

MEMORANDUM

TO: College of Humanities Heads and Directors

FROM: Kimberly Jones, Associate Dean

DATE: December 1, 2016

RE: **Annual Performance Review and Post-tenure Review CY 2016**

This memorandum and attached timeline can also be accessed on-line at <http://humanities.arizona.edu/annual-reviews>

I am writing to notify department heads and program directors that the annual performance review of all faculty should be initiated as soon as possible for Calendar Year 2016. This review should cover the performance of non-tenure-eligible, tenure-eligible, and tenured faculty. For tenured faculty, the review is part of the post-tenure review process. The APR/PTR process now uses the new UAVitae system.

I ask that you please keep the following points in mind as you conduct the APR/PTR process.

1. Please refer to the COH Common Elements Plan regarding the annual performance review of tenure-eligible faculty in your unit.
2. Our COH Procedures specify that performance reviews consider the past five calendar years' work in teaching, research and service (or time since initial appointment for faculty members appointed less than 5 years ago).
3. Every faculty member must be reviewed, including those who are on part-time status or on sabbatical. Departments should evaluate sabbatical work in terms of workload assignment (as a percentage of overall workload) for the year under review. In most cases, sabbatical work constitutes a 100% research assignment for the period during the leave, or some combination of research and service.
4. Reviews of faculty with split appointments are carried out in the primary department but should include input from the secondary department.



5. The *COH Criteria for Annual Performance Review and Post-tenure Review* (Section 3, Items 3.4 through 3.6) explains:

3.4. In some cases faculty members will have responsibilities that differ from the 40-40-20 norm, for example, when they are on sabbatical or leave, have significant administrative assignments, or make other arrangements with the department or program head. When faculty have such arrangements, the formula for arriving at an overall score will be adjusted accordingly.

3.5. Any negotiated variation from the 40/40/20 allocation should be noted and explained in the annual review of each faculty member.

3.6. The information specified in Items 3.4 and 3.5 will be made available to the college committee when conducting the dean's-level audit.

Finally, I call your attention to COH APR/PTR Procedures in Section 5, Items 5.1 through 5.3 quoted here:

5.1. All faculty members who are found to be performing overall at satisfactory levels in the annual performance review are eligible for salary increases and other rewards which may exist or be established at the departmental, college, or university levels. (UHAP 3.2)

5.2. Faculty who receive unsatisfactory ratings in two or more areas of responsibility in one performance review will automatically receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

5.3. Faculty who fail to provide the documentation necessary for the annual review will automatically receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

Thank you for your help with this important matter.

c: Alain-Philippe Durand, Dean

For additional information:

1. COH Common Elements Plan (July 1, 2003) <http://humanities.arizona.edu/annual-reviews>
2. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: Annual Performance Review and Post-tenure Review <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/annual-performance-review>
3. ABOR 6-201 <https://azregents.asu.edu/trc/Policy%20Manual/6-201-Conditions%20of%20Faculty%20Service.pdf>
4. UHAP 3.2 <http://policy.arizona.edu/university-handbook-appointed-personnel>