

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

Overview

A rigorous, fair, and consistently applied faculty performance review is one of the clearest indicators of an institution's commitment to academic quality. At American International University, the Faculty Performance Review is not an administrative formality; it is the primary instrument through which AIU demonstrates, to its faculty and to Accrediting agency, that teaching excellence, scholarly productivity, and professional service are genuinely valued, systematically assessed, and continuously developed.

This policy establishes the framework for the Annual Faculty Performance Review at AIU. It defines who is reviewed, the domains and criteria of evaluation, the weighting applicable to each faculty workload profile, the rating scale and its consequences, the roles and responsibilities of all participants, the timeline, confidentiality requirements, and the appeal process. It is designed to be read alongside, and is fully consistent with, the Faculty Responsibilities Policy (FAC-005) and the Faculty Workload Policy (FAC-006), from which the workload profiles and domain frameworks used in this policy are drawn.

Scope

This policy applies to all full-time regular faculty, visiting faculty, and academic non-faculty appointment holders at AIU, including persons holding the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Instructor, Instructor, and Foundation Program Instructor. Faculty members who are on leave for part of the evaluation period are reviewed for the activities undertaken during their active appointment period, with evaluation criteria adjusted proportionally. Adjunct and part-time faculty are reviewed using a simplified form administered by the Dean at the end of each semester. Administrative faculty (Deans and Department Chairs) are reviewed under this policy with additional criteria applicable to their administrative roles.

Purpose

The purposes of this policy are to:

- Provide a transparent, evidence-based, and peer-reviewed process for assessing faculty performance across the domains of teaching and learning, research and scholarship, service, and continuous professional development
- Recognized and reward meritorious performance while identifying areas requiring improvement and providing structured support for development
- Link faculty evaluation directly to the institutional mission, strategic plan, School business plans, and accreditation evidence requirements
- Establish the evaluation criteria and weighting structure aligned to each workload profile as defined in FAC-006, ensuring that the relative weight of each domain in evaluation reflects the faculty member's actual workload allocation
- Provide the documented basis to inform decisions regarding merit increases, contract renewal, and promotion, as governed by FAC-003
- Demonstrate AIU's compliance with faculty evaluation links teaching, scholarship, and service, faculty employment policies, and faculty development

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- Sustain a culture of continuous improvement, collegial engagement, and professional accountability across all Schools and academic units

Abbreviations and Definitions

Annual Faculty Activity Report (AFAR): The primary self-assessment document submitted by each faculty member at the end of each academic year, documenting accomplishments in teaching, research, service, and professional development, supported by evidence.

Course Portfolio: A structured compilation of evidence related to teaching during the evaluation period, including syllabi, assessment materials, student feedback results, teaching philosophy, and reflective commentary.

Teaching Philosophy Statement: A written reflection by the faculty member on their beliefs, values, and methods in teaching and learning, connected explicitly to the department's and School's educational objectives.

Reflection and Action Plan: A mandatory component of the AFAR in which the faculty member reflects critically on their performance during the evaluation period and articulates a specific, measurable action plan for the following year.

Enhanced Course Portfolio: A course portfolio with additional documentation for one selected course each year, including detailed evidence of active learning integration, assessment design, student feedback analysis, and reflective commentary.

Faculty Activity System (FAS): AIU's institutional platform for recording and managing faculty credentials, teaching schedules, scholarly outputs, service records, student evaluations, and annual activity reports.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET): A standardized, anonymous online questionnaire administered to all students in all courses each semester, providing student feedback on instructional effectiveness.

Peer Observation of Teaching (POT): A structured process in which a trained faculty peer or the Department Chair observes a class session and provides documented feedback on instructional quality.

Performance Review Committee (PRC): Teaching or workload assignment in excess of the standard load specified for a given rank, subject to compensation provisions in the employment contract.

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP): A formal, documented plan agreed between the Dean, Department Chair, and a faculty member whose evaluation falls in the Needs Attention range, specifying improvement targets, support resources, and timelines.

Merit Increase: A salary increment awarded on the basis of demonstrated meritorious or distinguished performance, as determined through the annual review process and subject to budget availability.

