



Republic of the Philippines  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION



**CHED MEMORANDUM ORDER**

No. 19

Series of 2025

**SUBJECT: REVISED GUIDELINES AND INSTRUMENTS FOR EVALUATING FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCs) PURSUANT TO DBM-CHED JOINT CIRCULAR NO. 3, SERIES OF 2022**

In accordance with the pertinent provisions Republic Act (RA) No. 7722, otherwise known as the "*Higher Education Act of 1994*," pursuant to DBM-CHED Joint Circular No. 3, series of 2022, titled "*Guidelines on the Reclassification of Faculty Positions in State Universities and Colleges*," and by virtue of Commission en banc Resolution No. 753-2025, the following guidelines and instruments are hereby adopted and promulgated.

**ARTICLE I  
INTRODUCTION**

**Section 1. Rationale**

The quality of teaching in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) is fundamental to delivering high-quality higher education. Previously, faculty position reclassification in SUCs was guided by National Budget Circular No. 461 (NBC 461), which included a Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) instrument for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness. This framework had been in use for several years in evaluating teaching performance.

To enhance the faculty reclassification process, DBM-CHED Joint Circular No. 3, series of 2022 (JC3) – Guidelines on the Reclassification of Faculty Positions in SUCs was issued, replacing NBC 461. With the implementation of JC3, a new set of guidelines and instruments for evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness was developed. These revised tools aim to ensure a more comprehensive, evidence-based, and transparent assessment framework aligned with national policies.

The updated evaluation framework integrates contemporary educational principles such as outcomes-based education (OBE), flexible learning strategies, and student-centered approaches. It also reinforces transparency and accountability in faculty evaluation to ensure that assessments are objective, fair, and responsive to the evolving needs of higher education. Through these enhancements, CHED aims to promote a culture of continuous improvement in teaching and learning, ultimately elevating instructional quality and student outcomes in SUC.

## **Section 2. Purpose**

Faculty evaluation serves as a mechanism for ensuring instructional quality and accountability in SUCs promoting continual improvement in learning and teaching. By systematically assessing faculty teaching effectiveness, institutions can identify faculty strengths, areas for improvement, and necessary professional development opportunities. This process not only enhances pedagogical approaches but also supports institutional decision-making in faculty development, curriculum enhancement, and resource allocation.

## **Section 3. Specific Objectives**

The evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness aims to:

- 3.1. Assess faculty performance in facilitating student learning across face-to-face and virtual settings;
- 3.2. Provide constructive feedback and utilize evaluation results in planning faculty development and capacity-building programs;
- 3.3. Strengthen collaboration between faculty and academic leadership in fostering a supportive learning environment;
- 3.4. Promote continuous improvement in teaching and learning through evidence-based practices; and
- 3.5. Enhance institutional accountability and transparency in delivering quality education.

## **Section 4. Scope and Coverage**

- 4.1. This CMO shall apply to all faculty members with permanent plantilla items in SUCs covered by JC3. It shall cover part-time faculty members and those engaged under contracts of service (COS) as part of their performance evaluation, particularly in assessing their potential for appointment to a permanent plantilla position.
- 4.2. The revised guidelines and instruments shall be used to evaluate faculty members across all disciplines, programs, and academic ranks, ensuring a standardized and objective assessment of teaching effectiveness. SUCs shall not modify or add indicators to the prescribed instruments. However, they may develop supplementary guidelines and tools for internal use if they wish to evaluate faculty members based on specific institutional objectives.
- 4.3. This evaluation shall cover a faculty member's regular teaching load per semester/term within the rating period. The results shall serve as the basis for computing the Teaching Effectiveness points under JC3. Evaluations for teaching assignments beyond the regular load (overload) shall not be included in the computation but may be used for feedback, professional development planning, and institutional reporting.



- 4.4. This CMO shall apply to all modes of instruction, including face-to-face, hybrid, and fully online teaching, and shall cover lecture, laboratory, and undergraduate thesis, ensuring that faculty performance is assessed comprehensively across diverse learning environments.
- 4.5. All SUCs covered under JC3 are expected to implement this CMO to ensure consistency in faculty evaluation processes.

