



<b>College</b>	<b>New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences</b>	
<b>Unit</b>	<b>School of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies</b>	
<b>Document</b>	<b>Bylaws</b>	
<b>Approved by the faculty</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Reviewed by the dean</b>		<b>Date:</b>

**Provost office approval**

<b>Vice Provost for Academic Personnel</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Office of the University Provost**

300 East University Drive  
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805  
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785  
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

**BY-LAWS**

**School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies**

**New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences**

**Arizona State University**

Table of Contents

I. Name

II. Mission Statement

III. Purpose and Goals

IV. Voting Eligibility

V. Meetings and Timely Notification of Upcoming Votes

VI. Appointment and Review of School Director

VII. Standing School Committees

VIII. Representation on College Standing Committees

IX. Academic Personnel Policies

X. Amending the By-Laws

## **I. NAME**

The School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies (SHArCS) is comprised of several academic degrees that are humanistic or artistic in orientation. Faculty members in SHArCS have their tenure home within the School as a whole, but they also affiliate with academic programs based on their education, research, and teaching.

## **II. MISSION STATEMENT**

The School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies fosters excellence in scholarship and creative activity consistent with the expectations of a research university. Faculty members produce intellectual and creative work while also engaging in service to their disciplines and to the broader community. As a teaching unit, SHArCS challenges students to explore and value the diversity of human culture, history, thought, literature, language, and experience. Drawing on disciplinary fields and transdisciplinary perspectives, divisional faculty members teach students to critically reflect on multiple dimensions of human identity and cultural life; contribute to scholarship, creative production, and innovation through multiple methods of observing and documenting the world; and develop the skills of responsible and engaged global citizens. Our creative, innovative, and accomplished students will graduate having mastered written and oral communication, critical thinking, historical understanding, and cultural competency—all of which are needed to participate capably in 21st-century global society.

## **III. PURPOSE AND GOALS**

The members of SHArCS are committed to the goals of the College and the University, as defined by the Strategic Plan and all updates thereof.

## **IV. VOTING ELIGIBILITY**

A. All full-time faculty members (i.e., tenure track, tenured, and non tenure eligible) are eligible to vote on all matters that come before SHArCS, with the exception of personnel issues. Faculty associates may attend faculty meetings and participate in discussions but are not eligible to vote on any matter.

B. Voting on the following issues is restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty only: promotion and tenure policies; by-laws relevant to promotion and tenure; and faculty annual reviews.

C. Numbers Required to Carry a Vote. Establishing and disestablishing degrees and creating and revising by-laws require a plurality (50%+1) of all tenured/tenure-track SHArCS faculty to pass.

D. Quorum Call. Absent a quorum, voting business must be rescheduled for a future SHArCS meeting and/or conducted online.

## **V. MEETINGS AND TIMELY NOTIFICATION OF UPCOMING VOTES**

Preliminary agendas will be distributed at least 48 hours in advance of all meetings by the Director for School meetings.

The SHArCS Director may designate one of the SHArCS staff to distribute meeting agendas and ballot votes. As needed, there will be separate meetings of faculty members in SHArCS who are affiliated with specific degree programs. The School Director or Associate Director shall be present at these meetings in order to ensure school continuity. It will be the responsibility of a representative of these groups to bring material to meetings of the full faculty.

## **VI. APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW OF SCHOOL DIRECTOR**

A. See approved by-laws of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences.

## **VII. STANDING SCHOOL COMMITTEES**

A. Executive Advisory Board. The Director shall appoint committee members from the SHArCS full-time faculty who will serve two-year terms. The committee, with a minimum of five and no more than nine members, will advise and guide the Director in creating School policies and procedures. School issues will first be addressed by the Executive Advisory Board for discussion and any necessary voting, and then passed on to the SHArCS faculty at general meetings with advisory board recommendations. The Director will serve in an ex officio capacity to this committee. The Chair of the Executive Advisory Board will be elected by simple majority at the first meeting of the academic year.

B. Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will consist of at minimum four tenured professors in the School who are available and eligible to serve (i.e., not on leave or engaged in related service at the College and/or University level). Members will be approved by a vote of the faculty. The Personnel Committee, by rank, is responsible for assisting and advising the Director in the conduct of Faculty Annual Reviews and Post-Tenure Reviews. In cases of “unsatisfactory” performance committee members will work with the Director and the faculty member to devise Faculty Development Plans and Performance Improvement Plans, where appropriate. Promotion and tenure reviews are conducted by, and in accordance with the By-laws of, the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences.

