



Guideline Title: Guideline for Instructor's Performance Evaluation

Guideline No.: 0003

Issuing Authority: Mizan-Tepi University Senate

Year: 2017/18

Modification History: Revised



Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Short Title	2
3. Scope.....	2
4. Objectives	2
5. General Provisions and Procedures	3
6. Weight	5
7. General Direction:	5
8. Annexes	6
FORM A: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY STUDENTS	7
FORM B: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY DEPARTMENT HEAD.....	9
FORM C: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY PEER.....	11
FORM D: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION (FOR SELF EVALUATION)	15
FORM E: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET.....	18

1. Introduction

Performance evaluation of instructors in higher education involves gathering evidence about students' participation and achievement; and processes for intended purposes.

It is one of the most important tools we have to recognize and improve skills of the individuals who contribute for the success of our University. In a rapidly changing working environment, it is absolutely necessary that the performance evaluation should be taken place frequently. It allows instructors, department heads, and other concerned bodies to adjust goals in a timely manner.

Performance evaluation instruments should be implemented to monitor our actions and for the evaluation of quality teaching though often challenged in reality. But as teaching is primarily appraised through activity and input indicators, the institutions struggle to create reliable evaluation instruments. Although quality teaching is an influential factor on learning outcomes, it is difficult to isolate (and thereby support) the right factors that most affect learning outcomes in the absence of appropriate evaluation tools.

Given the profound influence that instructors have on student achievement, accurately evaluating their performance is a natural control point for increasing instructor quality and expanding student learning.

A formal performance review provides fair and consistent documentation of the contribution that the instructors make to the department's programs. It serves as an ongoing planning and goal setting tool. It enhances communication between instructors and students and among colleagues in the respective department.

To go in line with the newly developed senate legislation; and also because in the former instructors performance evaluation formats performance indicators for each standards are not clearly put in a focused manner, the values for the rating scales are not put clearly , also this guideline urges any academic leader to be evaluated as an instructor .



Thus, developing the existing performance evaluation of instructors which will be effective after endorsement by the University senate has become imperative for our University.

This guideline puts in place its relationship to the concerned national policies and is also subservient to the existing national policies.

2. Short Title

This guideline shall be cited as: "Mizan-Tepi University Guideline for Instructors Performance Evaluation."

3. Scope

This guideline is applicable to all Mizan-Tepi University instructors at all levels.

4. Objectives

- to enhance the quality of learning opportunities offered to students;
- to be instrumental that enhances transparency in handling instructors performance evaluation related issues;
- to fill the gap timely that an instructor may have;
- to scale up good experiences of instructors among the staff members;
- to improve instruction and raise achievement;
- to able to use instructor evaluation as a means to identify instructors recognize and reward those who are effective or not;
- to support the continuous growth and development of each instructor by monitoring, analyzing, and applying pertinent data compiled within a system of meaningful feedback;
- to harmonize the evaluation system at University level.

5. General Provisions and Procedures

5.1 Performance evaluation of instructors will be conducted at respective department level.

5.2 There shall be independent schedule set for this purpose and known by all concerned bodies.

5.3 The participation of concerned bodies (students, department heads/leaders/ and instructors) is vital, as they are at the interface between an institution's decision-making bodies and instructors on the job. All have the responsibility of conducting the evaluation in a fair and transparent way.

5.4 Department head (chairperson) with two staff members (one possibly female) as an ad-hoc committee/ officially delegated body by department council composed of three members will administer and are responsible to select students and staff for evaluation.

5.5 For students evaluation 30% of the classroom students (the instructor is teaching) out of which 10% are from higher achievers, 10% from medium, and the remaining 10 % from lower achievers will be randomly selected considering gender mix.

5.6 For peer evaluation, 50% of instructors from the respective department will be randomly selected by the ad-hoc committee/official delegate.

5.7 For head evaluation to be filled by academic staff, 50% of the staff from the respective department will be randomly selected by the ad-hoc committee/official delegate;

5.8 The department head with members of the ad-hoc committee will explain the purpose of the evaluation for the selected students and staff members.

5.9 The evaluation has to be conducted before final examination and after completion of at least 90% of the course.

5.10 The department head has to announce the time for all concerned bodies before conducting the evaluation.

5.11 Instructors' performance evaluation will be conducted once per a semester.

5.12 All academic leaders in any level shall be evaluated in their respective departments and should have semester based evaluation.

5.13 Evaluation of an instructor shall be done in any of a section that he/she teaches; the selection could be made by the ad-hoc committee/the delegate.

5.14 Every evaluation of an instructor should be archived at department/college/school/University level.

5.15 The evaluation result of an instructor should be summarized and submitted officially:-

5.15.1 from the respective department to college/school/institute within two weeks of time after end of the semester.

