1 2					ARTICLE 8 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	8.1	General Principles. Performance evaluations are used to assess, recognize, and facilitate improvement in Employees' performance. This strengthens the University's workforce by providing a periodic and formal exchange of information between supervisors and employees regarding progress, accomplishments, and when applicable, areas needing improvement. Performance evaluations also provide an opportunity to clarify work standards, discuss training and development needs, set goals for the next year, and identify the support needed to reach such goals.					
10	8.2	<u>Purpo</u>	se and S	l Scope of Evaluation.			
11 12		(a)	-		annual evaluation is a subjective assessment of an individual's based on objective criteria.		
13 14			(1)		al evaluations for faculty members focus on performance in functions as teaching, research, service, and other duties that may be assigned.		
15 16			(2)		al evaluations for academic professionals focus on the performance of signed duties.		
17 18 19 20			(3)	indivi on th	Idition, all Employees are evaluated based on the terms of their idual contract, duties under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and neir contributions to the orderly and effective functioning of the ersity and their academic department/unit.		
21		<b>(b)</b>	Scope				
22 23 24			(1)	assist	nators should state goals for the upcoming year and should endeavor to the Employee in correcting any performance deficiencies reflected in nual evaluation.		
25 26				a.	Employees are encouraged to accept and seek such assistance, if needed.		
27 28 29				b.	The Evaluator may informally coach or counsel the Employee with the goal of improving performance. Such advice is not disciplinary, nor may it be part of the evaluation file.		
30			<b>(2)</b>	Perfo	rmance Evaluations must:		
31 32 33				a.	Fully consider information in the faculty member's dossier and any other faculty evaluative information that is provided and disclosed to the Evaluator, and;		
34 35				b.	Be consistent with the Evaluation Guidelines, and reasonably consistent with the Review Panel's guidance.		
36 37				c.	Take into account the quality of the performance, as well as the proportions and nature of the assignments.		

38 39 40				d.	Not evaluate an employee for a work assignment that is given, or implied to be given, in the area of research without the involvement of the Employee's supervisor and the agreement of the Employee.
41 42 43 44				<u>e.</u>	Evaluate how well an employee fulfilled the work duties they were assigned. Evaluators may take into consideration work that goes beyond the faculty member's assigned duties but remain within the professional responsibilities of a faculty member.
45 46 47				e <u>-f.</u>	Promotion and Evaulation Committees Only evidence should take great care in using student data that directly pertains to the candidate shall be considered.
48 49 50				<del>f.</del> g.	An evaluation may not penalize a faculty member for having less than twelve (12) credit hours of work assigned. See 7.3.
51 52 53 54 55			(3)	as assignments in write Minor	mic professionals have, as part of their job description, other duties gned. Significant duties assigned under this heading must be issued ing (via email) and are included in the expectation of performance. requests that are within the appropriate scope of the individual's job given verbally.
56 57 58			(4)	sufficie	Evaluator completing a performance evaluation must articulate ent and specific grounds or reasons to substantiate any rating other Meet Expectations."
59 60			(5)		tions shall not be arbitrary nor capricious and the evaluation shall the reviewer's best judgment of the individual's performance.
61		<b>(c)</b>	Promo	otion Ap	praisals.
62 63 64			(1)	Evalua	Members may request, at the time of the submission of the tion Information Sheet (see Section 8.3(b)), an appraisal regarding rogress toward promotion, if applicable.
65 66 67			(2)	and we	praisal is intended to provide a current assessment of the strengths eaknesses of the Faculty Member's candidacy for promotion and e assistance and counseling in progressing toward promotion.
68 69 70			(3)	to the a	aluator shall include the promotion appraisal as a separate addendum innual evaluation, but the promotion appraisal shall not be part of the ation for the ratings assigned for the annual evaluation.
71 72			(4)		ppraisals regarding progress toward promotion are non-binding on iversity and shall not be subject to the grievance process.
73 74			(5)		ppraisals shall not be included in the employee's personnel file and of be considered or used during the promotion process.
75 76	8.3			<u>ation</u> . Eng) and (h	mployees are evaluated at least once annually, except as described in ).

