ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS OF CONTINUING STATUS AND CONTINUING-ELIGIBLE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

POLICY

This section applies to annual performance reviews of continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees. In accordance with Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) policy, such employees are expected to participate and cooperate in evaluations to assess and enhance their performance. These employees will have an opportunity to participate in the preparation of evaluation guidelines and in the evaluation review process. The evaluation system should permit sufficient flexibility to adapt procedures to individual or organizational unit circumstances.

Continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of excellence in performance. The annual performance review is intended to support continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees in achieving excellence in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. Annual performance reviews are intended:

1. To involve continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees in the formulation of objectives and goals related to their program areas and their own personal evaluation of their performance and professional growth.
   a. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in the areas of the employee’s responsibilities through the use of peer review.
   b. To promote the effectiveness of continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make that enhance the University and will lead to greater personal and professional growth, recognition, and rewards.
   c. To provide a written record of continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees’ performance to support personnel decisions.
2. To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities, and achievements of continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees.

3. To correct unsatisfactory ratings. To provide feedback on performance and accomplishments in the areas of the employee’s responsibilities, which may include teaching, inclusive scholarship (UHAP 3.3.02B), and professional service, through the use of peer review.

4. To remediate ratings of “unsatisfactory” in one or more areas of responsibility through specific improvement plans designed to correct the deficiencies in a timely manner.

All continuing
Continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employees who are found to be performing with an overall rating of “meets or exceeds expectations” may be eligible for salary increases and other awards that may exist or be established at the unit, college, or University levels.

Continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of excellence in performance. The annual performance review is intended to support continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees in achieving excellence in the performance of their duties and responsibilities.

Annual performance reviews follow specific procedures outlined in Section 4A.2.01. For continuing-eligible academic professional employees, the mandatory successive renewal process, which occurs in the third and sixth years, follows procedures outlined in Promotion and Continuing Status (Section 4A.3.01).

**4A.2.01 Annual Performance Review Process**

Each

4A.2.01 Annual Performance Review Process

In accordance with University and ABOR policies, each continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee’s performance, personal progress, and future potential will be evaluated in writing on a scheduled basis at least once every 12 months.

**A. Elements of the Performance Evaluation**

Elements of the evaluation will include, but will not be limited to, the following:

1. Written evaluation criteria will be developed through participation of the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee to express performance expectations. Procedures and instruments for
evaluation of continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees will be developed by departments and organizational units. Evaluation procedures within organizational units will be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the unit without undermining the uniformity of the whole system.

2. An assessment of the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee's performance will include an assessment by the immediate administrative head.

3. The evaluation of the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee's past performance and expectations for the future will be discussed with the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee. A written statement recording the sense of this discussion will be provided to the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee. The continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee will be given the opportunity to add comments to this statement as a part of the official record.

The annual performance review will evaluate the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee's performance in an annual activity designed to assess the employee's department’s responsibilities and ABOR policies. For continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees whose responsibilities include teaching, the annual review will include peer and student input, including student evaluations of classroom performance in all classes, and other expressions of teaching performance in the employee's unit. The assessment of performance evaluation will include a peer review by faculty on an annual basis for continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professionals in the department, program, or instructional unit and a review by the immediate administrative head. If peer reviews are conducted by all members of the faculty or by peer reviewers specifically selected because their expertise is relevant to the individual faculty member, regardless of peer review method, a peer review committee must still be in place in order to oversee the peer review process. The committee will oversee the process and advise the immediate administrative head or director on any individual reviews that require remediation or other action. The peer reviewers are to be elected unless decided otherwise by the members of the unit, and their continuing-eligible and continuing status academic professional employees in the unit. The peer review committee deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations, as well as any evaluations or recommendations they may receive, are confidential, except that
peer review recommendations are shared with the individual being reviewed and the immediate administrative head.

Annual. However, upon request meetings with the immediate administrative head will provide the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee a summary of the peer evaluation are required for continuing-eligible academic professional employees in order that they receive written formative feedback on their progress toward continuing status and promotion. A rating of "meets or exceeds expectations" in an annual performance review does not necessarily indicate successful progress toward continuing status and promotion. Criteria and decisions regarding continuing status and promotion are detailed in UHAP 4A.3.02B.

B. Procedures for the Performance Evaluation

Annual meetings with the immediate administrative head are encouraged for academic professionals at the associate rank in order to provide feedback on their progress toward promotion.

The following procedures are involved in the annual performance review of continuing-status-eligible and continuing-eligible status academic professional employees. Within these general policies, the immediate administrative head and continuing-eligible and continuing status academic professional employees in the unit will set the schedule and procedures for annual performance reviews.