Policy

Article 1: Governing Principles

The AIU Faculty Performance Review is guided by the following principles, which govern every aspect of its design and administration:

1. Evidence-based: All evaluation conclusions must be supported by documented evidence. Subjective impressions unsupported by evidence may not form the basis of a rating.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

2. Peer-reviewed: The process involves faculty peers in formal evaluation roles, consistent with the academic value of collegial assessment.
3. Proportionate: The weight assigned to each evaluation domain reflects the faculty member's actual workload profile as approved under FAC-006. Faculty cannot be penalized for performance in domains that were not a primary obligation during the evaluation period.
4. Developmental: The primary purpose of the review is to support the continuous professional growth of faculty members. Evaluations must result in specific, forward-looking development plans, not only backward-looking ratings.
5. Consequential: Performance review outcomes may be taken into account when informing decisions regarding merit increases, contract renewal, probation extension, and promotion, in accordance with FAC-003.
6. Confidential: All materials submitted by a faculty member and all evaluation proceedings and outcomes are confidential. Disclosure is restricted to those with a legitimate role in the process.
7. Consistent: Evaluation criteria, weightings, and rating standards are applied consistently across all faculty members with the same workload profile within a School. School-level customization of criteria must be approved by the VPAA.
8. Transparent: Faculty members are informed of all evaluation criteria, weightings, processes, and timelines at the beginning of each evaluation cycle and must have the opportunity to respond to any preliminary evaluation before it is finalized.
9. Protective of Academic Freedom: No aspect of this process may be used to penalize a faculty member for the exercise of academic freedom as protected under ACA-002.

Article 2: Scope of Evaluation: Who is Reviewed and When

All full-time faculty and academic non-faculty appointment holders at AIU are subject to annual performance review. The specific structure of the review varies as follows:

2.1 Regular Annual Review

All full-time regular and visiting faculty members undergo a full annual performance review in accordance with this policy, beginning in their second year of appointment. In their first year, new faculty are subject to a Probationary Review under Article 2.2.

2.2 Probationary Review

All new faculty members undergo a Probationary Review at the end of their first semester and a full annual review at the end of their first year, as required by FAC-003. The Probationary Review uses the same domain framework and rating scale as the Annual Review but with evaluation criteria and expectations adjusted proportionally to the period of service. The outcome of the first-year Probationary Review forms the basis for recommendations regarding confirmation of appointment, extension of probation, or termination, in accordance with FAC-003, Article 8.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

2.3 Faculty on Leave

Faculty members who are on leave for part of the evaluation period are reviewed for the activities undertaken during their active service period, with all evaluation criteria and thresholds adjusted proportionally. The adjustments are agreed between the faculty member and the Department Chair before the start of the leave period and documented in the faculty member's workload record.

2.4 Administrative Faculty

Faculty holding administrative appointments, Deans, Department Chairs, Program Coordinators, and Course Coordinators, are evaluated under this policy using the workload-profile weighting applicable to their administrative designation. Additional criteria specific to their administrative responsibilities apply, as set out in Article 5 of this policy.

2.5 Adjunct and Part-Time Faculty

Adjunct and part-time faculty are reviewed using a simplified semester-end evaluation administered by the Dean. The evaluation covers teaching quality (as assessed through SET results and, where applicable, POT), professional conduct, and adherence to institutional policies. Results are documented and retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

Article 3: Evaluation Domains and Criteria

Faculty performance at AIU is evaluated across four domains. The specific weight assigned to each domain in any given evaluation varies by workload profile, as set out in Article 4. All four domains must be represented in every evaluation, though the weight of each domain reflects the faculty member's actual workload allocation.

3.1 Teaching and Learning

- a. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated through a combination of documentary evidence, student feedback, and peer assessment. The following elements constitute the formal evidence base for the Teaching and Learning domain:
 - Enhanced Course Portfolio: Faculty submit a Course Portfolio for the evaluation period, with one course designated as the Enhanced Course Portfolio each year. This must include: all syllabi for courses taught; a Teaching Philosophy Statement linked explicitly to the School's educational objectives; evidence of active learning strategies, technology integration, and student engagement; assessment methods demonstrating alignment with course learning outcomes; samples of student work at varying performance levels; and reflective commentary on what worked and what requires improvement.
 - Teaching, Creativity, and Assessment Evidence (80% of the domain): Evaluated on two indicators (1) integration of active learning, technology, and student engagement (50% of the 80%); and (2) quality and variety of assessment methods used to enhance student

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

learning (30% of the 80%). In courses using common examinations, weighting is adjusted to 60% and 20% respectively.

- Student Evaluation of Teaching (20% of the domain): The cumulative SET score across all courses taught during the evaluation period. SET is conducted online in all courses each semester, three weeks before the end of classes. Results are administered centrally by the VPAA Office. A minimum of fifteen student respondents per course is required for SET results to be used in formal evaluation; courses below this threshold are noted in the evaluation record but SET scores are not used punitively, unless otherwise approved by the VPAA in exceptional circumstances.
 - Peer Observation of Teaching: All faculty members normally participate in at least one POT cycle per academic year. POT feedback is documented using the AIU Peer Observation Form and is considered supplementary evidence in the teaching domain evaluation. POT is not scored independently but informs the holistic teaching assessment.
- b. SET score thresholds for the Teaching and Learning domain sub-rating:
- 85.0% or higher: Distinguished contribution to student learning
 - 75.0–84.9%: Meritorious contribution to student learning
 - 67.0–74.9%: Satisfactory contribution to student learning
 - Below 67.0%: Requires improvement a mandatory consultation with the Department Chair is triggered
- c. A faculty member who receives a teaching sub-rating below 2.0 (on the 0–4 scale) in any evaluation period will be required by the Department Chair to submit an additional course portfolio in the following cycle and to complete a documented professional development activity focused on instructional improvement.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

- a. Research and scholarship are formally evaluated for all full-time ranked faculty. The evaluation recognizes that scholarly productivity takes diverse forms across disciplines. Evidence submitted under this domain may include:
- Publications in peer-reviewed journals, with weight given to indexed, high-impact publications in discipline-recognized outlets. Special recognition applies to publications in Scopus-indexed journals, publications with significant impact factor, and publications where the AIU faculty member is the main author.
 - Books, book chapters, and edited volumes, with weight reflecting the publication outlet's standing in the discipline.
 - Conference presentations, with weight given to peer-reviewed full papers at reputable international conferences.
 - Creative works in applicable disciplines, including exhibitions, films, design outputs, and other forms of creative scholarship recognized by the discipline.
 - Research funding: grants received and submitted, with lead Principal Investigator status carrying the highest weight.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- Other scholarly activities: patent filings or awards, co-supervision of student research, grant writing, research center leadership, and international research collaboration.
- b. Publication ranking is determined at the School level, in consultation with the Faculty Council, at the beginning of each academic year, and communicated to all faculty before the evaluation cycle begins. Rankings are discipline-specific and must be formally recorded in the School's annual assessment documentation.
- c. The evaluation period for research is the two most recent calendar years. Research output is computed as a four-year rolling average for workload profile eligibility in accordance with FAC-006. High-quality publications in the discipline's top tier may be carried forward and credited in a second successive evaluation period.

3.3 Service

- a. Service is evaluated holistically based on the significance, impact, and scope of contributions across at least one of three categories:
 - Service to AIU: committee membership and leadership, Faculty Council participation, accreditation and quality assurance activities, student advising, program development, and mentoring colleagues.
 - Service to the Profession: professional association leadership, peer review of manuscripts and grants, editorial board membership, conference organization, and participation in professional standards bodies.
 - Service to the Community: consulting with government or industry, public lectures, media engagement on academic matters, school recruitment visits, and other community outreach activities connected to the faculty member's expertise.
- b. Compensated external consulting activity requires prior VPAA written approval under FAC-005. Service activities undertaken without institutional approval may not be claimed under this domain.

