Higher College of Technology

Guidelines and Procedures on the Conduct of Teaching Staff Performance Evaluation and Scoring of Results

1. Purpose:

This guideline sets a clear and transparent mechanism on how teaching staff should be evaluated.

The guideline sets also a clear and transparent scoring system that must be followed in converting the results of the performance evaluations to qualitative and quantitative data.

The staff performance evaluation would support the staff professional development needs within the context of the Department/Center’s improvement plan.

2. Scope:

- This guideline applies to all the teaching staff of HCT.
- This guideline covers the three evaluation tools that were developed by QAC and used to appraise the performance of the teaching staff. This implies that the appraisal of non-teaching staff is not covered by the guideline.
- To plan professional development based on the outcomes of evaluation.

3. Definitions:

Teaching staff: This refers to Lecturer, Assistant lecturer, Trainers as specified by the college bylaws.

New Teaching staff: They are those who have been hired into full-time positions by the Ministry of Manpower or recruiting agencies to begin teaching for the first time in Higher College of Technology.

Experienced teaching staff: They are those who have completed the probationary period of 3 effective teaching months (excluding examination, holidays, vacation, semester break, advising and registration phases) and have scored ≥ 3.5 (in the respective field of specialization) in the teaching staff appraisal. This category of staff would be evaluated using “Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation” tool within a span of 30 months; the other 2 components of the staff appraisal (Management Evaluation of Lecturer-In-class & Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery) would be conducted within a span of 60 months. The departmental council can conduct staff appraisal at any point of time as need arises in case of students complaints, staff complaints, abnormal award of students grades, etc.
Small size department: Any department whose staff members is less than 15 and with the number of students of students not exceeding 150. The HoD of these departments may formulate their own team and perform the staff appraisal not necessarily following all the parameters mentioned in this document. However, the entire process needs to be documented and final output of the process should be in-line with the other units of the college.

Department Staff Appraisal Committee (DSAC): The committee authorized to evaluate the staff performance and conduct the staff appraisal. The members of this departmental staff appraisal committee are: HoD/HoC, HoS, one senior lecturer who is an expert on the subject and one senior lecturer who has a background on teaching pedagogy or who has established credibility in his / her teaching methodologies. The nomination of the senior lecturers as member of the committee should be approved by the departmental council.

Criteria of selection of senior staff members to DSAC:

The lecturer should have

1. Master’s degree/PhD in linguistics/ TESOL/ TEFL/ Education for ELC & Master’s degree/PhD in specialization for Academic Departments.
2. A minimum of ten (10) years of experience in teaching English at secondary/tertiary level (for ELC).
3. A minimum of 5 years of experience in teaching specialization subject in similar HEPs in any recognized organization in/out of Oman out of which the staff must possess a minimum of 3 years of teaching experience in HCT.

Panel: It consists of two or three members of the DSAC approved by the department council and the panel can conduct the staff appraisal without any prior notification to the staff being appraised.

Cumulative result: It is the result that provides a summary of evaluations (Management Evaluation of Lecturer–In-class, Student Feedback on Teaching & Course Delivery and Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation) for teaching staff. It should always contain scores averaged from the individual instruments during the cycle of the appraisal system. The cumulative result can be used for administrative decisions.

Probationary period: It is the duration of 3 effective teaching months (excluding examination, holidays, vacation, semester break, advising and registration phases) from the first day of teaching for new lecturers.

Evaluation Cycle: The “Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation” would be conducted for the entire teaching faculty with a period of 30 months. The other 2 components of the staff appraisal – Student Feedback on Teaching & Course delivery and Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-Class) would be conducted for the entire teaching faculty within a period of 60 months.
**Improvement Plan (IP):** It is the professional development plan developed in agreement with the lecturer aimed at improving his/her performance.

The objectives of the IP should be CSMART

i. C = Challenging

ii. S = Specific

iii. M = Measurable

iv. A = Achievable

v. R = Relevant

vi. T = Timed

4. Responsibilities and Stakeholders:

4.1. **College Dean, Assistant Dean for Administration and Finance, and Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs:**

a. It should require all HoDs/HoC to conduct performance evaluations of the lecturers assigned to their Departments/Center, in accordance with the requirements and timelines set out in this guidelines and procedures.

b. It should speed-up the process of taking administrative decisions associated with this guideline and procedure.

