



**College of Information Science
Annual and Post-tenure Performance Review Guidelines
(30 November 2023)**

1. Introduction

The Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) requires all faculty to be formally evaluated on their performance once every twelve months. In addition to this annual review, there is a mandate from ABOR for a continuing review of tenured faculty. For these annual processes, evaluations will follow University and College guidelines, with UA's guidance providing the most complete description of the review process: <http://policy.arizona.edu/employmenthuman-resources/annual-performance-reviews-faculty>. The annual review process and the Promotion and Tenure process are not to be confused and have different goals (e.g., continued "meets expectations" performance does not necessarily equate to performance of a level sufficient to attain promotion and tenure). **This document provides clarity about the annual review process only and offers clarity on faculty expectations that are particular to the College of Information Science.** Generally, information provided at the University level is not meant to be replicated in this document.

2. The Review Process

The peer review committee in the College of Information Science will be composed as follows: one tenured faculty member (as Committee Chair) and three additional faculty members elected during the fall semester. Specifically, in addition to a tenured chair, this committee will ideally include one additional tenured faculty member, one untenured tenure-track (TT) faculty member, and one career-track (CT) faculty member (any rank). The two tenured members will write the "Progress Toward Tenure" component of the annual review of untenured TT faculty. Committee members will recuse themselves as necessary (e.g., for their own annual review).

The yearly review process covers the previous three years of employment with substantial emphasis on the most recent calendar year (per university policy). At the beginning of each calendar year, in January, each member of faculty will 1) update their materials (such as, publications, grants, honors, awards, certificates, mentoring, etc.) in Faculty Portfolio [*formerly UAVitae*] and 2) upload two attachments - a self-evaluation document and an updated CV using the UA-required formatting (faculty may additionally paste this as text into the appropriate Faculty Portfolio spaces).

The self-evaluation document will be comprised of three primary sections and a fourth optional section:

Section one will list the faculty member's views on their own workload for each of the three years under review. [*Please see 2023 College of Information Science Faculty Workload Guidelines Document for further details on workload responsibilities.*]

Workload must total 100% and may be divided in the general TT responsibilities - 40%

teaching, 40% research, and 20% service or other combinations for those with additional teaching, service, and administrative responsibilities. Within section one, any course releases, leaves, fellowships, or other workload changes will be explained. In the case of faculty on sabbatical, they will be evaluated considering their sabbatical duties, with workload percentages during the sabbatical year reflecting the distribution of effort toward research and away from teaching. In the case of faculty on leave, the request for leave must include criteria on which the faculty member will be judged while on leave. Even when a faculty member's workload is not formally adjusted but is changed by something like a temporary course release, this section allows the committee to focus the review on the quality of work in each area while keeping workload in mind, and while not reviewing faculty on their actual work assignments given that those assignments (e.g., courses taught) are often beyond the faculty member's control and imposed for administrative purposes or curricular need.

Section two will briefly describe or list their activities or primary accomplishments in each of their areas of work (e.g., research, teaching, service) over the previous three calendar years. In addition to describing activities, this section will note which accomplishments are viewed as exceeding expectation or deem the candidate distinct and working beyond the meeting of expectation. These notes on certain accomplishments will function to make a case for the reviewee so that reviewers understand how the activities function in a broader context.

Section three will briefly list the faculty member's plans for each of these three areas for the next calendar year, and the plan may include a request for peer observation of teaching.

Section four is optional, and will offer, if needed, a statement of circumstance that the member of faculty wishes to have considered by the Peer Review Committee.

The reviewing committee will produce a peer-evaluation document for each faculty member being reviewed, including a review of all non-administrative work conducted by the Dean and Associate Deans. Members of the committee will recuse themselves while their own evaluations are being discussed. The peer-evaluation documents for each faculty member will be sent to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs through Faculty Portfolio. The committee's report on the Dean will be sent directly to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. The Dean will review those they have assigned formalized administrative duties within the unit if a percentage of those duties take the place of expected work in the research/teaching/and service areas.

The peer-evaluation documents will be forwarded to the College's Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs for assessment. If the Associate Dean's assessment of the faculty member is markedly different from that of the Peer Review Committee, the Associate Dean will aim to honor the Review Committee's report while adjusting for privileged information. UA policy suggests the Associate Dean "evaluates the faculty member on the basis of information provided by the faculty member, peer evaluators, students, and such other information as is available." The Associate Dean will have the ultimate responsibility of sharing the final review assessments with each faculty member.

UA policy suggests Associate Dean-faculty meetings. UA policy suggests that following such a meeting, the final evaluation will be provided, commented on if needed (with comments recorded officially), and is signed through Faculty Portfolio by the faculty member and returned to the Associate Dean. Any faculty member who is dissatisfied with their evaluation may pursue an appeal.

3. Performance Ratings and Criteria

Each of the three areas of review will be rated by the Peer Review Committee as "Meets or exceeds expectations" or "Does not meet expectations."

In review of all areas, the Peer Review Committee will apply its professional experience to each individual case while also using each area's rating explanation and criteria list as guides.

