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**SCHOOL FOR THE FUTURE OF INNOVATION IN SOCIEY
Policy for Faculty Performance Review and Evaluation**

1. Preamble
	1. The School for the Future of Innovation in Society (SFIS) is a transdisciplinary school that is committed to informing, supporting, and enabling socially responsible and beneficial innovation through a multifaceted and integrated faculty-led program of research, scholarship and creative activities; teaching and instruction; and professional and public service, including engagement, communication, and translation.
	2. The school emphasizes knowledge generation and application that transcends conventional disciplinary and sectoral boundaries, leverages a diverse spectrum of knowledge, expertise, skills, and perspectives, and has a positive and transformative impact on organizations, institutions, communities, and publics more broadly.
	3. SFIS fully embraces the ASU Charter and its emphasis on access, excellence, and impact, and the Design Aspirations of the New American University.
	4. These guidelines are designed to establish expectations and processes for annual performance evaluations for faculty in SFIS. They set out school-specific expectations and evaluation criteria, within the context of ASU expectations, and clarify the timeline along which the annual evaluation process occurs.
	5. These guidelines form part of a broader collection of processes and expectations that support faculty professional development within SFIS, including formal and informal mentoring as well as other organized reviews, e.g., third year review and promotion and tenure. While important, these guidelines should not be taken as the sole, or even the primary, means of enabling faculty to reach their professional and career goals.
	6. Annual performance evaluations serve three distinct purposes: compliance with Arizona Board of Regents requirements to encourage faculty to establish goals for continued academic progress; guiding decisions about salary adjustments; and instituting the first step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty. An annual review on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty may occur at the same time and be based on the same material as the annual performance evaluation; however, probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit’s review of the candidate’s future promise. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective. The procedures and standards used in annual performance evaluations must be consistent with but are different from those used in retention, tenure, and promotion reviews. ([ACD 506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html))
	7. The SFIS Annual Review process is specifically designed to:
		1. Satisfy ASU requirements for annual faculty performance evaluations (ACD [506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html));
		2. Provide a mechanism for faculty self-evaluation, mentorship, and professional development, that helps identify progress toward articulated goals and aspirations, and opportunities for progress; and
		3. Form a structured basis for school-based annual evaluations and merit review.
	8. Faculty performance will be reviewed within three areas. In each, performance will be assessed based on key indicators of success, together with accompanying narratives which provide additional context and explanation. In addition, faculty will be required to provide a brief statement that describes their goals, aspirations, and program, and how it aligns with SFIS and ASU expectations and aspirations. The three areas of evaluation are:
		1. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities.
		2. Teaching and Instruction.
		3. Professional and public service, including communication, engagement, translation, and leadership.
	9. There is considerable fluidity between these categories, and many faculty will be engaged in activities that take good advantage of that fluidity. For instance, some faculty are engaged in community/engagement activities which holistically combine scholarship, instruction and service. While such activities may be placed within a specific category for the purposes of aligning evaluation with ASU expectations, the value and importance of this work will be assessed on its own merit, irrespective of how it is categorized. Given the commitment of the school to the ASU Charter and the Design Aspirations, there are expectations that faculty would affirmatively act across these categories.
	10. It is furthermore recognized that professional and public service, defined as enriching, enabling and empowering diverse communities through professional support, communication, engagement, translation, leadership, and other forms of interactions, is a highly valued and critical component (where relevant) of the school’s expectations of faculty.
	11. Likewise, it is recognized that excellence and impact in education and instruction, whether formal or informal, is an essential part of the school’s expectations of faculty with teaching responsibilities.
	12. SFIS recognizes that outcomes and measures in each category will be subject to relative opportunities based on the areas of expertise and/or organizational context within which academic work is carried out.
	13. The criteria established within these guidelines should be viewed as reasonable expectations of performance for a faculty member within the school. However, these should not be used as an absolute, but rather as an indication of performance that should be contextualized based on achievement relative to areas of expertise.
	14. It is important to acknowledge that these guidelines are not intended to provide a checklist to follow, but rather to serve as an indicative guide to activities, outputs and outcomes that constitute a reasonable expectation of performance.
	15. It is expected that faculty working at a particular academic level will also demonstrate and/or be involved with expectations and outcomes associated with preceding academic levels. It is also understood that all performance expectations are subject to and contingent upon individual position descriptions and workload negotiations.