5.15.2 From college/school/institute to academic affairs vice president office within a week time.

5.15.3 The academic affairs vice president office should officially send to archive making cc to the instructor and department.

5.16 Good experiences have to be scale up among the staff members and gaps have to be filled respectively by the department/college/school/institute in consultation with other concerned offices/directorates.

5.17 When it is deemed appropriate or requested by either the reviews can be conducted in a more frequent basis.

5.18 In exceptional cases where an instructor is not handling courses due to other assignments given by the University or any other justifiable and acceptable reason, the weighted evaluation of student shall be waived and the rest criteria evaluation can be taken out of 100%.

5.19 If an instructor scores below 75 %, different capacity building training shall be arranged.

5.20 If an instructor scores below 50 % his/her contractual agreement shall be terminated.

6. Weight

- 6.1 All instructors in the University shall be evaluated by students, peer, department head and himself/herself.
- 6.2 The contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation put here under to the overall rating of the performance of a instructor shall be as follows.

	Evaluator	Weight
1	Students	40%
2	Department Head	35
3	Peer	15
4	Self evaluation	10

7. General Direction:

Read each of lists of statements put in the respective formats that could help you evaluate the instructor named and rate your instructor's performance *by putting "X" mark* from the following rating options given below:

(5) Excellent :	Performance is consistently very high. The practice is demonstrated at a very high level.
(4) Very Good:	Performance is consistently high. Teaching practices are demonstrated at a high level.
(3) Good :	Performance is consistently Adequate /acceptable. Teaching practice fully meet all performance expectations at an acceptable level.
(2) Fair:	Performance is sometimes inadequate /unacceptable and needs improvement.
(1) Poor:	Performance is consistently inadequate or unacceptable and most practices require considerable improvement to fully meet minimum expectations.
(0)Zero	If not done at all
NA:	If the criteria of evaluation does not apply for the instructor.



8. Annexes

The following instructor's evaluation formats are attached with this guideline

Form A: Evaluation format to be filled by students

Form B: Evaluation format to be filled by department heads

Form C: Evaluation format to be filled by peer

Form D: Self evaluation format

Form E: Evaluation summery sheet

FORM A: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY STUDENTS

Instructor's Name-----

College/School.....Department.....Course Title-----

Course Code-----Academic Year-----Date of evaluation-----

Batch (I, II, III, IV, V)Semester (I, II):.....

No	Evaluation focus and Criterion	Rating scale						
		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1.	Presents the course objective clearly.							
2.	Specifies the activities to be done during the lesson clearly.							
3.	Explains the content of each units/chapters clearly.							
4.	Covers the course content according to time table given.							
5.	Presents the course clearly using the language of instruction.							
6.	Responds students' question positively.							
7.	Links the lesson clearly to the previous and future lessons.							
8.	Adapts knowledge to the level of the learners.							
9.	Makes students active participant during teaching and learning.							
10.	Tries to support students' attempt in solving problems.							
11.	Gives time for students during lessons.							
12.	Uses a variety of teaching techniques to accommodate different student learning styles.							
13.	Make the class thought provoking and interesting.							
14.	Gives make up classes properly if classes are missed							
15.	Gives tutorial classes properly when assigned							
Professional Ethics and Attitude Towards Students								
16	Begins and ends class on time.							
17	Makes effective use of class time (time on task).							
18	Gives consultation service for students in arranged							



	hours.						
19	Shows genuine concern for student's learning/problems.						
20	Encourages students to freely express feelings/opinion/ideas in classes.						
21	Encourages students' peer/cooperative learning.						
22	Acts in a professionally acceptable manner.						
23	Able to handle classroom atmosphere conducive.						

Assessment Methods & Feedback

24	Checks if students have understood the topic.						
25	Assesses students' learning with various techniques.						
26	Shows timely students results in every assessment.						
27	Gives subsequent feedback on time.						
28	Constructs tests that represent the course content.						
29	Allots appropriate time to complete exams.						
30	Assesses student performance continually to improve instruction.						

Overall evaluation of the students

Strengths of the Instructor?

Suggested points/aspects the instructor should improve.

FORM B: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY DEPARTMENT HEAD

Instructor's Name-----

College/School.....Department.....Course Title-----

Course Code-----Academic Year-----Date of evaluation-----

Batch (I, II, III, IV, V)Semester (I, II):.....

