



7/6 Aaly Tokombaev, 720060,  
Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan  
ИНН 01407199310022 | 999 УККН  
[www.auca.kg](http://www.auca.kg)

## **Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty of AUCA**

Adopted by Academic Senate of AUCA

# Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty of AUCA<sup>1</sup>

## Table of Contents

<b>OBJECTIVE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PRINCIPLES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF AUCA FACULTY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: Faculty Self-evaluation forms .....</b>	<b>10</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidelines have been adapted from *Evaluating College and University Presidents*, AASCU

## **OBJECTIVE**

The objective of this Policy is to establish university-wide standards and procedures to be used in the process of evaluation of faculty of AUCA.

Generally, the purpose of evaluation of faculty is to assess the quality and substance of faculty performance in the context of the University's mission, vision, and strategic goals. The role of any university faculty is exceedingly complex, diverse, and difficult. Accordingly, the evaluation must reflect the role and scope of faculty duties and expectations while fostering a positive climate for growth in professional competence and leadership.

This Policy outlines principles and responsibilities pertaining to the implementation of evaluation. In adopting this policy, the University recognizes that the evaluation of educational provision will involve more than the evaluation of teaching, courses, and programs. The University also recognizes that the resources available to develop and sustain programs may affect their quality. Therefore, the University will continuously evaluate the viability of its programs to use resources to maximum effect. The emphasis of the University evaluation system is on the use of feedback for continuous improvement within university quality assurance processes.

## **PRINCIPLES**

- The policy is grounded in the explicit values and mission of AUCA
- The Policy is based on principles of academic freedom, transparency, openness, accountability, and good governance
- The Policy aims at strengthening the principle of academic excellence, professional growth and sustainability
- It is designed in fostering academic, professional, administrative and leadership growth.

## **PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF AUCA FACULTY**

An evaluation of full-time faculty members', Chairs and Heads of Division performance is carried out regularly before the expiration of the contract. If the contract is a 1 year- evaluation is carried out annually, if the contract is 3 years – evaluation is carried out every 3 years, if the contract is a 5-year contract- evaluation is carried out in the third year and fifth year of the contract.

March 1 is the deadline for submission faculty and chair's self-evaluation to department chairs and heads of divisions

March 15 is the deadline for Chair's and Heads of divisions to submit self-evaluation + evaluation forms to the VPAA

- **Course evaluation by students** which is organized and supervised by the head of CTLT, who is providing the overall reports for each course.
- **Faculty self-evaluation** is undertaken at the end of the academic year and is organized by VPAA and program chairs and division heads. Faculty self-evaluation forms are annexed to the current policy.
- **Peer-observation** is initiated by a program chair and includes, but is not limited to, evaluating of a teacher's interaction with students, students' involvements in class activities, and consistency and quality of the course syllabus. After peer-observation, valuable feedback should be provided to instructors to improve the individual quality of their teaching.

The purpose of the self-evaluation is to document the quality of the faculty member's teaching, research/development, and service. The self-evaluation forms are designed to give the faculty member an opportunity to reflect on the achievements of the previous year and the goals for the coming year and to give the chair a vehicle to offer constructive feedback. The evaluation will also be taken into consideration when making recommendations about salary changes and contract prolongation.

- Each faculty member will be asked to regularly complete the Faculty Self-Evaluation Form (Part I) and send it to the department/program chair. The chair will take into account the faculty member's self-evaluation while completing the Chair's Evaluation of the Faculty Member (Part II) for teaching, research/development, service and planning. The supervisor will then provide a copy of both parts of the evaluation to the faculty member and discuss the evaluation and send them to VPAA.
- Chairs of programs should also annually complete Faculty Self-Evaluation Form and send it to Divisions heads. Heads of Divisions should complete the Heads Evaluation of the Chair and send it to the VPAA.
- If the faculty member does not agree with the chair's evaluation, the faculty member may attach a short statement explaining why. The faculty signature indicates that the faculty has received the evaluation and discussed it with the chair

## Faculty self-evaluation is based on following categories of evaluation

**Category I: Teaching (40-75% of the total evaluation score)** (Percentage range is decided individually at the beginning of each academic year between faculty and department chair.)

A successful evaluation requires excellence in teaching. Evaluation of teaching considers courses at all levels of the curriculum; work with students in the classroom and outside of it; tutorials, independent studies, and Senior thesis supervision; advising; innovation in course design and pedagogical methods; participation in programmatic, divisional, and college-wide discussion of curriculum; contributions to relevant programs; and fulfillment of curricular needs of the programs and of the University.

**Category II: Professional and research activity (25-40% of the total evaluation score)** (Percentage range is decided individually at the beginning of each academic year between faculty and department chair.)

