

## PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

**Date:** December 1997  
Revision December 1998  
Revision March 2000  
Revision November 2001  
Revision April 2003  
Revision June 2003  
*Revision April 2005. Effective December 1, 2005 for APR/PTR 2006 process regarding CY 2005*

**Authors:** College of Humanities Dean's Advisory Committee

**Reference:** College of Humanities Common Elements for Conducting Formal Assessment of Progress toward Promotion and Tenure (P&T) in the Annual Performance Review (July 1, 2003)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The first three sections of this document apply to the annual performance reviews of all faculty, tenured and non-tenured. Some procedures in later sections apply specifically to non-tenured faculty. Other procedures apply specifically to the post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty. This document does not supersede and should not be confused with the existing procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure in the College of Humanities. Copies of the College of Humanities documents governing procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure are available from the Office of the Dean.

### 2. SELECTION OF REVIEW COMMITTEES/THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. The departmental peer review committee is to be an elected committee unless decided otherwise by the faculty of the department (UHAP 3.10.01). The chair of the committee must be a tenured faculty member. See College of Humanities Common Elements Plan Item 1. [6/2003 Revision]

2.2. The primary duty of the departmental peer review committee is to conduct annual performance reviews of tenured and non-tenured faculty.

2.3. The duties of the departmental review committee also include: consulting with a tenured faculty member on the design of a Faculty Development Plan; evaluating together with the department head or program director, the success of a Faculty Development Plan or Performance Improvement Plan. ("Faculty Development Plan" and "Performance Improvement Plan" are terms used in ABOR documents and in UHAP. They are explained below under the heading DEFINITIONS).

2.4. The departmental committee is empowered to request additional documentation when conducting reviews if it is deemed necessary.

2.5. The peer review committee of the college is to be made up of five representatives elected from the tenured faculty of the college by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Three representatives will be elected every two years; two representatives will be elected in alternate years. Representatives will serve terms of two academic years [4/2003 Revision]; however, in the inaugural election of December 1997, two representatives will be elected for terms of one year. The Dean's Advisory Committee will solicit nominations from departments and programs of the college and will determine a slate of candidates. The election will take place during the final

four weeks of the spring semester [4/2003 Revision]. The faculty will be urged to take into account issues of appropriate balance when casting their votes. ***No more than two members of the committee can be from the same department.*** [4/2005 Revision] Committee members will recuse themselves from voting in cases concerning their own departments. [4/2005 Revision]

2.6. The duties of the peer review committee of the college include: making a determination, at the request of a tenured faculty member, about the suitability of a Performance Improvement Plan when the tenured faculty member and the department head or program director fail to agree; conducting the annual dean's-level audit of post-tenure reviews. The dean's-level audit will not examine the file of any faculty member who is appealing a rating to the college committee nor will the audit examine the file of any faculty member who has appealed a rating to the college committee in the previous two years.

### 3. INITIATING THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW/POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

3.1. Every faculty member is evaluated in the annual performance review. The foundation for the post-tenure review of tenured faculty will be the annual performance review.

3.2. No later than January 15 each year, all faculty members in the College of Humanities will submit to a designated person in their department or program the following items:

3.2.1. A copy of the signed agreement between the department head or program director and the faculty member specifying the faculty member's academic responsibilities for that calendar year (CY) workload agreement.

3.2.2. A Faculty Activity Report consisting of a description, not to exceed two pages, of the individual's performance in the categories of teaching, research and service during the past year. Work in progress may be included. Faculty members may wish to explain the ways in which they have met and/or exceeded their agreed-upon academic responsibilities. ***Faculty Activity Reports may exceed the two-page limit if a department has designed its own reporting form in excess of this limit*** [4/2005 Revision]

3.2.3. An updated, current and complete Curriculum Vitae. A complete CV will include the page numbers of any published works and an indication of whether those works were refereed. This CV, along with the Faculty Activity Report, will be made available to the committee conducting the dean's-level audit.

