

1 **ARTICLE 10**

2 **EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

3 **10.1 Annual Evaluations.** Performance evaluations are primarily intended to  
 4 communicate to an employee an assessment of that employee’s performance of  
 5 assigned duties by providing constructive written feedback. The annual  
 6 performance evaluation shall be based upon the performance of professional  
 7 assigned duties and shall consider the nature of the assignments and quality of  
 8 the performance. In cases of atypical assignments (such as a sabbatical), the  
 9 supervisor may adapt the assessment of an employee’s performance to reflect  
 10 that assignment. Evaluations may be considered in employment-related decisions  
 11 such as salary, retention, assignments, awards, tenure, and promotion.

**Commented [CP1]:** Language retained from 10.1(a) and some language moved to 10.1(a) from old 10.1(d); slight alteration in sentence.

**Commented [CP2]:** New language needed to provide flexibility for varied circumstances. (codifies practice)

**Commented [CP3]:** Same language as 10.1(a); no change.

12 (a) **Annual Evaluation Period.** The annual evaluation period shall begin May 8 of  
 13 and end at the close of the following Spring semester, on May 7 of the following  
 14 year. Each employee’s performance shall be evaluated in writing by an  
 15 appropriate administrator at least once annually.

**Commented [CP4]:** Less clear old 10.1(b) included "shall include the preceding summer" language.

**Commented [CP5]:** Moved from 10.1(a) to more appropriate section.

16 (b) **Employee Annual Report.** Every year, each employee shall submit to the  
 17 department chair or unit head (or “evaluator”) a report of the employee’s  
 18 performance in each area of assignment. This report shall be due to the evaluator  
 19 by May 7 of each year. The evaluator, may, at the written request from the  
 20 employee, provide an extension of up to twenty-one days to submit the annual  
 21 report. The employee’s annual report may include any interpretive comments and  
 22 supporting data that the employee deems appropriate for evaluating the  
 23 employee’s performance and shall also include an up-to-date and accurate CV.  
 24 The employee shall submit the report in the format determined by the college.  
 25 Failure to provide the complete annual report by these deadlines may result in  
 26 the evaluator finalizing the annual evaluation based only on the information  
 27 available to the evaluator.

**Commented [CP6]:** Moved from old 10.1(g)(1).

**Commented [CP7]:** Old 10.1(b) updated and moved to new 10.9

**Commented [CP8]:** New: Codifies existing practice of performing the eval when annual report not provided.

28 (c) **Evaluation Ratings.** Evaluations shall use the rating categories of  
 29 Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory in  
 30 each area of assignment and for the overall evaluation.

31 (d) **Overall evaluation.** The overall evaluation shall be consistent with the  
 32 employee’s annual assignment, the evaluations in each assignment area, and the  
 33 department or unit’s Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures. An employee

34 shall not be evaluated in, and the overall evaluation shall not be affected by, an  
35 area in which the employee had no assignment. An employee must receive a  
36 minimum rating of Satisfactory in each area with assigned effort of five percent  
37 (5%) or more in order to receive an overall rating of Satisfactory or above.

**Commented [CP9]:** From old 10.1(c) which addresses differences in calculating the overall evaluation from individual categories. Notifies the employee up front the consequences of not achieving S in all areas of assignment. Substantive change to make 5% rule mandatory.

38 (e) **Issuance of Annual Evaluation.** The proposed written annual evaluation shall  
39 be provided to the employee by August 8 of each year. Annual evaluations are not  
40 required for employees who have been non-reappointed or whose employment  
41 will end before December 31 of the new academic year. An employee who was  
42 not assigned to work for the university during the evaluation period shall receive  
43 a default overall evaluation of Satisfactory. (For example, a 9-month employee  
44 who was not provided an assignment during the summer, followed by a paid or  
45 unpaid leave for the academic year would receive a default evaluation of  
46 Satisfactory.)