## **ARTICLE II ADMINISTRATION OF FACULTY EVALUATION**

### **Section 5. Role of the SUC**

#### **5.1. Institutionalization of Faculty Evaluation**

The SUC shall establish systems, mechanisms, and support structures to ensure that all students, at all levels, have the opportunity to evaluate their faculty members' performance every semester/term. The SUC has the flexibility to implement either a manual or automated system to facilitate an effective and efficient faculty evaluation process.

#### **5.2. Data Confidentiality and Integrity**

The SUC shall ensure the confidentiality and integrity of faculty evaluation results, implementing appropriate safeguards to prevent bias, tampering, or misuse of evaluation data.

#### **5.3. Faculty Development Support**

The SUC shall actively support capacity-building activities such as seminars, workshops, training sessions, and other related programs designed either for individual faculty members or for the faculty as a whole, based on the results of the faculty evaluation.

### **Section 6. Designated Office in-Charge**

#### **6.1. Evaluation Administration**

Each SUC shall assign a designated office, unit, or committee to oversee the administration, processing, and management of the Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET) and the Supervisor's Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) every semester or academic term. This office shall ensure that the evaluation process is conducted systematically, fairly, and in accordance with institutional policies and national regulations.



## **6.2. Scheduling and Coordination**

In coordination with the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and relevant academic units, the designated office shall develop and disseminate a clear and structured evaluation schedule each semester/term. The schedule shall be announced in advance to allow sufficient preparation time for faculty members, students, and evaluators. The office shall also coordinate closely with academic departments to minimize disruptions to classes and ensure that all faculty members are evaluated in a timely and efficient manner.

## **6.3. Faculty Evaluation Implementation Plan**

The designated office shall develop and submit an annual faculty evaluation implementation plan to the VPAA for review and approval. This plan shall clearly outline the objectives, procedures, timelines, and responsibilities for conducting both the SET and the SEF.

## **6.4. Orientation and Awareness**

To enhance awareness and understanding of the faculty evaluation process, the designated office shall organize orientation sessions for faculty members, students, and academic administrators. The institution may also opt to integrate these orientations during general assembly of faculty members and students or similar activities. These sessions shall provide information on the objectives of the evaluation, the evaluation instruments, the rating scales, and the overall process. Orientations shall also emphasize the importance of objective and constructive feedback, promote transparency, and help ensure the reliability and integrity of evaluation results.

## **6.5. Pre-Evaluation Briefing**

Before administering the SET and the SEF, the designated office shall conduct a pre-evaluation briefing for students, faculty, and supervisors. This briefing aims to ensure that evaluators provide meaningful, unbiased, and informed responses, contributing to a fair and comprehensive assessment of faculty performance. The briefing shall cover:

- a. The purpose and significance of the evaluation process;
- b. An explanation of the instrument, including the criteria and rating scale;
- c. Confidentiality measures to protect the integrity of the responses;
- d. Guidelines on properly completing the evaluation forms; and
- e. Time for questions and clarifications.



For evaluations conducted online, the designated office shall prepare an online briefing presentation to ensure that all evaluators receive the necessary guidance and instructions, regardless of their mode of participation.

#### **6.6. Preparation of Individual Faculty Evaluation Report (IFER)**

Upon completion of the SET, the designated office shall process the results and prepare the initial Individual Faculty Evaluation Report (IFER) for each faculty member, following the format specified in **ANNEX C** of this CMO.

Similarly, after receiving the completed SEF instrument, the designated office shall encode the SEF ratings, along with the supervisor's comments and suggestions, into the initial IFER.

#### **6.7. Distribution of IFER and Acknowledgment Form**

Once finalized, the designated office shall submit the IFER to the respective department, accompanied by the Faculty Evaluation and Development Acknowledgment Form (FEDAF) attached as **ANNEX D** of this CMO.

#### **6.8. Faculty Evaluation Report (FER) for Institutional Use**

In addition to preparing individual faculty reports, the designated office may prepare a Faculty Evaluation Report (FER) for submission to the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) of the SUC. The FER shall include:

- a. Statistical trends
- b. Key insights
- c. Notable patterns derived from both quantitative ratings and qualitative feedback

The president may use the FER as a key resource for institutional decision-making, leveraging data-driven insights to guide faculty development and continuous improvement efforts, ultimately enhancing faculty teaching effectiveness and student learning. Additionally, the president may present the FER to the governing board to support the identification and implementation of capacity-building measures that strengthen faculty performance and professional growth.

