
000 INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

Revised: March 12, 2012

The School of Letters and Sciences (hereafter referred to as "school") Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual provides information for school **faculty** and **academic professionals** and their **administrators** on academic organizations, governance and personnel. This information applies directly to faculty, faculty with administrative **appointments**, academic professionals, and academic professionals with administrative appointments.

This manual is intended to be consistent with the **Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual (ACD)** and the Board of Regents' *Conditions of Faculty Service* and *Conditions of Professional Service*, the policies under which faculty and academic professionals at the school are employed.

Whenever federal or state law, the Board of Regents, or the president of ASU makes revisions in policy, the Office of the Director of the School of Letters and Sciences will issue revisions to this manual.

Corrections, changes or suggestions should be communicated to the **manual coordinator**, 602/496-0587.

In the event of an inconsistency or conflict, applicable law and Board of Regents' policies supersede university policies, and university policies supersede school or lower-unit bylaws, policies, or guidelines.

The school reserves the right to add, amend or revoke any of the contained **rules**, policies, regulations and instructions or incorporate additional ones, with or without notice, as circumstances or the good of the school community may require.

100 BYLAWS

Revised: March 12, 2012

PREAMBLE

These bylaws outline the structural framework and operational policies and procedures of the School of Letters and Sciences at Arizona State University. These rules apply to all faculties and operations of the School of Letters and Sciences.

ARTICLE I. Mission Statement and Objectives

Section 1. Mission Statement

The School of Letters and Sciences provides students across ASU with the knowledge and skills to comprehend and effectively engage the changing world of the 21st century at local, national and global levels.

Section 2. Objectives

(i) To offer a variety of undergraduate and graduate degree programs as well as minors and certificates that are innovative and rigorous; (ii) to provide general education course offerings for students at Arizona State University; (iii) to support knowledge enterprise development by advancing research, clinical and creative activities that promote discovery, innovation and human understanding; (iv) to form strategic partnerships within Arizona State University, with community organizations, and with national associations to create sustainable and substantive academic programs.

ARTICLE II. Membership

Section 1. Definitions of Faculty and School Assembly

According to the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, ACD 505-02, "Faculty include all employees of the Arizona Board of Regents in teaching, research, or service whose Notice of Appointment is as lecturer, senior lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical faculty, professor of practice, research faculty, or persons who are otherwise designated as faculty on the Notice of Appointment. Graduate students who serve as assistants, associates, or otherwise are academic appointees, as well as graduate students, but are not members of the faculty." The school assembly is composed of all faculty so designated on the Notice of Appointment as defined in [ACD 505-02](#) and [ACD 112-01: Academic Constitution and Bylaws](#).

Section 2. Definition of Voting Members

The school voting faculty includes all those who constitute the school assembly (lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical faculty, professor of practice, research faculty, or persons who are otherwise designated as faculty on the Notice of Appointment) and academic professionals with multiyear, probationary or continuing appointments, as defined in [ACD 112-01](#).

ARTICLE III. School Structure and Administration

Section 1. School Structure

The school is led by a director and consists of several academic areas called Faculties. Each Faculty is led by a faculty head and consists of all persons on a teaching, administrative or research appointment within the area. Each Faculty shall establish internal committees, policies or procedures through which the Faculty may function within the range of its authority and responsibility. No faculty-level policies or procedures may conflict with those of the school, Arizona State University, or the Arizona Board of Regents.

Section 2. Officers

A. School Director

The school director is responsible for the efficient execution of university policies and for the overall leadership and management of the school, in consultation with the faculty and staff through discussion and other participatory procedures. General responsibilities of the school director are outlined in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 102](#). The executive vice president and provost of the university will evaluate the school director. Faculty members evaluate the performance of the school director, including instructional effectiveness, and share these results with the executive vice president and provost of the university, as outlined in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 111-03](#).

B. Faculty Head

The school director in consultation with the respective Faculty appoints each faculty head. The faculty head is responsible for the overall leadership of the Faculty and shares leadership and decision-making responsibilities with faculty and staff through discussion and other participatory procedures. The faculty head will be evaluated by the school director who should seek feedback from the relevant faculty, including the appropriate faculty-level committee charged with evaluating instruction.

C. University Senators

The number of the school's university senators is determined by the rules of the constitution of the university senate, which is empowered by the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 112-01](#). The school's university senators shall be elected from among the current school-voting faculty. Each senator's primary duties will be to attend university senate meetings, represent the school to the senate, and report back to the school faculty on issues of importance. University senators should be elected by May 1 for a term beginning the next academic year.

D. Leadership of the School Assembly

The school assembly will elect one senator to serve as president of the School of Letters and Sciences Assembly. The secretary and parliamentarian of the school assembly are appointed by the president of the School of Letters and Sciences Assembly and will be confirmed by the assembly. Those elected as senators and the appointed secretary and parliamentarian will constitute the leadership of the school assembly for one-year terms. The school assembly shall nominate and elect its leadership according to election guidelines. The president of the school assembly will be elected by May 15 for a term beginning the following academic year.

E. Other Officers

The school director may appoint other officers as needed.

ARTICLE IV. Faculty Responsibilities

The school encourages its faculty members to achieve a healthy balance in their commitments to academic activities, which can include teaching, service, and research/creative activity appropriate to rank and job title. Such activities are viewed as integral and necessary parts of the university's mission and purpose. All members of the school share in the responsibility for its success. The faculty is responsible for the quality of the instructional programs and for

making curricular decisions within the context of university initiatives. General responsibilities of the faculty are outlined in Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201, *Conditions of Faculty Service*.

All school faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the school community by working to achieve both individual goals and school/faculty goals. It is the responsibility of the faculty heads to ensure that workloads are appropriately assigned.

The faculty will be responsible for conducting substantive reviews of the performance of their peers on an annual basis. The reviews will be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the school and according to the framework and criteria described in the schoolwide Guidelines for Annual Review. Annual reviews will be used as input on contract renewal decisions. Each Faculty within the school will decide how to review its nonfaculty academic appointees (e.g., faculty associates, teaching assistants, or associates).

ARTICLE V. Meetings and Elections

Section 1. Quorum

A quorum of the school assembly membership is required to conduct school business. A quorum is defined as a majority of the voting membership of the school assembly in residence (i.e., not on leave) during the semester. Voting faculty members who are on approved leaves of absence or sabbatical leave do not count towards making a quorum but may vote on matters if they are present for the meeting(s) in which such matters are discussed.

Section 2. Meetings of the School Assembly

The school director addresses the school assembly during at least two regular meetings, preferably one each semester, per academic year. Other meetings can be called as needed by the school director or the assembly leadership. Any member of the school assembly may submit items to the assembly leadership for placement on the agenda. Except in an emergency, the assembly leadership will announce meetings at least one week in advance and ideally distribute a preliminary agenda at least 72 hours in advance. Notification by electronic mail will satisfy these requirements. The assembly leadership must place an item on the agenda or call a special meeting to discuss a particular item if requested in writing by at least 10 percent of the members of the school assembly. Nonmembers of the school assembly can be invited to meetings by the assembly leadership.

Upon request, meetings will be conducted according to the latest edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*. If there are procedural disagreements, the school parliamentarian will settle the dispute.

The secretary shall take minutes of each meeting and distribute them to the assembly. Corrections and additions should be submitted before or at the next school meeting where attendees will approve the minutes. The office of the school director is responsible for seeing that one copy of the minutes is stored for safekeeping while at least one other copy is kept elsewhere for reference. The minutes shall include a list of members in attendance and not in attendance, the names of those making motions and amendments, and a summary of all actions taken.

Section 3. Nominations

Nominations for positions elected by the school assembly, including self-nominations, will be taken from the voting membership of the school assembly. Each nominee who accepts nomination shall give a brief statement of his or her qualifications and desire for the position.

Section 4. Voting and Election Procedures

Unless otherwise stated in this document or other documents referenced herein, matters put to a vote are typically decided by a simple majority of the votes cast. Depending on the matter at hand, voting may be by voice vote, hand vote, or electronic or written ballot. A written ballot will be used for a particular issue if requested by any voting member. If a written ballot is used, the results will be counted by two tellers appointed by the assembly president and the ballots will be destroyed after the results are announced. Proxy votes will not be allowed.

For university senators and other schoolwide elections, the school shall use plurality voting. Each member of the school voting faculty will be asked to vote for his or her preferred candidate(s) depending on the number of seats to be filled. The candidate with the highest number of votes would be elected. If there are multiple seats to be filled, the candidate(s) with the next highest number of votes would be elected.

ARTICLE VI. Committees

Section 1. Standing Committees

A. School Personnel Committee for Nontenure-Eligible Faculty

The School Personnel Committee for Nontenure-Eligible Faculty makes recommendations concerning promotion and contract renewal. The committee will consist of one member elected by each Faculty area with contract faculty. If the school director determines that members-at-large should be added to the committee, he or she may appoint members-at-large or request that one be elected by the school assembly. Representation from all faculty ranks is desirable but not required. Faculty heads may not serve on this committee. Committee members shall hold three-year staggered terms. When a vacancy occurs, the school faculty will elect a replacement to serve out the term of that seat on the committee. Each year, the committee members shall elect the chair of the committee. The selection of the committee and its chair shall take place by May 1 of each year. When appropriate, the committee will serve as an appeals committee for annual review.

B. School Personnel Committee for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

The School Personnel Committee for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty makes recommendations concerning promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and sabbatical leaves. The committee should consist of one tenured member elected by each Faculty area with tenured faculty. When possible, the members of this committee should be tenured faculty at or above the rank to which applicants are aspiring. If the school director determines that members-at-large should be added to the committee, he or she may appoint members-at-large or request that one or more be elected by the school assembly. Faculty heads may not serve on this committee. Committee members shall hold three-year staggered terms. When a vacancy occurs, the school faculty will elect a replacement to serve out the term of that seat on the committee. Each year, the committee members shall elect the chair of the committee. The selection of the committee and its chair shall take place by May 1 of each year. When appropriate, the committee will serve as an appeals committee for annual review.

C. Standards Committee

The function of the Standards Committee is to review petitions from students in any program in the school and make a recommendation to the University Standards Committee. The goal of the

committee is to help ensure that students are treated fairly and that they have every reasonable opportunity to earn their degrees in a timely fashion. The committee shall consist of at least six members. Committee members shall hold two-year staggered terms. Eligible members for the Standards Committee include academic success specialists and other advising staff, and contract or tenured/tenure-track faculty from all campuses where the school offers academic programs. When a vacancy occurs, the school director will appoint a replacement to serve out the term of that seat on the committee. The selection of the committee and its chair shall take place by May 1 of each year.

The committee should meet monthly, and each meeting should occur at least two weeks before the monthly meeting of the University Standards Committee because petitions regarding any university standard will need to be forwarded with the school's recommendation to the University Standards Committee. In emergency situations (e.g., if the decision will determine whether a student may register for classes in a term that begins that week), the Standards Committee may conduct its business electronically.

