Bylaws of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Approved: April 2, 2014, BGR
(Addition of Mission Statement approved by BGR August 3, 2015)
(Fixed Term Promotion Changes Approved by Deborah Clarke, June 14 2016)
06/14/2016

Mission Statement

Bringing together the best of both a small-college experience – with its close personal relationships – and a top-tier research university – with its innovative research faculty and facilities – ASU's New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences is nationally unique. Faculty members at New College work within and across traditional disciplinary boundaries to produce cutting-edge research and creative projects that garner national and international recognition. Students at New College are provided with extraordinary opportunities for personal and professional growth by engaging in the production of knowledge and innovation both within the classroom and beyond. Ultimately, collaboration with faculty members is the hallmark of the New College experience for students, and excellence in research, teaching and mentoring a cornerstone of every faculty member's work.

We firmly believe that this mission will achieve the ambitious goals of the New American University: providing access to an educational experience that is as distinctive as it is excellent, and that prepares each student to positively impact our communities through his/her life and career.

Table of Contents

Article 1. Organization of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Assembly

A. Rights and Privileges of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Assembly

The primary governing unit of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (hereafter NCIAS) is the NCIAS Assembly (hereafter the Assembly). The Assembly shall possess all rights, privileges and prerogatives conferred upon it by the Arizona Board of Regents, Arizona State University, the Academic Assembly Bylaws and Bylaws of Arizona State University NCIAS. Specifically, the Assembly shall have the authority:

- to recommend to the Dean educational, curricular and personnel policies as falling within the purview of NCIAS; and to recommend rules, regulations and bylaws to promote and enforce such policies;
- to recommend to the Dean bylaws for the governance of the NCIAS; and
- to receive and act upon reports of its standing committees and such ad hoc committees as may be appointed.

B. Meetings of the Assembly

The Assembly shall meet in a timely fashion to deliberate and make decisions related to the mission of NCIAS.

1. The Assembly shall meet at least once each semester during the academic year.
2. The Dean shall call the Assembly into session at the beginning of each semester. The Dean shall be called upon to report on the state of the College, and College committees shall report to the Assembly.
3. If he or she deems necessary, the Dean may call a meeting of the Faculty Assembly at any time.
4. Agenda items shall be submitted to the Assembly Chair and Dean at least ten calendar days prior to the meeting.
5. Notice of regular or special meetings of the Assembly will be provided via email to members of the Assembly at least three (3) work days in advance of the meeting. The notice will include the time, place and purpose of the meeting.
6. A special meeting of the Assembly may be called with a notice of seven calendar days when classes are in session by either (1) the request of the Dean or (2) the request of a petition signed by at least 10 percent of the voting members. Either the Dean's request or a petition requesting a meeting must state the specific item(s) to be considered at the meeting. Special meetings may take the form of a regular meeting on campus or, to meet specific goals, may take the form of retreats and/or workshops.

C. Membership and Voting Rights

Voting members are those faculty who hold academic appointments in NCIAS provided they meet one of the following criteria:

1. title of Dean/VP;

2. title of School Director;

3. faculty holding a tenure or tenure-track position;

4. academic professionals holding or eligible for a continuing appointment; or

5. academic employee with the title of lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, or clinical professor.

Faculty with joint appointments (the salary line is budgeted between two different Colleges) who meet any of the above criteria are voting members of the College.

Voting on the following issues is restricted to tenure-track and tenured faculty and full-time academic professionals: personnel (including hiring), promotion and tenure policies, curriculum, evaluation, appointments, and by-laws and other governing documents.

D. Conduct of Assembly Meetings

1. Unless a quorum is called, a majority of those present and voting at regular and special sessions of the Assembly shall be sufficient for the adoption of all measures, except as provided elsewhere in these Bylaws.

2. A quorum shall consist of at least one-third of the voting members.

3. An item of new business cannot normally be acted upon until the meeting subsequent to its introduction. However, it can be discussed and acted upon if it receives the approval for action of at least two-thirds of the members present.

E. Officers

1. Chair of the Assembly

   a. shall be a tenured member of NCIAS faculty;

   b. shall be elected annually by the members of the Assembly by April 15 of the semester prior to term of service;

   c. shall take office on May 15 of the year elected and serve one full year; and

   d. shall have the following duties:

      (1) conduct meetings of the Assembly;

(2) call for agenda items at least three weeks before the meeting;

(3) circulate agenda at least one week before the meeting;

(4) call meetings of the Assembly as deems necessary;

(5) proof and circulate the minutes of the Assembly meetings; and

(6) conduct votes and elections of the Assembly.

e. In the event that the Chair is unable to perform these duties, the Parliamentarian shall call for a new election.

2. Parliamentarian

a. shall be elected annually by the members of the Assembly at the same election and for the same term of office as the Chair;

b. shall be responsible for offering interpretations of these Bylaws; and

c. shall be responsible for emergency Chair vacancy elections.

F. Balloting

1. Responsibilities of Chair

The Chair of the Assembly shall be responsible for reporting committee vacancies, distributing requests for nominations, supervising the voting process, and reporting the results of all balloting to the College faculty.

2. Annual Designation of Committee Positions and Vacancies

At the beginning of each academic year, the Chair shall distribute a list of standing committees of the Assembly and for College and campus committees that identifies College representatives, their terms of service, and the committees' responsibilities.

