

Guidelines for Performance-Based Salary Increases for Library Faculty

Please refer to the Library Faculty Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion for information on the expectations for each category by rank.

EDUCATIONAL MISSION

Outstanding. The faculty member has accomplished significantly more than specified in the workload agreement in quantity or quality, or (for example):

- received a commendation or award for the performance of assigned duties
- achieved distinguished outcomes as measured by standard evaluations, where applicable
- demonstrated leadership in achieving the department's or unit's goals
- managed a task outside his/her workload expectations with distinction

Above Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished more than specified in the workload agreement in quantity or quality, or (for example):

- performed assigned duties with notable effectiveness
- achieved superior outcomes as measured by standard evaluations, where applicable
- demonstrated initiative in achieving the department or unit's goals
- successfully managed a task outside of his/her workload expectations
- demonstrated superior problem-solving skills

Meets Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished substantially what was specified in the workload agreement and (for example):

- performed assigned duties in a professional manner
- achieved expected outcomes as measured by standard evaluations, where applicable
- actively participated in achieving the department's or unit's goals
- demonstrated a degree of competence and judgment appropriate to his/her role and rank
- worked effectively both as a team member and independently, as appropriate to tasks

Below Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished less than specified in the workload agreement and has not adequately achieved an equivalent, agreed-upon outcome, or (for example):

- performed assigned duties below expected level of effectiveness
- achieved inferior outcomes as measured by standard evaluations, where applicable
- participated passively or grudgingly in achieving department's or unit's goals
- demonstrated a level of competence or judgment below expectations

Does Not Meet Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished significantly less than specified in the workload agreement and has not adequately achieved an equivalent, agreed-upon outcome, and (for example):

- performed assigned duties well below expected level of effectiveness, or not at all
- achieved unsatisfactory outcomes as measured by standard evaluations, where applicable
- did not participate in achieving department's or unit's goals
- demonstrated incompetence or lack of judgment as appropriate to his/her role or rank

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Outstanding. The faculty member has accomplished significantly more than specified in the workload agreement, or (for example):

- published (in the year under review) one or more major works (including but not limited to a book from a reputable/scholarly publisher, or a refereed article in a high-impact journal)
- produced high-impact library-related software or digital tools
- was awarded an external grant
- gave a major refereed presentation at a professional conference
- high-quality scholarship
- received a commendation or award this year for a current or past accomplishment in scholarly and creative activities

Above Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished more than specified in the workload agreement, or (for example):

- submitted (in the year under review) a major work for publication or a major grant application
- produced one or more articles in non-refereed or lesser-impact journals
- wrote one or more invited book, software, website, manuscript, or other professional reviews
- moderated or served on a panel at a professional conference
- served as a grant reviewer or on an editorial board
- presented a poster session at a professional conference

Meets Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished substantially what was specified in the workload agreement.

Below Expectations. The faculty member has not substantially accomplished what was specified in the workload agreement.

Does Not Meet Expectations. The faculty member has not accomplished what was specified in the workload agreement and has expressed no interest in pursuing scholarly and creative activities.

SERVICE

Outstanding. The faculty member has accomplished significantly more than specified in the workload agreement or served with distinction, as indicated by (for example):

- a commendation or award
- distinguished service to the libraries, University, or profession

Above expectations. The faculty member has accomplished more than was specified in the workload agreement and served meritoriously, as indicated by (for example):

- election or appointment as chair of a professional committee, task force, or office
- sustained service within an organization or professional specialty

Meets Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished substantially what was specified in the workload agreement and (for example):

- produces evidence of active and positive participation on a committee, task force, or office
- has a record of or demonstrated interest in continued service commitment

Below Expectations. The faculty member has not substantially accomplished what was specified in the workload agreement or (for example):

- served passively or with notable ineffectiveness on a committee, task force, or office
- demonstrated inconsistency in meeting service obligations

Does Not Meet Expectations. The faculty member has accomplished significantly less than what was specified in the workload agreement or (for example):

- did not participate in an elected or appointed service role
- expressed no interest in pursuing service activities

Appendix A.

Performance-Based Salary Increment Methodology: Connecting Workload to Salary Increments

The guidelines establish five levels of performance in educational mission, scholarly & creative activities, and service: outstanding, above expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, and marginal. Faculty will be awarded from 0 to 4 points in each area, and then the score for each area will be adjusted to reflect the workload effort for each faculty member. For instance, a faculty member whose workload is divided as follows: 70% – Educational Mission (EM), 20% – Scholarly & Creative Activities (SCA), 10% –Service (S) will have his/her EM points multiplied by .7, SCA points multiplied by .2, and S points multiplied by .1. The total of the three products will result in an adjusted performance-based rating on a scale of 0 to 4.

