Title: *Instructor Performance Evaluation: Weighted Scoring SOP*

Author: Jason A. Hill

Document Type: Internal Standard Operating Procedure

Intended Use: Performance Evaluation & Research Documentation

Date: October 21, 2019

---

1. Purpose

This document outlines the procedures for implementing a weighted scoring system to evaluate instructor performance in a structured academic environment. The system was designed to account for variability in student background and academic risk level, ensuring that instructor evaluations remain accurate and equitable across student groups.

---

2. Background

Historically, instructors teaching high-risk or repeating students in our language program received disproportionately low performance scores. These scores failed to reflect instructional effort or improvement over time and introduced bias in comparative analysis. A new scoring model was proposed and tested during the 2019 academic year.

---

3. Scope

This SOP applies to all instructional supervisors, program analysts, and administrative coordinators responsible for compiling, interpreting, or acting upon performance data within the training program.

---

4. Evaluation Model Overview

The performance scoring system incorporates the following:

- **Baseline student profile**: Each class is tagged with an average pre-course proficiency rating and failure history.

- **Category weighting**:
    - **Student improvement rate** – 40%
    - **Student pass rate** – 25%
    - **Behavioral discipline records** – 15%
    - **Admin compliance (paperwork/timeliness)** – 10%
    - **Peer and supervisor observations** – 10%

Scores are normalized using a z-score adjustment to compare across instructor types (i.e., remedial vs. advanced).

---

5. Data Collection Method

Data were pulled monthly from:

- Student language assessments (entry and exit)
- Attendance and discipline logs
- Teacher compliance reports
- Internal survey feedback (qualitative observations coded)

Each instructor's score was recalculated every quarter, with cumulative scoring reported annually.

---

6. Outcomes and Benefits

- Improved accuracy in identifying high-performing teachers with low-performing student cohorts.
- Balanced representation of instructional quality across departments.
- Data transparency used in coaching and performance improvement plans.

---

7. Limitations and Future Improvements

- Data entry inconsistencies from legacy systems reduced reliability in early quarters.
- Future versions should explore weighting adjustments based on longitudinal student success (e.g., delayed gains).
- Incorporate anonymized student feedback as a fourth data stream.