

Proposed changes to UHAP 5.2

Faculty Constitution Article V, Section 3 provides: *"The Committee of Eleven shall: a. Initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and to the University. b. Make reports to the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate. c. Speak for the General Faculty as and when authorized by the General Faculty."*

Over 3 years ago and responding to concerns brought by the General Faculty regarding the lack of annual review compliance and accountability for administrators (including Deans and Department Heads), the Committee of Eleven (C11) examined and considered revisions to the governing document for annual reviews of administrators (i.e., UHAP 5.2). After careful deliberations, C11 produced a set of changes/revisions to UHAP 5.2 that were subsequently presented in the Senate and to the Deans' Council by then-Chair of C11 Dr. Steven Schwartz. With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the planned revision to UHAP 5.2 was put on hold and never voted on in the Senate. In Academic Year 2021-2022, however, C11 picked up where C11 left off in 2019, finalized the suggested changes, and subsequently presented them to Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dr. Andrea Romero. We are now bringing them to the Senate floor for discussion with the intent of putting these to a Senate vote in the November Senate meeting.

I remain collegially yours

Dr. Wolfgang Fink
Chair of C11 on behalf of C11
Faculty Senator

1 Tracked proposed changes to the ORIGINAL version of UHAP 5.2 as it
2 currently stands:

3 [https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-](https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-administrative-personnel)
4 [administrative-personnel](https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-administrative-personnel)

5 This Section applies to annual performance reviews of administrative
6 personnel ~~including but not limited to Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate~~
7 ~~Deans, Vice Deans, Department Heads and Directors, and division-level and~~
8 ~~university-level administrators.~~

9 Administrators of the University are evaluated with respect to all personnel
10 matters on their leadership in developing collaborations and managing
11 resources to build capacity, improve performance, ~~foster a collegial, inclusive~~
12 ~~and supportive working environment,~~ and advance innovation. Annual
13 performance reviews are intended

14 1. To involve administrative personnel in the formulation of objectives and goals
15 related to their college, department, or program and their own professional
16 development;

17 2. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in each area of an
18 administrator's responsibility;

19 3. To promote an administrator's effectiveness by articulating the types of
20 contributions the administrator might make to the University community that
21 will lead to greater professional development, recognition and rewards;

22 4. To recognize and maximize administrators' special talents, capabilities and
23 achievements, including the achievements of those they supervise;

24 5. ~~To recognize efforts that ensure equal opportunity in hiring and retaining staff,~~
25 ~~faculty, and professionals, and in recruiting students;~~

26 6. ~~To advance innovations that better enable units to achieve their strategic goals;~~

27 7. ~~To identify weaknesses and other matters of concern that need to be addressed;~~
28 ~~and in cases where no change is seen in performance for at most two years in a~~
29 ~~row, to recommend to the direct supervisor appropriate action and/or change up~~
30 ~~to and including dismissal from the administrative position/role; and~~

31 8. ~~To provide written records to support the continuation or termination of the~~
32 ~~administrator.~~

Formatted: Numbering: Continuous

Deleted: all

Deleted:

Deleted: <#>To identify weaknesses that will be addressed during the next evaluation period;

Deleted: and

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Deleted: personnel decisions

39

40 5.2.01 Annual Performance Review Process

41 Each administrator's performance will be evaluated in writing on a scheduled
42 basis at least once every 12 months. The administrator's performance will be
43 evaluated with respect to the criteria set forth in Section 5.2.02.

44 Administrative personnel who also hold non-administrative (i.e., faculty or
45 other) positions will be evaluated on their non-administrative duties
46 according to the same conditions of service as others holding similar
47 positions in their unit.

48 The administrator's immediate supervisor will conduct the performance
49 review, which ~~shall~~ include peer review and input from those within the unit
50 whom the administrator directly or indirectly supervises. Such input may be
51 obtained by the use of a faculty or staff survey developed by the University
52 with additional items developed by an administrator's supervisor in
53 collaboration with the unit. Each performance review will be in writing and
54 contain, at a minimum, a discussion of the administrator's (a) past and
55 present performance with respect to assigned duties; (b) leadership
56 development; and (c) progress towards achieving the strategic goals of the
57 unit.

58 The following procedures are involved in the annual performance review of
59 administrative personnel:

- 60 1. The evaluation shall be initiated yearly on the anniversary of initial
61 appointment by the administrator's supervisor. The evaluation shall be
62 by a committee that is chaired by the supervisor or a delegate and shall
63 include faculty, staff, and senators from the administrator's unit. In the
64 case of Deans, a majority of the members of this committee shall be
65 elected by general faculty members of the College with the remaining
66 members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. In the case of
67 Department Heads and Directors, the members of this committee shall be
68 elected by general faculty members of the Department and will include
69 faculty governance representatives whenever possible.

Deleted: will

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: a majority of

Formatted: Not Highlight

72 2. Input from faculty and staff and other individuals ~~from within the~~
73 administrator's unit is gathered confidentially along with other
74 information on performance to provide benchmarks for the review.

