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This constitution provides the Department of Supply Chain Management with the organization and procedures by which and through which it may function. This is done within the range of its authority and responsibility, as prescribed by state law, the *Conditions of Faculty Service* established by the Board of Regents and other policies of the Board of Regents, the Arizona State University *Faculty Constitution and Bylaws*, the Arizona State University *Personnel Policies and Procedures for Faculty*, and the W. P. Carey School of Business *Constitution and Bylaws*. To the extent that there is any inconsistency between this document and the documents or policies identified above, the documents and policies identified above shall prevail. To the extent that there is any inconsistency between other Department of Supply Chain Management documents and the Department of Supply Chain Management *Constitution and Bylaws*, the Department of Supply Chain Management *Constitution and Bylaws* shall prevail.

1. Definitions
	1. Chair. The Chair is the administrative head of the Department, is a member of the faculty, is the Assembly Secretary, and is appointed by the Dean.
	2. Chair Designate. A voting faculty member from the department may from time-to-time serve as the Chair Designate by appointment of the Chair.
	3. Faculty Member. An employee of the Board of Regents in teaching, research, or service whose notice of appointment is as lecturer, senior lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, visiting professor, Regents Professor, or whose notice of appointment otherwise expressly designates a faculty position in the Department of Supply Chain Management. Graduate students serve as assistants, associates, or otherwise are academic appointees, but are not faculty members (ACD 005 definition).
	4. Voting Faculty Member. Faculty members who hold tenure or tenure-track positions at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or Regents Professor are entitled to vote.
2. Faculty Governance Responsibilities

Faculty governance responsibilities include, but are not limited to, recommendations regarding

* 1. The form of faculty governance at the Department level.
	2. Approval of course content and manner of instruction.
	3. Establishment of requirements for matriculation and for degrees.
	4. Faculty appointment, retention, promotion, dismissal, sabbatical leave of Ranked Instructional Faculty (see Appendix D).

2.5. Faculty appointment, retention, promotion, granting of tenure, dismissal, sabbatical leave and emeritus status (see the W. P. Carey School of Business guidelines.)

