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**I. INTRODUCTION**Faculty members of the Department of Philosophy of the University of Arizona are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of their performance. The annual performance review is intended to support faculty members in achieving excellence in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. The annual pre-tenure review, which takes place for all tenure-eligible faculty members except those in their third and sixth years, assesses the extent to which the candidates are making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

The function of the continuing review is both formative and summative: it involves faculty in the design of their own performance expectations within the context of the department's mission, and it provides a peer review process to evaluate the success of each year's work. More specifically, this formal review is intended:

* To involve faculty members in the design and evaluation of objectives and goals of their academic programs and in the identification of the performance expectations central to their own personal and professional growth;
* To assess actual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and professional service through the use of peer review;
* To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions their peers feel they might make that enhance the Department, the Profession, and the University;
* To provide a written record of faculty performance to support Departmental decisions;
* To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities, and achievements of faculty members; and
* To assist faculty members in improving their contributions in any areas where performance is considered by their peers to be below expectations.

The purpose of this document is to specify the processes, criteria, and measures used in the Department of Philosophy to achieve the goals of the annual performance review and the annual pre-tenure review, and to clarify the relationship of these reviews to the tenure processes which apply to tenure-eligible faculty and the post-tenure processes which apply to tenured faculty.

It is intended that this document be consistent with the preservation of academic freedom. Therefore, all procedures shall be implemented in such a manner as to preserve the following fundamental principles.

* Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties.
* Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject and in their methods of teaching.
* College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline.
* The application of post-tenure continuing review procedures shall not intrude on an individual faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction, nor shall it be used as a device for effecting programmatic change.
* The continuing reviews are separate from the pre-tenure reviews and bear no relationship to determinations of tenure.

**II. PROCESS**

**A. Period of Review**
Each faculty member shall complete an annual report by 1 April. The Peer Review Committee will submit its reports to the Department Head by 1 May. The Department Head shall produce an evaluation of each faculty member and annual pre-tenure reports as required by 1 June. The Head shall provide each faculty member an opportunity to discuss the reviews with him by 1 July.

**B. Performance Ratings**

    1. Pre-Tenure Review
Tenure-eligible faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Philosophy Department Policy Concerning Promotion to Tenure.
    2. Annual Review
Faculty shall be rated in each of the three primary areas of responsibility (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service) according to a five-level scale whose values are mandated by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR). An overall rating shall also be given according to the same scale.

|  |
| --- |
| **ABOR Scale** |
| **Score** | **Assessment Category** |
| 5 | Truly Exceptional |
| 4 | Exceeds Expectations |
| 3 | Meets Expectations |
| 2 | Needs Improvement |
| 1 | Unsatisfactory |

Tenured faculty who "meet expectations" overall but deficient in any one area must renegotiate work responsibilities to maximize their strengths within the limits of the Department mission and resources or enter a faculty development plan.

**C. Workload Assignments**
Each faculty member may negotiate with the Department Head the percentages of his or her work load that will be devoted to research, teaching, and service. In case special negotiations are not undertaken, the default value of 50 percent for research, 40 percent for teaching and 10 percent for service will be operative. The default values for the Department Head will be 20 percent for research, 10 percent for teaching, and 70 percent for service.

Workload assignments for individual faculty are flexible. It is expected that those assignments will vary as careers progress, in accordance with the strengths of each faculty member and the changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

Periods of time spent on leave without pay or full-time administrative assignments are separately evaluated.

**D. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head**
By the vote of the Department adopting these procedures and in accordance with the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel,* the faculty delegates to the Department Head the authority to appoint a Peer Review Committee consisting of three tenured members of the faculty. The Head will take care to ensure that membership on the Peer Review Committee rotates through the tenured faculty and that the members of the Committee represent the diverse interests of the Department insofar as that is possible.

The Head and Peer Review Committee will make reasonable efforts to advise faculty members whose overall performance is slipping in a manner that, if uncorrected, could lead to a rating of "Needs Improvement," either overall or in an individual area, and to acquaint such faculty members with the resources available to help improve their performances.

The function of the peer review committee is to conduct the annual pre-tenure and peer reviews of the performance of each faculty member during the previous year in light of the faculty member's report and the evaluation criteria here adopted. The continuing review will produce evaluations in the categories of research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

Members of the Peer Review Committee will not participate in their own evaluations. Instead, they will be evaluated by the other two members and the Department Head.

