

recognizing unequivocally superior performance.

**1. EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND FULFILLMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

Does Not Meet Improvement Meets Professional

Professional Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Needed \_\_\_\_\_ Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_

Explanation: [Indicated, when applicable, by such items as student evaluations, peer evaluations, classroom visitations, quality of syllabi, quality of student advisement, willingness to accept departmental work assignments, timely execution of work assignments, etc., (See Collective Bargaining Agreement XII, B, 1].

**2. CONTINUING SCHOLARLY WORK**

Does Not Meet Improvement Meets Professional

Professional Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Needed \_\_\_\_\_ Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_

N/A

**3. SERVICE: CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY**

Does Not Meet Improvement Meets Professional

Professional Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Needed \_\_\_\_\_ Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_

N/A

**4. OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

Does Not Meet Improvement Meets Professional

Professional Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Needed \_\_\_\_\_ Standards \_\_\_\_\_ Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_

(Refer to preceding sections where specific strengths and weaknesses are detailed as a basis for the recommendation to the appropriate dean or manager.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Evaluation Committee Member

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

===========================================================================

FACULTY MEMBER: Please check one of the following:

\_\_\_\_\_ I accept this evaluation report.

\_\_\_\_\_ I disagree with this report. My signature merely indicated that I have read the report and have had the opportunity to attach a personal statement to it.

\_\_\_\_\_ I disagree with this report and will attach a personal statement within one week of the date of

 my signature.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Faculty Member

cc: Department Chairperson

 Faculty Member

Rev. 06/08

1. Chairperson’s Performance Review looks much the same. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)