

TAI SOLARIN FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, IJAGUN

**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM 20...../20.....
(TEACHING STAFF)**

Section A

Personal Details

1. Name:..... (2) Age:

3. Department:.....

4. Present Position:.....

5. Present Annual Salary:.....

6. Date of First Appointment:.....

7. Date of Confirmation:.....

8. Date of Last Promotion:.....

9. Academic/Professional Qualifications with Dates:
 - i.

 - ii.

 - iii.

 - iv.

v.

10. Additional Academic/Professional Qualification with Dates (since First Appointment/Last Promotion)

i.

ii.

iii.

iv.

v.

Section B Activities During The Past One Year

1. Special Conferences/Seminars/Courses attended (with Titles of Paper Read)

i.

ii.

iii.

iv.

v.

vi.

vii.

2. Contribution to University Life:

i.

ii.

iii.

iv.

v.

vi.

3. Contribution to Community Life and Professional Association:

i.

ii.

iii.

iv.

v.

vi.

Section C

1. Publication and/or other important Projects undertaken and completed during the Academic year

i. Journal Articles.....

ii. Textbooks.

iii. Chapter in books

iv. Edited Conference Proceeding.

v. Other Conference Papers

vi. Monographs and Exhibited Works.....

vii. Patent and Artified Inventions.....

viii. Technical Report.....

2. Teaching Department:

Tertiary Institution:

1.

2.

Section D Students' Assessment Instrument

Instruction

You are hereby requested to give an honest and unbiased assessment of how your teacher has fared in the course of carrying out his/her functions during the semester. This sheet is for your assessment of just a lecturer whose course you attended. Notice that you need not supply your name if you prefer anonymity.

1. Your Name (Optional).....

2. Lecturer's Name.....

3. Course taught by the Lecturer.....

4. Semester during which you were taught the course:.....

5. Has this lecturer taught you in a previous course?

In the rest of this instrument, tick (√) the column for each item that best reflects your assessment of the lecturer under assessment. Do not tick (√) two options for them.

		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
a.	Punctuality to classes					
b.	Attendance at all lectures (not missing classes)					
c.	Evidence of adequate preparation for teaching task					
d.	Evidence of proper mastery of the content					

e.	Ability to cite authorities during the teaching					
f.	Adequate illustration of each lecture					
g.	Clarity of explanations					
h.	Proper and clear use of aids and/or illustrations					
i.	Adequate and proper use of questions					
j.	Prompt and proper acknowledgement of students' attempts					
k.	Clarity of questions asked during lecture					
l.	Frequency of continuous assessment tests					
m.	Early return of marks after continuous assessment tests/exams					
n.	Neatness and decency in and outside the class					
o.	Firmness and discipline in and outside the class					
p.	General rapport with students					

Thanks so much for your input.

Section E Assessment by Colleagues

Instructions:

You are requested through this instrument to give your candid assessment of one of your colleagues at work, in the person of We assume you are familiar with him/her to give an unbiased assessment that should enable the University take decisions on him/her. Kindly note that this is a responsibility you should not dodge since the prospects for the progress of your unit, department, college and indeed of the whole university could, in the final analysis, hang on his/her promotion/non promotion.

1. Your Name (Optional):.....
2. Department/Institute:.....
3. Length of service thus far in this university:.....

4. For how long have you worked with the officer being assessed?.....
5. Which of these best describes your personal relationship with him/her?
 - i. Very intimate friend in and out of service.....
 - ii. Well known to me but not particularly intimate.....
 - iii. Nothing more than a colleague, though we do work together.....
 - iv. Hardly on talking terms because of social distance.....
 - v. Never on talking or working terms.....