D. School Curriculum Committee

The function of the Curriculum Committee is to help individuals develop curriculum proposals that advance the mission of the school. The committee will review proposals for new courses and proposals for new or revised degrees, including new or revised majors, minors, concentrations, and certificates and make recommendations to the director of the school.

The committee should consist of eight members. The committee shall include one person from the Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) and one representative of each of the faculties in the school. Each Faculty within the school shall elect committee members for two-year staggered terms by May 1 for the subsequent academic year. When a vacancy occurs, the school director will appoint a replacement to serve out the term of that seat on the committee. At the first meeting of the academic year, the members of the committee shall elect a chair.

The Faculties within the school do not need to have their own curriculum committees; however, faculty members within a Faculty could meet to discuss curriculum proposals developed in that faculty. For example, the faculty members who teach history may wish to discuss a revision to the history major.

The head of each Faculty will be responsible for submitting curriculum proposals to the Curriculum Committee. Committee members should review proposals within one month of receiving them, sooner if possible. Proposal reviews may be conducted electronically or in person, depending on the situation. Once the committee has finished a review, the chair should forward the recommendations to the director of the school and notify the faculty head that originally submitted the proposal.

Section 2. Other Committees

The school director is authorized to appoint other committees as needed by the school. The school director will attempt to include representation on such committees from each group affected by the committee's work. The school director may appoint a committee chair or ask that the members elect a chair. Each committee chair is responsible for calling meetings and may be required to submit a report for the committee on request of the school director.

ARTICLE VII. Amendments

These bylaws may be altered, amended or repealed by a two-thirds majority of votes cast by a quorum of the eligible voting faculty. Any member of the school assembly may propose an amendment as a motion during a meeting of the school assembly. A motion for an amendment shall be considered at one meeting, discussed at a follow-up meeting, and then voted on through voting procedures.

ARTICLE VIII. Parliamentary Authority

These bylaws provide the organization by which and through which the school may function within the range of its authority and responsibility, as prescribed by state law, Arizona Board of Regents policies, and Arizona State University's Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures (ACD policies). If any policy or procedure in these bylaws should be found to conflict with policies or procedures of Arizona State University or the Arizona Board of Regents, the policies and procedures of the latter two bodies shall take precedence.

200 PERSONNEL POLICIES FOR TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Revised: March 12, 2012

The purpose of promotion and tenure reviews in the school is to assure and reward excellence in research and creative activity, teaching, and service. Probationary reviews are conducted to provide tenure-track faculty with timely evaluation of their development and their ability to meet promotion and tenure criteria. For further details on tenure and promotion and file content requirements, see [ACD 506-04 Faculty Personnel Actions: Tenure](#) (and the link to P5 in this section). The date when promotion files are due in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University is specified annually in the [schedule of personnel actions](#) released by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

201: Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor requires an overall record of excellence and the promise of continued excellence. The candidate must have achieved excellence in teaching and instructional activities as well as in research, scholarship and/or creative activities. Service must at least be "satisfactory" or "effective."

201-01: Research and Creative Activity

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the school requires that candidates for promotion present evidence of a continuing program of scholarly research and/or creativity that is focused and sustained, has progressed beyond the candidate's doctoral dissertation, and indicates the candidate's potential for achieving national or international recognition. By the end of the candidate's probationary period, this program must have resulted in refereed publications of high quality.

Research or creative productivity is indispensable for candidates for promotion and tenure. Particular emphasis is placed on the quality of publications, as judged by specialists in the relevant field (the external referees) and by the candidate's Peer Review Committee. As the

school is an interdisciplinary unit, the most appropriate and most highly valued types of scholarly production will be different for faculty in differing fields. In general, however, publications carrying the most weight include scholarly and creative books, monographs, articles in appropriate refereed journals or other works, edited volumes in all media (e.g., electronic books and journals), critical editions of texts, critical translations, edited volumes, and/or special issues of refereed journals, innovative textbooks, anthologized works, and technical reports. Where applicable, computer programs, CD-Rom texts, hypertexts, databases, and technological innovations with scholarly, creative or pedagogical applications will also be considered evidence of appropriate faculty activity in this evaluative category. Other publications, such as book reviews or encyclopedia entries, carry less weight. While quality is stressed over quantity, a candidate for promotion to associate professor will have a number of high-quality publications as is appropriate to the discipline.

Because the period of time between the acceptance of a manuscript and its publication is often lengthy, works in press, with appropriate documentation, may be considered evidence of scholarly productivity. Candidates for promotion will normally have presented papers at professional conferences or have given public readings, but conference participation and reading do not take the place of publication.

The quality of research and creative activities are measured by indicators such as the scholarly standards reflected in the work; its impact on intended audiences; the importance, innovativeness and relevance of the work as suggested by external peer reviewers or other appropriate authorities; the quality of the journals, publishers, conferences, or other communicative outlets; citations of the work; its longevity of influence; and other similar indicators appropriate to the discipline and academic unit. The scholarly aspects of all professional responsibilities undertaken on behalf of the academic unit, including instructional activities and service, may be assessed within this category if provided for in academic unit policy.

It is expected that the candidate will be actively engaged in seeking external support from major organizations and agencies. The faculty recognize that appropriate levels of external funding support vary widely across disciplines, and it is expected that successful candidates will meet or exceed funding expectations for their specific area of research or creative activity.

201-02: Teaching and Instruction

High-quality teaching is essential to gaining tenure, and evidence of the quality of teaching and instruction must be assessed through multiple indicators. Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students, and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction. Other possible indicators might include peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials and participation in teaching workshops. Additionally, teaching awards and honors are strong positive indicators. Mentoring of students at all levels, whether through independent studies, direction or service on honors theses, and graduate student committees, conducting workshops, or other opportunities for enhanced teacher-student interaction, are highly valued in the

evaluation process. The candidate for promotion and tenure will normally have shown ability in the area of curriculum development, for example, by developing and offering new courses, seminars, or workshops, or by redesigning existing courses. Excellence in teaching is an important component for tenure and promotion considerations. Unsatisfactory teaching would provide grounds for a negative recommendation for tenure and promotion; however, pedagogical achievement cannot compensate for insufficient scholarly or creative productivity.

201-03: Service

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and for the achievement of tenure, the school expects that the candidate will have served the university and the profession in a substantive fashion, commensurate with junior standing. The school expects active involvement in the life and work of the unit, but it also values the importance of more general university service, service to the profession, and community service that extends the faculty member's teaching and research activity to constituencies outside the university.

The quality of service to the academic profession are assessed in terms of the significance of the recognition brought to the individual and the university, the impact on the field, and the extent to which the service promotes the national distinction of the academic unit in the profession. Service to the university includes assessment of contributions to: faculty governance; the work of the academic unit, college and university; collegial working environments; and professional behavior toward peers and academic unit chairs/directors. The evaluation of public/community service is based on the quality and relevance to the academic unit's mission as well as the value of that service from the perspective of the community organization or partner.

202: Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion from associate professor to professor is not associated with a particular time span. An associate professor is never required to apply for promotion. Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a demonstration of maturity and distinction in one's field of study as well as in the three areas of evaluation. The candidate must also demonstrate continued effectiveness in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service since the promotion to associate professor and evidence of contributions at a level beyond that reflected in the promotion decision to associate professor. Generally, an overall record of excellence requires national and/or international recognition for scholarly and/or creative achievement.

202-01: Research and Creative Activity

The candidate for promotion to professor should provide evidence of continuing creative activity or research and publication and should have achieved a substantial body of research or creative works judged in the terms outlined in **201-01**. The successful candidate for promotion to professor will have a number of high-quality publications or creative works appropriate for the discipline. Further, a candidate for professor will often have developed a reputation such that the candidate will receive invitations to present lectures, collaborate in printed volumes or research projects, and give keynote addresses or readings. These or other measures will be used to determine if the candidate for promotion has achieved an appropriate level of external recognition for the research program or primary creative field. The work of the successful candidate for promotion to professor should be judged as highly

original and creative by the external referees and a selection of the publications should be considered leading contributions in the relevant field.

202-02: Teaching and Instruction

In order to earn promotion to the rank of professor, faculty members in the school must meet the criteria established for promotion to associate professor and present a record of sustained excellence in instruction and student advising and mentorship.

202-03: Service

Those seeking promotion to professor will be expected to have made significant service contributions to the school and university, as well as to the profession judged in the terms outlined in [201-03](#). This service, internally, will consist of major committee work, including often the chairing of a working committee. Externally, the candidate will normally have been called upon to participate in editorial board work, committee work for the national organization appropriate to the subfield, or other such professional service.

203: Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

203-01: External Review

Each candidate for promotion requires external review as specified by [ACD 506-05](#):

External evaluation of the faculty member's record is solicited for use in personnel decisions. This shall be done in a timely manner, in accordance with dates established by the Provost's Office each year, and should specify which areas of performance (i.e., teaching and instruction, research and creative activities, service) are included. Materials appropriate to the review should be provided to the reviewer.

1. The head of the academic unit or school director proposes reviewers and the candidate proposes reviewers. Reviewers ultimately solicited will represent both lists equally. All reviews received are included in the candidate's file.
2. While a specific number of completed reviews is not required, typically, 10 external reviews are solicited to ensure that the candidate's file is thoroughly reviewed. Typically there should be a minimum of five completed external evaluations from professors who are at highly respected colleges/universities (e.g., peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers may not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate's dissertation committee).
3. Evaluations are solicited by the unit head from persons of high reputation in the candidate's field.
4. The reviewer is asked for a curriculum vitae and a statement regarding his or her acquaintance with the applicant.
5. Guidelines with specific questions are furnished to each reviewer so that the evaluations have a consistent format and can be used objectively.
6. To give the reviewer an opportunity to develop a quality response, the reviewer has at least 30 days to respond.
7. Tenure and promotion decisions include consideration of external letters.
8. Letters written by ASU students, staff members, or colleagues cannot substitute for external evaluations of faculty members.

and

9. The campus promotion and tenure committee will not accept letters, either positive or negative, that have not come through a unit's established review procedures.

External letters of evaluation are solicited on a confidential basis. Neither the names of the reviewers nor the contents of the letters are to be shared with the applicant for tenure or promotion. Only officially appointed or elected review committees or other faculty groups specified by unit bylaws and administrators in the review hierarchy examine the letters. Letters should be kept in a central location and viewed only there. Solicitation letters to external reviewers should include a statement that describes who will have access to the letter of review and the extent to which confidentiality can be assured.

203-02: Peer Review

The Peer Review Committees shall be composed of three individuals, chosen by the director of the school in consultation with the candidate and his or her faculty head. This committee should be made up of tenured faculty in the school who have worked closely with the faculty member or who have a professional or discipline-based understanding of the faculty member's field of research. When possible, the members of the Peer Review Committee should be tenured faculty at or above the rank to which applicants are aspiring. One of the three members of the Peer Review Committee may be a tenured ASU faculty member from outside the school. A faculty member from the school must chair the Peer Review Committee.