4.2. **Department/Center Council:**

a. It should nominate and approve the additional members to conduct staff evaluation as per the guidelines provided by the College.

b. It should orient all the teaching staff members with the objectives, criteria, and procedure of Staff performance evaluation.

c. It should orient the students on their role in the staff performance evaluation.

d. It should carry out their duties in the performance evaluation process, and report regularly to the college Dean/Assistant Dean Academic Affairs on the status of the appraised lecturers.

e. The HoD/HoC should submit a written recommendation to the college Dean/Assistant Dean Academic Affairs / Assistant Dean for Administration & Finance for termination of a lecturer’s employment in instances where the DSAC members/Panel jointly determine that retaining a lecturer is not in the best interests of the students.

f. The HoS is responsible for discussing the result of the evaluations with the lecturer before he/she/ she is asked to sign the evaluation result and given a copy.

g. should maintain the evaluation records under strict confidentiality measures.
h. should organize personal development training sessions for staff as and when needed based on the result of the appraisal, in coordination with the Staff Activity Coordinator of the department / center.

i. The HoD/HoC may also conduct additional evaluations if he or she considers it advisable to do so in the light of circumstances related to the lecturer’s performance.

j. The HoSs through their Office Coordinators should schedule the evaluation activities for the Evaluation Cycle and disseminate it to all members of the Department Staff Appraisal Committee.

k. The HoSs through their office coordinator and assigned staff members in coordination with the QA Officer of the department and ETC, prepare the list of staff to be evaluated and the forms required by the ETC for on-line evaluations.

l. The HoSs through their office coordinator and assigned staff member collate the results of evaluation and prepare the summary result and the forms to be presented and signed by the concerned lecturer who was evaluated.

4.3. The Department Staff Appraisal Committee:

a. It should abide by the schedule and conduct classroom observation to appraise the lecturer’s performance in relation to the applicable competencies in an objective and fair manner.

b. It should ensure consistency and fairness in the application of evaluation principles.

c. It should prepare and sign the evaluation result.

d. To propose staff development plan based on the outcomes of evaluation. This staff development plan should be developed in agreement with the concern lecturer aimed at improving his/her performance and according to the availability of the needed recourses. In small departments with staff less than 10, the Head of Department will be responsible to link the staff evaluation outcome to the development/training needs.

e. They should organize personal development training sessions for staff as and when needed in coordination with the Staff Development committee.

5. Guidelines and Procedures:

5.1. Components of Teaching Staff Performance Evaluation

The HCT Teaching Staff Performance Evaluation consists of 3 components which are as follows. The percentage weight given for each component are also presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Staff Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>% Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-class)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the completion of each evaluation, the lecturer’s overall performance (cumulative result) will be calculated based on the weight given to each component. The result thus achieved will be analyzed & interpreted as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved %</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.5 - 5.0</td>
<td>Work performance always meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>4.0 - 4.49</td>
<td>Work performance usually meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.5 - 3.99</td>
<td>Work performance often meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69%</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>2.75 - 3.49</td>
<td>Work performance doesn’t meet the standards for the position. Serious effort is needed to improve the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 54%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.00 - 2.74</td>
<td>Work performance is inadequate and inferior to the standards of performance required for the position. Performance at this level cannot be allowed to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA –</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff is not required to perform this duty, it cannot be rated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Rating Standards

6. Performance Evaluation of New Teaching Staff:

6.1. Scheduling

6.1.1. Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-Class) is done twice during the probationary period in two different courses. However, if the cumulative result of the 1st staff appraisal is ≥ 3.5 there is no need to conduct second in-class observation. In any case, the panel members’ individual scores should be averaged.

6.1.2. The first in-class observation in the first course should be scheduled during the 4th week of teaching by a panel. The 2 evaluation components employed would be Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-Class) and Student Feedback on Teaching & Course Delivery. The report generated is “Cumulative Report-1” and would be given to the concerned faculty within 5 working days of the evaluation.

6.1.3. The “Management Evaluation of Lecturer (in-class)” in any course should be scheduled at a convenient time. The panel can conduct the staff appraisal without any prior notification to the staff being appraised.

6.1.4. In case the second in-class observation is needed, it should be done in the course which is pertaining to the concerned teaching staff’s specialization and it should be scheduled at the 8th week. All the 3 evaluation components (Management Evaluation of Lecturer In-class, Student Feedback on Teaching & Course Delivery and Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation) would be used for the appraisal. The report generated is
“Cumulative Report-2” and would be given to the concerned faculty within 5 working days of the evaluation.