Ratings

5– Outstanding

- Educational Mission
- Public Service
- Research

4 – Above Expectations

- Educational Mission
- Public Service
- Research

3 – Meets Expectations

- Educational Mission
- Public Service
- Research

2 – Below Expectations

- Educational Mission
- Public Service
- Research

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations

- Educational Mission
- Public Service
- Research

Examples:

$$\text{Prof. W} - \text{EM}(.7 \times 5) + \text{S}(.2 \times 4) + \text{SCA} (.1 \times 3) = \text{EM}(3.5) + \text{S}(.8) + \text{SCA}(.3) = 4.6$$

$$\text{Prof. X} - \text{EM}(.8 \times 4) + \text{S}(.1 \times 2) + \text{SCA} (.1 \times 3) = \text{EM}(3.2) + \text{S}(.2) + \text{SCA} (.3) = 3.7$$

$$\text{Prof. Y} - \text{EM}(.7 \times 2) + \text{S}(.1 \times 2) + \text{SCA} (.2 \times 2) = \text{EM}(1.4) + \text{S}(.2) + \text{SCA} (.4) = 2.0$$

$$\text{Prof. Z} - \text{EM}(.8 \times 3) + \text{S}(.1 \times 2) + \text{SCA} (.1 \times 1) = \text{EM}(2.4) + \text{S}(.2) + \text{SCA} (.1) = 2.7$$

APPENDIX B.

Parameters for Guidelines

The annual performance reviewⁱ serves several purposes:

- provides fair and consistent documentation of the contribution that the faculty member makes to the libraries' mission and programs
- serves as an ongoing planning and goal-setting tool
- enhances communication between the faculty member and the department chair and/or area administrator
- assists in defining the faculty member's development needs and in evaluating career progress and professional development
- provides the basis for recommending allocation of performance-based distributions

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) defines across-the-board, market/compression, and performance salary increases for UVM faculty.ⁱⁱ This document describes the methodology that will be used by the Libraries for allocation of performance-based distributions or merit increases to salaries.

According to the CBA, "Performance-based awards shall be made according to the following procedure: In consultation with the department chair, the dean of the school or college shall determine the performance-based distributions to individuals in each department. The methodology that will be used by the college/school for allocation of performance-based distributions in the following academic year will be determined and announced to the faculty prior to preparation of workload plans in the spring. The chair's recommendation shall be forwarded to the dean by the department chair in a timely fashion. The performance-based awards shall be based on performance evaluated against the workload expectations and assignments of the individual for the preceding academic year." ⁱⁱⁱ

Distribution of performance-based increases is an administrative process based on a system of merit rating. The merit rating will be determined as part of the annual performance review and should be considered as separate, but related to the greensheets reappointment and/or promotion process.

In accordance with the CBA's Procedure for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Promotion for Library Faculty:

*Library faculty shall be reviewed for reappointment and promotion in accordance with the following procedures: (a) Annual Performance Review and Reappointment. The procedures described in the libraries approved RPT^{iv} and Annual Performance Review Guidelines shall apply, together with the additional procedures described here. Area administrators and/or department chairpersons shall review annually the performance of each Library faculty member in his or her unit. The findings of that review will be communicated to the faculty member in writing with special emphasis given to areas of needed performance improvement. Before deciding on the recommendations for reappointment, the area administrator or department chairperson shall consult with members of the department and/or other appropriate groups or individuals. Performance appraisal criteria identified **in Section 10.g.ii**^v of this Article shall*

guide this review. The area administrator and/or department chairperson will make a written recommendation on reappointment to the dean of the Libraries. The dean shall make a final decision on reappointment.^{vi}

There are three specific criteria to be addressed in the annual review: Educational Mission, Scholarship and Creative Activities, and Service.^{vii} Merit ratings will take into consideration the different aspects of library faculty assignments and of performance appropriate for faculty at different levels of experience, administrative responsibility and academic rank. *The Library Faculty member must demonstrate effective performance in carrying out the responsibilities and goals applicable to his or her assignment. The goals of the Libraries are the development of collections and services to support the educational programs of the University; the application of a rational system for the organization, management and use of the collections and services; the creation of essential bibliographic records; and instruction in use of the libraries.*^{viii}

