

O-3 Past President's Report
Mickey Coalwell
August 3, 2018

Attached is a proposed revision to the Paid Staff Evaluation form. As mentioned previously, Annie, Eric S. and Leslie all agreed that a simpler evaluation format is sufficient for our association's purposes. The attached revision to the Rating Scale is intended to supersede the current annual evaluation form for the Executive Secretary, Newsletter Editor and System Administrator/Webmaster.

Prior to this proposed revision, the performance rating scale was 1-5, with possible gradations within a hundredth of a point. In addition to the scale, criteria were grouped into weighted "performance areas" (Finance - 30%; Board Liaison - 25%; Overall Performance - 15%). The simplified revision has a rating scale of 3-5, with no gradations. Grouping of criteria into performance areas has been dropped, as has weighting. The only significant addition in the revision is a mandatory Performance Improvement Plan should someone receive a "Needs Improvement" rating.

Former:

4.5-5.00 Significantly Exceeds
3.5-4.49 Exceeds
2.5-3.49 Fully Meets
1.5-2.49 Meets Most
1.0-1.49 Does Not Meet

Proposed:

5.0 Exceeds expectations

Performance consistently exceeded expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, and the quality of work overall was excellent.

4.0 Meets expectations

Performance consistently met expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, at times possibly exceeding expectations, and the quality of work overall was very good.

3.0 Improvement needed

Performance did *not* consistently meet expectations. Performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas of responsibility, and/or one or more of the position's job responsibilities were not adequately fulfilled. A professional development plan to improve performance is attached, including performance progress benchmarks and timelines to measure progress in the coming year.

Summary statement of performance (4-6 sentences):

The proposed streamlining of the rating scale to three whole-number rating categories recognizes the general excellence of paid staff performance over the years. There has been no demonstrated need for finer gradations or nuances in the performance of paid staff. **The expectation of this proposed evaluation scale is that MPLA paid staff will perform routinely at the "4.0 Meets Expectations" level. The scale will be used in all evaluations of paid staff.**

In addition to the revised rating scale, the Administration Committee will also look at updating the specific performance criteria for each paid position. Recently, I worked with Judy Zelenski so that the MPLA Executive Secretary position's performance criteria more accurately and completely reflects her work activities and priorities. The proposed revision for the Executive Secretary position is attached. The Administration Committee will take up review and revision of the other paid staff performance criteria in the coming year.

The revisions proposed here are to the Manual of Procedure, and are not bylaws changes. They do not require formal approval votes, but are presented to the Board for review, discussion, and confirmation.

Finally, the position of Leadership Institute Coordinator will be included in the revised evaluation protocol; all Paid Staff will then be evaluated with the same methods and rating scale.

Respectfully submitted,

Mickey