Introduction
At the request of the Dean, LFPA Executive called for volunteers in October 2011 for an ad hoc committee to investigate evaluation forms and merit application procedures for the faculty and unclassified professional staff annual evaluation process.

Charge
Committee will investigate different evaluation forms to be used by Faculty and Unclassified Professional Staff. Evaluation forms from other institutions will be reviewed, evaluated and identified. Of particular interest will be the Student Success evaluation form discussed in DC Exec. This committee is also charged with investigating the development of a merit application form and process. Recommendations will be reported to LFPA Exec by January 17, 2012 (the Committee requested an extension until February 3, 2012.) Any implementation of these forms is tentatively set for calendar year 2013.

Membership
Fran Devlin and Nikhat Ghouse (Co-Chairs), Monica Claassen, Julie Petr, Shannon Royer, Lyn Wolz, and Jen Church-Duran (ex-officio).

Background
The Committee began meeting weekly beginning November 21, 2011 to discuss its charge and carried out the following activities to gather information:

- Reviewed the literature available on the evaluation process (see Appendix A).
- Identified issues and governance documents related to the KU Libraries’ evaluation and merit process, including history and related background information.
- Identified and reviewed some examples of evaluation forms from colleagues within other KU units, other ARL institutions, and from searching the web (see Appendix B).
- Met with Dean’s Exec on January 6th, 2012 to discuss short-term actions that could be implemented without changing the Faculty Evaluation Plan (2009), but would improve the administrative process for the 2011 evaluation period.

Issues / Factors Identified
Below are some of the key issues and factors related to the current evaluation and merit processes the committee identified for review by the Library Faculty & Professional Assembly (LFPA) and/or the Dean’s Executive Council.

- What is the intended purpose and value of our assessment process? What are we trying to achieve?
- Does our current evaluation plan focus more on ratings/rankings, and not enough on coaching, mentoring, and development?
- The current rating definitions lack clarity, illustrative examples, or meaningful distinctions between levels. This can result in inconsistent application across supervisors and in grade inflation – “meets expectations” is considered a failure.
- The Faculty Evaluation Plan (2009) requires that a rating be given for each area of evaluation – professional performance, service, and research – then an overall rating. This has not been done consistently by supervisors.
Effective evaluations require articulated, shared understanding of standards/criteria for the unique elements of job responsibilities at the unit/departmental level. Some key elements of our work – including supervisor responsibility – are not explicitly addressed in evaluations of employees whose duties may include supervision.

The current Faculty Evaluation Plan (2009) indicates that the supervisor should use the Discipline Expectations For Library Faculty at KU (2009) and “criteria developed for each functional area” (line 250) to evaluate professional performance, service, and research/scholarly activity. These criteria are not always well defined in advance of the annual review, and it can appear unclear how the ratings have been determined for each area.

Performance appraisal should be connected to organizational and institutional needs, goals, and objectives, as well as staff member needs, strengths, and interests.

Campus-wide required elements are missing from the current plan, including specifically addressing “progress towards tenure/promotion.”

Supervisors will need to be trained in performance management and assessment.

There are external factors which might influence the Libraries’ evaluation/merit process:

- HR is currently considering changes to the Unclassified Professionals evaluation.
- The Provost might again determine how merit will be distributed.

Recommendations / Options for Consideration

**Investigate a substantial overhaul of the faculty evaluation process**
Since this Committee’s time frame was short, we propose that LFPA Exec form a new iteration of the Evaluation and Merit Ad Hoc Committee to continue this work. We recommend that at least two of the current committee members continue on the new group to act as the “institutional memory” of the group, explaining actions taken and discussions that occurred so that the new group will not have to start from the beginning. Any changes to the evaluation process will require further discussion and investigation of all factors, allowing for input and approval by the LFPA membership.

**Move from an “evaluation” to a “performance management” model**
Performance management is an ongoing process of communication between a supervisor and an employee that occurs throughout the year, in support of accomplishing the strategic objectives of the organization. The form would change substantially with more structure and guidance in shaping the contributions of both supervisor and employee, with a shared understanding of performance expectations and productivity levels.