C. Curriculum Committee. The Director will appoint members of the Curriculum Committee, which will be chaired by the SHArCS Associate Director. The committee

will be comprised of the Chair, a minimum of three full-time faculty members of any rank representing various degree programs, and the school curriculum/advising coordinator. The committee's purpose is to assist the Director and Associate Director in curricular initiatives including revising and creating programs, disestablishing programs, creating/deleting course prefixes, evaluating degree requirements, and other curricular matters. The committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Director.

D. Research and Funding Committee. The Director will appoint three committee members from the SHArCS tenured and tenure-track faculty, and will also appoint the committee Chair. The College research advancement manager will be invited to serve in an ex-officio capacity to this committee. The Research and Funding Committee is tasked with coordinating research efforts in the school, identifying and promoting funding opportunities, advising the Director on external and internal funding strategies for the School, and where possible, assisting faculty with grant applications.

E. Media Lab Advisory Committee. The Director shall appoint to this committee at least two members from the tenured and tenure-track IAP faculty and at least one non-IAP tenured/tenure-track faculty member. The Committee will also include the Media Specialist/Coordinator of the Media Lab in an ex officio capacity. The Committee shall be tasked with creating proposed policies and procedures for efficient functioning of the lab and advising the Director about funding needs, priorities, and strategies.

F. Emergency Preparedness Committee. This committee of at minimum five members is charged with implementing emergency preparedness procedures and plans for the SHArCS School, consistent with New College procedures and plans and ASU regulations. The Director shall appoint committee members from among the full-time faculty and staff in the school.

G. Ad Hoc Committees. Ad hoc committees may be created at the initiative of either the Director or the unit faculty, whenever they are considered useful in carrying out the business of the School. The Director of SHArCS 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 Director shall appoint the membership and the chair of these committees. The faculty may initiate the creation of an ad hoc committee whenever 3 faculty members deem it necessary or useful to work together. Representatives will go to the Director or SHArCS faculty meeting with an idea or proposal. If the Director or the SHArCS faculty considers the idea/proposal potentially useful to the School, the Director will call for participation from the faculty to assemble a committee. The committee shall elect its own chair.

## VIII. REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COLLEGE COMMITTEES

The School has representatives on all non-appointed college committees. Individuals will make their preferences to work with a particular committee known to the Director, and there will be a school vote when there is more than one candidate for a position.

## **IX. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICIES**

### **A. Preamble**

New College on the West campus of ASU is committed to research, creative work, and teaching that are innovative, interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary, collaborative, problem-based, and/or engaged with the community. These commitments are consistent with and productive of ASU's identity as a New American University and an RU/VH research university (very high research activity). Promotion and tenure of faculty are critical elements in sustaining and realizing this commitment. New College procedures for promotion and tenure review are described at length in the NCIAS bylaws.

By means of this policy statement on academic personnel, the School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies identifies the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the evaluation of tenure-track and probationary faculty for promotion, tenure, contract renewal, annual review, merit, and post-tenure review. It is understood that the policies outlined herein will be modified if necessary to remain in compliance with those of the Arizona Board of Regents, the University, and the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. The school's personnel policy is posted on the NCIAS website, provided to all faculty members in the School upon request, and a copy is maintained in the Director's office. It has been reviewed, voted upon, and approved by faculty members of the School in accordance with the School's policies. The purposes of this document are to ensure that academic personnel processes are reflective of current goals and standards within the School, College, and University; to ensure that internal faculty peer review and judgment—which lie at the core of our values—are maintained in reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit decisions; to ensure that criteria and standards are clearly defined and transparent; and to ensure that all faculty experience fair, equitable, and consistent processes.

The School expects faculty commitment to the interdependent areas of research/creative work, teaching, and service that is of the highest quality, grounded in intellectual discovery and humanistic inquiry, and guided by principles of academic freedom, rational discourse and civility. The goal of the evaluation process is to improve faculty members' performance through appropriate evaluation and timely feedback. Careful and consistent application of criteria and standards in evaluating faculty performance in research/creative work, teaching, and service is of fundamental importance in achieving the school's mission and in protecting the rights of the individual faculty member. School review processes are to be conducted clearly, responsibly, fairly, and as openly as possible.