3.2.4. No faculty member will rate himself or herself.

***3.2.5. When TCE Comparison Reports are available, they must be supplied to the departmental committee. When TCE Comparison Reports are not available, the departmental committee must examine hard copy of the alternate form of evaluation.*** [4/2005 Revision]

### 4. THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS FOR BOTH TENURED AND NON-TENURED FACULTY

4.1. During the first six weeks of the spring semester, the departmental review committee, guided by the COH APR/PTR Criteria document, will conduct and complete its deliberations. It will make its recommendations to the department head or program director by the end of February. This committee will bring to the attention of the department head or program director those cases requiring immediate attention.

4.2. Each faculty member will receive a rating in those areas (teaching, research, service) for which he or she is responsible. Each faculty member will also receive an overall rating.

4.3. Each annual performance review shall include the past five calendar years of the faculty member's performance with substantial emphasis on the most recent year for evaluation of teaching (UHAP 3.10.01).

4.3.1. For tenure-track faculty with less than five years of service at the University of Arizona, the period covered by the review shall commence with the date of the candidate's initial appointment to a tenure-track/continuing status faculty position at the university [6/2003 Revision].

4.3.2. Any candidate undergoing a third year probationary review is exempt from undergoing the promotion and tenure/continuing status component of the annual performance review that year [6/2003 Revision].

4.4. When an individual holds a dual appointment involving teaching, research or service, the annual performance review shall address contributions under both assignments. The unit in which the .51 line is lodged will conduct the review. It will obtain and carefully consider appropriate documentation from the other unit.

4.5. In reviews of faculty holding joint appointments or working in interdisciplinary programs, work outside the department will be assigned the same weight as comparable service within the faculty member's home department or program.

4.6. Each faculty member being reviewed will receive by April 1 a summary of the results of the peer committee's annual performance review (UHAP 3.09).

4.7. By April 15, department heads and program directors will complete their annual performance reviews of all faculty. The department head or program director's written evaluation shall be given to the faculty member involved no later than April 15 (UHAP 3.10.05).

4.8. The department head or program director will meet with each faculty member no later than May 15 to discuss the head or director's written annual performance review (UHAP 3.10.03 [4]).

4.9. Prior to meeting with the faculty member, the department head or program director will provide his or her preliminary written annual performance review (UHAP 3.10.01).

4.10. The faculty member may add written comments to the head or director's written annual performance review before signing it (UHAP 3.10.05). The faculty member, having provided comments as desired, signs the document and returns it to the head or director within fifteen days of the meeting (UHAP 3.10.03 [5]).

4.11. The department head or program director will meet with each faculty member by May 15 to agree upon goals, assignments and expectations for the next annual review (UHAP 3.10.03 [4]). The head or director will provide a written summary of those expectations for the next calendar year. If these are agreed to, the faculty member will sign the document and return it to the head or director within 15 days of the meeting. In the event that agreement is not reached, procedures for appeal are outlined below.

4.12. Upon receipt of the department head or program director's written annual performance review and upon receipt of the stated expectations for the next year, the faculty member may waive the right to a meeting with the head or director by signing in a designated space on the annual performance review.

## 5. OUTCOMES OF THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

5.1. All faculty members who are found to be performing overall at satisfactory levels in the annual performance review are eligible for salary increases and other rewards which may exist or be established at the departmental, college or university levels (UHAP 3.10.04).

5.2. Faculty who receive unsatisfactory ratings in two or more areas of responsibility in one performance review will automatically receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

5.3. Faculty who fail to provide the documentation necessary for the annual review will automatically receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

#### 6. OUTCOMES SPECIFIC TO NON-TENURED FACULTY

6.1. An un-tenured faculty member who receives one or more unsatisfactory ratings must immediately consult with his or her department head or program director regarding remedial action.

6.2. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress toward promotion and tenure requires scholarly accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities and includes evaluation by external referees, which is not a part of the annual review process (UHAP 3.10.02).

