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| Morrison School of Agribusiness Bylaws  **Bylaws**  **Morrison School of Agribusiness**  **W. P. Carey School of Business Arizona State University**  ***Reviewed and Approved by Faculty December 2, 2014*** |
| **I. General** |
| 1. Name   The Morrison School of Agribusiness in the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University, is the academic unit governed by these bylaws. For purposes of this document, the term *School* refers to the Morrison School of Agribusiness.  These bylaws supersede any previous documents intended to serve that purpose, and are binding upon current and future administrative officers, faculty, and other members of the School (ASU Academic Affairs Manual-ACD 111-02). Deviations from these rules are permitted only if appropriate amendments are made according to the procedures specified in Article VII.   1. School Assembly   The primary governing unit of the Morrison School of Agribusiness is the School Assembly. This faculty governance body makes recommendations to the Director who is the chief executive officer for the School. The School Assembly consists of tenured or tenure-track faculty at the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor, clinical faculty, full-time lecturers, or others that are designated as faculty in their Notice of Appointment (ACD 505-02).   1. Relation to College, University, and Board of Regents   If any policy or procedure in these bylaws should be found to conflict with policies or procedures of (a) the W. P. Carey School of Business, (b) Arizona State University, or (c) the Arizona Board of Regents, the policies and procedures of the latter three bodies shall take precedence. |
| **II. Voting Members of the School Assembly** |
| The voting members of the School Assembly shall include all full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members of the School at the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. Voting members who are on sabbatical or other leave agree to resign from all committees at the School, College, and University levels during the leave (ACD 705).  1 |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **III. Officers of the School Assembly** |
| A. School Director  The Director of the Morrison School of Agribusiness serves as the chief executive officer of the School. The Director is appointed by the Dean of the W. P. Carey School of Business with the approval of the Provost and President of the University.   1. General Duties   The general responsibilities of the Director are outlined in ACD 109. The Director, by delegation from the University President and the College Dean, has the authority and carries the responsibility for decision-making within the School. The Director will serve as the administrator responsible for personnel, budget, information technology, facilities, teaching assignments, and other administrative issues. Additional responsibilities include recommending School members for service to non-elected College and University committees, annual review of the academic performance of all faculty and academic professionals, recommending merit, equity and market salary adjustments, and allocating School resources including staff assistance, travel budgets, space allocations, and research funds.   1. Teaching Assignments   The Director is responsible for all teaching assignments, including (but not limited to) course selection, number of courses, teaching times, summer teaching, and teaching assistance. The Director shall attempt to match course offerings to faculty qualifications, areas of interest and scholarly records. Whenever possible, assignments should be responsive to faculty requests. The Director can assign teaching loads above the norm when other faculty duties are below performance standards or assign teaching loads below the norm when other faculty duties are above performance standards.   1. Service and Institutional Commitments   The Director is responsible for assigning faculty members to non-elected committees and to recommend faculty members for College or University committee assignments. In making those assignments and providing recommendations, the Director should consider requests from faculty members. Each faculty member is responsible for carrying out their service and institutional commitment assignments in an effective and professional manner. In addition, faculty may be asked to serve the School in advisor, director, or coordinator roles as determined and requested by the Director. |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. Resource Allocations  The School Director shall allocate all resources, including (but not limited to) salary, administrative assistance, computer facilities, travel budgets, summer stipends, and research/teaching assistance including the assignment of Ph.D. students to individual faculty. These allocations shall provide incentives for academic research, quality instruction, and effective institutional and professional service whenever possible.  B. Assistant/Associate Director  The Director, in consultation with the Dean, may appoint an Assistant Director who can assist in performing administrative duties at the request of the Director, and who can administer the affairs of the School in the absence of the Director. |
| **IV. Meetings of the School Assembly** |
| 1. Call to Meeting   The Director shall call the School Assembly into session at least once each semester during the academic year. A special meeting of the School Assembly can be called at any time by the Director. The Director will provide as much notice as possible for such meetings. Under ordinary circumstances, such meetings will not be called during the summer months. Any member of the School Assembly may submit items in writing to the Director for placement on the meeting agenda.   1. Quorum   Attendance at a meeting by 50% of the members of the School Assembly shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business.   1. Voting   Matters put to a vote are decided by a simple majority of the voting members of the School Assembly. Voting may be by voice vote, hand vote, or written ballot (including email ballot). A written, or email ballot, will be used for particular issues if requested by any voting member. If a written or email ballot is used, it will be counted by two tellers appointed by the Director. All written ballots will be destroyed (or deleted in case of email ballot) after the results are announced. Proxy votes from voting members not present to hear and participate in discussion on matters put to a vote will not be permitted. Meeting attendance and participation in deliberations are critical in forming an intelligent and informed opinion on matters put to a vote.   1. Minutes   Minutes of each School Assembly meeting will be submitted by the Director. A designee of the Director may be appointed to record the minutes. The main purpose of the minutes |