3. Voting Procedures for College-wide Elections

a. The Chair shall allow at least five working days for the submission of nominations.

b. The request for nominations shall include a description of the position's responsibilities (if new), term length, and the name of the current College representative.

c. The Chair shall verify the eligibility of nominees to serve.

d. The Chair shall allow at least five working days for the return of ballots.

e. All balloting is registered, secret and carried out under the direction of the Chair.

f. Elections shall be determined by a simple majority of votes cast.

g. All vacancies by resignation or for other reasons shall be filled within one month and by standard voting procedures.

4. Voting Procedures at Assembly Meetings

One-third of voting members at any Assembly meeting may call for a written ballot on a question presented to the Assembly. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

a. the Chair shall present written ballots to all members of the Assembly within ten days of the call for the vote;

b. the Chair shall allow five working days for the return of ballots;

c. the outcome of the vote shall be determined by a simple majority of votes cast; and

d. this procedure shall not apply to amending College Bylaws.

G. Process of Amending Bylaws

The process of amending College Bylaws shall consist of three steps: initiation by petition; approval for balloting by Assembly; and balloting by Assembly members.

1. Changes in the Assembly Bylaws that affect the internal governance of the College must be initiated in one of three ways: a) by a petition signed by a minimum of ten percent of Assembly members, b) by a proposal by the College Bylaws Committee, or c) by a proposal by the Dean. The petition or proposal shall be submitted to the Chair at least ten days prior to the next Assembly meeting.

2. The Chair shall circulate the petition or proposal to the College at least five days prior to the Assembly meeting at which it will be discussed and voted upon.

3. Balloting on the petition or proposal requires a simple majority of members at the Assembly meeting including absentee ballots submitted in advance of the meeting.

4. In the case of a favorable vote, the Chair shall circulate ballots within five days and allow ten days for the return of ballots.

5. Amendments to the Bylaws require a simple majority of all votes cast.

6. Changes to the Assembly Bylaws necessitated by the addition, deletion or modification of board or university policy or the result of academic reorganization may be initiated by the Chair.

Article II. Committees of New College of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences

A. Standing Committees of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Assembly

The standing committees of the NCIAS are created by the faculty to administer its responsibilities for personnel review and policy and curriculum review and policy; and student concerns. The composition of the committees is designed to reflect the diversity of schools within the College.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have the following responsibilities of review:

    a. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the files of all probationary, tenure and promotion candidates in NCIAS and making recommendations to the Dean.

    b. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing disputed Annual Reviews and making a recommendation to the Dean.

2. Personnel Committee responsibilities related to personnel policies and procedures for NCIAS are governed by the appropriate sections of the ACD Manual.

    a. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the files of all sabbatical applications and making a recommendation to the Dean.
    b. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the files of all fixed-term promotion files and making a recommendation to the Dean.

3. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall have the following responsibilities to make recommendations to the Dean concerning undergraduate curriculum policy and review:

    a. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing program-level changes to be processed through the university curriculum process.

    b. The Committee shall also review and make recommendations to the dean and faculty of NCIAS regarding undergraduate College degree requirements.

4. Graduate Curriculum Committee shall have the following responsibilities to make recommendations to the Dean concerning graduate curriculum policy and review:

    a. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing all graduate program-level curricular changes to be processed through the university curriculum process.

    b. The Committee shall also review and make recommendations to the dean and faculty of NCIAS regarding graduate College degree requirements.

4. Academic Standards Committee shall be advisory to the Dean of NCIAS regarding undergraduate student petitions that concern college-wide academic requirements and shall be advisory to the Dean on Academic Integrity Issues.

5. The Bylaws Committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes to the bylaws annually during the Fall Semester. They should ensure that the bylaws are in accordance with the ACD, ABOR, and University procedures. The Bylaws Committee will be advisory to the Dean and faculty with regard to governance issues.

B. Ad Hoc Committees of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Ad hoc committees may be created at the initiative of either the Dean or the Assembly, whenever they are considered useful in carrying out the business of the College.

1. The Dean of NCIAS shall appoint other committees such as a committee dealing long range planning and priorities, as he or she may deem necessary or useful to carry on the business of the College. The membership and the chair of these committees shall be appointed by the Dean.

2. The faculty may initiate the creation of an ad hoc committee whenever representatives of two or more schools deem it necessary or useful to work together. Representatives from two schools will go to the Dean or the Assembly with an idea or proposal. If the Dean or the Assembly considers the idea/proposal potentially useful to the College, he or she will call for participation from other schools. There will be only one voting member from each school that actively participates in the committee. The committee shall elect its own chair. The committee reports out to the Dean.

C. Membership and Operations of Standing Committees

1. Committee members shall be elected within each school, one per school, according to school bylaws.

2. Members shall serve three-year, staggered terms. In the first year of each standing committee, members will draw straws to allocate one, two and three year terms at the first meeting of the committee.

3. Vacancies in a committee's membership shall be filled by the school which is not represented, according to its bylaws.

4. Each standing committee shall elect its chair from the members on the committee.

5. Each standing committee shall report each semester to the Assembly. The chair shall submit an annual written report to the Dean no later than May 1st. The Assembly Chair shall maintain a file of these reports accessible to Assembly members.

6. Committee memberships shall be filled by April 15 for the following academic year. Current committee chairs shall convene meetings of these representatives by May 1 for the purpose of electing a chair for the following academic year.

7. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of three tenured Full Professors, whenever possible, one elected from each school of the College. If full professors are not available, an associate professor may be elected. If a faculty member is

being reviewed for promotion to full, then we may seek a full professor substitute from CLAS. A Full Professor Alternate member shall be elected at-large to the Committee to serve in the event that a committee member must recuse him/herself. The Alternate shall serve a one-year term.

8. The Graduate Curriculum Committee shall be made up of the Director of Graduate Programs and for the first year, the faculty directors or faculty coordinators of each graduate degree. Thereafter, program faculty will elect representatives from each of the graduate programs.

Article III. Position of School Director

The NCIAS of Arizona State University includes academic school and other administrative units as may be created to carry out its mission. The members of each academic school shall develop its own operating bylaws subject to review and approval by the Director, Dean and Office of the Provost. Voting membership must be clearly defined in writing by each school. School bylaws must be consistent with the regulations of the Arizona Board of Regents, the ACD Manual and the Bylaws of NCIAS. The Dean determines the dates, duration of appointment, and other aspects of School Directors. School faculty may be involved in the Annual Reviews as advisory to the Dean. Per ACD 107-01: University Deans, the faculty role relative to school heads or department chairs is stated to be that the dean recommends to the Provost "after consultation with the faculty" . The duties of school heads or department chairs are listed in ACD 109. The participation of faculty in the performance evaluation of school directors is stated in ACD 111-03, which for school directors is at least once every two years.

A. Duties of the School Director

School directors serve as academic leaders. School directors will foster a professional working atmosphere; maintain open communication with the academic personnel in their school and the College; and represent the interests of their school, their faculty and academic personnel in their relations with the College Dean, university administration, and external community. School directors will be fair in the distribution of resources, teaching and service among faculty and academic professionals. School directors will be responsible for keeping their faculties fully informed regarding all institutional matters. In addition, the duties of the school director will include fulfilling the responsibilities outlined in the ACD manual as well as those specifically assigned by the Dean of NCIAS.

B. Term of Appointment

School directors are officially appointed by the Dean of NCIAS and like all administrative officers serve one year appointments at the pleasure of the President of the University.

C. Re-Appointment

In making decisions on the future administrative appointments of school directors, the College Dean will take into consideration, but will not be bound by, the expressed wishes of the faculty as indicated both formally and informally in the evaluation process.

D. Annual Reviews

To facilitate the process of communication and accountability among peers, school directors will be reviewed annually by the faculty within their school during April of the spring semester. The designation of faculty who may participate in this review will be determined in the bylaws of the school. A survey instrument will be administered to all of the College faculty in respect to the school director of their individual school by the Office of the Dean. The survey instrument will be drafted by the Personnel Committee and approved by the faculty and then recommended to the Dean for approval, and the Dean will decide if the form is used. A written summary of the evaluation shall be distributed to the faculty and director of each school by the Dean. Other forms of evaluation deemed appropriate may be adopted by the schools, with the approval of the Dean.

E. Vacancies in Position

For situations in which the school director is no longer able to serve, the Dean will consult with the faculty in the relevant school regarding the desirability of either an interim appointment, an outside national or international search, or an internal appointment. The mechanism of consultation shall be at the Dean's discretion.

Article IV. Academic Review Policies and Procedures

A. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

The purpose of promotion and tenure reviews in NCIAS is to ensure a fair and impartial process for review and evaluation of each candidate. A candidate is promoted, granted tenure, or retained on the basis of excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence. in scholarship and artistic activity, teaching, and service. Probationary reviews are conducted to provide tenure –eligible faculty with early evaluations of their development and of their ability to meet tenure and promotion criteria.

NCIAS faculty at Arizona State University are expected to sustain an ongoing and coherent program of research or creative work that results in significant scholarly or artistic contributions. As teachers, faculty are expected to maintain command of their field(s) of specialization, and to teach effectively. Finally, to achieve excellence in service, faculty members are expected to contribute to the development of Arizona State University, to their professional field, and/or to the community.

NCIAS uses a peer review process to evaluate a faculty member's contributions. Faculty colleagues typically are the most knowledgeable about a candidate's field. The peer review process is designed to foster excellence and high standards, to recognize distinctive abilities and accomplishments of individual faculty members, and to make informed recommendations for promotion and tenure and for probationary evaluations. Schools, with the approval of the Dean, are free to develop standing personnel committees to conduct reviews in lieu of a peer review committee system.

These bylaws on "Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure" complement university policy by defining the areas of evaluation and describing the appropriate criteria and evidence for them. NCIAS faculty have school documents in which they define the standards, criteria, and evidence specific to their interdisciplinary and disciplinary areas. These school statements provide the most specific standards to guide the peer review process; evaluation narratives are expected to explicitly address these standards and demonstrate how a candidate's record does/does not comply.

1. Scholarly and Artistic Activity

a. Definition

Scholarly/artistic activities are essential to the mission of creating knowledge and art. A faculty member's scholarly/artistic activity is evaluated in a primary discipline, a related discipline, or in an interdisciplinary/intercultural field(s) of study.