The continuing review single-year overall evaluation will be computed as the average of the single-year evaluations in research and scholarship, teaching, and service, weighted in accordance with the work-load percentages previously negotiated with the Department Head. The single-year evaluations for the previous calendar year will be averaged with the four prior single-year evaluations (or as many years as is possible for faculty members who have not been at the University of Arizona for five years). The resulting five-year averages will constitute the Peer Review Committee's overall annual evaluation and its separate annual evaluations of research and scholarship, teaching, and service, with the following two exceptions: Special attention will be paid to the evaluation of teaching for the last two years, and if teaching has been particularly unsatisfactory, the annual teaching evaluation may be lowered to "Needs Improvement" solely on that basis.

The Department Head will produce an evaluation of each faculty member and pre-tenure reviews as required, based largely on the recommendations of the Peer Review Committee. The Department Head will communicate the results of the reviews to each faculty member, and if the results differ from those recommended by the Committee, that fact and the reasons for the difference will be communicated. To ensure that the annual continuing evaluation and pre-tenure review retain a primarily supportive role, all parts of the evaluations shall be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

The department head and faculty member may meet to discuss the Head's written evaluations, and to agree upon goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review. Goals, assignments, and expectations shall be at the discretion of the faculty member to the extent possible consonant with the missions and goals of the Department. The faculty member provides comments as desired and returns the evaluation to the Department Head within 15 days of this meeting.

**E. Appeals**
Any significant disagreements between the faculty member and the Department Head about either the evaluations or the work assignment shall be mediated by the Peer Review Committee. If this mediation process fails, each faculty member has the right to appeal his or her work assignment or evaluations to an Appeals Committee consisting of all full professors in the department, with the appeal to be decided by a majority of the Committee—except in the case of an evaluation of "Needs Improvement," in which case the evaluation must be confirmed by a two-thirds majority. In the event that proceedings for dismissal against a faculty member are being seriously contemplated, the Appeals Committee may also, although only at the request of the faculty member, consider the question whether the performance of the faculty member is so egregiously unsatisfactory as to warrant serious consideration of dismissal.

All appeals are to be decided by secret ballot in the absence of the faculty member whose evaluation is in question. Accurate minutes shall be kept of the proceedings of any meeting of the Appeals Committee.

**III. CRITERIA AND MEASURES FOR THE CONTINUING REVIEW**

The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position.

**A. Teaching**
Teaching is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense consistent with the educational mission of the University.

Activities considered to be positive contributions to this mission may include, but are not limited to:

* teaching regular course offerings
* developing course materials
* coordinating or team-teaching a multidisciplinary course
* supervising independent study courses reading groups
* supervising graduate and undergraduate research (including, but not limited to, senior projects, theses, and dissertations)
* implementing innovative technology or methodology for instruction
* developing and applying educational innovations in the classroom
* providing meaningful and timely feedback to students on their work
* advising undergraduate students on programs of study
* advising student groups, serving on master's or doctoral committees
* advising/mentoring graduate students
* advising about career planning, and helping students to improve communication and presentation skills
* writing textbooks or laboratory manuals
* reviewing textbooks written by others
* developing instructional projects
* publishing papers on teaching
* attending or presenting seminars on teaching
* seeking external evaluation for improvement of teaching

Assessment of the quantity and quality of these activities will be based on, but not limited to:

* student evaluations as reported in Teacher-Course Evaluations (TCE reports)
* self description of teaching activities
* peer review of material presented in the annual report and/or an associated teaching portfolio
* special honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation

Faculty members may, under various circumstances, have reduced teaching loads. For example, they may be on leave. The reduced quantity of teaching shall not have an adverse impact on the teaching evaluation.