The Peer Review Committee writes an initial evaluation of the file, contextualizing the faculty member's achievements, and makes an overall recommendation. A peer committee of this sort is particularly important in an interdisciplinary school, where even the head may not have deep background in the faculty member's research area or methodologies.

203-03: Faculty Head's Review

After receiving the Peer Review Committee's evaluation, the faculty head writes an independent evaluation of the candidate's materials and after consideration of the Peer Review Committee report makes an overall recommendation. The faculty head shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the academic unit level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

203-04: School Personnel Committee for Tenured/Tenure-Track Review

The Personnel Committee for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty, as constituted by Article VI, Section 1.B, of the bylaws will review the candidate's file.

The committee evaluates the file and makes an independent recommendation based on the candidate's materials and after consideration of the evaluations of the Peer Review Committee and faculty head.

In a case where a School Personnel Committee member has already provided written commentary on a candidate, either as faculty head or as a member of the Peer Review

Committee, that individual shall recuse himself or herself from that candidate's evaluation by the School Personnel Committee.

203-05: Director's Review

The director of the School of Letters and Sciences make his or her independent evaluation based on the candidate's materials and after consideration of the previous reviews. The school director shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the college level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point. The file is then forwarded to the ASU Promotion and Tenure Committee, in accordance with policies and procedures articulated by the executive vice president and provost of the university.

300 PERSONNEL POLICIES FOR CONTRACT FACULTY

Revised: March 12, 2012

Contract faculty in the School of Letters and Sciences refers to faculty who are not tenure-track and who have fixed-term appointments, e.g., clinical faculty, research faculty, lecturers, instructors, and faculty associates.

Section 300 deals primarily with policies and procedures for the promotion of contract faculty. For further details on promotion of contract faculty and promotion file contents, see [ACD 506-05 Faculty Personnel Actions: Faculty Promotion](#) (and the link to P6 in this section). The date when promotion files are due in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University is specified annually in the [schedule of personnel actions](#) released by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

301: Contract Faculty—Lecturers

Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers are nontenured, nontenure-track faculty members whose responsibilities, as defined by the school director, may include teaching graduate, undergraduate or clinical courses, or supervising supplemental kinds of student learning as defined by the supervising school director. Lecturers are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

301-01: Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

A senior lecturer normally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of five years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience ([ACD 505-02](#)). The lecturer's request for promotion is not based on time in rank, and the candidate must meet all conditions and include all materials specified in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 506-05](#).

The five years of college-level experience should be a full-time faculty appointment. College-level teaching experience must have occurred at an accredited university or college. Faculty members are eligible to apply for promotion to senior lecturer in their fifth year. For those who have three or more years of a successful full-time faculty appointment before coming to ASU, requests for promotion to senior lecturer typically can be made during their second year at ASU.

Lecturers requesting promotion to senior lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of excellence in teaching and service. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in [ACD 506-05](#) (and the link to P6 in this section).

The materials are reviewed by two faculty reviewers who have been selected by the school director (see [section 303](#)); a faculty-based peer review committee, if appropriate; the faculty head; the school personnel committee for contract faculty; and the director of the school. The recommendations are forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students, and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction. Other possible indicators might include peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials, student evaluations, participation in teaching workshops, teaching awards and honors. Student mentoring should be consistently meritorious to help advance the overall mission of the school.

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Service to the university is assessed in terms of contributions to the work of the academic unit, college and university and its impact on the well-being of the school and university. Peers and faculty heads assess contributions to affirmative action/diversity, recruitment and retention, faculty governance, collegial working environments, and professional behavior. The evaluation of public/community service is based on the quality of the service rendered, its applicability to the candidate's teaching responsibilities, the quality and relevance to the academic unit's mission, and value of that service from the perspective of the community organization or partner. The quality of service to the academic profession is assessed in terms of its overall value for the national distinction of the school, the significance of the recognition brought to the individual and the university, and the impact of the service on the field.

301-02: Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

A principal lecturer normally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of seven years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience ([ACD 505-02](#)). Normally, candidates for principal lecturer will have been at the rank of senior lecturer for three years full time or more. However, the request for promotion is based not on time in rank or years of service but rather exceptional teaching, service and leadership.

Senior lecturers requesting promotion to principal lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of exceptional teaching, service and leadership. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from senior lecturer to principal lecturer by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in [ACD 506-05](#) (and the link to P6 in this section).

The materials are reviewed by two faculty reviewers who have been selected by the school director (see [section 303](#)); a faculty-based peer review committee, if appropriate; the

faculty head; the school personnel committee for contract faculty; and the director of the school. The recommendations are forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students, and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction. Other possible indicators might include peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials, student evaluations, participation in teaching workshops, teaching awards, and honors. Student mentoring should be consistently meritorious to help advance the overall mission of the school. Principal lecturers should have a distinguished, recognized record of exceptional contributions to discipline-based or interdisciplinary instructional content, teaching modalities or technologies, or outcome-determined student success.

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Service to the university should be assessed in terms of contributions to the work of the academic unit, college and university and its impact on the well-being of the school and university. Peers and faculty heads assess contributions to affirmative action/diversity, recruitment and retention, faculty governance, collegial working environments, and professional behavior. The evaluation of public/community service is based on the quality of the service rendered, its applicability to the candidate's teaching responsibilities, the quality and relevance to the academic unit's mission, and value of that service from the perspective of the community organization or partner. The quality of service to the academic profession is assessed in terms of its overall value for the national distinction of the school, the significance of the recognition brought to the individual and the university, and the impact of the service on the field. Principal lecturers should have a distinguished, recognized record of exceptional service to the university, the community, and the profession.

302: Contract Faculty—Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are nontenured, nontenure-eligible faculty members who are qualified by training, experience or education to direct or participate in specialized university functions, including student internships, training, or other practice components of degree programs. They are appointed as clinical instructors, clinical assistant professors, clinical associate professors, clinical professors, or internship/practicum/training supervisors. These positions may be part-time or full-time.

Generally, assistant clinical professors are appointed to one-year terms. Associate clinical professors and clinical professors may be appointed to one-year or multiple-year terms of up to three years. Specific terms depend on the extent to which associate or full clinical professors possess the experience, expertise or qualifications established over a sustained period of time that qualify them to develop or supervise practice components of degree programs or to perform other duties that the school director determines will significantly enhance clinical/professional learning and advance the goals of the assigned academic unit or program in a substantial way. Clinical faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

302-01: Internship, Practicum, or Other Clinical Training Practice Components of the Degree Program

Clinical faculty who participate in the training, education, and/or supervision of students in internship, practicum, or other clinical training programs will be licensed in the appropriate area of clinical training for which they are responsible if such licensure is required by the faculty member's discipline or relevant professional practice. In the event licensing is a requirement, clinical faculty members are expected to maintain their clinical license and practice within the scope of their licensing board. Clinical faculty will report to the university any change in license status, such as suspension or revocation, immediately upon such actions being taken.

The clinical faculty members are responsible for the oversight, supervision, training, and education of students enrolled and/or assigned to them. Clinical faculty members are responsible for providing training, education and supervision consistent with the standards of care that apply to the student in the training setting.

Clinical faculty may become involved in the design and evaluation of student internship, practicum or training programs. Roles and responsibilities may include but are not limited to: consultation with other faculty and internship, practicum or training site administrators and clinicians; review of current best practices and applicable standards in relevant internship, practicum or training programs; evaluation of data on internship, practicum or training site performance; and contributing to new or revised policy and procedures for training programs.

Clinical faculty with areas of expertise in areas relevant to their unit or program may contribute to relevant areas of the unit. Examples of technical expertise include:

1. Program design and evaluation, such as measurement of training program performance, measurement of processes and outcomes.
2. Training and evaluation in the use of special technologies programs that advance teaching, learning or administration within the faculty member's unit.
3. Design of courses, course content, or supplemental training and education that contribute to programmatic development of the unit or program.

302-02: Promotion Reviews for Clinical Faculty

After the completion of three years in rank at ASU in the current position, the individual may elect to be considered for promotion (from assistant to associate clinical professor, from associate to full clinical professor). The basis of the review will be the annual workload agreement negotiated between the clinical faculty member and supervisor. The annual performance review will form a significant part of the promotion review documentation. The three primary areas to be considered in the evaluation are:

1. **Job Performance**—Fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities of the position held as detailed in the job description and in the workload agreement. The focus of the review will be on the relevant domains for each clinical faculty member and may include: teaching and instruction, training and supervision, administration, and service.
2. **Scholarship/Professional Development**—Evidence of continued professional development in relevant areas of the position. Efforts to keep abreast of current

developments in areas of responsibility. Development of new capabilities, methods and procedures, new knowledge, and/or instrumentation in area(s) of responsibility. Collaboration with faculty and students in facilitating, carrying out, and/or documenting innovative research, teaching, supervision, and/or service activities. Research, publications, presentation at conferences, and grant writing. In general, these are activities that represent a commitment to the profession or to the discipline beyond the daily duties of the position.

3. **Service**—Use of professional expertise in serving the interests of the school, unit, university, community, discipline, and/or higher education. It is also recognized that some clinical faculty may have greater opportunities for service than others.

302-03: Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The fulfillment of the agreed-upon workload and responsibilities is expected to be a major factor in decisions relating to promotion. The following are criteria for performance at each rank. Promotion to a higher rank requires performance at the appropriate level. (The terms in boldface text correspond to the definitions given in section 303.)

1. Assistant—Must meet degree or other training requirements and show promise of excellent performance, leadership, independence, and initiative.
2. Associate—Demonstrated sustained excellence in day-to-day performance and expertise in all **job performance** responsibilities, regular participation in **scholarship and professional development**, sustained evidence of initiative, demonstrated leadership and managerial capability, and a commitment to **service** activities.
3. Full—Outstanding performance of duties and fulfillment of all **job performance responsibilities**, recognized excellence in chosen field; evidence of substantial **scholarship and professional accomplishment**; contribution to school, unit or university programs; and proven commitment to **service**.

302-04: Procedures for Promotion Review of Clinical Faculty

The Peer Review Committee shall be composed of three individuals, chosen by the director of the school in consultation with the candidate and his or her faculty head. This committee should be made up of faculty in the school that have worked closely with the faculty member or who have a professional or discipline-based understanding of the faculty member's area of specialty. One of the three members of the Peer Review Committee may be an ASU faculty member from outside the school. A faculty member from the school must chair the Peer Review Committee.

The Peer Review Committee writes an initial evaluation of the file, contextualizing the faculty member's achievements and making an overall recommendation. A peer committee of this sort is particularly important in an interdisciplinary school where even the head may not have deep background in the faculty member's clinical area or methodologies.

After receiving the Peer Review Committee's evaluation, the faculty head writes an evaluation of the candidate's materials and makes an overall recommendation. The file is forwarded to the School Personnel Committee, which also writes an evaluation of the candidate's materials and makes an overall recommendation.