A successful evaluation requires excellence in professional work, which consists of written scholarly work and/or performed or exhibited artistic work, in the public arena; such work is distinct from work in Category I. The evaluation of professional work involves both works done prior to the evaluation and plans for future work, and it considers publications, exhibitions, performances, professional development and other activities that demonstrate an active scholarly or artistic engagement with the discipline at the professional level.

**Category III: Service to the Community and to the University (20-30% of the total evaluation score)** (Percentage range is decided individually at the beginning of each academic year between faculty and department chair.)

A successful evaluation requires demonstrated responsibility and ongoing contribution (commensurate with seniority), in work in the wider community. This work consists of all the types of faculty activity that are needed to make the pedagogical mission of AUCA succeed, and that are distinct from work in Category I and Category II. Evaluation of work in the community considers, but is not limited to, the following: engagement with the community; the ability to work with colleagues of your specialty; leadership as needed in performing relevant community tasks such as refereeing for journals and publishers, membership of editorial boards, involvement in the assessment of grants, promotions, projects, etc.

## Evaluation Rubrics

### Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching (40-75% max. of the total score)

<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.
-------------------------------	--

<b>Needs improvement</b> (2)	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.
<b>Satisfactory</b> (3)	Provides evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).
<b>Very good</b> (4)	Exceeds expected performance in at least <b>two ways</b> , including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; &gt;3.51 where 5 is highest);</li> <li>– Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards /competencies or updating materials);</li> <li>– Curriculum development activity;</li> <li>– Support of graduate research efforts;</li> <li>– Student advisement;</li> <li>– Coordination of academic program;</li> <li>– Contribution to the public affairs mission;</li> <li>– Innovative use of instructional technology;</li> <li>– Development of internet courses; or</li> <li>– Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation.</li> </ul>
<b>Excellent</b> (5)	High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest); Meeting above expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the Above Expected criteria.

**Evidence of Quality Teaching:**

- student evaluations and/or student feedback
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching

- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
- direction of theses or special projects
- service on thesis defense committees
- department head assessment of the candidate’s availability to students, collegiality, participation in curricular development, appropriate use of instructional technology
- other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty.

**Rubrics for professional and research activity (25-40% max. of the total score)**

<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a satisfactory manner in their profession, including research.
<b>Needs improvement (2)</b>	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their profession, including research.
<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>	At least one product from Category B, or at least two products from Category C.
<b>Very good (4)</b>	At least one scholarship product from Category A or at two products from B or C.
<b>Excellent (5)</b>	At least two scholarship product from Category A and one scholarship product from B or C.

**CATEGORY A**

- Scholarly/research articles published in international peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international peer-reviewed publications
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort (not funded).
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media
- National or international awards for research

**CATEGORY B**

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).

- Performance or exhibited artistic work, in the public arena. Performances, professional development and other activities that demonstrate an active scholarly or artistic engagement with the discipline at the professional level.

**CATEGORY C**

- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work and electronic presentation other than electronic media as described above.
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research from the University
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one’s own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.

**Service to the University and to the Community (20-30% max. of the total score)**

<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service
<b>Needs improvement (2)</b>	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.
<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>	Attained success in one of the Service Activities, listed below.
<b>Very good (4)</b>	Service extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrates attained success in one area of service to the community
<b>Excellent (5)</b>	Extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrate Sustained success in more than one areas of service to the community

**Examples of Service Activities to the Community (the list is not exhaustive)**

- Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels
- Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;
- Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state,



- national, and/or international levels;
- Sponsoring an active student organization;
  - Providing mentoring or advising;
  - Writing op-eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc.
  - Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries
  - Volunteering for local, community, national, and international organizations
  - Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
  - Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations
  - Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise

**Examples of Service Activities to the University (the list is not exhaustive)**

- Program service (e.g., participation in accreditation process, academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching);
- Departmental service (any service, as judged by appropriate program faculty member/coordinator)
- University service (e.g. chair or member of Senate University committees, membership in sub-committees of the Senate, IRB board, membership at ad hoc academic or non-academic committees, helping in development valuable University documents and policies)
- Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
- Active participation at the AUCA partner university activities (Bard College, Indiana University and OSUN).

**APPENDIX A: Faculty Self-evaluation  
forms**

**American University of Central Asia**  
**Faculty Self- Evaluation**  
**Forms**

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Department/Program</b>	

The purpose of the evaluation is to document the quality of the faculty member’s teaching, research/development, and service. The forms are designed to give the faculty member an opportunity to reflect on the achievements of the previous year and the goals for the coming year and to give the chair a vehicle to offer constructive feedback. The evaluation will also be taken into consideration when making recommendations about salary changes and contract prolongation.