#### **6.9. Data Management and Confidentiality**

The designated office shall be responsible for maintaining all records related to faculty evaluations. Proper data management procedures shall be observed to ensure the integrity, accuracy, and accessibility of records for institutional reporting and decision-making while complying with confidentiality and data protection policies.

## **6.10. Protection of Student Anonymity**

To uphold confidentiality, the designated office shall ensure that individual student responses remain anonymous. No faculty member, administrator, or unauthorized personnel shall be able to trace evaluation responses back to specific students.

## **ARTICLE III GUIDELINES**

### **Section 7. Evaluation Framework for Faculty Teaching Effectiveness**

Evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness requires both student and supervisor input. Students provide valuable insights into the learning experience, focusing on teaching styles and engagement. Supervisors offer an objective, experienced perspective on professional competencies, including pedagogy and adherence to standards. Together, these evaluations ensure a comprehensive assessment, supporting faculty development and instructional quality.

### **Section 8. Student Evaluation of Teacher (SET)**

#### **8.1. Mandatory Evaluation**

All students, both undergraduate and graduate, are required to evaluate their faculty using the prescribed evaluation instrument attached as **ANNEX A** of this CMO.

#### **8.2. Exemption from Evaluation**

Students who are unable to complete the evaluation within the designated period due to illness or other valid reasons may be granted an exemption, unless otherwise stipulated by the policies of the SUC.

#### **8.3 Weighted Computation of Overall SET Rating**

To ensure a fair, accurate, and representative evaluation of teaching effectiveness, a weighted computation shall be used in calculating the overall Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) rating of faculty members. This method considers the varying number of students in each class handled by a faculty member, assigning appropriate weight to SET ratings from larger classes, which offer broader and more representative feedback. By comparison, ratings from smaller classes are proportionally considered to prevent them from exerting undue influence on the final rating.

#### **8.4. Evaluation Schedule**

The evaluation shall be conducted every semester or term and may take place any time starting at least one (1) week after the midterm examinations, but no later than



two (2) weeks before the final examination period, unless otherwise specified in relevant SUC policies.

### **8.5. Limitation on Coverage of the Student Evaluation Instrument**

Faculty members teaching in undergraduate and/or graduate programs shall be evaluated based on the SET results from their respective students, in accordance with the implementation of JC3. SET results from basic education students in SUC Laboratory Schools will not be included in this evaluation. However, Cooperating Teachers (CTs) in Laboratory Schools shall be evaluated by undergraduate teacher education students assigned to them for practice teaching, using the prescribed SET instrument.

## **Section 9. Supervisor's Evaluation of Faculty (SEF)**

### **9.1. Mandatory Evaluation**

The immediate academic supervisors are mandated to evaluate the performance of their faculty members for the entire semester or term, using the prescribed evaluation instrument provided in **ANNEX B** of this CMO. The evaluation shall be based on the supervisor's overall assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance and fulfillment of academic responsibilities over the course of the term. It shall be conducted toward the end of each semester or term to ensure that it captures the faculty member's performance throughout the entire period.

### **9.2. Immediate Academic Supervisor**

The immediate academic supervisor is the academic administrator who directly oversees a faculty member's performance, provides guidance, and assesses their teaching effectiveness. To ensure a structured and objective evaluation process, faculty members shall be assessed by the Program Chair or its equivalent. In turn, the Program Chair or its equivalent will be evaluated by the Dean, ensuring accountability at the program level.

### **9.3. Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Across Programs**

Faculty members who teach professional courses in multiple programs, whether within the same college or across different colleges, shall be evaluated by the program chair of each program they serve. The overall supervisor's evaluation shall be the average of the individual ratings given by the respective program chairs. In contrast, faculty members under a service college who teach general education courses across different programs shall be evaluated by their respective supervisors within the service college.

### **9.4. Evaluation of Faculty with Administrative Designations**

Faculty members with administrative designations such as chancellors, campus administrators, vice presidents, deans, and directors shall be evaluated by the

program chairs of the academic programs in which they teach, as the evaluation focuses on teaching effectiveness rather than administrative functions.

### **9.5. Evaluation Schedule**

The evaluation may be conducted within two (2) weeks before the final exams, or as otherwise specified in relevant SUC policies.

## **Section 10. Feedbacking and Follow Up**

### **10.1. Supervisor Review of Evaluation Results**

After receiving the IFERs of the faculty members, the supervisor shall conduct a thorough review of the results, including qualitative feedback as well as the relevant comments and suggestions provided by the students.