The director of the School of Letters and Sciences make his or her evaluation based on the candidate's materials and makes a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost of the university who makes the final decision.

303: Letters of Evaluation for Contract Faculty

The promotion of contract faculty requires a minimum of two letters of evaluation from appropriate faculty at ASU, its partners, or other universities. Solicitation of letters should specify which areas of performance (i.e., teaching and instruction, research and creative activities, service) are included. Materials appropriate to the review should be provided to the reviewer.

1. The faculty head proposes three reviewers and the candidate proposes three reviewers. The reviewers will be selected by the director and will represent both lists equally. All reviews received are included in the candidate's file.
2. Evaluations are solicited by the faculty head from persons of high reputation appropriate to the candidate's field.
3. The reviewer is asked for a curriculum vitae and a statement regarding his or her acquaintance with the applicant.
4. Guidelines with specific questions are furnished to each reviewer so that the evaluations have a consistent format and can be used objectively.
5. To give the reviewer an opportunity to develop a quality response, the reviewer has at least 30 days to respond.

Letters of evaluation are solicited on a confidential basis. Neither the names of the reviewers nor the contents of the letters are to be shared with the applicant. Only officially appointed or elected review committees and administrators in the review hierarchy examine the letters. Letters should be kept in a central location and viewed only there. Solicitation letters to reviewers should include a statement that describes who will have access to the letter of review and the extent to which confidentiality can be assured.

400 ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Revised March 12, 2012

The Arizona Board of Regents requires all Arizona State University faculty to be reviewed on an annual basis. The results of the annual review are tied to salary increases based on merit, when funds for merit raises are available. The following procedures outline the annual review process for all tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching in the school.

In light of the fact that the school is home to faculty working in a variety of disciplinary fields, a flexible set of criteria that will allow individual faculty members to adequately highlight and contextualize his/her work in and accomplishments in his/her particular field with regard to the three review areas (research/creative activity, teaching, and service) is necessary.

For both faculty members and their reviewer(s), the review process has been streamlined in that requirements for documentation of activity in each of the three review areas are broadly defined yet not specifically mandated, serving instead as guidelines that will allow individual

faculty members to select and include only those substantiating documents s/he feels are most pertinent to his/her report.

Flexibility is allowed in the evaluation of a faculty member's annual review file, both in terms of qualitative assessment of each review area and the means by which a final assessment is awarded for each review area.

In order that both reviewee and reviewer(s) know what to expect and what is expected of him/her and them, dates will be established each year (in line with dates provided by the Provost's office) for the following:

1. When a faculty member must submit his/her annual review materials.
2. When the reviewer(s) must provide the reviewee with a written report, detailing evaluations and scores for each of the three review areas as well as an overall assessment with comments and recommendations.
3. When the reviewee must submit any appeal s/he may have to any portion of the reviewer(s)'s report.
4. When the reviewer(s) must respond to an appeal.
5. If the issues remain unresolved, when the reviewee must submit the appeal to the appropriate school-level person or committee.

401: Materials and Outline of Procedures

Faculty members are responsible for submitting the following materials in the requested print or electronic format to their faculty-level committee by the date designated each year:

1. Faculty Annual Report Form and accompanying documents (see [Appendix A](#)) covering the past calendar year.
2. Annual evaluation letters for the two years prior to the current year.
3. Curriculum vitae.

The school and its faculty will abide by the calendar of annual reviews as distributed annually by the Provost's Office.

The relevant faculty head will review annual review files for school tenured and tenure-track faculty. The faculty head must take into consideration the previous two calendar years' activities per [ACD 506-10](#), which states that annual reviews "should cover the previous 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year."

See [Appendix A: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Annual Report Form](#)

402: Evaluation Criteria

The assessment scale used by the faculty head to conduct the annual review will be 1 (UNSATISFACTORY) – 2 (SATISFACTORY) – 3 (MERIT) – 4 (MERIT PLUS) – 5 (HIGH MERIT).

403: Contributions to Affirmative Action Principles

Per **ACD 506-10**, the Faculty-level Review Committee and the faculty head will also be guided by diversity and affirmative action efforts in the evaluation process. Those faculty members contributing actively to the affirmative action and diversity aims of the school and university in their pedagogical, research, creative, professional development, and service activities should note these contributions appropriately.

404: Appeal Process

Faculty may appeal their annual performance evaluation, as specified by **ACD 506-10**. Faculty may request a review of his or her performance evaluation to the next-higher administrative level above the person who made the initial performance recommendation. For example, if a program director who is responsible to a department chair made the initial recommendation, the individual could request a review from the department chair, whereas if the department chair made the initial evaluation the individual could request a review from the school director. The request for such a review must be made within 30 working days (summer excluded) after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision lies with the reviewer, who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (summer excluded) after it is requested.

NOTE: Thirty days is measured in 30 work days, summer excluded.

There are no procedures for hearings unless a grievance is alleged.

Appeals of salary decisions may also be made. Grounds for an appeal of salary decisions shall be failure to implement the unit's approved evaluation and salary plan consistently. Appeals shall be filed first at the unit level and, if necessary, then at the next administrative level. For colleges with departments, the unit appeal process shall be approved by a vote of the unit's faculty and academic professionals, and the college appeal process shall be approved by a vote of the college's faculty and academic professionals. For colleges without departments, the college appeal process shall be approved by a vote of the college's faculty and academic professionals, and the appeal process at the next administrative level shall be determined by the provost in consultation with the college faculty and academic professionals.

An individual may grieve deviation from the Board of Regents' or university's policies and procedures to the appropriate grievance committee. Grievances based on discrimination are referred to the Office of Diversity, Human Resources.

500 ANNUAL REVIEW OF CONTRACT FACULTY—LECTURERS/INSTRUCTORS

Revised: March 12, 2012

The Arizona Board of Regents requires all Arizona State University faculty to be reviewed on an annual basis. The results of the annual review are tied to salary increases based on merit, when funds for merit raises are available. The following procedures outline the annual review process for all contract faculty teaching in the school.

The review process in general is designed to incorporate an element of peer review. Though it is recognized that the various faculties within the school are in the best position to review their

own faculty, the compositions of some faculties may be too small to provide for peer committee levels of review. Faculties will decide by consensus when they have sufficient numbers of full-time faculty to establish a faculty-level committee to conduct their own peer reviews with procedures that mirror those in this document (adapted, where appropriate, with approval). Faculties that do not have sufficient faculty to establish their own faculty-level committee will invite appropriate faculty members from other units to assist with the peer-review process.

501: Materials and Outline of Procedures

Faculty members are responsible for submitting the following materials in the requested print or electronic format to their faculty-level committee by the date designated each year:

1. Faculty Annual Report Form and accompanying documents (see [Appendix B](#)) covering the past calendar year.
2. Annual evaluation letters for the two years prior to the current year.
3. Curriculum vitae.

The Faculty-level Review Committee will forward faculty materials and recommendations for review scores to the faculty head by the date designated each year.¹ The Faculty-level Review Committee's performance evaluations and recommendations for ratings to the faculty head must take into consideration the previous two calendar years' activities per [ACD 506-10](#), which states that annual reviews "should cover the previous 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year." A quorum of Faculty-level Review Committee members must be present to decide the recommendations for ratings. (Thus, if one person is absent, the others can decide on all faculty members except other Faculty-level Review Committee members. When a Faculty-level Review Committee member steps out to be reviewed, the others must be present to have a quorum.) In cases where there is not a majority vote (equal numbers disagree and agree), the split will be reported as is to the faculty head.

At the end of the evaluation period, the faculty head prepares and delivers to each faculty member a letter about his/her evaluation with the accompanying scores in each area and the overall evaluation rating. The faculty member's materials also are returned at this time. Reflective of the mentoring relationship that exists between the faculty member and faculty head, a meeting between the parties is suggested (but not required). Either party may request such a meeting, and if requested, these meetings should be held before the end of the semester.

502: Evaluation Criteria and Calculations

The general assumption is that all school contract faculty will have an 80 percent teaching/20 percent service load, both of which rely upon active and consistent professional development activities. Faculty-level committees or faculty heads will evaluate progress in these areas by calculating separate scores for teaching, student evaluations, and service. These scores then will be combined in a weighted calculation to arrive at an annual review score that corresponds to an annual review rating (see below). The annual review rating functions as a summary of the faculty member's performance and as such may be used by the school director and faculty head to determine merit award distributions and faculty promotions, respectively.

¹Details for the calculation of annual review scores and ratings are discussed in the next section.

Teaching and service scores will be determined from a series of indicators found in the School Criteria for Annual Review rubrics (see [Appendix C](#)). The student evaluation score will be converted from statistical summaries of student course evaluations as described below. The rubrics and summaries together are intended to aid faculty members and evaluators in interpreting the instructional and service contributions of each faculty member during the period under evaluation. Specifically, the indicators in the School Criteria for Annual Review rubrics should be applied in a context-dependent manner to reflect the best pedagogical practices of the subject matter being taught (e.g., best laboratory practices in the sciences, best classroom practices in language classes), though not all indicators need to be satisfied to achieve or assign a given rating. Faculty are *encouraged* to review the indicators for each area prior to filling out the Faculty Annual Report so that evaluators may use the report as an evidentiary guide to arrive at their ratings. Likewise, evaluators are *encouraged* to exercise best professional judgment in their assessments. In all cases, emphasis should be placed on the most recent year's activities, but these are to be contextualized by the two previous years' accomplishments.

Teaching—Overall teaching evaluation scores (55 percent of total score) will take into account the following indicators (exclusive of student evaluations, which are calculated separately, as indicated below): effective teaching, curriculum development, professional development activities that enhance teaching, rigor and quality of courses taught, whether courses taught were requirements or electives, class size). See [Appendix C](#). Written comments from student course evaluations may be considered here as well.

Student Evaluations— Student evaluation scores (25 percent of total score) are calculated from scores that we receive from student course evaluations, which are based on a five-point scale (1=highest score, 5=lowest score). A weighted conversion must be applied to this scale in order for these scores to be consonant with teaching and service scores based on an inverted four-point scale (4=highest score, 1=lowest score). The formula

$$y = 5/x + 0.40$$

will be used to convert Mean Student Evaluation Scores (x) into Converted Student Evaluation Scores (y) as follows. The Mean Student Evaluation Score is calculated from the answers to common evaluative questions relating to instructor and course from the school student evaluation form.

Mean Student Evaluation Score (x)	Converted Student Evaluation Score (y)	Rating Correlation
less than 1.50	3.75 – 4.00	High Merit
1.50 – 1.75	3.25 – 3.74	Merit Plus
1.76 – 2.13	2.75 – 3.24	Merit
2.14 – 3.13	2.00 – 2.74	Satisfactory
greater than 3.13	1.00 – 1.99	Unsatisfactory

Service—Overall service evaluation scores (20 percent of total score) will take into account the following indicators: professional service and professional development activities that provide service to the profession. See [Appendix C](#).

