

AAP Evaluation of Faculty Guidelines

General Information

1. The AAP Evaluation of Faculty is mandated by the University's Affirmative Action plan and must be done on all libraries faculty each year; it is not optional.
2. This evaluation has its primary purpose the systematic and objectified improvement of faculty evaluation procedures. The chosen and mandated method is to rank the libraries faculty according to the degree of their professional competence and performance, as exemplified in the stipulated criteria, and to array that ranking against faculty salaries within the department to identify possible discrepancies.
3. The AAP Evaluation is an evaluation of libraries by the Executive Director and should be so understood. For AAP evaluation purposes, the Executive Director will not be evaluated or ranked. For Biomedical Library faculty, the Director will not be evaluated or ranked and shall consult with the Executive Director of University Libraries in scoring faculty.
4. The Executive Director. should avoid rating the libraries faculty only against itself i.e., "grading on the curve". Rather, they should be evaluated in terms of a standard of excellence based on the profession as a whole. The Medical Library Association Academy of Health Information Professionals (AHIP) points system will be used as a guide because it is the only national standard at this time.
5. So that the evaluation will reflect professional experience, the libraries faculty should be evaluated within their professional rank.
6. The AAP Evaluation from weights the three basic divisions of the criteria as follows
 - Job Effectiveness, 60 percent;
 - Professional Development, 30 percent;
 - University Service, 10 Percent

These weights are flexible and may be negotiated individually by faculty members with the Executive Director in advance or at the beginning of the evaluation year. In such case, the faculty member and Executive Director of University Libraries will mutually agree on a statement of activities and weights. The faculty member will prepare a written statement justifying the change, including the agreed upon changes(s) in activities. The statement should address, specifically as possible, the eleven criteria shown on the Faculty Evaluation Sheet. More specific criteria, relating activities to items on the evaluation form, may be specified. This description should include a

statement of the weighting of individual factors on the evaluation form. In the event agreement cannot be reached, the differences will be resolved by the Executive Director

Evaluation Procedures

1. Evaluate each librarian using the Faculty Evaluation Sheet for scoring and the guidelines/instructions below. Identify each faculty member by name and academic rank.
2. The librarian will be evaluated on each criterion using a scale of 0-10, the lowest, 5 the average, and 10 the highest value for each. Ratings will be assigned on a relative basis to each academic rank, i.e., senior librarians, associate librarians, assistant librarians, instructors, and senior instructors.
3. After the evaluation is completed, and only then, the evaluation must be reviewed with the individual faculty member. During the review, the faculty member may request information regarding general standing relative to other members of the department. Information concerning the relative allocation of recommended merit increases will be provided when available. Signature on the form indicates that this review has take place; it does not necessarily signify agreement with the rating assigned.
4. The back of the form may be used by the faculty member to make any comments.
5. Using the rating figures from the evaluation sheets, the Executive Director of University Libraries should array the faculty, from highest to lowest, in each rank. To this array should be added the current salary figures for each member.
6. The arrays should be examined by the Executive Director for any possible discrepancies between salaries and rankings. Should any appear, the Executive Director should list them together with the explanation of the reasons therefore or, if appropriate, proposals for remedial action should be sent to the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
7. Using the same rating figures, the Executive Director should rank the entire department faculty in the same way without regard for professional level.

Guidelines for Using the Faculty Evaluation Form

1. **Primary Job Responsibilities.** This criterion covers the duties and responsibilities of the librarian as specified in the position description and others assigned by the supervisor(s).
2. **Other (specify).** This criterion covers special duties and responsibilities assigned or agreed to by the Executive Director and the librarian.

3. **Publications.** As with research, it is important to discriminate between professional publication and publication extraneous to the faculty member's field. In addition, scholarly journals vary in prestige; a single article in a major publication may be equivalent to three or four articles in lesser ones. This category must be privileged, i.e., weighted higher than 4, 5, and 6.
4. **Research, grant activity.** This should reflect all professionally oriented research or creative activities of the particular faculty member, whether or not they result in publication. Grant activity should be reflected here
5. **Participation in professional institutes, workshops, conferences, etc.** The category should reflect any participation in professional activities, which enhance skills, and knowledge in professional areas
6. **Presentations to professional organizations.** Here again, it is important to consider the element of professionalism. A talk given to the Rotary Club or the Junior League, for example, would not properly be subsumed under this criterion.
7. **Other (specify).** This category of activities should be specified, but may include such activities as official professional recognition, or commendation, offices held in professional groups, activities such as serving as an editor, researcher, or abstractor on a continuing basis for a professional journal, or a prestigious lecture or seminar appointment, etc.
8. **Committee service.** The score here should reflect the faculty member's participation in and contribution to the work of the University-wide, collegiate, and departmental committees and councils, and the Faculty Senate.
9. **Extracurricular participation, etc.** The librarian should describe the nature of his or her involvement in extracurricular student organizations and activities.
10. **University-related community service.** This item reflects University-related community service, such as providing continuing education, professional consulting, or expert testimony, speaking before groups on behalf of the University or the profession, career guidance visits to high schools, etc.
11. **Other (specify).** This category of activities should be specified, but may include such activities as University-related clinical service, service on advisory boards, etc.