2. Relevant ASU policies and guidance documents:
	* 1. ACD 506-10: [Annual Evaluations of Faculty](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html)
		2. ACD 202-02: [Academic Professional Responsibilities](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd202-02.html)
		3. ACD 506–11: [Post-Tenure Review](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-11.html)
		4. P7: [Post tenure Review Process](https://provost.asu.edu/policies/procedures/p7)
3. Applicable faculty
	1. All faculty and academic professionals within SFIS having at least a 50% appointment, regardless of rank, are required to participate in the annual review process.
4. Timeline
	1. **Requests for material:** Requests for material to be evaluated will be sent out to faculty by early-December. Faculty will typically have approximately 6 weeks to compile and submit material.
	2. **Submission date:** Evaluation material will typically be requested by the end of the January following the evaluation period. Failure to meet this deadline may affect the final evaluation.
	3. **Evaluation completion:** Annual faculty evaluations shall typically be completed by the end of March.
	4. **Feedback:** Feedback shall typically be provided to individual faculty on their evaluations no later than mid-May following the evaluation period.
	5. Precise deadlines shall be published each year in the SFIS schedule of personnel actions, the publication of which will follow from the university’s published schedule.
5. Review process
	1. Annual reviews are based on performance against expectations for the previous 36 months, with an emphasis on the preceding 12 months. The SFIS review period is based on the calendar year.
	2. Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1 to 3 within each area of evaluation, and across their performance as a whole (see section 5.5). These evaluations form the basis of merit-based pay, and administrative actions resulting from performance that is assessed as being below expectations.
	3. Standard performance metrics such as publications, grants, grant expenditure, teaching loads and evaluations, professional service etc. shall be used to inform evaluations where appropriate. However, they shall be viewed within the broader context of activities, outputs, outcomes etc. as articulated within five short narratives. These shall address:
		1. **Goals, aspirations, and program.** Faculty will be asked to briefly describe the goals and aspirations that guide and drive their work, and the integrated program of work they are developing. They will be asked to specifically address how their research/scholarship/creative activities, teaching and instruction, and professional and public service (including engagement, communication, and translation) come together to support their professional/academic goals and aspirations. They should include how their goals, aspirations and program support SFIS and ASU goals and aspirations. (~300 words)
		2. **Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities.** Faculty will be asked to briefly describe the research, scholarship and/or creative activities they consider to be significant over the past year, within the context of their trajectory over the past three years. They should explain, where appropriate, key highlights of their activities, outputs, and impact. They should articulate the relevance and impact of their work within the context of their goals and aspirations, and their broader program of work. (~300 words)
		3. **Teaching and instruction.** Faculty will be asked to briefly describe, where relevant, aspects of their teaching and instruction—including student mentorship—over the past year, which they consider to be significant, within the context of their trajectory over the past three years. They should provide explanatory context where appropriate for their teaching and instruction activities and performance. They should articulate the relevance and impact of their teaching and instruction within the context of their goals and aspirations, and their broader program of work. (~300 words)
		4. **Professional and public service.** Faculty will be asked to briefly describe, where appropriate, aspects of their professional and public service over the past year which they consider to be significant, within the context of their trajectory over the past three years. They should include, where relevant, information on institutional service and service to their broader professional community, as well as aspects of public service that include, but are not limited to, communication, engagement, translation, and leadership. They should highlight achievements that illustrate the reach, impact, and significance of their activities. They should articulate the relevance and impact of their professional and public service within the context of their goals and aspirations, and their broader program of work. (~300 words)
		5. **Challenges and Opportunities.** Faculty will be asked to briefly describe any significant challenges experienced the previous year, their goals and aspirations for the coming year, and approaches they will be taking to help ensure they achieve them. They should include, where relevant, how the school can help support them in this. (~300 words)
	4. Faculty performance shall be evaluated by a Peer Review Committee consisting of at least three senior faculty from the school, and chaired by the Associate Director for Faculty. The committee shall be responsible for a) reviewing self-assessments and performance within and across areas of evaluation, b) writing brief evaluation summaries based on the material supplied, and c) providing the school Director with recommended merit scores within and across areas of evaluation. Final merit scores shall be discussed by the Associate Director for Faculty, the Deputy Director and the Director, with the final determination being made by the school Director.
