

EVALUATION OF SUPPORT STAFF MEMBERS

Performance evaluation is intended to be a constructive tool for encouraging and supporting the performance, effectiveness and morale of staff members. The value of evaluation lies in the opportunities for supervisors to conduct reliable measurements of performance which will recognize achievements, permit constructive feedback, and support personal growth of staff members.

Used properly, performance evaluations also provide supervisors with information and data which can inform individual or departmental training needs, and recommendations for promotion or advancement. They are also useful for assisting employees with problems or for justifying disciplinary action or dismissal when corrective efforts have failed.

It is the intent of this policy to place the responsibility for the evaluation of employee performance on immediate supervisors, who will advise their staff members of their performance ratings through discussion which affords the employee the opportunity for meaningful input.

Frequency of Evaluations

At the start of each evaluation cycle, the supervisor shall provide the employee with a copy of the evaluation instrument(s) which will be used by the supervisor to document the appraisal of the employee's performance.

Probationary evaluation. The performance of every new staff employee shall be reviewed and rated by the immediate supervisor prior to the completion of two (2) months employment and again at least two (2) weeks prior to the expiration of the probationary period.

Annual evaluation. The performance of every staff member will be reviewed by the immediate supervisor at least annually, to occur no later than May 15.

Special evaluation. The performance of staff members may be reviewed and rated at any time following a previous evaluation where their overall performance rating is other than satisfactory. This may include:

- Special recognition(s) of superior performance during a single assignment or period, but, due to the performance not being continuous, the overall rating is not changed. Special recognition is usually provided in narrative form as a letter to the employee, with a copy to the personnel file.

- Revised ratings on the basis of a performance level that has changed significantly since the last review, following a supervisor's recommendations for improvement. Ratings may be revised after a reasonable period of sustained performance or after ninety (90) days.
- Where performance deficiencies are noted by a supervisor in an evaluation, the supervisor shall provide recommendations for improvement with input from the employee.

Separation Ratings

An assessment of the overall performance of a staff member upon their separation from the District for any reason is a means of providing historical information for consideration in the event of application for reinstatement or rehire, or may assist in the provision of reference information to other employers.

A separation rating is considered a component of final personnel action papers and need not be completed on the usual rating form. Instead, a summary of overall performance during the entire period of employment will be entered on the Separation Form. (See Policy GDQD and Regulation GDQD-R, Discipline, Suspension, and Dismissal of Support Staff Members.)

External (Public) Complaints

Complaints against staff members for reasons not associated with their employment will not be considered unless there is clear evidence that there is a nexus between the issue and their duties or position within the District, especially where that nexus results in adverse effect upon the employee's performance or their ability to function effectively with the District.

Adopted: *date of Manual adoption*
Revised: *June 7, 2016*

LEGAL REF.: A.R.S. 15-341
 15-1326

EVALUATION OF SUPPORT STAFF MEMBERS

Annual Performance Evaluation

The human resources division will provide the site/department supervisor a list of employees that require an annual performance evaluation. A sample form of the performance evaluation is presented in Exhibit GDO-E.

Receipt of the forms constitutes notice that the employee indicated is due for evaluation, so that the responsibility may be assigned to the immediate supervisor.

Prior to initiating the evaluation process, the supervisor shall provide the employee with a copy of the evaluation instrument(s) to be used.

The supervisor will rate the performance of the employee by completing the reports of performance evaluation as fairly and equitably as possible, considering the criteria for the specific position.

The immediate supervisor or department head shall review the performance evaluation with the staff member and indicate areas both of strength and/or weakness. The employee shall sign the final evaluation document(s) to indicate their receipt of a copy of the same and their opportunity to discuss their evaluation with the supervisor. Their signature shall not be construed to indicate their agreement with the content of the evaluation document(s).

After rating the employee's performance, the supervisor shall submit the evaluation document(s) to the next higher administrative head, if any, for endorsement. Apart from this endorsement of the next higher administrative head, no other change to the evaluation document(s) shall be made following the employee's signature unless change is made through mutual agreement between the evaluator and the employee.

