



June 18, 2026

AA007GL

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN ERBIL

Faculty Evaluation Guideline: Standards-based

Related Policy: Faculty Evaluation and Development Policy (AA007)

Related Procedure: Faculty Evaluation and Development Procedure (AA007PR)

Responsible Office: Academic Affairs

I. PURPOSE

This guideline sets out the standards, criteria, and rubrics used to evaluate CUE faculty. Its purpose is threefold: to establish comprehensive evaluation criteria modelled on international faculty-evaluation standards; to foster fairness and objectivity through clear criteria, measurable rubrics, and evidence-based assessment; and to provide evaluators a framework for clear, formative feedback that supports continuous professional development.

The system aligns with two established models. The Arreola (2000/2007) model provides a comprehensive, quantitative framework using multi-source data and weighted ratings to reduce subjectivity. The Seldin (1999) model takes a holistic, qualitative approach grounded in the teaching portfolio and reflective practice. The CUE model combines both: numerical rubric ratings based on pre-determined standards, together with qualitative self-reflection in which faculty self-assess their performance as an integral part of the system.

Faculty responsibilities are organized into four standards: *Teaching Effectiveness*, *Research*, *Service*, and *Collegiality*. Each standard contains distinct but interrelated criteria, each assessed against a four-point rubric and supported by illustrative evidence. Faculty evaluation considers areas of responsibility appropriate to the faculty member's role and appointment.

II. DEFINITIONS

Collegiality: The measure of the effect faculty interactions have on their colleagues' professional productivity.

Evaluation Criteria: Established standards for teaching, research, service, and collegiality against which faculty performance is evaluated using descriptive and evidence-based rubrics.

Research: consistent and sound scholarly research that results in peer-reviewed output, actively seeks internal and external funding, and regularly disseminates research findings.

Service: Contributions that support the university community, including serving on committees, participating in governance, engaging in academic initiatives, providing student support, and other institutional responsibilities.

Scholarly and Professional Engagement: Activities that contribute to disciplinary knowledge through research, creative work, professional practice, or continued expertise.

Teaching Effectiveness: The competence and skills to develop, design, deliver, assess, and improve learning experiences that support student achievement.

III. HOW TO USE THESE GUIDELINES

- Each criterion is rated on a four-point scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient); 2 - Needs Improvement (Developing); 3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient); 4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary).
- Rubrics make expectations explicit, allow gradation of performance, and support formative feedback and goal-setting.
- The evidence listed for each criterion is illustrative, not exhaustive; the full list is not required to achieve an exemplary rating. Evaluators use it as a reference for the type of evidence that backs their judgement.
- Evaluation under this system complements the institutional QA data described in the Faculty Evaluation and Development Procedure (AA007).
- Department Heads and/or Deans and faculty themselves complete the evaluative process as described below, comparing and combining the ratings with faculty at the end to find an average.

IV. STANDARDS AND RUBRICS

1. Standard I: Teaching Effectiveness

The faculty member exhibits specialized mastery by connecting current research and real-world applications to logically structured content; utilizes instructional design to create effective materials and aligned assessments; adapts delivery to real-time cues and classroom variables to foster a learner-centered environment; and provides timely, meaningful feedback while actively integrating peer and supervisor input to refine professional practice.

Criteria and Sub-Criteria

1.1 Content Expertise:

- a. Exhibit specialized mastery of the subject matter.
- b. Bridge course material with contemporary research and emerging trends in the field.
- c. Integrate interdisciplinary concepts and real-world applications for practical relevance.

1.2 Instructional Design Skills

- a. Create rigorous, measurable learning outcomes that drive the course.

- b. Develop syllabi, coursebook, and materials that provide strategic scaffolding.
- c. Integrate media and technology to deepen learner understanding.
- d. Develop aligned, valid, and reliable assessment.

