

**Qatar University
Office of Evaluation**

Faculty Performance Review and Development System Guidebook

Job Number:					
Name:					
College:					
Department/Program:					

(2011 / 2012)

Faculty Performance Review and Development System Framework

Introduction:

A Faculty Performance Review and Development System is essential to each an academic institution looking forward to the long-term promotion of faculty competence and academic excellence.

Participants:

Performance Review and Development is a joint effort among several participants:

Faculty member:

1. Complete the faculty member records in this handbook.
2. Submit all requested documents, including the course portfolio, published research papers etc.
3. Send these materials to the Department Head.

Head of the Department:

1. Establish that the faculty has received the necessary materials to complete the Faculty Performance Review and Development System, and that their Review and Development process has commenced.
2. Present criteria against which faculty performance will be measured in the respective department.
3. Verify the documents presented by the faculty member.
4. Meet individually with each faculty to present feedback on strengths and prospective improvements.
5. Agree on a work plan for the subsequent year.

College Dean:

1. Support and monitor the execution of the system.
2. Verify and accredit the results submitted by the respective departments.
3. Consider reevaluation applications submitted by each faculty.
4. Prepare final college faculty evaluation report.
5. Send final report/s to the Office of Evaluation.

The Office of Evaluation:

1. General supervision of the application of the Faculty Performance Review and Development System.
2. Cooperation with the various departments/colleges at the university to implement the Review and Development System.
3. Contribution in overcoming problems arising at the time of implementation of the Review and Development System.
4. Preparation of the final Faculty Review and Development Report, and submission to university administration.

Prospective Weight Distribution:

Faculty academic responsibilities are weighted as follows:

Domain	Weight
Teaching performance	50% - 60%
Scholarly endeavor	10% - 40%
University and community service	10% - 30%
Total	100%

Heads of Departments, in collaboration with each faculty member, should agree on the different weights for scholarly endeavor and university and community service at the beginning of each academic year, provided that total "grade" should be equal to 100%.

Executive Measures/ Mechanisms:

1. Office of Evaluation distributes the Guidebook to the Faculty during (September and October).
2. Every Faculty member should fill out corresponding evaluation records through: (my.qu.edu.qa) after thoroughly reading the guidebook.
3. Faculty and the Head of the Department may agree on which "course portfolio" to submit for evaluation.
4. Faculty should send the completed guidebook, along with relevant documents, to the Head of the Department **before May 15** each year.
5. The Head of the Department should complete evaluation records **until end of May**.
6. The Head of the Department prepares an overall faculty performance assessment report.
7. A faculty member may go through his/her performance Review and Development report and sign it.
8. After receiving the report a faculty member has the right to appeal to the Dean of the respective college within three days' time.
9. The Head of the Department prepares final report reports to be officially endorsed by the Dean.
10. In coordination with the respective Head of the Department, the Dean defines a date for meeting with those faculty whose performance was less than expected or unsatisfactory, and fills out the professional development plan form (appendix 3).
11. Administration of the college reports to the Office of Evaluation.

General Principles:

1. Each college is entitled to modify the Review and Development criteria and scales providing that Faculty member are made aware of such changes at the beginning of the academic year.
2. The Head of the Department may seek help from whoever he/she finds necessary to assess any activities or domains included in the evaluation process.
3. The Head of the Department may seek advice from any faculty to report on faculty classroom performance (as per demand of the faculty member, students' evaluation, new faculty, or whatever), and should check with the Office of Evaluation about the rules and regulations necessary to this procedure.
4. Period of application of the faculty performance Review and Development system extends from last evaluation **to the mid of May, Except Scholarly endeavor where the application period for two years (15/5/2010 until 15/5/2012).**
5. Faculty may add information they find applicable to this handbook.
6. The teaching Performance Domain includes three activities: course, students' opinion, and academic advising; a final grade should be specified for each activity.
7. After completion of the system, the concerned Head of the Department is required to meet with every faculty member in person to provide necessary feedback on strengths and weaknesses of the faculty performance, so as to launch a better future plan.

Faculty Performance Rating Scale

The following scale is used to objectively evaluate faculty performance.

The scale is characterized by:

- A qualitative side expressing the level of performance and a quantitative side expressing assessed standards for each domain;
- Five-point performance rating scales.

Dimensions of the scale:

Grade		Quantitative/qualitative
General performance	Specific performance/in different domains	
4.7 - 5.0	5	Exceptional
4.6 - 3.8	4	More than expected
3.7 - 2.8	3	Expected
2.7 - 1.8	2	Less than expected
1.7 - 1.0	1	unsatisfactory

Overall effectiveness rating will be the result of multiplication of the percentage obtained with the grade.