### **10.2. Individual Feedback Meeting**

The supervisor shall schedule a one-on-one meeting with each faculty member to discuss their evaluation results in detail. This meeting shall cover the overall SET rating, SEF rating, and qualitative comments and suggestions. During the discussion, the supervisor shall provide constructive and balanced feedback, acknowledging the faculty member's strengths while addressing areas for improvement.

Using the Faculty Evaluation and Development Acknowledgment Form (FEDAF), as provided in **ANNEX D** of this CMO, the supervisor and faculty member shall jointly identify specific areas for improvement, propose relevant learning activities, and develop an action plan outlining specific steps to enhance teaching performance, instructional strategies, and professional growth. The supervisor shall then request the faculty member to sign two copies of the FEDAF; one copy of the signed FEDAF and the Individual Faculty Evaluation Report (IFER) shall be provided to the faculty member for their records.

### **10.3. Progress Monitoring and Evaluation**

The supervisor shall monitor and assess the faculty member's progress according to the established feedback and development plan. During subsequent evaluations, the supervisor will compare the current evaluation results with prior assessments. If identified improvement areas remain unresolved, the supervisor will initiate further discussions and implement additional interventions, such as targeted mentoring or specialized skills training, to ensure progress.

**ARTICLE IV  
TRANSITORY AND EFFECTIVITY**

**Section 11. Transitory Provision**

For Academic Years 2023–2024 and 2024–2025, the results of the NBC 461 Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) Instrument for Teaching Effectiveness shall be used in computing Teaching Effectiveness under Criterion A, KRA I of JC3. However, beginning Academic Year 2025–2026, the provisions of this CMO shall be applied.

**Section 12. Repealing Clause**

This CMO supersedes all other previous issuances pertaining to instrument and guidelines on Teaching Effectiveness relative to the Reclassification of Faculty Positions in SUCs.

**Section 13. Effectivity**

This CMO shall take effect immediately after fifteen (15) days of its publication in the Official Gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation.

Signed this 19<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025 in Quezon City, Philippines.

For the Commission:



**SGD.**  
**SHIRLEY C. AGRUPIS, Ph.D.**  
Chairperson



**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT  
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS (SET)**

**A. Faculty Information (to be accomplished by the Designated Office)**

Name of Faculty being Evaluated :  
 College/Department :  
 Course Code/Title :  
 Program Level :  
 Semester or Term/Academic Year :

**B. Rating Scale**

Scale	Qualitative Description	Operational Definition
5	Always manifested	Evident in nearly all relevant situations (91–100% of instances).
4	Often manifested	Evident most of the time, with occasional lapses (61–90%).
3	Sometimes manifested	Evident about half the time (31–60%).
2	Seldom manifested	Infrequently Demonstrated: Rarely evident in relevant situations (11–30%).
1	Never/Rarely manifested	Seldom Demonstrated: Almost never evident, with only isolated cases (0–10%).

**C. Instruction:** Read the benchmark statements carefully. Please rate the faculty on each of the following statements below using the above-listed rating scale. Encircle your rating.

Benchmark Statements for Faculty Teaching Effectiveness	Rating				
<b>A. Management of Teaching and Learning</b>					
<i>Management of Teaching and Learning refers to the intentional and organized handling of classroom presence, clear communication of academic expectations, efficient use of time, and the purposeful use of student-centered activities that promote critical thinking, independent learning, reflection, decision-making, and continuous academic improvement through constructive feedback.</i>					
1. Comes to class on time.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Explains learning outcomes, expectations, grading system, and various requirements of the subject/course.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Maximizes the allocated time/learning hours effectively.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Facilitates students to think critically and creatively by providing appropriate learning activities.	5	4	3	2	1