**Exception:** For the small size department, if it’s not possible to have a panel, the HoD/HoC will conduct the in-class evaluation.

6.1.5. **Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery** should be collected from two different courses with two different groups of students taught by the lecturer before the completion of the probationary period. This is conducted through on-line student evaluation which should be properly coordinated with the ETC

**Exception:** In the case of a small size department/center evaluation of teaching by students will be conducted twice for the courses taught, by 100% of the population during the probationary period.

6.2. **Procedure**

6.2.1. Conduct the Student Evaluation of Teaching & Course delivery and Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-class) during the 4th teaching week of teaching (by staff) as per the schedule. The panel can conduct the staff appraisal without any prior notification to the staff being appraised.

6.2.2. The lecturer being appraised should be provided with feedback (Cumulative Report-1) of the first appraisal within 5 teaching days after the in-class observation. During the feedback session the Lecturer should be given all the forms along with the cumulative results duly signed by the appraised and the appraiser.

6.2.3. If result of the first appraisal (Cumulative Report-1) of the lecturer is ≥ 3.5, the staff is recommended to continue in the employed position. He/she will then be evaluated again within a period of 60 months or if there are issues that necessitate staff appraisal.

6.2.4. If the cumulative result is < 3.5, then the DSAC will conduct a second appraisal, it should be done in the course which is pertaining to the concerned teaching staff’s specialization and it should be scheduled at the 8th teaching week. It would comprise all the 3 appraisal components (Management Evaluation of Lecturer In-class, Student Feedback on Teaching & Course Delivery and Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation).

6.2.5. The lecturer being appraised should be provided with feedback (Cumulative Report-2) of the second appraisal within 5 working days after the in-class observation. During the feedback session the lecturer should be given all the forms along with the cumulative results duly signed by the appraised and the appraiser.

6.2.6. If result of the second appraisal (Cumulative Report-2) of the lecturer is ≥ 3.5, the staff is recommended to continue in the employed position. He/she will then be evaluated again within a period of 60 months or if there are complaints that necessitate staff appraisal.
6.2.7. If the result of the second appraisal (Cumulative Report-2) of the lecturer is < 3.5, the staff may be recommended by the department council for termination.

7. Performance evaluation of all the experienced teaching staff:

7.1. Scheduling

7.1.1. “Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-Class)” should be done once during the evaluation cycle which is 60 months unless there are complaints that necessitate the conduct of classroom observation. The panel members’ individual scores should be averaged.

7.1.2. Distribute all the lecturers spacing them conveniently through the 60 months of the evaluation cycle, with priority given to those lecturers who have not been appraised for the past 60 months before the implementation of this evaluation scheme.

7.1.3. The evaluation cycle begins when you schedule the lecturer for class observation by a panel in any ONE of the courses taught by the lecturer.

7.1.4. The in-class observation by Management in any course should be scheduled at a convenient time. The panel can conduct the staff appraisal without any prior notification to the staff being appraised.

7.1.5. Feedback session should be scheduled within 5 working days of the in-class observation.

*Exception*: For the small size department/center if it’s not possible to have a panel, the HoD/HoC will conduct the in-class evaluation

7.1.6. Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery should be collected from two different courses with two different groups of students taught by the lecturer spacing it in semesters-1 and semester-2 of every academic year.

7.1.6.1. The first student evaluation of teaching and course delivery should be done in the first course and should be scheduled in the first semester.

7.1.6.2. The second student evaluation of teaching and course delivery should be done in the second course and should be scheduled in the second semester.

7.1.6.3. These scores must be averaged for the duration of the Evaluation Cycle when completing the Cumulative Result.

*Exception*: If a lecturer is teaching only one course to one / two sections of students, then he/she should be evaluated twice during the academic year. Each evaluation should be
scheduled in any two different semesters to make sure that a larger sample of students is evaluating that lecturer in that course.
In the case of a small size department/center evaluation of teaching by students will be conducted twice for the courses taught, by 100% of the population.

7.1.7. **Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation** by management for teaching staff should be done once every 30 months.

**7.2. Procedure**

7.2.1. Conduct student evaluation of teaching and course delivery as per the schedule during semester-1 and semester-2 of the academic year.