6.3. For tenure-eligible faculty, the mandatory successive renewal process, which occurs in the second, fourth and sixth (tenure) years, follows procedures outlined in UHAP 3.12. [Also see UHAP 3.12.04 revised 4/2003 for 3/6 Review Tenure Eligible Faculty]

#### 7. OUTCOMES SPECIFIC TO TENURED FACULTY

7.1. Faculty who receive one or more unsatisfactory ratings will proceed either to an appeal or to the process for removal of the unsatisfactory rating(s).

#### 8. THE APPEALS PROCESS FOR BOTH TENURED AND NON-TENURED FACULTY: OVERALL SATISFACTORY BUT WITH ONE UNSATISFACTORY RATING

8.1. Faculty who receive an overall rating of satisfactory or higher in the annual performance review but who are evaluated as unsatisfactory in a single area (teaching, research, or service) and who dispute the rating of unsatisfactory may appeal to the next administrative level, which ordinarily will be that of the dean (UHAP 3.10.06 [A]).

8.2. Such requests for review of an overall satisfactory rating but with one unsatisfactory rating must be made in writing to the administrative head of the next level within 30 days of receipt of the written evaluation and must state: (a) the points of disagreement; (b) specific findings to be reviewed; (c) facts in support of the request; and (d) corrective action sought. The administrator conducting the review shall consider the facts in support of the request and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The review shall be completed in writing within 30 days of receipt of the request, with copies provided to the faculty member and the department head or program director involved in the initial evaluation (UHAP 3.10.06 [A]).

#### 9. PROCEDURES OF APPEAL SPECIFIC TO NON-TENURED FACULTY: OVERALL UNSATISFACTORY RATING

9.1. For non-tenured faculty, appeals of overall unsatisfactory ratings will follow the procedures outlined in UHAP 3.10.06 [A]. Those procedures are identical to the procedures described above under the heading "The Appeals Process for Both Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty: Overall Satisfactory but with One Unsatisfactory Rating".

#### 10. PROCEDURES OF APPEAL SPECIFIC TO TENURED FACULTY: OVERALL UNSATISFACTORY RATING

10.1. Tenured faculty who receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory in the annual performance review and who disagree with the finding of unsatisfactory, may appeal that finding by opting for a review by (a) a committee of the unit appointed jointly by the head or director and by the chair of the unit peer review

committee; or (b) the elected peer review committee of the next higher level (i.e., the college); or by (c) the elected peer review committee of the university (UHAP 3.10.04). UHAP calls the appeal of an overall deficiency an “enhanced review”.

10.2. If deemed necessary by either the tenured faculty member who appeals an overall finding of unsatisfactory or by the peer committee, evaluations from external reviewers expert in the faculty member’s discipline will be sought and taken into consideration as part of this appeal (called an “enhanced review” in university documents) (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [2]). The notice of appeal from the faculty member to the appropriate committee must state whether an external review is to be conducted. The expenses of this external review will be borne by the university (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [2]). The review is to take no longer than 100 days from the date of communication to the faculty member of the results of the annual performance review (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [3]). Faculty who choose an external review may elect to have up to three external reviewers. At least one must come from a list of reviewers supplied by the faculty member. At least one must come from a peer institution. The peer committee chosen by the faculty member to consider the appeal will assemble the list and handle the solicitation of reviews. In most cases, the review will be conducted by mail. The exact process of the external review will be determined on a case-by-case basis; the process will be proposed by the peer review committee and agreed upon by the department head or program director and by the faculty member.

10.3. The committee hearing an appeal from tenured faculty may find that the faculty member’s performance meets stated expectations and is satisfactory, or that it fails to meet stated expectations and, if so, precisely how it fails, and that the faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [3]).

10.4. For a decision to be reached that performance is unsatisfactory, the burden of proof is on the institution to show that such a finding is warranted (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [3]).

10.5. Should the committee, hearing the appeal, uphold the rating of unsatisfactory, the tenured faculty member along with the department head or program director and the departmental peer committee, will develop a Performance Improvement Plan and gain approval by the dean within 45 days following the decision (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Enhanced Review [4]). (“Performance Improvement Plan” is described below under DEFINITIONS).