No	Evaluation Criteria	Scale						
		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
Core Competency								
1	Efforts of self development in his/her specialization							
2	Adequacy of subject matter knowledge							
3	Willingness to accept additional teaching assignments when compelling situation arises in the institute							
4	Willingness to accept related assignments other than regular teaching in the department							
5	Effectiveness as a mentor in educational development army, internship etc.							
6	Active participation in improvement of teaching-learning process							
7	Effectiveness in performing as an academic advisor							
8	Participation in community service affairs							
9	Participating actively in seminars/workshop/symposia							
10	Identifying priority areas in one's discipline and pursuing research in that area							
11	Participation in research project and project proposal development							
12	Active participation in community service endeavors							
Professional Competency								
13	Participation in problem identification and solving at department/college/institution							
14	Proper implementation of continuous assessment of students learning							
15	Participating actively in departmental/College/institution affairs							
16	Providing and reporting tutorial activities designed for the students							
17	Participation in preparation and reviewing of teaching materials							
18	Updating teaching materials							
19	Willingness to share University resources with other colleagues							
Time Management								
20	Executing assigned classes/invigilation on time.							
21	Notifying and implementing consultation timely							

22	Giving timely feedback to students						
23	Meeting deadlines (in reporting, SIMS result feeding, submission of grade/documents..etc)						
Ethical Competency							
24	Having positive attitude to work with others						
25	Showing concern for the use of resources of the department and the University						
26	Willingness and participation in committee works at department /University level						
27	Willingness to take assignments outside the University in his area of specialization						
28	His/her professional ethics (dressing, hair style, personality...)						

Overall evaluation of the department head

Strengths of the Instructor?

Suggested points/aspects the instructor should improve.



FORM C: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION TO BE FILLED BY PEER

Instructor's Name College/School Department

Course Title Course Code Academic Year Date of evaluation

Batch (I, II, III, IV, V) Semester (I, II)

No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scale					
		5	4	3	2	1	0
Subject Matter Competency							
1	Contribution in preparing and searching for teaching materials						
2	Continuous update of the subject matter						
3	Attending seminars organized by the department/college/school/institute						
4	Level of his/her subject matter knowledge and skill						
Research and Community Services							
5	Willingness and level of engagement in community service activities						
6	Participation on seminars/workshops at department/ college/school/ institute level during the year						
7	Identifying priority areas in one's discipline and pursuing research in that area						
8	Willingness to prepare research projects with other colleagues						
9	Willingness to help colleagues in identifying areas of research and proposal Development						
Professional Competency							
10	Guidance and counseling role to students						
11	Contributing ideas and activities that improve the teaching learning process.						
12	Participation in problem identification and solving at department/college/institution						
13	Willingness and preparedness to implement change tools						
14	Willing to actively participate in 1-5 grouping(Education development army) Activities						
15	Implementation of different teaching methods in his/her discipline.						
16	Properly invigilate exams and tests to ensure academic integrity						
Ethical Competency							
17	Willingness to participate and level of commitment in committee works						
18	Participating actively in departmental/college/ institute meetings						
19	Willingness to share university resources with other colleagues						
20	Showing cordiality to others						
21	Having positive attitude to work with others						
22	Respecting ideas of others						
23	Level of respect to rules and guidelines of the institution						
24	His/her discipline (dressing, addictions, personality etc...)						
Time Management							
25	Time management in department Affairs						
26	Time utilization for consultation hours						

Overall assessment of the peer

Strengths of the Instructor?

Suggested points/aspects the instructor should improve.

FORM D: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION (FOR SELF EVALUATION)

Instructor's Name-----College/School.....Department-----Course

Title-----Course Code-----Academic Year-----Date of evaluation-----

Batch (I, II, III, IV, V)Semester (I, II):.....

No	Evaluation focus and Criterion	Rating scale					
		5	4	3	2	1	0
1.	Presents the course objective clearly.						
2.	Specifies the activities to be done during the lesson clearly.						
3.	Explains the content of each units/chapters clearly.						
4.	Covers the course content according to time table given.						
5.	Presents the course clearly using the language of instruction.						
6.	Responds students' question positively.						
7.	Links the lesson clearly to the previous and future lessons.						
8.	Adapts knowledge to the level of the learners.						
9.	Makes students active participant during teaching and learning.						
10.	Tries to support students' attempt in solving problems.						
11.	Gives time for students during lessons.						
12.	Uses a variety of teaching techniques to accommodate different student learning styles.						
13.	Make the class thought provoking and interesting.						
14.	Gives make up classes properly if classes are missed						
15.	Gives tutorial classes properly when assigned						
Professional Ethics and Attitude Towards Students		5	4	3	2	1	0
1.	Begins and ends class on time.						
2	Makes effective use of class time (time on task).						
3.	Gives consultation service for students in arranged hours.						
4.	Shows genuine concern for student's learning/problems.						
5.	Encourages students to freely express their feelings/opinion/ideas in classes.						
6	Encourages students' peer/cooperative learning.						
7.	Acts in a professionally acceptable manner.						
8	Able to handle classroom atmosphere conducive.						

