

FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE		PROCEDURE NUMBER: AA007PR
		OWNER: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
		CONTACT INFORMATION: khalid.ibrahim@cue.edu.krd
		EFFECTIVE DATE: Sep-21 2026 REVIEW DATE: Sep-21 2029

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN ERBIL

Faculty Evaluation and Development Procedure

Content

I. PURPOSE	1
II. SCOPE	2
III. DEFINITIONS	2
IV. PROCEDURE STATEMENT	2
V. PROCEDURE STEPS	2
VI. PROCEDURE HISTORY	5
VII. APPENDICES	5

I. PURPOSE

This procedure establishes the processes and responsibilities for conducting faculty evaluation at the Catholic University in Erbil (CUE). It supports consistent implementation, accountability, compliance with the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MHE), Quality Assurance (QA), and alignment with the university's mission.

II. SCOPE

☐ University-Wide

☒ Departmental Specify Department(s): ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

This procedure applies to all faculty members responsible for teaching and academic programs, including full-time, part-time, visiting, and other instructional personnel as applicable. This procedure is not to supersede any University-wide procedures, including Human Resources policies governing employment practices.

III. DEFINITIONS

Terms used in this procedure are defined in the Faculty Evaluation and Development Policy (AA007). The following additional terms apply to this procedure:

Cumulative Evaluation Score: The unified annual performance score produced by corroborating data from the three sources (CAD, academic portfolio, and student feedback).

IV. PROCEDURE STATEMENT

Faculty evaluation at CUE is conducted annually by Heads of Departments as an integrated institutional process led and supervised by Academic Affairs in coordination with the Quality Assurance Office. It draws on the three data sources required by MHE: Continuous Academic Development (CAD), an academic portfolio, and student feedback. The QA Office monitors compliance and aggregates results across these dimensions into a cumulative annual score; Department Heads conduct the academic portfolio review and deliver formative feedback; and Academic Affairs oversees implementation, maintains records, and submits the unified institutional report to the Ministry. The Quality Assurance instruments and ranking scales that govern each source are set out in Appendices II-V. CUE integrates this faculty evaluation process with the Faculty Evaluation Guideline (AA007GL).

V. PROCEDURE STEPS

Step 1: Communication of Criteria and Timeline

Responsible Party: Academic Affairs / Quality Assurance Office

Required Actions:

1.1 Communicate the faculty evaluation process, criteria, required documentation, and timeline to all faculty members at the beginning of the academic year; to include providing access to and training on:

- a. the three institutional Quality Assurance (QA) evaluation sources: Continuous Academic Development (CAD), Academic Portfolio Evaluation, and Student Feedback (See Appendices II–V); and
- b. the Faculty Evaluation Guideline (AA007GL), including expectations for Teaching Effectiveness, Research, Service, and Collegiality, and explain how evidence related to these standards supports faculty evaluation, reflection, and professional development. Details within the Faculty Evaluation Guideline (AA007GL) are integrated with QA evaluations described in this procedure.

1.2 Confirm the roles and responsibilities of faculty members, the Quality Assurance Office, Academic Affairs, and designated evaluators (See Appendix I); provide training as needed.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Dated communication to faculty (email/memo/training); Published evaluation calendar per academic year

Step 2: Continuous Academic Development (CAD)

Responsible Party: Faculty Members / Quality Assurance Office/ Chief of Academic Affairs

Required Actions:

2.1 Faculty members document Continuous Academic Development (CAD) activities completed during the academic year according to the approved CUE Quality Assurance CAD Evaluation Table (see Appendix II).

2.2 Faculty members submit required evidence for eligible CAD activities, including scientific activities, research and publications, patents, awards, and grants, conferences, workshops and training activities, seminars, and other academic development activities.

2.3 The Quality Assurance Office reviews and verifies submitted CAD activities and supporting documentation according to the criteria established in the CAD Evaluation Table, then assigns points and calculates CAD results as one component of the faculty member's cumulative academic evaluation.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Completed CAD record/log including supporting evidence; QA Completed CAD Evaluation Table/results

Step 3: Student Feedback Surveys

Responsible Party: Quality Assurance Office

Required Actions:

3.1 Administer standardized student feedback surveys (see Appendix IV) at the end of each semester for each course.

3.2 Collate and verify response data for each faculty member and course.

3.3 Shares collated and verified data with Academic Affairs.

3.4 Academic Affairs shares data each Head of Department who then shares with their individual faculty members.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Standardized student survey instrument; Aggregated student feedback results per faculty member

Step 4: Academic Portfolio Review

Responsible Party: Heads of Departments

Required Actions:

4.1 Conduct the Academic Portfolio Evaluation according to the faculty evaluation criteria and rating system (see Appendix III). Review supporting documentation and evidence, including relevant materials from the Faculty Evidence where applicable. Meet with faculty to compare rubric scoring.

4.2 Record evaluation scores, comments, and recommendations according to QA procedures.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Completed Academic Portfolio Evaluation rubrics and form; Faculty Evidence / supporting documentation, where applicable; Evaluator scores and comments.

Step 5: Aggregation and Cumulative Scoring

Responsible Party: Quality Assurance Office

Required Actions:

5.1 Corroborate and unify data from CAD, academic portfolio, and student feedback.

5.2 Calculate the cumulative annual performance score for each faculty member.

5.3 Monitor institutional compliance across departments.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Cumulative score record per faculty member; Compliance summary.

Step 6: Feedback, Outcomes, and Development Planning

Responsible Party: Heads of Department / Academic Affairs

Required Actions:

6.1 Share final results with each faculty member and provide an opportunity to respond.

6.2 Recognize effective performance, identify development needs, and set goals.

6.3. Where significant concerns are identified, initiate improvement measures.

Required Documentation / Evidence: Evaluation feedback record and faculty response; Professional development plan / improvement plan, where applicable.

Step 7: Institutional Reporting and Records

Responsible Party: Quality Assurance Office / Academic Affairs

Required Actions:

7.1 Compile the unified institutional report and submit it to MHE, annually.

7.2 Maintain evaluation records securely; share information only with those responsible for academic oversight, professional development, or personnel decisions.

Required Documentation / Evidence:

- Unified institutional QA report submitted to MHE
- Securely archived evaluation records.

VI. PROCEDURE HISTORY

- a) Owned by: Academic Affairs
- b) Reviewed by: Policy and Procedure Review Committee, University Council, President's Cabinet.
- c) Approved by: President's Cabinet.
- d) Date approved: Sep-21 2026.
- e) Related Policies: Faculty Evaluation and Development Policy (AA007); Faculty Qualifications and Appointment Policy (AA006); Conflict of Interest Policy (HR003)
- f) Related Procedures/Guidelines: Faculty Evaluation Guideline (AA007GL)
- g) Version: 2026-06-18_CUE-AA007 PR FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE (Original)
- h) Revision dates: N/A

VII. APPENDICES

- [Faculty Evaluation Procedure Appendices](#)
- [Part-time Faculty Memo- Part-Time Faculty Evaluation.docx](#) .