## Article 10 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

3 ...

1 2

10.2 Sources and Methods for Evaluation.

5 6

• • •

4

(d) Development Process for Criteria and Procedures. If criteria and procedures for evaluating
faculty performance are not on file, they shall be developed. If such criteria and procedures are
already on file, the faculty of the department/unit shall review and revise them after ratification of
this Agreement.

(1) The department/unit administrator shall discuss with the department/unit faculty members who are to participate in the development or revision process the existing criteria and procedures of the department/unit, the mission and goals of the department/unit and the University, the provisions of the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, and relevant state law. A copy of the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement and the relevant portions of state law shall be provided to each department/unit at the outset of the process.

17 (2) These criteria and procedures, and any revisions thereof, shall be recommended by a
 18 secret ballot vote of a majority of the faculty members in the department/unit.

19 (e) These criteria and procedures shall

20 (1) Be consistent with the criteria and procedures specified in this Article and with all the 21 other provisions of this Agreement.

(2) Satisfy all provisions of Article 23 with regard to department/unit criteria and
 evaluative procedures for the distribution of merit-based salary increases.

(3) Be adaptable to various assigned duties, so that all faculty have an equal opportunity to
 earn favorable performance evaluations. The criteria must provide that the FTE allocated to each
 part of the faculty member's annual assignment shall be used to weight the performance of each
 part for determination of the overall assessment of performance/merit.

(4) Take into consideration the department's mission and reasonable expectations for
 different classifications/ranks, experience, and stages of career.

30

(5) Provide for a peer review component in the annual evaluation.

(6) Specify a new effective date-of January 1, 2013.

32 (7) Be detailed enough that any reasonable faculty member can understand what33 performance is required to earn each performance evaluation rating.

(8) Ensure that faculty members on approved leave are not penalized in the evaluationprocess.

- 36
- 37 ....

Michael Mattimore Renisha Gibbs **Co-Chief Negotiator** Co-Chief Negotiator FSU-BOT FSU - BOT 9 lewsh Date 52314 Date Way 23 20, Date Page: 1 of 5

Irene Padavic Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter

Scott Hannahs **Co-Chief Negotiator** UFF – FSU Chapter

## (f) Methods for Annual Performance Evaluations

1

2 . . . 3 (3) Evidence of Performance Report. The administrator responsible for the annual 4 5 evaluation shall request each member of the faculty to submit to him or her, annually, a report of Evidence of Performance in teaching, research or creative activities, service, and other University 6 7 duties where appropriate. 8 a. The Evidence of Performance report (EOP) shall be submitted after the end of each 9 calendar year, and shall cover the preceding calendar year. 10 b. Each department/unit shall specify in detail the required format and minimal content of the EOP, pursuant to this section. 11 12 c. The EOP shall also include any interpretive comments or supporting data that the 13 faculty member deems appropriate in evaluating his or her performance. 14, d. Any materials required for the EOP that depend on the University administration 15 shall be provided to the faculty member no less than fourteen (14) days prior to the date upon 16 which the Evidence of Performance report is due. 17 e. If a faculty member fails to submit an EOP report (after notification of such failure), 18 this may result in an overall evaluation of "Does Not Meets FSU's High Expectations."; 19 (4) Those persons responsible for supervising and evaluating shall endeavor to assist the person being evaluated in correcting any performance deficiencies reflected in the evaluation. 20 21 a. The supervisor may informally coach or counsel faculty with the goal of improving 22 performance. Such advice is not disciplinary, nor may it be part of the evaluation file. 23 b. The supervisor may offer advice for improvement in the annual Progress towards 24 Promotion letter and/or the annual Narrative Report. 25 c. The supervisor may create a structured improvement plan via a a Letter of Counseling or a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) as outlined in Section 10.5 (3). 26 27 (5) The Annual Performance Evaluation shall provide for an assessment of performance 28 for each faculty member using the following ratings: a. Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations 29 30 b. Exceeds FSU's High Expectations 31 ca. a. Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations 32 b. Exceeds FSU's High Expectations c. Meets FSU's High Expectations 33 34 d. db. Official Concern 35 ece. — Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations

36 10.4 Merit Evaluations.

