

Document title: CONDUCT OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS IN SBS**UPDATED: Spring 2015****BACKGROUND**

Changes in UHAP Chapter 3 around annual performance reviews, introduced in AY 2014-2015, invite the opportunity to revisit unit review criteria in the area of ranking categories, committee composition, and other areas of evaluation. While department faculty should work together to create performance review criteria, the college has some basic expectations for all units in the college, as per the below.

COLLEGE EXPECTATIONS

All units in SBS are expected to adopt sensible and fair **procedures** and **standards** that are reasonably in line with other units' expectations for conducting reviews. These include:

- The adoption of sufficiently rigorous, clear, sensible, and fair standards for satisfying the various ranking categories
- The application of unit procedures and criteria fairly to individual faculty members
- Delivery of a set of evaluations that are reasonably spread across the various rating categories, given the level of performance of unit faculty

REPORTING INFORMATION

Minimally, all tenure and tenure track, and continuing status and continuing eligible faculty in SBS should use UAVitae to report annual performance data. Units may elect to permit faculty to submit a brief narrative providing context to activities should faculty wish to do so; such narrative could be provided either within or outside of UAVitae.

RANKING CATEGORIES

All units in SBS should use the following ABOR numbers and labels:

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 5 | Truly Exceptional |
| 4 | Exceeds Expectations |
| 3 | Meets Expectations |
| 2 | Needs Improvement |
| 1 | Unsatisfactory |

UHAP Chapter 3 requires specific action based on an "Unsatisfactory" rating in any one category, making adoption of the specific ABOR ranking language important. UHAP also specifies that reviews consider performance over a 3-5 year window; the length of the window should be determined at the unit level based on departmental culture and disciplinary norms.

DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT

Unless prior permission is given, SBS defines one course as 10% effort, regardless of FTE or workload distribution.

DEADLINES

The deadlines are established by the unit's head. SBS has not established a college-wide deadline for these submissions. Instead, we adhere to the UHAP guideline which states that the head's written evaluation should ideally be shared with the faculty member involved no later than the end of March. Please schedule departmental requirements in order to meet this deadline.

PEER EVALUATION COMPONENT OF REVIEWS

In all cases, peer evaluation scores and comments are intended to be advisory to the unit Head/Director, who assigns a final score. UHAP makes clear that committee scores and comments are confidential.

SPECIAL CASES

1. *Joint Appointments*

Normally, faculty who belong to more than one unit will be reviewed on those components of their effort that apply to each unit (please consult the relevant shared appointment form). This may require consultation between the relevant Heads and Directors, a separate report from the secondary unit, and/or ad hoc representation from the secondary unit on the primary unit's committee. UA Vitae advancements will enable simplified and more inclusive processes for those with shared appointments in future.

2. *Renewal for Nontenure-Track Faculty on Multi-Year Appointments*

The contract period (1-3 years) is stipulated at the time of appointment. For faculty in the final year of their appointment, the unit may request a renewal by submitting a request along with a summary statement of the annual review packets completed during the contract period. The College will utilize annual reviews as well as reference to the current budget situation to determine whether to renew the contract.

3. *Heads and Directors*

All unit Heads/Directors must complete UA Vitae for the areas of teaching, research, and non-administrative service (typically 50% of workload). These are evaluated by your unit's annual performance review committee, with results submitted directly to the Dean's office. In addition, all H/Ds complete the annual Administrative Assessment Report covering your activities as leaders in your units (typically the other half of the H/D workload).

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Unit performance review criteria should indicate how works in progress are accounted for.
- Unit leaders should provide faculty members both formative and summative feedback, including how faculty scores (both by area and cumulative) were derived. A separate assessment of progress toward P&T/CS&P, written by the Head/Director, should attend all annual performance evaluations for probationary faculty.