1. The first step is information gathering, where the continuing-status-eligible or continuing-eligible status academic professional employee provides information on all areas identified in their workload. The type and format of the information will be indicated by the immediate administrative head and for peer Office of the Provost and the unit level annual review in a timely manner. In the area of criteria. If the individual is engaged in teaching, student evaluation of classroom performance in all classes is required. Periodic peer observation for teaching is recommended as part of the annual review process.

2. Peer evaluation, through procedures and criteria determined by continuing status and The continuing-eligible or continuing status academic professional employee and the immediate administrative head is required. The employee must provide information gathered in 4A.2.01.B.1, and any other materials that may be deemed relevant, are utilized in the peer review. Results of the peer evaluation are transmitted directly to the immediate administrative head and identified peer reviewers in a timely manner based on the deadline determined by the unit.

3. Peer reviewers will consider unit criteria and will provide written feedback for continuing-eligible or continuing-status academic professional employees. They will indicate if the individual "meets or exceeds expectations" or is "does not meet expectations" for each workload category, as well as overall. A brief written summary describing the rationale and results of the peer review are
transmitted confidentially to the immediate administrative head and the faculty member.

3.4. The immediate administrative head evaluates the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee final decision on the basis of the annual review rating based on information provided by the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee, peer evaluators, students, and such other information as is available, including findings that the academic professional employee has violated codes of professional conduct, as detailed in the Statement on Professional Conduct in UHAP 7.01.01. If the immediate administrative head determines that one or more areas of performance "do not meet expectations", they will further distinguish by assigning a rating of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory."

The immediate administrative head then provides the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee with a preliminary written evaluation. No in-person meetings are required for individuals who receive a "meets or exceeds expectations" overall rating. In-person meetings are only required for the following:

A. The immediate administrative head typically meets with the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee by March 31, if possible, to discuss the immediate administrative head's written evaluation, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review. If the continuing status or continuing eligible employees, regardless of rating;

B. When the rating in any category is "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory";

C. As requested by the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee so requests, the.

4. In cases where the performance is "unsatisfactory" in any category, the immediate administrative head and employee must meet within 30 days of the written evaluation date. The discussion at this meeting will include a summary of the results of the evaluation conducted through peer review. If the employee is continuing eligible, then this meeting will include a discussion of the continuing eligible academic professional employees progress toward continuing status and promotion.

immediate administrative head as well as that of the peer reviewers. As soon as possible thereafter, after meeting with the immediate administrative head, the continuing status or continuing eligible professional employee will receive the final written evaluation. The continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee provides employee may provide comments as desired, signs the final written evaluation, and must sign the document and returns it to the immediate administrative head within 10 days of the meeting described in 4A.2.01.b.4 above. The final written evaluation will become a part of the employee's departmental records personnel record
If the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, a plan for remediation and/or further action may be developed in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

4-5. If the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee disagrees with the evaluation, the employee may appeal within 30 days of receipt of the final written evaluation date as detailed in Section 4A.2.03 below.

2. If the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee disagrees with the evaluation, he or she may appeal as detailed in Section 4A.2.03.

A. If the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee fails to provide annual performance review information to the immediate administrative head and for peer review by the deadline established deadline after receiving appropriate notification, by the continuing status/IMMEDIATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD or continuing-eligible academic professional if they fail to sign the review document, the employee will receive an overall “unsatisfactory” performance rating unless the immediate administrative head determines that good cause exists for an exception. Units will put out the call for annual review information no later than 30 days prior to the deadline.

When an individual holds an appointment that involves an administrative assignment, less than 1.0 FTE, the related duties will be assessed by the appropriate individual’s supervising administrator, while the faculty continuing-status duties will be assessed considered through appropriate peer review. The supervisor for the majority of FTE will finalize the review (or the unit head).

6. Annual performance reviews may be considered in the case of an even split, taking peer review into consideration. The final review will be made available to both supervisors.

4A.2.02 Annual Performance Review Criteria

Written evaluation criteria for the annual performance review will be developed by continuing-eligible and continuing status process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion academic employees in the unit, together with the unit head, to document performance expectations for continuing-eligible and continuing status decisions. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and continuing status. Continuing status and promotion require excellence in performance over a period of years in all the duties and responsibilities assigned to the individual, and will
include evaluation by external peer reviewers, which is not a part of the annual review process. Criteria and decisions with regard to promotion and continuing status are detailed in Promotion and Continuing Status (Section 4A.3).