Example:

Domain	Percentage	Grade
Teaching performance	60%	3
Scholarly endeavor	25%	4
University and community service	15%	3
Total	100%	3.25

Grade: Exceptional more than expected expected less than expected unsatisfactory

Steps to estimate overall rating:

- (1): Percentage is multiplied by grade:
 - Teaching performance = $3 \times 60\% = 1.8$
 - Academic effort = $4 \times 25\% = 1.0$
 - University and community service = $3 \times 15\% = 0.45$
- (2) Overall score total = $1.8 + 1.0 + 0.45 = 3.25$
- (3) Overall rating = expected

General criteria against which faculty teaching performance to be measured

Activity		Criterion	
Teaching process/course		Content of the course is comprehensive and valid	
		Presented course material is new	
		How far material presented covers the course	
		Variety and compatibility of the activities with the objectives and outcomes of the course	
		Innovations (innovative teaching methods-innovative teaching activities)	
Scholarly Endeavor		Nature of participation (main participant/associate participant)	
		Agency/body of publication (periodical/conference/regional periodical/regional conference etc.	
University and community service	University and community service	Attends various committee meetings	
		Actively participates in the activities of committees	
		Presented a seminar, lecture, workshop or training sessions	
		Other services for university or society	
	Academic advising	Present during the period/s specified for academic advising, early registration and add and drop	
		Solves problems facing students at the time of registration/add and drop	
		Presents samples of students' advising files	
		Prosecutes all problems facing students	
Professional relations		Good relations with his/her colleagues	
		Good academic, professional and social reputation	
		Committed to university professional behavior	
Course portfolio Contents			
1. course description			
-Course data		-Instructor data	-Course description
-Educational outcomes		-Distribution of contents	-Methods of teaching
-Methods of students' evaluation		-Objectives and tasks	-Instructions for students
2. Course teaching philosophy			
3. samples of teacher work			
-Innovations introduced into the course		-Variety of assessment methods	
-Variety of presentation methods		-Innovations introduced to course references and sources	
4. Samples of students' work			
5. Reflection page			
-Updating contents	-Recommendations about advantages/disadvantages	-Development of evaluation methods	-Variety of course presentation methods
-Problems facing course instructor		-Suggestions for further course improvement	

Faculty Domain-Based Performance Rating

Domain	Exceptional (5)	Above expected (4)	Expected (3)	Less than expected (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Teaching Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obtains a prize of honor in the field of teaching performance from an organization/body. or - Develops the course materials in line with international standards related to his/her major - Attains "Excellent" rating in student questionnaire - His/her teaching methods are creative and innovative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develops course material by including major changes that assist to update the course. - Attains "Above Average" rating in student questionnaire. - Uses up to date teaching practices in presenting the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develops course materials by including some changes that help to update the course. - Attains "Average" rating in student questionnaire. - Uses a variety of teaching practices in presenting the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not present the teaching materials as expected. - Attains "Below Average" rating in student questionnaire. - Does not use the available teaching practices in presenting the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents an incomplete and below standard teaching materials. - His/Her portfolio reflects incomplete parts. - Attains "Unsatisfactory" rating in student Questionnaire.
Scholarly Endeavor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obtains a prize of honor in the field of academic work from an organization/body; or does one of the followings: - Publish a refereed research in a specialized international journal as a major researcher. - Writes/translates a refereed reference book 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publish a refereed research in a distinguished international conference as a main researcher; or do one of the following: - Publish a refereed research in a second standard journal as a main researcher. - Publish a refereed research in an international journal as a second researcher. - Writes/translates a reference book as a co-author. Obtains a grant for a research project in which he/she is a main researcher. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publishes a refereed research in a distinguished regional conference as a main researcher; or he should do one of the following: - Publish a refereed research in a second level journal as a second researcher. - Writes a course book. - Participates in a financed research project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publishes refereed researches in a regional conference in which he/she is a main researcher. or: - Participates in an on going scientific work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has not published any research. Has not participated in any research activity.
University and Community Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obtains a prize of honor from an organization/body in his/her major; or: - Develops main proposals for university and community service, - Has distinguished participation in developing his/her profession/major. Has distinguished participation in the main committees. - Performs an outstanding/excellent role in academic advising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participates in two or more of the following activities: - Takes leading roles in the university/college. - Plays leading roles in community service. - Has a positive participation in main committees. - A main conductor of training course, a workshop, or participates in organizing a conference. - Presents a technical/training support for institutions in his/her major. - Attends an international conference. - Performs an above expectations role in academic advising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carries out duties and works assigned to him/her with high efficiency. - Participates in committees upon appointment. - Participates actively in occupational activities related to his/her major, including attending a regional conference. - Plays an expected role in the domain of academic counseling. - Performs an expectations role in academic advising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carries out part of the duties and tasks assigned to him/her. - Has minimal participation in committees. - Attends the department and the college activities irregularly. - Performs less than expectations role in academic advising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not carry out the duties assigned to him - Has no participation in committees. - Does not attend the department and the college activities - Performs an Unsatisfactory role in academic advising.