* 1. Faculty performance evaluation procedures for performance review and post-tenure review (see Appendix A).
	2. Faculty joint appointments guidelines (see Appendix B).
	3. Faculty affiliation appointments guidelines (see Appendix C).
	4. Selection of the department chair and certain academic and center chairs. Recommending bodies shall include faculty representation.
	5. The formulation of rules and procedures for academic discipline of students.
	6. Establishment of norms for teaching responsibilities and for evaluation of both faculty and student achievement.
	7. Policies and procedures governing salary increases.
	8. Other matters of concern to the faculty.
1. Faculty Assembly
	1. Membership. The Faculty Assembly consists of the Chair and all Department Faculty.
	2. Meeting of the Faculty Assembly
		1. Regular Meetings. Regular meetings of the Faculty Assembly shall be held once each semester normally within two weeks of the beginning of each semester. The Chair of the Department or the Chair-Designate shall preside.
		2. Special Meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Chair or upon written petition of five or more of the members of the Faculty Assembly in residence. Written petitions shall state explicitly the purpose of the special meeting, which shall be limited to that subject.
		3. Agenda and notice of meeting
			1. The Chair shall determine the agenda for the meetings of the Faculty Assembly.
			2. The agenda of the meeting shall be sent to each member of the Faculty Assembly at least one week in advance of the meeting.
			3. If a meeting is called to appeal actions of the Chair or a Department committee, two weeks notice to members of the Faculty Assembly is required, and the agenda shall be accompanied by the proposals to be considered at the meeting. Actions at such a meeting shall be restricted to the items on the agenda. A meeting under this paragraph shall be called upon the written request of five or more members of the Faculty Assembly.
		4. Attendance and Quorum. The Chair and all faculty are eligible to attend the Faculty Assembly. A quorum shall be constituted when at least one-third of the voting faculty members of the Faculty Assembly not on sabbatical or other leave are present when the meeting is called to order.
		5. Methods of voting
			1. Any method of voting may be used at the discretion of the Chair or Chair Designate. However, at the request of two members a vote by secret ballot shall be ordered.
			2. When there is a quorum, the members present at the meeting of the Faculty Assembly may order, by a majority vote, all members of the Faculty Assembly in residence to be polled by campus mail or by electronic mail**.** The circulation and counting of a mail ballot or by electronic mail is the responsibility of the Chair. However, if there is objection to this method of circulation and counting, the Faculty Assembly, by majority vote may designate an alternate method of distribution and counting.
		6. Meetings shall be conducted according to the latest edition of ***The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*, Alice Sturgis.**
		7. Minutes. Minutes of Faculty Assembly meetings shall be prepared by the Chair, or a member of the Faculty Assembly at the request of the Chair, and shall be distributed to each member of the Faculty Assembly. Minutes shall
			1. Include the names of those making motions and amendments.
			2. Include a summary of all actions taken.
			3. Be submitted in draft form to the Chair for approval prior to distribution.
	3. Responsibilities of the Department Faculty Assembly
		1. The Faculty Assembly is the deliberative and legislative body for the Department.
		2. The Faculty Assembly shall have the power to act on all matters of faculty governance and on all other matters affecting the faculty's role in the Department.
		3. The responsibilities of the Faculty are contained in the *University ACD, 330 Faculty Responsibilities.*
		4. The Faculty Assembly may refer matters to a Department committee for review, advice, or action.
		5. The Faculty Assembly may establish and determine the responsibilities of Ad Hoc Faculty committees. Ad Hoc Faculty committees may also be established by the Chair.
		6. The Faculty Assembly shall review reports and recommendations directed to it from department faculty committees and take such action, within its authority, as the Assembly deems appropriate.
		7. The Faculty Assembly may review proposals or recommendations from any member of the Assembly and take such action, within its authority, as the Assembly deems appropriate.
		8. The Faculty Assembly, upon request of the Chair, may act in an advisory capacity to the Chair.
		9. Recommendations received from a Department Faculty Committee that require action by the Assembly have the status of a main motion and do not require a motion or a second from a member of the Assembly to be considered.
2. Amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws
	1. Amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws shall be approved by the action of the voting faculty members of the Faculty Assembly.
	2. At four-year intervals, beginning with Fall Semester of 1994, the Chair shall appoint a Committee to review the Constitution and Bylaws and recommend appropriate changes for Assembly consideration.
	3. Any voting faculty member, at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly, may propose an amendment as a main motion.
	4. The business of a special meeting of the Faculty Assembly may be to initiate an amendment or to vote on an amendment.
	5. In no instance is a proposed amendment to be acted upon by the Assembly in the same meeting in which it is introduced.
	6. A proposed amendment to the constitution shall be adopted on approval of 60 percent of all the voting faculty members. A proposed amendment to the bylaws and all other matters shall be approved by a majority of the voting faculty members at a duly called faculty meeting.
3. Faculty Associates, Visiting Professors, and others with a teaching, research, or administrative appointment, shall be governed by this Constitution and bylaws.
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1. Department Faculty Committees are designated as follows:
	1. Elected Faculty Committees are Standing Committees
	2. Appointed Faculty Committees are Standing Committees
	3. Ad Hoc Faculty Committees
2. Committees
	1. Committee Chairs. The members of an Elected Committee shall select their own chair. The Department Chair shall appoint the Chair from one of the members of an Appointed Committee. It is desirable that the Chair of each Appointed Committee shall have been a member of that Committee during the prior academic year.
	2. Term of Appointment. The normal term of an elected and/or appointed member of a Committee shall be for two academic years. Election or appointment to such Committees may be renewed. The normal term of appointment to an Ad Hoc Committees is for the life of the Committee.
	3. Meetings. All meetings of a Committee shall be called by the Committee Chair who shall preside at said meeting. The Chair may appoint another member of the Committee to preside over the Committee during the Chair's absence.
	4. Quorum. A majority of the members of an Elected Committee, an Appointed Committee, or an Ad Hoc Committee shall constitute a quorum. A majority vote of those present shall constitute official action by the Committee.
	5. Minutes and Reports. No written minutes shall be required of a Faculty Committee unless required by the Faculty Assembly or the Department Chair. At least one week prior to the end of the last regular class week of Spring semester, a written report summarizing the actions and activities of each Faculty Committee for the academic year shall be submitted by the Committee chair to the Department Chair. Written reports of Ad Hoc Committees will be submitted at the conclusion of the Committee assignment.
	6. Accountability for Service. It is expected that all faculty members who are appointed or elected to committees will perform their committee responsibilities in a dedicated manner. The Chair of an Appointed Committee may request that the Department Chair replace a member who fails to complete assignments or to attend meetings without notice and reasonable cause. The quality of Committee service shall be considered in recommendations and evaluations relating to promotion and tenure, performance review and post-tenure review (Appendix A) and sabbatical leave decisions.
	7. New Committees. New Standing Faculty Committees shall be established by amending this Bylaw to include the name, memberships, and purpose and function of the Standing Faculty Committee to be established.
	8. Discontinuation of Committees. Standing Faculty Committees shall be discontinued by amending the appropriate sections of this Bylaw to delete the name and description of the Standing Faculty Committee to be discontinued.
	9. Standing Faculty Committees. The purpose and function of Standing Faculty Committees shall be to provide a structure for the generation of and/or the processing and review of recommendations to the Faculty Assembly and/or the Department Chair regarding matters of faculty governance and other matters affecting the Faculty's role in the Department.
		1. A Standing Faculty Committee shall consider matters referred to it by the Faculty Assembly and by the Department Chair, in addition to the Committee's own initiative.
		2. A Standing Faculty Committee may consider matters referred to it by other Department Faculty Committees.
		3. Recommendations of a Faculty Committee concerning revision of existing policy or establishment of new policy shall be made to the Faculty Assembly. The Assembly may approve, amend, refer back to the Committee for further consideration, or disapprove of the recommendation of the Committee.
		4. Each Committee shall determine whether one or more individual members has an unacceptable conflict of interest in relationship to one or more of the Committee's functions and, if necessary, shall establish procedures to resolve issues involving conflicts of interest.
		5. If repeated conflicts or contradictions occur between the Department Chair or higher administrative levels and the majority of a Department Faculty Committee, the Committee Chair shall inform the Faculty Assembly of the conflict and the Committee may cease to operate until a working arrangement can again be established. The occurrence of such a conflict shall not adversely affect the accountability of the Committee. If the conflict is not resolved, the Department Chair may reconstitute the Committee during the academic year.
	10. Committee loads
		1. Relative service loads depend upon individual faculty member’s emphasis on teaching, scholarship**,** and service.
		2. It is desirable that non-tenured Assembly Members be assigned fewer committees than tenured Assembly Members.
3. Ad Hoc Faculty Committees
	1. Ad Hoc Committees may be established by the Faculty Assembly or by the Department Chair. In the establishment of Ad Hoc Faculty Committees, conflicts in functions with Standing Faculty Committees should be avoided except when a Standing Committee requests the appointment of an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to undertake a special project in relation to one or more of its functions.
4. Standing Committees
	1. Personnel Committee
		1. Responsibilities
			1. Review and submit written recommendations to the Department Chair of every Faculty Member’s contract continuation, sabbatical leave, performance review, and leave without pay requests, and for tenured Faculty Members, post-tenure reviews.
			2. Review of applicants for faculty positions when requested by the Department Chair,
			3. Review of sabbatical criteria, performance review procedures, post-tenure review guidelines, or workload disputes on its own authority, by direction of the Department Chair, or at the request of the Faculty Assembly. Recommend changes in criteria and/or procedures to the Faculty Assembly.
			4. Consider other matters related to personnel matters.
		2. Procedures
			1. When a committee member is considered for sabbatical leave, performance review, or post-tenure review, that person shall not participate in any deliberations and may not vote in the personnel actions for which he or she is being considered.
			2. The members of the Personnel Committee shall elect a Chair at the beginning of each academic year.
			3. The committee may choose to elect or have the Chair appoint subcommittees to evaluate issues or personnel as necessary.
		3. Membership. The Committee will be composed of all tenured voting faculty members who are not on sabbatical or other leave.
		4. Ineligibility. Members of the W. P. Carey School of Business Personnel Committee, the University Personnel Committee, or those holding more than 50 per cent administrative appointments shall not be eligible to be members in the Department Personnel Committee.
	2. Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC)
		1. Chair. The chair of the PTC shall be the elected chair of the SCM Department Personnel Committee, if also a member of the PTC; otherwise the chair shall be elected by a simple vote of the relevant PTC.
		2. Responsibilities. Review and submit written recommendations to the Department Chair of every Faculty Member’s petition for promotion or tenure, or both. A vote must be taken and summary report submitted pursuant to the rules and traditions of the department.
		3. Procedures. When a committee member is considered for promotion or tenure or both, that person shall not participate in any deliberations and may not vote in the personnel actions for which he or she is being considered.
		4. Membership. The Promotion and tenure Committee is a subcommittee of the Department Personnel Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will be composed of all tenured voting faculty members who are not on sabbatical or other leave who have already achieved the rank under consideration. For example, The Promotion and tenure Committee for a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will be composed of all Personnel Committee members who have attained that rank. Likewise, The Promotion and tenure Committee for a candidate for promotion to Professor will be composed of all Personnel Committee members who have attained that rank.
		5. Presentation Panel. The chair of the PTC shall appoint two faculty members from that PTC to serve as a presentation and analysis panel for the petitioning candidate. The role of this panel is to analyze the petition, provide a peer comparison, understand the strengths and weaknesses of said case and provide an unbiased summary and report to the relevant PTC.
	3. Undergraduate Committee
		1. Responsibilities
			1. Develop undergraduate programs and curricula and make recommendations for changes, additions, and deletions to the Department Chair and Faculty Assembly.
			2. Recommend degree requirements to the Faculty Assembly.
			3. Review undergraduate catalog copy.
			4. Develop and implement means, including coordination with Career Services, to improve placement of undergraduate majors upon graduation.
			5. Consider other matters related to undergraduate programs.
		2. Membership. Undergraduate faculty representative for the School and four additional members of the Faculty.
		3. Selection. Appointment of the committee members and the undergraduate faculty representative will be made by the Department Chair.
	4. Graduate Committee
		1. The Graduate Committee has two standing subcommittees: Masters and Doctoral
		2. Responsibilities
			1. Develop the Department's contribution to the masters and doctoral program.
			2. Develop the doctoral program.
			3. Recruitment procedures for graduate students.
			4. Review admissions applications for doctoral students, and recommend admissions.
			5. Review and recommend graduate curricula to the Faculty Assembly.
			6. Review evaluations of doctoral students and make recommendations concerning their continued status.
			7. Consider other matters related to the graduate program.
		3. Membership. Graduate Faculty Representative for the School, and three additional members from the Faculty Assembly. The majority of the Committee will be tenured faculty.
		4. Selection. The Department Chair will appoint the Committee members.
		5. Committee Chair. The Department Chair will appoint the Committee Chair.
	5. Faculty Recruitment Committees
		1. Responsibilities of a Recruitment Committee in combination with the Department Chair
			1. Develop means to obtain the most appropriate candidates.
			2. Identify faculty recruitment needs.
			3. Advertise for applicants.
			4. Screen applications for applicants.
			5. Recommend selected candidates to the Department Chair and academic area. .
			6. Coordinate applicant interviews and evaluations by members of the involved area and the Faculty Assembly.
			7. Pursue applicants from protected classes in compliance with University and Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policies.
		2. Membership. Committees will consist of at least three members. In addition, the Department Chair will be an ex-officio member.
		3. Selection. The Department Chair will appoint the committee members and chair.
5. Appendix A. Faculty Performance Annual Evaluation Procedures for Performance Review and Post- Tenure Review Guidelines
6. Appendix B. Joint Appointment Guidelines
7. Appendix C. Affiliation Appointments Guidelines
8. Appendix D. Faculty appointment, retention, promotion Guidelines