Within the context of school standards, scholarly/artistic activities include but are not limited to the following: contributions to disciplinary/interdisciplinary/inter-cultural field(s) of study, artistic presentations/performances, and appropriate studies that create, integrate, or apply knowledge within or related to the faculty member's field(s) of specialization.

b. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to sustain an ongoing and coherent program of research or creative work resulting in significant scholarly/artistic contributions. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on evidence of scholarly/artistic achievement that indicates a growing reputation in a field and the potential to achieve national or international recognition. Promotion to Full Professor is based on evidence of significant scholarly/artistic contributions to a field that sustain or enhance national or international recognition.

c. Evidence

Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following: published books or monographs, refereed and non-refereed articles or book chapters, grants, creative literary or juried artistic works, exhibits, performances, productions. Candidates should review the standard established for promotion and tenure in the past few years as operationalized by successful candidates within the school and the departments, schools or colleges among our aspirational peers.

External letters are part of the process of evaluation of research, publication, and creative activity. Please see appropriate passages in the ACD Manual and the Provost's website: http://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure. The director must consult with the dean in determining his/her list of possible external reviewers unless delegated by the dean. Both candidate and director must provide ten names each from which the final selection will be made—half will come

from the candidate's list and half from the director's list. The reviewers listed should be from aspirational peers, peers, or other highly respected institutions.

ASU policy dictates that separate consideration and recommendations regarding the performance of each candidate are given by faculty reviewers and administrators. External letters of evaluation are solicited on a confidential basis. Neither the names of 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. The greatest care is to be taken to insure confidentiality of external letters of evaluation. Letters should be kept in a central location and viewed only there. Solicitation letters to reviewers should include a statement which describes who will have access to the letters of review and the extent to which confidentiality can be assured. All original external evaluation letters received must be included with the file. If possible, academic unit directors and the dean shall explain any troublesome or confusing statement made by an external reviewer in their internal evaluation letter. Candidates must submit a four page personal statement describing their past, current, and future research or creative activity, which will accompany the other materials submitted to the external reviewers. This same statement will accompany the applicant's materials throughout the review process.

2. Teaching

a. Definition

Teaching in its various modes is essential to the College's educational mission. Being responsible for the intellectual development of students requires faculty members to be proficient and committed teachers. Teaching involves imparting knowledge to students, developing critical skills that enable students to weigh arguments and evidence, fostering in students the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge, and nurturing an appreciation for individual differences and cultural diversity.

b. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to teach effectively and to maintain current scholarly command of the professional field(s) appropriate to their academic assignment. The proficient teacher exemplifies a commitment that is reflected in instructional materials, classroom performance, and student mentoring and advising.

c. Evidence

Evidence may include the following: syllabi, comments from student evaluations, peer evaluations, samples of course materials, textbooks and articles dealing with teaching techniques, indications of activities that maintain currency in the subject matter, personal statement of teaching goals.

3. Service

a. Definition

NCIAS expects faculty commitment to building the University and its programs. Service to the College, therefore, as well as to the academic profession and to the community at large, is an essential part of every faculty member's record. Service is manifested in institutional development, collegial contributions, professional contributions, and community (local, state, national or international) contributions in which the faculty member represents the College.

b. Criteria

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Thus, evaluation of service must include an examination of the individual's contributions to internal committee work and to faculty governance activities. Service to the public should be an extension of the faculty member's research and teaching activity to the larger community outside of the College. Service to the profession is also important to the evaluation.

c. Evidence

Service to the College may include the following: committee work (at the level of the school, college, campus or university), faculty governance activities, and activities related to the preservation of a collegial atmosphere at all levels within the university. Service to the larger community may include any activity where the faculty member serves as a representative of the university to community organizations (e.g., public, non-profit, community-based). Service to the profession may include the following: editorial activities, referee services for artistic presentations or performances, office-holding in professional organizations. Service commitments must be listed on the CV.

4. Peer Review Committees

NCIAS Peer Review Committees shall be composed of at least three individuals, chosen by the Dean in consultation with the candidate's school director. Policy states the candidate may not have input into the peer review committee membership. The committee shall include a minimum of two faculty members from NCIAS. One member may be selected from a unit of Arizona State outside of NCIAS. The chair of the peer review committee must be from the NCIAS faculty at Arizona State University. The director of the candidate's school may serve on the peer review committee but in so doing cannot make an additional, separate evaluation (in such cases a substitute for the Director's Review will be designated by the Dean).

5. Review Procedures

a. Peer Review

In NCIAS, a peer review committee is composed of individuals selected consistent with the principles stated in the sections immediately preceding. The peer review committee completes its evaluation and makes an overall recommendation.

b. School Director's Review

After receiving the peer committee's evaluation, the school director writes an independent evaluation of the candidate's file and, after consideration of the previous reviews, makes an overall recommendation.

c. NCIAS Promotion and Tenure Committee Review

The Committee makes its independent recommendation based on the candidate's record and after consideration of the previous reviews.

d. Dean's Review

The Dean makes his/her independent recommendation and evaluation based on the candidate's record and after consideration of the previous reviews. All materials are then forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Annual Reviews for Tenure/Tenure Track faculty

The procedures for annual reviews of the NCIAS faculty follow from the policies outlined.

1. It is the responsibility of every faculty member to have updated curriculum vitae available every February 1.

2. The primary locus of review in NCIAS is between the faculty member and the school director. NCIAS faculty members will meet with their school directors to discuss accomplishments for the prior year and developmental goals for the coming year. The school director will compose a narrative summary of this meeting and assign the standard summary evaluation rating. Specific evaluations about teaching, research, or service expectations will be included with this summary. The summary and evaluation must be reviewed by the faculty member and may be signed by both parties before being forwarded to the Dean.

