ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science

Introduction

Faculty members of the University of Arizona are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of their performance. The annual performance review is intended to support faculty members in achieving excellence in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. The review provides a basis for the assessment and enhancement of faculty performance as well as accountability to the people of Arizona.

The function of the review is both formative and summative: it involves faculty in the design of their own performance expectations within the context of the department’s mission, and it provides a peer and administrative review process to evaluate the success of each year’s work. More specifically, this formal review is intended:

- To involve faculty members 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;
- To assess actual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and professional service through the use of peer and administrative review;
- To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make that enhance the University;
- To provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions;
- To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities and achievements of faculty members; and
- To assist faculty members in improving their contributions in any areas where performance is considered by their peers or the department head to be below expectations.

The purpose of this document is to specify the processes, criteria, and measures used in the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science to achieve the goals of the annual performance review, and to clarify the relationship of this review to the tenure processes which apply to tenure-eligible faculty and the post-tenure processes which apply to tenured faculty.

It is intended that this document be consistent with applicable portions of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy Manual and the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP). In case of conflict, the provisions of UHAP and of ABOR shall prevail.
PROCESS

A. Period of Review

By January 31st of each year, faculty members will submit an annual performance review report/dossier to the department head that covers the most recently completed calendar year. The report shall describe contributions of the faculty member to the academic mission of the department during the previous (or period of service if less than one year) in each of the three recognized areas of faculty effort: teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service. The report should reflect the faculty member’s individual objectives which were approved by the department chair. This report shall serve as the primary source of information for review by the peer committee and department head.

The department chair will maintain and review prior annual performance review reports for the past 2 years. Once the peer review committee completes the annual performance review, the department chair will compare current assessment with the assessment of the two previous years. If there are issues of continuing below expectation or declining performance, the department chair may ask the peer review committee to review annual reports from the most recent 3 years and request that the committee provide an overall assessment. Particularly with scholarship activities, there may be times in which publications or grants concentrate in one year, and in these cases an overall (3 year) assessment may be substituted for the annual review. This extended review period should be used only if the annual review rating result is “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory”.

B. Performance Rating

Faculty shall be rated of the three primary areas of responsibility (teach, research/scholarly activity, and service) according to a five level-scale. The performance categories include: truly exceptional (5), exceeds expectations (4), meets expectations (3), needs improvement (2), and unsatisfactory (1). In determining the performance category, the evaluator(s) need to consider the quantity accomplishments relative to the designated percent effort. A faculty member with 40% effort in teaching, for example, should be expected to teach more than a faculty member with 20% effort in teaching. Not all classes and teaching activities are equivalent and differences in the amount of work relative to actual student contact time should also be considered. Lastly, quality of word needs to be included in the categorical assessment. Using the teaching example, student evaluations of teaching and peer evaluations of teaching, awards received, innovations, and other recognitions may be considered.

C. Workload Assignments

Each faculty member must have an explicit expected percentage distribution of effort for each calendar year in teach, research/scholarly activity, and service. This distribution of effort is the result of discussions between the department head and the faculty member. It is expected that the workload assignment will be consistent with meeting the mission of the Department and complies with the agreed upon minimum percentage effort in each of the three areas. This will
be an essential part of the annual evaluation process. Examples of two percent effort designations are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure/Tenure-eligible</th>
<th>Teaching/Advising</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service/Outreach</th>
<th>Clinical Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Clinical Practice</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure-eligible</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the minimum percent effort in teaching, scholarship, and service is 10%. In cases where an individual is on sabbatical leave, leave without pay, or administrative assignments, the total FTE will be reduced accordingly. For example, if a faculty member is on leave without pay for 6 months, the total percent effort would only be 50% rather than 100%. Clinical service is typically provided at a separate site and should be evaluated by a manager at that site. The clinical practice evaluation will be provided to the department chair but will remain separate from the faculty evaluation. Given the example of the non-tenure-eligible faculty member above, the performance evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service would be based on 0.5 FTE effort, while the tenure-track faculty member would be based on 1 FTE. Clinical service contracts may vary, and the department chair will need to decide how to incorporate the clinical service evaluation into the overall evaluation on an individual basis.

Individual workload assignments need to be consistent with the mission of the department. It is expected that these assignments will vary as careers progress and in accordance with the strengths of each faculty member. Any changes to the workload assignment may be negotiated with the department head, and the changes would apply to subsequent years.

D. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head
The peer committee will consist of four faculty members for two year terms from and by Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science faculty for whom at least 50% of their salary is paid by the University. The composition of the committee will be determined by the Department Head in order to ensure that committee membership is as reflective as possible of the composition of faculty within the department. All eligible faculty are expected to eventually serve on this committee.

The functions of the peer review committee are to maintain this document, as approved by the faculty, and to conduct the annual peer reviews of all faculty as required by University regulations. A summary of the peer evaluation for each faculty member is transmitted directly to the department head.

The department head and peer review committee will share responsibility for the review process. The committee will review each faculty member’s report independent of the department head.
The committee’s evaluations will then be forwarded to the department head as stipulated in the UA online evaluation system, but no later than March 1st. The department head will concur or not concur with each of the evaluations. The department head will make the final determination of evaluation categories; however, if the category differs by more than one level, the Committee and department head shall meet to discuss a resolution. When no resolution at this level is attained, the case is referred to the dean for final determination. The final evaluation incorporating the peer review and department head assessment will be provided to the faculty member in writing by the department chair. University policy allows the faculty member to request to review determinations of the peer review committee.

The department head and faculty member meet no later than March 31st to discuss the head's written evaluation, and to agree upon goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review. The faculty member provides comments as desired, signs the document, and returns it to the department head within 15 days of this meeting. The peer committee shall mediate any significant disagreements between the faculty member and the department head about either the evaluation or the work assignment. If this mediation process fails, an appeal may be made to the dean.

The deliberations and evaluations (e.g., numeric ratings) by the peer review committee are confidential – any discussion of the deliberations or evaluations with non-committee members may result in disciplinary action. All written records should be given to the department head or designee (administrative coordinator) for destruction. Similarly, all electronic records should be purged after the committee’s findings have been given to the department head.

E. Overall rating
An overall performance level will be calculated by summing the performance rating for each of the three areas weighted by respective percentage effort. [For example, review of Professor X’s report leads to an assessment of a 4 in teaching, a 3 in research/scholarly activity, and a 2 in service. If each of the areas is given equal weight, the overall performance rating would be 3. However, if Professor X’s distribution of effort is 40% teaching, 40% research/scholarly activity, and 20% service, the weighted overall performance rating would be 3.2.]

The overall performance rating may be used to determine eligibility for salary increases and other incentives as indicated in the table below:
Performance Rating | Faculty Development: Improvement Action* | Compensation Action
--- | --- | ---
**Overall Satisfactory** | Truly exceptional (5)  Exceeds expectations (4)  Meets expectations (3) | Departmental and UA support for growth and development | Eligible for available salary increases
| Needs Improvement (2) | Departmental and UA support for remedial improvement of performance* | May be eligible for certain salary increases
**Overall Unsatisfactory** | Unsatisfactory (1) | Mandated performance improvement plan | No salary increase unless require by State law

*Faculty are “unsatisfactory” in one or more areas (i.e., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service) must enter a faculty development plan.

The overall evaluation by the peer review committee will provide assessment of University activities including teach, scholarship and service. The department chair will need to incorporate any external evaluation of clinical services if applicable.

### F. Timeline

- **By January 31:** Faculty submit review material
- **February 1 – March 1:** Peer and unit head reviews are conducted
- **March 1 – March 31:** Unit heads meet with individual faculty to discuss evaluation and review goals and percent effort distribution
- **April – September 15:** For faculty who do not at least meet expectations, a second meeting will be scheduled to discuss changes, mentoring, and/or goal revisions that will set the path to meeting

### OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

#### A. General Expectations

Given the high quality of the Department and its faculty, and the very stringent standards applied to the hiring and promotion processes, it is expected that ratings of unsatisfactory in any of the three areas will be very rare and that an overall unsatisfactory rating will be even more unlikely. A small fraction of the faculty may be identified from time to time as needing improvement, and it is expected that faculty development support from the department and university, as well as mentoring by other faculty, will assist those individuals in quickly regaining the expected levels of productivity. While some faculty will from time to time receive a rating of truly exceptional in one of the three areas, an overall rating of truly exceptional will be rare. Thus, it is anticipated that the vast majority of the faculty of the department will meet or exceed expectations in the individual areas as well as overall.