In this instrument, you are kindly required to tick the most appropriate column for each statement made about the officer being assessed. Note that the letters A, B, C, D and E above each of the columns should be interpreted this way:

Key: A: Very Correct/Excellent B: Correct/Very Good C: Fairly Correct/ Good
 D: Hardly Correct/Fair E: Incorrect/Very Poor

		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
a.	This staff is a scholar in his field.					
b.	He/she is a sticker for excellence in everything he/she does.					
c.	Though he/she goes only for excellence, he/she gently works with others to achieve this standard.					
d.	He/she works hard and encourages others to do so.					
e.	He/she has a charisma most of us like to emulate.					
f.	He/she is able to work smoothly with juniors and seniors.					
g.	He/she is a leader rather than a boss.					
h.	He/she is ready to share information on where and how others can develop.					
i.	He/she has won/initiated research projects to which others can develop.					
j.	He/she participates actively at seminars, workshops, etc.					
k.	At staff meetings, he/she contributes to					

	discussions.					
l.	He/she has a healthy relationship with students.					
m.	He/she doesn't extort students in anyway, e.g. through compulsory sale of textual materials.					
n.	In my opinion, he/she will not maltreat others in any way.					
o.	I would readily describe him/her as an academic leader.					
p.	In my opinion, the future of this institution would be secure with him/her.					

Section F Assessment by Immediate Superior Officer

(By Head of Department, Director or Dean)

Instructions

This instrument is to be used in respect of a candidate who is being put up for promotion to the next rank. Please be as candid as possible in your assessment.

At the very end of the instrument, you will have to indicate whether, and to what degree, you support the candidate's promotion to the next rank.

1. Candidate's Name:.....
2. Qualifications:.....
3. Department/Institute:.....
4. His/Her present rank:.....
5. For how long has he/she been on the rank?.....
6. His/Her specific area of specialization:.....

		Excellent 5	Very Good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
a.	Punctuality to meetings.					
b.	Zeal in addressing him/herself to work.					
c.	Thoroughness in getting a task executed.					
d.	Thoroughness in marking scripts.					
e.	Punctuality in returning scores.					
f.	Readiness to take instructions/correction.					
g.	Readiness to execute assignments.					
h.	Ability to design specific research work.					
i.	Thoroughness in executing research work.					
j.	Readiness to execute research tasks with others (group research).					
k.	Relationship with students.					
l.	Relationship with colleagues.					
m.	Attention to general personal appearance.					
n.	Alertness in (and contributions to) general staff meetings.					
o.	Alertness in (and contributions to) staff seminars.					
p.	Attendance at workshops and conferences in this University.					
q.	Attendance at workshops and conferences outside this University.					
r.	Potentials as a leader.					

Indicate overall performance of duties by ticking (√) the appropriate below. This should reflect the performance actually achieved in the circumstances which prevailed as scored above.

- a. Highly competent: (Excellent: 70+).....
- b. Competent: (Very Good: 60-69).....
- c. Just competent: (Good: 50-59).....
- d. Hardly competent: (Fair: 40-49).....

e. Not competent: (Poor: 0-39).....

General comments that might help the University arrive at a final decision about the level of competence of this candidate.

COMMENTS OF THE REPORTING OFFICER:

Please provide any additional relevant information here, drawing attention to any particular strength or weakness.....

.....

He/She has served under me for the past..... years months.....

Name in block letters.....

Signature.....

Grade.....

COMMENTS OF THE CANDIDATE EVALUATED

I certify that I have seen the contents of this report and that my supervisor has discussed them with me.

I have the following comment(s) to add.

.....

.....

Name.....

Signature & Date.....

College Recommendation(s)

.....

.....
.....
.....
Dean's Name.....

Signature/Date:.....

Section G Assessment of Candidate's Service to the University and/or to the Community

An academic's contribution to the life in his community should count since he is not an island to himself. While he is expected to be primarily busy with his academics, at the same time he is expected to influence his immediate society positively. This aspect cannot be directly assessed by a superior officer through a questionnaire; rather, the candidate himself should spell out in his curriculum vitae in what ways he has been relating to the society around him. In this direction, the roles he has been playing in it, the specific contributions he has been making to it, the types of programmes he has ever initiated within it, etc.

Generally speaking, the more senior an academic is, the more contributions he is expected to have been able to make in this regard. Conversely, a junior academic, still struggling to complete his doctoral degree and get published in journals, cannot be expected to make an earth-shaking impact on his society/community. Besides, as one of the services to a community includes roles played in an academic publication, e.g. founding one, editing it, etc., this is an area in which senior officers are more relevant. Thus, we should assess the various cadres of academics differently. Indeed, a lecturer II may be exempted from this exercise while a Reader should be fully assessed on a higher weighting. This is to be assessed by the Board of evaluation of each college.

In the light of the foregoing, the following schedule should be considered in the assessment of a candidate's services to his community/university.

Types of Services		Cadres of academics				
		AL	LII	LI	SL	Reader
a.	Clubs/societies on campus.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
b.	Political and National Honours	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
c.	Roles played in Academic societies on campus	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
d.	Academic societies outside campus, e.g. promoting academic activities in a school.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
e.	Roles played in schools in his community	---	---	1.0	1.0	1.0

	e.g. as a member of a governing board. PTA official, etc.					
f.	Roles played in national academic bodies, e.g. NGA, STAN, a national journal, etc.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Cadres of academics						
Types of Services		AL	LII	LI	SL	Reader
g.	Roles played in international academic bodies, e.g. as a member of an international association of...	---	---	1.0	1.0	1.0
h.	Extent of having influenced national educational issues, e.g. at the state/federal ministry of education.	---	---	0.5	0.5	2.0
Total maximum score for each cadre.		---	2.5	7.5	7.5	10.0

What do all these imply? The direct implications are that:

While the assistant lecturer would not be assessed on this basis, and the lecturer II can be assessed out of a maximum score of 2.5 marks, the reader aspiring to become a professor will be scored out of a total of 10 marks.

Section H Assessment of Academic's Administrative Competence

One of the almost inevitable duties of a very senior academic is administration. In the University, it is the professor that should be made a Head of Department, a Dean, a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, or a Vice-Chancellor. If a person of a lower cadre finds himself in any of these positions he/she will do so only in an acting capacity. Rather unfortunately, many academics do not have anything to prepare them for administrative tasks. Most often, there is nothing in the academic education that could prepare them for the eventual administrative tasks. However, along the way up, each academic member (rising from the lowest cadre of the academic ladder) is assigned some administrative tasks of different magnitudes by the Dean, Head of Department, or other Senior Colleagues. While some gladly accept such challenges, some others tactfully dodge them, while some of those who accept the responsibilities make a failure of them or manage to excel in them.

The assessment of this aspect should focus on the following:

Cadres of academics						
Types of Administrative tasks		AL	LII	LI	SL	Reader
a.	Minor tasks peculiar to a unit of a department.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
b.	Medium tasks applicable to a whole department, e.g. examination coordinator.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
c.	Major departmental tasks, e.g. headship of department.	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
d.	Major University wide tasks e.g. membership of a committee (publications committee)	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
e.	Membership of the Senate and a senate committee	---	---	1.0	1.0	1.0

f.	Representative in the council, or a council committee	---	---	1.0	1.0	1.0
g.	Representative in the University in an outside organ	---	0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0
h.	Ad hoc state wide task, e.g. membership of National, State or Local Government Committee	---	---	1.0	1.0	2.0
	Total maximum score for each cadre.	---	2.5	7.5	7.5	10.0

The above are merely the maximum scores a person could earn from each area. Thus, should a person have more than one function in each area, all he can still earn is the mark shown.

SUMMATION

From the five areas of assessment in Section D to H, the following shall be the weight assigned for the various categories of academics.

Cadres of academics		AL	LII	LI	SL	Reader
Types of Administrative tasks						
a.	Assessment by students	10	10	10	10	5
b.	Assessment by colleagues	15	10	10	10	15
c.	Assessment by HOD/Dean	25	25	15	15	10
d.	Service to the Community	---	2.5	7.5	7.5	10
e.	Administrative competence	---	2.5	7.5	7.5	10
	Total	50	50	50	50	50

State Two: Assessment based on productivity.

