




ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

College/ Independent Unit	New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Academic Unit/ Department, if any**	School of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies
Choose document type (bylaws or criteria Document?): Bylaws and criteria document	
If bylaws, does it include criteria for promotion/continuing status/tenure? Yes	
Please concisely list the ranks included in the criteria (if relevant). Promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor, as well as annual review for all ranks of tenure and career track faculty.	

Unit and college approval

Date of approval by the faculty and/or academic professionals	February 19, 2026
Date of review by the dean (or lead of independent unit)*	February 24, 2026

Provost office approval

	Patricia Friedrich	March 3, 2026
Signature	Name	Date

*Per ACD111-02, all colleges and academic units must have bylaws, approved by a majority of the unit faculty. With the consent of all college deans to which a unit reports, the faculty of the unit may choose to utilize the college’s bylaws as their unit bylaws.

**Academic units are usually departments and schools, not research centers or programs. Academic units, in this context, have criteria for promotion which were approved by its faculty and/or academic professionals.

BYLAWS

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. Amending the By-Laws

APPENDIX: FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES, GUIDELINES, AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND CULTURAL STUDIES

- I. Promotion and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty
- II. Promotion Guidelines for Career Track Faculty
- III. Goals and Criteria for the Annual Review Process
- IV. Grievance Procedures Regarding Personnel Matters

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, creative activity and teaching across a variety of humanistic and artistic disciplines adhering to the mission of Arizona State University. Trained in a number of scholarly traditions and creative fields, SHARCS faculty engage with the diversity of human art and culture, history, thought, literature, language, and experience. Working within and across disciplines, and drawing on a variety of perspectives, SHARCS faculty teach students to critically analyze, observe, document and represent the world, via clear, complex written and artistic expression. We challenge students to explore multiple dimensions of human identity and cultural life through a variety of methods, including: archival research, textual analysis, oral history, moral and philosophical reasoning, aesthetic appreciation, and art making, among others. Our graduates achieve mastery of written and oral communication, critical thinking, historical understanding and cultural and artistic competency, preparing them to contribute to innovative scholarship and creative production with the skills of responsible and engaged global citizens.

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 benefits-eligible faculty are eligible to vote on all matters that come before SHArCS with the exception that only tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on tenure-related policies and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty. However, they must be present to participate in the deliberations (or do so by phone or videoconference or similar technology). Faculty associates may participate in discussions but are not eligible to vote. SHArCS faculty on sabbatical or other leave may not vote as they are prohibited from university service (ACD 705) and thus may not participate in deliberations at faculty meetings.

B. All voting-eligible faculty shall be informed in a timely manner about plans to establish and/or disestablish degrees, minors, and certificates so that they may vote in an advisory capacity.

C. Voting on promotion and tenure policies is restricted exclusively to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Voting on bylaws relevant to promotion of career track faculty and bylaws relevant to faculty annual reviews should include all voting-eligible faculty.

D. Numbers Required to Carry a Vote. a plurality (50%+1) of all voting-eligible SHArCS faculty to pass.

E. Quorum Call. Absent a quorum of 60% of voting-eligible faculty, voting business must be rescheduled for a future SHArCS meeting and/or conducted online . However, it is a responsibility of all voting-eligible faculty to attend scheduled faculty meetings in order to uphold and contribute to the mission of SHArCS.

V. MEETINGS AND TIMELY NOTIFICATION OF UPCOMING VOTES

It is the responsibility of the School Director to solicit agenda items and circulate a preliminary agenda at least 48 hours in advance of all meetings.

The SHArCS Director may designate one of the SHArCS staff to distribute meeting agendas and ballot votes, and may request a volunteer to take minutes, or take minutes themself.

It is the responsibility of Faculty Program Leads to inform their respective degree affiliates about programming decisions such as course distribution, curriculum changes, and potential hires, and to hold at least one program meeting per semester. After faculty approval, minutes of these meetings shall be shared with the School Director 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.

The Director shall provide access (via zoom or other technology) to any faculty who must attend meetings—whether SHArCS or program-specific—remotely.

VI. APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW OF SCHOOL DIRECTOR

A. Terms and Conditions

For duties of the school director see bylaws of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Article III.

B. Faculty Participation in Review of Director

As noted in the New College bylaws Article IIID, faculty will provide feedback to the Dean in April of each year as part of the director's annual review process. All SHArCS faculty are eligible to provide this feedback using the instrument provided by the Dean's office. As indicated in New College bylaws, the SHArCS faculty may adopt other forms of review with approval of the Dean's office.

