Deans, Department Heads, Management Services Officers, Administrative Assistants:  
  
The memo below is being sent to the dlist-l listserv. Thank you for serving as one of the representatives for your department to receive this memo. Please distribute this message to the colleagues in your department.  
  
Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*PLEASE GIVE WIDEST DISTRIBUTION\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

April 14, 2016

TO:      Department Heads, Managers, Supervisors, and Policy-Covered Staff

FR:      Cynthia Señeriz, Acting Director, Human Resources

RE:      Important Clarification about Performance Evaluation Ratings for Policy-Covered (Non- Represented) Staff

I would like to thank all of you who have started taking steps to ensure the completion of performance evaluations in anticipation of the upcoming policy-covered staff (non-represented) salary program.  The transition to the core competency-based Performance Evaluation form for this fiscal year (FY2015-16) will require a fresh mindset towards performance ratings and a new leveling of performance standards for policy-covered staff.

Previously, the performance evaluation ratings for policy-covered staff were described as shown below.

**EVALUATION STANDARDS:**         Please rate each job function according to the following definitions:

**1 - LEVEL I:**  Demonstrates a high degree of expertise and mastery in all aspects of the position in a professional manner.

**2 - LEVEL II:**  Fully performs the entire range of duties in a professional manner.

**3 - LEVEL III:**  Generally performs essential duties satisfactorily.

**4 - LEVEL IV:** Does not perform essential duties in a satisfactory manner.

The new core competency-based [Performance Evaluation form](http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/sites/www.hr.ucsb.edu/files/docs/Performance%20Eval%20Form%20-%20Non-Represented%20Staff%20%20%28Type-In%29%20Version_2016.docx) describes performance standards in much clearer terms. The performance evaluation rating should be chosen based on the full description, not the label.  Using the full description to guide the actual rating will provide a single, consistent basis for evaluating policy-covered staff performance.  A normal distribution suggests that approximately 75% of the current year’s performances could be described as very good which is equivalent to the definition for Meets Expectations.  This recalibration in ratings will result in fewer employees receiving ratings of Exceptional and Exceeds Expectations, and is aligned with the systemwide message from the Office of the President concerning performance management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OVERALL RATING FOR THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:** | | | | |
| ☐  **EXCEPTIONAL** | ☐  **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** | ☐  **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** | ☐  **IMPROVEMENT NEEDED** | ☐  **CONSISTENTLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS** |
| Far exceeded performance expectations due to exceptionally high quality of work performed in all essential areas of responsibility, resulting in an overall quality of work that was superior, and either 1) included the completion of a major project, or 2) made an exceptional or unique contribution in support of unit, department, or University objectives. This rating is achievable by any employee though given infrequently. | Consistently exceeded performance expectations in most essential areas of a responsibility, and the quality of work overall was excellent. | Consistently met performance expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, at times possibly exceeding expectations, and the quality of work overall was very good.            A normal distribution suggests that very good work describes ~75% of the workforce | Did not consistently meet performance expectations in one or more essential area of responsibility. A professional development plan to improve performance will be outlined in **Section Four**, including timelines, and monitored to measure progress. | Performance was unsatisfactory and consistently below expectations in most essential areas of responsibility. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas. A plan to correct performance will be outlined in **Section Four**, including timelines, and monitored to measure progress. |

(If the image does not appear above below, please follow this link to the HR web site: <http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/memos/2016/important-clarification-about-performance-evaluation-ratings-policy-covered-non>

To ensure that the results of this recalibration are not misinterpreted as a decline in individual performance, a copy of this memorandum should be attached to the performance evaluation form to become a part of the policy-covered staff member’s personnel record.  In addition, the following language has been incorporated into the performance evaluation form this year:  *Unless otherwise indicated in an individual’s performance evaluation document, a shift in the performance rating from prior years is not a reflection of a decline in the performance or efforts of this valued staff member, but rather a renewed emphasis on campuswide performance expectations and a leveling of performance standards by all supervisors of policy-covered staff*.

There are three important reminders that I want to mention as performance evaluations are completed over the next two months:

·        Keep in mind that the perception of fairness is enhanced where a process exists to ensure that more than one level of management is reviewing the proposed performance rating, *before the performance rating is shared with the employee.*

·        Make plans to ensure that all policy-covered staff who report to you will have a recently completed performance evaluation on file no later than June 3, 2016.

·        Don’t lose sight of the future.  The performance review process serves two purposes:  to evaluate past performance and to support future skill/job development as well as career development of our staff.  Look for training and development opportunities that promote growth in skills, knowledge, and abilities.  Whether these development activities are documented using an [Individual Development Plan](http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/sites/www.hr.ucsb.edu/files/forms/Individual_Development_Plan_Form.doc) (IDP) or under the Professional/Skill Development Plan section of the [Performance Evaluation form](http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/sites/www.hr.ucsb.edu/files/docs/Performance%20Eval%20Form%20-%20Non-Represented%20Staff%20%20%28Type-In%29%20Version_2016.docx), time should be set aside to discuss activities that support each individual’s skill development.

Prior related communications:

April 7 2016 Memo to Campus Community regarding Performance Evaluations for Policy-Covered Staff:

<http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/memos/2016/fy-2015-16-performance-evaluations-policy-covered-staff>

November 6 2015 Memo to Campus Community regarding FY 2015-16 Performance Management Cycle for Policy-Covered Staff:  <http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/memos/2015/fy-2015-16-performance-management-cycle-policy-covered-staff>