# HIV/AIDS SERVICES

# PLANNING COUNCIL

### *[Address]*

**Phone: Fax:**

**Job Performance Evaluation for Planning Council Support Staff[[1]](#footnote-1)**

For use with professional staff

Name of Program Director/Staff Member: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Status of Evaluator (Please Circle): 1. Executive Committee Member

2. Recipient Representative

3. Personnel Director

4. PC Member

Purpose of Evaluation (Please Circle): 1. Annual 2. Probationary 3. Other

**Instructions to Evaluator:**

Select the behavioral description on each factor along the 5-point scale that most clearly describes the staff member’s performance and enter it in the score blank next to each factor. If you feel that you do not have sufficient information to make a judgment, enter “0” for insufficient information.

1. **Quality of work: accuracy and thoroughness Score: \_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Poor, undue number of errors

2 – Sometimes careless and inaccurate

3 – Meets standards of good quality

4 – Works quite carefully

5 – Outstanding, highly accurate

1. **Quantity of work: amount and promptness of work accomplished Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Work output very low

2 – Does less than reasonable amount

3 – Work volume meets job standards

4 – Output higher than required

5 – Usually high output

1. **Initiative: ability to act on own responsibility without instruction Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Always waits to be told

2 – Often waits for directions

3 – Goes ahead of regular work

4 – Resourceful beyond needs of job

5 – Seeks additional tasks

1. **Willingness to work with others Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Refuses to cooperate

2 – Non-cooperative tendencies

3 – Generally works well with others

4 – Willing team worker

5 – Exceptionally good team worker

1. **Relationships with public, consumers, providers, and others Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Irritating or indifferent

2 – Ineffective or lacking

3 – Maintains normal relations

4 – Above normal requirements

5 – Ideal attitudes and contacts

1. **Dependability, amount of supervision required Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Requires constant supervision

2 – Needs frequent checks on work output

3 – Generally reliable

4 – Requires only occasional direction

5 – Extremely reliable

1. **Judgment: ability to apply sound thinking to problem situations Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Unreliable, not acceptable

2 – Frequently lacking

3 – Dependable on routine matters

4 – Most decisions well thought out

5 – Usually quick and sound

1. **Breadth of factual, theoretical, and related knowledge relating to the job Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Demonstrates little or inaccurate knowledge

2 – Demonstrates limited knowledge

3 – Generally acceptable

4 – Demonstrates superior knowledge

5 – Considered authority in field

1. **Appearance: general impression on others Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Consistently untidy or inappropriate

2 – Generally poor

3 – Generally acceptable

4 – Well groomed

5 – Always professional and appropriate

1. **Attendance: regularity of attendance and punctuality, keeping of appointments Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Insufficient information

1 – Habitually late or absent

2 – Often late or absent

3 – Usually on time and on duty

4 – Rarely tardy or absent

5 – Always on time or early

1. **Knowledge of Ryan White Legislation and Program Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very good

5–Exceptional

1. **Knowledge of PC/B responsibilities, structure, policies and procedures Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very good

5–Exceptional

1. **Skills in working with PC/B members of diverse backgrounds and expertise Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very good

5–Exceptional

1. **Ability to provide or arrange appropriate orientation and training for PC/B Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very good

5–Exceptional

1. **Demonstrated ability to work productively with Recipient Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very good

5–Exceptional

**Evaluator’s Overall Judgment and Comments on Job Performance**

1. **Overall evaluation**

0 – Unable to judge

1 – Marginal

2 – Fair

3 – Satisfactory

4 – Very Good

5 – Exceptional

1. **Mean score : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

[Calculate this by adding up all your numerical scores and dividing by the number of questions for which you had scores other than “0.” Don’t count those questions.]

1. **Comments on employee’s strength and weaknesses**
2. **Suggestions for improving the employee’s performance**

**Employee’s Comments Regarding Evaluation**

I hereby certify that this evaluation has been discussed with me.

 I concur with the evaluation.

 I do not concur with the evaluation.

 *Signature of Staff Person Position Date*

 *Signature of Evaluator Position Date*

***This evaluation should be accompanied by an updated job description***

1. Prepared for DMHAP, under Task Order TA003111 through MSCG/Ryan White Technical Assistance Contract, 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)