

---

# CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

---

## FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT

- **Annual**
- **New Hire**
- **Improvement Plan**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Last, First, Middle)*

**Position Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Starting Date in Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Period:** From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Periodic Reviews:** Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

### A. Instructions

In the space provided under each of the three evaluation areas (1) teaching/advising, (2) research/scholarship and (3) service, the faculty member should list specific and measurable objectives and work projects to be accomplished during this performance period. These objectives/work projects should be submitted for review and concurrence to the departmental chair, program coordinator or, in the case of units without chairs/coordinators, to the dean at the beginning of the annual performance period. Weights for each area should be established in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the *Faculty Handbook* (see Section 2.5).

At the end of the performance period, the faculty member should document the actual results accomplished and submit the completed form to the person conducting the evaluation. In the area of teaching/advising, the documented performance results must include results from the Student Evaluation of Instruction in addition to any other agreed upon objectives. The evaluator (*chair, coordinator, or dean*) will meet with the faculty member to conduct the performance evaluation in each of the three areas and to determine an overall annual rating. A sample rating calculation process is contained in **Attachment 1**. A copy of the completed evaluation form should be provided to the faculty member.

The rating scale for each of the areas of evaluation is:

- 5 = Exceeds Expectations
- 4 = Meets Expectations/High Level
- 3 = Meets Expectations/Average Level
- 2 = Partially Meets Expectations
- 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations

## FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

(1) Teaching/Advising Objectives

Weight \_\_\_\_\_%  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_

**Results:**     *(Include results of Student Evaluation of Instruction)*

---

(2) Research/Scholarship Objectives:

Weight \_\_\_\_\_%  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_

**Results:**

FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(3) Service Objectives:

Weight \_\_\_\_\_%

Rating \_\_\_\_\_

Results:

\_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Evaluator's Summary and Overall Evaluation**

Using the results from the three areas of evaluation previously noted, use this section to summarize and document the faculty member's overall evaluation results.

**Performance Period/Academic Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Teaching/Advising Weight \_\_\_\_\_ Rating \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Research/Scholarship Weight \_\_\_\_\_ Rating \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Service Weight \_\_\_\_\_ Rating \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Rating** (Please refer to Attachment 1 for guidance on rounding.):

- 5 = Exceeds Expectations
- 4 = Meets Expectations/High Level
- 3 = Meets Expectations/Average Level
- 2 = Partially Meets Expectations
- 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations

**Evaluator's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLAN AND EVALUATION

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

C. Faculty Member's Comments

Use this section for faculty member to make any comments or observations about this evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*The faculty member's signature indicates receipt and discussion of the evaluation but does not necessarily mean that the faculty member agrees with the evaluation.*

Faculty Member's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewing Dean's Comments

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Dean's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Dean's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Attachment 1: CALCULATION OF PERFORMANCE RATINGS**

Calculation of the overall performance rating is to be carried out using the standard method for calculating weighted averages. Each area of service has a weight, expressed as a percent effort, and a rating. For each area of service, convert the percent weight to a decimal (*i.e. 35% → 0.35*) and multiply the rating by this decimal. The result is the weighted contribution that each area of service makes to the overall rating. To determine the overall rating, simply add the contributions from the three areas of service. An example calculation is shown in **Table 1**, below. In the example, the faculty member chose to be considered on the basis of 45% effort in Teaching, 35% effort in Research, and 20% effort in Service. The ratings for the example calculation are: Teaching - 4; Research - 3; and Service - 5.

**Table 1. EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING**

<b>Area of Service</b>	<b>Weight<sup>1</sup></b> (0-100%)	<b>Decimal</b> (0.00 - 1.00)	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b> (1 - 5)	<b>Weighted Contribution</b>
Teaching	45%	0.45	4	1.80
Research	35%	0.35	3	1.05
Service	20%	0.20	5	1.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	1.00	--	3.85

The faculty member's overall performance rating is determined to be 3.85. The rounding conventions are shown in **Table 2**, below.

**Table 2. ROUNDING CONVENTIONS TO BE USED FOR PERFORMANCE RATING**

<b>Calculated Rating</b>	<b>Overall Rating Given</b>
4.50 - 5.0	5
3.5 - 4.49	4
2.50 - 3.49	3
1.50 - 2.49	2
1.00 - 1.49	1

Thus, the example faculty member would receive an **Overall Performance Rating** of 4.