



## **Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures**

## **Table of Contents**

- 1. Purpose**
- 2. Summary of Sustained Performance Evaluation Activities**
- 3. Description of Sustained Performance Evaluation Activities**
  - A. Chair/Supervisor identifies faculty eligible for a Sustained Performance Evaluation
  - B. Chair/Supervisor prepares a Sustained Performance Evaluation following the Guidelines Governing Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures and Ratings
  - C. Faculty have the opportunity to discuss their Sustained Performance Evaluation with their Chair/Supervisor and the next highest administrator and to attach a response to their evaluation
  - D. Sustained Performance Evaluations are sent to the Dean
  - E. A Performance Improvement Plan will be developed only for faculty receiving an “Unsatisfactory” Sustained Performance Evaluation
  - F. Progress of the Performance Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored by the Advisory Committee
- 4. Implementation and Enforcement of the Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures**
- 5. Appendix A: Sustained Performance Evaluation Form**

## **Florida International University Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures**

### **1. Purpose**

According to the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, hereafter referred to as the BOT-FIU Agreement:

"Tenured faculty members shall receive a sustained performance evaluation once every seven years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development " (BOT-UFF Policy, Employee Performance Evaluations)

The Sustained Performance Evaluation combines the annual evaluation process with a periodic comprehensive review of performance. Continuous evaluation is emphasized in order to document performance in a reliable and timely manner, in a way most congruent with other on-going evaluation processes. The following procedures and guidelines describe the process to be implemented for the Sustained Performance Evaluation.

### **2. Summary of the Sustained Performance Evaluation Activities**

The following are the six sequential activities of the Sustained Performance Evaluation. Each activity is fully described in section 3.

- a) Academic Affairs identifies faculty eligible for a Sustained Performance Evaluation
- b) Chair/Supervisor shall prepare a Sustained Performance Evaluation for all eligible faculty following the Guidelines Governing Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures and Ratings
- c) Faculty shall have the opportunity to discuss their Sustained Performance Evaluation with their Chair/Supervisor and next highest administrator and to attach a response to their Sustained Performance Evaluation
- d) Sustained Performance Evaluations are sent to the Dean
- e) A Performance Improvement Plan will be developed for faculty receiving an "Unsatisfactory" Sustained Performance Evaluation
- f) Progress of the Performance Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored by the Advisory Committee

### **3. Description of Sustained Performance Evaluation Activities**

#### **A. Academic Affairs identifies faculty eligible for a Sustained Performance Evaluation**

Faculty members who have been tenured and had assigned duties for at least six years are eligible to be evaluated. Faculty members will be evaluated in the seventh year following: their award of tenure; their most recent promotion;

and/or their most recent SPE, whichever came last. Tenured faculty with administrative appointments of chairperson or above shall not be eligible for the Sustained Performance Evaluation until they have completed six years of continuous assignment primarily as faculty.

**B. Chair/Supervisor shall prepare a Sustained Performance Evaluation for all eligible faculty following the Guidelines Governing Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures and Ratings**

Guidelines Governing Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures and Ratings:

- (i) Employee annual evaluations, including the documents contained in the evaluation file, shall be the sole basis for the Sustained Performance Evaluation.
- (ii) Using the Sustained Performance Evaluation Form in Appendix A, the department Chair/Supervisor shall record: (1) the faculty member's load percentages in each of the areas of their assignments (e.g. 50% teaching, 40% research, and 10% service), (2) the faculty member's ratings in each of the three areas of assignment (teaching, research, and service) for each of the six previous years, and (3) the faculty member's overall rating for each of the previous six years. The following five rating levels will be utilized for the evaluation: Outstanding, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory; or equivalent language in accordance with unit/department policies regarding evaluative language.
- (iii) An overall evaluation for the six-year period is given at the bottom of the Sustained Performance Evaluation Form as either meets sustained performance or unsatisfactory. A Performance Improvement Plan shall be developed only for those faculty members whose performance is identified through the Sustained Performance Evaluation as being consistently unsatisfactory in one or more areas of their assigned duties or whose overall evaluations in the six-year period are consistently unsatisfactory, provided that one of the overall evaluations during that six-year period is unsatisfactory. A faculty member's performance shall be deemed consistently unsatisfactory in an area of assignment or overall only if he or she has received three or more years Unsatisfactory evaluations in an area of assignment or overall during the six-year period.