Benchmark Statements for Faculty Teaching Effectiveness	Rating				
5. Guides students to learn on their own, reflect on new ideas and experiences, and make decisions in accomplishing given tasks.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Communicates constructive feedback to students for their academic growth.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>B. Content Knowledge, Pedagogy and Technology</b>					
<i>Content Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Technology refer to a teacher's ability to demonstrate a strong grasp of subject matter, present complex concepts in a clear and accessible way, relate content to real-world contexts and current developments, engage students through appropriate instructional strategies and digital tools, and apply assessment methods aligned with intended learning outcomes.</i>					
7. Demonstrates extensive and broad knowledge of the subject/course.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Simplifies complex ideas in the lesson for ease of understanding.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Relates the subject matter to contemporary issues and developments in the discipline and/or daily life activities.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Promotes active learning and student engagement by using appropriate teaching and learning resources including ICT tools and platforms	5	4	3	2	1
11. Uses appropriate assessments (projects, exams, quizzes, assignments, etc.) aligned with the learning outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>C. Commitment and Transparency</b>					
<i>Commitment and Transparency refer to the teacher's consistent dedication to supporting student learning by acknowledging learner diversity, offering timely academic support and feedback, and upholding fairness and accountability through the use of clear and openly communicated performance criteria.</i>					
12. Recognizes and values the unique diversity and individual differences among students.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Assists students with their learning challenges during consultation hours.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Provides immediate feedback on student outputs and performance.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Provides transparent and clear criteria in rating student's performance.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>					

**Other comments and suggestions (Optional):**

---

---

---

---

**Signature of Evaluator** : \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Evaluator/ID number** : \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** : \_\_\_\_\_

*Note: Your feedback is important in enhancing the educational programs of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs). Please be informed that any information provided in this instrument will be treated as strictly confidential.*

**SET RATING Computation**

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Formula:**

Rating = (Total Score / 75) x 100

**COMPUTED RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_



**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT  
SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

**A. Faculty Information (to be accomplished by the Designated Office)**

Name of Faculty being Evaluated :  
 Academic Rank :  
 College/Department :  
 Course Code/Title :  
 Program Year :  
 Semester or Term/Academic Year :

**B. Rating Scale**

Scale	Qualitative Description	Operational Definition and Scale
5	Always manifested	Evident in nearly all relevant situations (91–100% of instances).
4	Often manifested	Evident most of the time, with occasional lapses (61–90%).
3	Sometimes manifested	Evident about half the time (31–60%).
2	Seldom manifested	Infrequently Demonstrated: Rarely evident in relevant situations (11–30%).
1	Never/Rarely manifested	Seldom Demonstrated: Almost never evident, with only isolated cases (0–10%).

**C. Instruction:** Carefully read each benchmark statement and rate the faculty member by encircling the appropriate rating based on the scale above. The "Suggested Means of Verification" column may guide the supervisor in conducting an objective assessment.

Benchmark Statements	Suggested Means for Verification	Rating				
<b>A. Management of Teaching and Learning</b>						
1. Comes to class on time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Daily time record</li> <li>Faculty schedule and timetable</li> <li>Informal interview with students</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
2. Submits updated syllabus, grade sheets, and other required reports on time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents submission log</li> <li>Submission Receipts or Acknowledgment Emails</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
3. Maximizes the allocated time/learning hours effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Class Schedules &amp; Timetables</li> <li>LMS Logs</li> <li>Informal interview with students</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1

Benchmark Statements	Suggested Means for Verification	Rating				
		5	4	3	2	1
4. Provide appropriate learning activities that facilitate critical thinking and creativity of students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
5. Guides students to learn on their own, reflect on new ideas and experiences, and make decisions in accomplishing given tasks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Student Work Samples</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• Faculty Consultation Log</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
6. Communicates constructive feedback to students for their academic growth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graded Student Work with Feedback</li> <li>• Faculty Consultation Log</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• Emails or Official correspondence</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>B. Content Knowledge, Pedagogy and Technology</b>						
7. Demonstrates extensive and broad knowledge of the subject/course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• IMs developed by the faculty</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• Mentorship or Thesis/ Dissertation Advisory records</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
8. Simplifies complex ideas in the lesson for ease of understanding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• Lecture notes and presentations</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
9. Integrates contemporary issues and developments in the discipline and/or daily life activities in the syllabus.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1

Benchmark Statements	Suggested Means for Verification	Rating				
		5	4	3	2	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LMS Logs</li> <li>• IMs developed by the faculty</li> <li>• Participation in Conferences, Webinars, and Training</li> </ul>					
10. Promotes active learning and student engagement by using appropriate teaching and learning resources including ICT tools and platforms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> <li>• Multimedia Lecture Materials</li> <li>• Student Work Samples</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
11. Uses appropriate assessments (projects, exams, quizzes, assignments, etc.) aligned with the learning outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• Assessment tools and rubrics</li> <li>• Exam and Quiz Samples</li> <li>• Graded Student Work Samples</li> <li>• LMS records</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>C. Commitment and Transparency</b>						
12. Recognizes and values the unique diversity and individual differences among students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Learning Plan</li> <li>• IMs developed by the faculty</li> <li>• Classroom Observation</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
13. Assists students with their learning challenges during consultation hours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Faculty Consultation Log</li> <li>• Advisory Records</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> <li>• Emails or Official Correspondence</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
14. Provides immediate feedback on student outputs and performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graded Student Work Samples</li> <li>• Assessment tools and rubrics</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• LMS Logs</li> <li>• Emails or Official Correspondence</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1