1.3 Instructional Delivery Skills

- a. Adapt delivery to real-time learner cues to foster a learner-centered, supportive climate.
- b. Organize lectures and presentations for maximum engagement and knowledge retention.
- c. Maintain awareness of variables (engagement, task difficulty, time, technology) to make proactive adjustments.

1.4 Feedback

- a. Deliver timely, meaningful, and substantive feedback to learners.
- b. Actively seek feedback from students, peers, and supervisors.
- c. Integrate and evaluate input to refine professional practice.

Standard I: Teaching Effectiveness Rubric

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
I. Content Expertise	Demonstrates limited or inaccurate knowledge; content is outdated. Fails to identify core disciplinary concepts.	Demonstrates foundational knowledge but struggles with complex concepts or connecting ideas logically.	Demonstrates strong, up-to-date content knowledge; provides accurate, relevant examples and illustrations.	Exhibits exceptional, specialized mastery. Skillfully connects material to current research, interdisciplinary concepts, and real-world applications.
II. Instructional Design Skills	Learning outcomes are missing, unmeasurable, or disconnected from content. Syllabi, coursebooks, and handouts are disorganized, insufficient, or contain significant errors. Media and technology used poorly, often distracting. Lectures lack a clear framework, with minimal impact. Assessment methods are poorly designed or unrelated to objectives.	Learning outcomes and objectives are present but may be vague or inconsistent. Syllabi and materials are standard but may lack polish or variety. Technology and media used functionally but in a supplementary or predictable way. Lectures follow a basic structure with moderate impact. Assessment design is basic and may drift from objectives.	Prepares clear, measurable learning outcomes and objectives. Develops well-structured syllabi and high-quality supportive materials (handouts/media) that facilitate learning. Uses technology and media properly to support goals. Lectures are organized logically for significant impact. Assessments are well-designed and accurately measure stated objectives.	Creates rigorous, measurable learning outcomes that drive every aspect of the course. Develops professional-tier syllabi and materials (coursebooks/handouts) that provide exceptional scaffolding. Integrates media and technology transformatively. Lectures are masterfully organized for maximum engagement and retention. Assessments are impeccably and innovatively designed.
III. Instructional Delivery Skills	Communication is rushed or confusing, discouraging participation in an unwelcoming environment.	Explanations often rely on jargon; engagement is superficial or teacher-dominated with inconsistent	Communicates complex information clearly using varied methods to maintain a respectful, inclusive	Masterfully adapts delivery to real-time cues, fostering a learner-centered environment and supportive climate.

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
	Frequently unaware of variables (engagement, task, time, tech) and repeatedly fails to make necessary instructional changes.	pacing. Inconsistently mindful of variables, leading to occasionally neglected or unneeded adjustments.	environment. Mostly mindful of variables, making occasional impromptu changes to facilitate effective instruction.	Maintains constant awareness of variables to make proactive, impromptu adjustments that optimize learning.
IV. Feedback	Rarely provides timely or effective feedback to students, frequently avoids or rejects peer and supervisor input, and fails to incorporate constructive feedback into ongoing practice.	Sometimes provides feedback (often exceeding 48 hours) and occasionally seeks or accepts peer/supervisor input, though integration into practice and pedagogical best practices remain inconsistent.	Generally provides timely, effective feedback within 48 hours, mostly welcomes and shares feedback using positive framing, and successfully incorporates it into subsequent practice.	Consistently delivers timely, meaningful feedback within 24 hours, while actively seeking peer/supervisor input and effectively integrating all feedback to refine professional practice.

Evidence Types (illustrative)

1.5 Content Expertise

- Course Materials Review: peer feedback on coursebooks, lecture slides, and handouts to verify accuracy and depth.
- Logical Sequencing: review of materials for scholarly, logical progression of topics.
- Technical Language: classroom observation of correct, effective use of discipline-specific terminology.