C. Appointment of Associate Director

The School Director, with the approval of the Dean, appoints an Associate Director to assist with the administrative duties of SHArCS. The Associate Director must be a tenured SHArCS faculty

member. The terms and conditions of the appointment will be responsive to the current conditions and needs of the unit as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Dean.

VII. STANDING SCHOOL COMMITTEES

A. Executive Advisory Board

The Director shall appoint committee members from the SHArCS faculty, (whose appointment is 100% in SHArCS) who will serve two-year terms. The Board, comprised when possible of at least one representative from each of the constituent programs within SHArCS, including both tenure-track and career-track faculty, 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 Board. The Chair of the Executive Advisory Board will be elected by simple majority at the first board meeting of the academic year.

B. Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee will consist of at minimum four tenured professors and three senior career track faculty (CTF). Senior CTF are those at ranks of Associate Teaching Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and are subject to election. All must have 100% of their appointment in SHArCS, and be 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. Only tenured faculty are eligible to evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty. This committee is a three-year commitment and its members should join in consecutive years so as to retain continuity of practice.

In the School, promotion and tenure reviews are conducted not by the Personnel Committee but rather by ad hoc peer-review committee, appointed by the Director and in accordance with the Bylaws of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. There must be at least one member of the career track on such ad hoc committees when evaluating career-track faculty.

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 benefits-eligible 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 such as the cancellation of scheduled classes. Concerning such matters, the committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Director.

D. 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 committee will communicate these plans to the faculty yearly, and will report concerns of the faculty to the Director on an ongoing basis. The Director shall appoint committee members from among the benefits-eligible staff in the school.

E. 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 with 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 present an idea or proposal to the Director or to the SHArCS faculty. 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. Committees formed within particular degree programs in SHArCS can be considered the service equivalent of committees formed at the discretion of the Director.

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 by voting-eligible faculty when there is more than one candidate for a position.

IX. 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 SHArCS Director on motion in accordance with the provisions of ACD.

The process of amending the School Bylaws will require steps: initiation by petition or ad hoc committee; circulation of petition or draft changes; and voting by eligible faculty members. Amendments to the Bylaws shall require 2/3 of all votes cast.

1. Changes in the by-laws must be initiated in one of two ways: 1) By ad hoc committee designated by the School Director or 2) 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 Bylaws in a meeting in which a quorum of at least 60% of voting eligible faculty are present.
4. If approved by the vote of the faculty, amendment(s) will be forwarded for review by the Dean and Provost.
5. The amendment becomes effective on approval by the Provost.

APPENDIX: FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES, GUIDELINES, AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND CULTURAL STUDIES

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 all faculty for contract renewal, annual review, and merit; and for tenure-track and probationary faculty for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

I. Promotion and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty

A. Definitions of Excellence for the Purposes of Probationary Review and Promotion to Associate Professor

As members of a 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. The humanities standards identified herein are seen as typical accomplishments for an individual who is successful in their field at a level that is consistent with that 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 or fields and considering the resources provided by the institution to the faculty member. 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 their field. Within the humanities, that typically is accomplished by the publication of material in refereed journals and/or recognized scholarly presses. In some fields, specifically arts and performance, excellence is typically established with a record of juried solo and/or collaborative creative activity. The process of establishing a national reputation in any field in the humanities or arts suggests that the research and/or creative portfolio will be characterized by both quality and quantity. SHArCS recognizes that given the diversity of fields constituting our school, these criteria may vary considerably. It is the responsibility of the candidate to contextualize the portfolio for promotion regarding the most salient criteria within the scope of their field(s) or discipline(s).

The overall mix of publications and/or creative works must show that the candidate has executed a portfolio of substantial contributions to their field(s) as verified through continued success at the peer-reviewed and/or juried level, thus demonstrating significant progress toward establishing national visibility within their field(s).

Achievement in scholarship and creative work must also be consistent with the candidate's workload. In their 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. However, particular fields, such as philosophy or social and cultural analysis tend to prioritize scholarly articles over monographs. In addition to recognizing the value of independent work, SHArCS recognizes the value of collaborative work. Peer-reviewed co-authored publications may fulfill criteria for tenure in the same way a peer-reviewed single-authored work would. In such cases, there should be a mix of single-authored and collaborative works in a successful portfolio.

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.

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

- Eight or more articles or chapters (either published, or in press where long lead times – six months or more – are common), in respected or high-impact refereed journals or peer-reviewed edited collections since hire. In fields where the norm is fewer than 8 article-length publications, such as philosophy, the candidate must contextualize their case with respect to the expectations of their discipline;

- 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 scholarly book; such a book may be co-authored and/or a translation, if the translation includes substantial, rigorous scholarly contextualization and analysis and a sophisticated scholarly apparatus. Edited books of high quality are often valuable, but they typically do not allow scope for evaluating the achievements and potential of junior scholars and thus are not by themselves strong evidence for recommending tenure;
- 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. Portfolios that present co-authored publications or translations must also include single-authored publications;
- A combination of publications and scholarly work of sufficient quality and quantity appropriate to the field(s) or discipline(s) that together constitute an excellent portfolio may include a mix of the above-stated criteria, as well as: publication by invitation or editorial review in creative or academic venues; presentations at peer-reviewed scholarly conferences; keynote presentations before national and international scholarly organizations/ academic institutions; receipt of competitive grants, fellowships, or awards from national or international bodies.

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

- Six or more commissioned, invited and/or juried art works in high quality international and national venues since hire;
- Two or more commissioned, invited, and/or juried art works in high quality international and national venues, and five or more commissioned, invited, and/or juried art works in local or regional venues;
- Some combination of scholarly publications and art works (including digital media) of sufficient quality and quantity appropriate to the field(s) that together constitute an excellent portfolio may include a mix of the above-stated criteria, as well as: publication by invitation or editorial review in creative or academic venues; presentations at peer-reviewed scholarly conferences; keynote presentations before national and international arts organizations/ academic institutions; receipt of competitive grants, fellowships, or awards from national or international bodies that demonstrate substantial and excellent creative or scholarly contributions.

The candidate is responsible for contextualizing the quality of the journals, presses, and art/performance venues and demonstrating that they are commonly accepted as respectable outlets of quality work for the discipline or interdisciplinary field(s) in which they work. 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 and/or the textbook can be considered field-establishing/defining. 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. Award amounts 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. The achievement 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, teaching award nominations and prizes, etc. 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 graduate theses or dissertations, and internship supervision in addition to classroom work.

Criteria for judging teaching effectiveness must include standard student evaluations, it may include peer evaluation and other forms of evidence. Where a candidate seeks peer evaluation of teaching, they should consult with either their degree faculty lead or the Director to facilitate an in-class observation. The following criteria may be considered evidence of effective instruction:

- Peer evaluations of the candidate's supervision of student research projects (includes theses/dissertations or honors projects) and other outside indicators that document the quality of collaborative research with students (which might include the presentation of results at a conference, co-authorship of a publication in a journal or book or other scholarly outlet, mentorship of a student organization and/or collaborative creative endeavors);
- Nomination for 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 to and/or receipt of grants related to instruction;

- Success of students mentored, as recognized by national scholarships, awards, placement in graduate or professional schools, etc.

Evidence of effective instruction 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. Evaluations may come from the Director, peers, students, or qualified individuals external to New College and ASU.

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

Members of an institution of higher education are expected to undertake basic levels of service consistent with institutional needs, but within 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. Nevertheless, a successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will provide evidence of 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.

Reviewers may look for evidence of committee work within the program, school, and college, as well as (in rare circumstances) work as Program Faculty Lead. 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 their service.

B. 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 their reputation in scholarship and/or creative activity.

During review for promotion to full professor, the same categories will be considered as outlined above 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 national or international visibility within their field. A successful candidate for promotion to full will have a record of sustained excellence which would include an established, mature, and productive research or creative program with evidence of significant positive impact on the field and may include external funding appropriate to their area of research and career context. A successful candidate will demonstrate evidence of a high standard of teaching effectiveness with breadth across the curricula.

Tenured faculty members are expected to take on enhanced service responsibilities alongside their research, creative work, and teaching. Therefore, a successful file for promotion to full professor should show evidence of substantial service and should involve leadership in service at the campus and university system level. Service to the community and to the professions should be more visible and may include editorships and/or membership on editorial boards, holding office in national or international professional associations, and service on internal and/or external review panels. Awards, fellowships, and similar forms of recognition further enhance a candidate's profile.

II. Promotion Guidelines For Career Track Faculty

Promotion guidelines and criteria of career track faculty are in accordance with the New College Career Track Faculty promotion guidelines described in the CTF Promotion Criteria document of the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. Career Track Faculty eligible for promotion in New College include instructors, teaching professors, research professors, and clinical professors.

III. Goals and Criteria for the Annual Review Process

The annual review is distinct from the tenure and promotion review process. Per ACD 506-10: Annual Evaluations of Faculty, "The review should cover the previous 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year." It constitutes an assessment of the performance of the faculty member across the three areas of faculty activity in accordance with their workload and rank: 1) Research/Creative Work, 2) Teaching, and 3) Service.

Annual review provides feedback to career-track faculty, as well as faculty members who are in a probationary period prior to tenure review, and post-tenure review for tenured faculty members. Additionally, merit-based pay raises will be determined in part based on the rating on annual review. The evaluation assesses how and to what degree the individual has helped advance the goals of the unit and institution through their activities, in the review period. The faculty member is responsible for providing evidence and information to the Personnel Committee and Director for the three preceding calendar years in order to provide a full context for the review, prior to a deadline established each year by the College.

Each annual review process will assess faculty members' performance with the following five-point scale.

- (5) Fulfillment of the responsibilities of the position exceeds expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner;
- (4) Fulfillment of the responsibilities of the position exceeds expectations;
- (3) Responsibilities of the position fulfilled;
- (2) Partially meets expectations;
- (1) Unsatisfactory performance - responsibilities of the position not fulfilled

The Director will share these ratings with the faculty in the form of a summary evaluation. The criteria for meeting and exceeding expectations must be aligned with the standards set by SHArCS, the New College and the University. Specific criteria with a points-based scale will be kept on file with the SHArCS Director and made available annually to all faculty. It is understood that no points-based rubric will address all possible evidence of faculty activity. It is the obligation of the personnel committee and the Director to consider the faculty member's self-narrative that may contextualize professional activities that do not explicitly align with the rubric.

Any proposed changes to the specific criteria for annual review process must be agreed upon by ad-hoc committee and Director and submitted to the faculty for vote one calendar year prior to enacting said changes. In order for changes to the review process to be enacted, there must be the support of a plurality (50%+1) of voting-eligible faculty as outlined in the Bylaws.

A faculty member's performance will be evaluated based upon the expectations related to their assigned workload which may include a combination of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, as determined by contract and the Director, in consultation with the faculty member. The workload will account for differences in appropriate expectations between instructors, career track, 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 appeals may be submitted to the Dean, who will make a final determination.

Each of the following may be considered measures of teaching performance: course evaluations; peer observation; evaluation of syllabi; creation of new courses; successful application for general education designation; research 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. It is the responsibility of the evaluated faculty member to contextualize their teaching and address any extenuating circumstances.

Each of the following may be considered measures of research/creativity performance: Publications including sole-authored or co-authored books, articles, translations, reviews; evidence of advancement of research; conference presentations; organization of/participation on round tables, scholarly panels, or other professional fora, editing a scholarly collection or journal; application for and attainment of awards and grants. Additionally, for the evaluation of artistic excellence, the following should be considered: commissioned, invited and/or juried art works; public performances, exhibits, installations and other public dissemination of artistic works in digital or analog publication. It is the responsibility of the evaluated faculty member to contextualize their research/ creative activities for non-experts in their field.

Each of the following may be considered measures of service performance: leadership roles and/or committee work at the unit, college, university, community or professional level; participation in/ organization of recruitment, retention and social cohesion activities; election to positions of university governance (e.g. faculty senate); editorial, curatorial and review boards for professional associations; election or appointment to leadership or service positions of professional organizations; public service related to faculty expertise; peer mentorship (e.g. class observation). It is the responsibility of the evaluated faculty member to contextualize any service that furthers the ASU Charter but may not clearly align with the articulated service criteria.

It also should be noted that the example criteria listed above 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 APARS system in a timely fashion. Failure to include an updated CV, evidence of progress in all relevant categories, and course evaluations may result in a negative review.

When a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating (2 or below) in any area of assigned responsibilities, they must work with the Director to develop an Academic Unit Development Plan as noted in "P7: Post-Tenure Review Process," linked within ACD 506-11. A second consecutive unsatisfactory performance rating in the same area will result in an overall unsatisfactory rating.

When a tenured faculty member receives a summary evaluation with an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, a college level Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required as outlined 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. Within 30 working days of notification of the rating, faculty may appeal to the Dean, who will make the final determination within 30 working days of receipt of the appeal, as provided for by ACD 506-10.

IV. 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 when relevant. A faculty member seeking redress of a broader range of personnel grievances should consult ACD 509-01 and 509-02