10.6. If no agreement on the terms of the Performance Improvement Plan occurs, the faculty member has a maximum of 15 days from the meeting to request the peer committee at the next higher administrative level to make a determination on the improvement plan with the approval of the dean. The committee has 45 days to render its determination as to an appropriate improvement plan (UHAP 3.10.06 [C] Appeal of Performance Improvement Plan).

10.7. For tenured faculty, when the annual performance review identifies cases of overall unsatisfactory performance of stated expectations, an enhanced review of the faculty member’s performance will occur unless the faculty member chooses to proceed directly with a Performance Improvement Plan (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] The Enhanced Review).

## 11. PROCEDURES FOR REMOVAL OF A RATING OF UNSATISFACTORY BY TENURED FACULTY IN A POST-TENURE REVIEW

11.1. Overall satisfactory performance but an unsatisfactory rating in one area in any one year.

11.2. In the case of tenured faculty who choose not to exercise their right of appeal, or who have exhausted the means of appeal of an unsatisfactory rating in a single area (teaching, research, service), the unsatisfactory rating may be removed by means of the Faculty Development Plan.

11.3. Faculty Development Plan. The tenured faculty member may propose and, with the approval of the department head or program director, implement a Faculty Development Plan in the following calendar year. If the head or director and the peer committee determine that satisfactory improvement in the deficient area has not occurred in one year within the terms of the plan, an overall unsatisfactory rating will be assigned and the faculty member must initiate a Performance Improvement Plan (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.4]). See DEFINITIONS below. If the faculty member cannot agree with the head or director on a Faculty Development Plan, he or she may refer the matter to the departmental peer review committee and then, if necessary, to the peer review committee of the college. A decision of any of the peer review committees in favor of the faculty member is conclusive. In the case of a faculty member who is appealing a finding of deficiency in a single area and in the absence of an agreed-upon statement of academic responsibilities, the conditions of the previous year's agreed-upon statement of academic responsibilities will be extended for the current year.

11.4. Two years with a continuing teaching, research or service rating of unsatisfactory, or an overall unsatisfactory performance in any one year. A continuing rating of unsatisfactory is defined as an unsatisfactory rating in the same area for two years in a row.

11.5. For tenured faculty, when the annual performance review identifies cases of overall unsatisfactory performance of stated expectations, an enhanced review of the faculty member's performance will occur unless the faculty member chooses to proceed directly with a Performance Improvement Plan (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] The Enhanced Review).

11.6. When the annual review of a tenured faculty member results in an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, upheld in the enhanced review process, or if a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a satisfactory outcome in a faculty development plan, a Performance Improvement Plan will be developed. The Performance Improvement Plan will be designed with the intent to provide structures and resources for the tenured faculty member to make changes in order to attain appropriate performance levels. For details, see "Performance Improvement Plan" under DEFINITIONS below.

## 12. DEFINITIONS

### 12.1. Faculty Development Plan

12.1.1. A Faculty Development Plan addresses a single area of deficiency, where the overall performance is satisfactory, before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the tenured faculty member's overall performance (UHAP 3.10.04 [A]).

12.1.2. The plan, developed at the departmental level in collaboration with the faculty member, may have a maximum of one-year duration and should include appropriate interim monitoring and feedback (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.2]).

12.1.3. Corrective action can involve a plan to improve the deficiency and/or to redirect the faculty member's work responsibilities to areas of particular strengths (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.1]).

12.1.4. If the faculty member's performance is deemed satisfactory in all areas at the end of the Faculty Development Plan, he or she returns to regular standing. From this point forward, he or she will be evaluated through the normal performance evaluation process.

12.1.5. Improvement to a satisfactory level in the deficiency area within one year will make the faculty member eligible for any rewards that become available during that year (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.3]).

