

ARTICLE 8
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
[AMENDED AUGUST 2019]

- 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.
- 8.2 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation.
- (a) Purpose. An annual evaluation is a subjective assessment of an individual's performance based on objective criteria.
1. Annual evaluations for faculty members focus on performance in functions such as teaching, research, service, and other duties that may be assigned.
 2. Annual evaluations for academic professionals focus on performance of all assigned duties.
 3. In addition, all Employees are evaluated based on the terms of their individual contract, duties under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and on their contributions to the orderly and effective functioning of the University and their academic department/unit.
- (b) Scope.
1. Evaluators should endeavor to assist the Employee in correcting any performance deficiencies reflected in the annual evaluation. Employees are encouraged to accept and seek such assistance, if needed. The evaluation should also state goals for the upcoming year and address progress toward promotion.
 2. Performance Evaluations must:
 - 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;
 - b. be consistent with the Evaluation Guidelines, and reasonably consistent with the Review Panel's guidance.
 3. Evaluations must take into account the quality of the performance, as well as the proportions and nature of the assignments. An Employee may not be evaluated 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/or the agreement of the Employee.

4. Academic professionals have, as part of their job description, other duties as assigned. Significant duties assigned under this heading must be issued in writing (via email) and are included in the expectation of performance. Minor requests that are within the appropriate scope of the individual's job may be given verbally.
5. Each Evaluator completing a performance evaluation must articulate sufficient and specific grounds or reasons to substantiate any rating other than "Meet Expectations."

8.3 Annual Evaluation. Employees are evaluated at least once annually, except as described in Sections 8.3(g) and (h).

- (a) The annual evaluation period will cover all employment occurring from February 1 through January 31, regardless of the employment start date.
- (b) The Employee must submit the Evaluation Information Sheet (see Section 8.7) to the Evaluator, with a copy to the Provost's Office, no later than February 15.
- (c) On or before May 1, the Evaluator must:
 1. Complete the performance evaluation;
 2. Provide a copy of the Evaluation to the Employee, and;
 3. Discuss and review the evaluation with the Employee (the Employee may choose to not discuss the evaluation). The discussion will be scheduled by the Evaluator during normal business hours, unless both parties agree to a meeting outside of normal business hours.
- (d) On or before May 1, the Employee must acknowledge receipt of the performance evaluation by signing the evaluation. The Evaluator must sign the evaluation and submit the signed evaluation to the Provost's Office.
- (e) On or before May 15, the finalized performance evaluation must be added to the Employee's file in the Provost's Office.
- (f) If errors, omissions, or other documentable issues with the evaluation are discovered, the University may issue a revised performance evaluation to replace the original evaluation. The Evaluator and Employee must acknowledge receipt of the revised performance evaluation by signing the revised evaluation. The University would retain both evaluations and would indicate on the original evaluation that it had been replaced by the revised evaluation.
- (g) The performance of an Employee must be evaluated annually, with the following permissible exceptions:
 1. Employees that have resigned;
 2. Faculty members in the terminal year of the contract, or;
 3. Faculty members whose employment began less than ninety (90) days prior to the end of the evaluation period.

8.4 Probationary Evaluation. In addition to the annual evaluation, the academic professional must receive a probationary evaluation after ninety (90) days of employment in their position.

- (a) In the absence of a completed probationary evaluation, a probationary employee will default to a “satisfactory” rating.
- (b) If the academic professional’s probationary period ends between October 1 and January 30, the employee’s immediately following annual performance evaluation may be skipped. If skipped, the employee must be evaluated during the next annual evaluation period.

8.5 Evaluators.

- (a) Faculty Evaluators are the Department Chair or Division Director that has been assigned personnel management responsibility by the Provost for the Employee’s area. When the Evaluator is a Division Director, the Division Director will seek advice and context from a department chair for each of the faculty members in the unit. The Assistant Librarian and Wellness Counselor are evaluated by their immediate supervisor.
- (b) For faculty, the Provost will appoint an evaluation review panel which will consist 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 Faculty Assembly. The purpose of the review is to ensure the Evaluators have applied a consistent standard to all faculty members when conducting the evaluations. The reviews prepared by Department Chairs or Division Directors may change as a result of panel discussions. The Provost will serve as chair of the evaluation review panel. All members of the evaluation review panel must agree to the confidentiality of the review process.

8.6 Evaluation Review.

- (a) Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, the faculty member may request a review, in writing, with the Provost’s Office to discuss (with the Provost or Provost’s designated administrator) concerns regarding the evaluation, which were not resolved in previous discussions with the Evaluator.
- (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.
- (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.

8.7 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.
 - (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 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 comment on the guidelines on or before November 1 of that year. The comments provided must be approved by 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) Annual evaluations for February 1, 2019 through January 31, 2020 period will use the evaluation guidelines that were used for the 2017-2018 evaluations. The University must provide the final guidelines to Employees before the start of classes in the Fall 2019 semester.

(d) The scale for the evaluations is provided in the following table:

EVALUATION KEY	
Unsatisfactory	<i>Performance that is clearly substandard.</i>
Needs Improvement	<i>Performance that is below a reasonable expectation for the person's job description.</i>
Meets Expectations	<i>Performance is sound and within reasonable expectations for the person's job description.</i>
Exceeds Expectations	<i>Performance is sound and within reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has distinguished themselves in some way by performing at a level that is above a normal expectation for their job description.</i>
Exemplary	<i>Performance is sound and above reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has truly done something that is outstanding.</i>

- 8.10 Evaluation File. Faculty members must refer to 6C13-6.008 Personnel Records and Limited-Access Records regarding access to, and disclosure of, performance evaluations and other faculty evaluative information.