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**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.