4A.2.02 Annual Performance Review Criteria for Continuing Status and Continuing Eligible Academic Professional Employees

Written evaluation criteria will be developed through participation of continuing status and continuing eligible academic professional employees within each department or other organizational unit, together with the. The criteria will differentiate between performance that "meets or exceeds expectations" or "does not meet expectations." In cases where the immediate administrative head, to express their determines performance "does not meet expectations. The recommended categories for evaluation are truly exceptional, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or "unsatisfactory." The stated expectations will differentiate between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance and criteria must be in accordance with the mission and goals of the department and or unit, the college or division, and These expectations must be approved by the college dean or division administrator and the Provost. Depending upon assigned responsibilities, criteria for annual reviews of performance may consider teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly growth, creative activity, each portion of the continuing status academic professional activity, and service and outreach employee's workload as described in their job description. Evaluation criteria may provide for recognition of long-term activities and outcomes. Concentration of effort in one or more of the duties and responsibilities of a continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee during a particular year is permissible, and may even be encouraged. Guidelines and evaluation procedures within departments will be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the department without undermining the uniformity of the whole system. When teaching effectiveness is evaluated, a systematic assessment of both student and peer opinion will constitute one component of the evaluation APR process described herein. Each annual review will include the past review year of the continuing status or continuing eligible academic professional employee's performance. The review period may include the past three to five years of performance, with substantial emphasis on the most recent year for evaluation of teaching. The time period will be determined by the unit.

-
4A.2.03 Appeals of Annual Performance Reviews for Continuing Status and Continuing-Eligible Academic Professional Employees

Continuing status and continuing-eligible academic professional employees who disagree with their annual performance reviews or the outcome of their performance review may appeal their review to the next administrative level, ordinarily the dean of the appropriate college. Such appeals must be made in writing to the next administrative level within 30 days from the date that the written performance review was received and must state with specificity: (a) the findings to be appealed; (b) the points of disagreement; (c) the facts in support of the appeal; and (d) the corrective action sought.

The administrator reviewing the appeal will consider the facts in support of the appeal and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The decision on the appeal will be completed in writing within 30 days, with copies provided to the continuing status or continuing-eligible academic professional employee and the immediate administrative head involved in the initial annual-performance review. The decision is final and not subject to further appeal.

4A.2.04 Unsatisfactory Review Ratings of Continuing-Eligible Academic Professional Employees

If a continuing status academic professional receives an overall rating of "unsatisfactory" in any area of responsibility, employees who receive an annual performance review rating of "unsatisfactory" in any single area of performance are required to enter one of two processes, either the Academic Professional Development Plan (APDP) or fails to complete the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), depending upon the extent of the deficiency or deficiencies.

1. The Faculty Development Plan

A continuing status academic professional who receives an annual performance review in a timely manner when provided rating of overall "meets or exceeds expectations" but with a rating of "unsatisfactory" in any single area of performance will enter into a APDP at the unit level, except as set forth in Section 4A.2.04.2 below.

   A. Objective and Process

   i. The objective of the APDP is to address an "unsatisfactory" rating in a single area of performance before it becomes sufficiently serious to
impair the continuing status academic professional employee’s overall performance.

ii. Corrective action outlined in the APDP can involve a plan to improve the performance and/or to redirect the continuing status academic professional employee’s work responsibilities to areas of particular strengths.

iii. The plan, developed at the unit level in collaboration with the continuing status academic professional employee, may have a maximum of one-year duration and will include appropriate notification, the employee’s interim monitoring and feedback. The plan should include the following components:

- Describe specific reasons for not meeting expectations;
- Provide a list of reasonable outcomes needed to meet expectations in the future;
- Describe the process to be followed to achieve outcomes;
- Provide the timeline for accomplishing the process, including at least annual or more frequent reviews;
- Describe benchmarks and expectations;
- Describe the criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the APDP;
- Address the resources needed to facilitate the APDP; and
- Describe any alteration in job responsibilities that may be necessary to implement the APDP.

B. Outcomes

i. Improvement to a level that “meets or exceeds expectations” in the “unsatisfactory” area within one year will make the continuing status academic professional employee eligible for consideration for any awards that become available during that year. If the immediate administrative head, in consultation with the peer review committee, may either develop a remediation plan for the continuing-eligible academic professional employee, which includes specific benchmarks to improve the continuing-eligible academic professional employee’s performance over determine in the next review evaluative period, or may initiate other actions in accordance with University policy, which could include termination if sufficient progress in the “unsatisfactory” area has not occurred in one year within the terms of the plan, an “unsatisfactory” rating will be assigned to the continuing status academic professional employee’s overall performance for that evaluative period and the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) process described below will apply.
If the continuing status 4A.2.05 Less Than Satisfactory Ratings of Continuing Status Academic Professional Employees

If an academic professional with continuing status receives a performance review rating of overall satisfactory, but with an unsatisfactory rating in any single area of performance (for example, teaching), the employee’s immediate administrative head, in consultation with the peer review committee, will develop a remediation plan. This plan will include benchmarks to improve the employee’s performance over the next review period or may redirect the employee’s work responsibilities to areas of particular strength.

ii. Academic professionals with academic professional employee refuses to participate in developing the APDP, an "unsatisfactory" rating will be assigned to their overall performance for that evaluative period and the PIP process described below will apply.

iii. The continuing status academic professional employee may appeal a finding that the employee failed to meet the requirements of the APDP. See Section 4A.2.03 above for appeal process and timeline.