3.4 Continuous Professional Development

- a. This domain constitutes a mandatory component of all faculty evaluations and reflects AIU's commitment to faculty development under Accrediting agency requirement. Evidence submitted may include:
 - Attendance at and implementation of workshops on active learning, assessment, research methodology, or discipline-specific professional development
 - Completion of online training programs with documented outcomes
 - Participation in peer coaching, classroom observation, or instructional improvement programs
 - Attendance at academic conferences for development purposes
 - Completion of any institutional training module required in the evaluation year
- b. The mandatory Reflection and Action Plan, submitted as part of the AFAR, is the primary document for this domain. The Reflection and Action Plan must: evaluate the faculty member's

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

own performance against the learning outcomes of their courses and against the research and service goals set in the prior year's action plan; identify areas for improvement and specific steps to be taken; and specify the faculty development activities to be pursued in the coming year. Failure to submit the Reflection and Action Plan results in a zero score for the Continuous Professional Development domain.

Article 4: Evaluation Weights by Workload Profile

1. The weight assigned to each evaluation domain must reflect the faculty member's actual approved workload profile for the evaluation year, as determined under FAC-006 and confirmed in the Annual Workload Assignment. The following table sets out the weights applicable to each profile:

Workload Profile (FAC-006)	Teaching & Learning (%)	Research & Scholarship (%)	Service (%)	Professional Development (%)	Admin. Contribution (%)
Regular (12 CH)	50	30	10	10	—
With Research Release (9 CH)	40	40	10	10	—
Teaching Track (15 CH)	70	10	10	10	—
Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (15 CH)	70	10	10	10	—
Instructor/Senior Instructor (20 CH)	80	—	10	10	—
Deans (6 CH min)	30	20	10	10	30
Chairs (9 CH min)	40	20	10	10	20

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- Where a faculty member's approved profile changes mid-year due to enrolment changes, administrative appointment, or other documented circumstances, the applicable weights are calculated on a pro-rata basis. The VPAA approves all profile weight adjustments at the beginning of the evaluation cycle or at the point of mid-year change.
- Faculty on special leave, sabbatical, or full-time secondment receive a customized evaluation framework negotiated with the Department Chair and approved by the Dean before the leave commences. Evaluation requirements must be congruent with the nature of the leave assignment.

Article 5: Rating Scale

- The overall annual performance evaluation score is expressed as a percentage (0–100). The score is calculated by multiplying each domain score by its approved weight and summing the results. Domain scores are assigned on a scale of 0–100 based on the rubric evidence in each domain. The overall rating categories are:

Rating	Score Range	Qualitative	Meaning and Consequential Action
Distinguished	90–100	Excellent	Performance substantially exceeds expectations across all domains. May be considered for a merit increase, accelerated promotion consideration, and recognition award.
Meritorious	80–89	Very Good	Performance consistently exceeds expectations in most domains. Eligible for merit consideration and positive promotion recommendation.
Satisfactory	75–79	Satisfactory	Performance meets expectations. No negative employment consequences; faculty development plan encouraged.
Needs Attention	60–74	Needs Improvement	Performance is below expectations in one or more domains. A mandatory Performance Improvement Plan is required. Contract renewal remains conditional on improvement.
Unsatisfactory	0–59	Unacceptable	Performance fails to meet minimum institutional standards. Grounds for probationary review, non-

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President
			renewal, or termination in accordance with FAC-003.	

2. Consequences of each rating are governed jointly by this policy and FAC-003. A faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory or Needs Attention rating in two consecutive annual reviews is subject to the probationary review provisions of FAC-003. A faculty member who achieves Distinguished or Meritorious in three or more consecutive years is given priority consideration for merit increase and promotion review, subject to rank eligibility criteria in FAC-003.

Article 6: Roles and Responsibilities

6.1 Faculty Member

- Maintain an accurate and current FAS profile throughout the year, ensuring all teaching, research, service, and development activities are recorded promptly.
- Submit the complete Annual Faculty Activity Report (AFAR) including the Enhanced Course Portfolio, all supporting evidence, and the mandatory Reflection and Action Plan by 31 August each year.
- Agree with the Department Chair at the beginning of each academic year on the workload profile, evaluation weights, and annual goals for teaching, research, and service. Goals must be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound.
- Review the preliminary evaluation provided by the Department Chair and submit a written response within ten working days where there is disagreement.
- Meet with the Department Chair to discuss evaluation results, performance feedback, and the action plan for the coming year.
- Engage constructively with the Performance Improvement Plan if applicable, and implement agreed development activities within the specified timelines.
- Maintain the confidentiality of the evaluation process and the evaluations of other faculty members.

