

Technical Services Evaluation Summary

The following is a summary of input about employee performance. It is generated through a Web based tool by using information that was submitted by the employee, the employee's supervisor as well as clients and coworkers. It provides an automated and standardized reporting mechanism for many areas of performance evaluation.

The evaluation form is based upon several sources, including Evaluation Factors for Technical Services by Charles F. Dunn, The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People from the Franklin Covey Program, and the Data Processing Management Associations (DPMA) Code of Ethics, Standards of Conduct, and Enforcement Procedures. These evaluation sources were reviewed, discussed and condensed into sections that reflect the work performed in Technical Services / CIT. These areas are:

Technical	Attitude
Planning and Approach	Communication
Timeliness	Completeness
Leadership Skills	Growth Potential
Relationship with Supervisor	

Each section has several questions that focus on particular issues in the broader category.

The questions ask for input rating the employee as *Outstanding, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor* or *Don't know*. Return values of *Don't Know* are not included in calculating the mean and standard deviation. If all responses to a question are *Don't Know*, then the question is omitted from the evaluation summary.

Input responses from clients and co-workers are combined and averaged and the standard deviation is calculated for each item. Input responses from the employee and supervisor are separated to facilitate direct and valuable discussions about mutual performance perceptions.

In addition to the standardized questions, the web form solicits free-form comments from the evaluators. These free format comments are stripped of attribution to preserve confidentiality and are available for inclusion in the performance evaluation as additional text.

These comments can be combined with a plan of action in the performance appraisal or subsequent programs.


This system of performance evaluation provides an overview of employee strengths and weaknesses. It can be used immediately to help shape employee training needs and over time to show growth in a variety of areas.

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review

January 1999 - January 2000


A. Technical

A1. Consistently produces high quality work




Freq 8 Mean 4.50 S-Dev 0.76

A2. Understands issues and concerns within work group




Freq 8 Mean 4.25 S-Dev 0.89

A3. Grasps broad picture of computing technologies and trends




Freq 7 Mean 4.57 S-Dev 0.79

A4. Is current and knowledgeable about field of work




Freq 9 Mean 4.56 S-Dev 0.73

A5. Demonstrates proficiency with various technologies




Freq 9 Mean 4.44 S-Dev 0.88

A6. Describes technical problems and solutions (the big picture) at a detailed level that is comfortable for you



Freq 8 Mean 4.50 S-Dev 0.93

A7. Demonstrates effective diagnostic and troubleshooting skills



Freq 9 Mean 4.56 S-Dev 0.73




- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
 Mean = average of responses
 S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

B. Attitude



- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self


- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

C. Planning and Approach

		Freq	Mean	S-Dev
C1. Plans ahead on projects and is proactive in approach		8	4.75 4.00 4.00	0.46
C2. Defines and focuses the end objective		8	4.25 4.00 4.00	0.89
C3. Maintains an appropriate balance between planning and doing		8	4.12 4.00 4.00	1.13
C4. Strives for outcomes that are viewed as positive by all concerned		9	4.56 5.00 4.00	0.73
C5. Shares and presents factual and objective information		8	4.50 4.00 4.00	0.76
C6. Includes appropriate people in work process		9	4.56 4.00 4.00	0.73
C7. Works to solve problems rather than ignoring them		9	4.67 5.00 4.00	0.50
C8. Protects privacy and confidentiality of University information		6	4.50 5.00	0.84



Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
 Evaluation from Supervisor
 Evaluation from Self


1 = Poor
 2 = Fair
 3 = Good
 4 = Very Good
 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
 Mean = average of responses
 S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000


D. Communication

D1. Listens effectively




Freq	Mean	S-Dev
9	4.00	1.41
	4.00	
	4.00	

D2. Seeks to understand other points of view




9	4.22	0.97
	4.00	
	4.00	

D3. Verbally communicates effectively




9	4.56	0.73
	4.00	
	4.00	

D4. Writes effectively



8	4.75	0.46
	4.00	
	4.00	



- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self


- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation


Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

E. Timeliness


E1. Keeps promises and honors commitments




E2. Meets requests in a timely manner



E3. Is able to work on multiple projects despite distractions



E4. Prioritizes work and spends time on most important issues



Freq Mean S-Dev

7 4.86 0.38

4.00
4.00

9 4.67 0.71

4.00
3.00

9 4.56 0.73

4.00
3.00

8 4.50 0.76

4.00
4.00

- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self


- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

F. Completeness

- F1. Consistently follows through on projects, giving attention to detail
- F2. Prepares in advance and is well organized for meetings/projects
- F3. Positively contributes to the effectiveness of meetings and/or projects
- F4. Provides adequate documentation on projects
- F5. Keeps current and complete record of work progress



	Freq	Mean	S-Dev
F1	8	4.75	0.71
F2	7	4.57	0.79
F3	9	4.44	0.88
F4	7	4.57	0.79
F5	7	4.71	0.49

- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self


- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000


G. Leadership

G1. Encourages others to be productive




Freq 8
Mean 4.50
S-Dev 1.07

G2. Expresses ideas and feelings with confidence




Freq 9
Mean 4.22
S-Dev 1.39

G3. Takes initiative to get things done




Freq 8
Mean 4.50
S-Dev 0.93

G4. Helps to identify and solve problems not directly assigned




Freq 6
Mean 4.50
S-Dev 0.84

G5. Demonstrates effective coaching skills



Freq 7
Mean 4.29
S-Dev 1.11

G6. Participates in the technical development of junior staff




Freq 6
Mean 5.00
S-Dev 0.00

G7. Supervises staff or leads projects effectively



Freq 6
Mean 4.83
S-Dev 0.41



Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
 Evaluation from Supervisor
 Evaluation from Self


1 = Poor
 2 = Fair
 3 = Good
 4 = Very Good
 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
 Mean = average of responses
 S-Dev = standard deviation

Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

H. Growth Potential


H1. Strives to develop new skills and abilities



Freq Mean S-Dev


9 4.56 0.73
5.00
4.00

H2. Strives to build and improve relationships with others




9 4.56 0.73
4.00
4.00

H3. Adapts to changing situations and requirements




9 4.56 0.73
4.00
4.00

H4. Seeks increasing responsibilities and spheres of influence



9 4.56 0.73
4.00
4.00

H5. Demonstrates an understanding of the role of IT in UB's mission



6 4.83 0.41
4.00
3.00

- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self


- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation


Evaluation for USG A Sample Review January 1999 - January 2000

J. Relationship with Supervisor


J1. Functions with an appropriate level of supervision




J2. Acts independently when appropriate



J3. Cooperates and communicates with supervisor



J4. Willingly complies with policies and procedures



	Freq	Mean	S-Dev
J1. Functions with an appropriate level of supervision	2	4.00	1.41
		5.00	
		4.00	
J2. Acts independently when appropriate	3	4.33	1.15
		5.00	
		4.00	
J3. Cooperates and communicates with supervisor	1	5.00	0.00
		4.00	
		4.00	
J4. Willingly complies with policies and procedures	4	4.25	0.96
		4.00	
		4.00	

- Evaluation from Clients/CoWorkers
- Evaluation from Supervisor
- Evaluation from Self

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Outstanding

Freq = number of responses
Mean = average of responses
S-Dev = standard deviation