* Minimum Points for promotion at Each Level

Assistant Lecturer to Lecturer II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Minimum of three years teaching experience as an Assistant Lecturer. ii. Evidence of continued research and productivity from last promotion. iii. 4 points from publications* for those without Ph.D.; and not more than three (3) letters of acceptance.
Lecturer II to Lecturer I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Minimum of three years teaching experience as a Lecturer II. ii. Evidence of continued research and productivity from last promotion. iii. 15 points at least from five (5) publications* for those without Ph.D. or 10 points from at least three (3) publications* for those with Ph.D.; and not more than three letters of acceptance.
Lecturer I to Senior Lecturer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Minimum of three (3) years teaching experience as a Lecturer I. ii. Evidence of continued research and productivity from the last promotion. iii. A Ph.D. degree in relevant area of specialization. iv. 35 points from at least ten (10) publications* and not more than three letters of acceptance.
Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Must possess a Ph.D. degree in the relevant area. ii. Minimum of three years teaching experience as a Senior Lecturer. iii. Must have at least three (3) publications* after the last promotion as evidence of continued research and productivity. iv. Must score a minimum of 45 points from at least sixteen (16) publications*, out of which two (2) must be foreign-based; and not more than three Letters of acceptance. v. Articles published in College of Education or Polytechnic journals up to 2005 only are acceptable and should be assessed. vi. Each published papers article shall be assessed on a maximum of three (3) points. vii. The published papers must show, explicitly, the research focus of the candidate. viii. A paper-by-paper assessment is required.
Associate Professor to Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Must possess a Ph.D. degree in the relevant area. ii. Minimum of three years teaching experience as an Associate Professor. iii. Must have at least three (3) publications* after the last promotion as evidence of continued research and productivity. iv. Must score a minimum of 60 points from at least twenty two (22) publications*, out of which three (3) must be foreign-based; and not more than three Letters of acceptance. v. Articles published in College of Education or Polytechnic journals up to 2005 only are acceptable and should be assessed. vi. Each published papers article shall be assessed on a maximum of three (3) points. vii. The published papers must show, explicitly, the research focus of the candidate. viii. A paper-by-paper assessment is required.

Legend

*Publications include monographs, chapter in books, conference proceedings, journal articles, etc.

CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT FOR ACADEMIC STAFF FOR YEARLY EVALUATION AND PROMOTION

A. PERSONAL DATA

- (i) Names:
- (ii) Place and Date of Birth:
- (iii) Nationality:
- (iv) State of Origin:
- (v) Home Address:
Office/Postal Address:
Telephone Numbers: Home:
 Office:
 Mobile:
- E-mail Address:
- (vi) Marital Status:
- (vii) Number of Children:
- (viii) Next of Kin:
 Name:
 Relationship:
 Address:
 Telephone:

B. WORKING STATUS IN TASUED

- (i) Date of First Appointment and Post
- (ii) Date of Confirmation
- (iii) Present Status and Salary:
- (iv) Date of Last Promotion / Present Status

C. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY WITH DATES

- (i) Institutions Attended
- (ii) Academic Qualifications

D. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS WITH DATE

E. EMPLOYMENT HISTORY WITH DATE

F. ACADEMIC AWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS (SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS AND PRIZES)

G. MEMBERSHIP OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

H. DETAILS OF TEACHING AND WORK EXPERIENCE

- (i) Projects
- (ii) Courses Taught During the Session
- (iii) Administrative Services

I. AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION AND RESEARCH INTEREST

J. PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH (USING APA FORMAT)

- (i) Thesis and Dissertation
- (ii) Publications in Learned Journals
- (iii) Publications in Edited Books
- (iv) Published Books
- (v) Publication in Edited and Published Conference Proceedings
- (vi) Technical Reports
- (vii) Conferences Attended and Papers Presented

Note: Publications since last right placement exercise

K. EXTRA CURRICULA ACTIVITIES

- (i) Non-Teaching Service to the University
- (ii) Service to Community

L. HOBBIES

Signature

Date