7.2.2. Conduct the management evaluation of lecturer (in-class) as per the schedule.

7.2.3. Complete the General performance evaluation Report for the lecturer immediately after the in-class observation.

7.2.4. Average all the scores available of student evaluation of teaching and course delivery at the time of completing the *cumulative result*.

7.2.5. Complete the *cumulative result* by averaging all the scores of Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-class), Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation and Student Feedback on Teaching & Course Delivery got during the evaluation period by following the 45:35:20 % weight distribution, respectively.

i. If the cumulative result is ≥ 3.5 then the lecturer will be evaluated after 60 months.
   However, if need arises in case of student’s complaints, staff complaints, abnormal award of student grades, etc., the lecturer may be evaluated at anytime and this is left to the discretion of the HoD or concerned HoS.

ii. If the cumulative result is < 3.5 then the lecturer should be given the warning notice during the feedback session and will undergo 2nd staff appraisal 3 months before the end of the academic year. If the cumulative result is still < 3.5 then he/she can be recommended for termination. If the result is ≥ 3.5 then he/she will be evaluated on general performance within 30 months unless there are complaints against him / her. If the need arises, the staff would be evaluated on all the 3 evaluation components.

8. **Procedure for staff reward and recognition**

8.1. The HoS will compile the final scores of the lecturers and select the top 5 lecturers every semester for reward and recognition.

8.2. The following are a few suggestions on lecturer’s reward and recognition:

- The “top 5 lecturers” names could be displayed on staff notice boards in all the staff offices.
- Their names may be published on the website and newsletters.
- They could be felicitated in the end of semester staff meetings with a Certificate of Merit.
9. Examples:

9.1. New Lecturer / Under Probationary Period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Cumulative Report-1*</th>
<th>Cumulative Report-2**</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Next Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. X</td>
<td>≥3.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>After 60 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>After 60 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Z</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple evaluations in any component must be averaged to generate the final cumulative report)

* Cumulative Report-1 = Management Evaluation of lecturer (In-class) - (70%) +
  Student Feedback on Teaching and Course delivery - (30%)
  (in two classes / sections – on-line)

** Cumulative Report-2 = Management Evaluation of lecturer (In-class) - (45%) +
  Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation (35%) +
  Student Feedback on Teaching and Course delivery (20%)
  (in two classes / sections – on-line)

9.2. Experienced Lecturer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>First Appraisal  (Cumulative Report)*</th>
<th>Second Appraisal (Cumulative Report)*</th>
<th>Next Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P</td>
<td>≥3.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>After 60 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Q</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5</td>
<td>≥3.5</td>
<td>After 30 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. R</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple evaluations in any component must be averaged to generate the final cumulative report)

* Cumulative Report = Management Evaluation of lecturer (In-class) - (45%) +
  Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation (35%) +
  Student Feedback on Teaching and Course delivery (20%)
  (in two classes / sections – on-line)

** Staff recommended for termination
After 4 Effective Teaching Weeks

**Management Evaluation of Lecturer In class (70%)**

**Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery (30%)**

Cumulative Report-1 (CR-1)

After 5 working days

Result / Feedback presented to the Lecturer

Yes → To be appraised as experienced staff

No → To be appraised as experienced staff

**Management Evaluation of Lecturer In class (45%)**

Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation (35%)

*Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery (20%)

Cumulative Report-2 (CR-2)

After 5 working days

**CR-2 > 3.5**

No → Terminate

Yes → To be appraised as experienced staff

Figure-1. Flowchart of the performance evaluation procedure for New Teaching Staff

Student Feedback on Teaching & Course delivery and Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In-Class) should be done in the course which is pertaining to the concerned teaching staff’s specialization.
Figure-2. Flowchart of the performance evaluation procedure for Experienced Teaching Staff

Preparation of Appraisal for Experienced Staff

- Management Evaluation of Lecturer In class (45%) as the need arises
- Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation (35%) (within 30 months)
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery (20%) as the need arises

Cumulative Report-1 (CR-1)

After 5 working days

Result / Feedback presented to the Lecturer

Yes

Next Appraisal within 60 months or as the need arises

No

Warning

Three (3) months before the end of academic year

- Management Evaluation of Lecturer In class (45%)
- Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation (35%)
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery (20%)