**APPENDIX A**

**Guidelines for Faculty Annual Performance Review and Post-Tenure Review**

Two policies are set out in this appendix to evaluate faculty. The Evaluation Procedures for Annual Performance Review Guidelines are for the faculty annual performance review. The Evaluation Procedures for Post-Tenure Review Guidelines are to provide accountability of tenured faculty in the process of higher education. This appendix implements the policies of the Arizona Board of Regents, Arizona State University, and the W. P. Carey School of Business.

1. Philosophy of Evaluation.

The purposes of the annual discussions between the faculty member and the Department Chair that result in the annual evaluations are to:

* 1. assist faculty in their career development.
	2. provide a basis for the establishment of annual salary compensation adjustment.
	3. provide a basis for Post-Tenure Review.
	4. provide a basis for decisions on retention, promotion, tenure, and termination.

Consistent with the rules of the University, peer evaluations shall play a role in the performance evaluation process. These guidelines should reduce ambiguity in the evaluation; however, no guidelines can completely reduce ambiguity without hampering creativity and limiting the growth and development of the Department. The appropriate standards and mix of activities for one academic area may differ from another academic area.

Additionally, the standards and mix of activities that are appropriate for an assistant professor who is seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor are not the same as those for a senior professor whose service may be considerably greater. The Department takes a long-term view of the faculty member’s performance.

Even within a given academic rank, some faculty will excel at scholarship, others at teaching, and still others at service. All faculty members must contribute to some extent in each of these areas, but a requirement for some contribution is not the same as a demand for consistency. Faculty are often encouraged to experiment in different areas. As a result, a faculty member shall not be considered to be unsatisfactory if a project does not work out as expected.

1. Work Plan.

Each faculty member will submit annually a written Work Plan to the Department Chair. The Work Plan leads to the Assessment Report (see Section III). The Assessment Report will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee and the Chair. The time table is found in section V of this appendix. The purpose of the Work Plan for untenured faculty is to create a plan that will lead to retention and eventually to tenure and promotion, and for consideration for salary compensation adjustment. The purpose of the Work Plan for tenured faculty is to create a plan that will lead to a successful post-tenure review and to be considered for salary compensation adjustment.

The Work Plan will project the objectives the faculty member plans to accomplish in the next annual period. While each Work Plan must reflect the School's performance components of teaching, scholarship, and service, the percentages assigned to these three components will differ in the Work Plan submitted by each faculty member. The minimum percentages should be teaching, 35 percent; scholarship, 20 percent; and service, 20 percent, with a total of 100 percent. The final percentages are reached by agreement between the faculty member and the Chair in the Work Plan.

The Department Chair will approve the Work Plan and meet with a faculty member if necessary to review and agree to the objectives set out in the Plan. Faculty members can exhibit variance in how they contribute to their students, their discipline, and to the institution. The process is designed to acknowledge these varied contributions in all of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the faculty member to produce a Work Plan that recognizes each individual’s comparative advantages in satisfying the objectives of the department. At the same time, faculty will recognize the obligation the Department has in contributing to the teaching, scholarship and service missions of the School. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to agree to an individual Work Plan that is consistent with the objectives of the Department, the expertise of individual faculty member, and the goal of the faculty member, whether it is for retention, promotion, tenure, salary compensation adjustment, or post-tenure review.

If a disagreement arises between the Chair and a faculty member concerning the Work Plan, the matter shall be referred to the Personnel Committee. The Committee cannot impose any solution, but functions to facilitate an amicable agreement between the Chair and a faculty member.

1. Assessment Report for Performance Review and/or Post-Tenure Review.

Each faculty member will complete an Assessment Report that reflects the accomplishment of the objectives over the previous three years as set out in the annual Work Plans (Arizona Board of Regents *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process,* February 13 & 14, 1997). The Assessment Report will include the three most recent Work Plans, and the attachments requested therein for the current year. The Assessment Report form is set out at the end of this Appendix. A faculty member who has split time between the department and another commitment may not double count an item that may be valid in either area. For example, a speech given in the capacity of an administrator may not be counted in the materials for faculty evaluation if the person has chosen to place it in the evaluation for his/her performance as an administrator. A presentation to an academic organization that is also published in the proceedings may not be double counted as both a presentation and a proceeding.

A central file system will be maintained for each faculty member by the Department Executive Assistant (EA). Each faculty is responsible for providing to the EA the Assessment Report and attachments. The EA will submit the Assessment Report and attachments to the Committee. In addition to a completed Assessment Report Form, each tenured faculty member shall submit only one copy of the following materials and attachments to the EA. The EA will make the appropriate number of copies for the personnel committee.

* 1. The Assessment Report shall contain
		1. current vita.
		2. the three most recent Work Plans.
		3. summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught within the past 36 months.
	2. Attachments
		1. One copy of publications and submissions during the last three years.
		2. A maximum of 15 pages demonstrating any special teaching materials.
1. Items for Consideration

The following are suggestions for review in the Assessment Report. These items are not exhaustive, and it is not expected that each faculty member will include all these items.