The annual review score will be calculated according to the following example (note that the weighting factors applied to the Teaching and Converted Student Evaluation scores combined account for the 80 percent load attributed to teaching-related contributions):

General Formula	Specific Example
(Teaching Score) × 0.55	4.00 × 0.55 = 2.20
(Converted Student Evaluation Score) × 0.25	3.40 × 0.25 = 0.85
+ (Service Score) × 0.20	+ 3.00 × 0.20 = 0.60
Annual Review Score	3.65

Ultimately, each person will receive one of the following ratings for their annual evaluation based on their annual review score:

Rating²	Annual Review Score	Description
(4.0) High Merit	3.75 – 4.00	Performed at an outstanding level
(3.5) Merit Plus	3.25 – 3.74	Performed at a superior level
(3.0) Merit	2.75 – 3.24	Exceeded satisfactory expectations
(2.0) Satisfactory	2.00 – 2.74	Competently fulfilled responsibilities
(1.0) Unsatisfactory	1.00 – 1.99	Failed to perform competently

Notes: While it appears we are using a strict algorithm for determining the overall performance rating, there may be divergence from it. The faculty head can adjust an overall rating in a way that better reflects all aspects of faculty work, not necessarily as a mathematical combination of the ratings received in teaching, student evaluations, and service. Thus, the formula above and the guidelines listed below suggest the rating boundaries, but do not rigidly define them. In some cases, it may also be necessary to alter the 80/20 load distribution; the faculty head and the faculty member should determine these alterations, ideally in advance of the academic year. This will assist the faculty head in evaluating performance in relation to the distribution of agreed-upon effort. Should opportunities or obstacles arise that would suggest altering that agreement, both parties would discuss this to do so. Faculty on joint and/or affiliated appointments will be evaluated according to the provisions of their **Joint Appointment Memorandum of Understanding**.

Remark for Faculty Members with Administrative Responsibilities: Faculty members who perform ongoing administrative services to the school, and who are not compensated in that capacity through fiscal-year salaries, will have reduced requirements in other areas of departmental work. Their administrative work should be documented and will be evaluated by the faculty head. The individual should report teaching and service activities on their Faculty Annual Report as performance in teaching and service are subject to the same standards as all other faculty. Thus, the Faculty-level Review Committee would review those with administrative loads as they would any other (assigning simple teaching and service scores, but taking into account the time and energy spent on administrative duties) and the resulting score would be combined with the evaluation of administrative work made by the faculty head according to the predetermined proportions. For example, someone with a 50-percent administrative load would be evaluated by his/her administrative supervisor for that work. The faculty member's other 50 percent (dedicated to teaching and service) would be evaluated by the Faculty-level Review

² The numeric ratings in parentheses will be reported to the school director. What is then forwarded to the Provost's Office will be whole numbers only, with merit plus being reported as a 3.

Committee as indicated below and those two scores would be combined to get an annual review score.

503: Contributions to Affirmative Action Principles

Per **ACD 506-10**, the Faculty-level Review Committee and the faculty head will also be guided by diversity and affirmative action efforts in the evaluation process. Those faculty members contributing actively to the affirmative action and diversity aims of the school and university in their pedagogical, research, creative, professional development, and service activities should note these contributions appropriately.

504: Appeal Process

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her annual review scores and/or rating must notify the faculty head in writing within 30 working days (summer excluded) of receiving evaluation results. The faculty member may submit additional information with his/her notification as deemed necessary.
2. The faculty member will meet with the faculty head and a member of the Faculty-level Review Committee (typically the committee chair, unless precluded for some reason). If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.
3. In the event of such an appeal, a three-person ad hoc Committee of Review will be appointed from the School Assembly, excluding the faculty head and members of the Faculty-level Review Committee. The appellant, the faculty head, and the school director each will select one member of the Committee of Review.

At the beginning of its deliberations, the Committee of Review will meet with the chair of the Faculty-level Review Committee to obtain information regarding the context of the evaluation in question, but then will excuse the chair and conduct its own independent review. The Committee of Review then will submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the faculty head.

4. The faculty head will consider all evidence to determine whether to amend or retain the original performance evaluation. The appellant maintains all rights to file a grievance following the completion of this appeal procedure.
5. If the aggrieved faculty member still is not satisfied with the faculty head's recommendation, he or she may seek relief through the school faculty grievance process at the next higher level (school director). According to **ACD 506-10 "Annual Evaluations of Faculty,"** the request for such a review must be made within 30 working days (summer excluded) after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision lies with the school director, who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (summer excluded) after it is requested. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member. There are no procedures for additional appeals or hearings.

600 ANNUAL REVIEW OF CONTRACT FACULTY—CLINICAL FACULTY

Revised: March 12, 2012

The Arizona Board of Regents requires all Arizona State University faculty members to be reviewed on an annual basis. The results of the annual review are tied to salary increases based on merit, when funds for merit raises are available. The following procedures outline the annual review process for all clinical faculty who teaching in the school.

Clinical faculty will undergo annual performance reviews. Clinical faculty negotiate an annual workload agreement with the faculty head and the submission of annual review papers that demonstrate how the faculty member has met the conditions of the workload agreement. This workload is normally distributed between teaching, supervision, scholarship, and service. Such a distribution may be appropriate for individuals appointed to carry out instructional functions. However, some individuals may have full-time administrative, supervision, research, or other assignments, and workload distribution agreements and annual reviews must reflect these assignments, as well as the professional development goals of the individual. The employee's immediate supervisor is responsible for conducting the annual review and negotiating annual workload agreements.

The review process in general is designed to incorporate an element of peer review. Though it is recognized that the various faculties within the school are in the best position to review their own faculty, the compositions of some faculties may be too small to provide for peer committee levels of review. Faculties will decide by consensus when they have sufficient numbers of full-time faculty to establish a faculty-level committee to conduct their own peer reviews with procedures that mirror those in this document (adapted, where appropriate, with approval). Faculties that do not have sufficient faculty to establish their own faculty-level committee will invite appropriate faculty members from other units to assist with the peer-review process.

601: Materials, Deadlines, and Outline of Procedures

Faculty members are responsible for submitting the following materials in the requested print or electronic format to their faculty-level committee by the date designated each year:

1. Faculty Annual Report Form and accompanying documents (**Appendix D**) covering the past calendar year.
2. Annual evaluation letters for the two years prior to the current year.
3. Curriculum vitae.

The Faculty-level Review Committee will forward faculty materials and recommendations for review scores to the faculty head by the date designated each year. The Faculty-level Review Committee's performance evaluations and recommendations for ratings to the faculty head must take into consideration the previous two calendar years' activities per **ACD 506-10**, which states that annual reviews "should cover the previous 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year." A quorum of Faculty-level Review Committee members must be present to decide the recommendations for ratings. (Thus, if one person is absent, the others can decide on all faculty members except other Faculty-level Review Committee members. When a Faculty-level Review Committee member steps out to be reviewed, the others must be present to have

a quorum.) In cases where there is not a majority vote (equal numbers disagree and agree), the split will be reported as is to the faculty head.

At the end of the evaluation period, the faculty head prepares and delivers to each faculty member a letter about his/her evaluation with the accompanying scores in each area and the overall evaluation rating. The faculty member's materials also are returned at this time. Reflective of the mentoring relationship that exists between the faculty member and faculty head, a meeting between the parties is suggested (but not required). Either party may request such a meeting, and, if requested, these meetings should be held before the end of the semester.

602: Evaluation Criteria and Calculations

Clinical faculty job responsibility will be based on the workload agreement and may entail areas such as instruction, training and supervision, and administration. The general assumption is that the workload agreement will be based on active and consistent professional development activities. Faculty-level committees or faculty heads will evaluate progress in these areas by evaluating performance ratings and other performance documents for the relevant domains in the workload agreement: teaching, training and supervision, administrative duties, and service, using the school Criteria for Annual Review of Clinical Faculty ([Appendix E](#)). These performance measures and materials will be evaluated together in order to arrive at an annual review rating for each domain (see below). The annual review rating functions as a summary of the faculty member's performance and as such may be used by the school director and faculty head to determine merit award distributions, term renewals, and promotions in rank for clinical faculty.

Teaching, training and supervision, administration, and service scores will be determined from a series of indicators found in the School Criteria for Annual Review of Clinical Faculty rubrics (see [Appendix E](#)). The rubrics and summaries together are intended to aid faculty members and evaluators in interpreting the instructional, training and supervision, administration, and service contributions of each faculty member during the period under evaluation. Clinical faculty members are encouraged to review the indicators for each area prior to filling out the Faculty Annual Report so that evaluators may use the report as an evidentiary guide to arrive at their ratings. Likewise, evaluators are encouraged to exercise best professional judgment in their assessments. In all cases, emphasis should be placed on the most recent year's activities, but these are to be contextualized by the two previous years' accomplishments.

603: Contributions to Affirmative Action Principles

Per [ACD 506-10](#), the Faculty-level Review Committee and the faculty head will also be guided by diversity and affirmative action efforts in the evaluation process. Those faculty members contributing actively to the affirmative action and diversity aims of the school and university in their pedagogical, research, creative, professional development, and service activities should note these contributions appropriately.

604: Appeal Process

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her annual review scores and/or rating must notify the faculty head in writing within 30 working days (summer excluded) of receiving evaluation results. The faculty member may submit additional information with his/her notification as deemed necessary.

2. The faculty member will meet with the faculty head and a member of the Faculty-level Review Committee (typically the committee chair, unless precluded for some reason). If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.
3. In the event of such an appeal, a three-person ad hoc Committee of Review will be appointed from the School Assembly, excluding the faculty head and members of the Faculty-level Review Committee. The appellant, the faculty head, and the school director each will select one member of the Committee of Review.
4. At the beginning of its deliberations, the Committee of Review will meet with the chair of the Faculty-level Review Committee to obtain information regarding the context of the evaluation in question, but then will excuse the chair and conduct its own independent review. The Committee of Review then will submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the faculty head.
5. The faculty head will consider all evidence to determine whether to amend or retain the original performance evaluation. The appellant maintains all rights to file a grievance following the completion of this appeal procedure.
6. If the aggrieved faculty member still is not satisfied with the faculty head's recommendation, he or she may seek relief through the school faculty grievance process at the next higher level (school director). According to **ACD 506-10 "Annual Evaluations of Faculty,"** the request for such a review must be made within 30 working days (summer excluded) after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision lies with the school director, who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (summer excluded) after it is requested. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member. There are no procedures for additional appeals or hearings.

700 STANDARDS COMMITTEE

See School of Letters and Sciences Bylaws, Article VI, Section C.

800 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

See School of Letters and Sciences Bylaws, Article VI, Section D.

900 STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Revised: July 8, 2010

Students who are enrolled in a University College or School of Letters and Sciences course and believe they have been unfairly or improperly graded may be assured of just treatment and fair consideration through the processes described in this document. Any such grievance must be started within the regular semester immediately following the course at issue, whether the student is enrolled in the university or not.