Deleted: comprising

75 3. Using the performance expectations and benchmarks set out for the
76 evaluation period, the administrator will write a self-assessment,
77 reflecting on each of the criteria on which the administrator is to be
78 evaluated.

79 4. The administrator's supervisor and the review committee will prepare a
80 written assessment of the administrator's performance over the
81 evaluation period on the basis of those written criteria and benchmarks,
82 the administrator's self-assessment, and feedback from staff and faculty
83 (if there are faculty in the unit as well as staff). If the administrator has
84 assigned research, teaching, or other non-administrative duties, the
85 administrator's supervisor for these assignments will evaluate these
86 duties as well with input from the review committee for the unit.

87 5. The administrator's supervisor will provide the administrator with the
88 performance review and will meet with the administrator to discuss the
89 review and future expectations, typically by May 15, if possible.

90 6. The administrator may add a response to the written performance review
91 before the administrator signs the document and returns it to the
92 administrative supervisor. The signed performance review will become a
93 part of the administrator's individual personnel record.

Deleted: comments

94 7. The review committee or its subcommittee will prepare a non-confidential
95 executive summary of the review to be shared with the faculty and staff
96 supervised by the administrator under review.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

97 8. An annual report will be presented to the faculty senate listing the
98 reviews performed for each academic year.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing:
Multiple 1.38 li

Formatted: Font: (Default) Verdana, Font color: Dark Gray

100 5.2.02 Annual Performance Review Criteria

101 Administrators are assessed on their leadership in building trust, fostering
102 collaboration, managing resources, encouraging innovation, fostering a
103 collegial, inclusive and supportive work environment, and achieving results.
104 Written evaluation criteria will include consideration of administrators'
105 leadership skills, including their effectiveness in communicating and

108 responding to coworkers, forging partnerships and building consensus,
109 acquiring and managing resources, , and advancing innovations in research,
110 teaching, outreach, and other aspects of their unit’s mission. The unit’s
111 progress will be assessed using performance benchmarks developed in
112 collaboration with the administrator’s supervisor and the faculty, staff and
113 others in the unit. These benchmarks will be aligned with the University’s
114 strategic plan and may include but are not limited to the following:

- 115 • Participation, performance, and perception of faculty, staff, and other individuals
116 in the administrator's unit;
- 117 • Quantifiable measures of productivity of reporting staff. For example in the case
118 of Deans, the success of assistant, associate, and vice deans in advancing the
119 goals for which they are responsible. If this cannot be quantified in a positive
120 way, direct action shall be taken by the Dean to alter their administrative staff;
- 121 • Evidence of fulfillment of fair and rigorous reviews of faculty as required by
122 ABOR;
- 123 • Success of collaborations with internal and external partners;
- 124 • Business and community boards and outreach initiatives as appropriate to the
125 mission of the unit;
- 126 • Increases in donations, research revenues, technology transfer, and other types
127 of external funding;
- 128 • Management of resources within the unit;
- 129 • Efforts to recruit and retain diverse and outstanding faculty, staff, and students
130 as appropriate to the mission of the unit;
- 131 • Measures of teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes, where relevant;
- 132 • Increases in undergraduate and graduate student enrollments and retention,
133 including those from underserved backgrounds;
- 134 • Increases in online enrollments, where applicable;
- 135 • Improvements in time to degree and graduation rates where relevant;
- 136 • National and international recognition for research, scholarship, innovation,
137 entrepreneurship, and creative achievements that are relevant to the mission of
138 the unit;
- 139 • Clinical performance, where relevant;
- 140 • Performance on professional licensing examinations in units that train medical
141 residents; and
- 142 • Success in meeting accreditation requirements, as appropriate and relevant.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Highlight
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Deleted: <#>Input from faculty, staff, and other individuals in the administrator's unit;¶
<#>Feedback from
Deleted: <#>collaborators

147

148 5.2.03 Appeals of Annual Performance Reviews

149 Administrative personnel who disagree with their annual performance
150 reviews may appeal their review to the administrative head at the next level
151 within 30 days after receipt of the written annual performance review. The
152 appeal must state with specificity (a) the findings to be appealed; (b) the
153 points of disagreement; (c) the facts in support of the appeal; and (d) the
154 corrective action sought.

155 The administrator reviewing the appeal will consider the facts in support of
156 the appeal and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The decision
157 on an appeal will be completed in writing within 30 days, with copies
158 provided to the employee seeking the appeal and the employee's supervising
159 administrator.

160 If an administrator also holds a non-faculty appointment and disagrees with
161 the review related to that appointment, the administrator may appeal the
162 review to the next administrative level. If an administrator also holds a
163 faculty appointment of more than 25% of the administrator's total workload
164 assignment and disagrees with the review of the administrator's
165 performance as a faculty member, then the administrator may appeal the
166 review according to the same procedures provided for faculty in [Section](#)
167 [3.2.03](#).
168