3. Annual Performance Review Evidence and Annual Performance Evaluations for Faculty shall include:

a) Updated Curriculum Vitae, and

b) Documentation for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service activities as determined by each NCIAS School.

There shall be four components to the performance evaluation:

a) teaching excellence;

b) excellence in scholarly and creative activity;

c) excellence in service; and

d) excellence in overall performance.

4. Levels of Annual Performance Ratings: there shall be five levels for annual performance ratings

a) Unsatisfactory performance – responsibilities of the position not fulfilled (1),

b) Partially meets expectations (2)

c) Meets expectations (3);
d) Exceeds expectations (4);

e) Exceeds expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner (5).

The ratings given tenured and tenure-eligible faculty performance in each area are based on the three most recent years of activity, with an emphasis on the past 12 months.

5. Definitions of Unsatisfactory Performance for tenure track/tenured faculty: Unsatisfactory performance in Teaching is demonstrated by a failure to meet the responsibilities expected in school policies with respect to instruction, mentoring, or supervision of students, including students' evaluations of instruction that indicate unsatisfactory performance on the college instrument's rating scale and unsatisfactory performance identified from other evidence defined by the policies of the faculty member's school. Unsatisfactory performance in the area of Scholarship/Creative Activity shall consist of failure to meet the criteria of satisfactory performance in scholarship/creative activity as defined in school policy or a violation of the principles of academic integrity such as engaging in academic dishonesty by intentionally misappropriating the scholarly or creative activity of others. Unsatisfactory performance in the area of Service includes failure to meet the responsibilities of faculty governance, among other things it includes no evidence of service contributions as defined in a school's policy and consistently poor quality of contributions, as defined by school standards, in those activities an individual has agreed to perform.

6. If the faculty member does not agree with the Director's evaluation, he or she may request a separate evaluation from the Dean, whose decision is final. A faculty member must appeal the school director's evaluation within 30 calendar days of receiving that evaluation.

7. Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and promotion decisions. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective and summative, whereas tenure and promotion reviews are prospective and summative.

C. Post-Tenure Reviews

Applicability: All tenured faculty.

1. Post-Tenure Performance Evaluation Principles, Policies, and Procedures are the same as for Annual Reviews.

2. Outcomes and Consequences of Post-Tenure Reviews:

   a) Satisfactory performance in all four areas maintains the faculty member in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises;

   b) Overall Satisfactory with a single area of Unsatisfactory leads to a Faculty Development Plan at the school level;

   c) Overall Unsatisfactory resulting from two or more single areas of Unsatisfactory or also may result from one area of Unsatisfactory depending on the weights assigned to an area in the Performance Agreement negotiated between the faculty member and the school Director. Overall Unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan that must be implemented no later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

3. Addressing Unsatisfactory Performance in Post-Tenure Review:

   a) Faculty Development Plan, which the school Director develops for the faculty member which specifies the goals for an area that are to be reached within a period not to exceed twelve months. The school Director will seek the input of the faculty member in the development of this Plan, but the school Director retains final authority for establishing the Plan's content. If the goals are satisfactorily met, the individual returns to the annual review process. If the goals are not met, the individual enters the performance improvement process. The determination about whether the goals have or have not been met rests with the school Director;

   b) A Performance Improvement Plan is constructed using the same procedures. Because of the seriousness of the problems and the potential serious nature of the consequences, Performance Improvement Plans must be reviewed by the NCIAS Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Committee will submit a recommendation to the school Director, who will determine the final plan.

   c) Performance Improvement Plans identify the

      1) specific problems to be addressed;

      2) the means and resources that will be provided by the school and/or College to improve performance in the targeted area(s) while maintaining satisfactory or better performance in other areas; and

      3) the time period for the improvements to take place.

Deficiencies in teaching or position effectiveness generally shall be addressed through a one-year performance improvement plan. For a research/creative activity or professional contribution deficiency, the duration of the plan should be as brief as possible. Under no circumstances, however, should it be longer than three years. Multi-year plans must be approved by the Dean and include annual or more frequent benchmarks. Individuals whose performance is rated satisfactory or better according to terms of their Performance Improvement Plans return to the regular annual evaluation process. The judgment about whether the goals have been met rests with the school Director.

Failure to meet annual or more frequent benchmarks or to achieve a satisfactory evaluation within the time period set by the Performance Improvement Plan will lead to a recommendation for dismissal.

4. Appeal Processes in Post-Tenure Reviews:

   a) When a Performance Improvement Plan has been implemented, the faculty member's performance will be evaluated against the PIP rather than through the normal annual review process.

   b) Faculty Development Plan: If the faculty member does not agree with the school director's evaluation of his or her post-tenure review performance under the terms of a Faculty Development Plan, he or she may request a separate evaluation of their post-tenure performance from the Dean. The Dean's decision on outcomes of the plan – did the faculty member meet the stipulations and conditions of the plan – is final.

   c) Performance Improvement Plan: If the faculty member does not agree with the dean's evaluation of his or her post-tenure performance under the Performance Improvement Plan, he or she may request a re-review by the dean. The Dean's decision on the outcomes of the plan – did the faculty member meet the stipulations and condition of the plan – is final.

   d) A faculty member undergoing post-tenure review who believes that implementation of that process has not been in substantial compliance with the regular university procedure may use the faculty grievance process specified within ACD 509-02.

   e) A faculty member who chooses not to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan or who fails to bring his or her performance up to a satisfactory or better level will be subject to the process for dismissal for just cause under ABOR 6-201.H and L.