* 1. Teaching Information

The following is based in part on Appendix C of the Braun (1994) document *Instructional Evaluation at ASU*, August 1994, *The Place of Teaching in the University,* December 1992, and *ASU Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines*.

* + 1. Products of good teaching.
			1. student evaluations (required by the Arizona Board of Regents).
			2. student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
			3. student essays, creative work, and project or field-work reports.
			4. publications by students on course-related work.
			5. record of faculty member’s students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
			6. record of students who elect another course with the same professor.
			7. supervision of theses.
			8. establishing or running a successful internship program.
			9. the effect of courses on student career choice.
			10. help provided by faculty member to students in securing employment.
			11. assistance provided by faculty member to colleagues on teaching improvement.
		2. Courses.
			1. statement of teaching philosophy.
			2. current classes.
				1. list of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, and enrollments with brief elaboration.
				2. self-evaluation statement on how faculty member perceives his/her effectiveness.
				3. list of course materials prepared for students.
				4. report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
				5. description of how videos, computers, or other non-print materials were used in teaching.
				6. guest lecturers and how they were used in learning process.
				7. description of steps taken to emphasize the inter-relatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.
				8. team teaching with colleagues.
			3. Overall class development.
				1. record of changes resulting from self-evaluation.
				2. summary of journals read on improving teaching and of attempts made to implement acquired ideas.
				3. summary of new teaching materials reviewed for possible application.
				4. exchange of course materials with a colleague from another program area or institution.
				5. involvement in associations or societies concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.
				6. description of instructional innovations attempted and the evaluation of their effectiveness.
				7. list of general support services used in improving one’s teaching, such as the Faculty Development Office or Consortium for Instructional Innovation (CII).
				8. participation in seminars, workshops, and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
				9. course development, curriculum development, course innovation.
				10. research pursued that contributes directly to teaching.
				11. information on editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one’s subject.
				12. course objectives.
				13. any factors that contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.
		3. Other factors.
			1. size of class.
			2. type of class, such as core requirement or elective.
			3. level of the course.
			4. nature of students, such as undergraduate, graduate, honors students.
			5. physical layout of classroom.
			6. availability of equipment, such as overheads or computers, and their working condition.
			7. number of classes and types of classes taught.
			8. delivery method of class, i.e., television, web based, or combination of delivery methods.
		4. Other information
			1. students.
				1. student course and teaching evaluation data that suggest improvement or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.
				2. written comments from a student committee to evaluate courses and provide feedback.
				3. unstructured and unsolicited written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed.
				4. documented reports of satisfaction with out-of-class contacts.
				5. interview data collected from students after completion of a course.
				6. honors received from students, such as being elected “Teacher of the Year.”
			2. Colleagues.
				1. statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
				2. written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
				3. evaluation of contribution to course development and improvements.
				4. statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared from graduate studies.
				5. honors or recognition, such as a distinguished teacher award or election to a committee on teaching.
				6. requests for advice or acknowledgment of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.
			3. Other sources.
				1. statements about teaching achievements from administrators at one’s own institution or from other institutions.
				2. alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
				3. comments from parents of students.
				4. reports from employers of students (in a work-study or cooperative program).
				5. invitations to teach for outside agencies.
				6. other kinds of invitations based on one’s reputation as a teacher (for example, a media interview on a successful teaching innovation).
	1. Scholarship information.

The following is based in part on *Scholarship Reconsidered* by Ernest L. Boyer, published by the Carnegie Foundation in 1990. The four types of scholarship are scholarship of discovering knowledge (discovery), scholarship of integrating knowledge (integration), scholarship of applying knowledge (application), and scholarship of teaching (teaching).

* + 1. Scholarship.
			1. articles published in refereed publications.
			2. articles accepted for publication in refereed journals.
			3. articles submitted for publication in refereed journals.
			4. articles published in non-refereed journals.
			5. articles accepted for publication in non-refereed journals.
			6. articles submitted for publication in non-refereed journals.
			7. presentations at international academic conferences.
			8. presentations at national academic conferences.
			9. presentations at regional academic conferences.
			10. poster presentations at academic conferences.
			11. research conducted on one’s own teaching or course that leads to a publication or presentation.
			12. presentation of instructional innovations attempted and the evaluation of their effectiveness.
			13. record of research pursued that contributes directly to teaching.
			14. research leading to correspondence study.
			15. research leading to a television course instruction.
			16. research leading to Internet instruction.
			17. research leading to the development of supplemental instruction outside the classroom.
			18. research leading to the creation of active innovative learning environments.
			19. research leading to the development of teaching materials.
			20. research that supports doctoral dissertation supervision, honors thesis, and independent study supervision.
			21. textbook, software, or other instructional materials prepared by the faculty member.
			22. other scholarly material produced.
		2. Applications and Education Outcomes and Activities.

Other methods of using scholarship in teaching, training, mentoring, etc. For example,

* + - 1. incorporation of current research into teaching, i.e., readings, exercises, lectures;
			2. use of research findings/theory in the study of applied problems;
			3. efforts that bring together researchers and practitioners;
			4. applying scholarly theory and/or findings in lectures, workshops, publications, and other activities directed at practitioners;
			5. systematic efforts to improve teaching, i.e., application of theory and research to delivery methods, collecting, and applying student feedback on teaching effectiveness; or
			6. published textbooks, presentations, or publications on teaching.
	1. Service

The following is based in part on the ASU *Task Force on Evaluation and Recognition of Service*, December 4, 1996.

* + 1. Committee assignments.
			1. University.
			2. School.
			3. Department.
		2. Major service.
			1. University.
			2. Community.
			3. National.
			4. International.
		3. Scholar’s discipline.
			1. University.
			2. Community.
			3. National.
			4. International.
		4. Other types of service.
			1. coordination responsibilities within the Department.
			2. generation of funds to support Departmental research, operations, travel, or equipment.
			3. serving in appointed public positions such as a judge pro tempore, arbitrator, mediator, or governmental commission or committees.
			4. consulting (gratis).
1. Time Table.

By February 15, each faulty member will provide the EA with seven copies of their Assessment Report, including the three most recent Work Plans and the proposed Work Plan, and one copy of the attachments listed above. By March 30, the Personnel Committee will have reviewed the Assessment Reports, with attachments, and made its recommendations concerning both post-tenure review and performance review to the Chair. By April 30, the Chair will have met with each faculty member for purposes of providing feedback concerning post-tenure review and performance review. The Chair will provide each member with a written statement that includes the evaluations in the three performance areas. The statement will include a qualitative statement of the factors considered in evaluating the faculty’s performance. This statement is confidential and will not be released to anyone except the Dean of the W. P. Carey School of Business and appeal review committees, without the written permission of the faculty member. By April 30, each faculty member will have signed a Work Plan with the Chair to reflect his or her planned allocation of effort for the current evaluation period.