6.2 Department Chair

- Ensure all faculty members in the department receive, understand, and have accepted the AFAR requirements, FAS update obligations, and evaluation timeline at the beginning of each academic year.
- Review and agree on each faculty member's workload profile, evaluation weights, and annual goals before the start of the academic year. Document the agreed plan in the performance evaluation system.
- Conduct an interim check-in with each faculty member midway through the evaluation year, providing constructive feedback on progress toward agreed goals.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- d. Review the AFAR and all supporting evidence submitted by each faculty member, prepare a preliminary evaluation, and share it with the faculty member by 30 September.
- e. Ensure that the workload profile and agreed weights used in the evaluation are consistent with the faculty member's approved allocation under FAC-006.
- f. Submit the department's consolidated evaluation materials to the Performance Review Committee by 15 October.
- g. Write a formal response to the PRC evaluation report for each faculty member, including a quantitative performance assessment, a comment on collegiality, and recommendations for goals and development in the next cycle.
- h. Not influence the PRC's evaluation process before receiving the committee's report.
- i. Maintain the confidentiality of all evaluation materials and outcomes.

6.3 Performance Review Committee

- a. The Dean appoints the PRC for each School, in consultation with Department Chairs. The PRC must comprise at least three members: a minimum of two faculty members from the relevant department or School, and one Full Professor from the same or a different School as Chair. Department Chairs are not members of the PRC for their own department's evaluations.
- b. Before beginning evaluations, PRC members must confirm the absence of any conflict of interest with the faculty members being evaluated. Where a conflict exists, the Dean replaces the affected member.
- c. The PRC reviews all materials submitted to the performance evaluation system AFAR, supporting evidence, SET results, POT reports, and the Department Chair's preliminary evaluation and provides a quantitative rating and written rationale for each domain and the overall evaluation.
- d. The PRC's written report must specify: the extent to which goals have been met; mitigating factors affecting performance; support, resource, and development needs; and recommendations for the next cycle.
- e. Decisions are made by consensus or majority vote. The PRC Chair finalizes and submits the report through the performance evaluation system.
- f. All PRC proceedings and materials are strictly confidential.

6.4 School Dean

- a. Review all submitted documents the AFAR, PRC report, Department Chair commentary, and faculty response and issue the final Dean's evaluation for each faculty member by 15 November.
- b. Where the Dean identifies a concern about fairness or inconsistency in any evaluation, the Dean may request that the PRC reconvene or appoint a separate review committee to reconsider the evaluation.
- c. Receive and manage appeals submitted by faculty members, in accordance with Article 8 of this policy. The Dean's decision on appeal is final at the School level.
- d. Prepare the School Evaluation Summary an anonymized aggregate report of evaluation outcomes and submit it to the VPAA by 30 November.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- e. Initiate Performance Improvement Plans for all faculty members rated Needs Attention, in accordance with Article 7.2 of this policy.
- f. Report faculty evaluation aggregate data to the VPAA for inclusion in the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

6.5 VPAA

- a. Hold ultimate institutional responsibility for the administration, consistency, and integrity of the Faculty Performance Review system.
- b. Oversee the FAS and the performance evaluation system, ensuring both are operational, maintained, and accessible to all relevant parties.

Review School Evaluation Summaries submitted by Deans and initiate any cross-School consistency review where significant disparities in evaluation outcomes are identified.

- c. Consolidate School summaries into an annual University Faculty Performance Report, submitted to the President by 15 December.
- d. Present aggregate faculty performance data to the Board of Trustees through the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.
- e. Initiate a policy review of the Faculty Performance Review Policy at least every three years.
- f. The VPAA may issue implementation guidelines, templates and evaluation rubrics to support the consistent application of this policy across all Schools.