1.6 Instructional Design Skills

- Curriculum Alignment: exams, quizzes, and projects checked for alignment with Module Learning Outcomes (MLOs) and Bloom's levels.
- Structural Planning: coursebook review of material distribution across the semester and adherence to schedule.
- Policy Articulation: review of coursebooks for clear grading, late-work, and academic integrity policies.
- Assessment Design: evidence of reliable, valid assessment tools and clear, descriptive rubrics.

1.7 Instructional Delivery Skills

- Communication Clarity: observation of delivery fluency and examples; clarity of written communication; student feedback on explanations.
- Student Engagement: observer notes on questions, group work, discussions; Moodle participation data; ratings on interactive strategies.
- Real-time Management: observer notes on pacing, timing, and lecture vs. active-learning balance.
- Climate and Respect: observer notes on tone and inclusivity; student ratings on inclusivity and professionalism.

1.8 Feedback

- Qualitative Review: review of assignments/papers for specificity and quality of comments.

- b. Timeliness Data: documentation of turnaround time between submission and feedback.
- c. Student Perception: ratings and comments on helpfulness, frequency, and fairness of feedback.
- d. Transparency: evidence rubrics are used consistently to justify grades and guide improvement.

2. Standard II: Research

The faculty member maintains consistent and sound scholarly research that results in peer-reviewed output, actively seeks internal and external funding, and regularly disseminates research findings.

Criteria and Sub-Criteria

2.1 Productivity and Output

- a. Maintain a high and sustained level of research output (approx. 15-20% of workload; benchmark of ~1 peer-reviewed article per year; Middaugh, 2020).
- b. Develop research publishable in peer-reviewed outlets.
- c. Produce varied outputs: experimental/scholarly research, creative works, articles/books, grant and fund proposals, performances/exhibits, and conference participation.

2.2 Quality and Impact

- a. Publish in top-tier journals such as R1 journals and prestigious university presses.
- b. Produce work demonstrating originality, rigor, and national/international impact.
- c. Achieve significant citations, awards, or press coverage.

2.3 Funding and Resource Generation

- a. Identify external funding sources (national, international, and foundation grants).
- b. Secure funding that directly supports research and enhances institutional research capacity.

2.4 Dissemination and Mentorship

- a. Integrate knowledge across disciplines to benefit the academic community.
- b. Translate research insights into the public arena (publications, keynotes, policy influence).
- c. Mentor students to publish or present their work.

Standard II: Research Rubric

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
I. Productivity & Output	Produces little to no scholarly output. Inactive or has failed to submit any work for external peer review during the evaluation period.	Output is minimal or sporadic. Fails to meet minimum university standards for quantity. Evidence consists mainly of conference presentations, submissions in review, or internal reports.	Produces consistent, high-quality scholarly output that meets or exceeds the minimum quantitative requirements.	Maintains a high, sustained level of productivity (e.g., multiple peer-reviewed publications, major exhibits, or successful grant submissions) that significantly exceeds the university standard.
II. Quality & Impact	Work is consistently rejected by external peer review. Quality judged as fundamentally flawed, derivative, or retracted/unpublishable.	Work is primarily published in low-impact, unranked, or internal venues. Minimal or uncertain external impact.	Publishes in respected, peer-reviewed venues appropriate to the discipline (e.g., 1 peer-reviewed journal and 1 local journal). Work is sound, valid, and contributory, often receiving citations or positive reviews.	Publishes in top-tier, highly competitive venues (e.g., R1 journals, prestigious presses, Tier 1 grants). Work shows originality, intellectual breadth, and national/international influence, leading to citations, awards, or press coverage.