- **Option 1 – “Better grading”**
  Detailed and shared clarification of the ranking categories with various illustrative examples, justifications, and demonstrations of what “exceptional” and the remaining four categories really mean in the KU Libraries context. *(See Appendix C)*

- **Option 2 – “Stop grading”**
  Performance evaluations are not competitive in this model, but developmental instead. Performance is either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” with focus on clarifying expectations, setting objectives, identifying goals, providing feedback, and evaluating outcomes. Competitive rankings are part of the merit process instead of the evaluation process. *(See Appendix D)*
- **Separate the Evaluation and Merit Processes**
  The committee recommends that evaluation and merit be made into separate processes.

  - **Option 1** – Evaluation is only one factor to consider in awarding merit. Other factors might be:
    - Performance - The meritorious performance of a staff member's job duties.
    - Additional, more complex responsibilities - Staff might have assumed additional, more complex duties because of increased skill levels, staff restructuring, or additional departmental programs.
    - Skill acquisition - Staff might have acquired new skills approved as useful by the campus department or school to address the unit's mission. Those skills might have been acquired through certification, formal coursework, or licensing.
    - Conduct - The employee's contribution to effective and harmonious working relationships with coworkers and customers during the annual merit period.

  - **Option 2** – Develop a process of self-nomination and portfolio review for merit increases that might include a separate merit committee of peers to review and rank those who apply or an administrative committee to perform the same function.

- **Educate Supervisors**
  Supervisors should be given training on the evaluation process, in order to have a common understanding of the ratings, principles, and criteria. Currently, some supervisor evaluations do not identify specific areas of improvement or coaching strategies.

- **Evaluation Forms**
  The committee identified four evaluation forms (see Appendix B), each with various aspects that are worthy of consideration. However, we did not create a new or revised evaluation form at this time, since it will depend upon which approach (i.e., "Better grading" or "No grading") is determined by LFPA membership.

- **Integrate This Committee's Work Into the Strategic Planning Process**
  Discussion of the evaluation process could be integrated into the outcomes and strategies of the Working Groups in the Strategic Planning Process, and the committee’s research shared with those involved in broader discussions of organizational style, governance, personnel management, supervisor training, hiring, compensation, and flexibility of work assignments.

**Supplemental Materials**

- **Appendix A**  Bibliography
- **Appendix B**  Examples of Evaluation Forms
- **Appendix C**  Option 1 - “Better Grading”
- **Appendix D**  Option 2 - “Stop Grading”
- **Appendix E**  Other Supporting Documentation
Appendix A

Evaluation & Merit Review Committee Bibliography


Appendix B

Examples of Evaluation Forms Reviewed

1. KU IT Unclassified Professionals Form, 2011
   http://lib.ku.edu/lfp/evaluation/EMR.adhoc.docs/IT_Professional_Eval.pdf


3. Student Success Evaluation Form, 2009-2010
   http://lib.ku.edu/lfp/evaluation/EMR.adhoc.docs/StudentSuccessEvalform2009-10.pdf

4. University of Nebraska, Lincoln Performance Evaluation Form
   http://lib.ku.edu/lfp/evaluation/EMR.adhoc.docs/UNebraska_Performance_Evaluation_Form.pdf
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Option 1: Move to Performance Management with “Better Grading”

In this option, the Libraries move from an annual evaluation to a “performance management” approach with a focus on assessment and development. This still includes annual ratings. The overarching purpose of performance management is to create a year-long process for development and coaching, with a focus on addressing personal goals in ways that facilitate the effective delivery of strategic and operational goals. This method requires employee involvement and input.

To maximize effectiveness for this model, the Faculty Evaluation Plan (2009) must include well-defined, overall ratings (with illustrative examples) that highlight the distinctions between rating levels. While the work of librarians varies greatly across the organization, it is possible to design rating definitions that more thoroughly explain the standards and help both the supervisor and the employee understand the criteria. Having researched ratings from other libraries and other academic departments across institutions, the Evaluation and Merit Review Committee has drafted potential language, in “Options for Rating Definitions” at the end of this appendix.

In addition to the ratings, the current Faculty Evaluation Plan (2009) leaves much of the final rating determination under the umbrella of “criteria for functional areas.” These criteria, unique to the major responsibilities of each position and to the needs of units/departments, are not necessarily articulated in the evaluations. In the Performance Management model, these criteria would be discussed between the supervisor and employee at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and clearly spelled out as performance expectations for the annual review.

