



Claflin University Annual Faculty Performance Rating

I. Effective Teaching and Advisement (60%)					
Excellent (60-49)	Very Good (48-37)	Good (36-25)	Fair (24-13)	Marginal (12-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Honors such as awards for teaching excellence. ➤ Student evaluations far above university mean. Student comments exceptionally positive and encouraging. ➤ Excellent advisement of exceptional number of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Significant participation in collaborative teaching efforts. ➤ Student evaluations above university mean. Student comments positive and encouraging. ➤ Satisfactory advisement to exceptional number of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Effective undergraduate and /or graduate academic advising. ➤ Participation in collaborative and multidisciplinary teaching efforts. ➤ Student evaluations at or above university mean. ➤ Satisfactory advisement. 	<p>The individual is generally performing at the level expected for a rating of Good but is below expectations in some of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected for a rating of Good and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is seriously neglecting his or her duties to the department, college, and university.</p>

II. Research, Scholarship and Grantsmanship (20%)					
Excellent (20-17)	Very Good (16-13)	Good (12-9)	Fair (8-5)	Marginal (4-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Major grant as PI, PD, or Team Leader that support students, provides a return on indirect costs, and generates release monies at or above the norm. ➤ Significant number of: referred journal publications, art exhibits or displays, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Significant contribution to the educational experience of the students with documented effective innovation in the classroom, lab, or project. ➤ Major research grants that support students and returns indirect costs to the department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Proposals (internally or externally) prepared and submitted. ➤ Submitted, created or/ and developed: referred journal publications, art exhibits or displays, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. ➤ Participation in collaborative and multidisciplinary research. 	<p>The individual is generally performing at the level expected for a rating of Good but is below expectations in some of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected for a rating of Good and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is seriously neglecting his or her duties to the department, college, and university.</p>

Notes:

1. A rating of “Good” reflects solid performance in assigned duties and established goals. An individual rated “Good” is an asset to the department.
2. Other assigned duties may require substitution for one or more of the criteria in each category. Such assignments include unusual service to the department.
3. The rating of “Excellent” is unusual. It will be given for exceptional work over the course of a year. No expectation for a rating of “Excellent” for the current year should be based on a rating of “Excellent” in the previous year.



II. Research, Scholarship and Grantsmanship (20%)

Excellent (20-17)	Very Good (16-13)	Good (12-9)	Fair (8-5)	Marginal (4-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Author of a book. ➤ Honors such as awards for research contributions and scholarship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Generates external release monies. ➤ Accepted for publication or presentation: referred journal publications, scholarly conference presentations, art exhibits or displays, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. 				

III. Service to the University and Community (10%)

Excellent (10-9)	Very Good (8-7)	Good (6-5)	Fair (4-3)	Marginal (2-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Major new long-term programmatic initiatives impacting the department, college or university. ➤ Significant documented service to the profession, such as an officer of a state, regional, national or international professional organization. ➤ Significant leadership service to the department well above the norm. ➤ Substantial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Significant service to a state, regional, national or international professional organization. ➤ Significant service benefiting the department. ➤ Lead role in department and/or university committees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Effective departmental service. ➤ Participation in department and/or university committees. 	<p>The individual is generally performing at the level expected for a rating of Good but is below expectations in some of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected for a rating of Good and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.</p>	<p>The individual is seriously neglecting his or her duties to the department, college, and university.</p>

Notes:

1. A rating of “Good” reflects solid performance in assigned duties and established goals. An individual rated “Good” is an asset to the department.
2. Other assigned duties may require substitution for one or more of the criteria in each category. Such assignments include unusual service to the department.
3. The rating of “Excellent” is unusual. It will be given for exceptional work over the course of a year. No expectation for a rating of “Excellent” for the current year should be based on a rating of “Excellent” in the previous year.



contributions to the Strategic Goals of the department and College. ➤ Honors such as awards for professional service.					
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

1. A rating of “Good” reflects solid performance in assigned duties and established goals. An individual rated “Good” is an asset to the department.
2. Other assigned duties may require substitution for one or more of the criteria in each category. Such assignments include unusual service to the department.
3. The rating of “Excellent” is unusual. It will be given for exceptional work over the course of a year. No expectation for a rating of “Excellent” for the current year should be based on a rating of “Excellent” in the previous year.



IV. Faculty Development (10%)					
Excellent (9-10)	Very Good (7-8)	Good (5-6)	Fair (3-4)	Marginal (1-2)	Unsatisfactory (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Significant Advanced Study in discipline. ➤ Post-Doctoral Study. ➤ Development of workshops at the state, regional national, or international level. ➤ Professional Certifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Advanced study in discipline. ➤ Participation in workshops, webinars or other professional training programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Professional development. ➤ Participation in professional societies or equivalent professional service. 	The individual is generally performing at the level expected for a rating of Good but is below expectations in some of the criteria with no special circumstances.	The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected for a rating of Good and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.	The individual is seriously neglecting his or her duties to the department, college, and university.

Notes:

IV. Other (5%)					
Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Marginal (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
Use own judgment!	Use own judgment!	Use own judgment!	Use own judgment!	Use own judgment!	Use own judgment!

Notes:

1. A rating of “Good” reflects solid performance in assigned duties and established goals. An individual rated “Good” is an asset to the department.
2. Other assigned duties may require substitution for one or more of the criteria in each category. Such assignments include unusual service to the department.
3. The rating of “Excellent” is unusual. It will be given for exceptional work over the course of a year. No expectation for a rating of “Excellent” for the current year should be based on a rating of “Excellent” in the previous year.