

## **THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

### **STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POST TENURE REVIEW COMPENSATION**

---

#### **CALENDAR YEARS**

This plan presents the School's principles and procedures for evaluating and compensating faculty, academic professionals, and service professionals.

#### **GOALS**

The purpose of this plan is to develop a system of evaluation and salary allocation that enhances professional development, rewards meritorious performance, reduces inequities, encourages collegiality, provides accountability, and minimizes the costs of implementation.

The plan encourages performance that advances the School's mission to:

- Serve the public policymaking needs of Greater Phoenix, the State of Arizona, and the nation;
- Prepare students for leadership in public service in a diverse, interdependent, and dynamic world; and
- Advance research in discovering, integrating, sharing, and applying knowledge of public affairs.

As a unit, the School strives to balance, respect, and value equally its teaching, research, and service missions. To advance these missions, the School evaluates and rewards faculty on the basis of their performance in achieving excellence in teaching, research, and service. The School evaluates and rewards academic and service professionals on the basis of their performance in achieving excellence in the unique responsibilities of their positions and in their contributions to the School mission.

#### **PROCESS OF EVALUATION**

Evaluations for faculty and academic and service professionals will cover activities from the previous three calendar years. Faculty evaluations are based upon activity reports, vitae, portfolios, written and goal-based performance agreements, and evaluations by members of the Personnel Committee and the director. Faculty members may review the materials submitted by other faculty and transmit their evaluations of peers to the director. Members of the Personnel Committee shall review the materials submitted by faculty and transmit their evaluations of all faculty to the director. After reviewing materials submitted by faculty and recommendations submitted by the Personnel Committee, the director will compose and transmit his/her performance evaluation to individuals. The director will discuss the

performance evaluation and statement of goals with each individual. Once signed by both the director and the individual, the "Faculty Performance Agreement" constitutes the written, goal-based performance agreement required by the Arizona Board of Regents. The director then will transmit these required documents to the dean.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

While the School attempts to balance teaching, research, and service activities, individual tenured faculty may develop varying emphases when it serves the needs of the individual and the School and when it is recommended by the Personnel Committee and approved by the director of the School. Since faculty interests, skills, and profiles differ, the School seeks to find that special combination of activities that best suits their talents and interests and that allows them to make their highest contribution to the School, College, University, and public. Flexibility, however, is limited by the School's need and expectation that all faculty will teach on a regular basis; carry a fair share of School, College, and University service; stay current in their field; and maintain a program of public service that serves the needs of the School and community.

Faculty are evaluated on the basis of their contributions to teaching, research and creative activities, service, and diversity. The School considers contributions to diversity as activities supporting the School's teaching, research, and service programs. Accordingly, contributions to diversity are incorporated and reported as contributions to teaching, research, and service. The School considers contributions to collegiality as adherence to the Faculty Code of Ethics (ACD 204-01) and Standards of Professional Conduct for Faculty and Academic Professionals (ACD 204-02).

### **Criteria for Evaluating Teaching**

Teaching includes classroom and individualized instruction, advising, instructional innovations, curriculum development, and other contributions to student learning and success. The mission statement of the School of Public Affairs commits faculty to " Prepare students for leadership in public service in a diverse, interdependent, and dynamic world." To achieve this mission, faculty are expected to enable students to analyze public problems, communicate, collaborate, make decisions, and manage public institutions effectively, ethically, and democratically. Moreover, faculty are expected to teach at times and locations appropriate for working students and practitioners. Finally, faculty are expected to foster the next generation of scholars.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Research and Creative Activities**

Research and creative activities include publications, presentations, performances, grant proposals, and other written, audio, or video "products" resulting from the program of scholarly activity that are prepared for academic audiences, public/community service audiences, and /or student audiences. The mission statement of the School of Public Affairs commits the faculty to " Advance research in discovering, integrating, sharing, and applying knowledge of public affairs." Accordingly, faculty are expected to contribute to public affairs scholarship by maintaining an active program in research, publication, or other creative endeavors. The School respects and values both academic and applied research. Such activity is

valuable not only because it expands our understanding of public affairs and improves our teaching but also because it helps policymakers and public administrators make decisions and respond to public problems.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Service**

Service includes public/community service; university, college, and departmental service; and professional service.