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
III. Funding & Resource Generation	Exhibits mismanagement or non-compliance with existing grant obligations, resulting in penalties or loss of institutional credibility.	Grant activity is non-existent or limited to exploratory, unfunded proposals. Fails to seek available institutional or external resources.	Actively submits proposals for internal and external funding and secures some grants (e.g., internal faculty grants, smaller foundation grants). Manages awarded grants with fiscal compliance.	Secures substantial external funding (e.g., federal, major foundation grants). Funding directly supports research and significantly enhances institutional research capacity.
IV. Dissemination & Mentorship	Fails to participate in any formal dissemination. Does not seek opportunities to share knowledge, or discourages/neglects student research supervision.	Dissemination limited to local, college, or internal venues. Fails to share research with the broader community. Minimal involvement in guiding student research.	Regularly presents at appropriate national or international conferences. Disseminates effectively through formal academic channels. Supervises student research and/or serves on thesis/dissertation committees.	Demonstrates leadership in integrating knowledge across disciplines or translating findings into public benefit (cross-disciplinary publications, invited keynotes, policy influence). Mentors students to publish or present.

Evidence Types (illustrative)

2.5 Productivity & Output

- Chronological list of all research, scholarly, and creative work produced during the evaluation period.
- Copies of acceptance letters for journal articles, books, book chapters, conference proceedings.
- Submission confirmation emails for manuscripts under external review.
- Comparison of research goals from previous periods against current output.

2.6 Quality & Impact

- Documentation of impact factor, acceptance rate, or prestige ranking of journals/presses.
- Letters from recognized experts on the originality, rigor, and significance of the work.
- Documentation of prestigious external recognition (awards, fellowships, best-paper awards, major media coverage).
- Reports showing findings integrated into policy, professional guidelines, or industry standards.

2.7 Funding & Resource Generation

- Official documentation confirming receipt of external funding (amount and duration).
- Confirmation from the Office of Programs of managing active grants in compliance with regulations.
- Evidence of serving as a reviewer or panelist for a major funding agency.

2.8 Dissemination & Mentorship

- Records of invited talks, keynotes, and conference presentations (local, national, international).
- Documentation of supervision of graduate theses and dissertations.
- Evidence of co-authored publications or presentations with students.
- Research communication for non-academic audiences (public seminars, op-eds, training materials).
- Evidence of joint publications or funded projects across academic units.

3. Standard III: Service

The faculty member is a reliable and engaged institutional professional who fulfills all assigned service obligations across the department, college, and university; provides regular, high-quality professional

service to their discipline; and offers contributions to the community that leverage their professional expertise. Approximately 10% of faculty time is devoted to service.

Criteria and Sub-Criteria

3.1 University Service

- Serve at the departmental and institutional levels per the needs determined by the Department Head and Academic Affairs.
- Examples: serving on and chairing committees (QA, Examination, Accreditation) and governance/administration roles such as program/department coordinator.

3.2 Professional Service

- Enrich the field through professional contribution.
- Examples: participating in organizations or committees, consulting, and guest lecturing.

3.3 Community Service

- Make direct contributions to the larger society, leveraging professional expertise.
- Examples: consulting for a local NGO; giving lectures or speeches to the local community.

Standard III: Service Rubric

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
I. University Service	Fails to participate in department or university service without an approved waiver or clear justification. Ignores institutional requests for service.	Participation in required committees is minimal, sporadic, or passive. Fails to contribute meaningfully or follow through on assigned tasks.	Consistently and reliably participates as an active member of required departmental, college, and/or university committees. Fulfills all assigned responsibilities promptly and effectively.	Takes on and successfully executes major leadership roles at the institutional level (e.g., Chair of a key standing committee, ad-hoc task force chair). Service is transformational and results in significant, documented improvements.
II. Professional Service	Provides no documented professional service or fails to engage with the professional community outside personal conference attendance.	Service to the profession is limited, irregular, or localized. Performs minimal service for career progression (e.g., reviews a single manuscript per year).	Provides regular, high-quality service to the discipline (e.g., reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal, organizes a conference panel, holds elected office in a regional/state organization).	Provides sustained, high-impact service, often in a national or international leadership role (e.g., Editor/Associate Editor of a major journal, Chair of a national society committee, hosting a major conference).
III. Community Service / Engagement	No documented evidence of service connecting professional expertise to the community or broader public.	Community engagement is infrequent or transactional, or involves general volunteerism rather than professional expertise.	Provides documented service to the community using professional knowledge or skills (e.g., serves on a local non-profit board, consults a community group, delivers workshops to schools or businesses).	Initiates and leads significant external engagement applying professional expertise to substantial public needs, with demonstrable impact (e.g., secures grant funding for a community project, advises an agency, publicizes research through major media).
Overall Impact	Service efforts are absent or demonstrably counterproductive, hindering the functioning of the unit or committee.	Unreliable or requires excessive prompting to complete service obligations; contributions may be seen as detrimental to the collegial environment.	Quality of service is solid and dependable. Contributions are reliable, collegial, and fulfill all expectations of citizenship and rank.	Quality of service is consistently outstanding, characterized by initiative, creative problem-solving, and a clear, documented positive influence on the department, institution, or discipline.