#### B. Rewards
Faculty with overall ratings in the top three categories will be eligible for available salary increases as well as for support for growth and development and other rewards that may be made available. This applies to non-tenure-eligible, tenure-eligible, and tenured faculty.

Those faculty with an overall rating in the fourth category will be eligible for Departmental and University support for remedial improvement of performance and may be eligible for certain salary increases (e.g. cost-of-living raises). Those faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will not be eligible for any salary increases unless required by State law but may receive departmental and university support for improvement of performance.

C. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes

Tenure-eligible faculty are also required to participate in the tenure processes described in UHAP policy. The annual performance reviews are taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative of promotion and tenure outcomes. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress toward promotion and tenure requires substantial accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, which is not a part of the annual review process. Criteria and decisions with regard to promotion and tenure are detailed in UHAP policy.

Annual performance reviews of all probationary faculty will include a component discussing the candidate’s progress toward P&T/CS. This component will include peer review of the candidate’s “Progress to Tenure Dossier” and candidate’s statement of accomplishments on research, teaching, and service/outreach (3-5 pages). The appointed department faculty status committee conducts the peer review on progress toward tenure and an elected department peer review committee conducts the annual performance review based on the annual performance review document. Participation in the annual P&T/CS component is limited to those faculty holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate. The faculty status committee will use the department’s P&T/CS guidelines to describe and assess the candidate’s progress in a report to the department head. The department head provides a written progress report to the candidate in conjunction with the annual evaluation. Each year, the department head will submit the P&T/CS section of annual reviews to the dean and college faculty status committee for any probationary faculty whose progress toward P&T/CS is not satisfactory. For candidates whose progress in any area is not satisfactory, a written plan must be developed by the candidate in consultation with the department head within 120 days of the annual performance review with guidelines for improvement and for integration into subsequent annual reviews until the plan is completed. This plan must be submitted with the results of the progress toward P&T/CS.

For tenured faculty, the annual review is NOT intended to be a re-tenuring process; it is simply an opportunity to assess progress toward the goals outlined in this document. Those tenured faculty who receive a rating of unsatisfactory in any of the three individual areas, or an
overall rating of unsatisfactory, however, are required to participate in the post-tenure processes described in UHAP policy.

D. Expectations for the Next Review Year

Criteria for annual performance must consider teaching effectiveness, research/scholarly activity, and service. The evaluation criteria are intended to provide recognition of long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration of effort in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities during a particular year is permissible and may even be encouraged. These guidelines are designed to be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the Department, without undermining the objectives of the college or University. It is important that each faculty member have goals, percent effort assignments, and expectations for the next annual review, and that these be documented in writing.

CRITERIA

Service/Outreach

Service is often partitioned into areas of faculty service (participation in university activities other than teaching or research), professional service (voluntary activities with professional organizations in the faculty member’s discipline), and public or community service (outreach). In addition, in the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science, a significant number of faculty members provide service in the form of direct or indirect patient care (i.e., a clinical practice). The evaluation of clinical service is separate from the Department annual review process and may depend on the practice site. The department chair must consider the evaluation of clinical service in the overall performance evaluation, presumably with input from the clinical site administration.

Examples of Specific Criteria Measures for Service:

- Board of Director, Officer, Section Chair, or Chair of a standing committee in a state/regional/national/international organization or associations.
- Honor, award, or grant presented by a national/international organization or association, or the University, for service efforts (would not include routine recognition awarded at the end of the service activity).
- Chair of a University committee or task force (includes activities such as faculty senate).
- Chair of a College committee.
- Active service University, College or Department committees or task forces (includes activities faculty senate).
- Active service in a state/regional/national/international organization or associations.
- Active service as a preceptor for student-run health screenings and activities, organizations, etc.
- Active service to the County, State, and National Governments.
- Similar types of service not specifically identified above (describe).
Evaluation will be based on quantitative and qualitative measures. Does the amount of service activities meet or exceed the percent effort allotted to service? Does the individual have any special recognition for providing service beyond expectation?

