

6-23-2010

Faculty Annual Review Document

Nelson Poynter Memorial Library.

Follow this and additional works at: http://digital.usfsp.edu/npml_fac_gov_guidelines



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nelson Poynter Memorial Library, "Faculty Annual Review Document" (2010). *Library Faculty Governance: Guidelines*. 4.
http://digital.usfsp.edu/npml_fac_gov_guidelines/4

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Faculty Governance at Digital USFSP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Governance: Guidelines by an authorized administrator of Digital USFSP.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA ST. PETERSBURG

NELSON POYNTER MEMORIAL LIBRARY

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW DOCUMENT

Approved June 23 2010

Faculty members at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg library are evaluated annually by their supervisor. This review process is intended to assess performance, to provide feedback to enhance the librarian's professional development, and may be used to determine appropriate salary adjustments and merit awards if such funds are available. The evaluation process seeks to acknowledge the different talents, interests, and responsibilities of the library faculty. The annual review is focused primarily on the librarian's assigned duties, but it also considers success in meeting annual goals and the assessment of contributions to the library, the university and the community. In addition to a supervisor's evaluation, the librarian will also be evaluated by a committee of peer librarians.

The document that follows outlines the criteria and procedures for peer review and supervisor's recommendations. It relies on sections of the operative Collective Bargaining Agreement and the operative USF St. Petersburg Faculty Annual Review Guidelines for its authority.

This document is in four sections: Section I provides a step-by-step account of the evaluation process. Section II presents criteria for judging the librarian's level of performance. Section III explains the appointment of the Departmental Review Committee. Section IV describes the procedures for completing the review summary form. This process will adhere to the operative USF St. Petersburg timetable.

This process is intended to assist library faculty members in professional development by identifying strengths and weaknesses. Since the librarian's record of peer review has traditionally been an important part of the evaluation and promotion process, this procedure should be followed every year, even when money for salary adjustments is not available.

I. PROCEDURE

A. Librarian's Self-Review

1. The librarian is responsible for completing a self-review narrative of his/her professional activities on FAIR by the announced deadline. The self-review narrative should describe both the librarian's performance of his/her written job assignment(s) and success in accomplishing the librarian's annual goals. The librarian's annual goals should have been agreed upon with the supervisor at the beginning of the year under review. Librarians with administrative responsibilities may discuss departmental accomplishments, leadership efforts, and staff support efforts, as appropriate. Librarians are encouraged to include the average percentage for each assigned duty in their narrative, and to submit detailed descriptions of their service, research, and creative activities. For research/creative activities, the librarian may submit copies of his/her publications, or concise descriptions of other appropriate activities, if clarification is needed. Descriptions of service activities may include the goals and duration of the committee, frequency of meetings, and the amount of work expected from the committee member. The librarian has the option of entering numerical rankings in the "Faculty Member Self Review" column of the Annual Faculty Review Summary chart. Librarians are encouraged to include the average percentage for each assigned duty in their narrative. The Percent Assigned section of the annual review summary form should be completed.

B. Departmental Review Committee

1. The Departmental Review Committee reviews each librarian's self-review narrative and the completed annual review summary form, located in FAIR. Based on the librarian's self-review narrative and optional rankings, the librarian's job assignment percentages and goals, and the Evaluation Criteria set forth in Section II, the Committee completes the Departmental Review (Faculty Committee) section of the annual faculty review summary form. If

sufficient information is lacking, the Committee may ask to interview the librarian in question. Committee members may not review themselves or those they supervise.

2. In addition, for each librarian reviewed, the Committee prepares a concise narrative to support its evaluation, which it adds to the electronic annual review summary form.

3. The Committee notifies the librarian's supervisor that it has completed its review.

C. Supervisor's Evaluation

1. The supervisor reviews the librarian's job assignment, self-review narrative, and goals, and writes an evaluation of the librarian's performance. As part of the evaluation process, the job assignment is reviewed and updated as appropriate, and goals are set for the coming year. The supervisor completes the Departmental Review (Dept Chair/Director) section of the Annual Review Summary form and, based on the evaluation criteria set forth in Section II, assigns rankings for each category.

2. The supervisor discusses the evaluation and rankings with the librarian. The supervisor notifies the Library Dean that the review has been completed.

D. The Librarian's Response

The librarian reviews the evaluations and provides an electronic signature on the Annual Review Summary form. The librarian may submit a response to the supervisor's evaluation and/or the Departmental Review. The response must be entered in Module 9 – Evaluations, Faculty Response section of the Annual Review form. Should the librarian request a re-evaluation by the Departmental Review Committee, the faculty response must clearly state the concern and describe it in detail. If the librarian's discussion with the supervisor has left disagreements unresolved, the librarian may also request a meeting with someone at the next higher level of supervision to discuss the evaluation. Grievances can be pursued according to university policies.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The annual librarian review considers the quality, quantity, and effectiveness of the librarian's performance of his/her job assignment. The evaluation process must take rank and assignment percentages into consideration. Librarians should be evaluated on their ability to meet their assigned roles as librarians, with librarianship as the primary role, defined as contributing in one of three areas: public services, including reference, instruction, and media services; technical services, including acquisitions, cataloging and serial management, and collection development. Job assignments differ among librarians, but all have the following broad components:

1. Primary professional duties include

the librarian's regularly scheduled activities that directly support the library: reference assistance, bibliographic instruction, teaching university courses, cataloging, serials management, collection development, service and resource assessments, administrative and supervisory duties, acquisitions, fiscal management and budget oversight, database management, or other public or technical services responsibilities, and continuing education that contributes to the librarian's performance. These activities are the foundation of the librarian's position and form the bulk of the job assignment and are given the greatest weight in recommendations.

An evaluation of the librarian's performance of these duties should consider the following:

- the librarian's knowledge of his/her assigned area of library specialization;
- initiative, resourcefulness, and originality in developing resources;
- solving problems and locating information;

- productivity and accuracy;
- organizational and administrative skills;
- successful interaction with staff and library clientele;
- development of productive liaison relationships with the faculty and students of designated departments;
- contributions to improvements in service and efficiency;
- critical perspective;
- capacity for growth;
- ability to remain current with the policies, procedures and technologies that are necessary to carry out primary responsibilities;
- assumption of new or expanded responsibilities;
- special efforts made under difficult circumstances;
- demonstration of significant leadership;
- mentoring or advising activities;
- professional development such as participation in training, webinars, workshops, course work, and conference attendance to enhance professional skills

These criteria will be judged using a 5-point scale from Outstanding (5) to Unacceptable (1). Each librarian will be evaluated based on his/her individual job assignments for this category.

2. Service includes

participation in library committees and task groups; university committees, councils, senates, and organizations; professional and scholarly organizations; thesis advising, etc. Service on governmental boards, agencies, and commissions may be considered if they complement the mission and strategic goals of the university and utilize the librarian's professional expertise.

An evaluation of the librarian's service activities might consider the following:

- the number of the librarian's activities and the time spent on each, relative to his/her service assignment (percentage);
- the level of the librarian's responsibility in the activity;
- the knowledge and creativity demanded by the activity;
- the activity's contribution to the functioning or improvement of the library, the university, the community, or the profession;
- the activity's contribution to the librarian's professional development or the reputation of the library.
- assumption of leadership roles

These criteria will be judged using a 5-point scale from Outstanding (5) to Unacceptable (1). Each librarian will be evaluated based on his/her individual job assignments for this category.

3. Research, scholarship, and creative activity includes

publication of books, articles, reviews, etc.; presentations at professional conferences; developing university courses; written review and assessment of practices in other institutions that could lead to improvements in the library; major reports relating to accreditation or library operations; earning advanced degrees; producing significant in-house materials or creative works that serve the library, the university, or the community.

An evaluation of the librarian's research, scholarship, and creative activity might consider the following:

- the number of the librarian's activities and the time spent on each, relative to his/her research assignment (percentage);

- the level of knowledge, investigation, and creativity involved in the activity;
- the activity's contribution to knowledge or to the development of techniques;
- the activity's contribution to the librarian's professional development, the reputation of the library, or the university.

These criteria will be judged using a 5-point scale from Outstanding (5) to Unacceptable (1). Each librarian will be evaluated based on his/her individual job assignments for this category.

III. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

The Departmental Review Committee will consist of three members appointed by the USFSP Dean of the Library. At least two librarians will be from Nelson Poynter Memorial Library and one librarian from one of the other libraries within the University of South Florida system, if necessary. The Committee chooses its own Chair. Members serve staggered two-year terms. Eligibility is limited to permanently appointed library faculty with at least one full year within the USF Library System. Supervisors may serve on the Review Committee but will limit their participation on their supervisees' evaluations to answering questions from other Committee members. After the completion of one term, a member is not eligible to serve again for two years unless staffing circumstances dictate otherwise.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR COMPLETING THE REVIEW SUMMARY FORM

The Departmental Review Committee prepares a concise narrative to support its evaluation, which it adds to the electronic Annual Review form, Module 9 – Evaluations, Faculty Committee Chair Narrative section.

In addition, the Departmental Review Committee assigns a rating ranging from outstanding to unacceptable for the level of performance in each category on the electronic Annual Faculty Review Summary Form under the Departmental Review (Faculty Committee) column.

Rankings are as follows:

5	Outstanding
4.5	Strong to Outstanding
4	Strong
3.5	Satisfactory to Strong
3	Satisfactory
2.5	Weak to Satisfactory
2	Weak
1.5	Unacceptable to Weak
1	Unacceptable

Rankings will be automatically weighted based on the percentages listed in the Activity % Assigned column.

The Chair of the Departmental Committee electronically signs the Annual Review Summary form and notifies the supervisors that the committee's review has been completed.