(a) The determination of meritorious performance for the distribution of funds allocated for
 merit-based salary increases pursuant to Article 23 shall be according to each department/unit's

39 faculty evaluation criteria and procedures developed pursuant to this section, which must be

Page 2 of 5

Renisha Gibbs **Co-Chief Negotiator** FSU-BOT leus Date

Michael Mattimore Co-Chief Negotiator FSU - BOT

Date

Telav 23 2019

Irene Padavic Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter

Podepe 5-23-19

Scott Hannahs Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter

Date 6/5/2019

consistent with the criteria for faculty evaluation specified elsewhere in this Article. All faculty
 members will be reviewed for merit.

(b) These criteria and procedures may include any refinements of the methods for the
 distribution of salary increase funds that are permitted by Article 23 and are based on the annual
 performance evaluation.-a period of time consistent with approved department criteria, which may
 include multiple years of annual-performance evaluations.

7 ...

. . .

8 10.5 Annual Evaluation Reporting Procedures

9 10

(b) Discussion. After completion of the Annual Evaluation Summary Form, the evaluator shall
 discuss the Summary with the faculty member concerned.

12

(1) The faculty member may attach to the Summary any statement he or she desires.

14 (2) The persons responsible for supervising and evaluating shall endeavor to assist the 15 person being evaluated in correcting any performance deficiencies reflected in the evaluation.

(3) For non-tenured faculty members, in the case of an evaluation rating of "Does Not Meet 16 17 FSU's High Expectations," the evaluator shall fully document the rating prior to discussion with the faculty member. Non-tenured faculty members whose overall performance is rated "Does Not 18 Meet FSU's High Expectations" in any given year may be placed on a Performance Improvement 19 20 Plan (PIP). A tenured faculty member whose overall performance is rated "Does Not Meet FSU's 21 High Expectations" in three (3) or more of the previous six sevensix (667) evaluations may be placed on a PIP. A PIP shall be developed in one or more areas of assigned duties. The PIP shall 22 23 be developed by the faculty member's supervisor in concert with the faculty member, and shall be written. It shall include specific performance goals and timetables to assist the faculty member in 24 achieving at least a "Meets FSU's High Expectations" rating. Specific resources identified in an 25 approved PIP, shall be provided by the department/unit. Examples of recommendations/resources 26 include, but are not limited to: audit a course; participate in a webinar or webcast; work with or 27 observe the work of an outstanding professor; etc. If the faculty member and the supervisor are 28 unable to agree on the elements of the PIP, the dean shall make the final determination on the 29 elements of the PIP. The PIP shall be approved by the President or representative and attached to 30 the Annual Evaluation Summary Form. The supervisor shall meet periodically with the faculty 31 member to review progress toward meeting the performance goals. It is the responsibility of the 32 faculty member to successfully complete the PIP. No improvement plan can be recommended or 33 imposed unless a faculty member receives a "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" rating on 34 35 the Annual Evaluation Summary Form.

36

37

• • •

Renisha Gibbs Co-Chief Negotiator FSU-BOT Date

Michael Mattimore Co-Chief Negotiator FSU - BOT

Date/

Irene Padavic Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter 5 - 23 - 19

Date

Page 3 of 5

Dute

Scott Hannahs **Co-Chief Negotiator** UFF - FSU Chapter

Date 1512019

1 10.7 Provision for Appeal

(a) If a faculty member is not satisfied with the Evaluation Summary prepared by the evaluator
(department chair or equivalent), including the determination of failure to successfully complete a
PIP, dissatisfied with an evaluation, including the determination of failure to successfully complete
a PIP the faculty member may register his or her disagreement in writing and attach it to the
Evaluation Summary to be placed in the evaluation file. Summary, the faculty member may
register his or her disagreement in writing.

8 (b) In additionIn additionAs an alternative, if the faculty member is not satisfied with an 9 evaluation, he or she may present submit a written request his or her request for review of the 10 evaluation by in writing to the appropriate appropriate higher level reviewer (dean or equivalent) 11 within thirty (30) days after being informed of the evaluation. The reviewer, like the evaluator, 12 shall have complete freedom of action, consistent with this Agreement, in seeking to settle or resolve differences concerning evaluations and presumably his or her efforts will be largely 13 conciliatory. The reviewer shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the request within fifteen 14 15 (15) days of receipt of the written request for review. Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the written request, the reviewer shall reach a decision and report it to the faculty member. 16

(c) If the faculty member is not satisfied with the reviewer's decision, the faculty member may
request in writing a review from the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement
within fifteen (15) days after the reviewer's decision. Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the
written request, the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement shall meet with the
faculty member to discuss the request. Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the written request,
the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement shall meet with the
faculty member to discuss the request. Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the written request,
the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement shall reach a decision and report it
to the faculty member.