5. Dean's Level Audit of Post-Tenure reviews:

   a) Each year one school shall submit their entire faculty's post-tenure review files for audit so that all files will be audited over a three- year period;

   b) The Audit Committee shall be members of the NCIAS P and T Committee, excluding the member of the school being audited. The member whose school is being audited shall be replaced by the Alternate on the P and T Committee, unless of course the Alternate is from the same school.

c) Whenever the Audit Committee determines that the review process has not been conducted properly, it will send the school's files back to the school Director, via of the Office of the Dean, with a request of reconsideration by the school Director who completed the review. Specific problems or flaws identified by the Audit Committee will be highlighted with a recommendation that the school Director reconsider the previous review. The Audit Committee shall prepare an Annual Report of its review and any responses and forward that report to the Faculty Assembly and to the Dean, ensuring the anonymity of faculty members.

D. Annual Feedback on Progress Toward Tenure

The school director, after consulting with unit faculty, is responsible for annually meeting with and providing feedback to each tenure-eligible faculty member about his or her professional development and progress toward earning tenure. The school director will provide a written summary of the feedback to the faculty member. This feedback will typically occur at the same time as and be based upon the same materials submitted for annual performance evaluation. However, feedback on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty is distinct from the annual performance evaluation. The former addresses the academic unit's estimates of future promise. The annual performance evaluation summarizes performance over the prior evaluative period (usually one to three years). The probationary review may serve the purpose of the annual feedback on progress toward tenure for the year it is scheduled.

E. Guidelines for Promotion of fixed-term instructional faculty

1. Definition of instructional faculty appointments eligible for promotion

Instructional faculty appointments include lecturers and clinical professors with appointments of "Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer" and "Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor".

According to ACD 505-02:

> "Lecturers are fixed-term faculty members with responsibilities that may include teaching service responsibilities, supervising supplemental kinds of student learning, professional development, and/or administrative duties related to teaching."
>
> "Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor: Clinical faculty are fixed-term faculty members who are qualified by training, experience, or education to direct or participate in specialized university functions, including teaching, student internships, training, or other practice components of degree programs. Responsibilities of clinical faculty may encompass any area of professional practice and/or technical expertise and may include professional development."

2a. NCIAS Promotion of Lecturers: eligibility

Schools will follow uniform college level guidelines for promotion of lecturers.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer in NCIAS (the college) generally requires a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree specific to the discipline and/or teaching assignment plus a minimum of five years of full-time college-level teaching experience at ASU. Promotion to Principal Lecturer generally requires a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree plus a substantial and sustained record of excellent performance since the previous promotion. The majority of that service should be at ASU.

2b. Standard for Evaluation of Lecturers

Because of the nature of the position, evaluation for promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer will be based on the candidate's pedagogical contributions. The candidate may work with their unit chair/director to identify appropriate materials that would effectively demonstrate an engaged effort to improve/sustain excellence in teaching and mentoring. Evidence supporting excellence in teaching and mentoring and the multiple professional endeavors and experiences that enhance the quality of teaching and related activities should be included in the file presented by the candidate. Specifically, the evaluation of instructional materials must take into account relevant factors such as adherence of syllabi to student learning outcomes, course content that is appropriate and up-to-date with standards of the field, and the contribution of the course to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy, and the scholarship of instruction. Aspects of pedagogical performance such as peer and student evaluations, course development, and student mentoring should be consistently meritorious to help advance the overall mission of the college.

2c. Criteria for Promotion of Lecturers

i) **Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer:** The promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer is based on the quality of evidence presented to demonstrate excellence in teaching and mentoring, and any other position responsibilities. Such materials should include pedagogical contributions, innovations, or activities beyond the classroom (such as pedagogical publications, workshop presentations, and creative activities) that inform one's teaching and advance the mission of the college. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank.

In addition to the basic expectations for the rank of Lecturer, successful candidates for Senior Lecturer will demonstrate excellence in teaching and mentoring through a combination of the lines of evidence listed below. Excellence in teaching and mentoring should be documented by the candidate for promotion with reference to:

- NCIAS standardized teaching evaluation by students
    - A teaching portfolio that includes student teaching evaluation scores and an analysis/description of how these scores demonstrate excellence in teaching;

- High-quality pedagogical techniques (use of appropriate and current instructional technologies; active learning principles);

- Innovation and breadth of contribution (new courses taught/developed); number and variety of different courses taught (e.g., introductory and advanced);

- School director and/or peer reviews of instruction by appropriate faculty members of equivalent or higher rank;

- Peer reviews of student portfolios or other student work;

- Numbers of students taught or mentored per year;

- Annual performance evaluations;

- Evidence of continuing professional development through participation in workshops, panels, and seminars;

- Mentoring activities such as honors thesis committees, independent studies, etc.;

- Evidence of student success through a sequence of courses, or student career success related to the candidate's teaching and/or mentoring; and

- Other indicators might include teaching awards or other external recognition from appropriate agencies and professional associations

Candidates are encouraged to consult the latest Process Guide for a complete list of items that may be included.

ii) **Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer:** The promotion of Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer is based on the quality of evidence presented to demonstrate exceptional contributions in teaching service responsibilities including significant leadership in those roles and a distinguished and recognized record of contributions. Such materials must include pedagogical contributions, innovations, and activities beyond the classroom (such as pedagogical publications, workshop presentations, and creative activities) that inform one's teaching and advance the mission of the college. Principal Lecturers should have consistent contributions to college and university service, or professional organizations, scholarship and/or pedagogy, or similar activities. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank.

