# ACADEMIC EVALUATION SYSTEM

## CHAIRPERSON/DEAN RATING OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

### FORM FE-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member’s Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 = Superior          2 = Good          1 = Needs Improvement

Rating x Weight = Score

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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  
\( \text{Score} \div 30 \times 100 = \)
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.