Assessment Methods & Feedback		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1.	Provides students with appropriate assignments.							
2	Checks if students have understood the topic.							
3.	Assesses students' learning with various techniques.							
4.	Shows timely students results in every assessment.							
5.	Gives subsequent feedback on time.							
6.	Constructs tests that represent the course content.							
7.	Allots appropriate time to complete exams.							
8.	Assesses student performance continually to improve instruction.							
9.	Uses continuous assessment during instruction.							
Overall Personal Behavior		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1.	Offers appropriate respect for his/her colleagues and heads.							
2.	Keeps dignity of his/her job and professional ethics.							
3.	Free from alcohol and any drug addiction.							
4.	Arrives on time for appointments/ meetings she/he has with colleagues for institutional activities.							
5.	To be role model for students and surrounding society.							
6.	Takes appropriate care for materials he/she borrows from the institution for teaching –learning process.							
7.	To be free from considering others work or findings as if it is his/her own.							
8.	Raises his /her complains in the right way to the appropriate body.							
10.	Proposes ideas on how teaching –learning activities could be improved in his/her department.							
Professional Attitude		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1	Attends in professional meetings and seminars.							
2	Participates in activities to improve personal knowledge.							
3	Participates in solving the problem arises in the department							
4	Engages Professional researches in his/her field.							
5	Lets the concerned college community know the outcome of his/her research.							
6	Gets him/her self ready to share his/her knowledge and experience to his/her colleagues.							



7	Accepts constructive comments of evaluation and attempts to put in to practice for improvement.							
8	Shows willingness to help less experienced colleagues in identifying areas of research and develop proposals.							
9	Performs additional mandates/responsibilities given to him/her.							
10	Participates in the instructor's performance efficiency evaluation which takes place in his/her department.							
11	Participates with other college and the department head in curriculum development and in accomplishing the instructional mission of the department.							
12	Adheres to establish laws, policies, rules and regulations that are important for the teaching and learning effectiveness.							
13	Service, especially in a leadership role, on major university and college committees.							
14	Handles resources and materials carefully and wisely.							
Interpersonal Relationship Capability.		5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1	Participates in the development of a broad vision of the university.							
2	Fosters relationships with institutions, colleagues, department and communities to support students learning and well-being.							
3	Is aware of, and acts in accordance with the university policies and practices.							
4	Holds meetings with students to discuss their learning problems.							
5	Communicates with students and instructors positively.							
6	Works cooperatively with his/her department head.							
7	Works collegial with other college and staff in the Department							

FORM E: INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET

Instructor's Name-----College/School.....,.....Department-----

Course Title-----Course Code-----Academic Year-----

Date of evaluation-----Batch (I, II, III, IV, V) Semester (I, II):.....

I. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION BY THE STUDENTS OUT OF 40 (%)

Focus Area of the Evaluation	Average result out of 5	Total result out of 40 %	Remark
Instructional Skills			
Professional Ethics & Attitude			
Towards Students			
Assessment Method & Feedback			
Sum Total			

II. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION BY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD OUT OF 35 (%)

Focus Area of the Evaluation	Average result out of 5	Total result out of 35 %	Remark
Core Competency			
Professional Competency			
Time Management			
Ethical Competency			
Sum Total			

III. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION BY THE PEER 15 (%)

Focus Area of the Evaluation	Average result out of 5	Total result out of 15 %	Remark
Subject Matter Competency			
Research & Community Service			
Professional Competency			
Ethical Competency			
Time Management			
Sum Total			

IV. SUMMARY OF SELF EVALUATION OUT OF 10(%)

Focus Area of the Evaluation	Average result out of 5	Total result out of 10%	Remark
Instructional skill			
Professional Ethics and attitude towards Students			
Assessment methods & feedback			
Overall personal behavior			
Professional attitude			
Performing non- instructional duties			
Interpersonal relationship capacity			
Sum Total			

V. TOTAL RESULT OUT OF 100 (%)

Evaluator	Result	Remark
Evaluation by students out of 40 %		
Evaluation by department/leader out of 35 %		
Evaluation by peer out of 15 %		
Self evaluation by an instructor out of 10 %		
Sum Total		

VI. FINAL COMMENT BY THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE/HEAD

- A. Appreciable strengths of the instructor.

- A. Points to be improved.

Name of the instructor ----- date ----- sign. -----

Name of the leader ----- date ----- sign. -----

Note that: It will be prepared with three copies; one copy to the instructor, one copy to the department and one copy to the College/School.

(Instructors signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with evaluation only that evaluator reviewed with instructor.)

