Academic Performance Evaluation and Professional Development of Faculty
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

Faculty Member's Name: Click or tap here to enter text.
SAP Personnel #: Click or tap here to enter text.
Department/Units: Click or tap here to enter text.

Evaluation Year: Click or tap here to enter text.
Rank: Click or tap here to enter text.
Position Title:Click or tap here to enter text.
Appointment: Teaching%_____ Service% __
Scholarly Work % ____Other% _____

Provide comments to the faculty member that are both summative (noting performance during the year evaluated) and formative (ways to improve the existing level of performance). Choose one evaluation category (at end of form) that is reflective of the faculty member's overall performance during the year evaluated. Not all performance areas have equal weight in determining the overall evaluation. Faculty will submit a 2 to 3-page report documenting the following areas outlined below.

PERFORMANCE AREAS	COMMENTS
Accomplishments The faculty member documents: • That student learning outcomes were assessed in all courses, results were summarized, and the outcome of that analysis was used to improve subsequent teaching activities. • Accomplishments focused on meeting goals and objectives related to department and NCTA vision and strategic plans. • Establishment of linkages/teams necessary to accomplish goals. • Creativity/flexibility in meeting goals/objectives. • Program and curriculum advancements, equipment upgrades, classroom/lab enhancements, etc.	
Impacts The faculty member documents: • Meaningful impacts related to goals and objectives that department and NCTA vision and strategic plans. • Impacts that are reflected in research, teaching, extension, and/or service in the discipline, across disciplines, and for Nebraska stakeholders and other relevant clientele. • Potential future impacts.	

PERFORMANCE AREAS	COMMENTS
Next Year Goals and Accomplishments The faculty member demonstrates: • In collaboration with academic lead, indicates how the analysis of previous student learning outcome assessment will be used to improve student learning in the upcoming year. Faculty will also briefly discuss how student learning outcomes will be assessed in all upcoming courses, results will be summarized and analyzed to improve subsequent teaching activities. • Lists other appropriate goals for the upcoming year, generally involving improving teaching, faculty professional development, cultivating strategic partnerships with industry and other groups, or securing additional college resources. • How goals will be aligned with NCTA strategic plan and overall goals for the college.	

PERFORMANCE AREAS					
Dean evaluation: Please check a box, from 1 through 5, which best describes your evaluation of the corresponding faculty member.	1 = unsatisfactory 2 = needs improvement 3 = good work 4 = outstanding work 5 = extraordinary year				
This person effectively and appropriately…	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Facilitates appropriate student learning and development					
Measures, reports and utilizes student learning outcomes assessment					
Is competent in the subject matter taught					
Uses appropriate instructional technology					
Is involved in college wide activities such as clubs, committees, etc.					
Is supportive and nurturing to students both in and out of class					
Gets along well with colleagues and other college employees					
Uses college resources efficiently and appropriately					
Dean's overall evaluation of faculty members effectiveness					

February 2021

Dean's recommendation for rehire	**Yes**		**No**	

Dean's rationale for recommendation:

This form was reviewed with employee on Click or tap to enter a date.(Date).

_____(Dean's Signature)   _____(Employee's Signature)

Comments by Faculty Member (attach additional sheet if needed)

*Explanation of Performance Evaluation Principles and Categories

The NCTA **Academic Performance Evaluation and Professional Development of Faculty** form is designed to provide feedback to the faculty member striving towards excellence in all aspects of the academic appointment, and to the faculty member's professional development. It is designed to reinforce a consistent evaluation philosophy – that the administrator provides meaningful and actionable written feedback, praising excellence and offering constructive suggestions to improve performance. Evaluation feedback should predominantly focus on three areas: 1) Accomplishments, 2) Impacts, and 3) Organizational, Team, and Individual Goals.

Accomplishments and Impacts are the result of effective programmatic planning. The most significant parts of each annual evaluation are the written comments on this form, and subsequent discussions throughout the year between the faculty member and the unit administrator.

The final evaluation rating is the unit administrator's assessment of the faculty member's overall performance for the year being evaluated.

Good Work – is the performance rating that is the accepted standard of excellence at NCTA, and is the rating that most faculty members are likely to receive.

Outstanding Work – defines performance in a year in which a faculty member clearly has significant successes beyond the normal expectations, but not in all programmatic areas. The administrator should clearly state how the accomplishments of the faculty member exceed the accepted standard of excellence for the rating of Good Work.

Extraordinary Year – is reserved for an occasional year when the typical faculty member can identify extraordinary impacts, accomplishments, and organizational achievements across all program areas, *or* for those very few faculty members whose level of performance is consistently outstanding across all apportioned mission areas and who have meaningful programmatic impacts and accomplishments far above their peers. The administrator should clearly state the accomplishments of the faculty member that made it an Extraordinary Year.

Needs Improvement – is **not** to be used in consecutive years. Guidance in the form of specific recommendations should be provided by the administrator to the faculty member so significant improvements can realistically be achieved (reaching at least Good Work performance within one year). Failure to meaningfully improve will result in an Unsatisfactory rating during the next evaluation period. This rating should **not** be used for faculty members who have performance levels representing a substantial and chronic deficiency that deserve an Unsatisfactory performance rating.

Unsatisfactory – performance represents a substantial and chronic deficiency. Guidance for significant improvement should be provided by the administrator to the faculty member through the use of an improvement plan. If the faculty member does not make substantial, acceptable progress toward remedying the deficiency by the next annual evaluation, a post-tenure review will be initiated. An overall evaluation of either Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory during the next annual evaluation represents a failure to make substantial acceptable progress towards remedying the deficiency.

The final evaluation category is the administrator's assessment of the faculty member`s overall performance for the year being evaluated.