1. Evaluation Process of the Assessment Report.

The Assessment Report is evaluated first by the Personnel Committee, then by the Chair. Each individual will be evaluated on teaching, scholarship, service, and on overall performance. The Committee will base its evaluation of the individual on the information submitted in the Assessment Report as to the achievement of the objectives set out in the Work Plan. It is not expected that every objective set out in the Work Plan will be achieved within a one-year period, but may be met over a period of two or three years, such as major course revisions or research projects. Some items may never be achieved because of changing circumstances. Thus, the Committee will review a rolling three-year period of time.

The Assessment Report is evaluated first for Post-Tenure Review, then for performance review for tenured faculty. Untenured faculty are reviewed for performance review and, when appropriate, are reviewed for retention, promotion, and tenure. The percentages set out in the Work Plan are not required for the Post-Tenure Review since this process assesses a base level of performance in the three areas. The percentages are used in making the performance evaluation. The Committee shall abide by the percentages agreed to in the Work Plan and modify the expected performance standards to reflect these percentages.

This appendix contains lists that describe activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These lists are not mutually exclusive. The same activity may count in different areas depending upon the faculty focus.

For example, the development of a new course that involves significant research may be counted as scholarship by one professor while another who developed a new course with minimum research may consider it teaching.

* 1. Annual Post-Tenure Review Evaluations.

Annual post tenure review evaluations will be based upon the Work Plan. Each faculty member is evaluated annually by the Personnel Committee and the Chair. The Committee shall evaluate each individual’s performance on four measurements: teaching, scholarship, service and overall performance (*Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, 1.a.*).

The Committee will examine the Work Plan and whether the goals stated were qualitatively met. The Committee will look for continuous improvement by the individual and for quality in a faculty member’s performance.

Using the evaluation scales in Section VII, the Committee shall evaluate the material submitted by each faculty member and make recommendations to the department chair with respect to both Post-Tenure Review and performance. For Post-Tenure Review, the Committee will evaluate each faculty member in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as either unsatisfactory or satisfactory, and based on these evaluations will provide an overall evaluation of either satisfactory, satisfactory performance overall but unsatisfactory in one area, or unsatisfactory performance overall in two or more areas. For its performance evaluation, the Committee will apply the nine-point scale shown in Section VII to each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Committee may use fractional ratings (for example, 5.6) in this performance evaluation.

A faculty member is performing satisfactorily for Post-Tenure Review when each of the following conditions is true. Each condition is essential, and the absence of any one reflects an unsatisfactory situation. The following conditions are from the *ASU Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines.*

A faculty member is performing at a satisfactory level when he/she:

1. Has a full (1.0 FTE) workload of assigned activities.
2. Engages in those activities at an acceptable level of quality.
3. Exhibits acceptable balance among the activities making up his/her professional portfolio.
4. Is providing acceptable instructional and service contributions.
5. Conducts himself/herself in a professional manner (*ACD Manual, Section 204-02*, *Standards of Professional Conduct for Faculty Members and Academic Professionals*).
	1. Performance Evaluation Guidelines.

Although performance evaluations must be closely related to salary increases, this is not a perfect relationship. Salary enhancement is given for one year's performance has a long-term effect on salary since it is given for the duration of a faculty member's career with the University. Therefore, the Department needs to take a long-term view of the process rather than reduce it to an annual series of events. For these reasons, an emphasis is placed on a three-year period for evaluation. Final responsibility for recommending salary enhancement rests with the Department Chair and the Dean of the W. P. Carey School of Business.

* + 1. Teaching.

A faculty member normally teaches 12 hours per academic year, but this load may be modified in the Work Plan to reflect factors, such as in the teaching of television courses, web-based courses, large lectures, or using cooperative learning methods. A faculty member may demonstrate satisfactory performance in teaching through student evaluations and other evidence.

Student evaluations shall be included in the evaluation (Question 8 and average of all 8 items). The student evaluations, although required to be part of evaluation, shall not be the only measurement. The Committee will evaluate the faculty member’s overall trends on his/her student evaluations over the previous three years. Other approved evaluation forms, syllabi, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness may be submitted, when requested by the Committee, to demonstrate satisfactory teaching performance. Team teaching, particularly interdisciplinary, is encouraged when the faculty obtain a higher degree of teaching effectiveness and integration that would have been difficult to achieve if they had taught separate courses. Teaching is evaluated on both its quality and quantity of performance.

Above Satisfactory Performance

Above satisfactory performance in teaching is composed of a number of elements. The student evaluations during the previous three years are typically better than the average for the School for that program (B.S., mega sections, B.S. non-mega sections, MBA, PhD). In addition to the student evaluations, the following activities as well as those set out in Section II.A. are taken into consideration. It is not expected that all of these activities will be performed. For example, not all faculty can engage in course development every three years. Typically, the Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has substantive evidence of

1. student evaluations (required by the Arizona Board of Regents).
2. course development.
3. development of course materials.
4. delivery methods.
5. innovative teaching methods.
6. course load, including new courses and repeat courses, graduate and undergraduate courses, class size, nature of the courses taught, and availability of teaching assistants.
7. facilitation of student development, including contributions to advisory and dissertation committees, facilitation of graduate student publications, and participation in curriculum development.
8. participation in three Faculty Development Workshops in three years.
9. attended sessions on teaching techniques at professional society meetings.
10. published an article on teaching.
11. presentations or publications on teaching.

Satisfactory Performance

The student evaluations during the previous three years are no more than two standard deviations below the School average for that program (B.S., mega sections, B.S. non-mega sections, MBA, PhD). The Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has some evidence of activities listed in Section II.A. or in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance.

Unsatisfactory Performance

The student evaluation during the previous three years are more than two standard deviations below the School average for that program (B.S., mega sections, B.S. non-mega sections, MBA, PhD). The trend of student evaluations has been downward with no apparent attempt to correct the trend or little or no explanation for the trend. The Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has little or no evidence of activities listed in the Section

II.A. or listed in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance.

* + 1. Scholarship.

It is essential that faculty engage in scholarly endeavors. A faculty member may demonstrate satisfactory performance by engaging in one type of scholarship. Joint research is encouraged particularly when synergy results and the faculty who have worked together obtain tangible output which would have been difficult to achieve if they had worked separately. Scholarship is evaluated on its quality and quantity.

Above Satisfactory Performance

Above satisfactory performance in scholarship is composed of a number of elements. Generally, above satisfactory performance is based on the scholarship found in discovery and integration types of scholarship, but application and teaching types of scholarship may also qualify. The following activities as well as those set out in Section II.B. are taken into consideration. It is not expected that all of these activities will be performed. For example, not all faculty will be published in a top academic journal every three years. Typically, the Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has substantive evidence of

1. two articles published or accepted for publication in top academic journals.
2. three articles published or accepted for publication in top practitioner journals.
3. papers published or accepted for publication in books or monographs.
4. papers published or accepted for publication in other outlets.
5. presentation of three conference papers.
6. refereed papers at professional meetings.
7. documented research in progress.
8. research funding and proposals.
9. development of interdisciplinary activities (e.g., symposia, workshops, conferences, or publications).
10. significant incorporation of recent research in teaching materials.
11. published textbook.