6.6 Additional Criteria for Administrative Faculty

Faculty members holding administrative roles are evaluated on the additional criteria below, in proportion to the administrative weight in their approved profile:

- Deans: Strategic leadership of the School; budget management; faculty and staff development oversight; accreditation compliance; and effectiveness of the School's academic and assessment activities, as assessed by the VPAA.
- Department Chairs: Quality and timeliness of workload planning; effectiveness of faculty mentorship; outcome of department assessment activities; program health indicators; and faculty satisfaction with departmental governance, as assessed by the Dean.
- Program Coordinators and Course Coordinators: Completion of coordination responsibilities; assessment documentation quality; and effectiveness in ensuring course consistency and quality, as assessed by the Department Chair.

Article 7: Consequences of Evaluation Outcomes

1. Distinguished and Meritorious Performance

- a. Faculty members rated Distinguished or Meritorious are eligible for:
 - Merit increase, subject to Board-approved budget allocation and the merit pay procedures administered by HR
 - Positive recommendation in any concurrent or subsequent contract renewal or promotion review

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- Priority access to University-funded research support, conference travel, and development opportunities
- Consideration for institutional recognition awards, at the discretion of the President
- b. Three or more consecutive Distinguished or Meritorious ratings constitute a positive performance record for promotion eligibility purposes under FAC-003.

2. Satisfactory Performance

Faculty members rated Satisfactory have met institutional expectations. No negative employment consequences arise from a Satisfactory rating. A forward-looking development plan is recommended and is discussed during the annual evaluation meeting with the Department Chair.

3. Needs Attention

A Needs Attention rating triggers the following mandatory actions:

- The Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, prepares a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) within three weeks of the final evaluation.
- The PIP specifies: the domain(s) in which performance is below expectations; the specific improvement targets for the following academic year; the support and development resources AIU will provide; the timeline for improvement; and the consequences of failing to achieve the targets.
- The PIP is discussed with, and acknowledged in writing by, the faculty member. Where the faculty member disputes the PIP targets, they may raise a concern under the FAC-002 grievance process.
- Contract renewal for a faculty member on a PIP is conditional on satisfactory progress toward PIP targets.
- A faculty member who receives Needs Attention in two consecutive annual reviews is subject to probationary review under FAC-003, Article 7.

4. Unsatisfactory Performance

- a. An Unsatisfactory rating is grounds for one or more of the following, in accordance with FAC-003:
 - Non-renewal of contract at the end of the current contract term
 - Initiation of probationary review procedures
 - In the case of gross performance failure, referral to the FAC-004 misconduct process
- b. A faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory rating has the right to appeal in accordance with Article 8 of this policy before any consequential employment decision is made. No consequential action may be taken until the appeal process is concluded.

Article 8: Appeal Process

A faculty member who disagrees with any aspect of the Dean's final evaluation may file a formal appeal in accordance with the following procedure:

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

1. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Dean within ten working days of the faculty member receiving the final evaluation. The written appeal must state the specific grounds for the appeal and include supporting evidence.
2. Grounds for appeal are limited to: (a) procedural irregularity that materially affected the evaluation outcome; (b) the evaluation was not supported by the evidence on the balance of probabilities; or (c) the weighting applied was inconsistent with the faculty member's approved workload profile.
3. The Dean acknowledges the appeal within three working days and responds with a final decision in writing within ten working days of receiving the appeal. The Dean may appoint a separate review committee to support this process.
4. Where the faculty member disagrees with the Dean's decision on appeal, they may escalate to the VPAA within five working days of receiving the Dean's written response. The VPAA's decision is final at the institutional level.
5. Faculty members may also pursue procedural grievances under FAC-002 (Faculty Grievance and Due Process Policy) where they believe the appeal process has itself been conducted improperly.
6. No consequential employment decision arising from the evaluation (non-renewal, probation, merit denial) may be implemented during the period in which an appeal is pending.