**C. Faculty shall have the opportunity to discuss their Sustained Performance Evaluation with their Chair/Supervisor and next highest administrator and to attach response to their Sustained Performance Evaluation**

The Chair/Supervisor shall share the Sustained Performance Evaluation with the faculty member who shall be offered the opportunity (during the (30) day period following receipt of the Sustained Performance Evaluation) to discuss the

Sustained Performance Evaluation with the Chair/Supervisor prior to its being finalized and placed in the employee's evaluation file. The Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be signed and dated by the Chair/Supervisor and by the faculty member being evaluated, who may attach a response to the evaluation. A copy of the Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may request in writing a meeting with the administrator at the next higher level to discuss concerns regarding the Sustained Performance Evaluation that were not resolved in the previous discussions with the Chair/Supervisor.

#### **D. All Sustained Performance Evaluations are sent to the Dean**

A faculty member whose performance is identified as being "Unsatisfactory" will be notified by the Dean to develop a Performance Improvement Plan following the guidelines in sections E. and F. of this document.

#### **E. A Performance Improvement Plan will be developed for faculty receiving an "Unsatisfactory" evaluation**

The Chair/Supervisor, along with two other members of the department/unit (one appointed by the chair, one chosen by the faculty member) will be constituted as an Advisory Committee to each faculty member receiving an "Unsatisfactory" evaluation. The Advisory Committee's charge is to assist the faculty member in developing a Performance Improvement Plan to address the deficiencies identified in the Sustained Performance Evaluation. The Performance Improvement Plan will be an individualized process, tailored to the faculty member's professional needs and circumstances. Minimally, the plan will:

- Identify specific deficiencies
- Define goals and performance targets to remedy the deficiencies
- Outline activities to be undertaken
- Identify the institutional resources, (e.g., equipment, cost for training or retraining, , research costs, , etc.) required to achieve the goals and performance targets.
- Set specific and reasonable timetables, and identify the criteria for assessment and achievement of the Performance Improvement Plan

If the faculty member and the Advisory Committee cannot agree on a Performance Improvement Plan, the Committee will request that a Department Peer Review Committee be established to adjudicate the disagreement. The Peer Review Committee will be made up of two tenured members of the department/unit (who are not members of the Advisory Committee) and one tenured member of a separate department/unit. If the Peer Review Committee rejects the Performance Improvement Plan, then the Advisory Committee

must modify it along the lines recommended by the Peer Review Committee. A contested Performance Improvement Plan goes into effect only if the Peer Review Committee approves it.

**F. The progress of the Performance Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored**

As stated in the BOT-UFF Agreement, "it is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets in the performance improvement plan." The Advisory Committee will meet with the faculty member at the times stated in the Performance Improvement Plan to review his or her progress toward meeting the performance targets.

At the end of the timeline specified in the Performance Improvement Plan the faculty member's performance will be evaluated by the department Chair/Supervisor, and an evaluation report will be provided to the faculty member.

There may be good reasons why the targets specified in the Performance Improvement Plan were not met. This may call for additional work on the part of the faculty member and the Advisory Committee.

**4. Implementation and Enforcement of the Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures**

These procedures shall take effect Spring 2018. The Provost shall determine the specific timeline for this review.

The Sustained Performance Evaluation, as part of the BOT-UFF Policy, Employee Performance Evaluation, shall be enforced through the BOT-UFF Policy on Neutral Internal Resolution of Policy Disputes.

## Appendix A Sustained Performance Evaluation Form

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

*The faculty member will be evaluated in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship and service in direct proportion to the relative emphasis or percentage (%) in the assignment. The chair/supervisor will record both the load percentage and the evaluation in all three areas for each year, with the percentage totaling 100% and the overall rating being outstanding (O), very good (VG), good (G), satisfactory (S), or unsatisfactory (U). The chair/supervisor will prepare a written evaluation report, and will share the evaluation with the faculty member. The faculty member may read the evaluation and sign it or request a meeting with the chair and/or next highest administrator to discuss the evaluation. The faculty member may also attach a response to the Sustained Performance Evaluation. The Sustained Performance Evaluation and the faculty member's response, if any, will be sent to the Dean.*

Year	Teaching		Scholarship/ Research		Service		Overall	
	%	Rating	%	Rating	%	Rating		
							100	
							100	
							100	
							100	
							100	
							100	
<b>Overall Evaluation: Meets Sustained Performance or Unsatisfactory</b>								

Rating Scale: 0 - Outstanding, VG-Very Good, G-Good, S - Satisfactory, U- Unsatisfactory

Overall, this faculty member's performance for the six-year period of \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ is (circle one): Unsatisfactory or meets sustained performance.

If the overall rating is unsatisfactory, circle which if any areas contain four or more unsatisfactory ratings: Teaching Scholarship/Research Service

Additional Comments:

Signature of Chair/Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_