Satisfactory Performance

The Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has evidence of engaging in discovery, integration, application, or teaching scholarly activities listed in Section II.B. or in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance.

Unsatisfactory Performance

The Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has little or no evidence of discovery, integration, application, or teaching scholarly activities listed in the Section II.B. or listed in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance.

* + 1. Service.

A faculty member may demonstrate satisfactory performance in service through internal service or external professional activities, or preferably a combination of both. Service is evaluated on its quality and quantity.

Activities for which the faculty member receives remuneration, such as consulting or conducting seminars, is specifically excluded from consideration in this category. Generally, service to the Department, School, the University, and the profession is considered. Civic or public service is the responsibility of citizenship in the United States. When such service is of such a public nature as to bring goodwill to the Department, School or University, it will be considered as service that warrants a positive evaluation.

Above Satisfactory Performance

Above satisfactory performance service is based on activities that go beyond satisfactory levels. The mere expenditure of time and effort is not sufficient to warrant substantial rewards for service; there should be evidence that the faculty member has taken on significant responsibility for the service rendered through the assignment.

Internal service over a three-year period may be demonstrated by service on one or more major committees that is commensurate with the time period. External service shall be demonstrated by serving at a regional, or national, or international levels of a professional organization. Service may be demonstrated by factors, such as, but not limited to, holding office, or serving on the editorial board, or serving as reviewer. It is expected that most faculty will have a combination of both internal and external commitments.

The following activities as well as those set out in Section II.C. are taken into consideration. It is not expected that all of these activities will be performed. For example, not all faculty will serve as Chairs of important committees every three years. Typically, the Committee will evaluate substantive evidence of

1. creating or significantly revising an academic program.
2. significantly contributing to the Department, School, or University by serving as a committee member for two years or serving as a Chair for one year.
3. significantly contributing to the Department, School or University by serving on a recruiting committee or serving as Chair.
4. serving as a coordinator of a core course.
5. serving on an externally funded grant proposal involving multiple faculty.
6. attending and participating in professional organizations.
7. serving as a reviewer of a scholarly or professional journal.
8. serving as an editor or associate editor of a scholarly or professional journal.
9. serving as an officer in professional organizations.
10. creating innovative, collaborative relationships with the business community.
11. generation of funds to support Departmental research, operations, travel, or equipment.
12. serving in appointed public positions such as a judge pro tempore, arbitrator, mediator, or governmental commission or committees.
13. consulting (gratis).

Satisfactory Performance

Satisfactory performance for service is based on activities that are satisfactory performed. The mere expenditure of time and effort is not sufficient to warrant satisfactory performance for service; there should be evidence that the faculty member has taken on some responsibility for the service rendered through the assignment. The Committee will evaluate whether the faculty member has some evidence of activities listed in Section II.C. or in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance.

Unsatisfactory Performance

Unsatisfactory performance for service is a lack of participation in some of the activities listed in the Section II.C. or listed in the previous section on Above Satisfactory Performance or a lack of collegiality.

1. Evaluation Scales

**Scale for Post-Tenure Review: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating = 1 | Rating = 2 | Rating = 3 |  |
| Unsatisfactory Performance Overall in two or more areas. | Satisfactory Performance Overall,but unsatisfactory in one area. | Satisfactory Performance |  |

**Scale for Performance Evaluation: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating = 1 |  | Rating = 2-3 |  | Rating = 4-5 |  | Rating = 6-7 |  | Rating = 8-9 |
| Unsatisfactory |  | Minimum SatisfactoryPerformance |  | Minimum MeritoriousPerformance |  | Significant MeritoriousPerformance |  | Outstanding MeritoriousPerformance |

1. External Market

From time to time, the Personnel Committee will evaluate a faculty member’s external market value within his/her academic discipline. The Committee shall not take into account the individual’s current salary level. The Committee must determine the individual’s market value taking into account academic rank (Assistant, Associate, or Full) and his/her academic discipline as defined by AASCB**.** The faculty member is rated relative to peers at the same rank in the same discipline at AACSB peer institutions, i.e., public AACSB accredited schools.

1. Procedures for Other Than Above Satisfactory or Satisfactory Performance.

In accordance the *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process,* the following procedures apply.

* 1. Satisfactory Performance Overall with an Unsatisfactory Performance in One Subarea, Faculty Development Plan

If a faculty member is evaluated as having an overall satisfactory performance with a single area of unsatisfactory performance, the faculty member will create with the chair a Faculty Development Plan *(Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, 4*). The Faculty Development Plan addresses the single area of deficiency before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member’s overall performance. The Plan lasts for one year. If the objectives of the Plan are evaluated by the Committee as achieved, the faculty member returns to the regular performance evaluation process. If the Plan objectives are not achieved at the end of the year, the faculty member shall receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory and must enter the Performance Improvement Process (*Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, 4*).

* 1. Unsatisfactory Performance Overall, Mandatory Enhanced Review and Performance Improvement Plan

If a faculty member is evaluated as having an overall unsatisfactory performance, a mandatory enhanced review will occur. *(ASU Post-Tenure Review Process*, *III. Step 2*). The mandatory enhanced review is a more thorough review of the faculty member’s record to verify the results of the process, verify the unsatisfactory performance rating, and/or provide information for improvement. Upon completion of this review, a report will be forwarded to the Dean with recommendations of how to proceed. The enhanced review will be performed by a committee, composed of three faculty appointed by the Dean, or a three-person subcommittee from the W. P. Carey School of Business Personnel Committee, selected by the chair. The affected faculty member will choose one of the two committee options (*ASU Post-Tenure Review Process, III. Step 3*).

The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is formulated by the Chair and the Dean, with the assistance of the faculty member. The PIP process, monitoring and follow-up, and completion of the PIP is addressed in the *ASU Post-Tenure Review Process, III. Steps 4, 5, and 6*. Teaching and service deficiencies will generally be addressed through a one-year Performance Improvement Plan. In a rare case that the Plan goes beyond one year, it must be approved by the provost. For a research deficiency or for the research component of an overall deficiency, the duration of the plan shall be as brief as is reasonable, but under no circumstances will it be longer than three years. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the provost (*Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, 5*). Annual or more frequent benchmarks tied to performance goals must be met. Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to these annual or more frequent benchmarks and performance goals shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal (*Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process, 5*) pursuant to the provisions outlined in the ADC Manual, section 501, Conditions for Faculty Service (*W. P. Carey School of Business, Guidelines for Implementation for Post Tenure Review Policy, page 3*).

* 1. Appeal

The post tenure review process does not eliminate the rights of the faculty member to appeal an evaluation or the process by which the evaluation was formed (*ACD Manual, Section 501, Conditions of Faculty Service*, and *ASU Post-Tenure Review Process, III*).

**WORK PLAN DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT**

Time Period: January 1 through December 31, 20xx DUE DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 20xx

**RETURN TO OFFICE OF THE SCM CHAIRPERSON**

Name: Rank:

**Time assigned to the Department: percent.**

**Percentage of effort allocated to each area. Faculty listing less than 100 percent should include only activities that pertain to his/her faculty appointment.**

Teaching Activities: %

Scholarship Activities: %

Service: % Total: %

**TEACHING PLAN**

**SCHOLARSHIP PLAN**

**SERVICE PLAN**

**ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND/OR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

**DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT**

**Time Period: January 1, 20xx through December 31, 20xx**

DUE DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 20xx RETURN TO OFFICE OF THE SCM CHAIRPERSON

Name: Rank:

Time assigned to the Department: percent.

Percentage of effort allocated to each area. Faculty listing less than 100 percent should include only activities that pertain to his/her faculty appointment.

Teaching Activities: %

Scholarship Activities: %

Service: %

Total: %

Please complete pages 2-5. Do not eliminate or renumber any of the categories. Please attach one copy of the following to this Assessment Report.

1. Current Vita,
2. Your three most recent Work Plans (1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002, and
3. Summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught in the last 3 years (Spring 1999 through Fall 2001).

In a separate folder, please submit one copy of the following:

1. A copy of publications and submissions during last three years.
2. A maximum of 15 pages demonstrating any special teaching materials.

**TEACHING REVIEW**

Please attach the Student Evaluation Report supplied by the Department. It is your responsibility to ensure that the numbers have been correctly typed into the Report from the data and attached to this Assessment Report.

**TEACHING REVIEW**

List all courses taught.

List all dissertation committees (doctoral and masters) chaired.

List all dissertation committees (doctoral and masters) on which you were a member, but not chair.

List all honors theses committees and projects (footnote 18).

List other evidence of teaching performance.

**SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW**

List all research articles in refereed publications (provide complete citations), including dates and beginning and ending pages.

List all research presentations at academic conferences.

List all research articles accepted for publication in refereed journals.

List all research articles submitted for publication in refereed journals.

List all books published or revised.

List all non-refereed scholarly publications.

List all other scholarly material produced.

Applications and Education Outcomes and Activities.

**SERVICE REVIEW**

List all committee assignments and the major accomplishments of each. Department

School

University

List other major service responsibilities and major accomplishments University

Community

National

International

List other evidence of service.

**APPENDIX B**

**GUIDELINES FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS**

These guidelines apply to all joint appointments within the Supply Chain Management Department.

1. Application Procedure

Applicants for consideration for a joint appointment to the Department will submit:

* + A full vita.
	+ Evidence of research interest and propensity in an academic area within the supply chain management department.
	+ A written statement of the expected contribution the applicant would make to the Supply Chain Management Department, and how that contribution could be better carried out if the applicant had a joint appointment in Department.
	+ Correspondence from the Chair of the applicant’s current department endorsing the appointment.
	+ Correspondence from the Dean of the applicant’s college endorsing the appointment.
	+ Correspondence from at least one current member of the Department, recommending the person for the joint appointment.

The credentials submitted by the applicant shall be reviewed for potential suitability with the Department’s goals and objectives.

An initial review shall be conducted by the personnel committee to determine if there is sufficient evidence of a potential fit with Department’s goals and objectives. The personnel committee shall make a recommendation to the Department Chair about whether to continue the review procedure. If the Department Chair decides to continue with the process, then the voting faculty shall review the application and vote on whether to recommend the joint appointment

The Chair shall consider the results of the personnel committee evaluation and recommendation and the faculty vote, and shall formulate a recommendation to the Dean of the W. P. Carey School of Business concerning the granting of the applicant’s joint appointment to the Department of Supply Chain Management.

The Dean of the School of Business may offer the applicant a joint appointment within the Supply Chain Management Department. The initial appointment is for a period not to exceed three years, and is renewable in three-year increments at the mutual agreement of the faculty member, the department chair, and the Dean of the W.

P. Carey School of Business.

1. Criteria for Evaluation

At a minimum the candidate for joint appointment to the Department shall fulfill the following criteria.

The candidate is a tenured member of the faculty and holding the rank of associate professor, professor, or Regents Professor at Arizona State University.

The Candidate has a distinguished research record, and in some way has attracted the attention of the appropriate research constituency.

The Candidate has demonstrated an ability to enhance the reputation of the Supply Chain Management Department within the global academic/business community.

1. Expected Duties of Joint Appointees to the Department of Supply Chain Management.

A percentage of time that the joint appointee is to give to the Department will be negotiated with the joint appointee and the joint appointee’s tenure-home department (It is recommended that it be at least 25 per cent). This

percentage will determine the portion of the individual’s teaching load to be carried out in Supply Chain Management. Salary levels, benefits, office space, computer support, grant administration, overhead from grants, and travel budgets and how they are to be divided between the two departments are also negotiable at the front end of the appointment. The impact that the joint appointee could have on the department’s limited support resources, including travel and administrative support should be considered. It should also be clear if the joint appointee brings any such resources that could benefit the department, and how those resources will be managed. All of these issues must be clearly laid out and agreed to in writing at the time the candidate accepts the joint appointment.

1. Teaching;

The joint appointee should be expected to teach at least one course in the appropriate academic area of the appointment every two years for a 25 per cent appointment, and up to two courses a year for a half-time appointment.

1. Scholarship:

Scholarship in the form of journal publications, research grants, and national and international conference participation in the selected academic area is expected.

1. Service:

The joint appointee is expected to attend department meetings

The joint appointee is expected to serve on committees and provide department service, including search committees.

V. Evaluation Procedures of Joint Appointees

Joint appointees shall be reviewed annually using the procedures set forth in the Department constitution and by- laws. The review will cover the joint appointee’s teaching, relevant research productivity, and relevant service in the appropriate academic area.

**APPENDIX C AFFILIATION GUIDELINES**

1. According to ACD 505-02, “an affiliated faculty member is an employee of Arizona State University who is invited to serve in a faculty role in a program or department other than the one paying his or her salary.” For this relationship, the ASU considers the department which pays his or her salary as the home department and the other department as the affiliated department.

An individual who wishes to become an affiliated faculty of the Supply Chain Management Department shall send a letter of intent, stating the purpose behind such an appointment, and an academic vita to the Department's Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee shall make a recommendation to the voting faculty members, who may vote as to approve or disapprove the recommendation on affiliation. Affiliation appointments shall not confer voting rights or any departmental responsibility for performance review or post-tenure review. The initial appointment will be for a period not to exceed three years, and will be renewable in three-year increments at the application of the faculty member to the Personnel Committee for renewal. During the three year period, the individual may self- terminate the affiliation status, or it can be terminated by a majority vote by voting faculty members.

1. Application Procedure
	1. The number of affiliate faculty shall not exceed one-half of the department's tenured plus tenure-track faculty.
	2. Applications for affiliate faculty status will be considered at regularly scheduled Personnel Committee meetings.
	3. Applicants who are not currently of affiliate status must submit a vita, and either the applicant or a department faculty member shall outline in a cover letter what their contributions have been/are to the department, and what their future contributions will entail.
	4. Applicants seeking renewal will provide specific examples of their contribution to the department in the previous three years.
	5. A person with affiliate faculty status may only refer to their Supply Chain Management Department status following reference to their primary Arizona State University affiliation.