	5. Evaluation scores correspond to the following expectations:
		1. **3: Substantially above expectations.** Faculty member is consistently performing at a level that substantially exceeds expectations, based on their area of expertise, rank, and agreed-on workload.
		2. **2: Meets expectations.** Faculty member is consistently performing at a level that meets expectations, based on their area of expertise, rank, and agreed-on workload.
		3. **1: Does not meet expectations.** Faculty member is consistently performing below expectations, based on their area of expertise, rank, and agreed-on workload.
	6. In addition, in rare cases an evaluation score of 4 may be awarded within the school to denote exceptional and/or sustained performance in a specific area. This will be taken into consideration when establishing merit increases.
	7. Faculty will receive a brief summary in writing of their evaluation. There will be an opportunity to discuss the evaluation, together with their professional development, with the school’s Associate Director for Faculty. Faculty are also encouraged to work with formal and informal mentors on review their evaluation, and on their professional development strategy.
	8. Faculty receiving an evaluation score of 1 in any area will be required to take corrective action as per section 10 below.
6. Categorization of activities, outputs, and outcomes
	1. Given the diversity of the work of faculty within SFIS, together with a frequent blurring of the lines among the three evaluation categories, there will be occasions where activities, outputs, etc., do not fit neatly within one of the three evaluation categories. To prevent this circumstance from adversely biasing evaluations, evaluations shall take into account where activities, outputs and/or outcomes in one category inform performance in another.
	2. To aid in determining how best to categorize activities, outputs, and outcomes that straddle multiple categories, the following framework is provided as a means to help assign activities, etc., to the research, scholarship and/or creative activities category.
	3. Research, scholarship and/or creative activities may be defined by what is produced through them (“products”), the processes involved in producing outputs/outcomes, and the degree to which they are critically reviewed by others.
	4. **Products:** Relevant “products” may include but are not limited to:
		1. New knowledge
		2. New insights
		3. New concepts
		4. New understanding
		5. New discoveries
		6. New capabilities
		7. New tools
		8. New processes
		9. New objects
	5. **Processes:** Relevant processes include:
		1. **Creativity:** Producing original and unusual ideas; being imaginative; making something new
		2. **Rigor:** Demonstrating critical thinking and disciplined evaluation of evidence and ideas
		3. **Methodology:** Establishing and/or following a clear, systematic, and robust process
		4. **Analysis:** Systematically developing “products” from data/information
	6. **Review:** Review involves processes whereby products are critically evaluated for scholarly/research/creative novelty, quality, significance, and value, by relevant communities.
	7. For the purpose of performance review and evaluation, activities etc, which combine a “product,” one or more processes, and that satisfy critical review requirements, may be considered as research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.
7. Assessment of student opinion on faculty performance
	1. The annual review process shall explicitly take into account student opinions on faculty performance, where applicable. This process shall be based on the systematic use of anonymous course evaluations.
	2. While it is recognized that student evaluations are subjective, may not always reflect teaching success, and are subject to specific kinds of bias, they may nevertheless provide an indicator of high or low teaching performance. Importantly, student evaluations can provide early warnings of areas where action may be needed to change teaching assignments, refine teaching techniques, or increase teaching proficiency in service of student success.
	3. As per [ACD 309-4](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd304-09.html), “every instructor in every class every semester is required to provide the opportunity for registered students to submit an academic-unit-approved course evaluation. The administration procedure should assure students the ability to respond forthrightly and anonymously. Regardless of the mode (e.g., web-based, paper, etc.) in which the evaluation takes place, the evaluation must be distributed and collected by someone other than the instructor. The instructor must not see the results of the evaluation or its summary prior to submitting grades for the course.”
	4. Faculty shall be provided access to student evaluations as soon as possible after their release to the school, enabling them to evaluate their teaching in response to them in a timely manner.
	5. In evaluating performance, particular attention shall be paid to responses to questions 8 – 14 within the standard ASU evaluation system.
		1. 8. The instructor was knowledgeable about the topic.
		2. 9. The instructor was prepared for class.
		3. 10. The instructor seemed genuinely interested in the course material.
		4. 11. The instructor encouraged students to express their own ideas and ask questions.
		5. 12. The instructor was respectful toward students.
		6. 13. The instructor’s grading was fair, impartial, and clear.
