



Rules and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the AUT University Council of 18 March 2025

Purpose and Guiding Principles

Article 1: The faculty evaluation process is conducted annually and serves as an essential component of decisions related to promotion and salary increases. The evaluation provides a structured opportunity for faculty members to reflect upon their performance, plan for professional development, and receive constructive feedback.

Article 2: The evaluation takes the University standards as reference and shall serve the University's mission.

Article 3: Faculty evaluations are grounded in AUT academic values and the principle of peer review. They should be considered a collaborative process that allows faculty members to reflect once per year upon their strengths, challenges, and growth opportunities.

Article 4: The evaluation is twofold:

1. Self-Evaluation – The faculty member provides an honest self-assessment of her/his performance across all relevant areas.
2. Peer Evaluation – The dean provides a formal evaluation based on performance data, institutional goals, and departmental expectations.

Article 5: The evaluation encompasses the following categories:

1. Teaching Performance – Including course delivery, student engagement, innovation in pedagogy, and feedback from students.
2. Scholarship and Research – Including research productivity, publication quality, grant acquisition, and academic contributions.
3. Service to the Institution and Community – Including committee work, mentorship, and contributions to the broader academic or local community.

Evaluation Procedure

Article 6: The evaluation should take place annually, with the process beginning towards the end of the Spring semester. A clear schedule is to be communicated to all faculty members.

Article 7: A standard evaluation form is to be made available possibly online, with clear instructions for each section.

AUT Policies and Procedures: Faculty Evaluation Rules and Procedures

Article 8: The provost, in consultation with the president, informs deans of the start date for faculty evaluations. The evaluation period must not exceed four weeks to allow sufficient time for comprehensive assessment.

Article 9: The dean will distribute the evaluation forms to faculty members, requesting them to complete the self-assessment parts.

Article 10: Faculty members must submit their self-assessment forms by the deadline set by the dean. This deadline will allow sufficient time for review before the peer evaluation meeting.

Article 11: After submission, the dean will schedule a meeting with the faculty member in a neutral, private setting. The dean shall ask clarifying questions to better understand the self-assessment, focusing on specific evidence and performance metrics.

Article 12: After the meeting the dean completes the peer-evaluation part of the form.

Article 13: The dean will send the completed evaluation form to the provost and to the vice president for effectiveness and institutional strategy. The form should include the self-assessment and dean's evaluation, and any additional information.

Article 14: The vice president for effectiveness and institutional strategy will study the evaluation outcomes and share related information and comments with the provost.

Article 15: The provost will meet with each dean to review the outcomes of faculty evaluations, discuss any disparities, and ensure consistency across departments. A final version of the evaluation forms will be created and saved in the provost's office. A copy will be sent to the vice president for effectiveness and to the president.

Article 16: The president calls the provost and the vice president for effectiveness and institutional strategy for a meeting to discuss the outcomes of the evaluation.

Article 17: The provost will compile a summary report about the major outcomes of the faculty evaluations, which will be shared with the president, and may be used for institutional planning and improvements. This report will anonymize individual results to protect confidentiality.

Additional Considerations:

- 1. Student Feedback:** For teaching evaluations, student feedback should be incorporated through existing mechanisms (end-of-semester surveys). If additional student input is needed, the dean may request feedback from relevant courses or student groups.
- 2. Campus Director Feedback:** For faculty members teaching at off-Halat Campus, the Campus Director may provide additional insights into faculty performance, or Deans and Provost may seek his input, particularly in relation to institutional priorities, campus-wide initiatives, and engagement beyond departmental contributions.
- 3. Actionable Development Plans:** The final evaluation should not only highlight areas for improvement but also propose specific, actionable steps. These could include further training, mentoring, or changes in teaching methods, research goals, or service roles.

4. Annual Check-ins for Progress: Faculty members, if they feel the need to, should have the opportunity to meet with the dean mid-year to discuss progress on their development goals, allowing for adjustments and continued support.

4. Confidentiality and Transparency: Faculty evaluations should be treated as confidential documents. However, the process should maintain transparency, and faculty should have access to their own evaluation reports and the opportunity to discuss them with the dean and provost.