**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Department Performance Review Committee**

**Summative Evaluation of Faculty Member Report**

**(As per collective Agreement)**

[The \_\_\_\_ Department Performance Review Committee performed a summative evaluation of faculty member XXX, during the \_\_\_\_ academic year, in accordance with Article 7 of the TRUFA Collective Agreement. This evaluation resulted from [indicate specific instance from list in 7.1.3 (b) i. through v.]

XXX is a (tenured/tenure-track /LTC--tripartite/bipartite)/ (sessional) faculty member in (indicate role/position/ e.g. lecturer, Librarian/Counsellor/Instructional Designer, Coordinator etc.) in the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Department.

The Performance Review Committee for this Summative Evaluation was comprised of: *[include all those at meeting of final review and vote] name (Chair); name (Faculty Association Representative); name; name; and name—members of committee.]*

The PRC used the following evidence (as per Article 7.3.7.2) in this summative evaluation:

(*List evidence that was used*—student questionnaires, peer classroom visit report(s), APARs, other evidence)

The \_\_\_\_ Department has instructed the PRC that the standards to be met for purposes of summative evaluation are as follows:

(*List Departmental standards to be met in teaching/professional role, scholarship, and/or service)*

Indicate whether or not the faculty member was invited to meet with the PRC. *Also* state whether or not the member did meet with the PRC and, if yes, indicate the day/time and the relevant clarification/discussion/questions involved pertinent to the summative evaluation.

The PRC has concluded that XXX (has/has not) met the required standards for the following reasons:

* *list the reasons, using objective data from instruments used to evaluate teaching (questionnaires and observations), scholarly activity (as applicable), service, and/or professional role (as applicable).* If the department has set a numerical benchmark for “satisfactory performance,” indicate that the faculty member evaluation has met/not met that standard without specifying a particular score.
* *in the case of a successful review, briefly add positive attributes noted*—including comments from student questionnaires and from peer classroom visit report(s). Do not add any recommendations for improvement when the PRC deems the member’s performance to be “satisfactory.” Recommendations for improvement can be offered in a collegial manner by the department Chair. In a “satisfactory” assessment, the letter should state “The PRC recommends…” thus not providing any wiggle-room for the Dean to come to any other conclusion.
* *in the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation only, add recommendations for improvement.*

Performance Review Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Department