(d) An appeal of the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement
may be made to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Such a request for review
shall be made in writing within fifteen (15) days after the Vice President for Faculty Development
and Advancement' decision. Within fifteen (15) days of the receipt of the written request, the
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall reach a decision and report it to the faculty
member.

30 <u>10.8 Sustained Performance Evaluations.</u>

31 (a) Tenured faculty members shall receive a sustained performance evaluation once every 32 sevensix sevensix six (66) years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion, 33 whichever is most recent. (For example, if the last sustained performance evaluation was 34 conducted in spring of 2013, then the next sustained performance evaluation would be conducted 35 in the spring of 201920201919). The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous six sevensix years of assigned duties and to encourage continued 36 37 professional growth and development. Every year of performance since the most recent SPE or 38 Promotion must be considered in a Sustained Performance Evaluation. This shall be reported on a 39 form specified in Appendix K.

Renisha Gibbs Co-Chief Negotiator

FSU-BOT Date

Michael Mattimore Co-Chief Negotiator FSU - BOT

Date

2(ay 23

Irene Padavic Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter s - 23 - 19

Date

Page 4 of 5

Scott Hannahs Co-Chief Negotiator UFF – FSU Chapter

Date

| 1<br>2 | (b) The sustained performance evaluation program shall provide that:<br>(1) Only elected faculty members may participate in the development of applicable |
|--------|---|
|        |   |
| 3      | procedures. Such procedures shall ensure involvement of both peers and administrators at the  |
| 4      | department and higher levels in the evaluation and shall ensure that a faculty member may attach  |
| 5      | a concise response to the evaluation;   |
| 6      | (2) The proposed procedures for the sustained performance evaluation shall be available   |
| 7      | to faculty members and to the UFF for review prior to final approval.   |
| 8      | (bcc) Faculty members' Annual Evaluation Summary Form along with attachments, including   |
| 9      | the documents contained in the evaluation file, shall be the sole basis for the sustained performance   |
| 10     | evaluation.   |
| 11     | (1) A faculty member who received "Meets FSU's High Expectations" or better as an   |
| 12     | Overall result on her or his Annual Evaluation Summary Form duringfor the previous  |
| 13     | six sevensix (6) years and received "Meets FSU's High Expectations" or better for   |
| 14     | each domain of their assignment (e.g., Teaching, Research, Service) for at least six of   |
| 15     | the previous seven years shall not be rated below "Meets FSU's High Expectations" in  |
| 16     | the sustained performance evaluation, nor subject to a PIP. Faculty whose performance   |
| 17     | falls below "Meets FSU's High Expectations" in more than two three two of the   |
| 18     | previous six seven six evaluations shall develop a performance improvement plan, as   |
| 19     | specified in 10.5.  |
| 20     | - A faculty member will be rated "Meets FSU's High Expectations" in the sustained   |
| 21     | performance evaluation if she or he received "Meets FSU's High Expectations" or   |
| 22     | better on both the following: 1) as an overall rating on the Annual Evaluation Summary  |
| 23     | form for the previous six years, and 2) as a rating for each assignment domain (e.g.,   |
| 24     | teaching, research, service) that constitutes 20% or more of the AOR for at least four  |
| 25     | of the six previous years.  |
| 26     | (1)   |
|        |   |
| 27     |   |

Renisha Gibbs Co-Chief Negotiator FSU-BOT ng Date SZZZ

Michael Mattimore Co-Chief Negotiator FSU - BOT

Muha Date Alay 23,2019

Irene Padavic Co-Chief Negotiator UFF - FSU, Chapter Inge labori 5-23-19

Date

Page **5** of **5** 

Scott Hannahs Co-Chief Negotiator UFF-FSU Chapter

4 Hanne 415/2019 au Date