

**ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS
POLICY MANUAL**

6-211 Evaluation of Faculty

Revision Dates

5/1/1992, 4/6/1990, 12/3/1983 (adopted)

A. Faculty Performance Evaluation Philosophy

1. The Arizona Board of Regents recognizes the need for a faculty performance evaluation system that identifies, assesses, and enhances performance. It is essential that the evaluation process incorporate guidelines relevant to the achievement of the academic goals and objectives of teaching, advising, mentoring research and professional service while recognizing the unique nature and diversity of the universities. To this end, it is necessary that guidelines be established and evaluations conducted in a manner that is flexible enough to serve the particular mission, objectives, and needs of the respective universities, their colleges and departments.

2. It is further recognized that faculty evaluation should be a peer-participatory, cooperative and continuing process intended to assess and enhance the performance of academic personnel. Given the nature of the varied academic responsibilities and the specialization both between and within disciplines, the faculty evaluation process should provide for faculty participation in the preparation of evaluation guidelines and must necessarily presuppose a high degree of confidence in the faculty and their ability to objectively judge each other. Therefore, the evaluation process should be as localized as possible in order to adapt procedures to individual or departmental circumstances.

3. The faculty performance evaluation procedures should pursue the following objectives:
 - a. To involve faculty 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.

 - b. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, advising, mentoring, research, and professional/public service through a peer review process.

 - c. To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make to the

university community that will lead to greater personal and professional rewards.

- d. To provide a written record of faculty assignments (workloads) and performance to support such personnel decisions as retention, promotions, tenure, sabbatical leave, merit increases, transfers, reassignment, and reemployment.
- e. To recognize special talents, capabilities, and achievements of faculty members.

B. General Policy

It is the policy of the Arizona Board of Regents that faculty shall be evaluated on their performance in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Faculty shall have their performance, personal progress and future potential formally reviewed on a scheduled basis at least once every twelve months.
2. The summative assessment process shall include both peer review and assessment by the department administrator and/or other appropriate administrators.
3. Elements of the summative evaluation shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:
 - a. Written evaluation criteria will be developed through faculty participation in each department, college, or division, to express the performance expectations for faculty members therein. Evaluation criteria may provide for recognition of long-term faculty activities and outcomes.
 - b. Criteria for merit awards must consider teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly growth activity, and professional/public service, and efforts to assist in the achievement of departmental and/or university affirmative action goals and minority student recruitment and retention goals.
 - 1) In the case of teaching evaluation, measurement techniques should include some items that afford comparability among individuals and units.
 - 2) A systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one, but not the only, component of the evaluation.

-
- 3) Student advising and mentoring whether classified as teaching or service must also be considered.
 - 4) Efforts to improve minority student retention and graduation are significant parts of the advisement process.
 - 5) Performance criteria for tenure track positions shall be consistent with promotion and tenure criteria and expectations within an academic unit.
- c. Procedures and instruments for evaluation of faculty members on each criterion shall be developed by departments and colleges and approved by the university administration. Guidelines and evaluation procedures within departments shall be flexible without undermining the uniformity of the whole system.
 - d. The evaluation of the faculty member's yearly past performance and expectations for the future will be discussed with him/her. A written statement recording the sense of this discussion will be provided to the faculty member. The employee shall be given the opportunity to add his/her comments to the statement as part of the official record.
 - e. Each university shall establish a procedure by which a faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation may request that the performance evaluation be reviewed at the next administrative level.
4. Formative Evaluation (Opportunities for Improvement)

Opportunities for improvement in instruction should be made available to faculty members in accordance with policies developed at each institution.
 5. Accountability

The chief academic officer at each university is responsible for ensuring that this policy is implemented and carried out in cooperation with faculty governance.

Policy History

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 12/3/1983 | Approved by the Board on second reading. |
| 4/6/1990 | Policy revision approved by the Board on second reading. |

5/1/1992 Policy revision approved by the Board on second reading.

Related Information