Article 9: Student Evaluation of Teaching: Policy and Procedures

The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is a mandatory institutional instrument administered in all courses each semester. The following provisions govern its administration, use, and protection:

1. SET is conducted online three weeks before the end of classes each semester. The survey closes before the final examination period.
2. All surveys are fully anonymous. No person, including the course instructor, may access individual student responses or know which students participated.
3. The VPAA Office administers the SET system, notifies students of survey availability, sends reminders, and generates distribution reports. The minimum response threshold for formal use of SET results in evaluation is fifteen respondents per course. Results from courses below this threshold are shared with the faculty member for developmental purposes only.
4. Where two or more faculty members teach a course jointly, a separate SET is conducted for each faculty member who taught at least one-third of the course.
5. SET results are distributed as follows: a summary report to the individual faculty member; a departmental summary to the Department Chair; and aggregated School data to the Dean and VPAA. Results at the individual course level are not shared beyond the faculty member and Department Chair without the faculty member's consent.
6. Faculty members are expected to use SET feedback in preparing future iterations of the course and to comment explicitly on SET findings in the Reflection and Action Plan section of the AFAR.
7. Department Chairs are required to reference SET results explicitly in their annual evaluation of each faculty member's teaching performance.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

8. SET results may not be used punitively for courses below the fifteen-student threshold, for courses that were newly developed, or for courses where adverse circumstances during the semester materially affected student engagement.

Article 10: Confidentiality

All materials, proceedings, and outcomes of the faculty performance review are confidential. This includes the AFAR, supporting evidence, PRC deliberations and reports, Department Chair evaluations, and the Dean's final evaluation. The following rules govern confidentiality:

- Access to individual evaluation records is restricted to the faculty member being evaluated, the relevant Department Chair, PRC members (in aggregate for the department, not by individual), the Dean, and the VPAA.
- HR has access to final evaluation ratings for the purposes of merit pay and contract administration, but not to the full evaluation record.
- Aggregate, anonymized data may be shared in the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report and for accreditation purposes.
- Any breach of confidentiality by a participant in the evaluation process is a breach of professional conduct under FAC-004.

Article 11: Record Retention

All faculty performance evaluation records including AFARs, supporting evidence, PRC reports, Department Chair evaluations, Dean final evaluations, PIPs, and appeal outcomes are retained as official University records for a minimum of ten years from the date of the evaluation. Records are stored in the FAS and are accessible for Accrediting agency review, internal audit, and Faculty Council oversight. Record retention is managed by the VPAA Office in accordance with the University's records management policy.

Procedures

The following procedures govern the annual cycle of the Faculty Performance Review. The timeline is based on the AIU academic calendar. All deadlines are mandatory; failure by a responsible party to meet a deadline must be reported to the VPAA within three working days.

Activity	Deadline	Responsibility
AFAR submission portal opens; faculty update FAS profiles	1 August	Faculty
Faculty submit complete Annual Faculty Activity Reports	31 August	Faculty

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

Department Chair conducts initial workload and completeness review	15 September	Department Chair
Department Chair issues preliminary evaluation and shares with faculty member	30 September	Department Chair
Faculty member submits written response (optional)	10 October	Faculty
Performance Review Committee convenes; committee report prepared	31 October	PRC
Dean reviews PRC report, Chair commentary, and faculty response; issues preliminary Dean evaluation	15 November	Dean
Faculty member submits appeal if applicable	Within 10 working days of Dean notice	Faculty
Dean issues final evaluation and development plan	30 November	Dean
VPAA consolidates School evaluation summaries; submits University report to President	15 December	VPAA
Annual Performance Review data included in Annual IE Report to Board	January (following year)	VPAA

Annual Goal-Setting and Profile Confirmation

1. At the beginning of each academic year, before 1 September, each faculty member meets with the Department Chair to confirm the workload profile for the year, agree on evaluation weights, and set specific measurable goals for teaching, research, service, and professional development.
2. Goals must be framed against the Department's strategic plan and the School's business plan. They must be documented in the FAS and approved by the Department Chair by 15 September.
3. Goal-setting for new faculty also constitutes their 18-month activity plan. The Department Chair reviews and formally approves the plan within four weeks of the faculty member's start date.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

4. Faculty may revise agreed goals mid-year only with the documented agreement of the Department Chair and only in response to extraordinary, unforeseen circumstances. Revised goals must be approved before the mid-year interim check-in.