In fully implementing a performance management approach, there are key elements that must be implemented:

1. **Planning work and setting expectations:**
   a. Working together, employee and supervisor should outline the major responsibilities (essential functions of the job) and set performance goals for each. This should include clearly defined expectations as measures against which performance results are assessed.
   b. This would be primarily under the “professional performance” area. However, as goals and expectations are mutually set for “service” and “research/scholarship” – there would be an opportunity to set a shared expectation for achievement in these areas as well.
   c. Annual goals: set to address both personal development goals and strategic and operational objectives

2. **Continual check-in, input and coaching:** Supervisor and employee meet regularly during the evaluation cycle

3. **Developing professional capacity:** addressing the professional development of staff to increase individual staff performance and achievement

4. **Rating performance:**
   a. At the end of evaluation cycle, the supervisor will assess performance results against these mutually established expectations/goals.
Examples of Rating Definitions

**Unsatisfactory (sustained non-performance):** Employee consistently falls short of goals and expectations of his/her professional responsibilities, research/scholarly activities, and service. This rating initiates a process that could lead to dismissal.

**Needs Improvement:** Employee meets goals and expectations in some areas of his/her professional responsibilities, research/scholarly activities, and service, but needs improvement in specific areas as identified in the annual evaluation. The employee generally is doing the job at a minimal level, and improvement is needed to fully meet performance expectations. An indication that expectations are not being met (i.e. “Needs improvement”) in any year constitutes a signal to the librarian that quick and significant improvement in professional performance is expected. Indefinite performance at this level is not acceptable and should be viewed as borderline performance which warrants intervention by the supervisor and the Library administration to rectify deficiencies in performance. Specific goals detailing areas in need of improvement must be documented to facilitate shared understanding of the issues and the steps to deal with them.

**Meets Expectations:** Employee produces desired or intended outcomes and completely satisfies the established standards and expectations in all essential areas of responsibility and, at times, may exceed expectations in some areas. A rating at this level indicates that the employee is a competent, productive, and valued member of the team. Employee demonstrates fully proficient knowledge, skills and abilities for the required work and makes appreciable contributions to the unit and the department.

These employees demonstrate many of the characteristics described in the illustrative examples for professional performance below:

- Produces the quality and quantity of work to meet and occasionally exceed job expectations
- Willingly implements new techniques, considering the concerns and suggestions of others
- Accepts constructive criticism
- Handles suggestions to problems reasonably and within an appropriate time frame
- Minimizes wasted time or downtime; continuously tries to improve work performance
- Maintains up-to-date knowledge of relevant procedures and functions
- Readily accepts a change once the team decides to move in a direction
- Promotes/supports department, colleagues, supervisors, administration, the Libraries, and the University in action and in words

**Exceeds Expectations:** Employee completely satisfies the established standards and expectations in all essential areas of responsibility and, frequently exceeds these expectations in multiple performance areas. Employee’s contribution to the success of the unit is substantial. This category may also be considered for employees who “meet expectations” in most areas of their essential responsibilities, but also had a significant contribution in a key area that deserves special recognition and acknowledgement. The supervisor should clearly identify this contribution and its impact on the unit/department, Libraries or campus.
Illustrative Examples for Professional Performance:

- Routinely meet and exceed expectations and job requirements by producing an above average quality and quantity of work
- Demonstrate the ability to take on progressive responsibility with a consistent level of success.
- Consistently shows strong problem solving skills that result in improved work functions
- Possess full knowledge of their job functions/duties, as well as other related aspects of the department, division, and organization
- Dependable, reliable follow through on all provided or otherwise undertaken assignments
- Recognized by peers, managers, students and other customers/personnel as collaborative, skilled, and trustworthy
- Consistently exhibit behavior that demonstrates the values and qualities of the organization
- Exhibit teamwork or is a team player in varied settings without prompting and can work collaboratively with others
- Effective in a variety of settings including one on one communication, writing skills, correspondence, and public situations

Exceptional: Reserved for employees whose performance consistently, at times substantially, exceeds the performance expectations in most all essential areas of responsibility for the position. Employees rated at this level have typically achieved extraordinary results with readily demonstrable benefits to the Libraries. Overall productivity is characterized by sustained exemplary accomplishments at the highest level throughout the rating period. This category may also be considered for employees who “exceed expectations” in most areas of their essential responsibilities, with some outstanding additional contributions that deserves special recognition. The supervisor should clearly identify these contribution(s) and the impact on the unit/department, Libraries or campus.