|  |
| --- |
| is to record motions, ensuing discussion, and the ultimate outcome of voting on such motions rather than serving as a transcription of the meeting. Minutes from the previous School Assembly meeting(s) will be reviewed and approved at the subsequent meeting. |
| **V. Rights and Duties of the Faculty** |
| Faculty members have a responsibility to carry out effective teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative duties and assignments, including committee assignments and other collegial activities/citizenship.   1. Teaching   Faculty members have academic freedom when teaching courses subject to the course description contained in the General Catalog, School norms, and norms within the faculty members’ scholarly field.   1. Research   Faculty members have the responsibility of developing and augmenting scholarly competence. This includes conducting research and disseminating the results of that research. Freedom to pursue particular research avenues is the right of the faculty member.   1. Service and Institutional Commitment   Faculty members are expected to be available to perform institutional service functions (University, College, and School level) during the academic year, including term(s) in which they have no teaching responsibilities. Faculty members are not expected to carry out institutional service responsibilities during the summer and winter sessions and during the term of a sabbatical leave. However, while on sabbatical or other extended leave, faculty members are encouraged to maintain contact with graduate advisees or to make other arrangements so that a graduate student’s progress will not be affected by a faculty member’s absence. It is also expected that any service to one’s academic field (professional service) is ongoing throughout the year and during a sabbatical leave.   1. Annual Evaluation of Faculty (Performance Reviews)   Annual evaluations of faculty (performance reviews) shall be conducted as described in the *Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures*.   1. Grievances and Appeals   Faculty members have the right to grieve and/or appeal without prejudice or retaliation any allocation, assignment, or decision made under the provisions of this document. After discussing any disagreement with the Director and failing to reach a mutually agreeable |

|  |
| --- |
| solution, the faculty member is free to pursue further action outside the School as specified in College or University documents. |
| **VI. Morrison School of Agribusiness Committees** |
| The Morrison School of Agribusiness transacts business through Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees.  A. Standing Committees   1. Personnel Committee   The *Morrison School Personnel Committee* (known in this document as the Personnel Committee) shall advise the Director in personnel matters involving promotions, tenure, retention and sabbaticals of tenured and non-tenured tenure track faculty as outlined in the document *“Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures.”* Similarly, the Personnel Committee shall advise the Director in personnel matters involving promotions, continuing status, and retention of non- tenure track faculty. The Personnel Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members. Members serving on the University or College Personnel Committees are excluded from serving on the School Personnel Committee. In cases of promotion to full professor, only faculty members at the rank of full professor are eligible to vote. All Personnel Committee deliberations and decisions are to remain strictly confidential.   1. Performance Review Committee   The *Morrison School Performance Review Committee* is responsible for providing an evaluation of each tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty member in accordance with the annual review guidelines provided in the *Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures*. The committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members elected by the School Assembly to serve one year terms. All deliberations and decisions are to remain strictly confidential. These peer reviews are used by the Director as one input to consider in evaluating the annual performance of faculty.   1. Undergraduate Committee   The *Undergraduate Committee* shall be responsible for advising the Director on undergraduate curricular and programmatic matters, recruiting, as well as the integrity and quality of the undergraduate learning environment in the School and for recommending enhancements to that environment. The Director may appoint *ad hoc* curriculum groups to develop courses and course sequencing for specific concentrations or programs. The committee will meet to review recommendations of such *ad hoc* groups and items needing action by the W. P. Carey School of Business Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and present recommendations to the Director |

or the School Assembly. Major changes to undergraduate curriculum or programmatic changes should ultimately be approved by the School Assembly.