The grievance procedures do not deal with matters that properly belong in personnel proceedings.

901: Primary Procedures

1. Initially, the aggrieved student should communicate with the faculty member concerned and discuss the problem openly.
2. If this discussion does not result in a satisfactory resolution, the student may appeal to the faculty head or professor in charge of the instructor's area who will employ the area's procedures to resolve the grievance.

If the grievance has not been successfully cleared at this time, the student may request that the grievance be referred to the Office of the Dean, who will forward the case to an Academic Grievance Committee. The committee will convene for the specific purpose of hearing a student academic grievance as needed.

902: Secondary Procedures

1. The student must file a written statement of the grievance with the dean. The grievance must include a description of the specific events, actions, course and grade (if applicable), relating to the grievance and the resolution the student is seeking.
2. The dean will form a three-person Academic Grievance Committee and appoint a committee chair who will:
 - a. Notify the student that all further communication related to the grievance should be made with the chair of the panel.
 - b. Forward a copy of the grievance to the faculty member against whom the grievance is filed and request the instructor to file three copies of a written response with the panel chair within seven (7) days after receiving a copy of the grievance.
 - c. Forward a copy of the student grievance and faculty response to the faculty head of the area offering the course and ask that administrator to provide an opinion on the case at hand to the committee within seven (7) days after receiving a copy of the two documents.
3. The committee chair will:
 - a. Forward copies of the grievance, the instructor's response to the student, and the response from the faculty head to the other members of the panel.
 - b. Schedule a hearing, which may consist of one or more meetings with the student and the instructor, to hear the positions of the student and instructor respectively, related to the grievance. The first meeting will be scheduled no later than 30 days after the panel chair received the grievance.
4. If the student or instructor believes a member of the panel should not participate, based on perceived or actual bias or conflict of interest, the student or instructor may request, in writing, that the panel member be excused and the dean will appoint another member of the faculty to serve on the committee. If a designated committee panel member believes he

or she has a bias or conflict of interest which would negatively impact on the ability to decide the grievance fairly, the panel member will excuse himself or herself, notify the dean, and the dean will appoint a new panel member.

5. The student and instructor may provide documents to the panel for review and consideration, if three (3) copies of the documents are provided to the panel chair at least 10 days before the first scheduled date of the hearing. However, the chair of the panel will advise the student and the instructor that the panel will only consider documents that specifically relate to the grievance and response. The panel chair will retain one set of documents and forward the other two sets to the other two panel members at least seven (7) days before the hearing.
6. In keeping with the Family Education and Privacy Rights Act, if the grievance involves the grievant's grade, other matters, or information contained in the grievant's academic or educational records maintained by ASU, it is presumed that the student has consented to the review of such information by the filing of the grievance. In the event any information will be reviewed or provided to the panel related to grades or information contained in the educational records or academic files of students other than the grievant, such information is considered confidential under the Family Education and Privacy Rights Act and the panel shall proceed as follows:
 - a. The panel will obtain the written consent of the students involved (other than the grievant) to review grades or information from their educational records, OR
 - b. The chair of the panel will excise the names, social security numbers, addresses, and any other identifying information from the education records of the students involved (other than the grievant).
7. The hearing shall be conducted by the panel chair and shall be closed. Participants may be accompanied by an advisor of their choice. Advisors may make an oral statement on behalf of, and confer with, their advisee. Advisors may not directly address the committee or other participants. Arrangements for the order of appearance, for submission of materials, testimony, and related matters should be made through and by the panel chair.
8. At the hearing, the grievant will present his or her position first and try to do so within 30 minutes, including presentation of witness testimony and documentation. The chair may extend the time if necessary. The members of the panel may question the grievant during the presentations of their testimony. The instructor may question the student at the end of the presentation, but questioning should be limited to approximately 10 minutes or less. The chair may require the instructor to direct questions to the grievant through the chair.
9. The same process will be followed with the presentation of the instructor's case.
10. All questions should be related to the specific allegations of the grievance or statements in the response and the chair has final authority to judge relevancy.
11. The chair of the panel will digitally record the hearing and the digital file will be maintained by University College/School of Letters and Sciences for two years after the decision on the grievance is made. The student and/or instructor may record the meeting at their own expense and with their own equipment.

12. After the presentations of the grievant and instructor have concluded, each will be excused while the panel deliberates.
13. The chair of the panel shall prepare a written report with the recommendations of the majority of the panel for the dean. If there is disagreement among the panel, a minority report and recommendation may be submitted by the dissenting panel member to the dean. The report shall include:
 - a. Identity of student grievant and instructor involved in the grievance.
 - b. Date grievance and response were filed with the committee.
 - c. Identity of the panel members who heard the grievance.
 - d. Dates the panel met to conduct the grievance.
 - e. Summary of the positions of the student and instructor.
 - f. Summary of the testimony and documents presented.
 - g. Conclusions of the panel.
 - h. Recommendations of the panel.
14. The dean will take final action in each case after full consideration of the committee's recommendation. The dean may make grade changes, if any are recommended. The dean shall inform the student, the instructor, the appropriate faculty head, the registrar, and the grievance committee of any action taken.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Revised: March 12, 2012

According to Arizona Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis. This annual review is one element of post-tenure review. It is unrelated both to pre-tenure, third-year reviews of junior faculty and to promotion and tenure reviews of junior and/or senior faculty.

Please use this Annual Report Form to report your accomplishments in research/creative activity, teaching, and service. Use the category and subcategory headings. On those lines of the form where there is no activity to report, leave the line blank. Provide an explanation or clarification wherever you think it may be useful, including contributions to affirmative action principles. **Please submit both the completed Annual Report Form and all supporting materials ELECTRONICALLY.**

NAME: _____

Workload Distribution

Area	Previous Year 2	Previous Year 1	Current Year
Teaching	%	%	%
Research/Creative Activity	%	%	%
Service	%	%	%

CATEGORY 1. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

ABOR mandates that research be evaluated in three-calendar-year increments.

Please give complete bibliographical information for each entry. For works that have already been published, please provide a copy of the first page only or as otherwise directed by the faculty head. For articles or books in press, please provide the entire manuscript as well as letters from the relevant editor documenting that the work is to be published. Additionally, please provide substantial manuscripts in progress if you wish to have these count within the three-calendar-year window. **Online publications:** Please provide URLs for these and distinguish between edited, refereed publications, invited nonrefereed publications, and book reviews, putting any online publications in the appropriate categories. Online teaching- and service-related publications should appear in the sections relating to instructional contributions and service, respectively. Feel free to supply a few lines establishing a context for material outlined. **Please list all scholarly work using APA or MLA style and demark student authors in bold.**

1. Books (including monographs, edited volumes, and textbooks)
2. Articles, chapters, essays, poems, and short stories in refereed venues
3. Invited publications
4. Grants (both internal and external; specify amount and role)
 - a. Proposals funded. Include funding agency, amount funded, degree of involvement (% , PI, Co-PI, etc.), and dates.
 - b. Proposals submitted. Include funding agency, amount requested, degree of involvement (% , PI, Co-PI, etc.), and dates.
5. Invited addresses, such as keynotes
6. Conference presentations and papers
7. Professional-development workshops attended
8. Travel to collections for research purposes
9. Book reviews, review essays, and research notes
10. Honors and awards for scholarship
11. Sabbatical report
12. Shows, performances and exhibits
13. Other contributions *

* The category "Other contributions" should be used for work in progress and/or for any relevant materials that do not fall under a previous category. Include manuscripts in progress or under review if you wish them to count within the three-calendar-year window. Include evidence of material in press (e.g., editorial correspondence).

CATEGORY 2: INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

ABOR mandates that teaching be evaluated in one-calendar-year increments.

Evaluation of teaching will include attention to SYLLABI AND OTHER COURSE MATERIALS, student evaluations, the number of students enrolled in a class, and the demonstrated relation between the classes offered and departmental needs.

- List the courses you taught each semester. Explain any special circumstances that apply to these courses (e.g., a first-time prep; team-teaching; teaching early in the morning, at night, or on Saturday; teaching high-enrollment/multicultural content classes; or teaching online or web-enhanced courses).

List course, credits, and enrollment by semester and year, most recent first.

Semester/ Year	Prefix/ Number	Enroll- ment	Credits	SCH	Title

- Syllabi and other course documents. Please submit one syllabus for each unique course you taught (i.e., if you taught the same course two semesters in a row, only submit one syllabus for this course). Please also submit one representative assignment for each unique course taught.
- For online and web-enhanced courses, faculty using My ASU are encouraged to enroll their head as an instructor so that the head can view password-protected materials; faculty using their homepages or other web pages should provide their head with URLs and access.
- Course evaluations. Please provide one (1) printed-out copy of all your student evaluations that were conducted online for courses taught in the evaluation year, (2) an average of the evaluation numbers for Question 17 (All things considered, this instructor was a very effective university teacher.) for all courses, and (3) a 1-2 page, single-spaced narrative that contextualizes your evaluation scores. In particular, discuss areas in which you excel (such as particularly effective teaching strategies, your accessibility to students, your ability to provide an effective learning environment), as well as any changes in your teaching strategy you intend to implement.
- Names of students supervised in independent study courses and names of students you are mentoring at the graduate level, indicating whether you are serving as chair or member of their committees.

Thesis Supervisor – In Progress

Student	Title (tentative or general)

Thesis Supervisor – Completed

Student	Date Completed	Title (tentative or general)

Non-Thesis Advisees & Graduates

	Number	Number
Advisees		
Graduates		

Dissertation Supervisor – In Progress

Student	Title (tentative or general)

Dissertation Supervisor – Completed

Student	Date Completed	Title

- 6. Any additional mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students (e.g., co-authoring with students or assisting them to make conference presentations; participating in professional-development workshops).

Thesis Committee Member

Student	Title (tentative or general)

Dissertation Committee Member – Completed

Student	Date Completed	Title (tentative or general)

- 7. Names of undergraduate honors students you have mentored, either as chair or member of their thesis committees.
- 8. Teaching awards you have received.
- 9. Materials that provide evidence of curriculum development and/or significant course revision.
- 10. Evidence of course supervision, mentoring of teachers.
- 11. Other instructional contributions not listed above.

CATEGORY 3: SERVICE

ABOR mandates that service be evaluated in three-calendar-year increments.

Service to the Profession

1. Academic activities (e.g., editorships; boards of directors; consulting editor; occasional reviewer of proposals, manuscripts; conference sessions organized and/or chaired). Specify journal or agency, role, and time period.
2. Service (e.g., committee work for professional organizations). Specify organization, role and time period.

Service to the University

1. Membership on university-level committees. Indicate with an asterisk those committees you chair(ed).
2. Work with other departments (e.g., serving on search committees, coordinating joint programs).
3. Lectures, seminars given specifically to other departments.
4. Other service to the university (e.g., faculty senator).