- Each faculty member is asked to complete the Faculty Self-Evaluation Form (Part I) and send it to the department/program chair. The chair will take into account the faculty member’s self-evaluation while completing the Chair’s Evaluation of the Faculty Member (Part II) for teaching, research/development, service and planning. The supervisor will then provide a copy of both parts of the evaluation to the faculty member and discuss the evaluation.
- Chairs of programs should also annually complete Faculty Self-Evaluation Form and send it to Divisions heads. Heads of Divisions should complete the Heads Evaluation of the Chair and send it to the VPAA.

If the faculty member does not agree with the chair’s evaluation, the faculty member may attach a short statement explaining why. The faculty signature indicates that the faculty has received the evaluation and discussed it with the chair.

Summary of self-evaluation (Please rate yourself on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet)

	<b>Self-Evaluation</b>					<b>%</b>
	<b>(1 is low, 5 is highest possible)</b>					
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
1. Category I: Teaching ( <b>40-75%</b> of the total evaluation score evaluation)						
2. Category II: Professional Work, including research activity ( <b>25-40%</b> of the total evaluation score)						
3. Category III: Service to the Community and to the University ( <b>20-30%</b> of the total evaluation score)						
<b>Total %</b>						

**Part I**  
**Faculty Self-Evaluation Form**  
**Category I: Teaching (40-75% of the total evaluation score)**

1. Please indicate courses taught in the last review period

Year/Sem	Dept.	Course Title	Enrollment

(Please rate yourself on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet)

2. Practiced student-centered teaching:

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

3. Provided sufficient feedback in comprehensible formats:

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

4. Offered a variety of teaching and learning methods:

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

5. Facilitated independent learning by students:

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**6. Used technology for teaching appropriately and sufficiently:**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**7. Met with students during office hours or by appointment regarding their coursework:**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**8. All course syllabi and e-course are detailed and easy to use, having detailed rubrics for all assignments:**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**9. Summarize the student evaluations of your courses' strengths and weaknesses. Do you agree, and if so, how are you going to respond?**

**10. What kinds of professional development, including pedagogical training have you engaged in in the last review period (for example, CTL workshops, attending panels at professional conferences, attending workshops, etc.)?**

**11. Theses advised**

Year	Name of Student	Topic

**Category II: Professional Work, including research activity (25-40% of the total evaluation score)**

(Please rate yourself on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet)

**12.** Conducted a scholarly work (publications in Category A, B and C: check the evaluation policy)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**13.** Participated in research projects (received research grants, projects, consultancy or any other research in Category A, B and C):

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**14.** Participated in conferences, roundtables, workshops, seminars and other research and professional development activities

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**15.** List scholarly work that you have published in the last review period (publications in Category A, B and C: check the evaluation policy)

**16.** List research projects that you were involved in the last review period (research grants, projects, consultancy or any other research in Category A, B and C):

**17.** List conferences, roundtables, workshops, seminars and other research and professional development activities that you have attended in the last review period.

**Category III: Service to the Community and to the University**  
**(20-30% of the total evaluation score)**

(Please rate yourself on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet)

**18.** Made a contribution to the work of AUCA Senate or Senate committees (for examples please see self-evaluation policy)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**19.** Made a contribution as a part of intra-departmental or other AUCA committees, task forces or working groups (for examples please see self-evaluation policy)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**20.** Made a contribution to a work of a department or a program (for examples please see self-evaluation policy)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**21.** Made a contribution to services activities to community (for examples please see self-evaluation policy)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**22.** List University Committees where you have served in the review period

**23.** In addition to teaching and research, how have you contributed to your department/program and to the University?

**24.** List any community service activity in which you participated in the review period.

**Part II**  
**Chair's Evaluation of the AUCA Full-time Faculty**  
**Head of Division's Evaluation of the Chair**

To be completed annually by the Department/Program Chair or Division Head

Name of the Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Program/Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the Chair/Head: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Program/Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching Effectiveness & Performance of Assigned Task (40-75%) = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Professional Development/Research (25-40%) = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Service to University or Community Representative (20-30%) = \_\_\_\_\_**

**TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_**

**FACULTY COMMENTS (if desired)**

\_\_\_\_\_ Check here if comments are attached.

**Faculty's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_**

(Signature does not imply agreement with the evaluation.)

**Chair's/ Head's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_**

**VPAA's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_**



**I. Category I: Teaching (40-75%) of the total evaluation score)**

(Please rate faculty on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Chair or Head of Divisions Comments:

**II. Category II: Professional Work, including research activity (25-40%) of the total evaluation score)**

(Please rate faculty on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Chair or Head of Divisions Comments:

**III. Category III: Service to the Community and to the University (20-30%) of the total evaluation score)**

(Please rate faculty on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Chair or Head of Divisions Comments:

#### IV. Summary/Conclusions

(Please rate faculty on provided scales for each criterion) (1- unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-very good, 5-excellet).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Chair or Head of Divisions Comments: