



Process and Considerations for Annual Reviews in SBS

The [webpage on annual reviews](#) on the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs site outlines the background on policy changes, provides formative approaches to annual reviews, and offers a list of FAQs.

The College guidelines for annual reviews mirror [UHAP 3.2.01](#) for 'Annual Performance Reviews of Faculty,' which was last revised in June 2022.

COLLEGE EXPECTATIONS

All units in SBS are expected to adopt and update sensible and fair procedures and standards for conducting reviews. These include:

- The adoption of sufficiently rigorous, clear, sensible, fair, equitable, and inclusive standards for satisfying the various ranking categories;
- The application of unit procedures and criteria that are fair 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

All tenure/tenure track, continuing status/continuing eligible, and Career Track faculty (Lecturers, Professors of Practice, Research Professors) in SBS should use the standardized Faculty Portfolio Annual Profile (formerly UAVitae) activity input process to report annual performance data.

FACULTY PORTFOLIO ANNUAL PROFILE – Faculty Activity to be Submitted

Faculty are expected to submit annual review materials in accordance with the content, format, and timing requested by the University of Arizona. *Given this requirement in UHAP Chapter 3.2 and [UHAP 4B.2](#), missing information in receives an 'unsatisfactory' score* (unless the Head/Director determines good cause exists for making an exception).

What is needed?

- Upload CV (depending on the unit, additional highlights or record of activities may be requested)¹
 - scholarship (or creative work) related activities (if germane, with dates), such as publications, conference papers, grants, and other applicable entries;
 - teaching activities with dates of when performed;
 - service-related activities, including ad hoc journal reviewing, outreach projects, committee memberships, etc.

¹ **DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT:** Unless prior permission is given, SBS defines one course as 10% effort, regardless of FTE or workload distribution.



- UAProfiles
 - Automated
 - Titles, phone, address, email
 - Courses and Student Course Surveys (SCS) (Faculty must review and confirm.)
 - Scholarly contributions
 - Manual entry
 - Degrees, Certificates, Licenses
 - Awards & Honors
 - Interests
 - Undergraduate research opportunities

RANKING CATEGORIES

All units in SBS should use the following UHAP categories for ratings.

<i>REVIEW COMMITTEE OPTIONS</i>	<i>HEAD/DIRECTOR REVIEW OPTIONS</i>	
• Meets or exceeds expectations	4	Truly Exceptional
	3	Meets/Exceeds Expectations
• Does not meet expectations	2	Needs Improvement
	1	Unsatisfactory

DEADLINES

The deadlines are established by the unit’s Head or Director. SBS has not established a college-wide deadline for these submissions. **Normally, SBS recommends the following:**

- **By the end of January:** faculty have entered activities.
- **In February,** peer reviewers review.
- **In March,** Heads/Directors review.

PEER EVALUATION COMPONENT OF REVIEWS

In all cases, peer evaluation ratings and comments are intended to be advisory to the unit Head or Director, who assigns a final score. Under UHAP, committee ratings and comments are shared with the faculty member under review.

Annual review evaluations inform, but do not determine merit raise decisions.



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. Faculty Portfolio Annual Profile advancements will enable simplified and more inclusive processes for those with shared appointments in future.

2. Renewal for Career 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 and Directors must complete the Faculty Portfolio Annual Profile for the areas of teaching, research, and non-administrative service (typically 40% of workload – 10% Teaching, 20% Research, 10% non-administrative service). These are evaluated by your unit's annual performance review committee, with results directly submitted to the Dean's office. In addition, all Heads and Directors complete the annual Administrative Assessment Report covering your activities as leaders in your units (typically the other 60% of the workload).

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Head or Director will provide formative written feedback to all entry-level faculty (Tenure-eligible, Continuing-eligible, or Career Track) focused on progress towards promotion.
2. In-person annual meetings as part of annual performance reviews are required
 - a. for all entry-rank faculty (Tenure-eligible, Continuing-eligible, or Career Track)
 - b. for any faculty member when the Head or Director rating in any category is "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory," or
 - c. when requested by the faculty member.

Otherwise, in-person meetings are not required.

3. Unit performance review criteria should indicate how works in progress are accounted for.

SBS UNITS – ANNUAL REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

Annual Performance Review criteria are created to express department / unit values and processes and should exist in every SBS unit. Their presence enables consistency in practice and ensures compliance with University of Arizona and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences policies and practices.



UHAP specifies that reviews consider performance over a three-to-five-year window; the length of the window should be determined at the unit level based on departmental culture and disciplinary norms.

In any revisions to the previous criteria for unit reviews, the following recommendations have been made. These recommendations and options were culled entirely from criteria and processes already in use by units throughout the College, and then aggregated.

The three pieces:

- (1) What counts as contributing to teachings, research/scholarly/creative activity, and service/outreach?
- (2) What measures are used to assess these activities?
- (3) How do these measurements track into the various ranking categories?

Other considerations:

- From the previous rating categories, what used to be 3 and 4 (meets and exceeds, respectively), are now in one grouping.
- Units are asked to consider adding or continuing to incorporate in the annual review, contributions around equity, representation, access, and inclusion in research, teaching and/or service/outreach/leadership.
- The default for entering the feedback into UAVitae will be one 'author' on behalf of the committee, yet (a) if the unit usually has multiple committee members enter comments, the college can set the system up that way, and (b) whoever enters the committee information – one person or multiple – will not be identified by name in the committee feedback section (no-name is the default).
- Selection processes for who serves on peer review committees may remain the same as before the shift in rating categories in UHAP, though elected (rather than appointed) participants are broadly preferred.

Formative approaches to annual reviews outlined on a [webpage](#) from the university's Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs:

- Best practices for unit-level faculty shared governance for annual reviews
- Suggestions for avoiding bias and providing formative comments for peer reviews
- Recommendations for holistic evaluation of teaching

About 'Unsatisfactory' Ratings (See [UHAP 4B.2](#))

- Career Track: Heads/Directors, in consultation with the peer review committee, can either put together a remediation plan (with objective, process, and outcome) or consider non-renewal.
- Tenure-eligible Tenured, Continuing Eligible, or Continuing Status: Need a Faculty Development Plan (if overall score is 'meets/exceeds' but have an 'unsatisfactory' in any one category) or a Performance Improvement Plan (if overall score is 'Unsatisfactory').



Appeals Process

When faculty members disagree with the review, [UHAP 3.2](#) provides the steps and timeline for the appeal and response.