Public/Community Service is service to the community, state, or nation through instructional, research, or other projects and by holding an office or chairing a committee in a public or community-based organization, or in a non-academic professional association consistent with the mission of the School and College. Public service involves such activities as identifying emerging public issues, applying research to public problems, disseminating information, proposing solutions to public problems, assisting public, private, and nonprofit organizations; and facilitating community discourse on public issues. The mission statement of the School of Public Affairs commits the faculty to " Serve the public policymaking needs of Greater Phoenix, the State of Arizona, and the nation." Accordingly, the School of Public Affairs expects all faculty to maintain active programs in public service.

University, College, and Departmental Service is service for the department, college, or university. The School expects all members to be collegial and active citizens in the affairs of their school, college, and university.

Professional Service (academic and non-academic) is service to academic and professional organizations, such as giving speeches at professional meetings or holding an office in a national association.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Academic and Service Professionals**

The director of the School will evaluate and determine merit and equity adjustments for the directors of the Advanced Public Executive Program and the Morrison Institute. The directors of the Advanced Public Executive Program and the Morrison Institute in turn will evaluate and recommend merit and equity allocations for all academic and service professionals reporting directly to them.

Academic and service professionals are evaluated on the basis of the fulfillment of the requirements of their position descriptions and performance agreements with their immediate supervisor.

### **CATEGORIES AND OUTCOMES**

The School will evaluate each faculty member in terms of their teaching, research and creative activities, service, and overall performances. Within each area of performance, faculty will be evaluated in terms of their productivity, quality or impact of their efforts, and their professionalism/citizenship contributions to unit and college goals, given the FTE assigned, as specified in the College "Statement of Professional Responsibilities." For each specific area, faculty will be evaluated as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, or exemplary according to the definitions specified in the College "Statement of Professional Responsibilities":

- *Unsatisfactory*—failure to meet most of the unit’s criteria for evaluating productivity, quality, and citizenship, or failure to correct serious deficiencies noted in a written performance agreement.
- *Satisfactory*—meeting most of the unit’s criteria for productivity, quality, and citizenship.
- *Meritorious*—meeting most of the unit’s criteria for productivity, quality, and citizenship and exceeding the unit’s expectations on several criteria.
- *Exemplary*—meeting virtually all of the unit’s criteria for productivity, quality, and citizenship and exceeding or greatly exceeding the unit’s expectations on many of the criteria.

The overall evaluation is based on the individual’s evaluation outcomes in teaching, research/creative activities, and service as well as previous performance agreements. An overall unsatisfactory evaluation will be given if the person is unsatisfactory in 50% or more of his or her assigned responsibilities (FTE); or if the person receives a second consecutive unsatisfactory in any one area of responsibility; or if he or she fails to complete satisfactorily the personal development plan that resulted from a previous unsatisfactory rating. Overall evaluations of satisfactory, meritorious, and exemplary should be determined by combining the evaluations for teaching, research, and service in accord with the FTE assigned to each, and by taking into account any specific deficiencies noted in the most recent performance agreement and the progress made by the person in correcting those deficiencies.

## **CONSEQUENCES OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE**

The policy for addressing unsatisfactory performance for tenured faculty is stated in university and college policies regarding post tenure review. The School uses the policy expressed in the college “Statement of Professional Responsibilities”:

· (a) Unsatisfactory in a specific area—A rating of unsatisfactory in any area of assigned responsibility will result in a developmental plan at the unit level. This developmental plan will have specific goals for the faculty member to achieve, within one year, with appropriate monitoring and feedback. A second consecutive unsatisfactory performance rating in the same area will result in an overall unsatisfactory rating.

· (b) Unsatisfactory overall—If a faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory rating during the annual performance evaluation, a mandatory enhanced review will occur. The mandatory enhanced review is a more thorough review of the faculty member’s record undertaken to verify the results of the process, verify the unsatisfactory performance rating, and/or provide information for improvement. This review can result in overturning the unsatisfactory evaluation, overturning it but noting areas of weakness that need to be addressed, or confirming the unsatisfactory performance. If it is confirmed, the faculty member will be expected to participate in a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) as formulated by the unit head and the Dean with the assistance of the faculty member. If the PIP is completed successfully, that is, goals or outcomes are satisfied, the faculty member will return to the normal annual performance evaluation process.. If the goals and

outcomes are not achieved by the expiration of the PIP, the appropriate administrator will exercise the option to initiate the Dismissal for Cause process. In either case, a final report will be made by the unit head to the faculty member and the Dean. It is important to note that in no way does this post-tenure review process eliminate the rights of the faculty member to use the grievance process outlined in ACD 501, Conditions of Faculty Service.