1. Graduate Committee

The *Graduate Committee* shall be responsible for advising the Director on graduate curricular and programmatic matters, recruiting and retention, and evaluation of applicants, as well as the integrity and quality of the graduate learning environment in the School and for recommending enhancements to that environment. The Director may appoint *ad hoc* curriculum groups to develop courses and course sequencing for specific programs. The committee will meet to review recommendations of such *ad hoc* groups and items needing action by the appropriate W. P. Carey School of Business Committees, and present recommendations to the Director or the School Assembly. Major changes to undergraduate curriculum or programmatic changes should ultimately be approved by the School Assembly.

Consistent with the structure of the W. P. Carey School of Business Ph.D. program, the Director of the School will appoint a Director of the Ph.D. in Business Administration – Concentration in Agribusiness. The Director of the Ph.D. program shall advise the Director of the School on all Ph.D. program matters. The Director of the Ph.D. program will be a standing member of the Graduate Committee.

1. Scholarship Committee

The *Scholarship Committee* shall consist of a total of three faculty members elected by the faculty to administer the School’s scholarship programs.

B. Guiding Principles regarding Standing Committees

1. Members for each Standing Committee are to be elected by the School Assembly before the end of the spring semester of each year to serve for the next academic year.
2. There should be a *minimum* of three faculty members for each Standing Committee.
3. The Chair of each Standing Committee shall be elected by the committee members unless otherwise specified and must be elected before the end of the spring semester of each year to serve for the following academic year.
4. The role of Chair of any Standing Committee shall be limited to a tenured faculty member.
5. The Director of the School can serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of any Standing Committee, providing input towards matters at hand.

|  |
| --- |
| C. Ad Hoc Committees  The Director may create and appoint faculty to such other committees as may become necessary to carry on the business of the School on an ongoing or an *ad hoc* basis. |
| **VII. Governing Principles, Interpretations and Amendments to the Bylaws** |
| In areas not specifically addressed by this document, the School will adhere to Arizona State University policies as outlined in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures (ACD) Manual. Should any policy or procedure in these bylaws conflict with one in the ACD Manual, the ACD Manual takes precedence. If one portion of the document becomes in conflict with ACD Manual policy or invalid, the rest of the document remains in force.   1. Any questions of clarification or interpretation of these bylaws should be directed to the Director, who will review the areas of ambiguity and bring a recommended interpretation to the School Assembly, which by vote may adopt or reject that interpretation. 2. Amendments to the School bylaws must be approved by the School Assembly.    1. Proposals for amendments must be presented by physical or electronic copy to the members of the School Assembly at least ten days prior to the date on which action is to be taken upon them.    2. A consideration of an amendment to the bylaws is not subject to a motion to suspend the rules.    3. Amendments to the School bylaws shall require a vote of a two-thirds majority of those members of a quorum of the School Assembly present and voting. |