It is noted that only the highest levels of accomplishment identified in the annual review criteria are consistent with the expectations identified for promotion and tenure. The receipt of tenure and promotion should reflect both the highest levels of past achievement and the promise of future excellence.

As written in Academic Affairs Manual (ACD) 506-10, “Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure, promotion, termination, or release decisions. For probationary faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with the probationary review. Annual feedback on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty may occur at the same time and be based upon the same material as the annual performance evaluation, but probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit’s estimate of the candidate’s future promise. Thus, the procedures and standards used in annual performance evaluations are different from those used in retention, promotion, and tenure reviews. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective and summative, whereas tenure and promotion reviews are prospective and summative.”

#### B. Goals and Criteria for the Probationary Review Process

Probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit’s estimate of a candidate’s future promise based on a retrospective review of the candidate’s accomplishments since hire. Probationary faculty members are reviewed during the third and sixth years of their service. The purpose of the first review is to give the university and the candidate an accurate appraisal of the progress being made toward earning continuing status with the university. Procedures for probationary reviews are found in ACD 506-03.

#### C. Definitions of Excellence for the Purpose of Review and Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

A person is promoted, granted tenure, or retained on the basis of excellent performance in all categories and the promise of continued excellence. All performance evaluations involve assessment of faculty professional responsibilities, particularly with regard to the quality of teaching and instruction; the quality of research and publications and/or arts and performance and/or other creative endeavors; and the quality of service to the profession, university, and community at local, state, national, and international levels.

As members of a transdisciplinary school within an interdisciplinary college, the faculty of SHArCS acknowledge that there is no single route to excellence, and that indeed there may be many paths. The humanities standards identified here are seen as typical accomplishments for an individual who is successful in his or her field at a level that is consistent with the expectations of the New College and Arizona State University, viewed within the context of the university’s aspirational peer institutions. The categories of review are not substitutable, but the content of the categories is determined by the goals laid out by the candidate and the school director during the years prior to probationary review, in keeping with expectations

in the faculty member's scholarly field and the available resources. While the candidate's entire portfolio is of great relevance in assessing the individual's accomplishments—including work done prior to the doctorate or other terminal degree and work done at other institutions—there must be substantive evidence of continued progress towards excellence while at ASU.

### **(1) Scholarly and/or Creative Activity**

A candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure must present a portfolio of scholarly work and/or creative activity in arts and performance that is indicative of excellence and progress toward the establishment of a national reputation in his or her field. Within the humanities, that typically is accomplished by the publication of material in refereed journals and/or recognized presses. In some fields, specifically arts and performance, excellence is typically established with a record of creative activity that is innovative and interdisciplinary. The process of establishing a national reputation in any field in the humanities suggests that the research and/or creative portfolio will be characterized by both quality and quantity. To some degree, these categories are substitutable—publication in journals that lack a high reputation (as determined, for example, by external reviewers) will demand greater quantity than publications in journals with the most stringent acceptance rates. For creative arts and performance, the scope and scale of the venue matters. For example, a few high visibility venues such as international or national museums and shows will typically be considered more influential than local and regional shows. For performance, visual, and sound artists, invitation to perform/exhibit their work is considered central to their professional development, and as such should be rewarded.

The overall mix of publications and/or creative works must show that the candidate has demonstrated scholarly and/or creative independence and made significant progress toward establishing a national reputation within the context of New College and ASU—a comprehensive RU/HV research university with a commitment to the high quality instruction of all students alongside excellence in research and creative activity that demands levels of service commensurate with the college's rapid growth. Achievement in scholarship and creative work must also be consistent with the candidate's workload. In his or her letter soliciting external reviewers, the responsible administrative official will contextualize the general work environment of the school.

Scholarship and creative work is not merely the fulfillment of a quantitative target: the body of material should achieve the standards of quality common to the humanities, arts, and performance. The primary evidence of quality will be the established process of peer review, undertaken by editors and reviewers of scholarly journals and/or presses, by juries of artistic shows and performances, by those who review grant proposals, and, subsequently, by external reviewers. In the case of joint authorship or creative ownership, the percent contribution made by the candidate must be stipulated. Evidence of the candidate's growing stature in the



field (measured in part by place in the list of authors/artists/performers or a higher percent contribution to the publication, artwork, or performance), and of the impact of the work, will be sought from external reviewers.

