

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Guidelines

I. Biographical Fields:

1. **"Name"** – The full name of the person being evaluated should include last name, first name, middle initial.
2. **"Date"** – The date of the evaluation.
3. **"LU Hire Date"** – This should be the date the evaluatee began work at Liberty.
4. **"Time in Position"** – This is the date the evaluatee first began in this position.
5. **"Purpose of Evaluation"** – The reason the evaluation is being completed at this time – initial, annual, periodic, special (to justify special recognition), other.
6. **"Evaluator"** – Name of the person completing the evaluation.

II. Evaluation Criteria and Procedure: Each evaluation will assess the individual's performance in thirteen specific areas on a five point scale. A "3" will be used as a median score and defines the "typically excellent" performance in that area expected of every person employed by Liberty University. Under normal circumstances, most personnel will receive an assessment score of "3" in each of the fields for which they are being evaluated. The evaluator is not required (but is encouraged) to provide a written comment on the evaluatee's performance in each area.

Score

- 5 **"Consistently Performs Above Expectations"** – This is an assessment value of "5" and should only be given when the evaluatee so far exceeds expectations in job performance that that individual's skills are being under-utilized in their current position. It may also be used when the evaluatee has performed in a unique manner to accrue a significant, definable benefit to LU. The evaluator is not required (but is encouraged) to provide a written comment on the evaluatee's performance in this area. In addition, the evaluator has a responsibility to determine whether the individual performing at this level is a candidate for promotion to another position; or the position, itself, warrants redefinition and upgrading to acknowledge the additional responsibility and demands of the position.
- 4 **"Exceeds Expectations"**- This is an assessment value of "4" and should only be given in circumstances where the individual has clearly and specifically exceeded the evaluator's expectations for performance in that area being evaluated. The evaluator is not required (but is encouraged) to provide a written comment on the evaluatee's performance in this area.
- 3 **"Satisfactorily Meets Expectations"**- This is an assessment value of "3" and will be used as a median score and defines the "satisfactorily meets expectations" performance in that area expected of every person employed by Liberty University. Under normal circumstances, most personnel will receive an assessment score of "3" in each of the fields for which they are being evaluated. If a person receives a score of "3" in a graded attribute area, the evaluator is not required (but is encouraged) to provide a written comment on the evaluatee's performance in that area.
- 2 **"Needs Improvement"** – This is an assessment value of "2" and should only be given in circumstances where the evaluatee has job performance challenges in the functional area graded. An assessment of "2" should normally be given only after counseling the evaluatee on specific unrealized job performance expectations or under-performance. In cases where significant performance lapses are unanticipated and noteworthy, the mark may be awarded with follow-up counseling and remedial proctoring given to ensure the evaluatee is aware of the problems and is provided the opportunity and assistance needed to improve the assessment during the following performance evaluation period. Specific written rationale for the assessment is required on the evaluation. In addition, a written outline or summary of the training/instruction/counseling provided the evaluatee to improve performance should normally be appended and made a part of the individual's personnel file.
- 1 **"Subject to Corrective Action"** – This is an assessment value of "1" and should only be given in situations where job performance is so below expectations, or behavior is so inappropriate, as to justify significant corrective action up to, and including, termination of employment. Clearly, an assessment value of "1" should only be given either where there is little reasonable hope that job performance in the evaluated area will improve significantly absent extreme measures, or where the evaluatee and the school are confronted with fact the individual's aptitudes or skill sets do not match the requirements of the position. An assessment of "1" in any area should not be a surprise to the evaluatee or to the school. Normally, the predicate to an evaluation of "1" will include counseling and/or progressive discipline. In some instances, however, such an evaluation in one or more performance areas could result from a significant event(s) mandating immediate corrective action without prior counseling or progressive discipline. Due to the significance of such a low assessment, it is incumbent upon the evaluator and the organization to provide specific written justification for the assessment. In cases where multiple marks of "1" are given, specific justification for each mark should be provided or referenced.