Service performance will be categorized according to:

- Truly Exceptional
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Categories other than “Meets Expectations” should be accompanied with justification.

The “Needs Improvement” category will include individuals who perform less service activities than is commensurate with the percent effort allotted to service. This may also include cases where there are documented complaints relating to quality of service provided; however, the Department Chair is expected to evaluate and substantiate those complaints.

The “Unsatisfactory” category is usually reserved for cases in which there is a continuing “Needs Improvement” and insufficient progress towards the improvement plan. Other serious and well documented concerns may be used as a basis for an “Unsatisfactory” evaluation by the Department Chair.

TEACHING/ADVISING

The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom, in other learning environments, with individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication in diverse media. Teaching is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense consistent with established University policy regarding contact hour calculation.

Examples of Specific Criteria Measures for Teaching (During Evaluation Year)

- Educator of the Year Award given by the College.
- Teaching-related honor, award, or grant by a national/international organization or association; would not include routine recognition awarded at the end of the teaching activity.
- Teaching-related presentation or program at a national/international organization or association meeting.
- Publication of instructional material in peer-reviewed journals.
- New instructional strategy and/or use of active learning strategies with documentation and analysis of strategy.
- Any recognized University honor, award, or grant related to teaching.
- Student and peer evaluations of teaching may be considered.
• Similar types of teaching/advising not specifically identified above (describe)

Evaluation will be based on quantitative and qualitative measures. Does the amount of teaching activities meet or exceed the percent effort allotted to teaching.

Teaching performance will be categorized according to:

- Truly Exceptional
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Categories other than “Meets Expectations” should be accompanied with justification.

Assignments for teaching and the percent effort for teaching is pre-determined by the Department Chair and agreed upon by the faculty member. “Needs Improvement” may arise from teaching less than expected in terms of contract hours or poor teaching evaluations. Since the Department Chair may possess information not normally provided to the Committee in the annual report, final determination of the performance may be adjusted by the Department Chair.

SCHOLARSHIP
The research function of the University requires faculty members to be actively engaged in the expansion of intellectual and scholarly frontiers, in the creation and/or application of new knowledge, and in the integration of knowledge from various disciplines. This scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the research mission of the University.

Examples of Specific Criteria Measures for Research/Scholarly Activity (During Evaluation Year)

- Author/editor of a book.
- Author of a book chapter.
- Articles in peer-reviewed journals.
- Competitive grant or contract; faculty member must be principal, co-principal investigator or co-investigator with College of Pharmacy receiving appropriate credit.
- Award or honor at the national/international level for scholarly accomplishments.
- Contributed research posters or presentations (abstracted) at a national/international meeting.
- Invited local/state/regional/national/or international research presentation.
- Editor, co-editor, or assistant editor of peer-reviewed journal.
- Employment of research personnel or funding of graduate students.
- Member of an editorial advisory board for a peer-reviewed journal.
- Similar types of scholarship not specifically identified above (describe).
Evaluation will be based on quantitative and qualitative measures. Does the amount of scholarship activities meet or exceed the percent effort allotted to scholarship? Does the individual have any special recognition for providing scholarship beyond expectation?

Scholarship performance will be categorized according to:

- Truly Exceptional
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Categories other than “Meets Expectations” should be accompanied with justification.

The “Needs Improvement” category will include individuals who perform less scholarship activities than is commensurate with the percent effort allotted to scholarship. This may also include cases where there are documented complaints relating to quality of scholarship provided; however, the Department Chair is expected to evaluate and substantiate those complaints.

The “Unsatisfactory” category is usually reserved for cases in which there is a continuing “Needs Improvement” and insufficient progress towards the improvement plan. Other serious and well documented concerns may be used as a basis for an “Unsatisfactory” evaluation by the Department Chair.