**Commented [CP10]:** Moved from old 10.1(g) (5) where it was difficult to find.

47 The employee shall be offered the opportunity to discuss the evaluation with  
48 the evaluator prior to its being finalized and placed in the employee's evaluation  
49 file. The evaluation shall be signed and dated by the evaluator, and the employee  
50 must acknowledge receipt of it. The employee may attach a concise comment to  
51 the evaluation within thirty days of receipt. A copy of the complete, finalized  
52 evaluation shall be provided to the employee. Upon written request from the  
53 employee, the evaluator shall endeavor to assist the employee in addressing any  
54 performance deficiencies. Evaluations not acknowledged by the employee shall  
55 be finalized 30 days after issuance.

**Commented [CP11]:** Codifies our current practice. New language.

**Commented [CP12]:** Aligns with Interfolio process

56 **10.2 Sources of Annual Evaluation.** All assigned activities for which an employee  
57 receives compensation from the university, including summer assignments, shall  
58 be reported upon and evaluated. An employee may report activities related to the  
59 areas of assignment that are performed when the employee is not compensated  
60 by the university; if reported upon, these activities shall be evaluated.

**Commented [CP13]:** Old 10.1(g)(5). Very slight change for electronic processing (must acknowledge receipt)

**Commented [CP14]:** Codifies our current practice. New language.

61 The evaluator considers information from various sources: immediate  
62 supervisor (if different from the evaluator); peers; students; employees; other  
63 university officials who have responsibility for supervision of, or business-related  
64 interaction with, the employee; and individuals to whom the employee may be  
65 responsible in the course of a service assignment, including public school officials  
66 when the employee has a service assignment to the public schools. The  
67 information provided by these other sources is not based upon a review of the

**Commented [CP15]:** Old 10.1(g)(3), moved; very slight alteration.

**Commented [CP16]:** Old 10.1(g)(2); language changed "evaluator shall also ... appropriate and available" for simplicity. +"business-related"

68 employee’s annual report, but is regarded as feedback on the employee’s  
 69 performance. ~~Copies of materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted~~  
 70 ~~by persons other than the employee shall be provided to the employee, who may~~  
 71 ~~attach a written response within thirty days of receiving that document.~~

**Commented [CP17]:** New language - info is not from annual rept.

**Commented [CP18]:** Old 10.1(g)(2) - not needed, deleted.

72 The evaluator shall consider the quality and productivity of an employee’s  
 73 professional performance in the following categories:

**Commented [CP19]:** Taken from 10.1(d), condensed.

74 (a) **Teaching effectiveness (Instruction & Advisement).** Teaching effectiveness  
 75 includes effectiveness in imparting knowledge, information, and ideas by means  
 76 or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration,  
 77 laboratory exercise, workshop and practical experience, assessment of and  
 78 engagement with student work, and direct consultation with students. ~~Student~~  
 79 ~~Perceptions of Instruction may not be the sole method of gauging employee~~  
 80 ~~teaching effectiveness.~~ The evaluator shall consider all available information in  
 81 forming an assessment of teaching effectiveness. Examples of this information  
 82 includes:

**Commented [CP20]:** Term used on the evaluation document.

**Commented [CP21]:** New language. Codifies practice.

**Commented [CP22]:** Old 10.1(d)(1)(d).

83 1. Consideration of effectiveness in stimulating students’ critical thinking  
 84 and/or creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum and course  
 85 structure, effective assessment of student performance, and adherence to  
 86 accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to  
 87 students. The learning objectives of each course, the means of assessing learning  
 88 objectives, and the outcomes of the assessment should be considered as part of  
 89 the teaching performance.

**Commented [CP23]:** Removes repetition, not changing meaning

**Commented [CP24]:** Eliminates confusion with SPoIs

**Commented [CP25]:** Just to have a different word than assessment.

90 2. Consideration of other assigned university teaching duties, such as  
 91 advising, counseling, supervision, or duties of the position held by the employee.

92 3. Any relevant materials submitted by the employee such as class notes,  
 93 syllabi, student exams and assignments, an employee’s teaching portfolio, results  
 94 of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the  
 95 employee’s instructional assignment.

96 (b) **Research/Creative Activity.** Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge,  
 97 development of new educational techniques, and other forms of  
 98 research/scholarship/creative activity. Examples of this information includes:

99 1. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity, either print or  
 100 electronic, shall include, but not be limited to, as appropriate, published books;  
 101 chapters in books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical

102 compositions, paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at  
103 meetings of professional societies; funded grant activities; reviews; and research  
104 and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, funding, display, or  
105 performance.

106 2. Consideration of the quality and productivity of the employee’s  
107 research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the  
108 evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of  
109 what has been accomplished.

110 (c) Service and Performance of assigned professional duties. Service and/or  
111 professional development work may be assigned to employees. Examples of this  
112 information includes:

113 1. Public service that extends professional or discipline-related  
114 contributions to the community; the state, including public schools; and the  
115 national and international community. Such service includes contributions to  
116 scholarly and professional conferences and organizations, governmental boards,  
117 agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.

118 2. University Service. Service within the university and participation in the  
119 governance processes of the institution through significant service on  
120 committees, councils, and senates, attendance at commencement, and the  
121 employee’s contributions to the governance of the institution through active  
122 participation in regular departmental and/or college meetings.

123 3. Professional Development as assigned, including goals for the annual  
124 evaluation period, if agreed upon.

125 (d) Other assigned university duties, such as academic administration.

126 (e) Service for UFF activities is not considered university service and shall not  
127 be evaluated.

128 10.2 Process for collecting evaluative information through observation or peer  
129 assessment.

130 (a) Planned Classroom Observation/Visitation. The evaluator or the evaluator’s  
131 representative may conduct classroom observations/visitations in connection  
132 with the employee’s evaluation. If such classroom observations/visitations are to  
133 be used in the annual evaluation, no fewer than two observations/visitations shall  
134 be completed during the evaluation period.

Commented [CP26]: Not just submissions - productive contributions (addition of "productivity", deletion "quantity")

Commented [CP27]: Since this is on the AA-17 as a header, combined the service concepts and the performance of assigned prof duties together as they are in that document. No change to substance.

Commented [CP28]: New language for setting goals, credit.

Commented [CP29]: Provides example.

Commented [CP30]: Moved to the end, since this activity is not evaluated. Language unchanged.

Commented [CP31]: It made sense to provide this information separately, rather than subsuming it in the area focused on teaching effectiveness. Entire section moved from old 10.1(g)(4) without changes.

Commented [CP32]: Must have 2 to include observations in the annual evaluation

135 1. Absent immediate concerns, the evaluator shall notify the employee at  
 136 least two days in advance of the date and time of any direct classroom  
 137 observation or visitation. If the employee determines this date is not appropriate  
 138 because of the nature of the scheduled class activities, the employee may suggest  
 139 a more appropriate date. If the evaluator has received a complaint or other  
 140 information that gives rise to immediate concerns about the conduct of the class,  
 141 the evaluator or the evaluator’s representative may observe or visit the class at  
 142 any time without notice to the employee.

143 2. Observation/visitation of online classroom settings is permitted at any  
 144 time.

145 3. A written summary of the observation/visitation shall be submitted to  
 146 the employee within two weeks of the observation/visitation. If the  
 147 observation/visitation involves a course that was assigned to the employee with  
 148 less than six weeks’ notice, the date of notice shall be included. The employee  
 149 shall be offered the opportunity to discuss the summary with the evaluator or  
 150 evaluator’s representative prior to its being finalized and placed in the employee’s  
 151 evaluation file; the employee may submit a written reply within thirty days of  
 152 receipt, which shall be attached to the summary.

153 4. Peer Assessment. An employee has the right to have the evaluator  
 154 assign a peer to observe/visit the employee’s teaching and to have an assessment  
 155 of that observation/visitation included as part of the employee’s annual report. A  
 156 department or unit may require peer observation/visitation. In these cases, the  
 157 peer may be a colleague within the University, a retired colleague, or a colleague  
 158 in the same discipline from another university.

159 **10.3 Required Proficiency in Spoken English.** To be involved in classroom  
 160 instruction beyond one (1) semester, employees must establish proficiency in the  
 161 oral use of English, as set forth in Section 1012.93, Florida Statutes, and any  
 162 applicable Board of Education or Board of Governors rule or resolution.  
 163 Uncorrected deficiencies may result in termination.

164 **10.4 Employee Assistance Programs.** An employee's participation in an employee  
 165 assistance program or information generated by participation in the program shall  
 166 not be used as evidence of a performance deficiency within the evaluation  
 167 processes described in this Article. However, if an employee fails to participate in

**Commented [CP33]:** A few changes for clarity; nothing substantive.

**Commented [CP34]:** Updated language for clarity.

**Commented [CP35]:** Information is not in a subsection, sentence not needed.

**Commented [CP36]:** Combined 10.4 (a) and (b) for this section, non-substantive language change.

**Commented [CP37]:** Language from 10.4 - moved. Last sentence condensed from 10.4(b).

168 an employee assistance program consistent with a prior agreement between the  
169 employee and the supervisor, that information may be included in the evaluation.

**Commented [CP38]:** Moved from old 10.5, sentence broken up for readability. Same idea, different phrasing.

**Commented [CP39]:** Slightly updated.

170 **10.5 Cumulative Progress Evaluations (CPE).** Cumulative progress evaluations  
171 are intended to provide an accurate consideration of cumulative performance  
172 leading to attainment of tenure and/or promotion, and to provide assistance and  
173 counseling to candidates to help them qualify themselves for tenure and/or  
174 promotion. For those seeking tenure, CPEs focus only on the tenure-earning  
175 period. For consideration of promotion only, the quality and productivity of an  
176 employee’s body of work is assessed, including recognition by the academic or  
177 professional community of what the employee has accomplished.

**Commented [CP40]:** This section promoted from old 10.2 (a).

**Commented [CP41]:** Replaces "was" - non-substantive.

**Commented [CP42]:** New language to assist in understanding how the process is for both T & TE and those only seeking promotion.

**Commented [CP43R42]:** This part is essentially copied (restated) from the explanation of research/creative evaluation consideration (10.1(d)(2)b.):  
*"...consideration of the quality and quantity of the employee’s research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of what has been accomplished."*

**Commented [CP44]:** This language is a result of condensing (2) and (3) of old 10.2(c)(2). Substance is unchanged.

178 (a) **Assessment of progress towards tenure/promotion.**

179 1. Cumulative progress toward **promotion to the rank of associate**  
180 **professor** will be assessed annually based on professional performance of  
181 teaching, research, and service, and the likelihood of future contributions at or  
182 exceeding current levels of performance. **Associate professors** who request a CPE  
183 **for promotion** will also be assessed on the achievement of national and/or  
184 international prominence and evidence of advancing their field of study.

**Commented [CP45]:** This is a result of condensing (2) and (3) of old 10.2(c)(2). Substance is unchanged.

**Commented [CP46]:** Header changed from "Policy" in old 10.2(a) to "Eligibility" information, which is what this section is actually talking about. Minor language updates.

185 2. Cumulative progress toward **tenure for tenure-eligible employees** will  
186 be assessed annually. These CPEs will be based on the cumulative impact of the  
187 professional performance of teaching, research, and service, and the likelihood of  
188 future contributions at or exceeding current levels of performance. **Tenure**  
189 **eligible employees seeking tenure** will also be assessed on the achievement of  
190 national and/or international prominence and evidence of advancing their field of  
191 study.

192 (b) **CPE Eligibility.** **Tenure-eligible employees** shall be informed annually of their  
193 progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Each year’s cumulative progress  
194 evaluation shall build upon prior cumulative progress evaluations, so an  
195 employee’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion in a given year will be  
196 viewed in the context of attainments over the entire tenure and/or promotion  
197 earning period. Tenured employees eligible for **promotion to professor** may, at  
198 their option and upon written request, be apprised of their progress toward  
199 promotion through the CPE process.

**Commented [CP47]:** Potential conflict for COBA with 2-2 to 3-3 load if no CPE

200 (c) **CPE Progression**. Beginning with the second year of employment (or the first  
 201 year, if tenure credit was given) and continuing annually, an employee who is  
 202 eligible for **tenure** shall receive a cumulative progress evaluation. Separate  
 203 cumulative progress evaluations shall be provided by the tenured members of the  
 204 department or unit (excluding the chair/head and dean), the chair/head, and  
 205 dean. All cumulative progress evaluations shall be completed during the spring  
 206 semester. An employee may request, in writing within 30 days of its receipt, a  
 207 meeting with the chair/head and/or dean to discuss concerns regarding the  
 208 cumulative progress evaluation.

**Commented [CP48]:** New header for clarity. Language from old 10.2(b). ("Process" to "CPE Progression")

**Commented [CP49]:** Sets time in the process for research/clinical promotions to be started (old 10.2(b))

**Commented [CP50]:** New language to codify practice.

209 (d) **CPE Process**. Barring a conflict of interest leading to recusal, all tenured  
 210 faculty in the unit are expected to participate in the evaluation of an employee's  
 211 CPE materials. However, associate professors shall not participate in cumulative  
 212 evaluations of progress for an individual being considered for **promotion to**  
 213 **professor**. If the department or unit has fewer than three tenured members or  
 214 tenured professors, as appropriate, to evaluate the tenure/promotion of an  
 215 individual in the unit, the dean may increase the committee membership to three  
 216 using tenured members of appropriate rank from other departments or units. If  
 217 the chair/head of the department or unit does not hold the rank of professor, or  
 218 is not a tenured member of the department/unit, the dean may appoint a  
 219 tenured faculty member of an appropriate rank from another department/unit to  
 220 serve in this role for the purpose of completing the cumulative progress  
 221 evaluations.

**Commented [CP51]:** Old 10.2(b) broken up into previous section (b) above and this section (c). No new language

**Commented [CP52]:** There is only one tenured assistant professor left at UCF, so this language might be ready for a refresh to ignore that possibility.

**Commented [CP53]:** This is new language for the same concept as old 10.2(b): codifies practice.

**Commented [CP54]:** Same language as 10.2(b) (no changes)

222 **10.6 Post Tenure Review (PTR) Procedures.** The Board of Governors of the State  
 223 of Florida enacted a post-tenure review requirement effective March 29, 2023.

224 (a) **Timing**. Each tenured faculty member will have a comprehensive post-  
 225 tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last  
 226 promotion or the last comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is later. For  
 227 faculty hired with tenure, the hire date will constitute the date of the last  
 228 promotion. Necessarily, there is a five-year period of phasing-in the post-tenure  
 229 review process.

230 (b) **Eligibility**. All tenured faculty members are eligible, except those that are  
 231 already participating in the transition-to-retirement program (T2RP), and faculty  
 232 with an irrevocable resignation date within the same academic year as the review.

**Commented [CP55]:** \*\*\*\*\*Is this the right word? \*\*\*\*  
 What about "Participation" or "Participation Guidelines" depending on what state requires

**Commented [CP56]:** "...are required to participate"

233 Another exception includes faculty approved for more than 160 hours of  
 234 authorized leave during one academic year within the five-year period of review.  
 235 Employees who were serving more than 50% of their assigned FTE in a non-unit  
 236 administrative role will undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year following a  
 237 return to a predominantly non-administrative faculty appointment.

238 (c) **Review Requirements.** The PTR will assess the faculty member’s  
 239 performance in assigned teaching, research/creative work, service, and other  
 240 responsibilities for sustained contributions in the **previous five years**. Utilizing the  
 241 criteria relevant to the faculty member, the PTR is expected to rate the:

- 242 1. Level of accomplishment and productivity relative to assigned duties in  
 243 research and creative activities, teaching, and service, and other assigned  
 244 responsibilities, including clinical and administrative assignments.
- 245 2. History of professional conduct (positive and negative) (inclusive of the  
 246 review requirements in BOG Regulation 10.003) and performance of academic  
 247 responsibilities to the university and its students.

248 (d) **Performance Rating Categories.** The rating categories shall be: Exceeds  
 249 expectations, Meets expectations, Does not meet expectations, and  
 250 Unsatisfactory.

251 (e) **Process Requirements.** Materials will include complete, current, and  
 252 accurate materials that highlight accomplishments and demonstrates  
 253 performance relative to assigned duties over the evaluation period. Dossiers must  
 254 be submitted in an approved format by the employee in time to meet published  
 255 deadlines. If, by the expiration of the submission deadline, a section is not  
 256 provided, the evaluator may make a decision based on the available information,  
 257 which may result in a final performance rating of “Unsatisfactory.”

258 (f) **Outcomes.** Employees will receive a communication regarding their final  
 259 performance rating.

- 260 1. Exceeds expectations
- 261 2. Meets expectations
- 262 3. Does not meet expectations: The employee must be issued a  
 263 Performance Improvement Plan.
- 264 4. Unsatisfactory: Employee will receive notice of intent that the university  
 265 will proceed with termination pursuant to terms in this agreement.

266 10.7 **Sustained Performance Evaluations (SPE).** If a supervisor determines that a  
 267 tenured employee has not maintained productivity expectations over the most

**Commented [CP57]:** If employee's research is interrupted by a lengthy approved leave, this could change the 5yr clock.

**Commented [CP58]:** This section is quite reduced, since post-tenure review takes over all the routine examinations. \*\*\*\*\*Maybe we need a new title for this????\*\*\*\*\* "Outcome of Annual Evaluation?????" \*\*\*\*\*



268 recent two terms, an employee’s sustained performance may be evaluated. This  
269 evaluation will consist of a review of relevant materials, including their  
270 assignment, annual evaluation ratings, and productivity and professionalism  
271 during that period of interest. If the employee’s overall performance is deemed to  
272 be below satisfactory, then the employee shall be issued a performance  
273 improvement plan.

274 **10.8 Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).** An employee whose PTR or SPE  
275 evaluation fails to meet performance expectations will be issued a performance  
276 improvement plan.

**Commented [CP59]:** Old section 10.3: (b)2.

277 (a) **PIP Creation.** The appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty  
278 member’s unit head, and with any information provided by the faculty member,  
279 will propose a performance improvement plan to the provost or designee. The  
280 provost or designee will make final decisions regarding the requirements of each  
281 performance improvement plan.

282 (b) **PIP Composition.** The PIP document shall include specific measurable  
283 performance goals with target dates for the faculty member to achieve the  
284 requirements of the PIP. The final deadline may not extend more than 12 months  
285 past the date the faculty member receives the PIP. The plan must list specific  
286 deficiencies and outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary  
287 outcomes, set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes, and indicate the  
288 criteria for assessment.

289 (c) **Termination of PIP.** Each tenured faculty member who fails to meet the  
290 requirements of a PIP by the established deadline(s) will be notified by the  
291 Provost of their pending termination for just cause. Successful completion of the  
292 PIP results in continued employment as a tenured employee.

**Commented [CP60]:** It is better to be broader here. Changed from "incompetence"

293 **10.9 Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESPs).** Each University  
294 department or unit shall maintain written AESPs to serve as guidelines on how to  
295 evaluate the quality of each employee’s performance. AESPs provide clarifications  
296 of the University criteria in terms tailored to the department or unit’s  
297 discipline(s), employee positions (e.g., tenured or tenure earning, non-tenure-  
298 earning, library faculty), and assigned duties. The AESP must be rigorous enough  
299 to allow for stratification of merit within the department. The evaluation period

**Commented [CP61]:** Addition (new language) - intended to make the AESPs less prone to checklists without interpretation.

**Commented [CP62]:** Redundant language in old 10.1(e) deleted.

**Commented [CP63]:** From old 10.1(e), language clarifies purpose of AESP

**Commented [CP64]:** New language suggestion for purpose of AESP to provide guidelines for evaluator.

300 for research may be longer than one year, if specified, to distinguish between  
301 ratings of Conditional and Unsatisfactory in any area of assignment.

302 These discipline-specific clarifications shall:

303 (a) take into consideration the University’s mission, the college’s or division’s  
304 mission, the department’s mission, and the expectations for the different ranks;

305 (b) be adaptable to various assignments, given that the supervisor has the  
306 ability to utilize discretion when the assigned duties for the employee are atypical  
307 for the evaluation period (e.g. the employee has a sabbatical, has a course  
308 release, or has been on sick or military leave for an extended period of time). A  
309 supervisor is not limited by the AESP when making an assignment, but has  
310 flexibility to adapt the evaluation to the effort and quality of the resulting  
311 product.

312 (c) account for differences in assigned duties between tenured/tenure-earning  
313 employees and non-tenure-earning employees such as instructors/lecturers.

314 (d) address, as appropriate, how various research/scholarship/creative  
315 activities are valued and the outlets in which employees might be expected to  
316 publish, exhibit, or perform.

317 (e) be rigorous and detailed enough that a reasonable employee should not be  
318 uncertain or confused about what performance or accomplishment is sufficient in  
319 teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, professional duties commonly  
320 assigned in the department or unit, and quality of service output needed to earn  
321 each performance evaluation rating.

322 The clarifications shall identify for each assignment area some representative  
323 examples of the achievements or performance characteristics that would earn  
324 each performance evaluation rating, consistent with an employee’s assigned  
325 duties. Examples shall be included for typical assignments within the department  
326 or unit (e.g., for 2-2 and 3-2 teaching assignments with correspondingly larger and  
327 smaller research assignments, if typically assigned), and must demonstrate  
328 equitable opportunity.

329 **10.10 AESP Development Process.**

330 (a) A committee of six members, including four in-unit members of the  
331 department/unit elected by a majority vote of employees of the dept/unit in a  
332 secret ballot, the department chair or unit head, and one representative

**Commented [CP65]:** Current language appears to lock in research as only category that can use 1+years, and also cannot be used to distinguish between O and AS, for example. \*\*\*\*\* SUGGESTED CHANGE: \*\*\* --> "The evaluation period for research may be longer than one year. If specified, the evaluation period in any area of assignment may be longer than one year to distinguish between ratings of Conditional and Unsatisfactory in any area of assignment" \*\*\*\*\*

**Commented [CP66]:** Taken from ann eval section. Also, language changed from "may be" to "shall be" from old 10.1(b)

**Commented [CP67]:** No change from 10.1(e)(1)

**Commented [CP68]:** From 10.1(e)(2).

**Commented [CP69]:** New language. Codifies practice.

**Commented [CP70]:** New language to consider to give guidance to the supervisor to be able to effectively evaluate different ranks. CHR said MH-T suggested.

**Commented [CP71]:** Additional language intended to clarify this section, found in old 10.1(e)(4).

**Commented [CP72]:** From old 10.1(f), promoted and made into a header, no substantive change.

**Commented [CP73]:** Does this area need more refinement?

333 appointed by the dean will develop or revise AESPs. If the dept/unit has four or  
334 more tenured employees, then 2 of the elected members must have tenure.