		7. 14. I received timely and helpful feedback on my work in this class.
	6. Aggregated responses to these questions shall be contextualized by factors that include class topic, level and size, and other circumstances that may have an undue influence on them. In general, aggregated responses shall be used as one of a number of indicators of teaching excellence that, together, form a more complete picture of teaching performance.
	7. Where a faculty member receives a teaching valuation score of 3 or above (or 3 or below for online courses) to any of these questions, careful attention shall be paid to whether this is a result of extenuating circumstances, or an indicator of below-expectation teaching performance. Consistent scores that raise concerns may result in an overall performance evaluation of 1 (does not meet expectations)
	8. Where student course evaluations are consistently poor, faculty shall be expected to address this and, where appropriate, develop and implement a professional development plan for teaching, in consultation with the school’s Associate Director for Programs.
8. Review Criteria
	1. Given the diversity of faculty tracks, ranks, disciplines, activities, and areas of expertise, within the school, there are few cut and dried criteria defining performance expectations. Rather, it is recognized that taking a prescriptive approach to evaluation runs the risk of being counterproductive as it potentially disadvantages exemplary yet non-conventional achievements, and discourages creativity and innovation. Nevertheless, there are three broad expectations that are used within the school to inform faculty evaluations. These include:
		1. Evidence of excellence and impact that is commensurate with track, rank, area of expertise, and agreed-on expectations, within and across scholarship, research and/or creative activities; teaching and instruction (as appropriate); and professional and public service (as appropriate).
		2. Evidence of excellence and impact that is commensurate with track, rank, and area of expertise, and agreed-on expectations, within and across a coherent and integrated program of work or scholarly enterprise.
		3. Evidence of significant alignment with the school’s mission and objectives, and the mission and aspirations of ASU.
	2. Faculty evaluations shall specifically consider indicators of performance within the following areas as appropriate, as per requirements for explicit above and below expectations indicators in [ACD 506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html):
		1. **Knowledge generation:**
		2. **Above expectations:** Strong evidence, integrated across multiple areas of activity, for developing substantial new knowledge, insights, etc., as detailed in section 8.4, within an integrated program or scholarly enterprise, appropriate to rank, that has relevance and impact.
		3. **Below expectations:** Marginal evidence for the development of new knowledge, insights, etc., (section 8.4) or activities which are anticipated to lead to the same, or lack of a coherent program of work or scholarly enterprise, appropriate to rank, that supports knowledge generation.
		4. **Research, scholarship and/or creative outputs:**
		5. **Above expectations:** Strong evidence, integrated across multiple areas of activity, for producing substantial outputs of a high quality, quantity, and relevance.
		6. **Below expectations:** Zero or few outputs, outputs of low quality compared to norms and expectations, or a lack of activities which are expected to lead to the same.
		7. **Teaching excellence:**
		8. **Above expectations:** Strong evidence of highly effective and responsive teaching practices, based where appropriate on student numeric evaluations (section 8.5), peer evaluations, and other indicators of success.
		9. **Below expectations:** Consistently poor numeric student evaluations (see section 7) and peer evaluations that indicate substantial teaching deficiencies.
		10. **Professional service:**
		11. Above expectations: Strong evidence for substantial active, effective and sustained leadership in service to the school, university and/or professional communities.
		12. Below expectations: Little or no institutional or professional service where this is expected of the faculty position, or poor quality/unresponsive service.
		13. **Public service:**
		14. **Above expectations:** Strong evidence for substantial communication and engagement with, leadership within, translation of knowledge and insights for, and/or other forms of extension-based activities geared toward, non-academic audiences, which are responsive, impactful, and which exceeds that which is considered the norm for similar faculty.
		15. **Below expectations:** Little or no evidence for communication and engagement with, leadership within, translation of knowledge and insights for, and/or other forms of extension-based activities geared toward, non-academic audiences
	3. Specific factors that may be used to support these faculty evaluations may include, but are not limited to, those listed in sections 8.4 – 8.6 below:
	4. **Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities:**
		1. Peer reviewed publications in appropriate journals. Expectations around publication numbers will vary across areas of expertise and whether faculty are focused on research, scholarship, or creative activities.