This rating is achievable by any employee, but because outcomes are of such outstanding quality, it may occur among only a small number of staff in any given review cycle.

These employees demonstrate many of the characteristics described in the illustrative examples for professional performance below:

- Work with minimal supervision and generate output that is exceptionally high in quality, quantity, and timeliness.
- Takes responsibility for all aspects of job; exhibits creativity in seeking out improvements or enhancements to work.
- Performance regularly and consistently results in the best possible attainment and demonstrates an extraordinary level of skill and in-depth knowledge of their job functions/duties
- Well recognized by others within the University community or within their area of expertise as an authority in their area of work
- Skillfully manages multiple and varied types of tasks with competing priorities, overcoming challenges to successfully complete work on or ahead of schedule.
- Through their own initiative, made an exceptional or unique contribution that furthered the goals or objectives of the unit, department, Libraries or University.
- Exhibit teamwork or is a team player in varied settings and influence others to work collaboratively to bring about positive outcomes while furthering the goals of the department, division and organization. Contribution to the success of the team/work unit is considerable and far-reaching.
- Exhibit model behavior that exemplifies the values and qualities of the organization and that is worthy of emulation by supervisors/staff members.
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Option 2: “Stop Grading” - Performance Management Instead of Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluations are not competitive in this model, but developmental instead. Performance is either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” with focus on clarifying expectations, setting objectives, identifying goals, providing feedback, evaluating outcomes, and agreeing on developmental opportunities.

Through the committee’s research in the organizational management/leadership literature, we found ample evidence to support the elimination of an annual performance evaluation system and recommend that KU Libraries replace the current evaluation system with a performance management, employee development oriented system.

Table 1: A Comparison of the Two Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Evaluation (used currently)</th>
<th>Performance Management (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on evaluation and rating</td>
<td>Focus is on employee development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as a once a year event</td>
<td>Seen as an on-going process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, both positive and negative, is given annually</td>
<td>Feedback is given frequently – formally at least twice a year, often quarterly or monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews whether employee achieved the goals set by the supervisor</td>
<td>Employee and supervisor negotiate goals in line with the unit mission / strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engenders fear and anxiety</td>
<td>Encourages better communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages short-term thinking</td>
<td>Encourages long-term vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stifles teamwork (“me first” thinking)</td>
<td>Encourages teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to evaluate objectively, which can increase negative feelings</td>
<td>Engages the employee-supervisor team in mostly positive interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As numerous authors have pointed out, the vast majority of any work force will do a good job, no matter what the management of the organization does. In a variation of the bell curve, 80-95 percent of employees will perform adequately, even without concrete motivations. A small percentage of employees will produce insufficient or otherwise unsatisfactory performance. At the other end of the scale, a small percentage of employees will produce substantially more than other workers or otherwise offer outstanding performance. According to author Florence Stone, a motivational employee development plan will be able to deal with all three of these categories of employees in a way that will improve performance and productivity.

The key legal requirement is that some kind of procedure be in place to deal with the sub-par performance of this small percentage of employees. Employees earning an unsatisfactory label need counseling and lots of one-on-one time from the supervisor or an HR professional in order to bring performance up to an acceptable level. This type of system can do that by documenting the employee’s work / behavior / attitudes that are unacceptable/unsatisfactory, then pursuing necessary remedies with concrete deadlines and consequences, up to and including dismissal. At any point in this process, the employee is able to file a grievance, if he or she feels that the supervisor is treating them unfairly.
Employees earning an outstanding label need mentoring so that the talented individual can continue to grow in the direction of their strengths and interests and contribute even more to the unit’s goals and aspirations. Such mentoring will provide opportunities that develop these employees into future leaders of the unit.

The vast majority of employees who fall between the top and lowest rankings are self-motivated, professional, and accomplish their personal and unit goals – they need only a little bit of coaching, recognition, and encouragement to keep them performing at their current high level or better, thus making sure they accomplish what the organization needs them to do.

