Claflin University
Faculty Performance Assessment Plan

Assessment of Overall Performance

Each faculty member will be given an overall performance assessment based on the ratings earned in teaching, research, service and professional development. The overall rating will be determined using the scale as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1
Evaluation Scale

Evaluation Label	Range
Unsatisfactory	0.00-.999
Marginal	1.00 – 8.4
Fair	8.5-16.8
Good	16.9-25.2
Very Good	25.3-33.6
Excellent	33.7-42.0

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, service and professional development activities will be used to determine an overall rating. For purposes of calculating the overall evaluation score, the Chair has the discretion of using any point value within the rating range on each performance dimension.

Faculty evaluations that receive an **overall rating less than 16.9 (less than Good)** should provide a 1-year development plan to address the deficient performance areas. This plan should be made in consultation with the chair and dean (attach to the evaluation).

Categories of Performance
These adjectives are ordinal rankings of the department annual evaluation performance criteria: excellent, very good, good, fair, marginal, unsatisfactory. *(See Performance Rating Chart for examples in each performance area).*

Excellent performance clearly exceeds department expectations for excellence.

Very good performance is defined as meeting department expectations; no major areas of weakness exist.

Good performance indicates moderate progress in a given area but one or more weaknesses render the performance not quite to the expectations of excellence in the department.
Note: A rating of "Good" reflects solid performance in assigned duties and established goals.

Fair performance suggests minor progress in an evaluation area because one or more major weaknesses exist in performance. Although there may be one or more strengths as well, the performance clearly is not consistent with the department's expectations for excellence. Performance at this level warrants remediation planning.

Marginal performance is characterized as having substantial weaknesses that jeopardize professional progress as a Claflin faculty member. Performance at this level requires remediation activity.

Unsatisfactory performance is characterized as seriously neglecting his/her duties to the department, school and university.

Claflin University Annual Faculty Performance Rating

I. Effective Teaching and Advisement (60%) The minimum expectations may be met with at least one of the following activities.					
Excellent (60-49)	**Very Good (48-37)**	**Good (36-25)**	**Fair (24-13)**	**Marginal (12-1)**	**Unsatisfactory (0)**
➢ Extraordinary contribution to the educational experience of students with documented effective innovation in the classroom, lab, or project. ➢ 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.	➢ Significant participation in collaborative teaching efforts. ➢ Development and implementation of an innovative teaching activity/exercise. ➢ Student evaluations above university mean. Student comments positive and encouraging. ➢ Satisfactory advisement to exceptional number of students.	➢ Effective undergraduate and /or graduate academic advising. ➢ Participation in collaborative and multidisciplinary teaching efforts. ➢ Participation in innovative teaching activity/exercise. ➢ Student evaluations at or above university mean.	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.

II. Research, Scholarship and Grantsmanship (20%)
The minimum expectations may be met with at least one of the following activities.

Excellent (20-17)	Very Good (16-13)	Good (12-9)	Fair (8-5)	Marginal (4-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
- 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, directing, creative works, performance related efforts, theatrical design, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. - Author of a book. - Honors such as awards for research contributions and scholarship. - Student awards for scholarly projects.	- Major research grants that support students and returns indirect costs to the department. - Generates external release monies. - Accepted for publication or presentation: referred journal publications, scholarly conference presentations, art exhibits or displays, directing, performance related efforts, creative works, theatrical design, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. - Faculty-student mentored scholarly projects presented at state, regional, national, international meeting/conference.	- Proposals (internally or externally) prepared and submitted. - Submitted, created or/ and developed: referred journal publications, art exhibits or displays, directing, performance related efforts, creative works, theatrical design, concerts, recitals, productions, etc. - Participation in collaborative and multidisciplinary research/project. - Mentoring students in scholarly projects i.e. research, performances, productions, etc.	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.

III. Service to the University and Community (10%)
The minimum expectations may be met with at least one of the following activities.

Excellent (10-9)	Very Good (8-7)	Good (6-5)	Fair (4-3)	Marginal (2-1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
➢ 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 contributions to the Strategic Goals of the department and College. ➢ Honors such as awards for professional service.	➢ Significant service to a state, regional, national or international professional organization. ➢ Significant service benefiting the department. ➢ Lead role in department and/or university committees.	➢ Effective departmental service. ➢ Participation in department and/or university committees.	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.

