LFPA Special Meeting

January 30, 2012
2pm - 3pm
Watson Library 450

Attendees: Mike Broadwell, Julie Buchsbaum, Jennifer Church-Duran, Susan Craig, Lea Currie, Ada Emmett, Nikhat Ghouse, Jon Giullian, Sarah Goodwin Thiel, Kathy Graves, Sally Haines, Lorraine Haricombe, Elspeth Healey, Letha Johnson, Jana Krentz, Lars Leon, Micki Lubbers, Deb Ludwig, Scott McEathron, Kent Miller, Amalia Monroe-Gulick, Sara Morris, Julie Petr, Mary Raple, Angela Rathmel, Marianne Reed, Mary Roach, Brian Rosenblum, Shannon Royer, Rebecca Smith, Tara Wenger, Beth Whitaker

The purpose of this special meeting was to hold an open forum for LFPA members to ask questions about the changes to annual performance evaluation process.

Sarah Goodwin Thiel shared a timeline of events:

**September, 2011** – Dean requests LFPA form Ad Hoc committee to investigate evaluation forms & merit application procedures to begin after Fall Assembly

**October, 2011** – Call for volunteers for Evaluation and Merit Review (EMR) Ad Hoc committee at Fall Assembly.

**November, 2011** – Volunteers selected, first meeting held. Final report due end of January.

**December, 2011** – Merit allocations distributed

**December, 2011** – DC Exec addresses merit allocation inconsistency concerns raised by faculty and staff. Request initial findings report from the EMR Ad Hoc committee to avoid duplication of research on the topic.

**January 4th, 2012** – Report completed by EMR, reviewed by LFPA Exec, SGT makes decision not to send report to Assembly before it is presented to DC Exec on January 6th.

**January 6th, 2012** – EMR committee members and SGT attend DC Exec meeting. Initial findings report is presented.

Dean Haricombe shared her perspective on the changes: Dean's Council wanted to make revisions to the evaluation procedures as soon as possible to address concerns raised by the Provost's guidelines for merit allocation, and to have the changes in place in time for this round of evaluations. The evaluation changes are administrative and procedural in nature, therefore do not require a vote of approval by LFPA members. The changes are intended to address concerns about consistency and transparency. 2 things have changed: 1) review of evaluations by assistant deans happens before the supervisor makes the final recommendations and shares with the employee; and 2) the timeline has been extended beyond March 1 to allow more time to complete the full process. Several other inconsistencies in the evaluation process were addressed:

- everyone should include a C.V. with their evaluation
- there need to be ratings in 3 separate areas: professional duties/service/research, rather than just one overarching rating (this had not been done consistently)
• reviews of progress towards tenure need to be done more consistently

Questions from LFPA members:

• **Why did the Ad Hoc report go directly to DC Exec instead of being first shared with the full assembly?**
  Deans Council needed short turn-around time. The Ad Hoc committee report was not finalized--it was originally scheduled to be completed by January 17, later extended to February 3, at which time it will be shared with the entire LFPA membership. The report contains many recommendations, some of which are procedural and some of which are criteria-related. This report will provide a basis for further discussions within LFPA during the coming year as the entire evaluation process and criteria is reviewed.

• **If an AD recommends a different rating than the supervisor intended to give, will the employee be informed that the AD requested the change?**
  The new procedures are intended to make overall process fairer. The consultation between supervisor and AD is intended to be a discussion to better understand the rating, not an opportunity for the AD to personally decide what rating an employee should receive. The standard appeals process remains in place.

• **What was the Ad Hoc Task Force charged with?**
  Evaluation and Merit Review Ad Hoc LFPA Committee 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 also is also charged with investigating the development of a Merit Application form and process. Recommendations will be reported to LFPA Exec. Recommendations will be finalized by January 17, 2012. Any implementation of these forms is tentatively set for fiscal year 2012/2013. Membership will consist of 5 members.
  Ad Hoc Task Force was charged with reviewing the evaluation forms and processes--not the criteria, which are to be discussed by LFPA later this year and changes to which will require voting.

Other discussion points:

• Definitions of rankings (exceptional, exceeds expectations, etc.) need to be improved, perhaps with specific examples.

• Grade inflation is an issue.

• The Provost's system of awarding merit to the top 25% likely to continue. Distinction needs to be made between merit and evaluation. Merit is competitive, but the evaluation process shouldn't be. Lack of cost-of-living adjustments meant that merit is the only way
to get an increase in pay. Tying merit directly to the evaluation process is unfair and creates unnecessary pressure on employees.

- Discipline expectations also need to be revised in the coming year.

- LFPA may want to consider separating unclassified professionals from the "faculty" evaluation plan. There is an effort underway the University level towards standardizing unclassified professionals grades and pay scales, which would mean UPs should be separated from the faculty plan. While not imminent, this may take place in a year.

- All raises at KU are merit raises and are an administrative function. Historically within KU Libraries merit has been calculated using a combination of equal percentage and equal dollar amounts. (KU policy does not allow merit to be calculated strictly by one or the other.) Equal dollar amounts may seem fairer, but it can also lead to salary compression.