The annual evaluation period will cover all employment occurring from February

77

(a)

78 1 through January 31, regardless of the employment start date. 79 **(b)** The Employee must submit the Evaluation Information Sheet (see Section 8.7) to 80 the Evaluator, with a copy to the Provost's Office, no later than February 15. 81 (c) On or before May 1, the Evaluator must: 82 **(1)** Complete the performance evaluation; 83 **(2)** Provide a copy of the Evaluation to the Employee, and; 84 **(3)** Discuss and review the evaluation with the Employee (the Employee may choose to not discuss the evaluation). The discussion will be scheduled by 85 86 the Evaluator during normal business hours, unless both parties agree to a meeting outside of normal business hours. 87 88 (d) On or before May 1, the Employee must acknowledge receipt of the performance 89 evaluation by signing the evaluation. The evaluation shall make clear to the 90 employee that this is only to acknowledge the receipt of the evaluation and does 91 not represent acceptance of the contents of the evaluation. The Evaluator must sign 92 the evaluation and submit the signed evaluation to the Provost's Office. 93 **(e)** On or before May 15, the finalized performance evaluation must be added to the 94 Employee's evaluation file in the Provost's Office unless the employee and the 95 Provost's Office have agreed to postpone a review meeting until after May 15 (see 96 8.6(c)). 97 **(f)** Revised evaluations 98 **(1)** If errors, omissions, or other documentable issues with the evaluation are 99 discovered, the chair, division director if present, Provost, or Provost 100 designee may issue a revised performance evaluation to replace the original 101 evaluation. However, a revised evaluation may only be issued within 120 102 days of the finalized evaluation being added to the Employee's evaluation 103 file (see 8.3 (e)) except by mutual agreement of the Employee and the 104 University. 105 **(2)** If the performance evaluation contains indisputable factual errors or 106 omissions (e.g. an SAI result or DFW rate is misreported), the chair, division director if present, Provost, or Provost designee will issue a 107 108 corrected performance evaluation to replace the original evaluation. 109 **(3)** The Evaluator and Employee must acknowledge receipt of the revised or 110 corrected performance evaluation by signing the revised or corrected 111 evaluation. The University would retain both evaluations and would indicate on the original evaluation that it had been replaced by the revised 112 or corrected evaluation. 113 114 **(g)** The performance of an Employee must be evaluated annually, with the following

permissible exceptions:

115

- 116 Employees that have resigned; **(1)** 117 **(2)** Faculty members in the terminal year of the contract, or; 118 Faculty members whose employment began less than ninety (90) days prior **(3)** 119 to the end of the evaluation period. Probationary Evaluation. In addition to the annual evaluation, the academic professional 120 8.4 121 must receive a probationary evaluation after ninety (90) days of employment in their 122 position. 123 In the absence of a completed probationary evaluation, a probationary employee (a) 124 will default to a "satisfactory" rating. 125 If the academic professional's probationary period ends between October 1 and **(b)** 126 January 30, the employee's immediately following annual performance evaluation 127 may be skipped. If skipped, the employee must be evaluated during the next annual 128 evaluation period. 129 8.5 Evaluators. 130 Faculty Evaluators are the Department Chair or Division Director that has been (a) 131 assigned personnel management responsibility by the Provost for the Employee's 132 area. When the Evaluator is a Division Director, the Division Director will seek 133 advice and context from a department chair for each of the faculty members in the 134 unit. The Assistant Librarian and Wellness Counselor are evaluated by their 135 immediate supervisor. 136 **(b)** For faculty, the Provost will appoint an evaluation review panel which will consist 137 of Evaluators, and if the Faculty Representative Council chooses to do so, two faculty members of senior rank (Associate Professor or Professor) appointed by the 138 139 Faculty Assembly. The purpose of the review is to ensure the Evaluators have 140 applied a consistent standard to all faculty members when conducting the evaluations. The reviews prepared by Department Chairs or Division Directors may 141 change as a result of panel discussions. The Provost will serve as chair of the 142 143 evaluation review panel. All members of the evaluation review panel must agree to 144 the confidentiality of the review process. 145 8.6 Evaluation Review. 146 Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, the faculty member (a) 147 may request a review, in writing, with the Provost's Office to discuss (with the 148 Provost or Provost's designated administrator) concerns regarding the evaluation, 149 which were not resolved in previous discussions with the Evaluator. 150 **(b)** Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, the academic
- 150 **(b)** Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, the academic professional may request, in writing, a meeting with the administrator at the next higher level in their line of authority to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation, which were not resolved in previous discussions with the Evaluator.
- 154 (c) The evaluation reviews in (a) and (b) above must take place no later than May 15 unless both the Provost's Office and the faculty member or academic professional mutually agree to schedule the meeting after May 15.

- Evaluation Information Sheet. A sample Faculty Activity Report format is attached to this contract in Appendix B. The Faculty Representative Council may provide the Provost with recommended changes to the information sheet's format no later than December 1 on an annual basis. The Provost will communicate decisions on changes in the format to the Faculty Representative Council by January 15. (See Appendix B).
- **8.8** Sources of Faculty Evaluative Information. Evaluations are intended to be comprehensive and not based on a single or limited number of sources of information.