		2. Scholarly books and monographs
		3. Book chapters.
		4. Authoritative non peer-reviewed commentary.
		5. Invited commentary.
		6. Citations, and citation metrics such as the H-index and i10 index (recognizing that these need to be contextualized).
		7. Fine/performing arts outputs, and other forms of substantial creative outputs that are evaluated/juried in some manner.
		8. Videos, podcasts, creative products, and games, where they reflect input to and/or outputs/outcomes of research, scholarship and/or creative activities.
		9. Submitted research/funding proposals.
		10. Research awards.
		11. Evidence of collaboration and knowledge co-creation.
		12. Patents and other indicators of uniquely created intellectual property.
		13. Talks and presentations.
		14. Evidence of intellectual- and thought-leadership in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities, including community engagement, citizen science, and informal education.
		15. Outputs from professional organizations such as reports, articles, and other forms of gray literature.
		16. Outputs and outcomes associated with leadership in major engagement and translation initiatives with a research/scholarly/creative dimension.
		17. Outputs and outcomes associated with intellectual leadership in public engagement and communication events and initiatives.
		18. Development and implementation of informal education initiatives where there is a clear research/scholarly/creative aspect to the work.
		19. Curated exhibits and programs.
		20. Construction of novel tools, including methods, databases, procedures etc.
		21. Organization and execution of translation, communication and engagement-oriented workshops and events, where there is a clear research, scholarship and/or creative activities component.
	5. **Teaching and Instruction:**
		1. Course development, and the development of syllabi that meet or exceed professional standards.
		2. Evidence of student success, such as measured performance against specific competencies and skills.
		3. Numeric student evaluations (section 7).
		4. Teaching peer evaluations.
		5. Evidence of responsiveness to student and peer feedback.
		6. Evidence of effective student mentorship, engagement and training.
		7. Evidence of effective innovation in teaching and instruction.
		8. Evidence of progression over time in teaching quality and impact
		9. Evidence of effective research mentorship and co-authorship or other co-creation of scholarly outputs with students.
		10. Documented professional development, publishing or other creative outputs related to teaching and instruction.
		11. Development and successful implementation of informal education initiatives.
		12. Development and successful implementation of innovative approaches to learning and instruction
		13. Development and implementation of successful executive, continuing and/or professional education courses and content.
	6. **Professional and Public Service**
		1. Participation and leadership in school and university committees and formal initiatives.
		2. Participation and leadership in professional organizations.
		3. Professional organization outputs such as reports, articles or papers, and associated demonstrable impacts or influence beyond academia.
		4. Evidence of development of and leadership in major engagement and translation initiatives.
		5. Evidence of development of, leadership in, and impact through, extension-based activities.
		6. Proactive and impactful use of social and traditional media, including blogs, podcasts, and videos.
		7. Evidence of participation and leadership in public engagement and communication events and initiatives.
		8. Development of and participation in informal education initiatives.
		9. Public testimony.
		10. Evidence of engagement with individuals and organizations as part of extending the impact of the school, university, and personal academic work.
		11. Development and execution of translation, communication and engagement-oriented workshops and events.
		12. Evidence of responsive and effective engagement with media.
		13. Evidence of creative, systematic and outcome-oriented approaches to public engagement.
		14. Evidence of development and execution of citizen science initiatives.
		15. Evidence of effective and impactful practices around community engagement,
9. Workload/flexible performance arrangements
	1. The annual review process shall reflect agreed-on expectations regarding workload and priorities, as well as being sensitive to circumstances beyond the control of faculty.
	2. Where appropriate, evaluations shall align with agreed-on time-commitments to scholarship, research and/or creative activities, teaching and instruction, and professional and public service. Faculty that have elevated expectations in any of these areas will be evaluated accordingly.
	3. Faculty working part time shall be evaluated according to their contractual time commitment.
	4. Personal circumstances that may limit a faculty member’s productivity or performance, such as illness or life circumstances, shall be taken into account in evaluations.
	5. Faculty with joint appointments but where SFIS is their primary or tenure home shall be evaluated based on a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the other unit(s). In the absence of such an MOU, faculty shall be evaluated on the sum of their work across units with the expectations and norms of other units taken into consideration in the evaluation process, after taking into consideration the expectations and norms of the school.
10. Unsatisfactory performance
	1. If faculty receive an evaluation rating of unsatisfactory in any of the three areas of assessment, they will be required to develop a plan for improving their performance.
	2. For tenured faculty, if their overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, they will need to follow the procedure set out in section 11 below.