The ratings shall ordinarily be assigned according to the following criteria:

* Truly Exceptional. Determinants of an outstanding contribution to teaching may include either outstanding classroom performance (as evidenced by evaluations or awards) or superior classroom performance accompanied by unusual service beyond the classroom. Examples of the latter include but are not limited to a disproportionate amount of supervision of student projects, preliminary examinations, starred papers, and graduate dissertations; disproportionately high undergraduate enrollments; the leading of reading groups and other educational endeavors beyond official teaching loads; imaginative contributions to curriculum development; and exceptionally high attention to individual student needs.
* Exceeds Expectations. Determinants of exceeding teaching expectations may include any of the following: superior classroom performance; a major amount of supervision of student projects; graduate dissertations, and the like; disproportionally high undergraduate enrollments; the leading of reading groups; introduction of valuable new courses; substantial numbers of new course preparations, especially when those involve courses outside one’s own disciplinary specialty; or substantial attention given to individual student needs.
* Meets Expectations. An evaluation of “meets expectations” reflects good teaching, significant work to discharge teaching assignments, and proper concern that students are progressing. A faculty member can need improvement in one of these areas and still meet expectations overall.
* Needs Improvement. An evaluation of “needs improvement” reflects below-average performance in the classroom (as evidenced by student evaluations or peer evaluations) and a lack of robust involvement in graduate and undergraduate education outside the classroom.
* Unsatisfactory. Faculty members who miss classes frequently without good reason, neglect or abuse students, teach poorly (as evidenced by student evaluations or peer evaluations), or otherwise fail to discharge their plain duties will be evaluated as needing improvement.

**B. Research and Scholarly Activity**
Research and scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the research mission of the University.

Activities considered to be positive contributions to this mission may include, but are not limited to:

* the publication of books, book chapters, journal articles, peer-reviewed conference papers, monographs, abstracts, and reviews (acceptance for publication of a book at a leading press will be credited for at least one and as many as three successive calendar years)
* presenting invited talks at departmental colloquia, conferences, workshops, seminars or poster sessions
* editing books or journals
* obtaining grants and contracts or other outside support for projects
* producing papers and manuscripts for submission
* production of other non-refereed publications, including electronic media
* reviewing book manuscripts for publishers
* refereeing journal articles

Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

* self description of research and scholarly activity
* citations
* awards and honors
* professional certifications

The ratings shall ordinarily be assigned according to the following criteria:

* Truly Exceptional. Grounds for “truly exceptional” typically will include publishing more than two significant papers while being robustly engaged in other scholarly activity. The publication of a book at a leading press will merit a score of truly exceptional for one year and may merit such a score for two or, in exceptional cases, three successive calendar years (in such cases, the faculty member can decide which year or years, before or after the book’s publication year, the book is to be credited). In addition, in unusual cases, fewer than three especially important articles in elite journals (even one such article) may merit a score of truly exceptional.
* Exceeds Expectation. Grounds for “exceeds expectations” typically will include publishing two significant papers while being robustly engaged in other significant scholarly activity. A single important article in an elite journal may merit a score of exceeds expectations.
* Meets Expectations. Grounds for “meets expectations” typically will include publishing one paper and engagement in other significant scholarly activity.
* Needs Improvement. Grounds for “needs improvement” typically will include publishing one paper without other scholarly activity, or scholarly activity but no publications.
* Unsatisfactory. An evaluation of “unsatisfactory” will be assigned to those who present no clear evidence of involvement in research or scholarly activity.

It is recognized that faculty members sometimes work on various projects over a period of several years and finish them all at once, and also that some papers do not appear in print for several years after their acceptance. To avoid these contingencies resulting in a penalty, faculty members are entitled to claim credit for a publication in any year after its official acceptance (whether that year is prior to or after its official publication date). If a faculty member wishes to claim credit for a publication in a year different from its official publication date, s/he must notify the Peer Review Committee and submit evidence of official acceptance. Each publication may be credited only once.

**C. Service**
Service is often partitioned into areas of faculty service (participation in university activities other than teaching or research), professional service (voluntary activities with professional organizations in the faculty member's discipline), and public or community service.