Strong and effective professional performance in fulfilling the goals and responsibilities of the Library Faculty member's particular assignment is fundamental, though the implications of the listing of characteristics within each area of evaluation do not imply that meeting any one is sufficient, or having to meet all of them is required. Rather, it is the composite (aggregate) nature of the performance in assigned areas – as defined in the annual Workload agreement – that is evaluated for merit. Continuous merit ratings of “Meets Expectations” or above do not guarantee that the faculty member will achieve promotion. Candidates for promotion must refer to the *Library Faculty Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion*.

Library Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (CBA, Article 16.1 (p.56)

Department chairpersons shall be responsible for the scheduling and assignment of all faculty under their direction, subject to the approval of the dean. In units where there are no chairpersons, the dean or designee will be responsible for the scheduling and assignment of all faculty under his or her direction. The department chairperson, or where there is no chair, the dean or designee of each unit, will annually establish and maintain a written record of work expectations for each faculty member after consultation with the faculty member. Such consultation will normally take place in the spring semester for the following academic year and will include a discussion of schedule as well as workload expectations.

and CBA, Article 16.7 (p.59).

The general responsibilities of the Library faculty may include, but shall not be limited to, library services, reference services, circulation services, technical services, University and professional service, teaching in library subject matter, supervision of library staff employees and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research. These responsibilities shall be set by the dean of the library and appropriate supervisors and will vary depending on the particular position held. The percentage of effort required in the three areas of educational mission, scholarship and creative activities, and service will be indicated in the workload plan.

The department chairperson, or where there is no chair, the dean or designee of each unit, will annually establish and maintain a written record of work expectations for each faculty member after consultation with the faculty member. Each faculty member must have a Faculty Workload

Plan, which will be the starting point for evaluating that faculty member in the annual review. During the evaluation process it is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the department chairperson to set the faculty member's goals and effort distribution percentages for the coming year. These annual goals and percentages establish guidelines for the faculty member's performance and indicate the priorities for the coming year. Goals and percentages include job responsibilities (Educational Mission), the planned Scholarly and Creative Activities work agenda, and Service activities. Goals should be challenging, yet realistic, and they should reflect the mission and goals of the university, the libraries and the service unit.

CBA, Article 16.1 (p.57)

Nothing shall preclude a department chair from modifying the work expectations or schedules as may be necessary prior to or during the academic year or its equivalent provided he or she first discusses such changes with the faculty member, and provided the changes are not arbitrary or capricious. In addition the faculty member may request to adjust the workload agreement at any time; such requested changes will go into effect provided the chair and the dean approve. The faculty member and dean will receive a copy of this written record of work expectations, and any modification of such work expectations.

The Faculty Workload Plan, with the agreed upon annual goals and effort distribution percentages will form the basis for determining how well the individual faculty member has performed. In evaluating the faculty member's performance in these areas during the annual review, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier assignments and responsibilities in one area against lighter assignments and responsibilities in another. Since Faculty Workload Plans are diverse, care should be taken to apply the criteria as they relate to the faculty member's job responsibilities and goals, and overall percentage of effort.

* Notes 4 and 5 consist of suggested wording amendments relative to library faculty in the UA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

ⁱ Cf. CBA, Article 14.10.e.iii.(a), p. 50.

ⁱⁱ CBA, Article 18, p.63.

ⁱⁱⁱ Allocations for performance, and procedures for performance-based awards, are given in the CBA, Article 18.2.c. (p.64-65) for fy10 and CBA.3.c. (p.66) for fy11.

^{iv} * Library faculty guidelines are referred to as RPT in the CBA. Since T implies "Tenure" and Library Faculty do not have tenure, it might be worth amending the CBA at some point to read ARP (Appointment, Reappointment Promotion). Cf. CBA, Article 14.10.e.iii, p. 50.

^v * **Section 10.g.ii** is a blind reference in the CBA. Consider amendment to read **Section 10.g.ii** (cf. p. 48 of the CBA).

^{vi} CBA, Article 14.10.e.iii, p. 50.

^{vii} These areas are defined in the *Library Faculty Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion* and are listed on the Annual Activities reporting form that was developed by the Libraries Faculty Standards Committee.

^{viii} "General Considerations," *Library Faculty Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion*, p.3.