2. The Performance Improvement Plan

A continuing status academic professional employee who receive overall ratings of overall "unsatisfactory" are required to enter directly into a Performance Improvement Plan. An overall unsatisfactory rating the PIP process. A PIP may result from (a) an overall rating of "unsatisfactory"; (b) two or more areas of performance rated as unsatisfactory; (b) one area of performance rated as unsatisfactory, depending on the emphasis assigned to that area or the extent of the deficiency; or "unsatisfactory"; (c) the continuing status academic professional employee’s failure to provide annual performance review information to the immediate administrative head and peer review committee by the established deadline, unless the administrator has extended the deadline for providing that information based upon good cause; or (d) the continuing status academic professional employee’s failure to achieve a satisfactory outcome in a APDP or failure to participate in the APDP.

A. Objective and Process for a Performance Improvement Plan

The objective of the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is to enable the continuing status academic professional employee to become resume their place as a fully contributing member of the employee's
The continuing status academic professional employee must take responsibility for meeting to develop the PIP and submitting any necessary materials in a timely manner, and for following the PIP once it is developed.

i. Within 30 days of receiving the annual performance review rating or the outcome of an appeal of that review, the continuing status academic professional employee and the immediate administrative head will develop the PIP in consultation with the peer review committee and with approval by the dean or division administrator.

ii. The PIP will specify its anticipated duration, and will be implemented as soon as possible after it has been developed but no later than the semester following the overall "unsatisfactory" annual performance review rating. For deficiencies "unsatisfactory" ratings in any area (teaching, service, or research), the PIP will generally be effective no longer than one year. In those rare circumstances where the nature of the deficiency issue cannot be fully remedied in one year, the PIP may extend beyond one year but in no event will a PIP exceed three years in duration. The Provost must approve any PIP that exceeds one year in duration. The PIP will generally:

- Describe specific deficiencies/reasons for not meeting expectations;
- Provide a list of reasonable outcomes needed to correct deficiencies/meet expectations in the future;
- Describe the process to be followed to achieve outcomes;
- Provide the timeline for accomplishing the process, including at least annual or more frequent reviews;
- Describe benchmarks and expectations;
- Describe the criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the PIP;
- Address the resources needed to facilitate the PIP; and
- Describe any alteration in job responsibilities that may be necessary to implement the PIP.

iii. The University college and unit will make reasonable efforts to provide appropriate resources to facilitate the PIP's implementation and success.

iv. The continuing status academic professional employee's performance within the context of the PIP will be evaluated as early as possible, but no later than one year after the PIP is put into effect. This special evaluation will be carried out by the immediate administrative head and the peer review committee in place at the time of the evaluation with the "unsatisfactory" rating, and must be
approved by the dean or division administrator.

B. Outcomes of the Performance Improvement Plan
The PIP concludes when any one of the following occurs:

i. The continuing status academic professional employee achieves overall satisfactory “meets or exceeds expectations” performance as required by the PIP and as documented by the special evaluation and approved by the dean or division administrator.

ii. The continuing status academic professional employee fails to demonstrate adequate progress relative to the PIP’s benchmarks and performance goals, which will constitute just cause for dismissal, and result in a recommendation for dismissal, in accordance with ABOR-PM 6-302(G) and (IG2).

iii. The continuing status academic professional employee fails to participate in developing the PIP process or fails to submit required materials when requested, which will lead to a recommendation for dismissal, in accordance with ABOR-PM 6-302(G) and (IG2).

4A.2.05 Audits and Reporting
In order to audit the annual performance review process, the dean of each college and an elected committee of continuing status academic professionals convened by the dean will review a sufficient number of continuing status cases each year to ensure that over a maximum of five years every file is reviewed.

Accordingly, every continuing status academic professional employee will have their annual reviews and curriculum vitae reviewed by this elected college-level peer review committee no less than once every five years. The college-level peer review committee will provide a brief write up of progress to the immediate administrative head who will meet in person with the continuing status academic professional employee to discuss feedback. For continuing status academic professionals at the associate rank, particular focus will be provided on feedback on their progress toward promotion.

This dean’s-level audit will determine the adequacy, fairness, and integrity of the process. If deemed appropriate as a result of the audit, the dean may refer files back to unit-level peer committees.

The Provost will review the annual review process and the dean’s-level audit outcomes, and from that review will report on the number of “meets or exceeds expectations” and “unsatisfactory” ratings of annual reviews, by unit, to the Faculty
Senate each year.