Activities considered to be positive contributions to the service function may include, but are not limited to:

* serving on department, college, and/or university committees
* chairing any committee
* serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
* serving as a sponsor for student activities or groups
* administrative assignments
* mentoring other faculty
* recruiting students
* recruiting faculty
* activity in professional organizations
* consulting to other universities, colleges, or primary or secondary schools
* developing external relations with government entities
* serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies
* participating in local, state, or national civic activities and organizations
* applying one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community
* reviewing book manuscripts for publishers
* refereeing journal articles

Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

* peer review of material presented in the annual report
* self evaluation
* opinions of faculty and staff colleagues
* opinions of university leaders, committee members, or chairs
* awards and honors
* letters or certificates of public service

The ratings shall ordinarily be assigned according to the following criteria:

* Truly Exceptional. Those who accept and discharge extraordinary responsibilities and give evidence of major involvement in services to the Department, University, community, or wider profession will receive an evaluation of truly exceptional.
* Exceeds Expectations. Those who accept and discharge significant responsibilities and give evidence of broad involvement in services to the Department, University, community, or wider profession will receive an evaluation of “exceeds expectations.”
* Meets Expectations. Those who willingly accept and competently accomplish committee assignments will receive an evaluation of “meets expectations.”
* Needs Improvement. Those whose assigned committee work is incomplete or routinely late, and whose record shows no significant service beyond assigned committee work, will receive an evaluation of “needs improvement.”
* Unsatisfactory. Those whose record shows no involvement in service activities or who have repeatedly botched assignments by failing to keep major appointments, shirking assigned work, missing deadlines, and the like will receive an evaluation of “unsatisfactory.”

**IV. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes**
Tenure-eligible faculty are also required to participate in the established promotion and tenure processes. The annual pre-tenure reviews are taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but satisfactory ratings in the annual pre-tenure reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure and are not sufficient for obtaining promotion or tenure. The dismissal of untenured faculty members cannot be recommended under the procedures for continuing review or annual pre-tenure review, but must be in accordance with the established promotion and tenure processes.

The annual review is *not* a re-tenuring process; it is simply an opportunity to assess progress toward the goals outlined in Article I of this document. Those tenured faculty who receive a rating of Needs Improvement in any of the three individual areas, or an overall rating of Needs Improvement, however, are required to participate in the post-tenure processes described in 3.10.04 of the UA’s University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. Any formal development or improvement plan shall not be imposed on any faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation. It should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. The standard here should be that of good faith on both sides—a commitment to improvement by the faculty member and to the adequate support of that improvement by the institution—rather than the literal fulfillment of a set of non-negotiable demands or rigid expectations, quantitative or otherwise.

Failure to successfully complete a faculty development plan adopted after a rating of Needs Improvement in an individual area may result in an overall rating of Needs Improvement within one year with the consequent requirement that a performance improvement plan be adopted. In the event that recurring evaluations pursuant to such a plan reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable separation settlement or reassignment to other duties, should be explored. If these are not practicable, or if no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then there shall be peer consideration of whether the problems warrant proceedings toward dismissal or imposition of another severe sanction. Failure to successfully complete a performance improvement plan adopted after an overall rating of Needs Improvement may therefore lead to the institution of proceedings for dismissal, but it shall not be used to shift the burden of proof from the University (to show cause why a tenured faculty member should be dismissed) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained).

The standard for dismissal or severe sanction remains that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the University to show such cause for dismissal in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted hearing body of peers convened for that purpose. Evaluation records may be admissible but rebuttable as to accuracy. Even if they are accurate, the administration is still required to bear the burden of proof and demonstrate through an adversarial proceeding not only that the negative evaluations rest on fact, but also that the facts rise to the level of adequate cause for dismissal. Since adequate cause for dismissal requires a showing of demonstrated incompetence or dishonesty in professional activities or substantial neglect of properly assigned duties, even a finding that a faculty member has not improved to a satisfactory level of performance as defined in this document after a performance improvement plan will not be enough to justify dismissal. The faculty member must be afforded the full procedural safeguards set forth in the American Association of University Professors' 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings* and the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, which include, among others, the opportunity to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.

The annual pre-tenure review is not a part of the definitive final evaluation for tenure. It does not involve external evaluations, and the Peer Review Committee may have no special competence in the relevant area of study. The pre-tenure review is simply an assessment of the extent to which candidates for tenure are producing research, teaching, and participating in service at levels that are likely to result in satisfactory progress toward tenure. Satisfactory ratings do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure.

**V. Expectations for the Next Review Year**
Criteria for annual performance must consider teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and service. The evaluation criteria are intended to provide for recognition of long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration of effort in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities during a particular year is permissible, and may even be encouraged. These guidelines are designed to be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the department, without undermining the objectives of the college or University. It is important that each faculty member have goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review, as agreed to according to the process specified in Article II, and that these agreements be documented in writing.