

Academic Affairs Manual (ACD)

ACD 507–08: Annual Performance Evaluation of Academic Professionals

Effective: 2/21/1990

Revised: 7/1/2011

Purpose

To define annual performance evaluation for academic professionals

Sources

Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual - 6–301, 302

Office of the Provost of the University

Applicability

Academic professionals

Policy

All academic professionals shall have annual performance evaluations, which may also be used as the basis for merit increases. Performance evaluations should promote the effectiveness of academic professionals by articulating the actions that will enhance professional contributions, recognizing applications of relevant talents and capabilities, and identifying issues of position effectiveness that were below expectations and should be addressed during the next evaluation period. Each performance evaluation shall document that position effectiveness, professional contributions, and institutional, professional, and/or community service, in accordance with the academic professional's job description during the evaluation period, were considered. (See [ACD 202–02](#), "Academic Professional Responsibilities" for more information about position effectiveness, professional contributions, and service.)

Annual performance evaluations do not cumulate into continuing appointment or promotion decisions. Annual feedback on progress toward continuing appointment may occur at the same time and be based upon the same material as the annual performance evaluation, but probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the library's or academic unit's estimate of the candidate's future promise. Thus, the procedures and standards used in annual performance evaluations are different from those used in promotion and continuing appointment reviews. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective and summarize performance over the past evaluation period.

Even though annual performance evaluations differ significantly from probationary, continuing appointment, and promotion reviews, there are some common elements. Annual performance evaluations should be as similar as possible to the other reviews in terms of the categories of work that are evaluated, the definitions and scope of each of these kinds of work, and the types of evidence that academic professionals are expected to provide for the review.

Guidelines

1. Libraries or academic units must establish guidelines for conducting annual performance evaluations; these guidelines should include:
 - a. requirement for developing and annually updating academic professional job descriptions

- b. involvement of academic professionals in the formulation of objectives and goals related to their program areas and professional growth
 - c. identification of the period covered by the evaluation (should normally cover the previous 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year for probationary and continuing appointment academic professionals; should cover the previous one to three years for fixed-term academic professionals)
 - d. identification of performance criteria and standards for each academic professional job description
 - e. identification of the participants in the library's or academic unit's annual evaluation process, (e.g., library or academic unit administrator, immediate supervisor, peer review committee)
 - f. identification of material to be submitted by the candidate under review (e.g., curriculum vitae, goal statement for the evaluation period, activity report for the evaluation period)
 - g. compliance with university and ABOR policies.
2. The evaluations are to be completed and filed with the appropriate dean's/university librarian's office by April 30 each year.
3. The library or academic unit administrator will:
 - a. provide a written performance evaluation to the academic professional at least 24 hours before the meeting to discuss the evaluation
 - b. discuss the evaluation with the academic professional, set goals for the next evaluation period, and agree on modifications to the job description if necessary
 - c. revise the written evaluation or the job description, and/or write an amendment to the evaluation, as appropriate.
4. The library or academic unit administrator and the academic professional will both sign the evaluation document and any amendments, verifying that they have been received and discussed.

The library or academic unit may develop additional procedures for monitoring progress throughout the year, such as a six-month review, especially for new employees.

Nonrenewal

An academic professional on a fixed-term appointment may receive a notice of nonreappointment in accord with [ACD 503](#), "*Conditions of Professional Service*." An academic professional with continuing appointment may be dismissed for just cause or released for financial exigency or reorganization. See also [ACD 507-09](#), "Post-Continuing Appointment Review."

Appeals

The annual performance evaluation may be appealed to the next administrative level above the library or academic unit administrator. The request for the appeal must be made within 30 working days of the evaluation discussion. The administrator, to whom the appeal is made, must respond within 30 days after the request is received. The final decision lies with the administrator who conducts the appeal. The academic professional may ask that his or her written request for the appeal become part of the record of the performance evaluation.

Individuals may also file a grievance regarding their annual performance evaluation in accord with [ACD 509-03](#), "Grievance Policy for Academic Professionals."

Cross-References

1. [ACD 202–02](#), “Academic Professional Responsibilities.”
2. [ACD 503](#), “*Conditions of Professional Service*.”
3. [ACD 507–05](#), “Academic Professional Probationary Appointments.”
4. [ACD 507–06](#), “Continuing Appointment for Academic Professionals.”
5. [ACD 507–09](#), “Post-Continuing Appointment Review.”
6. [ACD 509–03](#), “Grievance Policy for Academic Professionals.”