**Annual Performance Reviews**

The SHPRS Personnel Committee shall prepare a report to the Director using a 3-point scale. In accord with ACD 506.10 (<http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html>),the review shall cover the past three years’ Faculty Activity Reports, “with substantial emphasis” on the immediately past year. The criteria in the following paragraphs presume a standard 40/40/20 workload assignment; proportionate adjustments in the criteria will be made for faculty with different workload assignments. The Director shall maintain complete confidentiality with respect to the Personnel Committee’s review of faculty members.

Teaching and service shall be reviewed using standardized cross-SHPRS standards in order to create equitable assessments. For this purpose, the FARs to be reviewed will be divided among Personnel Committee members. Each member will provide an assessment using the criteria will flag any difficult cases. The entire committee will review the assessments, checking the accuracy of the report against the FAR, and asking any questions, especially where the numbers are at the low or high end. Special attention will be given to any 1s at this meeting.

**Criteria – Teaching:**

1 – Unsatisfactory

The faculty member fails to meet reasonable expectations with respect to one or more of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member meets reasonable expectations with respect to all of the following but does not significantly exceed reasonable expectations with respect to any of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success, and (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member meets reasonable expectations with respect to all of the following and significantly exceeds reasonable expectations with respect to at least one of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success and (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

**Criteria – Service (for Associate Professors and full Professors):**

1 – Unsatisfactory

The faculty member has no or insignificant service.

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member has performed minimal or moderate amounts of service to the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member has served on up to 3 committees or in one or two positions involving a significant workload in the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

**Criteria – Service (for Assistant Professors)**

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member has performed minimal or moderate amounts of service to the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member has served meritoriously in at least two significant roles in the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

Research criteria will be established within each discipline. For the purpose of reviewing research, Personnel Committee members will divide into 3 disciplinary subcommittees and review the FARs according to their disciplinary criteria. If the members of a disciplinary subcommittee reports to the Chair of the SHPRS PC that they need additional help to review the research part of the FARs, the Chair of the Personnel Committee shall ask the relevant faculty head to hold an election among the faculty of that discipline to elect one to three additional members of the disciplinary subcommittee to assist with this specific task only. When the entire Personnel Committee meets, the disciplinary subcommittees (excluding any extra members elected to assist with the research component of the review) will be expected to defend any scores of 1. All Personnel Committee members will have a chance to review the research assessments and ask questions.

It should be noted that according to ACD 507-09 (<http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-09.html>), an Unsatisfactory rating in one category triggers a Unit Development Plan; an Unsatisfactory rating in two categories, or failure to meet a previously set Unit Development Plan, generates a Performance Improvement Plan. The faculty member must appeal within 30 days. These consequences shall be brought to the attention of all faculty in the memo sent out requesting faculty to fill in their Faculty Activity Reports.