

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 583

IR 052 050

AUTHOR Christopher, Rachel; Culpepper, Jetta
 TITLE Library Faculty Evaluation: Criteria and Scoring Instrument.
 INSTITUTION Murray State Univ., Ky.
 PUB DATE May 87
 NOTE 14p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Academic Rank (Professional); *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Job Performance; *Librarians; *Personnel Evaluation; Promotion (Occupational); Records (Forms); Research; Teaching Skills; Tenure
 IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status; *Murray State University KY

ABSTRACT

In an effort to improve individual progress toward meeting university requirements for promotion and tenure, librarians at Murray State University (Kentucky) recently revised their Faculty Activities Report and Faculty Evaluation forms to meet the following objectives: (1) to develop a Faculty Activities Report form that would be easier to administer and more equitable, providing for a continuous listing of activities through the years rather than the annual listing formerly used; and (2) to develop a Faculty Evaluation form that would specifically address university criteria for promotion and tenure. The new Faculty Activities Report form allows faculty members to keep account of their accomplishments during each calendar year in the five categories of teaching excellence/job performance, research/creative achievement, professional service, academic and professional service, and university service. Designed to be used for the evaluation of each librarian by his or her immediate supervisor, the new Faculty Evaluation form includes a rating scale of 1 to 5 for the criteria of teaching excellence/job performance (70% of the total score), research/creativity (20%), and service (10%). The Faculty Evaluation form and rating scale are included. (KM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

LIBRARY FACULTY EVALUATION:
CRITERIA AND SCORING INSTRUMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

Rachel Christopher
Associate Professor
Head of Periodicals

and

Jetta Culpepper
Associate Professor
Head of Acquisitions

Murray State University

May 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rachel Christopher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED284583

IR052050

ABSTRACT

University librarians with faculty status, along with teaching faculty, are placing more emphasis on research and publication. Librarians at Murray State University in Murray, Kentucky have revised two forms for reflecting this emphasis in assessment for tenure and promotion. A cumulative Faculty Activities Report which is updated annually is kept by each librarian. Based on that report, the Evaluation instrument uses a formula to rate (A) teaching/job performance at 70% of the total score, (B) research/creativity at 20% and (C) service activities at 10%.

Library Faculty Evaluation: Criteria and Scoring Instrument

In an effort to improve individual progress toward meeting university requirements for promotion and tenure, librarians at Murray State University recently revised their Faculty Activities Report and Faculty Evaluation forms.

A committee of three librarians volunteered to develop new drafts of previously used forms for majority approval by the library faculty. Two objectives were set:

1. To develop a Faculty Activities Report form which would be easier to administer and more equitable by providing for a continuous listing of activities through the years rather than the annual listing formerly used.
2. To develop a Faculty Evaluation Form which would specifically address university criteria for promotion and tenure.

Faculty Activities Report

The activities report form used by the University of Oklahoma was found to address concerns similar to those at Murray State University and to lend itself to annual updating resulting in a cumulative record of accomplishments. This form became a working draft to which a few modifications were made to comply with local criteria for performance.

The Faculty Activities Report form adopted by Murray State was divided into five sections: (1) teaching excellence/job performance, (2) research/creative achievement, (3) professional service, (4) academic and professional service, (5) university service. Under each of these sections, the faculty member keeps an account of accomplishments for the calendar year. The completed report is submitted in January.

Faculty Evaluation Form

The more difficult of the two tasks delegated to the committee was the development of the Faculty Evaluation Form to be used by the immediate supervisor for rating each librarian. Copies of forms used by the other state supported universities in Kentucky and benchmark institutions for Murray State University were added to the forms already in hand from Memphis State University and the University of Oklahoma.

Unlike the Faculty Activities Report form, no single evaluation form collected approximated the committee's idea of a suitable form for Murray State University librarians. The drafting of this form required a great deal of time spent in individual work, followed by sessions of discussion. After the committee had approved a draft, suggestions for minor changes were made by the other librarians and the Dean of Libraries.

The final draft provided one Evaluation Form for all library faculty, allowing for variation in job assignment and emphasis on job performance. Since the annual evaluation is

based on the data supplied on the Faculty Activities Report, it was particularly important that the two be compatible. Ensuring that criteria paralleled as closely as possible those used for evaluating teaching faculty was also a major concern.

Criteria. The form adopted provided for the three areas of faculty performance usually identified by universities for evaluation of faculty: (A) teaching excellence/job performance, (B) research/creative achievement and (C) service. The complete form appears at the end of this discussion.

Section A, teaching excellence/job performance, counts 70% of the total score and consists of 10 items, each of which is rated separately. Most universities supplying copies of their evaluation forms used similar criteria in this section. The itemized list on the Morehead State University (Kentucky) form was adopted with some alterations.