Evidence Types (illustrative)

3.4 University Service

- University Order documenting appointment as chair of a committee.

- b. Committee final report or minutes crediting the faculty with leading a successful, high-impact policy change.
- c. Department Head or Dean letter praising leadership in resolving a critical institutional issue.
- d. Attendance records showing participation in events.

3.5 Professional Service

- a. Letters of invitation from national/international journals, organizations, or societies.
- b. Letters/records of successful hosting of a conference.
- c. Letters or memos indicating serving as a reviewer in the discipline.
- d. Appointment letter as Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor for a respected peer-reviewed journal.
- e. Documentation of regular, high-quality peer review of manuscripts.
- f. Documentation of holding a national, regional, or international elected office.

3.6 Community Service / Engagement

- a. Document or letter showing receipt of grant funding for a community-based project.
- b. Letter confirming active service on the board of a local non-profit; media appearance publicizing research.
- c. Document showing service to the community using professional knowledge or skills.
- d. Document showing consultation offered to a community group.
- e. Document showing delivery of a workshop or training to schools or local businesses.

4. Standard IV: Collegiality

The faculty member serves as an exemplar of professional integrity, proactively fostering a trusting, collaborative climate by equitably sharing responsibility, effectively mentoring colleagues, and championing institutional excellence through respectful, constructive engagement and adherence to shared governance processes. Collegiality is measured by the effect of one's interactions on colleagues' professional productivity (Arreola, 2000; Lund et al., 2010).

Criteria and Sub-Criteria

4.1 Communication and Interaction

- a. Foster trust and mutual respect; mediate conflicts between colleagues.
- b. Value and acknowledge diverse perspectives; promote transparent communication.
- c. Adhere to organizational protocols; refrain from unproductive rumors or speculation.

4.2 Shared Responsibility and Workload

- a. Share job-related responsibilities equitably; provide accurate, insightful information.
- b. Provide feedback to colleagues on departmental tasks; maintain departmental presence.
- c. Volunteer for special, high-need, or unpopular tasks.

4.3 Support, Mentorship, and Feedback

- a. Help new faculty learn department and university policies and procedures.
- b. Provide resources and assist with developing syllabi and assessments.
- c. Provide feedback to colleagues on teaching, assessment, and research.

4.4 Respect for Decisions and Processes

- a. Adhere to and champion approved department, college, and university policies and decisions.

- b. Use appropriate collegial channels (e.g., committee voting) to propose changes.
- c. Accept decisions made without one's input; recognize and state one's own biases.

