Libraries Faculty Meeting
May 21, 1992
Minutes


This meeting was called by the FPC to discuss revisions to the faculty evaluation form. A revised form was distributed and Nancy Carter led the discussion. The form distributed here reflects changes suggested at this meeting. If you wish to review the form as discussed at the meeting, contact the FPC. Passages from the revised will be quoted in bold, and a summary of the ensuing discussion will follow.

The introductory page was extensively revised. Minor changes were made to order of pages, to group the self-evaluation for categories II & III with the ratings sheets for those categories.

Self-evaluations

Each section of the self-evaluation will be limited to 1 or 2 pages (maximum).

This change was made in response to some of the very lengthy self-evaluations which were written this year. Hamilton suggested that a recommended rather than a required length would be more appropriate. The ensuing discussion dealt with both the length and the focus of the self-evaluation, especially for librarianship.

N. Carter noted that the self-evaluation should not be an annual report, but should focus on plans and priorities. Robertson stated that the evaluation task force had felt that there was too much emphasis on special activities, and not enough on the actual job description in the old form.

O'Mahony suggested that a summary of job tasks and a summary of highlights could both be included. Arp suggested that someone could be brought in to assist the faculty in writing and summarizing activities. N. Carter brought up the point that it should not be necessary to write down everything we do, the supervisor should be know if our work has been getting done. Baia said that this is our only opportunity to explain what has happened. Lo Bue pointed out that only the supervisor reads this self-evaluation and they should know what has happened.

Lo Bue moved that the self-evaluation for category I be eliminated, seconded by Hamilton. Anthes said that as a supervisor she knows what people do, but needs input as to results. A vote was taken and the motion failed. The consensus was that it is the supervisor's responsibility to ensure that the self-evaluation provides the necessary information and is not too lengthy.
Evaluation by first-level supervisor

The written evaluation by the first-level supervisor must support the numerical rating assigned. This is especially critical when the rating assigned is very (5 or 6) or very low (2 or lower).

Maloney suggested that the word very be deleted.

Additional comments

Comments from Library Faculty concerning the faculty member must be addressed to the first-level supervisor, with copies sent to the faculty member. These comments must be received by the deadline for the first-level supervisor evaluation. The faculty member may address these comments in writing in section IV, page 6.

There was concern that this paragraph does not limit those from whom comments may be received. Krismann said that outside comments should be agreed upon between the faculty member and supervisor at the beginning of the evaluation period. Lo Bue said that in regards to evaluation of bibliography, there needs to be an opportunity to discuss work with the person evaluating. O’Mahony moved that the FPC contact Human Resources, University Counsel, and other campus resources to check the legality of having outside comments on faculty evaluations. Seconded by Busick. The motion passed. Sani asked if there had been thought given to being evaluated over a several year period.

Signatures

A signature line for requesting appeal of rating will be added to the ratings sheet. On the signature page, a place for the date will be added beside the faculty member’s initials.

Review

The FPC will conduct a comparative review of Category I for all library faculty.

Krismann suggested that the sentence be changed to indicate that the FPC is reviewing the supervisor’s evaluation and rating for category I.

Ratings sheets:

Arp pointed out the wording for each rating acknowledge expanding depth of responsibility, but not breadth. She suggested adding “added responsibilities” to each statement. Thus for a rating of 5 in librarianship, the text would read “Practice of librarianship consistently exceeds what is expected in major areas of responsibility or added responsibilities.

Hamilton moved that for all categories the words ‘meritorious’ and ‘excellent’ associated with ratings 5 and 6 respectively, be reassigned to ratings 4 and 5 respectively, and that the word ‘superior’ be associated with a rating of 6. He also moved that the line be redrawn on the ratings sheet so that a rating of 4 or 5 is equivalent with the VCAA rating of 4. This makes the form conform more closely with the VCAA evaluation form. The motion was passed.