Upon completion of the interview, the original copy of the performance evaluation document(s) shall be forwarded directly to the records department. The supervisor will retain one (1) copy for departmental records.

Applying Employee Rating Factors

Because the specific application and weight of each evaluation criteria may vary considerably between and among occupational classes and individual positions, the evaluator should apply the criteria in a manner that reflects the specific nature, duties, and conditions of each particular job classification.

Universal district-wide standards of performance for each occupational class are undesirable, as they cannot fairly consider the many unique situations found in any particular academic or other work environment. For this reason, evaluators should discuss and review their application of the performance standards with employees at the start of each evaluation period to ensure continuity and equity, as well as employee understanding.

General considerations for evaluating employee performance in each factor are: quality of work, quantity of work, work habits and attitudes, personal characteristics, relationships with others, supervisory ability, and an overall rating.

The Rating Scale

The rating scale consists of four (4) choices of rating values, which are to be applied to each factor and to the overall evaluation. These are:

- *Excellent.* Consistent performance in excess of the standard level.
- *Satisfactory.* Consistent performance at the standard level.
- *Needs Improvement.* Performance below the standard level, but with a potential for improvement.
- *Unsatisfactory.* Consistent performance below the standard level. A rating of *unsatisfactory* indicates that improvement is required within ninety (90) days.

Determining Ratings

The evaluator will complete the review form without the employee being present by entering a check mark and/or appropriate comments in the column that reflects the intended rating.

Each factor will be considered separately, taking into account only the particular factor that is being rated. A general opinion of the employee's overall performance or any factor that does not relate to the one being rated should not influence the evaluator.

The evaluator is to be fair, impartial, and objective in evaluating the employee so that the rating of *Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, or *Unsatisfactory* accurately describes the employee's performance for the factor.

Evaluations should be considered in terms of the employee's present duties, not in terms of the duties of a different, higher, or lower class. By the same token, evaluators will rate performance for only periods during which they supervised the employee.

Potential value or personal abilities of the employee, except as they are actually applied on present work assignments, should not be considered. Ratings should reveal what the

employee actually does in the present position; however, potential or special aptitude should be noted in the "Comments" section of the form.

Employees should not be expected to meet standards of performance unless they have been instructed in job requirements. Employees cannot be responsible for work accomplishments if they have not received understandable assignments and instructions. If an employee has an area of difficulty, the supervisor should consider what has been done to help solve the problem that handicaps the employee's performance.

It is normal for ratings to differ between factors, since an employee's performance in some areas usually will be better than in other areas. The overall rating should be a true measure of the employee's whole performance of duty in relation to the requirements of the position. However, an overall rating of *Satisfactory* will not prohibit the possibility of dismissal if one (1) or more ratings of *Needs Improvement* and/or *Unsatisfactory* exist.

Ratings should not be influenced in a "halo effect," i.e., allowing one aspect of performance to influence the overall evaluation.

Evaluators should also guard against the common fault of "central tendency," the easy method of rating all employees *Satisfactory*.

Recommendation for Improvement

Where the performance deficiencies are noted by a supervisor in an evaluation, the supervisor shall provide recommendations for improvement. Such recommendations may be informal in nature, but shall be documented in some form. Where an individual's performance rating is "*Unsatisfactory*" in any area, however, the supervisor shall provide formal written recommendations for improvement to the employee. In developing recommendations for improvement, a supervisor shall provide the employee with an opportunity for input.

Recommendations for improvement shall include reasonable and specified timelines within which the employee must improve performance. Such timelines may vary based upon the nature of the performance element(s) involved, but a follow-up review and reevaluation is automatically required within ninety (90) days following the provision of recommendations for improvement to ensure timely resolution of concerns that may affect district efficacy and services to the public. If the employee is employed for the academic year, the timeline provided for improvement shall not include the summer.

If performance and/or action(s) are not raised to the *Satisfactory* (or better) level during that period, the supervisor, with the approval by the Associate to the Superintendent, may initiate corrective action, which may include dismissal from employment.