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 facilitat 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 workstandards, discuss training and development needs, set goals for the next year, and identify the support needed to reach such goals.				
10	8.2	Purp	Purpose and Scope of Evaluation.			
11 12		(a)	-		n 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)		ual evaluations for academic professionals focus on the performance of signed duties.	
17 18 19 20			(3)	indiv on t	ddition, all Employees are evaluated based on the terms of their idual contract, duties under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and heir contributions to the orderly and effective functioning of the ersity and their academic department/unit.	
21		(b)	Scope	<u>e</u> .		
22 23 24			(1)	assis	uators should state goals for the upcoming year and should endeavor to t the Employee in correcting any performance deficiencies reflected in nnual evaluation.	
25 26				a.	Employees are encouraged to accept and seek such assistance, it 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			(2)	Perfo	ormance Evaluations must:	
	For the University				For the UFF	
	Alex	Landba	ack		Myles Kim	
	Chief Negotiator				Chief Negotiator	
	Date				Date	

		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)	as the evalu area	partions must take into account the quality of the performance, as well a proportions and nature of the assignments. An Employee may not be lated for a work assignment that is given, or implied to be given, in the of research without the involvement of the Employee's supervisor of the agreement of the Employee.
	(4)	as ass in wr Mino	emic professionals have, as part of their job description, other duties signed. Significant duties assigned under this heading must be issued iting (via email) and are included in the expectation of performance. It requests that are within the appropriate scope of the individual's job be given verbally.
	(5)	suffic	Evaluator completing a performance evaluation must articulate eient and specific grounds or reasons to substantiate any rating other "Meet Expectations."
	<u>(6)</u>	Evalı	nations shall not be arbitrary nor capricious.
(c)	Prom	otion A	ppraisals.
	(1)	Evalı	Ity Members may request, at the time of the submission of the nation Information Sheet (see Section 8.3(b)), an appraisal regarding progress toward promotion, if applicable.
	(2)	and v	appraisal is intended to provide a current assessment of the strengths weaknesses of the Faculty Member's candidacy for promotion and de assistance and counseling in progressing toward promotion.
	(3)	to the	Evaluator shall include the promotion appraisal as a separate addendum annual evaluation, but the promotion appraisal shall not be part of the fication for the ratings assigned for the annual evaluation.
For the University			For the UFF
Alay I andha	vols		Mulas Vins
Alex Landback			Myles Kim
Chief Negoti	iator		Chief Negotiator
Date			Date

Florida Poly/UFF UFF--FPU Proposal 2021-2024 CBA

p.3

1 2		(g)		performance of an Emp issible exceptions:	ployee must be evaluated annually, with the following
3			(1)	Employees that have	resigned;
4			(2)	Faculty members in	the terminal year of the contract, or;
5 6			(3)	Faculty members wh to the end of the eval	ose employment began less than ninety (90) days prior luation period.
7 8 9	8.4		receiv		n to the annual evaluation, the academic professional ation after ninety (90) days of employment in their
10 11		(a)		e absence of a completed default to a "satisfactor"	ted probationary evaluation, a probationary employee y" rating.
12 13 14 15		(b)	Janu: may	ary 30, the employee's	l's probationary period ends between October 1 and immediately following annual performance evaluation the employee must be evaluated during the next annual
16	8.5	<u>Evalı</u>	<u>iators</u> .	ators.	
17 18 19 20 21 22		(a)	assig area. advid unit.	med personnel manager When the Evaluator is see and context from a de-	Department Chair or Division Director that has been ment responsibility by the Provost for the Employee's a Division Director, the Division Director will seek epartment chair for each of the faculty members in the an and Wellness Counselor are evaluated by their
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31		(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.		
	For the	he Univ	ersity		For the UFF
	Alex Landback				Myles Kim
	Chief Negotiator				Chief Negotiator
	Date				Date

8.6

1

Evaluation Review.

2 3 4 5		(a)	may request a review, in writing,	of receipt of the evaluation, the faculty members, with the Provost's Office to discuss (with the dministrator) concerns regarding the evaluation, us discussions with the Evaluator.	
6 7 8 9		(b)	professional may request, in writi	s of receipt of the evaluation, the academic ng, a meeting with the administrator at the next ity to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation, us discussions with the Evaluator.	
10 11 12		(c)		(b) above must take place no later than May 15 nd the faculty member or academic professional eting after May 15.	
13 14 15 16	8.7	contra recon annua	ract in Appendix B. The Faculty Repr mmended changes to the information	Faculty Activity Report format is attached to this resentative Council may provide the Provost with a sheet's format no later than December 1 on an icate decisions on changes in the format to the ry 15. (See Appendix B).	
18 19	8.8		ces of Faculty Evaluative Information. Evaluations are intended to be comprehensive not based on a single or limited number of sources of information.		
20 21 22 23 24		(a)	relevant to the Employee's perform Employee and information prov supervisor(s), peers, students, othe	appropriate and available information that is nance. This includes information provided by the yided from the following sources: Immediate or University officials who have responsibility for y, and members of the University community.	
25 26 27 28			that included in the faculty	on used to evaluate a faculty member other than member's dossier will be provided or explained the Evaluator during the evaluation meeting a 8.3(c).	
29 30				tion that have not been disclosed to the faculty $8(a)(1)$ cannot be used in the evaluation process.	
31 32		(b)	es of any investigation of Employee misconduct, plaint against an Employee, including anonymous		
	For th	ne Univ	rersity	For the UFF	
	A 1	T 11		M 1 W.	
		Landba		Myles Kim	
	Chief	Negoti	lator	Chief Negotiator	
	Date			Date	

- 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 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.

For the University	For the UFF	
Alex Landback	Myles Kim	
Chief Negotiator	Chief Negotiator	
Date	Date	

1

2 3

4

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

Evaluation Key		
Unsatisfactory	Performance that is clearly substandard.	
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.	
Exceeds Expectations	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.	
Exemplary	Performance is sound and above reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has truly done something that is outstanding.	

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.

For the University	For the UFF
Alex Landback	Myles Kim
Chief Negotiator	Chief Negotiator
Date	Date