**ANNEX B – Supervisor’s Evaluation of Faculty**

Benchmark Statements	Suggested Means for Verification	Rating				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty Consultation Log</li> <li>• Advising Reports</li> </ul>					
15. Provides transparent and clear criteria in rating student’s performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Syllabus</li> <li>• Assessment Tools and Rubrics</li> <li>• Informal interview with students</li> <li>• LMS Records</li> <li>• Grade Sheets and Records</li> </ul>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>						

**Other comments and suggestions:**

---



---



---



---

**Signature of Supervisor** : \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Supervisor** : \_\_\_\_\_

**Designation** : \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** : \_\_\_\_\_

**SET RATING Computation**

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Formula:**

Rating = (Total Score / 75) x 100

**COMPUTED RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_



## INDIVIDUAL FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT

### A. Faculty Information

Name of Faculty Evaluated : **JUAN DELA CRUZ**  
 Department/College : **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**  
 Current Faculty Rank : **Associate Professor I**  
 Semester/Term & Academic Year : **1<sup>st</sup> Semester / 2025-2026**

### B. Summary of Average SET Rating

Computation:

**Step 1:** Get the average SET rating for each class.

**Step 2:** Multiply the number of students in each class with its average SET rating to get the Weighted SET Score per class.

**Step 3:** Get the total number of students and the total weighted SET score

Seq	(1) Course Code	(2) Year/Section	(3) No. of Students	(4) Average SET Rating	(3 x 4) Weighted SET Score
1	PA 101	BPA1A	10	90	900
2	PA 102	BPA1B	15	85	1,275
3	PA 103	BPA2A	20	88	1,760
4	PA 104	BPA3A	40	95	3,800
5	PA 105	BPA3B	8	70	560
6	PA 106	BPA1C	35	91	3,185
7	PA 107	BPA1D	42	89	3,738
8	PA 108	BPA3C	45	92	4,140
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>215</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19,358</b>

### C. SET and SEF Ratings

**Computation:** Calculate the Overall SET Rating by dividing the total Weighted SET Score by the total number of students. In the example above, the total weighted value is 19,358 while the total number of students is 215. Therefore,  $19,358 \div 215 = 90.04$

	SET Rating	*SEF Rating
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>	<b>90.04</b>	<b>92.00</b>

Note: rating given by the supervisor using the SEF instrument



**D. Summary of Qualitative Comments and Suggestions**

<b>Seq</b>	<b>Comments and Suggestions from the Students</b>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
...	<i>(add additional rows if necessary)</i>

<b>Seq</b>	<b>Comments and Suggestions from the Supervisor</b>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
...	<i>(add additional rows if necessary)</i>

Prepared by:

**Signature of Staff** :**Name of Staff** :**Date** :

Reviewed by:

**Signature of Authorized Official** :**Name of Authorized Official** :**Date** :

**FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM****A. FACULTY MEMBER INFORMATION**

Name of Faculty : **JUAN DELA CRUZ**  
 Department/College : **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**  
 Current Faculty Rank : **Associate Professor I**  
 Semester/Term & Academic Year : **1<sup>st</sup> Semester / 2025-2026**

**B. FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Overall Rating	
Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET)	Supervisor's Evaluation of Faculty (SAF)
<b>90.04</b>	<b>92.00</b>

**C. Development Plan (to be jointly accomplished by the Supervisor and Faculty)**

Areas for Improvement
Proposed Learning and Development Activities
Action Plan

I acknowledge that I have received and reviewed the faculty evaluation conducted for the period mentioned above. I understand that my signature below does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation but confirms that I have been given the opportunity to discuss it with my supervisor.

SUPERVISOR	
Signature	:
Name	:
Date Signed	:
FACULTY	
Signature	:
Name	:
Date Signed	:

