

Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM FOR STAFF	3-0741 ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE Human Resources May 2004
---	---

PURPOSE

1.01 Any system for evaluating staff performance is merely a tool of management and not an end in itself. Appraisals can be a positive means in assisting staff members in improving job performance, and an appraisal system further affords management an opportunity to make known to the staff the objectives and goals of the department and of the University, and what is expected of the employee toward the attainment of the objectives and goals. Staff members cannot be expected to meet performance standards which have not been clearly defined and explained as a part of the requirements of their position.

1.02 Staff performance evaluations should be conducted on a periodic basis, and should not reflect personal prejudice, bias or favoritism on the part of those conducting the ratings or reviews. The results of such evaluation procedures should be used to assist management in the decision making process of the following:

- A. Determining staff merit pay increases
- B. Identifying staff for promotion
- C. Informing staff of deficiencies, training needs, and improvement expected
- D. Justifying disciplinary actions
- E. Identifying staff for lay-off during emergency reductions in work force.

SCOPE

2.01 This policy applies to all departments and divisions of the University not specifically exempted from these policies and procedures.

2.02 This policy is applicable to all regular, continuous employed, staff, regardless of time worked (FTE). This policy is not applicable to faculty or students.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES

3.01 Each department shall establish a system of staff performance evaluation that reflects an impartial rating of the staff members' performance and potential for further advancement.

3.02 Each department's staff performance evaluation system shall produce overall ratings of at least five (5) levels as follows:

- A. Special Merit
- B. Merit
- C. Good
- D. Needs Improvement
- E. Unsatisfactory

3.03 Each staff member is rated by his/her immediate supervisor and all ratings are reviewed and approved by a higher level supervisor than the one who prepared the rating. The immediate supervisor performing the rating must be familiar with the performance of the staff member during a major portion of the rating period.

3.04 Frequency of Performance Evaluations and Ratings

A. Staff members other than temporary appointees shall be given formal performance ratings at least annually. Special ratings for the purpose of recognizing performance other than satisfactory may be made at any time.

B. In addition, all Classified staff other than temporary appointees shall be given performance ratings within two to four weeks prior to the completion of three months of service following a new appointment or promotion.

3.05 It is required that the immediate supervisor discuss the rating with the staff member in all cases. The supervisor shall work with the staff member to assist in improving performance.

3.06 Both the signature of the supervisor and the staff member are required on the written evaluation.

3.07 The employee's signature will be preceded by the following statement: "I acknowledge that I have seen this report and have been apprised of my evaluation. I understand that I may make a written statement below and/or within ten working days following. If a statement is submitted within ten days, it will be attached to this evaluation report."

3.08 The written results of an evaluation, including supervisor and employee signatures and any statements, will be retained in the department, and the staff member shall receive a copy of his/her finalized performance evaluation upon request.

3.09 The date of the last performance evaluation for each employee shall be maintained by the department on the Human Resource System.

3.10 All supervisors who conduct performance evaluations are required to receive training in the techniques of a uniform and effective staff performance evaluation program at least once every three years. These training sessions should include presentations and discussions of such subjects as:

A. Detailed explanation of the employee performance evaluation and rating system to be used.

B. Instructions as to what the administration of the department expects in the way of performance standards and the requirements for disseminating the expectations to all staff members

C. The requirements and desirability of maintaining an effective and uniform evaluation program within and among all units of the department

D. Caution about the pitfalls of common errors which can cause problems in performance rating, including:

- rating all staff as average,
- allowing one aspect of a staff member's performance to influence the entire evaluation,
- over-valuing or under-valuing a given factor, and discriminating based on
- race, sex, age, religion, ethnicity, color, national origin, sexual orientation, religion, veterans' status, or qualified disability.

3.11 The date of latest training on performance evaluation techniques attended by the supervisor conducting the evaluation is to be added to the evaluation form.

3.12 Criteria used to evaluate the performance of the staff should be directly related to the skills, abilities, and behaviors required to accomplish the work. The criteria or factors may vary with the type of work being reviewed. A current position questionnaire should be maintained on each position.

3.13 A department may develop any rating factors that are determined to be significant in evaluating the performance of its staff. However, as required in section 3.02, the rating system must produce overall ratings that fall within at least five categories of Special Merit, Merit, Good, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory.

3.14 Deficiency Review

A. In the event that a staff member is rated "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory," with a serious problem concerning performance and/or behavior, and the staff member does not show satisfactory progress upon being informed of the deficiencies, a department may find it helpful to use a program of staff deficiency reviews. (This type of review should not be used for minor deficiencies; minor matters should be reviewed in the supervisor's daily contact with the staff member.)

B. The following procedures are suggested for conducting deficiency reviews:

1. The immediate supervisor or higher ranking supervisor should initiate the action for staff deficiency review.
2. The staff member should be given a clear explanation of the deficient performance or problem behavior.
3. The expected level of performance or behavior and the action necessary to meet the expectations should be outlined, along with the time frame allowed for improvement and the consequences for failure to meet the standards set forth.
4. At the close of the review, the staff member should be advised as to when the matter will again be discussed, and this date should be noted.
5. The supervisor shall "follow up" the review on the date set to determine whether the staff member is making progress in the correction of the problems outlined in the review, or whether further corrective action is needed.
6. In the event that the staff member's performance does not improve, the department may find it necessary to take further disciplinary action, including discharge.

7. Appropriate records should be shared with the employee and higher ranking supervisor and maintained in the employee's personnel file in the department.

EXCEPTIONS TO POLICY AND PROCEDURES

4.01 The authority to grant exceptions to one or more of these policies and procedures is vested in the Office of the President of the University, as stated in Policy and Procedures Letter 3-0701, section 3.03.

4.02 Oklahoma State University reserves the right to change these Policy and Procedures or any portion thereof at any time.

4.03 The policy replaces 3-0741 (Performance Evaluation & Rating for Administrative/Professional and Classified Staff) adopted November 1984 with the latest revision August 1995.

Adopted: November 1984

Revised: August 1995

June 1998

May 2004