The most prevalent, but certainly not the only, standard for promotion and tenure within the great majority of disciplines in the humanities, both at ASU and aspirational peer institutions, is one or more single-authored books published with a recognized university press or with a peer-reviewed trade press OR a combination of refereed journal articles, peer-reviewed book chapters, and demonstrated progress toward a single-authored or edited book.

While quantity alone does not connote excellence, examples of a prevalent threshold portfolio in the humanities indicating progress toward establishing a national reputation of excellence and the promise of continued excellence might appear as follows:

- Eight or more published articles (or articles in press where long lead times – six months or more – are common), of sufficiently high quality in respected or high-impact refereed journals since hire. This portfolio of refereed journal articles would be strengthened by publication of peer-reviewed book chapters and/or demonstrated progress toward a high-quality edited or co-edited book or demonstrated progress toward the first single-authored scholarly book;
- One or more single-authored scholarly books published (or in press) since hire with a recognized university press or with a peer-reviewed trade press plus one or more high-quality edited or co-edited books or demonstrated progress toward a second single-authored scholarly book;
- One or more books published (or in press) since hire with a reputable press and two or more refereed articles or book chapters in respected or high-impact venues in the case of fields where publication in various outlets is typical; in some instances, a high-quality edited volume may be included;
- Any other combination of publications of sufficient quality and quantity appropriate to the field or discipline that together constitute a substantial and excellent scholarly contribution.

For creative arts and performance, alternatives to the scholarly publication standards in the humanities would be:

- Six or more commissioned, invited and/or juried artistic works in high quality international and national venues since hire;
- Two or more commissioned, invited, and/or juried artistic works in high quality international and national venues, and five or more commissioned, invited, and/or juried artistic works in local or regional venues;
- Any other combination of publications and artistic works (including digital

media) of sufficient quality and quantity appropriate to the field that together constitute a substantial and excellent scholarly or creative contribution.

The candidate is responsible for contextualizing the quality of the journals, presses, and artistic/performance venues and demonstrating that they are commonly accepted as respectable outlets of quality work for the discipline or interdisciplinary field in which she or he works. Presentations and published abstracts at major professional meetings will be taken into consideration as part of the overall portfolio of professional involvement, but do not substitute for published journal articles or books. Non-refereed publications of research results (e.g., symposium volumes, contract reports) are considered in a subordinate role, except in cases where these are typical in a field (e.g., digital media). In most cases, textbooks cannot be substituted for the publication of research results. Possible exceptions include fields (e.g., rhetoric and composition, oral history) in which research and pedagogy are intertwined. Other presentations of research results will be judged according to their merits.

In addition to its role in supporting research and creative activity, external funding also represents an important validation of the quality of scholarship and creative works. Seeking of external funding—that is, funding that comes from a source outside ASU—to support research and/or creative activity will be viewed favorably. Amount of external funding will be judged relative to the norms of the candidate's discipline and/or subfield. It is generally recognized that funding for the humanities and arts lags behind funding for other types of scholarship at all levels, from local to international. Absence of external support will be considered in the context of the availability of funds and the appropriate campus infrastructure including grantwriting support and service needs, and may be offset by a successful publication record. The presence of a grant or grants cannot, however, compensate for an absence of publications.

## **(2) Teaching**

As members of a comprehensive institution, it is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion in the School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies will demonstrate excellence in teaching as established through a range of measures including, but not limited to, course evaluations, peer evaluation/observations, and syllabi review. The form of instruction will be dictated by the norms of the school and specific programs, and may include research with students, field experiences, supervision of undergraduate and/or M.A. theses, and internship supervision in addition to classroom work. Criteria for judging teaching effectiveness will include standard student evaluations, along with the following additional possible indicators:

- Evidence of effective instruction that evaluates the candidate's teaching competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and presentation of

material, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative teaching methods, integration of new course materials, development of new courses, and examinations that adequately test the students' knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. These evaluations may come from the Director, peers, students, or qualified individuals external to New College and ASU; these may also be summaries of the assessments of teaching quality/performance done during annual reviews.

- Peer evaluations of the candidate's supervision of student research projects (includes theses) and other outside indicators that document the quality of collaborative research with students (which might include the presentation of results at a scientific meeting and/or publication of results in a journal and/or collaborative creative endeavors);
- Nomination and/or receipt of awards for teaching;
- Publication of peer-reviewed material related to teaching;
- Publication of a textbook, related to teaching, by a recognized press;
- Submission of grant requests related to instruction to external agencies;
- Success of students mentored, as recognized by national scholarships, awards, placement in graduate or professional schools, etc.

While the evaluation of instruction is complex, and may vary with class size, course content, the mix of required and elective courses and similar factors, reviewers expect that negative feedback from peers and/or students will be addressed during the probationary period. Candidates who receive negative feedback and subsequently show no improvement of their teaching as measured by the above indicators may be judged to be ineffective instructors. Persistent summary evaluations on the overall performance score lower than the relevant norm for "exceeds expectations" may be viewed negatively depending on course and/or divisional norms.

Work (including co-authorship) with student groups or with graduate students of all ranks and from all parts of the university, and curricular innovations (within courses, of new courses, and of new degrees and/or programs) will be recognized as valuable and evaluated positively. However, such achievements cannot normally be substituted for basic competence in instruction.

### **(3) Service**

Service is ordinarily recognized in the following areas: 1) program/school; 2) college; 3) campus; 4) university; 5) community; 6) appropriate regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Members of an institution are expected to undertake basic levels of service consistent with its needs, but this occurs with the understanding that prior to tenure, the faculty member is focused primarily on the development of research and/or creative work and instructional capabilities and achievements. Tenured faculty members will be expected to take on enhanced service responsibilities alongside their research, creative work, and teaching.

Reviewers may look for evidence of committee work within the program, school, and college. Service at the campus level and beyond will be rewarded, but a strong service record within the institution or beyond cannot be substituted for weaknesses in the teaching and/or research and creative activity portfolios.

Service to the community and to professional organizations can be evidence of an integration of research and teaching and can be seen as extensions of one or both. Work with community organizations that furthers the mission of the school, college, and/or university will be valued. Work within a professional organization (e.g., as a program chair, an officer, a journal reviewer, a board member) may be additional evidence of an individual's ability to develop national visibility. However, these are activities that may be rewarded but are not substitutable for excellence in teaching and research and/or creative activity. The candidate will provide evidence of the impact of his or her service.

D. Definitions of Excellence for the Purposes of Review and Promotion to Full Professor

Tenured faculty members, at their request, may be reviewed for promotion to full professor rank. The goal of this review will be to assess the continuing and sustained progress of the candidate, the continued and sustained demonstration of excellence and leadership in teaching and service, and the extension of his or her reputation in scholarship and/or creative activity.

During review for promotion to full professor, the same categories will be considered as were considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor; excellence, quality, and impact will be evaluated as described above in that section. In addition, the individual must demonstrate the attainment of a national or international reputation within her or his field. A satisfactory record of sustained excellence for promotion to professor would include an established, mature, and productive research or creative program with evidence of significant positive impact on the field, along with achievement of a sustained level of external funding appropriate to her or his area of research and career context. Teaching should have been sustained at a high standard of effectiveness with evidence of breadth across the curricula. Service will become more substantial and typically would involve leadership in service at the campus and university system level. Service to the community and to the professions would be more visible and typically would include editorships and/or membership on editorial boards, office in national or international professional associations, and service on federal or foundation review panels. Awards, fellowships, and similar forms of recognition would be usual.

E. Goals and Criteria for the Annual Review Process

The annual review constitutes an assessment of the performance of the faculty member during the prior calendar year, viewed within the context of a three-year period and distinct from the tenure and promotion review process. However, annual review provides feedback to the faculty member who is in a probationary period

prior to tenure review, and it also serves as a post-tenure review for tenured faculty members. The evaluation assesses in a given year how the individual has helped advance the goals of the unit and institution through his or her activities. The faculty member is responsible for providing evidence and information to the Director for the three preceding calendar years in order to provide a full context for the review, prior to a deadline established each year.

The review involves a five-point scale: Unsatisfactory performance - responsibilities of the position not fulfilled (1); Partially meets expectations (2); Responsibilities of the position fulfilled (3); Fulfillment of the responsibilities of the position exceeds expectations (4); Fulfillment of the responsibilities of the position exceeds expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner (5).