IV. Faculty Development (10%)
The minimum expectations may be met with at least one of the following activities.

Excellent (9-10)	Very Good (7-8)	Good (5-6)	Fair (3-4)	Marginal (1-2)	Unsatisfactory (0)
➤ Significant Advanced Study in discipline. ➤ Post-Doctoral Study. ➤ Development of workshops at the state, regional national, or international level. ➤ Coordinator for state, regional or national meeting/conference. ➤ Professional Certifications	➤ Advanced study in discipline. ➤ Participation in workshops, webinars or other professional training programs. ➤ Development of workshops on campus.	➤ 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.

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.

I.   **<u>Evaluation of Teaching Performance</u>**

The Department Chair will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 1. The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities during the current evaluation year. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty members, irrespective of their assigned teaching loads. The Chair's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors, including those listed below.

Teaching Performance Criteria:

- Developing course content that is at the leading edge
- Demonstrating extraordinary innovation in course design/delivery
- Maintaining content, materials, pedagogy appropriate to the level of the course
- Preparing new courses and or revising previously-taught courses significantly
- Holding sufficient office hours and meeting all professional obligations to students
- Using higher-order learning activities in courses, e.g.,
  Essay exams
  Individual projects/cases
  Writing and/or speaking assignments
  Overseeing student projects
  Assignments requiring technology skills
  Assignments requiring quantitative analyses

- Providing timely and quality feedback to students
- Using technology to enhance course delivery
- Supervising independent studies
- Winning, excellence in teaching, and/or other awards
- Achieving positive evaluations/feedback from students
- Participating in the preparation, publication, measurement, and achievement of assessment-related learning outcomes
- Maintaining a high rate of student retention in assigned classes
- Participating in graduate student training (thesis chair, committee member, mentor, etc.)

II.   **Evaluation of Research Performance**

The Department Chair will evaluate the research component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 1. The research evaluation will be based only on research activities during the current evaluation year. Expectations of quality and quantity of research productivity needed to achieve a specific level of performance evaluation will be the same for all faculty members, irrespective of assigned teaching loads. The Chair shall consider the research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's research program and to the mission and goals of the Department. This assessment includes the quantity and quality of publications in scholarly journals and other academic outlets, research contracts and grants, and other activities listed below.

Research Performance Criteria:

- Publishing in the top journals in the discipline
- Publishing research monographs/books
- Publishing research of significance to the discipline
- Winning external competitive research grants
- Participating in conferences as a presenter and/or discussant
- Maintaining a strong research program/pipeline
- Developing and moving forward a focused program of research
- Achieving a national/international reputation in research
- Consistency in publishing at or above previously-achieved levels
- Winning, excellence in research, or other awards
- Serving as editor, associate editor, or special issue editor of a journal in the discipline
- Serving on the editorial review board of journals in the discipline
- Conducting research seminars/workshops (internal and external)

III. Evaluation of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated for the current evaluation year by the Chair and rated using the scale in Table 1. Service is expected of all faculty members. However, the type of service activity can be expected to vary based on the professional focus of a given individual. It is expected that all faculty will perform service activities primarily associated with their assigned teaching load, and that individual ratings are associated with a record of consistent effort and quality contributions. Types of service activities are listed below.

Service Performance Criteria:

- Performing department service
  Note: these would typically be elected or appointed seats on department committees or serving as faculty adviser to student organizations, etc.

- Performing university service
  Note: these would typically be elected or appointed seats on university committees.

- Performing professional service
  Performing ad hoc reviews for journals
  Performing reviews for conference proceedings
  Performing book reviews for journals
  Conducting conference workshops
  Holding office in associations relevant to the discipline
  Acting as conference proceedings editor
  Conducting guest lectures/workshops/seminars at other universities

- Performing relevant community service e.g., K-12 activities
- Winning excellence in service awards
- Working cooperatively with colleagues
- Meeting service obligations, e.g., attending committee meetings, commencement, etc.

IV.   **Evaluation of Faculty Development Performance**

The professional development component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated for the current evaluation year by the Chair and rated using the scale in Table 1. Professional development in the faculty member's scholarly area is expected. However, the type of activities can be expected to vary based on the professional focus of a given individual. It is expected that all faculty will engage in professional development activities. Types of faculty development activities are listed below.

Faculty Development Performance Criteria:

- Participation in workshops, webinars or other professional training programs
- Development of workshops at the state, regional national or international level
- Consultancy
- Post graduate studies in discipline
- Professional Certifications
- Participation in professional societies

V.   Evaluation of Other University Duties

Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities such as administrative duties, special projects, etc.

Relationship Between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation is just one of numerous components that are examined in the University tenure and/or promotion process. Therefore, it should NOT be construed that achieving a satisfactory or higher rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision.