PERIODIC EVALUATION - ANNUAL
LECTURERS - PRIMARY FORM

This form is for informational purposes only. All evaluations will be entered in eFaculty.

Annual evaluation of lecturers for the prior calendar year are reported on this form by the primary evaluator(s), either the department committee or the department chair. The first level of review must submit this form. Subsequent reviewers need not use this form.

For example, if this form is submitted by a committee, the department chair may write a separate review if they did not serve on the committee. However, this form is not required. There is a "Periodic Evaluation - Annual & Cumulative - Reviewer Comments" form they may use.

Faculty Appointment Information
Name *
Employee ID *
Lecturer Range *
• L-A
• L-B
• L-C
• L-D
Appointment Type *
• Full-Time
• Part-Time
Department/School *

Reviewers
Name of Person Submitting Review *
Review Level *
• Department/School Committee
• Department Chair/School Director
• Dean or Appropriate Administrator

Materials Reviewed *
This evaluation is based on the ASA and the following sources of information. Please note that F12-6 states: Information from SOTEs is but one source of information for assessing teaching effectiveness. Additional sources of information pertaining to faculty teaching effectiveness must also be considered when reaching any personnel decision.
• SOTEs and/or SOLATEs
• Direct Observations of Teaching
• Other Teaching Materials (e.g., Syllabi, Tests, Assignments)
• Department Performance Evaluation(s)
• Other
Evaluation

ACADEMIC ASSIGNMENT: TEACHING, SUPERVISION, AND/OR OTHER ACADEMIC WORK ASSIGNMENTS

Please rate performance on the scale below. (Required if faculty member was teaching.)
PLEASE NOTE: if there is a particular component of the faculty assignment that deviates from the overall rating (e.g., teaching one particular subject was unsatisfactory) please provide one overall rating on the scale here, but explain and rate the "carve out" below in comments.

- Commendable
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

ACADEMIC ASSIGNMENT: TEACHING, SUPERVISION, AND/OR OTHER ACADEMIC WORK ASSIGNMENTS
Comments required if faculty member was teaching. Please evaluate this faculty member's performance on assigned duties related to teaching or academic assignment. Please explain the rating on the scale above.
Note: Please rate and explain any "carve out" evaluation here.


SERVICE TO STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSION

Please rate service performance only if applicable to the work assignment on the scale below.
PLEASE NOTE: if there is a particular component of the faculty assignment that deviates from the overall rating (e.g., advising majors was unsatisfactory) please provide one overall rating on the scale here, but explain and rate the "carve out" below in comments.

- Commendable
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

SERVICE TO STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSION
Comments required only if faculty member was appointed to service duties. Please evaluate this faculty member's performance on assigned duties related to service. Please explain the rating on the scale above.
Note: Please rate and explain any "carve out" evaluation here.
ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, QUALIFICATIONS, RSCA, AND/OR CONTRIBUTIONS
Please rate RSCA and Other Achievements only if applicable to the work assignment on the scale below. PLEASE NOTE: if there is a particular component of the faculty assignment that deviates from the overall rating (e.g., laboratory research productivity was unsatisfactory) please provide one overall rating on the scale here, but explain and rate the "carve out" below in comments.

- Commendable
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, QUALIFICATIONS, RSCA, AND/OR CONTRIBUTIONS
Comments required only if faculty member was appointed to RSCA or Other duties. Please evaluate this faculty member's performance on assigned duties related to this area of professional achievement. Please explain the rating on the scale above.

Note: Please rate and explain any "carve out" evaluation here.