Service to the School of Letters and Sciences

1. School committees on which you have served and/or are serving. Indicate with an asterisk those committees you chair(ed).
2. School activities you organize(d), beyond assigned committee work.
3. School administrative position(s) you have held/currently hold.

Service to the Community

1. Consultation and membership on community committees and boards. List agency, duties and time period.
2. Lectures, talks, workshops, and other public relations.

Other Professional Activities

Please provide information not covered in previous headings, such as being the subject of interviews.

To faculty with course releases. If you have nonresearch-related course releases, please specify what you are doing for that course release.

CATEGORY 4: GOALS FOR NEXT CALENDAR YEAR

Please list goals for each of the three evaluative categories (research, teaching and service) for the next year.

APPENDIX B: LECTURERS/INSTRUCTORS ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Revised: March 12, 2012

According to Arizona Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis.

Please use this Annual Report Form to report your accomplishments in instructional contribution and service relevant to you this year. Use the category and subcategory headings. On those lines of the form where there is no activity to report, leave the line blank. Provide an explanation or clarification wherever you think it may be useful, including contributions to affirmative action principles.

NAME: _____

CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching will include attention to SYLLABI AND OTHER COURSE MATERIALS, student evaluations, the number of students enrolled in a class, and the demonstrated relation between the classes offered and departmental needs.

1. In the table below list the courses you taught each semester (most recent first), enrollment, credits, SCH and course titles. Explain any special circumstances that apply to these courses (e.g., a first-time prep; team-teaching; teaching early in the morning, at night, or on Saturday; teaching high-enrollment/multicultural content classes; or teaching online or web-enhanced courses).

Semester/ Year	Prefix/ Number	Enroll- ment	Credits	SCH*	Title (add another column: special circumstances)

- b. Calculate SCH by multiplying enrollment by number of credits (e.g., 10 students in one 3 credit course produce 30 SCH)
2. Syllabi and other course documents. Please submit one syllabus for each unique course you taught (i.e., if you taught the same course two semesters in a row, only submit one syllabus for this course). Please also submit one representative assignment for each unique course taught.
3. For online and web-enhanced courses, faculty using My ASU are encouraged to enroll their head as an instructor so that the head can view password-protected materials; faculty using their homepages or other web pages should provide their head with URLs and access.
4. Course evaluations. Please provide one (1) printed-out copy of all your student evaluations that were conducted online for courses taught in the evaluation year, (2) an average of the evaluation numbers for Question 17 (All things considered, this instructor was a very effective university teacher.) for all courses, and (3) a 1-2 page, single-spaced narrative

that contextualizes your evaluation scores. In particular, discuss areas in which you excel (such as particularly effective teaching strategies, your accessibility to students, your ability to provide an effective learning environment), as well as any changes in your teaching strategy you intend to implement.

Student Academic Mentoring

Describe student academic mentoring/supervision (e.g., honors thesis, footnote 18, independent studies). Names of students supervised required.

Graduate Advising

List advisees and their degree programs.

Graduate Committees (Thesis and Dissertation)

For each, list committee role and thesis/dissertation title.

Curriculum Development and/or Revision

Describe curriculum development and/or revisions made to courses.

Professional Development

List conferences/workshops, brown bags, lectures, etc. attended and engagement with the literature of the profession.

Teaching Awards

List teaching awards you have received.

Other Instructional Contributions

Describe other instructional contributions not listed above (teaching awards, pedagogical projects, etc.).

CATEGORY 2. SERVICE

Committee Service

Describe committee activities and your contributions

1. Unit (Languages and Cultures, area committees)
2. College/School (School of Letters and Sciences committees)
3. University (ASU committees, e.g., CAPC)
4. Profession or discipline (committee or taskforce)

Community Service

Community outreach, activities, lectures, readings organized for community, etc. Describe these activities and provide a brief annotation explaining how each relates to your position and how it aids you in fulfilling the mission of the university, your unit, or your position.

Administrative Service/Duties

Administrative position(s) you have held or currently hold. Describe the affiliated duties as negotiated with supervisor.

* Your faculty head's evaluation of you will also include his/her assessment of your effectiveness as an administrator or mentor; the school director will evaluate the administrative service of faculty heads.

Mentoring

- Describe mentoring of students (e.g., advising student clubs, Obama Scholars)
- Describe course supervision and mentoring of teachers, i.e., providing workshop sessions for other faculty, mentoring incoming faculty, and observation write-ups of your visits to mentees' classes.

Professional Development Activities

Describe dissemination of pedagogical or professional knowledge via the following:

1. Publications (solicited or unsolicited/refereed reviews, articles, chapters, essays, poems, and short stories)
2. Conference presentations and papers
3. Professional development workshops
4. Shows, performances and exhibits

Other Service-Oriented Activities/Commendations

Describe grants, awards, special projects, and service to the profession (e.g., officer or journal editor), etc.

APPENDIX C: CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF LECTURERS/INSTRUCTORS

Revised: March 12, 2012

CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Faculty achieving a given level will exhibit the characteristics typical of those listed by category below. These characteristics provide general guidelines for performance, not an exhaustive list.

<p>High Merit (4.0)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Merit Plus requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated very high-quality teaching. • Offers extra learning opportunities to students (e.g., research assistantships, independent study, internships, service learning, honors projects). • Implements innovative ways of challenging and supporting students. • Creates and implements a new instructional technique that receives recognition and is broadly applicable. • Achieves widely recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching award external to the school. • Engages in professional development activities at the state, regional, or national level.
<p>Merit Plus (3.5)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Merit requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated high-quality teaching. • Offers accessibility to students outside teaching normal course load and required office hours (e.g., involvement with tutorial sessions, academic programs, student success center, faculty sponsorship of academic clubs, etc.). • Provides a challenging and supportive learning climate. • Evaluates learning outcomes, solicits input (from peers or students), and shows a continual refinement and reflection of teaching techniques and assignment design to improve student learning. On this characteristic, faculty should discuss up to, but no more than, 3 examples to illustrate. • Engages in professional development activities at the university level (ASU).
<p>Merit (3.0)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Satisfactory requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated quality teaching • Makes extra effort to support students (e.g., is accessible to students outside of class time, such as availability beyond normal office hours and prompt replies to emails, or well-documented Blackboard announcements emailed or direct proactive or notification emails to students). • Provides a supportive learning climate. • Uses strategies in teaching materials and presentation designed to enhance student engagement. To meet these criteria faculty might adopt or employ instructional techniques such as cooperative learning, active learning, learning-centered education, independent study, use of new technologies, web-based course components, and electronic communication processes for student participation, etc. • Engages in School of Letters and Sciences professional development activities.
<p>Satisfactory (2.0)</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated average teaching with pedagogically sound instructional practices (e.g., uses formal syllabus and challenging assignments, provides timely feedback).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is accessible to students outside the classroom. • Provides an adequate learning environment. • Is respectful to students.
Unsatisfactory (1.0)	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated poor quality teaching. • Repeatedly fails to be accessible to students. • Is disrespectful to students. • Violates the professional student-teacher relationship.

CATEGORY 2. SERVICE

Note: If job requirements match particular categories listed below, they should be weighed more heavily in evaluating performance. See "Remark for Faculty Members with Administrative Responsibilities" in the Procedures document.

<p>High Merit (4.0)</p> <p>Meets two of these at High Merit Level and at least two others at Merit Plus Level or higher.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Makes vital service contributions to university/school. School committees or community; membership often by faculty election or director appointment; serves on state, regional, national, or international committees. • Community Outreach—Takes leadership role in forging wide-ranging community partnerships. • Administrative Duties—Gains recognition for outstanding performance of duties. • Mentoring—Participates in the quality review and improvement of mentorship models. • Professional Development—Distributes new teaching philosophies and major content revisions through publications and special recognition at conferences. Submits and receives grants for teaching, and student or community enhancement. • Other—At least one of the following: grants, awards, special projects, service to the profession (association officer, journal editor), etc.
<p>Merit Plus (3.5)</p> <p>Meets two of these at Merit Plus Level and at least one at Merit Level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if a contribution meets High Merit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Makes meaningful contributions to time-consuming committees, with crucial roles. • Community Outreach—Initiates and develops community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Meritorious and shows systematic means of seeking improvement or evaluating effectiveness. • Mentoring—Initiates helping and mentoring others in a structured and systematic manner. • Professional Development—Demonstrates new ideas and content through seminars, conferences and workshops; publishes; submits proposals for grants; development work promoting enhancement of teaching and student learning. • Other—Applying for grants, awards, and special projects.

<p>Merit (3.0)</p> <p>Meets at least three of these at Merit level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if at least one meets Merit Plus or higher.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Serves actively on unit or school committees with specific or purpose-driven functions; enhances faculty profile; volunteers for service such as convocation, etc. • Community Outreach—Actively and regularly participates in community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Meritorious and timely performance of duties. • Mentoring—Contributes positively and regularly to the professional development of colleagues. • Professional Development—Shares knowledge with colleagues through formal and informal means. Collaborates on proposals and workshops.
<p>Satisfactory (2.0)</p> <p>Meets at least three of these at satisfactory level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if at least one meets Merit or higher.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Serves on unit or school committees, participates in a supportive faculty environment, attends meetings, etc. • Community Outreach—Participates in community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Satisfactory completion of duties. • Mentoring—Contributes to the professional development of colleagues. • Professional Development—Engaged with literature of the profession.
<p>Unsatisfactory (1.0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—No or minimal evidence of service. • Community Outreach—Does not participate in or has contributed negatively in activities. • Administrative Duties—Fails to perform duties in a satisfactory manner. • Mentoring—Does not contribute positively to professional development of self or others. • Professional Development—No evidence of activities that provide service to the profession.

APPENDIX D: CLINICAL FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Revised: March 12, 2012

According to Arizona Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis.

Please use this Annual Report Form to report your accomplishments in instructional contribution, administration and service. Use the category and subcategory headings. On those lines of the form where there is no activity to report, leave the line blank. Provide an explanation or clarification wherever you think it may be useful, including contributions to affirmative action principles.

NAME: _____

CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching will include attention to SYLLABI AND OTHER COURSE MATERIALS, student evaluations, the number of students enrolled in a class, and the demonstrated relation between the classes offered and departmental needs.

1. In the table below list the courses you taught each semester (most recent first), enrollment, credits, SCH and course titles. Explain any special circumstances that apply to these courses (e.g., a first-time prep; team-teaching; teaching early in the morning, at night, or on Saturday; teaching high-enrollment/multicultural content classes; or teaching online or web-enhanced courses).