**APPENDIX D**

**Guidelines for Faculty appointment, retention, promotion**

* 1. **APPOINTMENT, RETENTION AND PROMOTION OF RANKED INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY**

Clinical faculty have an earned doctorate. In contrast, faculty without a doctorate who focus on a teaching career hold lecturer ranks, and people with extensive business experience, either with or without doctorates, who plan to teach for only a few years are appointed as professors of practice. Clinical faculty, lecturers, and professors of practice are not eligible for tenure. Contracts for these faculty may be either nine-month or twelve-month.

1. Initial appointment of lecturers or clinical assistant ranks may be filled through either a local or national search.
2. Initial appointment of advanced rank non-tenure track faculty must be made through a national search.
3. Application for and promotion to advanced rank for non-tenure track faculty should follow W. P. Carey School promotion procedures and time schedules established by the university.
	* 1. Minimum Criteria for Clinical Faculty

All clinical faculty in the W. P. Carey School must meet the following minimum criteria:

* + - 1. Earned doctorate in a related field.
			2. Faculty qualifications, as defined by the W. P. Carey School of Business for AACSB accreditation purposes and as assigned by the department head.

To maintain a clinical faculty designation, the minimum criteria must be maintained.

* + - 1. Criteria for Clinical Assistant Professor

Must meet the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, but does not meet the criteria for a higher rank.

* + - 1. Criteria for Clinical Associate Professor

In addition to meeting the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, Clinical Associate Professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

* + - * 1. The equivalent of five years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the W. P. Carey assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of five years may be reduced on a case-by-case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarly research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience in business.
				2. Significant excellence in teaching, as demonstrated by such indicators as good teaching evaluations, preparation of innovative course materials, textbook or case publication, new course preparation, academic or practitioner-oriented publications, and successful teaching in a variety of different types or courses.
				3. Active participation in service roles related to teaching. This must include a) active participation in academic unit or school committees related to instruction and b) participation in national professional activities related to the faculty member’s teaching (such as attending relevant national meetings).
			1. Criteria for Clinical Professor (Full)

In addition to meeting the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, clinical full professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

* + - * 1. The equivalent of 12 years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the W. P. Carey assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of 12 years may be reduced on a case-by- case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarship research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience in business.
				2. Sustained long-term excellence and diversity in teaching, as demonstrated by such indicators as good teaching evaluations, preparing of innovative course materials, textbook or case publication, new course preparation, academic or practitioner- oriented publications and successful teaching in a variety of different types of courses.
				3. Demonstrated leadership in curriculum development.
				4. Demonstrated leadership in service roles related to teaching. This must include a) successful leadership roles in academic unit or school committees related to instruction and b) active participation in national professional activities related to the faculty member’s teaching (such as making presentations at relevant professional meetings or serving on relevant professional committees).
		1. Minimum Criteria for Lecturer Ranks

All lecturers in the W. P. Carey School must meet the following minimum criteria:

* + - 1. Earned master in a related field.
			2. Have teaching experience at the college level in a related field.
			3. Faculty qualifications, as defined by the W. P. Carey School of Business for AACSB accreditation purposes and as assigned by the department head.

To maintain a lecturer rank designation, the minimum criteria must be maintained.

* + - 1. Criteria for Lecturer

Must meet the minimum criteria for lecturer ranks, but does not meet the criteria for a higher rank.

* + - 1. Criteria for Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

A Lecturer may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer after a minimum of five consecutive years of teaching service have been successfully completed and reviewed. Additional requirements for promotion are outlined in sections II.6.2.3 and II.6.2.4.

* + - 1. Criteria for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

A Senior Lecturer is eligible to be considered for promotion to Principal Lecturer after a minimum of twelve consecutive years of service have been successfully completed and reviewed. Additional requirements for promotion are outlined in sections II.6.2.3 and II.6.2.4.

* + - 1. Candidates for promotion in should present evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship, including evidence regarding AACSB Faculty Qualification status. Academic units and the school will sometimes assign roles to Lecturers that vary in their emphasis on teaching, service, and scholarship contributions. The emphasis assigned to these roles by the Lecturer’s unit will be considered in the overall evaluation of performance.
1. Teaching. Candidates for promotion should present a record of sustained long-term excellence and diversity in teaching. Evidence of sustained excellence and diversity includes, but is not limited to, good student evaluations, teaching awards, new course development, course innovations, and successful teaching in a variety of different types of courses. Evidence of a record of continuing success in mentoring students, supervising honors theses, independent studies or internships, and advising students will also be considered. Candidates will typically present evidence of leadership in curriculum development. Candidates for promotion should summarize their record in the form of a teaching portfolio that describes their contribution to the teaching mission of their academic unit and the school, presents evidence of excellence in the areas noted above and any other areas relevant to their teaching role, and includes a statement of teaching philosophy.
2. Service – Internal and External Contributions. Candidates for promotion should present evidence of sustained service contributions to the mission of the academic unit, school, and/or university (internal service) and to the profession and community at large (external service). The roles assigned within his/her unit will be considered in evaluating the magnitude of accomplishment expected in service overall, and in internal and external service. Evidence of internal service contributions includes, but is not limited to, records of accomplishment and leadership in administrative roles, committee work, and advisement to student groups and individuals. Evidence of external service includes, but is not limited to, active participation and/or leadership in professional associations, representing the unit to external constituents, and professional service linking the university to the larger community.
3. Scholarship of Teaching. Candidates for promotion should present evidence of scholarship competence and accomplishment. Scholarly accomplishments expected of a candidate for promotion will vary by the role assigned by his/her unit. However, all candidates will present evidence of a continuing commitment to the scholarship of teaching. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to, course development, instructional innovation, membership in professional associations, participation and presentation at professional meetings (particularly those relevant to pedagogical development), and continuing education.

Promotion is warranted only if and when the achievements outlined above are tangibly demonstrated. Thus, promotion is based neither on promise nor longevity. It is natural for faculty members to vary in the time required to attain the appropriate level of achievement.

* + - 1. Requests for Promotion in the Lecturer ranks

Requests for promotion should occur at the time of the normal review and are due in the Office of the University Provost by the date set by the University. If the promotion is awarded, it will become effective during the following academic year. Promotion, regardless of length of appointment, also will be contingent upon the offer of a contract in the following academic year. Materials to be sent forward for promotion review generally include:

* + - * 1. The appropriate form provided by the Office of the University Provost along with any additional forms used by the academic unit and school.
				2. Evaluations by personnel committees
				3. Transmittal letters of the chair/director and dean
				4. Summary of teaching effectiveness, including both student and peer teaching evaluations
				5. Self-assessment
				6. Current curriculum vita

This file is reviewed by the Dean’s Personnel Advisory Committee which writes a memo to the dean with its recommendation. The dean then writes an independent review of the material. The entire packet is forwarded to the Office of the University Provost for final approval.