Standard IV: Collegiality Rubric

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory (Deficient)	2 - Needs Improvement (Developing)	3 - Meets Expectations (Proficient)	4 - Exceeds Expectations (Exemplary)
I. Communication & Interaction	Engages in a pattern of persistent harassment, intimidation, bullying, or public/private disparagement of colleagues, staff, or students.	Communication is occasionally abrupt, dismissive, or passive-aggressive; frequently avoids conflict or handles disagreements in a public or inflammatory manner that disrupts meetings.	Communicates respectfully, professionally, and civilly in all formats. Addresses conflicts directly and constructively, adhering to university policies.	Actively fosters an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect; consistently and skillfully mediates conflicts between colleagues; is sought out for consultation.
II. Shared Responsibility & Workload	Consistently refuses or fails to participate in mandatory shared administrative tasks (advising, course scheduling, required reports).	Completes assigned shared tasks late, minimally, or poorly, requiring intervention. Frequently neglects shared duties, increasing colleagues' burden.	Reliably and proactively completes shared assignments and common department tasks on time, contributing equitably to the workload.	Proactively volunteers for difficult, high-need, or unpopular tasks without being asked. Anticipates needs and takes the lead in solving them, often outside formal service roles.
III. Support, Mentorship & Feedback	Actively undermines colleagues or students (spreading rumors, sabotage, withholding critical information, obstructing collaboration).	Perceived as unwilling to share knowledge, resources, or information; provides unduly critical, unhelpful, or negative feedback.	Responsive to requests for assistance or collaboration. Provides timely, constructive feedback (peer reviews, committee input, syllabus consultation) when asked. Shares resources appropriately.	Serves as a formal or informal mentor to multiple junior colleagues or new faculty/staff. Proactively offers resources, expertise, and assistance to support departmental growth.
IV. Respect for Decisions & Process	Engages in direct and sustained violation of department/university policy, or attempts to incite defiance of legitimate governing decisions.	Habitually bypasses, ignores, or fails to implement approved policies. Publicly debates or undermines established decisions after governance concludes.	Adheres to adopted policies and decisions, supporting established procedures and shared governance (voting outcomes, curriculum changes).	Champions approved policies and decisions with integrity, even when personally disagreeing. Consistently models the use of appropriate, collegial channels to propose changes.

Evidence Types (illustrative)

4.5 Communication & Interaction

- a. Meeting minutes and attendance records evidencing respectful language, active listening, and constructive contribution; absence of disruptive behavior.
- b. Records of written communication reviewed for responsiveness, tone, professionalism, and civility.
- c. Colleague feedback from department heads or deans regarding conflict resolution.
- d. Formal complaints records: absence or successful resolution of harassment, bullying, or disparagement complaints.

4.6 Shared Responsibility & Workload

- a. Service record/emails/minutes: committee assignments and proof of completed tasks.
- b. Departmental workload documentation compared against departmental norms.
- c. Chair/Committee Head feedback on timely submission of required administrative materials.
- d. Volunteering/leadership records of proactively taking on unpopular or high-need roles.

4.7 Support, Mentorship & Feedback

- a. Mentoring records: formal mentor assignment; documented attendance at mentoring sessions/workshops.
- b. Peer review records of constructive reviews of teaching, grant proposals, or manuscripts.

- c. Colleague commendations thanking the faculty for sharing resources or assistance.
- d. Collaborative outputs: co-authored papers, joint grants, or collaborative curriculum projects.

4.8 Respect for Decisions & Process

- a. Committee reports showing the faculty's critique led to positive, data-driven changes.
- b. Voting/policy implementation records showing adherence to approved policies, even those opposed.
- c. Evidence of using official, collegial channels to advocate for policy change.
- d. Chair/Dean observation confirming the faculty upholds and champions institutional decisions publicly.

V. REFERENCES

- Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1999). *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Jossey-Bass.
- Buller, J. L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders*. Jossey-Bass.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching - a meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 507-542.
- Marsh, H. W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 603-641.
- Lund, J., Boyce, B. A., Oates, R., & Fiorentino, L. (2010). Faculty dispositions: Seeking clarity while looking at muddy waters. *Quest*, 62(3), 268-286.
- Middaugh, M. F. (2020). *Understanding faculty productivity: Standards and benchmarks for colleges and universities*. Wiley.