- (a) The Evaluator may consider all appropriate and available information that is relevant to the Employee's performance. This includes information provided by the Employee and information provided from the following sources: Immediate supervisor(s), peers, students, other University officials who have responsibility for supervision of the faculty member, and members of the University community.
  - (1) Any materials or information used to evaluate a faculty member other than that included in the faculty member's dossier will be provided or explained to the faculty member by the Evaluator during the evaluation meeting offered pursuant to Section 8.3(c).
  - (2) Any materials or information that have not been disclosed to the faculty member as described in 8.8(a)(1) cannot be used in the evaluation process.
- (b) Records maintained for the purposes of any investigation of Employee misconduct, including but not limited to a complaint against an Employee, including anonymous complaints, and any final conclusions reached pursuant to the investigation of such complaint may not be used or considered in the evaluation process until they are considered final, pursuant to section 1012.91, Florida Statutes. Information that has been validated that is a part of an investigation may be used, regardless of complaint finding and the status of the complaint.
- (c) Information from outside the evaluation period must not be considered in the determination of the Employee's evaluation rating. However, reference to prior evaluations may be appropriately considered for the purpose of providing context or comparison (such as meeting previously stated goals, or noting improvement, consistency, or regression), if directly relevant to performance during the current evaluation period.
- (d) All employees may provide a written response and/or comments regarding their evaluation and have it added to the evaluation file within sixty (60) days of the receipt of the evaluation. All written material used to produce a performance evaluation shall be included in the evaluation file.
- **8.9** Evaluation Guidelines. The administration will develop a set of evaluation guidelines for each of the faculty ranks that indicate performance characteristics appropriate to each rating for teaching, scholarship, and service.
  - (a) Judgments of academic excellence are complex. Evaluation guidelines cannot easily be reduced to a quantitative formula, nor can the considerations that must be

- 197 198 199 200
- 201 202 203 204 205 206 207
- 208 209
- 210 211

213

214 215

216 217

218

219

- applied in each individual case be completely described in general terms or by numbers alone, separate from necessary qualitative assessments. Therefore, the guidelines are used to create consistency in ratings across the range of evaluators and are specifically not a scoring rubric.
- **(b)** The guidelines for a review period will be provided to the academic departments by September 15 of the year prior to the beginning of the review period and the departments will provide comments on the guidelines on or before November 1 of that year. The comments provided must be approved by the majority vote of the department. The vote must take place anonymously. By January 15, the review evaluation panel will consider the department recommendations and provide a recommendation to the Provost on evaluation guidelines to be used for the next review cycle. The University must provide the final guidelines to faculty before the review period begins.
- (c) The scale for the evaluations is provided in the following table. The performance rating will typically be used in setting salary increases as described in Article 12.

Evaluation Key		
Deficient	Performance that does not meet an acceptable standard. This rating will typically require a supervisor and employee to develop a performance improvement plan.	
Needs Improvement	Performance that is below a reasonable expectation for the person's job description.	
Meets Expectations	Performance is sound and within reasonable expectations for the person's job description. Supervisors may add a "+" or a "-" to this rating as further indicators of an employees performance.	
Exceeds Expectations	Performance that goes beyond the "Meets Expectations" standard in some significant way. The individual has performed at a level that provides distinction for themselves.	
Exemplary	Performance that is extraordinary and reflects outstanding distinction for the individual.	

## 212 8.10 Performance Improvement Plan.

- No employee in their terminal year of employment will be required to develop a (a) performance improvement plan.
- When an employee receives an overall evaluation of "Deficient," they and their **(b)** supervisor will develop a performance improvement plan except in the situation explained in 8.10 (a). The primary responsibility for putting together the plan lies with the faculty member.
- (c) When an employee receives an overall evaluation of "Needs Improvement" for two

Florida Poly/UFF UFF-FPU reopen\_2024.7.1 (v2) 2024-2027 CBA July 12, 2024

220 221				cutive years, they and thei vement plan except in the situa	r supervisor will develop a performance ation explained in 8.10 (a).		
222 223 224 225		(d)	catego develo	ry used in the evaluation, the	ds Improvement" or "Deficient" rating in any by may request that they and their supervisor t plan. Such a request will be approved by the plained in 8.10 (a).		
226 227 228		(e)	cooper		an will be developed by the employee, in and include specific performance targets and a		
229 230			(1)	The performance improvement representative.	ent plan will be approved by the President or		
231 232 233 234			(2)	may be approved and provide	in an approved performance improvement planed by the University. However, the University ide resources requested by the faculty member		
235 236 237 238		<b>(f)</b>	meetir	ng the performance targets. It is mance improvement plan as	with the employee to review progress toward s the responsibility of the supervisor to use the the part of the basis for the next annual		
239 <b>8.11</b> Evaluation File. Faculty members must refer to Limited-Access Records regarding access to, and c and other faculty evaluative information.							
	F	For the U	Jniversi	ty	For the UFF		
	=						
		David Fugett			Wylie Lenz		
	C	Chief Negotiator Chief Negotiator					
	Ι	Date			Date		