335 (b) Employees in the department or unit shall propose AESPs or changes  
336 thereto as developed by the committee by a majority vote in a secret ballot. If a  
337 majority exists, the proposed AESPs shall be forwarded to the dean or the  
338 appropriate vice president. If there is an even split vote, the dean shall act as the  
339 tie-breaker.

**Commented [CP74]:** There is no time frame here. From old 10.1(f)(1)

**Commented [CP75]:** New language for no majority situation

340 (c) The proposed AESPs or revisions thereto shall be reviewed by the dean or  
341 vice president. If the dean/vice president determines the proposed AESPs do not  
342 meet their expectations, the dean/vice president will refer them back to the  
343 department or unit for revision with a written statement of the reasons for non-  
344 acceptance.

**Commented [CP76]:** Must either go back or forward.

345 (d) Once the dean/vice president determines the proposed AESPs or revisions  
346 are acceptable, they shall be forwarded to the university's representative for  
347 review to ensure they are consistent with the mission and goals of the University  
348 and comply with this Agreement. If the university's representative determines  
349 that the proposed AESPs or revisions thereto are acceptable, they shall be  
350 approved. If not, they shall be referred back to the college or division for revision  
351 by the department or unit with a written statement of reasons for non-approval.

**Commented [CP77]:** Same language as old 10.1(f)(4).

352 (e) The process is considered initiated after the first meeting of the AESP  
353 committee. If, at least six months after the initiation of the process described in  
354 this subsection, AESPs acceptable to the dean/vice president and university's  
355 representative have not been approved by the department or unit, draft AESPs,  
356 committee and department votes, and comments from employees, committee,  
357 and the dean/vice president shall be forwarded to the university's representative  
358 for consideration. The university's representative shall, in conjunction with the  
359 dean/vice president and department/unit head, and in consideration of the  
360 opinions of the employees and of approved AESPs for other departments and  
361 units, develop and institute new department or unit AESPs. These AESPs shall  
362 remain in place until such time as new AESPs are developed and approved  
363 according to the procedure outlined in this subsection.

**Commented [CP78]:** Change language from "first meeting" to "formation of committee"???

**Commented [CP79]:** New language for when process starts. Old language in 10.1(f)(5) was unclear.

**Commented [CP80]:** Substantive change: AESPs are generally finished for all areas and now require tweaking. If they are not ready after 6 months, the Dean needs to act to get them set for the upcoming annual review period. One year is too long.

364 (f) Approved AESPs and revisions thereto shall be kept on file in the  
365 department or unit office. Upon written request, employees in each department  
366 or unit shall be provided an electronic copy of that department or unit's current  
367 AESPs.

**Commented [CP81]:** Benign clarification from old 10.1(f)(5)

368 (g) Review of AESPs must occur on a regular basis and must begin no later than  
369 five (5) years after the adoption or most recent review of those AESPs. The  
370 university’s representative, the dean, or a majority of employees in the  
371 department or unit may initiate the review of AESPs at any time. The process for  
372 reviewing a department or unit’s AESPs shall be the same as the process for  
373 developing them (including the committee composition, timeline, and approval  
374 process), as described in this article.

**Commented [CP82]:** From old 10.1(f)(7).

**Commented [CP83]:** From old 10.1(f)(7)

375 (h)The effective date for AESPs or revisions thereto shall be the start of the  
376 annual evaluation period that begins after the date the AESPs or revisions are  
377 approved by the university’s representative and the employees of the department  
378 or unit are so informed in writing. Therefore, an employee will be evaluated on  
379 the AESP that was approved and in effect beginning on May 8. If an AESP is  
380 approved on or after May 9, the employee would not be subject to or evaluated  
381 using the terms of the new AESP until the following May 8.

**Commented [CP84]:** For clarity.

**Commented [CP85]:** From old 10.1(f)(7)

**Commented [CP86]:** New language; codifies practice.