

Abridged Task Force Recommendation:

Annual Evaluations of Smathers Libraries Faculty

Joint Task Force for the Annual Evaluation of Smathers Libraries Faculty: Joe Aufmuth (Chair), Steve Carrico, Brian Keith, Elizabeth Outler, Patrick Reakes, Betsy Simpson, Michele Tennant, Ben Walker, and Lois Widmer.

The Task Force charge was formed based upon the Libraries' objective to maintain an annual faculty evaluation design that promotes and recognizes professional accomplishment, growth, engagement, and enrichment of library faculty through the utilization of fair, meaningful, and distinguishable rating levels that are applicable to the wide variety of professional endeavors in which library faculty are active.

Specifically the group was charged to:

1. Examine the evaluation levels and level descriptions of peer groups (in the Libraries, elsewhere on campus, and nationally) to identify and assess alternatives or refinements to our current levels.
2. Review relevant UF policies and regulations.
3. Report findings to LFA officers, Library Council and library administrators and solicit their comments.
4. Recommend a series of evaluation levels and descriptions that would best serve the Libraries and faculty.

Proposed Five Tier Evaluation Scale

Exceptional

This level is reserved for employees who exceed expectations during the year in all areas with an outstanding additional contribution that deserves special recognition. Outcomes of this kind are of such quality that they occur among only a small number of employees.

The standards for earning an evaluation level of "exceptional" are as follows:

The faculty member achieved extraordinary results that have readily demonstrable benefits to the Libraries.

The faculty member made contributions which expand or consistently go beyond the scope of the position.

Accomplishments might include:

- assumed major added responsibility or assignment beyond current position which requires extraordinary commitment of time, energy and other resources
- provided leadership or major contribution to activities which result in a significant impact on efficiencies or effectiveness, or have a broad impact beyond the individual's unit
- received an honor or had an award for conduct in area of responsibility

The individual assumed a very high level of responsibility for his or her own performance, or contributed to the articulation and definition of new programs or services.

Faculty member demonstrated role model behavior for others to emulate.

Excellent

This level is reserved for faculty members whose performance or service was at a very high level and who consistently and substantially exceed overall expectations and goals, or demonstrate unusual success in carrying out their areas of job responsibility and/or accomplishing annual goals during the year. Excellent performers worked with little or no supervision and generated output that is especially high in quality, quantity, and timeliness.

The standards for earning an evaluation level of “excellent” are as follows:

The faculty member frequently made contributions over and above those associated with his or her position and rank in several areas of job responsibility. These additional contributions are evaluated for their quality, innovation and initiative and might include the following:

- Contributed to an important or sustained enhancement of service in the librarian’s area of job responsibility
- Contributed through leadership or technical expertise, to the introduction of significant new service in librarian’s area of responsibility
- Accepted and performed substantive temporary assignments in addition to current job responsibility

The faculty member demonstrated exceptional depth and breadth of position knowledge, and is highly recognized by others within the University community or beyond.

Successful

Employees rated at this level regularly met and occasionally exceeded the high expectations and goals of a library professional during the year.

A fully successful employee consistently met expectations within specified time and cost limits, understands and supported library-wide goals and priorities, and contributed innovative and creative approaches to meeting and furthering achievement of the University Libraries' mission.

A rating at this level indicates the employee possessed full depth and breadth of role knowledge and is a competent, productive, and valued member of the team.

The standards for earning an evaluation level of “successful” are as follows:

The faculty member demonstrated knowledge of library policies and procedures and the interrelationships of various departments; and furthered the department and library's goals and objectives through active participation.

The faculty member is perceived by peers, managers, students and other customers as collaborative, skilled and reliable.

The faculty member consistently interacted effectively with patrons, peers and/or management.

The faculty member completed assignments on time and met annual goals.

Needs Improvement

Employees rated at this level did not consistently meet overall expectations during the year. Employees rated at this level may regularly meet or exceed job performance expectations in some areas, but did not consistently meet expectations in other performance areas. Employees in this category need improvement to reach the SUCCESSFUL level.

The standards for earning an evaluation level of “needs improvement” are as follows:

The faculty member inconsistently demonstrated the required role knowledge and did not fully perform all requirements and duties.

In some instances faculty members may be learning new roles and may have not yet completely mastered the required competencies.

The performance issues may include inconsistent interactions with patrons, peers and/or management.

The faculty member demonstrated willingness or an ability to improve performance and resolve deficiencies.

When performance is at this level, counseling and coaching is warranted.

Unsatisfactory

Employees at this level clearly and consistently failed to meet all or a significant portion of the performance expectations of a library professional in the past year.

Their work product was regularly incomplete and/or did not meet the minimal standards for quantity or quality, or the faculty member often missed deadlines.

The employee may have shown either unwillingness or an inability to improve.

The characteristics of UNSATISFACTORY performance could include but are not limited to:

- Took little to no initiative, even with prompting
- Exhibited inappropriate or unprofessional interactions with patrons, peers and/or management
- Required more than the expected level of supervision due to lower quality work or level of learning required to complete role successfully
- Refused to accept or fulfill work assignments
- Failed to work towards improving problematic performance
- Did not work effectively with colleagues or patrons
- Performed without conforming to library mission, policies or procedures

Performance at this level requires corrective action.

Additional Notes

The five evaluation levels presented above need to be considered within the context of the following statements.

- The “Successful” level is compatible with the attainment of tenure and/or promotion.
- Each faculty member will be evaluated individually based on the established criteria for each level and not in comparison with other faculty being evaluated.
- There will be no “quota” or forced bell curve associated with the various evaluation levels.
- A new evaluation culture will need to accompany the proposed changes and evaluators need to be consistent in their method of assessment. Training will be provided to supervisors and other faculty members to help ensure this happens.

- Implementation of the new evaluation levels requires a faculty vote.
- Timetable if implemented:
 - The new evaluation levels will be used for the first time for the 2013-2014 evaluation cycle.
 - For the 2012-2013 evaluation cycle, supervisors will use the current evaluation levels for all faculty evaluations, but also provide separate feedback to the faculty member on how they would have been assessed based on the new rating levels.
- Use of these evaluations for future merit pay considerations will be addressed separately if the new evaluation levels are adopted.