Checklists for the academic year (200 / 200)
(To be filled out by the faculty member electronically thru <http://my.qu.edu.qa>)

1. Teaching Performance

1. a. Course:

Data on the course to be presented for evaluation

Course number	Course title	semester	No. of students

1. b. Academic Advising:

- Are you officially in charge of academic advising?

Yes no

- If (yes, define number of the students):

2. Scholarly Effort: %

Preparation and publication of Scholarly works/Participation in Scholarly Projects/Compiling and Translation between (15/5/2010 – 15/5/2012)

Title of the work	Category*	Place of/body responsible for publication	Nature of Participation	Date of publication

* Categories: 1. Published; 2. Accepted for publication; 3. Scholarly project;
 4. Translation; 5. Composition; 6. Work in process

3. University and community service: Percentage %

3. a. Participation in committees/duties (inside and outside University)

Committee or Task	Body/Institution	Nature of the participation	Date*	
			From	to

* In case one has resigned from the committee or completed the task

3. b. Participation in conferences, symposiums, training sessions, and workshops

Subject	Category 1. conference 2. symposium 3. lecturer 4. participant	Date	1. coordinator 2. head of a session 3. lecturer 4. participant	Organizing institute/body	Place

4. Other activities:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">------

Reflection Page

Dear Colleague,

Filling out this form may help the Head of the Department evaluate properly your performance. Therefore, please give your judgments about your activities in the following domains:

* Teaching performance:

- - - -

* Scholarly endeavor:

- - -

* University and community service:

- - -

- In the light of the data you provided above, please lay down the academic work plan for next year.

Objective	Activity

Name of the instructor:

signature:

Date:

Percentage of General Performance
(To be filled out by the Head of the Department)

Percentage of General Faculty Performance					
Serial	Domain	Activity		Percentage	Grade
1	Teaching performance	Teaching process/ course	Grade: -- -----	50% - 60%	
		Students' opinion	Grade: -- -----		
		Academic advising	Grade: -- -----		
2	Scholarly endeavor			10% - 40%	
3	University and community service	University and community service	Grade: -- -----	10% - 30%	
		Academic counseling	Grade: -- -----		
Total				100%	

* **Grade:** Exceptional: 5 Above expected: 4 Expected: 3 Less than Expected: 2 Unsatisfactory: 1

Justification of the result:

How do you describe the faculty member's professional relations: (Give reasons)

Good Unsatisfactory

Faculty signature:

Signature of the Head of the Department:

Dean's Signature:

Date:

- Faculty signature in the specified fields in this guidebook does not necessarily imply his acceptance of the result, but rather to prove that he/she was informed about evaluation results.

Qatar University / Office of Evaluation

Appendix (1)
Faculty Revaluation Form

College:	
Department	
Faculty Name:	
Job Number:	

*** Reasons why the result should be reevaluated:**

-

Signature:	
Date:	

*** How to submit the application form:**

1. The form should be filled out by faculty member and sent to his/her respective Dean's office; copies of the form may be sent to other pertinent offices (e.g. Associate Dean).
2. The concerned Dean should discuss the evaluation results with faculty member in the presence of the Head of the Department.
3. After reviewing the sides of the case, the Dean decides upon the proper .outcome of the appeal.

Appendix (2)
Revaluation Results Form *

College:	
Department	
Faculty Name:	
Job Number:	
Date:	
Venue:	

Revaluation Results

*** Justification of the result:**

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Faculty member:	
Head of Department:	
Dean:	
Date:	

*** This form used by dean of the faculty and keep with the original form; a copy of the form may be sent to faculty member and another copy to the Head of the Department.**

Appendix (3) Professional Development Plan Form

In coordination with the Head of the Department, the Dean may assign a date to meet with faculty whose teaching performance was less than expected or unsatisfactory. The following form may be filled out or used as a guide in documenting this meeting:

Purpose of the meeting
<p>Why faculty member couldn't score the required marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - <p>Performance strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - <p>Domains in his/her performance to be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - -
Suggestions for improvement (Professional Development Plan)
<p>Teaching performance:</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - <p>Future activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - -
<p>Scientific endeavor:</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - <p>Future activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - -
<p>University and community service:</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - <p>Future activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - -

Name of faculty:	
Head of the Department:	
Dean:	
Date	