The College of Information Science's Associate Dean will evaluate the findings from the Peer Review Committee and offer ratings as follows:

- 4 "Truly Exceptional"
- 3 "Meets/Exceeds Expectations"
- 2 "Needs Improvement"
- 1 "Unsatisfactory"

College of Information Science faculty have generated a set of examples of how criteria apply, while acknowledging that these lists are not exhaustive. Though faculty will be reviewed relative to their distinct disciplinary norms and as explained by faculty under review, the lists provided in this document are provided to offer guidance for new faculty, to aid evaluators should disagreement occur, and to also provide evaluators examples of how they might explain or justify their decisions. The College requires detailed elaboration in writing of reasons and evidence from evaluators in all cases, and with particular effort in this area in the case of any evaluations of "unsatisfactory." In the case of unsatisfactory reviews, faculty will be provided improvement plans and mentoring as needed.

Research and Scholarly Activity

It is expected that faculty with research as part of their assignment will be regularly engaged in the different components of the research process, such as: designing research to advance knowledge, preparing proposals, implementing research projects, and reporting results to sponsoring agencies (i.e., project reports) and to the wider profession and the academy (i.e., books, journal articles, etc.).

The College of Information Science is an interdisciplinary unit. The members of the faculty do very different (and often incommensurable) sorts of research. So, research and scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the research mission of the University.

Activities considered to be positive contributions to this mission may include, but are not limited to:

- having books, book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed conference papers, monographs, abstracts, and reviews accepted for publication (credit is to be given for the acceptance for publication of a book during the current calendar year)
- presenting invited talks at conferences, workshops, seminars, or poster sessions
- editing books or journals
- submitting proposals for external funding/obtaining grants and contracts or other outside support for projects
- obtaining patents or royalties, system development
- production of other refereed or non-refereed publications
- reviews of previous work published during the review period, or any other evidence which indicates the merit of a faculty member's work
- producing public scholarship (opinion work, documentaries, art installations, other productions).

While each case is distinct and each faculty member can describe their own merit, these examples can be utilized as a guide:

Sample activities contributing to an outstanding case:

A book published, or a large number of published papers per year in ranked/revered journals or prestigious proceedings (with “large” defined by discipline and workload, e.g., 2-3 / year for philosophy and/or humanities faculty with 40% research workload, 3 / year for computational and/or social science faculty with 40% research workload).

Top paper awards or similar kinds of recognition for scholarship.

Funded grant proposal of any kind.

Licensed patent or participation in patent process.

Invited international talk.

Multiple (more than one) conference presentations at national or international conferences, prestigious conferences (e.g., HIICS, AAAI, ICML, iConf, ICA) along with publishing or grant-related activity.

Sample activities contributing to a meets expectations case:

A book published, or an average number of published papers per year in ranked/revered journals or prestigious proceedings (with “average” defined by discipline and workload, e.g., 1-2 / year for philosophy and/or humanities faculty with 40% research workload, 2 / year for computational and/or social science faculty with 40% research workload).

Grant proposals submitted as PI or co-PI (but not necessarily funded) per year.

A conference presentation along with publishing or grant-related activity.

Generating research activity by serving on boards or participating on projects for the purpose of developing new research collaborations and grants.

Teaching and Mentoring

Unless individual job descriptions indicate otherwise, it is expected that faculty members will teach and mentor students (including interns) and actively participate in the teaching-related tasks of course development, membership on admissions and curriculum committees, and so on. The evaluation of teaching hinges on the faculty member's execution of these responsibilities. While the annual performance review covers a period of three years, the evaluation of teaching should give "substantial emphasis" to the last calendar year. Teaching is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense consistent with the educational mission of the University, and UA policy suggests that "When teaching effectiveness is evaluated, a systematic assessment of both student and peer opinion will constitute one component of the evaluation."

Keeping course materials current is an assumed activity. Special activities considered to be positive contributions to the instructional mission may include but are not limited to:

- Student Course Surveys (SCS) that are typically over 3.8, excluding outliers, OR are within range/norms of comparison class types.
- mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, interns, independent study students, honors students, capstone projects, etc.
- special teaching approaches or refined pedagogies (e.g., flipped classrooms, service-learning activities, co-enrolled f2f/online courses) or similar course refreshing efforts (new assignments, bringing in special guests, offering students special engaged activities).
- publication or presentation/proceedings with honors students, graduate students, and/or post-docs as co-authors.
- participation on master's or doctoral student committees.
- publishing or presenting on topics related to pedagogy, reviewing published work related to teaching.
- efforts to improve underrepresented student recruitment and retention.
- education/teaching/learning-related grants applied for or funded.
- encouraging students to show their projects at events held for the College to develop students' public communication abilities (e.g., Festival of Books, iShowcase, AZ tech council, campus engagement fairs, donor events, Steamworks).

While each case is distinct and each faculty member can describe their own merit, these examples can be utilized as a guide:

Sample activities contributing to an outstanding case:

Overall, and regardless of teaching load, three or more among the choices above or another demonstration of excellence (e.g., strong SCS scores within range/norms of comparison class types across courses, the mentoring of students in some capacity outside of formal class time, encouraging students to show their projects at events held for the College) would be outstanding.

Sample activities contributing to a meets expectation case:

Overall, and regardless of teaching load, two or more among the choices above or another positive contribution (e.g., strong SCS scores within range/norms of comparison class types across courses, and the mentoring of students in some capacity outside of formal class time) would meet expectations.

Service

The College is based on a principle of faculty governance that places much of the day-to-day work tied to running a unit in the hands of the faculty. Therefore, faculty members are expected to contribute to the functioning of the University and to the enhancement of wider communities and constituencies at local, state, national, and international levels. In addition, faculty members are expected to demonstrate their professionalism as scholars who contribute to the enhancement of the discipline, and as colleagues in a unit where teamwork and camaraderie are essential elements of the unit's success. It is expected that faculty-members will participate in professional meetings, serve on review panels, and share ideas with their colleagues. Faculty should always demonstrate open collegiality, a willingness to cooperate, and the strongest sense of respect for the dignity of staff and professional colleagues alike.

Activities considered to be positive contributions to the service function may include, but are not limited to:

- showing contributions (e.g., leadership on particular projects) on department, college, and/or university committees.
- chairing any committee or managing an important process (e.g., TA/GA training).
- sharing knowledge in ways unique from typical instructional contexts (e.g., blogs).
- serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles.
- serving as a sponsor or faculty organizer for student activities or groups.
- administrative or faculty governance assignments.
- mentoring faculty peers.
- recruiting students and faculty.
- leadership on a service-oriented grant team.
- activity in professional organizations.
- marketing projects or special showcases on and off campus.
- consulting to other universities, colleges, or primary or secondary schools.
- developing external relations with government entities.
- serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies.
- participating in local, state, or national civic activities and organizations.
- applying one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community.
- giving lectures, public talks, or presentations to the community.
- reviewing book manuscripts for publishers.
- refereeing journal articles.
- offices held in professional societies.
- organizing panels or colloquia at professional meetings.
- other responsibilities for professional organizations.
- editorial Boards.
- evaluating book or article manuscripts or externally-funded proposals.
- national boards and review panels.

- judging of contests (local, regional, national, international).
- other community service or consulting work related to professional expertise.

While each case is distinct and each faculty member can describe their own merit, these examples can be utilized as a guide:

(NOTE: Attendance at faculty meetings and other unit events does not warrant special note as these activities are required of faculty members.)

Sample activities contributing to an outstanding case:

Chair of a departmental, college, or university-level committee. Chairing or spearheading special or unique (not yearly) committees or managerial projects that go uncompensated (e.g., hiring committees) warrant strong service scores for the year. (NOTE: Chairing APR comes with a course release so does not warrant the same level of review score.)

Visible commitment to success of the unit amid other campus or disciplinary commitments.

Sole oversight of a unit-sponsored event on campus.

High disciplinary involvement (organizational leadership, editorial boards or extensive reviewing service for publications or tenure/promotion cases).

Multiple presentations in the community with special appreciation for those who travel to other locales (e.g., Yuma, Phoenix, Washington DC) for workshops, informing community members, recruiting, or simply raising awareness.

Sample activities contributing to a meets expectations case:

Service on an average number of committees or managing a non-course release area (e.g., TA training, assessment, colloquia, lecture series work) in the unit, plus additional unit/campus/disciplinary service, with “average” defined by workload (e.g., 1-2 committees or assignments for a faculty with 20% service workload).

Reviewing more than a few scholarly articles a year (or serving on an editorial board) is expected of research faculty, less so of instructional faculty, this kind of review work meets expectation and also indicates activity in disciplines.

4. Improvement Plans, Support, and Appeals

If the peer evaluation in any of the three areas is "does not meet expectations," the Peer Review Committee should elaborate on the specific evidence that led them to this conclusion. If the evaluation from the Associate Dean in any of the three areas is "needs improvement," the Associate Dean and Peer Review Committee should collaborate to specify any improvements that are needed.

Special care and attention will be given to the case of "unsatisfactory" teaching. In order to avoid the damaging impact of poor teaching to the academic programs of the College, a faculty member may receive an evaluation of "unsatisfactory" in teaching for only one-year's worth of

data. In such cases, both the Peer Review Committee and the Associate Dean would have to agree, independently, that an "unsatisfactory" rating in teaching was deserved.

For those faculty whose overall performance is rated at "unsatisfactory," a Faculty Development Plan as outlined in [UHAP 3.2.04 / 3.2.05](#) will be required. This plan will outline a set of actions and expectations that will improve performance by the time of the next annual review. This plan will be prepared collaboratively by the faculty, Associate Dean, and the Dean. In the special case of below-average teaching, specific plans are mandated to seek improvement within a period of one year.

UHAP and University-wide policies and procedures will govern appeals regarding the annual or continuing review process. In general, the appeal process must begin within the College of Information Science. The points of disagreement should be clearly articulated in writing to allow each party to address the points of disagreement and resolve the points of disagreement, if possible. Any appeal should first be brought to the Dean's Office. If the points of disagreement cannot be settled within the College, the faculty member has the right to carry the points of disagreement to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs Office and, ultimately, to appropriate committees within the faculty governance structure.