

# RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY

## Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station

### Purpose of Evaluations

Performance evaluations are basic to good personnel management. They are useful in achieving desired work performance, receiving ideas and input, and promoting employee development. Principal objectives of the performance evaluation system are to:

- Identify the level of performance of each employee.
- Clarify performance standards in conjunction with the current job description.
- Update the current position description as appropriate.
- Provide a basis for better utilization of outstanding performers.
- Provide a basis for improving the performance of substandard employees.
- Serve as a resource for decisions on salary adjustments.
- Provide a link between the work planning for individual employees and the overall departmental, divisional and Ag Center goals and objectives.

The review process is designed to promote discussion between employees and supervisors regarding current job responsibilities, performance of assigned duties, problems that may have arisen on the job, and other pertinent topics.

### Evaluation Instrument

A standard evaluation form will be used. The employee will be rated in all categories applicable to the position. There will be 4 rating options:

G	=	Meets the Desired Performance Level
E	=	Excels in This Area
I	=	Working Toward the Desired Performance Level, But Does Not Fully Meet the Level in All Areas
N	=	Does Not Meet Requirements

In lieu of the above ratings, the rater will also have the option to enter "NA" (not applicable) for any category which is not applicable to the specific position.

### Evaluation Process

1. The performance evaluation is carried out by the employee's unit head. The unit head should seek input from the employee's immediate supervisor in the manner the unit head deems appropriate.
2. The evaluation form must have the signature of the unit head and the employee's immediate supervisor. If the unit head is the employee's immediate supervisor, the form must also be signed by the Director.
3. The purpose of this multi-tiered system is to facilitate consistency and objectivity. While one reviewer cannot substitute his/her basic judgment for that of another reviewer, he/she can act as a leveling influence in the entire process.
4. The employee has the opportunity to include comments (not limited to the space on the form). The employee shall also sign the form. The employee's signature will not imply concurrence with the evaluation.

5. The employee's position description should be reviewed during this process and updated as appropriate. When updates are minor, they may be made to the departmental copy. Updates of a more significant nature (i.e., those involving the addition of a new function or a change in a large (20% or >) percentage of duties) require completion of a new position description form to be forwarded to the Ag Center Human Resource Management Office.
6. Duties of positions are assigned by the immediate supervisor subject to administrative approvals.
7. The performance evaluation process should also include an interview session between the employee and the unit head or the unit head's designee (i.e., the supervising faculty member).
8. The evaluator must give an accurate rating. *Failure to objectively evaluate will reflect negatively on the evaluator.*
9. A copy of the evaluation will be maintained in the unit office. The original will be forwarded to the Ag Center Human Resource Management Office.

#### Evaluation Timeframe

1. Evaluation of new employees should be conducted within the first 6 months of appointment to the position. Likewise, when an employee transfers to a new unit or position, the employee should be evaluated within the first 6 months. New employees must be advised of the evaluation instrument at the time of employment in the position and should be given the opportunity to ask questions.
2. After the initial evaluation, employees will be evaluated in November or December of each year. The Director will determine the date evaluations are due. *\*NOTE: This was changed to January and February of even-numbered years, except that if the previous evaluation was unsatisfactory, the employee must be rated in the odd-numbered year.*
3. A new employee whose initial evaluation occurred during September or October will not have to be re-rated in November.
4. An employee who receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory must be re-rated no later than 4 months following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

#### Additional Review Process

An employee or immediate supervisor who disagrees with the evaluation may, within 15 days following the date evaluations are due, request that the evaluation be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor and Director. The request must be in writing and must include the reasons the requester disagrees with the rating. The letter should also indicate how the employee has attempted to resolve the disagreement with his/her immediate supervisor and/or unit head. The letter should be sent through channels to the Director. If the letter is not sent through channels, it may be reviewed, but normally no action can be taken to change the evaluation until the letter is sent to the immediate supervisor and/or unit head for review and comment. The Vice Chancellor and Director shall determine the appropriate manner for reviewing the request, which may consist of making a decision based on the written record, and will make the final decision.