Exceptional contributions in teaching and mentoring service responsibilities should demonstrate a sustained and substantial pattern of engagement with the undergraduate (and if appropriate graduate) population of the college and increasing knowledge of the craft of teaching, as represented by one or more (or a combination of) the following criteria. The strongest cases will show a pattern of these activities throughout the promotion period.

- Course or curricular development or the development of new pedagogies. For example, contributions to textbooks, archival course materials, or online teaching materials available to others (beyond the instructor's own classes), helping to develop the online instructional program of the unit, developing and teaching a new course title; participating in the redesign of large or required courses in the unit (e.g., introductory or methodology courses).

- Substantial contributions to instruction in the form of advising or mentoring students (e.g., peer mentoring, service-learning programs, study abroad programs, advising student organizations).

- Administration, service, and/or grantsmanship related to the instructional mission of NCIAS. For example, leading or developing programs promoting undergraduate research or internship programs, training programs for teaching assistants, diversity or outreach initiatives, active participation in college and school committees relating to undergraduate programs, instruction, community-college articulation, student retention, undergraduate student life, etc.

2d. Procedures for Promotion of Lecturers

The review and included materials follow the procedures set out in ACD 506-05 (Faculty Promotion) and those specified by the Office of the Provost (P6: Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion Process Guide). In the event that the process changes, the Process Guide will take precedence over these guidelines. Review materials provided by the faculty member are reviewed by their School's Personnel Committee, the School Director, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Dean before the materials and reviews are forwarded to the Office of the University Provost who makes the final decision.

The following materials should be submitted:

i) The Request for Academic Personnel Action form, along with any additional forms used by the college;

ii) Job description that includes the position description for each fixed-term faculty member and the duties specific to their position;

iii) A personal statement provided by the candidate (up to four pages long);

iv) A current Curriculum Vitae for the candidate;

v) Evidence from the candidate of excellence in the areas of Teaching and Mentoring which includes a minimum of three (3) different types of evidence, with the Summary of Student Evaluation of Instruction (which reflects all student evaluations releasable to the instructor) being one of the evidence pieces. Additional pieces of evidence may include but are not limited to:
    - Teaching statement or philosophy
    - Teaching or mentoring honors/awards
    - Peer Evaluations
    - Scholarship with a focus on pedagogy;

vi) Optional Supporting Materials to demonstrate excellence in other areas of assignment (e.g. research and/or service);

vii) Evaluation(s) by the school and college personnel committee(s);

viii) Evaluation letters from the Director and Dean; and

ix) A current copy of the school's and/or college's approved performance review criteria as appropriate.

Any promotion becomes effective during the following academic year. Any promotion, regardless of length of appointment, also will be contingent upon the offer of a contract the following

academic year.

3. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor and to *Clinical* Professor

3a. Promotion

To be considered for promotion from Assistant Clinical to Associate Clinical Professor, the faculty member must have spent at least five years in rank as Assistant Clinical Professor at ASU. To be considered for promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor, the faculty member must have a substantial and sustained record of excellent performance since the previous promotion. The majority of that service should be at ASU.

3b. Standards for Evaluation of Promotion

Evaluation of a candidate's record will focus on three areas: job performance, scholarship/professional development, and service.

- **Job performance**:
  Fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities of the position held as detailed in the job description and in the workload assignment. 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; and administration. The candidate may work with his/her unit chair/director to identify appropriate materials that would effectively demonstrate an engaged effort to improve/sustain excellence in teaching and mentoring. Evidence about one's teaching and the multiple professional endeavors and experiences that enhance the quality of teaching and related activities should be included in the file presented by the candidate. For clinical faculty whose duties include supervising internships or practicums, evidence for the successful management of these programs needs to be presented.

- **Scholarship/Professional Development**:
  Evidence of continued professional development in relevant areas of the position may include conference presentations and/or published papers on pedagogical practices or research findings in the candidate's discipline, a creative activities portfolio, public exhibitions or performances, attending conferences or workshops to learn novel teaching strategies in his/her discipline or to update their content knowledge, and hosting workshops for other professionals in their discipline.

- **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.

3c. Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The relative weights given to each of the three areas will depend on the workload and responsibilities assigned to the faculty member by the School Director.

For promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor: The promotion of Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor is based on the quality of evidence presented to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, professional development, teaching and mentoring, service and any other position responsibilities. Such

materials should include pedagogical contributions, innovations, or activities beyond the classroom (such as pedagogical publications, workshop presentations, and creative activities) that inform one's teaching and advance the mission of the college. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in day-to-day performance and expertise in all job performance responsibilities, regular participation in scholarship/professional development, evidence of initiative, demonstrated leadership and managerial capability, and a commitment to service activities.

For promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor: The promotion from Associate Clinical to Clinical Professor is based on the quality of evidence presented to demonstrate exceptional contributions in scholarship, professional development, teaching, and service responsibilities including significant leadership in those roles and a distinguished and recognized record of contributions. Such materials must include contributions, innovations, and activities beyond the classroom (such as pedagogical publications, workshop presentations, and creative activities) that inform one's teaching and advance the mission of the college. Clinical Professors should have achieved national recognition through their contributions or service to professional organizations, or similar activities. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank. Candidates must demonstrate exceptional 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, college, or university programs, and proven commitment to service.