A level 1 or 2 performance evaluation will trigger additional review for faculty members undergoing post-tenure review as noted in ACD 506-11. There is no limit in the school as to the number or proportion of faculty members who can receive any given score. Annual ratings of each faculty member's performance, following input by the Personnel Committee, are made by the Director. Ratings may be appealed to the Dean within 30 working days of the notification of the rating, who will make the final determination within 30 working days, as provided for by ACD 506-10.

A faculty member's performance will be evaluated based upon expectations (e.g., workload percentages) for teaching, research/creative activity, and service, as determined by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. These expectations must be defined within the goals and mission of the school and college, the context of the university's aspirational peer institutions, and available resources, and grounded within the standards for promotion and tenure (as described above). The workload will account for differences in appropriate expectations between pre-tenure and post-tenure faculty, and within each of these categories. The faculty member shall receive a written statement of the workload assignment annually. Workload assignment may be appealed to the Dean, who will make the final determination.

Each of the following shall be considered measures of teaching performance: course evaluations; peer observation; evaluation of syllabi; creation of new courses; search and/or creative work that directly contributes to enhancing teaching; instructional innovations; examples of student work in classes; examples of independent study projects or honors' theses; etc. Evaluation of teaching will take into account the context of the course – whether it is required or is an elective; the amount of theoretical or methodological content; lower- or upper- division; and the class size. It also should be noted that the example criteria listed below for Annual Review are activities that would take place within a single academic or calendar year; naturally, a review based on a three-year window would display some aggregation or combination of these accomplishments.

It is the responsibility of faculty members to ensure that material related to annual reviews is input into the FAR system in a timely fashion. Failure to include an updated CV, evidence of progress in all three categories, and course evaluations will result in a negative review.

F. Summary Evaluations

(1) Scholarship/creative activities: A summary evaluation of 1 indicates failure to produce scholarship/creative work during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 2 indicates that the candidate has partially met productivity expectations during the period under review; a summary review of 3 indicates that the candidate has met productivity expectations during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 4 indicates that the candidate has exceeded productivity expectations during the period under review; and a summary evaluation of a 5 indicates that the candidate has exceeded productivity expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner during the period under review .

(2) Teaching: A summary evaluation of 1 indicates that the candidate has failed to meet minimum expectations for teaching during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 2 indicates that the candidate has partially met teaching expectations during the period under review; a summary review of 3 indicates that the candidate has met teaching expectations during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 4 indicates that the candidate has exceeded teaching expectations for the period under review; and a summary evaluation of a 5 indicates that the candidate has exceeded teaching expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner during the period under review.

(3) Service: A summary evaluation of 1 indicates failure to provide service to internal and external academic communities; a summary evaluation of 2 indicates that the candidate has partially met service expectations during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 3 indicates that the candidate has met service expectations during the period under review; a summary review of 4 indicates that the candidate has exceeded expectations during the period under review; a summary evaluation of 5 indicates that the candidate has exceeded service expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner during the period under review.

G Grievance Procedures Regarding Personnel Matters

A faculty member with personnel grievance issues regarding annual performance reviews should consult ACD 506-10, which outlines the grievance process. The faculty member may also consult the Director, the Dean, and/or the Associate Dean, but any actions must be consistent with ACD 506-10. Also, the Director shall work with the faculty to develop appropriate grievance procedures within the School,

including appointment of an ombudsperson. A faculty member seeking redress of a broader range of personnel grievances should consult ACD 509-01 and 509-02.

#### **X. AMENDING THE BY-LAWS**

Changes to the SHArCS Bylaws necessitated by the addition, deletion or modification of board or university policy or the result of academic reorganization may be initiated by the unit Director on motion in accordance with the provisions of ACD.

The process of amending the School by-laws will require steps: initiation by petition; circulation of petition; and voting by eligible faculty members. Amendments to the by-laws shall require a simple majority of all votes cast.

1. Changes in the by-laws must be initiated by a petition signed by a minimum of 20 percent of the full-time faculty. The petition shall be submitted to the Director at least ten days prior to the next faculty meeting.
2. The Director shall circulate the petition to the faculty at least five days prior to the faculty meeting at which it will be discussed and voted on.
3. Faculty members shall vote on the petition/changes to the by-laws.
4. If approved by the vote of the faculty, the amendment will be forwarded for review by the Dean and Provost.
5. The amendment becomes effective on approval by the Provost.