Semester/ Year	Prefix/ Number	Enroll- ment	Credits	SCH*	Title (add another column: special circumstances)

- a. Calculate SCH by multiplying enrollment by number of credits (e.g., 10 students in one 3 credit course produce 30 SCH)
2. Syllabi and other course documents. Please submit one syllabus for each unique course you taught (i.e., if you taught the same course two semesters in a row, only submit one syllabus for this course). Please also submit one representative assignment for each unique course taught.
 3. For online and web-enhanced courses, faculty using My ASU are encouraged to enroll their head as an instructor so that the head can view password-protected materials; faculty using their homepages or other web pages should provide their head with URLs and access.
 4. Course evaluations. Please provide one (1) printed-out copy of all your student evaluations that were conducted online for courses taught in the evaluation year, (2) an average of the evaluation numbers for Question 17 (All things considered, this instructor was a very effective university teacher.) for all courses, and (3) a 1-2 page, single-spaced narrative that contextualizes your evaluation scores. In particular, discuss areas in which you excel (such

as particularly effective teaching strategies, your accessibility to students, your ability to provide an effective learning environment), as well as any changes in your teaching strategy you intend to implement.

Student Academic Mentoring

Describe student academic mentoring/supervision (e.g., honors thesis, footnote 18, independent studies). Names of students supervised required.

Graduate Advising

List advisees and their degree programs.

Graduate Committees (Thesis and Dissertation)

For each, list committee role and thesis/dissertation title.

Curriculum Development and/or Revision

Describe curriculum development and/or revisions made to courses.

Professional Development

List conferences/workshops, brown bags, lectures, etc. attended and engagement with the literature of the profession.

Teaching Awards

List teaching awards you have received.

Other Instructional Contributions

Describe other instructional contributions not listed above (teaching awards, pedagogical projects, etc.).

CATEGORY 2. SERVICE

Committee Service

Describe committee activities and your contributions

1. Unit (Languages and Cultures, area committees)
2. College/School (School of Letters and Sciences committees)
3. University (ASU committees, e.g., CAPC)
4. Profession or discipline (committee or taskforce)

Community Service

Community outreach, activities, lectures, readings organized for community, etc. Describe these activities and provide a brief annotation explaining how each relates to your position and how it aids you in fulfilling the mission of the university, your unit, or your position.

Administrative Service/Duties

Administrative position(s) you have held or currently hold. Describe the affiliated duties as negotiated with supervisor.

* Your faculty head's evaluation of you will also include his/her assessment of your effectiveness as an administrator or mentor; the school director will evaluate the administrative service of faculty heads.

Mentoring

- Describe mentoring of students (e.g., advising student clubs, Obama Scholars)
- Describe course supervision and mentoring of teachers, i.e., providing workshop sessions for other faculty, mentoring incoming faculty, and observation write-ups of your visits to mentees' classes.

Professional Development Activities

Describe dissemination of pedagogical or professional knowledge via the following:

1. Publications (solicited or unsolicited/refereed reviews, articles, chapters, essays, poems, and short stories)
2. Conference presentations and papers
3. Professional development workshops
4. Shows, performances and exhibits

Other Service-Oriented Activities/Commendations

Describe grants, awards, special projects, and service to the profession (e.g., officer or journal editor), etc.

CATEGORY 3. TRAINING, SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

Evaluation of these categories will be based on criteria defined in the faculty workload agreement. The criteria may include student evaluations (e.g., practicum course), peer evaluations, or evaluations completed by individuals outside of the school or outside of ASU who work closely with the faculty. These materials must be submitted to the FAR committee chair for your unit.

Practicum Training/Supervision

List the practicum training/supervision activities you were involved in each semester. Explain any special circumstances that apply to these training activities (e.g., a first-time placement of students in new site, team supervision; supervision early in the morning, at night, or on Saturday; training or supervision using online or web-enhanced resources; substantial revision of an existing training program, etc.). You might also point out areas in which you excel, such as particularly effective or innovative training and supervision strategies, your accessibility to students, your ability to provide an effective and supportive learning environment, reflect on learning outcomes achieved by students, enhance student engagement and student learning, etc. (refer to [Appendix E](#) for evaluative criteria).

Administrative

List specific management or administrative responsibilities. Describe the expected results documented in the workload agreement and provide evidence of progress towards achieving stated goals. Administrative projects, data analyses, reports or other documentation.

APPENDIX E: CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF CLINICAL FACULTY

Revised: March 12, 2012

CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Faculty achieving a given level will exhibit the characteristics typical of those listed by category below. These characteristics provide general guidelines for performance, not an exhaustive list.

<p>High Merit (4.0)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Merit Plus requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated very high-quality teaching. • Offers extra learning opportunities to students (e.g., research assistantships, independent study, internships, service learning, honors projects). • Implements innovative ways of challenging and supporting students. • Creates and implements a new instructional technique that receives recognition and is broadly applicable. • Achieves widely recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching award external to the school. • Engages in professional development activities at the state, regional, or national level.
<p>Merit Plus (3.5)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Merit requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated high-quality teaching. • Offers accessibility to students outside teaching normal course load and required office hours (e.g., involvement with tutorial sessions, academic programs, student success center, faculty sponsorship of academic clubs, etc.). • Provides a challenging and supportive learning climate. • Evaluates learning outcomes, solicits input (from peers or students), and shows a continual refinement and reflection of teaching techniques and assignment design to improve student learning. On this characteristic, faculty should discuss up to, but no more than, three (3) examples to illustrate. • Engages in professional development activities at the university level (ASU).
<p>Merit (3.0)</p> <p>Assumes fulfillment of Satisfactory requirements</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated quality teaching. • Makes extra effort to support students (e.g., is accessible to students outside of class time, such as availability beyond normal office hours and prompt replies to emails or well-documented Blackboard announcements emailed or direct proactive or notification emails to students). • Provides a supportive learning climate. • Uses strategies in teaching materials and presentation designed to enhance student engagement. To meet these criteria faculty might adopt or employ instructional techniques such as cooperative learning, active learning, learning-centered education, independent study, use of new technologies, web-based course components, and electronic communication processes for student participation, etc. • Engages in SLS professional development activities.
<p>Satisfactory (2.0)</p>	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated average teaching with pedagogically sound instructional practices (e.g., uses formal syllabus and challenging assignments, provides timely feedback).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is accessible to students outside the classroom. • Provides an adequate learning environment. • Is respectful to students.
Unsatisfactory (1.0)	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated poor quality teaching. • Repeatedly fails to be accessible to students. • Is disrespectful to students. • Violates the professional student-teacher relationship.

CATEGORY 2. SERVICE

Note: If job requirements match particular categories listed below, they should be weighed more heavily in evaluating performance. See "Remark for Faculty Members with Administrative Responsibilities" in the Procedures document.

<p>High Merit (4.0)</p> <p>Meets two of these at High Merit Level and at least two others at Merit Plus Level or higher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Makes vital service contributions to university/school. School committees or community; membership often by faculty election or director appointment; serves on state, regional, national or international committees. • Community Outreach—Takes leadership role in forging wide-ranging community partnerships. • Administrative Duties—Gains recognition for outstanding performance of duties. • Mentoring—Participates in the quality review and improvement of mentorship models. • Professional Development—Distributes new teaching philosophies and major content revisions through publications and special recognition at conferences. Submits and receives grants for teaching and student or community enhancement. • Other—At least one of the following: grants, awards, special projects, service to the profession (association officer, journal editor), etc.
<p>Merit Plus (3.5)</p> <p>Meets two of these at Merit Plus Level and at least one at Merit Level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if a contribution meets High Merit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Makes meaningful contributions to time-consuming committees, with crucial roles. • Community Outreach—Initiates and develops community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Meritorious and shows systematic means of seeking improvement or evaluating effectiveness. • Mentoring—Initiates helping and mentoring others in a structured and systematic manner. • Professional Development—Demonstrates new ideas and content through seminars, conferences, workshops; publishes; submits proposals for grants; development work promoting enhancement of teaching and student learning. • Other—Applying for grants, awards, and special projects.
<p>Merit (3.0)</p> <p>Meets at least three of these at</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Serves actively on unit or school committees with specific or purpose-driven functions; enhances faculty profile; volunteers for service such as convocation, etc. • Community Outreach—Actively and regularly participates in community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Meritorious and timely performance of duties.

Merit level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if at least one meets Merit Plus or higher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring—Contributes positively and regularly to the professional development of colleagues. • Professional Development—Shares knowledge with colleagues through formal and informal means. Collaborates on proposals, workshops.
Satisfactory (2.0) Meets at least three of these at satisfactory level. Meeting fewer at this level is acceptable if at least one meets Merit or higher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—Serves on unit or school committees; participates in a supportive faculty environment; attends meetings, etc. • Community Outreach—Participates in community outreach activities. • Administrative Duties—Satisfactory completion of duties. • Mentoring—Contributes to the professional development of colleagues. • Professional Development—Engaged with literature of the profession.
Unsatisfactory (1.0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Service—No or minimal evidence of service. • Community Outreach—Does not participate in or has contributed negatively in activities. • Administrative Duties—Fails to perform duties in a satisfactory manner. • Mentoring—Does not contribute positively to professional development of self or others. • Professional Development—No evidence of activities that provide service to the profession.

CATEGORY 3. CLINICAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, TRAINING AND SUPERVISION

Faculty achieving a given level will exhibit many of the characteristics for the category in which placed.

High Merit (4.0) Assumes fulfillment of Merit Plus requirements	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision or other evaluations are very high. • Offers extra learning opportunities to students (e.g., clinical training, independent study, etc.). • Implements innovative ways of challenging and supporting students. • Creates and implements a new administrative programs or procedures or training and supervision techniques that receives recognition from or is applicable to another unit. • Achieves widely recognized administrative, clinical or training success, such as receiving awards or special recognition external to the school.
Merit Plus (3.5) Assumes fulfillment of Merit requirements	<p>Many of these characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision or other evaluations are high. • Offers accessibility to students outside teaching normal job duties and responsibilities (e.g., community-based clinical activities, administrative programs, student success center, faculty sponsorship of clubs, etc.). • Provides a challenging and supportive learning climate. • Evaluates learning outcomes, solicits input (from peers or students), and shows a continual refinement and reflection of administrative, training and supervision

	techniques and assignment design to improve student learning.
Merit (3.0) Assumes fulfillment of Satisfactory requirements	Many of these characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision or other evaluations are adequate. • Makes extra effort to support students (e.g., is accessible to students outside of scheduled time, such as availability beyond normal office hours and prompt replies to emails or well-documented Blackboard announcements emailed or direct proactive or notification emails to students). • Provides a supportive learning, training or administrative climate. • Uses strategies in management, training and supervision designed to enhance student engagement. To meet these criteria faculty might adopt or employ administrative or training techniques such as group activities, role-play, clinical case reviews, independent study, use of new technologies, program evaluation, web-based programs, and electronic communication processes for student participation, etc. • Engages in professional development activities.
Satisfactory (2.0)	Many of these characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching evaluations are marginal. • Is accessible to students outside the classroom. • Provides an adequate learning environment. • Is respectful to students. • Demonstrates pedagogically sound instructional practices.
Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Many of these characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision or other evaluations are unsatisfactory. • Repeatedly fails to be accessible to students. • Is disrespectful to students. • Violates the professional student-teacher relationship. • Uses poor management or training practices