

**ARTICLE 8**  
**PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

1  
2  
3  
4 8.1 Policy. Performance evaluations are used to assess, recognize, and facilitate improvement  
5 in Employees’ performance. This strengthens the University’s workforce by providing a  
6 periodic and formal exchange of information between supervisors and employees  
7 regarding progress, accomplishments, and when applicable, areas needing improvement.  
8 Performance evaluations also provide an opportunity to clarify work standards, discuss  
9 training and development needs, set goals for the next year, and identify the support  
10 needed to reach such goals.

11  
12 8.2 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation.

13  
14 A. Purpose. Annual evaluations for faculty members focus on performance in functions  
15 such as teaching, research, service, other duties that may be assigned. Annual evaluations  
16 for Academic/Professionals focus on performance of all assigned duties. In addition, all  
17 Employees are evaluated based on their contributions to the orderly and effective  
18 functioning of the University and their academic department/unit.

19  
20 B. Scope. Evaluators should endeavor to assist the Employee in correcting any  
21 performance deficiencies reflected in the annual evaluation. Employees are encouraged to  
22 accept and seek such assistance, if needed. The evaluation should also state goals for the  
23 upcoming year and address progress toward promotion.

24  
25 8.3 Annual Evaluation. Employees are evaluated at least once annually.

26  
27 (a) The annual appraisal period will cover all employment occurring from February 1  
28 through January 31, regardless of the employment start date. The annual evaluation  
29 process will approximately follow the sample schedule below:

Date/Date Range	Activity
February 1 to January 31	Performance appraisal time period
February 1 to February 15	Employee evaluation materials completed by Employee and transmitted to their evaluator

**For the University**

**For the UFF**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Bonfanti  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candi Churchill  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

February 16 to March 30	Evaluators complete draft evaluations and submit faculty evaluations to Panel for review
April 1 to April 7	Panel reviews faculty evaluations
April 8 to May 15	Evaluations revised if necessary, and distributed to Employees
May 15 to May 29	Evaluations discussed with employees
May 30	Evaluations submitted to HR

1  
 2 (b) This process does not align with the academic semesters but provides for  
 3 evaluation during the spring semester while all Employees are on campus. The  
 4 evaluator must complete the appraisal, review and discuss it with the Employee  
 5 (unless the Employee chooses to not discuss the appraisal), and provide a copy to  
 6 the Employee prior to May 15. The Evaluator and Employee shall sign the  
 7 appraisal, and the Evaluator shall submit the signed appraisal to Human  
 8 Resources by May 30, and a copy of the signed appraisal shall be placed in the  
 9 Employee’s personnel file.

10 8.4 Probationary Appraisal. In addition to the annual evaluation, Academic/Professionals  
 11 shall receive a probationary appraisal after ninety (90) days of employment in their  
 12 position.

13  
 14 (a) In the absence of a completed probationary appraisal, a probationary employee  
 15 will default to an “satisfactory” rating.

16  
 17 (b) If an Academic/Professional’s probationary period ends between October 31 and  
 18 January 30, the employee’s immediately following annual appraisal may be  
 19 skipped. If skipped, the employee shall be evaluated during the next annual  
 20 appraisal period.

21 8.5 Evaluators.

22  
 23 (a) Faculty Evaluators are the Department Chair or Division Director that has been  
 24 assigned personnel management responsibility by the Provost for the Employee’s

**For the University**

**For the UFF**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Mark Bonfanti  
 Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Candi Churchill  
 Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

1 area. When the evaluator is a Division Director, the Division director will seek  
2 advice and context from a department chair for each of the faculty members in the  
3 unit. Academic/Professionals are evaluated by their immediate supervisor.

- 4  
5 (b) For faculty, the Provost will appoint an evaluation review panel which will consist  
6 of Evaluators, and if the Faculty Assembly chooses to do so, two faculty members  
7 of senior rank (Associate Professor or Professor) appointed by the F.A. The purpose  
8 of the review is to ensure the Evaluators have applied a consistent standard to all  
9 faculty members when conducting the evaluations. This review may produce  
10 changes in evaluations. The Provost will serve as chair of the evaluation review  
11 panel. All members of the evaluation review panel must agree to the confidentiality  
12 of the review process.

13  
14 8.6 Contesting Evaluations.

- 15  
16 (a) Faculty that wish to contest their evaluation may request a review, in writing, within  
17 fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, where the Provost, the faculty  
18 member, and the evaluator will discuss the evaluation. ~~The Provost shall make the final~~  
19 ~~evaluation decision.~~ The faculty member may at his/her election, accept the final  
20 decision of the provost, or may request a reconsideration by the evaluation  
21 panelPresident. In the event of a reevaluation by the panelPresident is requested, the  
22 evaluation results will be fully reconsidered and the ultimate evaluation “score” may  
23 go down as well as up.

- 24  
25 (b) Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation,  
26 Academic/Professionals may request, in writing, a meeting with the administrator at  
27 the next higher level in their line of authority, to discuss concerns regarding the  
28 evaluation which were not resolved in previous discussions with the evaluator. Such  
29 administrator shall make the final evaluation decision.

30  
31 8.7 Evaluation Information Sheet. A sample faculty information sheet format is attached to  
32 this contract. The Faculty Assembly may provide the Provost with recommended changes  
33 to the information sheet’s format no later than December 1 on an annual basis. The Provost

**For the University**

**For the UFF**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Bonfanti  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candi Churchill  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

1 will communicate decisions on changes in the format to the Faculty Assembly by  
 2 January 15. See Appendix \_\_. Information used to evaluate a faculty member other than  
 3 that included in the faculty member’s dossier will be disclosed to the faculty member.

4  
 5 8.8 Evaluation Criteria. The administration will develop a set of evaluation guidelines for each  
 6 of the faculty ranks that indicates performance characteristics appropriate to each rating for  
 7 teaching, scholarship, and service. The guidelines will also indicate how an overall “rating”  
 8 will be determined. This guideline will be provided to the academic departments on  
 9 approximately September 15 of each year and the departments will provide comment on  
 10 the guidelines on or before November 1 of each year. IN early January the review  
 11 evaluation panel will consider the department recommendations and provide a  
 12 recommendation to the provost on evaluation guidelines to be used for the current review  
 13 cycle.

14  
 15 The scale for the evaluations is provided in the following table.

16 **Evaluation Key:**

Unsatisfactory	Performance that is clearly substandard. <u>Receipt of this rating indicates that further review of the individual’s performance is required and the termination may be appropriate.</u>
Needs Improvement	Performance that is below a reasonable expectation for the person’s job description. <u>Receipt of this rating is formal notice to the employee that their performance is substandard and that further action may be required.</u>
<del>Satisfactory-</del>	<del>Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The minus indicates that an improvement in some area is strongly encouraged.</del>
<u>Satisfactory Meets Expectations</u>	Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description.
<del>Satisfactory+</del>	<del>Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The individual has</del>

**For the University**

**For the UFF**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Mark Bonfanti  
 Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Candi Churchill  
 Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

	<del>distinguished themselves in some way within the parameters for their job description.</del>
Exceeds Expectations	Performance is basically 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.
Exemplary	Performance is basically sound and above reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has truly done something that is outstanding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8.8 Evaluation File. Faculty members shall refer to 6C13-6.008 Personnel Records and Limited-Access Records regarding access to performance evaluations. A faculty member may provide a written response and/or comments on their evaluation and have it added to the evaluation file within sixty (60) days of the receipt of the evaluation.

**For the University**

**For the UFF**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Bonfanti  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candi Churchill  
Chief Negotiator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date