The policy for addressing unsatisfactory performance of untenured faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and academic professionals is stated in the college "Statement of Professional Responsibilities":

An unsatisfactory rating in any one area or overall for an untenured faculty member (including instructors or lecturers) or an academic professional who is not on a continuing appointment may result in a recommendation for (a) a regular contract in the next year with notation of improvement that is expected; (b) dismissal at the end of the academic year; (c) a conditional contract during the next year; or (d) a terminal contract, as described in ACD 507.01.

## **SALARY ALLOCATION**

The School of Public Affairs allocates discretionary salary using a performance-based merit and equity model with adjustments to the base . Merit and equity are awarded in individualized amounts as recommended by the School director to the dean.

The School of Public Affairs elects to allocate discretionary salary using a performance-based merit and equity model with adjustments to the base . Discretionary salary funds will first be divided into equity and merit pools. Faculty, academic professionals, and service professionals will determine annually by vote the proportion of discretionary salary to allocate to equity and merit pools. The equity pool will consist of funds to be applied to faculty, academic professional, and service professional equity adjustments. The merit pool will be divided commensurate to the respective proportions of faculty and academic and service professional salaries relative to the total state-funded salaries of faculty, academic professionals, and service professionals. For example, if the total of the academic and service professional salaries equals 20 percent of the total salaries of the School, then 20 percent of the discretionary merit funds will be allocated to the academic and service professional pool and 80 percent will be allocated to the faculty pool.

Merit for faculty rewards excellence in teaching, research, and service and other valuable contributions to the missions of the School. The School of Public Affairs respects, values, and weights equally contributions to its teaching, research, and service missions. Merit for faculty is allocated in individualized amounts by the School director on the basis of the following performance levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, and exemplary.

Merit for academic and service professionals also is performance and evaluation based and is designed to reward excellence in performance and contributions to the missions of the school. The merit component for academic and service professionals is based on the evaluations of their immediate director. Merit for academic and service professionals is allocated in individualized amounts by directors on the basis of the following performance levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and meritorious.

Equity for faculty, academic professionals, and service professionals is performance and evaluation based and is designed to remedy salary compression and salary inversion problems, to correct discriminatory salary inequities that may arise for individuals or entire groups. Equity adjustments are recommended to the dean by the director upon analysis of data from peer institutions. Equity adjustments will be allocated by the director in individualized amounts grounded in the principles of uniformity and proportionality that apply to individuals' entire careers and not simply to their most recent evaluations. Uniformity means that persons who are similarly situated in terms of rank, years of service after the doctoral degree, and career contributions should be similarly compensated. Proportionality means that persons who are of higher rank, more years of service after the doctoral degree, or who have more outstanding contributions should be compensated at a proportionately higher level.

## **APPEALS**

Faculty have the right to appeal the recommendation of the director of the School first to the school's Personnel Committee. Appeals can only be based on violation of processes or on an unfair or unprofessional application of criteria. Appeals can be grounded in a claim that a reasonable person who assessed the evidence according to professional standards within the criteria specified by the unit, and who was aware of the other evaluations within the unit, would have arrived at a different decision. If an appeal is not resolved at the unit level, it may be appealed to the dean's office by the party who lost at the unit level. The appeal must be filed with the chair of the School's Personnel Committee within 5 working days after the individual's formal meeting with the director. If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome from the Personnel Committee, the appellant has 5 working days to appeal the decision to the office of the dean.

Academic and service professionals have the right to appeal recommendations of the unit director to an appeals committee consisting of all academic and service professional peers in the school not party to the appeal. Appeals can only be based on violation of processes or on an unfair or unprofessional application of criteria. Appeals can be grounded in a claim that a reasonable person who assessed the evidence according to professional standards within the criteria specified by the unit, and who was aware of the other evaluations within the unit, would have arrived at a different decision.

If an appeal is not resolved at the unit level, it may be appealed to the dean's office by the party who lost at the unit level. The appeal must be filed with the School's academic and service professionals' appeals committee within 5 working days after the individual's formal meeting with the unit director. If the appellant is not satisfied with the outcome from the appeals committee, the appellant has 5 working days to appeal the decision to the office of the dean.