	3. For faculty receiving an evaluation of unsatisfactory in just one area, they will be required to develop a written professional development plan that describes the steps they will take to improve their performance. This should be submitted to and agreed on by the Associate Director for Faculty within 30 days of receiving their evaluation.
	4. Contract faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory performance rating may be required to develop, in collaboration with the Associate Director for Faculty and Director, a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). However, this is in addition to any actions that may result from their performance evaluation within the terms of their employment.
	5. Pre-tenure faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory performance rating will be required to develop, in collaboration with the Associate Director for Faculty and Director, a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).
	6. The PIP shall identify, at a minimum:
		1. The specific deficiencies that led to the unsatisfactory performance rating;
		2. Specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies;
		3. An outline of activities to be undertaken to achieve the outcomes;
		4. Milestones with specific criteria so that progress toward goals or outcomes can be measured periodically; and
		5. Reasonable resources that can be made available to assist the faculty member in the achievement of goals.
	7. The faculty member shall work with their mentors and the Associate Director for Faculty to implement the plan, and work toward raising performance to satisfactory or above.
	8. The expectation is that the PIP shall lead to a satisfactory (or higher) rating the follow year. If it does not, further actions shall be considered by the school Director based on evaluations.
11. Post Tenure Review
	1. As per [ACD 506-11](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-11.html), “post-tenure review assures accountability for sustained, high quality performance as well as promotes continued professional development [amongst tenured faculty]. The post-tenure review is guided by the Principles for Post-Tenure Review at ASU approved by the University Senate in 1996.”
	2. When a tenured faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, a school-level Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required. An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas with unsatisfactory ratings in consecutive years or may result from one area with an unsatisfactory rating (for example, teaching) depending on the emphasis assigned to that area in the faculty member’s goal-based work load agreement and the extent of the deficiency.
	3. If an individual’s performance becomes unsatisfactory, the faculty member has a responsibility, shared with the university, to improve performance. Every attempt shall be made to support the faculty member through a school-level PIP that provides specific and unambiguous goals, timelines and milestones for achieving the goals. Only after the faculty member has clearly not achieved these goals or when a faculty member chooses not to enter into a PIP will dismissal for cause be considered.
	4. The PIP shall be formulated by the school’s Associate Director for Faculty and Director. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to provide input. The PIP will identify, at a minimum:
		1. The specific deficiencies that led to the unsatisfactory performance rating;
		2. Specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies;
		3. An outline of activities to be undertaken to achieve the outcomes;
		4. The timeframe within which the deficiencies are to be rectified. Typically, this is one academic year. In those rare circumstances where the nature of the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in one year, the duration of the plan may go beyond one year. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University;
		5. Milestones with specific criteria so that progress toward goals or outcomes can be measured periodically; and
		6. Reasonable resources that can be made available to assist the faculty member in the achievement of goals.
	5. Where appropriate, the PIP may lead to the distribution of a tenured faculty member’s load being significantly altered to align expectations with strengths and abilities.
	6. Once a PIP has been established, progress will be monitored with specific regard to established milestones. A three-person committee selected by the school Director will have the responsibility to monitor progress. At the completion of each milestone date, progress will be reported to the school Director. Should the appropriate progress toward goals as measured by the specific criteria previously established not be met, the Director may exercise the option to initiate the dismissal for cause process.
	7. The PIP is completed when the faculty member has achieved the goals or outcomes specified in the plan, or when the time allotted to the plan has expired. If the PIP is completed successfully, 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 school Director may exercise the option to initiate the dismissal for cause process. In either case, a final report will be made the faculty member and the school Director.
	8. For more information, see:
		1. [P7: Post-Tenure Review Process](https://provost.asu.edu/policies/procedures/p7)
		2. [Principles for post-tenure review at ASU](https://provost.asu.edu/policies/procedures/principles)
12. Appeals
	1. As per [ACD 506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html), performance evaluation may be appealed to the next higher administrator above the evaluator. The request for an appeal must be made within 30 working days (excluding summer) of receipt of the evaluation. The final decision lies with the appeal review administrator who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (excluding summer) after the receipt of the appeal.
	2. Individuals may also file a complaint regarding their annual performance evaluation in accord with [ACD 401](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd401.html), “Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Nonretaliation.”