Section B, research/creativity, counts 20% of the total score. This has been the biggest stumbling block for librarians in attaining tenure and promotion. East Carolina State University (North Carolina) supplied a list of types of publications given in order of significance. Murray State librarians adopted this list excluding the ranking. Local variation in acceptance of formats prohibits assigned ranking. This list may serve as much as a source of inspiration to individual librarians as it does as an aid to the evaluator.

Section C, service, counts the remaining 10% of the total score. Statements here closely resemble those in the Faculty Handbook. The category includes service to the library,

to the university and to the community. Activities indicative of professional development and growth are also assessed.

Section D, the final section of the form, allows for comments by the evaluator. All ratings below a 3 are to be substantiated in this section.

Scoring. The evaluator rates performance on a Rating Scale with a low of 1 and a high of 5. Descriptive definitions on the scale, which appear on the last page of the Faculty Evaluation Form, were based on those used by the University of Oklahoma.

The formula used to calculate the score, which is slightly modified from that used by Memphis State University, and computation of a typical score appear below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\text{Sum of A}}{10} \times .7 \right) + (B \times .2) + (C \times .1) = \text{mean} \\ & \left(\frac{40 \times .7}{10} \right) + (4 \times .2) + (4 \times .1) = \text{final score} \\ & (2.8) + (.8) + (.4) = 4 \end{aligned}$$

The average of points awarded ($\frac{40}{10}$) on the 10 items on Section A is multiplied by the weight (.7) of the section. The second portion of the equation is determined by multiplying points awarded (4) on Section B by the weight (.2) of the section. The third portion of the equation is determined by multiplying points awarded (4) on Section C by the weight (.1) of the section. The final score (4) indicates excellent performance.

Cover Page. The first page of the form fills the dual role of a cover page and a source of instruction. The signature of the person evaluated is required, indicating that he/she has read the evaluation, as well as the signatures of the evaluator (if other than the dean) and the dean. The librarian evaluated has the option of filing his/her comments on the appraisal.

In the case of faculty not yet tenured, evaluations are prepared by the dean as well as an immediate supervisor, if any. The last section of page one contains a summary/explanation of the score.

Review of Forms. The library faculty agreed to review the effectiveness of the new Faculty Evaluation Form after a trial of one year. Updating or revision as deemed appropriate may be made before the form is used again. The revised Faculty Activities Report form has been used for two years, the Evaluation Form for one year.

Murray State University Libraries

Faculty Evaluation Form

This form has been prepared for the annual evaluation of your (a) teaching excellence/job performance, (b) research or creative achievement, and (c) service. Your evaluation will be based on the Faculty Activities Form on which you have reported your year's activities, accomplishments and achievements.

Name: _____ Evaluation Period: _____

Rank: _____ Position Title: _____

Signatures:

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

Reviewed by:

Dean: _____ Date: _____

Instructions:

Each item in the following sections has a rating scale ranging from a low of "1" to a high of "5." Please refer to the last page of this form for an explanation of the rating scale.

To determine mean of the evaluation use the following formula:

$$\frac{(\text{Sum of A})}{10} \times .7) + (B \times .2) + (C \times .1) = \text{the mean}$$

A = _____

B = _____

C = _____

Overall evaluation: _____

A. TEACHING EXCELLENCE/JOB PERFORMANCE (70%)

1. Quality of Work: Performs with accuracy, thoroughness, consistency and competency; applies knowledge and skills of profession.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

2. Quantity of Work: Regularly produces an acceptable volume of work with speed and consistency of output; performs amount of work expected in that position using time effectively and efficiently; accepts new responsibilities/tasks over and above assigned duties.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

3. Knowledge of Profession: Commands the knowledge essential for present position; shows an awareness of current practices, developments, research and technology in area of responsibility and in profession as a whole.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

4. Human Relations: Interacts effectively with library personnel, faculty and other university personnel and library users; approachable.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

5. Initiative and Resourcefulness: Exhibits ability to work independently and decisively; develops new plans and ideas; exhibits ambition and drive to perform routine as well as unique work activities.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

6. Attitude: Exhibits enthusiasm for position and the profession as a whole; performs duties willingly and with enthusiasm; accepts constructive criticism and suggestions from supervisor; willingly cooperates in working for the good of the whole Library.

1	2	3	4	5
low				high

D. COMMENTS

All ratings on this evaluation below "3" should be substantiated under this section.

RATING SCALE

5: Consistently excellent performance with demonstration of an unusually high degree of competence, responsibility, initiative and professional expertise. All activities must indicate an extra high quality and quantity of accomplishments. Regional or national recognition for professional activities or contributions should be in evidence.

4: Excellent performance with demonstration of a high level of competence, responsibility and professional development and with continuing evidence of career development. Campus or state recognition of professional activities or (faculty) contributions should be in evidence.

3: Performance of basic responsibilities in a competent manner with demonstrated potential for future academic growth and professional development.

2: Improvement needed in performance of professional activities. Performance may be improved by further training and development.

1: Consistently low level of performance in all areas of professional activities. If immediate improvement is not demonstrated, retention is unlikely.