Evidence of quality of teaching and related activities may include, but is not limited to:

- NCIAS standardized teaching evaluation by students
    - A teaching portfolio that includes student teaching evaluation scores and an analysis/description of how these scores demonstrate excellence in teaching;
- High-quality pedagogical techniques (use of appropriate and current instructional technologies; active learning principles);
- Innovation and breadth of contribution (new courses taught/developed); number and variety of different courses taught (e.g., introductory and advanced);
- School director and/or peer reviews of instruction by appropriate faculty members of equivalent or higher rank;
- Peer reviews of student portfolios or other student work;
- Numbers of students taught or mentored per year;
- Annual performance evaluations;
- Evidence of continuing professional development through participation in workshops, panels, and seminars;
- Mentoring activities such as honors thesis committees, independent studies, etc.;
- Evidence of student success through a sequence of courses, or student career success related to the candidate's teaching and/or mentoring; and
- Other indicators might include teaching awards or other external recognition from appropriate agencies and professional associations.

Candidates are encouraged to consult the latest Process Guide for a complete list of items that may be included.

Evidence of Scholarship/Professional Development may include but is not limited to:

- Efforts to keep abreast of current developments in areas of responsibility by:
    - giving conferences presentations;
    - publishing papers on pedagogical practices or research findings in the candidate's discipline;
    - keeping an updated creative activities portfolio;
    - hosting public exhibitions or performances;
    - attending conferences or workshops to learn novel teaching strategies in their discipline or to update their content knowledge base;
    - hosting workshops for other professionals in their discipline; and
- 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, and supervision; and
- Grant-writing related to candidate's discipline or innovative teaching projects.

Evidence of Service may include but is not limited to:

a. Active participation in service to the School, College, and University;
b. Participation in activities of professional organizations, service that leverages the faculty member's area of scholarly expertise and contributes to the embeddedness of ASU within the community, and refereeing for conferences, journals, and/or granting agencies.

3d. Procedures for the Promotion Review of Clinical Faculty

The review and included materials follow the procedures set out in ACD 506-05 (Faculty Promotion) and those specified by the Office of the Provost (P6: Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion Process Guide). In the event that the process changes, the Process Guide will take precedence over these guidelines. Review materials provided by the faculty member are reviewed by their School's Personnel Committee, the School Director, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Dean before the materials and reviews are forwarded to the Office of the University Provost who makes the final decision.

The following materials should be submitted:

i) The Request for Academic Personnel Action form, along with any additional forms used by the college;

ii) Job description that includes the position description for each fixed-term faculty member and the duties specific to their position;

iii) A personal statement provided by the candidate (up to four pages long);

iv) A current Curriculum Vitae for the candidate;

v) Evidence from the candidate of excellence in the areas of Teaching and Mentoring which includes a minimum of three (3) different types of evidence, with the Summary of Student Evaluation of Instruction (which reflects all student evaluations releasable to the instructor) being one of the evidence pieces. Additional pieces of evidence may include but are not limited to:
    a. Teaching statement or philosophy

b. Teaching or mentoring honors/awards
c. Peer Evaluations
d. Scholarship with a focus on pedagogy;

vi) Optional Supporting Materials to demonstrate excellence in other areas of assignment (e.g. research and/or service);

vii) Any candidate whose job description includes an expectation of research/scholarship shall also submit Publications/Creative Materials (up to four);

viii) Evaluation(s) by the school and college personnel committee(s);

ix) Evaluation letters from the Director and Dean; and

x) A current copy of the school's and/or college's approved performance review criteria as appropriate.

Any promotion becomes effective during the following academic year. Any promotion, regardless of length of appointment, also will be contingent upon the offer of a contract the following academic year.

Article V. Sabbatical Leaves

A. Articles of Policy Concerning Sabbaticals

1. Applicability:

   a) Administrators with faculty rank and tenure who have completed six years of service at ASU

   b) Faculty members who have achieved tenure and completed six years of full-time service with the rank of assistant professor or higher at ASU; and

   c) Academic professionals who have achieved continuing status and completed six years of full-time service at ASU as probationary or continuing status academic professionals.

2. Sabbaticals are the university's investment in the future. Sabbaticals are not a right, as per policy, but a privilege granted to faculty. Because of our diverse faculty, there are a wide range of possibilities in sabbatical undertakings. Not all sabbaticals will be expected to result in a "product" for dissemination. Sabbaticals may provide opportunities for, but are not limited to, the following:

   a) exploring new directions of professional interest in scholarship and teaching;

b) having unencumbered time to organize, and/or prepare, and/or complete projects for scholarship and teaching;

c) focusing on the pursuit of grants;

d) gathering materials for a book;

e) becoming involved in community-based projects;

f) exploring venues for exhibition of creative works or performances; or

g) developing a new research, writing, or creative activity.

3. The proposed sabbatical activity must be of sufficient magnitude in terms of the time and effort that it cannot be done in a timely way as a normal part of the faculty member's annual expectation of scholarly research, publication and/or creative activities

4. Application Materials:

Items to be included in a sabbatical application are

a) completed NCIAS application forms;

b) title and description of product;

c) rationale for project;

d) curriculum vitae; and

e) School Director's evaluation letter.