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

https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-administrative-personnel

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

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

1. To involve administrative personnel in the formulation of objectives and goals related to their college, department, or program and their own professional development;
2. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in each area of an administrator’s responsibility;
3. To promote an administrator’s effectiveness by articulating the types of contributions the administrator might make to the University community that will lead to greater professional development, recognition and rewards;
4. To recognize and maximize administrators' special talents, capabilities and achievements, including the achievements of those they supervise;
5. To recognize efforts that ensure equal opportunity in hiring and retaining staff, faculty, and professionals, and in recruiting students;
6. To advance innovations that better enable units to achieve their strategic goals;
7. To identify weaknesses and other matters of concern that need to be addressed; and in cases where no change is seen in performance for at most two years in a row, to recommend to the direct supervisor appropriate action and/or change up to and including dismissal from the administrative position/role; and
8. To provide written records to support the termination or livelihood of the administrator.
5.2.01 Annual Performance Review Process

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

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

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

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

1. The evaluation shall be initiated yearly on the anniversary of initial appointment by the administrator's supervisor. The evaluation shall be by a committee that is chaired by the supervisor or a delegate and shall include faculty, staff, and senators from the administrator's unit. In the case of Deans, a majority of the members of this committee shall be elected by general faculty members of the College with the remaining members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. In the case of Department Heads and Directors, the members of this committee shall be elected by general faculty members of the Department and will include faculty governance representatives whenever possible.
2. Input from faculty and staff and other individuals from within the administrator's unit is gathered confidentially along with other information on performance to provide benchmarks for the review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.2.02 Annual Performance Review Criteria

Administrators are assessed on their leadership in building trust, fostering collaboration, managing resources, encouraging innovation, fostering a collegial, inclusive and supportive work environment, and achieving results. Written evaluation criteria will include consideration of administrators’ leadership skills, including their effectiveness in communicating and
responding to coworkers, forging partnerships and building consensus, acquiring and managing resources, and advancing innovations in research, teaching, outreach, and other aspects of their unit's mission. The unit's progress will be assessed using performance benchmarks developed in collaboration with the administrator's supervisor and the faculty, staff and others in the unit. These benchmarks will be aligned with the University's strategic plan and may include but are not limited to the following:

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

Administrative personnel who disagree with their annual performance reviews may appeal their review to the administrative head at the next level within 30 days after receipt of the written annual performance review. The appeal 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 an appeal will be completed in writing within 30 days, with copies provided to the employee seeking the appeal and the employee's supervising administrator.

If an administrator also holds a non-faculty appointment and disagrees with the review related to that appointment, the administrator may appeal the review to the next administrative level. If an administrator also holds a faculty appointment of more than 25% of the administrator's total workload assignment and disagrees with the review of the administrator's performance as a faculty member, then the administrator may appeal the review according to the same procedures provided for faculty in Section 3.2.03.