12.1.6. If the head or director and the peer committee determine that satisfactory improvement in the deficient area has not occurred in one year within the terms of the plan, an overall unsatisfactory rating will be assigned and the Performance Improvement Plan process described below, which addresses cases of

overall unsatisfactory ratings, will apply (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.4]). The policy of the Arizona Board of Regents requires that a faculty member's performance be evaluated as "overall unsatisfactory" if a single deficiency in any area of job responsibility is not corrected within one year. "Within one year" means within the calendar year for which the Faculty Development Plan is in effect. ("Calendar year" means January through December.) For example, a faculty member who agrees to a Faculty Development Plan on October 1, 1997 would put that plan into effect in January 1998 and be evaluated on the success of that plan in 1999.

12.1.7. The faculty member may appeal the finding that there has been unsatisfactory improvement in the Faculty Development Plan at the next higher administrative level (UHAP 3.10.04 [A.5]).

## 12.2. Performance Improvement Plan

12.2.1. A Performance Improvement Plan addresses an overall finding of unsatisfactory or two years in a row of unsatisfactory in a single area (which is considered to be an overall unsatisfactory rating).

12.2.2. Within 45 days of the rating or outcome of appeal, the Performance Improvement Plan will be developed by the tenured faculty member, the department head or program director and the department peer committee, with approval of the dean (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [1]).

12.2.3. The Performance Improvement Plan shall be implemented no later than the semester following the overall unsatisfactory evaluation (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [2]).

12.2.4. The plan must state reasonable expectations and may involve an altered mix of job responsibilities (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [3]).

12.2.5. The university will make reasonable efforts to provide appropriate resources to facilitate the plan's implementation and success (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [4]).

12.2.6. Depending upon facts and circumstances, the improvement plan may include the following: a description of specific deficiencies; a list of reasonable outcomes needed to correct deficiencies; the process to be followed to achieve outcomes; the timeline for accomplishing the process, including annual or more frequent benchmarks; the criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the plan; the resources needed to facilitate the plan (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [5]).

12.2.7. The faculty member's performance within the context of the improvement plan must be evaluated as early as possible, and no later than one year after the plan is put into effect. This special evaluation will be carried out by the department head or program director and the elected peer review committee in place at the time of the evaluation, and approved by the dean (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [6]).

12.2.8. The improvement plan will stay in effect until performance returns to a satisfactory level according to stated expectations. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Provost. In no case shall an improvement plan take more than three years to lead to satisfactory performance (UHAP 3.10.04 [B] Performance Improvement Plan [7]).

12.2.9. The spirit of the improvement plan is to support, encourage and measure the quality of faculty performance, to the end that faculty performance meets stated expectations.

12.2.10. It is the objective of the post-tenure review process that performance improvement plans have successful outcomes. If the faculty member meets the objectives of the Performance Improvement Plan, neither the finding of deficiency nor the particular conditions leading to that finding of deficiency will be

used in performance evaluations for later years. Only when a successful outcome fails to occur can any further action ensue.

12.2.11. If a faculty member seeks to appeal a finding that he or she is not performing satisfactorily under a Performance Improvement Plan, he or she should appeal to the peer review committee of the college.

12.2.12. Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to the benchmarks and performance goals of the Performance Improvement Plan shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal, according to ABOR policy, Chapter 6-201(J). Such action may occur in cases where one of the following circumstances exists:

12.2.12a The faculty member is unwilling to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan following a finding of unsatisfactory performance and the conclusion of any appeals provided for in Section 3.10.06 of UHAP.

12.2.12b The faculty member fails to make progress considered acceptable within the evaluation periods under the implementation of the Performance Improvement Plan.

12.2.12c The faculty member fails to achieve a satisfactory performance according to stated expectations within the duration of the Performance Improvement Plan (UHAP 3.10.04.[B] Performance Improvement Plan [8]).

12.2.13. Given that current recruiting and tenure practices are focused on attracting and retaining the best qualified individuals for any position, cases of persistent unsatisfactory performance should be rare. In such cases, however, the procedures specified in The Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, 6-201 (J and L) can be initiated. Section J.1.a states as follows: “Tenured faculty members shall not be dismissed or suspended without pay except for just cause. Such termination of service or suspension may take effect only following an opportunity for the faculty member to utilize the conciliation/mediation and hearing procedures as prescribed in sections L.3 and L.4 below.”