Cumulative Report-2 (CR-2)

CR2 > 3.5

Start of Evaluation Cycle for experienced staff

Terminate

No

Yes
Higher College of Technology  
STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION  
NEW STAFF - CUMULATIVE REPORT-1

Notes:
1. The objective of the evaluation is to evaluate the performance of staff regularly in order to inform performance improvement efforts.
2. HCT adheres to transparency in the conduct of its activities; hence the results of the Staff Evaluation will be discussed with the concerned staff member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved %</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.5-5.0</td>
<td>Work performance always meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>4.0-4.49</td>
<td>Work performance usually meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.5-3.99</td>
<td>Work performance often meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69%</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>2.75-3.49</td>
<td>Work performance doesn’t meet the standards for the position. Serious effort is needed to improve the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 54%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.00-2.74</td>
<td>Work performance is inadequate and inferior to the standards of performance required for the position. Performance at this level cannot be allowed to continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA – Not applicable  
Staff is not required to perform this duty, it cannot be rated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Multiplier Factor (x)</th>
<th>Average score (retrieved from the forms) (Y)</th>
<th>Achieved % (x * y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In - Class)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall performance rating: ______________________________________________________
Second Appraisal □ Required □ Not required

HoD/HoC’s signature:  
DATE:

Staff signature:  
DATE:

Distribution of copies/confidentiality/accessibility details: HoC/HoD, the Lecturer

(A copy of this form should be given to the staff member after the interview session)
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STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
NEW STAFF - CUMULATIVE REPORT-2

Notes:
3. The objective of the evaluation is to evaluate the performance of staff regularly in order to inform performance improvement efforts.
4. HCT adheres to transparency in the conduct of its activities; hence the results of the Staff Evaluation will be discussed with the concerned staff member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Program / Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Joining:</td>
<td>Academic Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Center:</td>
<td>Level:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved %</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.5-5.0</td>
<td>Work performance always meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>4.0-4.49</td>
<td>Work performance usually meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.5-3.99</td>
<td>Work performance often meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69%</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>2.75-3.49</td>
<td>Work performance doesn’t meet the standards for the position. Serious effort is needed to improve the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 54%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.00-2.74</td>
<td>Work performance is inadequate and inferior to the standards of performance required for the position. Performance at this level cannot be allowed to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA –</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff is not required to perform this duty, it cannot be rated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Performance Evaluation Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Multiplier Factor (x)</th>
<th>Average score (retrieved from the forms) (Y)</th>
<th>Achieved % (x * y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In – Class)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall performance rating:
□ Staff Retained □ Recommendation for Termination issued

HoD/HoC’s signature: DATE:

Staff signature: DATE:

Distribution of copies/confidentiality/accessibility details: HoC/HoD, the Lecturer

(A copy of this form should be given to the staff member after the interview session)
Higher College of Technology
STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
EXPERIENCED STAFF - CUMULATIVE REPORT

Notes:
5. The objective of the evaluation is to evaluate the performance of staff regularly in order to inform performance improvement efforts.
6. HCT adheres to transparency in the conduct of its activities; hence the results of the Staff Evaluation will be discussed with the concerned staff member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved %</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.5-5.0</td>
<td>Work performance always meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>4.0-4.49</td>
<td>Work performance usually meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.5-3.99</td>
<td>Work performance often meets the standards for the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69%</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>2.75-3.49</td>
<td>Work performance doesn’t meet the standards for the position. Serious effort is needed to improve the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 54%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.00-2.74</td>
<td>Work performance is inadequate and inferior to the standards of performance required for the position. Performance at this level cannot be allowed to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA –</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff is not required to perform this duty, it cannot be rated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Performance Evaluation Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Multiplier Factor (x)</th>
<th>Average score (retrieved from the forms) (Y)</th>
<th>Achieved % (x * y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Management Evaluation of Lecturer (In – Class)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Student Feedback on Teaching and Course Delivery</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Lecturer’s General Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Achieved</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall performance rating:

☐ Staff Retained  ☐ Warning Notice issued  ☐ Recommendation for Termination issued

HoD/HoC’s signature: __________________________ DATE: __________

Staff signature: __________________________ DATE: __________

Distribution of copies/confidentiality/accessibility details: HoC/HoD, the Lecturer

(A copy of this form should be given to the staff member after the interview session)