Annual Faculty Activity Report Submission

1. The FAS is open for data entry year-round. Faculty members are expected to update their FAS profile immediately upon the occurrence of a new publication, grant award, committee appointment, development activity, or other reportable event. Year-end data entry is not acceptable as a practice.
2. Faculty members submit their complete AFAR through the FAS by 31 August. The AFAR must include: all FAS-recorded activities for the evaluation period; the Enhanced Course Portfolio for one designated course; a complete Course Syllabus record for all courses taught; SET results as auto-populated from the FAS; supporting evidence for all claimed research, service, and development activities; and the Reflection and Action Plan.
3. A faculty member who fails to submit the AFAR by the deadline receives an automatic Unsatisfactory sub-rating for the Continuous Professional Development domain and a formal notice from the Department Chair. Where submission is delayed beyond 15 September without VPAA-approved extension, the overall evaluation is rated Needs Attention for the evaluation period regardless of other domain performance.

Department Chair Review and Preliminary Evaluation

1. The Department Chair reviews all submitted AFARs and supporting evidence within the FAS. Where additional evidence is needed, the Chair requests it from the faculty member within five working days of the AFAR submission deadline.
2. The Chair prepares a preliminary evaluation for each faculty member, providing domain-level ratings with written justification referencing specific evidence. The preliminary evaluation is shared with the faculty member through the FAS by 30 September.
3. The faculty member has ten working days to review the preliminary evaluation and submit a written response, correction of factual errors, or additional evidence. Where the faculty member does not respond within this period, the preliminary evaluation proceeds unchanged to the PRC.

Performance Review Committee Evaluation

1. The Dean convenes the PRC no later than 15 October. The PRC reviews all materials in the FAS AFAR, evidence, SET data, POT reports, preliminary Chair evaluation, and any faculty response and prepares its written evaluation report for each faculty member.
2. The PRC evaluates each domain independently, assigning a score and written rationale based on the approved evaluation criteria and the evidence submitted. The PRC does not rely on personal knowledge or informal assessment; all conclusions must reference documented evidence.
3. PRC decisions are made by consensus or majority vote. The PRC Chair submits the committee report through the FAS by 31 October.

 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY الجامعة الأمريكية الدولية	Policy Main Title	Faculty Performance Review Policy	Effective Date	14/06/2026
	Policy Subject	Faculty and Professional Staff	Last Review date	
	Policy Number	FAC-007	Next Review date	14/06/2029
	Responsible Entity	Vic President for Academic Affairs	Approved By	President

- The Department Chair reviews the PRC report, writes a formal response including a quantitative performance assessment and development recommendations, and submits both documents to the Dean by 8 November.

Dean's Final Evaluation and Development Plan

- The Dean reviews all submitted documents and issues a final evaluation for each faculty member by 15 November. The Dean's evaluation includes: a confirmed overall rating; domain-level confirmation or modification of the PRC assessment; specific development recommendations; and, where applicable, a Performance Improvement Plan or positive merit recommendation.
- The final evaluation is shared with the faculty member through the FAS. The faculty member acknowledges receipt in writing within five working days, indicating agreement or intent to appeal.
- Where a PIP is required, the Dean convenes a meeting with the Department Chair and the faculty member within three weeks of the final evaluation to agree on PIP targets, timelines, and support resources. The PIP is documented in the FAS and signed by all parties.

Annual University Performance Report

- The VPAA compiles a University Faculty Performance Report from School summaries submitted by Deans. The report includes: aggregate distribution of ratings by School and rank; trends across evaluation years; summary of PIPs initiated; and data on faculty development activities undertaken. All data is anonymized.
- The report is submitted to the President by 15 December and presented to the Board of Trustees in the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report. The Faculty Council receives an anonymized summary for institutional governance purposes.
- The VPAA uses the University Performance Report to identify systemic professional development needs, equity concerns in workload distribution, and patterns in evaluation outcomes, and to propose targeted institutional responses.

President Signature

Signature: _____ Date: _____