

University Policy Impact and Tracking Statement

<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed or Revised Policy Title:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Revisions to the Annual Performance Reviews in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Policy Sponsor:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Office of the Provost in partnership with the Faculty Senate's Appointed Personnel Policy Committee</p>
<p>Senior Leadership Review Dates: These policies will be discussed in Provost's Council, Deans' Council, and the Academic Personnel and Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate and will be sent to the President's Office after deliberations in the Faculty Senate on May 4.</p>
<p>Publication Dates:</p> <p><i>Lo Que Pasa</i> - Forthcoming</p> <p><i>UAnnounce</i> - Forthcoming</p> <p>Other – Emails to all faculty, heads and deans</p>

Policy description:

Revision of Annual Performance Reviews in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, Sections 3.2 and 4A,2

Reason for new policy or revision:

A key tenet of the University's policies on annual reviews of faculty has been to provide units with the flexibility to address their distinctive needs and objectives without undermining the general functions of annual performance reviews. The proposed changes to UHAP Chapters 3 and 4 will more fully recognize that faculty in some departments prefer to have all faculty involved in reviews and will allow units to assign reviewers to faculty with related expertise on an individual basis if decided by the faculty of the unit. Units will still be required to have a peer review committee to advise the head or director on individual reviews that require remediation or other action.

Major impacts to University and potential stakeholders:

The proposed changes will give faculty greater flexibility with integrating peer mentoring into annual reviews without undermining the functions of performance reviews in assessing and remediating performance.

Anticipated concerns or objections:

The proposed revisions will not require changes in any unit that does not wish to assign individual peer reviewers to faculty. Units that wish to do so will need to continue to recognize the UHAP policies that treat peer reviews as advisory to heads' final assessments of faculty performance.

Estimate and description of financial cost to implement, if any: None

Will the policy affect any of the following?

Existing UA Policy Yes No

Compliance with federal law/regulations Yes No

Existing UA Procedure Yes No

Compliance with state law/regulations Yes No

Existing Board Policy Yes No

General Public Yes No

Describe any item checked “yes”:

Small edits will be made in UHAP Chapters 3 and 4 to allow for greater flexibility in conducting peer reviews in annual performance reviews. Units that choose to use an alternative model will have to update their individual bylaws or other governing documents.