**Table 2: A Common Profile of Employees in Professional Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underperforming Staff</th>
<th>Successful Staff</th>
<th>Star Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 %</td>
<td>85 - 95%</td>
<td>3 - 10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need counseling</td>
<td>Need coaching</td>
<td>Need mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A performance management system will not be a panacea—as with any other system, unintended consequences will result. The committee recognizes that extensive development and discussion of guidelines, as well as extensive training for supervisors, will be needed to make such an employee development system work. However, we think the investment of time and resources will result in a system that encourages employees to develop their strengths, talents, skills, and interests in service to the organization's mission and users. We believe it will ultimately benefit the Libraries’ administration, in tandem with the Library Faculty and Professionals Association, to develop a performance management / employee development model in order to accomplish the strategic goal of becoming a more agile staff.

The following section contains the text of an online article by HR professional Susan Heathfield and outlines the steps necessary to establish an effective performance management system.
Performance Management Process Checklist
Step-by-step to a Performance Management System, By Susan M. Heathfield
[http://humanresources.about.com/od/performancemanagement/a/perfmgmt.htm]

Susan Heathfield is a member of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) and the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). Susan contributes regularly to professional publications including a book chapter for ASTD and a recent article in the American Society for Quality’s Journal for Quality and Participation.

Performance appraisals, performance reviews, appraisal forms, whatever you want to call them, let's call them gone. As a stand-alone, annual assault, a performance appraisal is universally disliked and avoided. After all, how many people in your organization want to hear that they were less than perfect last year? How many managers want to face the arguments and diminished morale that can result from the performance appraisal process?

How many supervisors feel their time is well-spent professionally to document and provide proof to support their feedback all year long? Plus, the most important outputs for the performance appraisal, from each person's job, may not be defined or measurable in your current work system. If you want to make the appraisal system one step harder to manage, tie the employee's salary increase to their numeric rating!

If the true goal of performance appraisals is employee development and organizational improvement, consider moving to a performance management system. Place the focus on what you really want to create in your organization - performance management and development. As part of that system, you will want to use this checklist to guide your participation in the Performance Management and Development Process. You can also use this checklist to help you in a more traditional performance appraisal process.

In a recent Human Resources Forum poll, 16 percent of the people responding have no performance appraisal system at all. Supervisory opinions, provided once a year, are the only appraisal process for 56 percent of respondents. Another 16 percent described their appraisals as based solely on supervisor opinions, but administered more than once a year.

If you follow the checklist below, I am convinced you will offer a performance management and development system that will significantly improve the appraisal process you currently manage. Staff will feel better about participating and the performance management system may even positively affect performance.

**Preparation and Planning for Performance Management**

Much work is invested, on the front end, to improve a traditional employee appraisal process. In fact, managers can feel as if the new process is too time consuming. Once the foundation of developmental goals is in place, however, time to administer the system decreases. Each of these steps is taken with the participation and cooperation of the employee.

**Performance Management and Development in the General Work System**

- Define the purpose of the job, job duties, and responsibilities.
• Define performance goals with measurable outcomes.
• Define the priority of each job responsibility and goal.
• Define performance standards for key components of the job.
• Hold interim discussions and provide feedback about employee performance, preferably daily, summarized and discussed, at least, quarterly. (Provide positive and constructive feedback.)
• Maintain a record of performance through critical incident reports. (Jot notes about contributions or problems throughout the quarter, in an employee file.)
• Provide the opportunity for broader feedback. Use a 360 degree performance feedback system that incorporates feedback from the employee’s peers, customers, and people who may report to him.
• Develop and administer a coaching and improvement plan if the employee is not meeting expectations.

**Immediate Preparation for the Performance Development Meeting**

• Schedule the Performance Development Planning (PDP) meeting and define pre-work with the staff member to develop the performance development plan (PDP).
• The staff member reviews personal performance, documents “self-assessment” comments and gathers needed documentation, including 360 degree feedback results, when available.
• The supervisor prepares for the PDP meeting by collecting data including work records, reports, and input from others familiar with the staff person’s work.
• Both examine how the employee is performing against all criteria, and think about areas for potential development.
• Develop a plan for the PDP meeting which includes answers to all questions on the performance development tool with examples, documentation and so on.
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Other Supporting Documentation

KU Libraries:

Faculty Evaluation Plan (Approved by LFPA Membership 12/17/2009)
http://lib.ku.edu/lfpa/FacultyEvaluationPlan2009.pdf

Discipline Expectations for Library Faculty at KU (July 1, 2009)

University of Kansas:

Faculty Evaluation Policy for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Members
https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm

Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff