

**ACADEMIC EVALUATION SYSTEM**

**CHAIRPERSON/DEAN RATING OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

**FORM FE-1**

Faculty Member's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

3 = Superior

2 = Good

1 = Needs Improvement

Rating x Weight = Score

1            2            3  
\_\_\_\_\_

A. Preparation for Teaching (30%) \_\_\_\_\_ × 3 = \_\_\_\_\_

B. Classroom Presentation (30%) \_\_\_\_\_ × 3 = \_\_\_\_\_

Comment:

C. Evaluation of Student Achievement (10%) \_\_\_\_\_ × 3 = \_\_\_\_\_

Comment:

D. Response to Individual Student Needs (20%) \_\_\_\_\_ × 3 = \_\_\_\_\_

Comment:

E. Professional Conduct (10%)

Comment:

---

General Comments:  
(Comments are not required)

Sum of Scores \_\_\_\_\_ ÷ 30 × 100 = \_\_\_\_\_

**Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness:**

3 SUPERIOR

This rating should be used only in rare cases. It carries the implication that the individual's performance in a particular area of activity reflects the highest degree of productivity and effectiveness.

2 GOOD

This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light. In a group, no matter what level, there is a middle range of performance. This rating implies that the individual has been productive and effective in the area that is being evaluated. It is expected that this rating will be the one which is most frequently applied.

3 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

This rating indicates that the performance in this area is not satisfactory, but that the shortcoming may be compensated by other strengths. Continued overall performance at this level may be grounds for dismissal.