|  |
| --- |
| Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures  **Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures Morrison School of Agribusiness**  **W. P. Carey School of Business Arizona State University**  ***Approved December 2, 2014*** |
| **I. General** |
| The *Morrison School of Agribusiness Faculty Review Procedures* describe the process for faculty annual performance, post-tenure review, and provides criteria and guidelines for promotion, tenure, and sustained performance. For the purposes of this document, the term *School* refers to the Morrison School of Agribusiness. While the School Director is responsible for all annual performance review matters, peer evaluations also play an important role in the process. All faculty members are expected to contribute to research, teaching, and service consistent with the missions of the Morrison School of Agribusiness and the W. P. Carey School of Business.  Each faculty member shall be reviewed at least every 12 months. Faculty annual evaluations are to be used as a means to assist faculty in their professional development. Faculty evaluations are also used by the Director for determining compensation adjustments and future workload assignments, as well as serving as the first-step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.  The annual faculty review summarizes and assesses faculty members’ performance in teaching, research, and service/institutional commitment. |
| **II. Annual Faculty Evaluations** |
| A. Materials for Annual Review and Timeline  The Director shall request that faculty provide information on his or her performance in research, teaching and service activities by a specific date each year, consistent with the timeline for annual reviews established by the W. P. Carey School of Business Dean’s office and Arizona State University. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain this information is provided in a timely and accurate fashion. The enumeration of activities in each of those areas found in Section III should serve as a guide to providing the necessary information. The annual performance evaluations are based on faculty contributions during the preceding 36 months, with more emphasis on the immediate past year.  The Director will outline the specific information needed from the faculty to conduct the review. However, the following information will be needed at a minimum:   * Updated vita (vita should be updated through the calendar year of the review).   1 |

* Summary of teaching evaluations for courses taught during the time spanning the review.
* Summary on courses taught, including any new course preps, changes to courses, etc.
* Summary of research activities including papers forthcoming or in press papers in review, papers at conferences, grants awarded, grant proposals, graduate student involvement, and any other evidence of research output.
* Summary of institutional service activities (School, College, and University level), professional service (e.g., service to academic field), and community service.

B. Performance Reviews

The Director will provide the previous year’s work load assignments and individual faculty evaluation material to the *Morrison School Performance Review Committee* and establish a deadline for submission of the evaluation recommendation back to the Director. *The Morrison School Performance Review Committee* shall only provide an evaluation of overall faculty performance as either *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory*. These peer reviews are used by the Director as one input to consider in evaluating the annual performance of faculty (see Morrison School of Agribusiness Bylaws: VI-A-2).

After receipt of the peer evaluations from the *Morrison School Performance Review Committee*, the Director shall provide each faculty member with both the Director’s and the *Morrison School Performance Review Committee’s* evaluation scores of his or her performance. Those scores will consist of an overall score and individual scores in the ar- eas of research, teaching, and service/institutional commitment using the following scale:

0 = unsatisfactory

1 = satisfactory

2 = good

3 = excellent or outstanding

4 = superior or exceptional

The Director will then discuss expected levels of performance with each faculty member individually. Each faculty member will also receive a written evaluation that comments on strengths, weaknesses, any needed improvement, opportunities for growth, and expec- tations for future performance. Workloads and/or flexible performance arrangements for the next academic year should also be specified at this time. Evaluations of tenure- eligible and those not yet at full professor rank will include a statement indicating that the procedures for annual evaluation are not the same as those for a tenure or promotion re- view. Critical in the annual evaluation is an assessment by the Director of the faculty member’s trajectory of maintaining AACSB faculty classification consistent with the guidelines put forth by the W. P. Carey School of Business. The Director will provide the evaluations of individual faculty to the Dean as required by College bylaws.

Faculty shall be provided the opportunity to respond in writing to performance reviews, with the response included in the official record. A faculty member may appeal his or her evaluation as described in Section V-E of the Morrison School of Agribusiness Bylaws.

**III. Standards of Performance**

1. *Teaching activities* are of fundamental importance to the School and it is through effective teaching that graduates are prepared to move directly into careers and become ethical leaders in professional, public, and private life. In general, faculty are expected to show evidence of:
   * Currency and relevancy in pedagogical approach as evidenced by syllabi and other teaching materials.
   * Use of course syllabi that clearly identify learning objectives and measures of student learning.
   * Scholarly currency (up-to-date research and knowledge in the discipline) appropriate to academic assignment.
   * Communication of course material effectively (e.g., as evidenced by student evalua- tions).
   * Effective teaching as evidenced by student evaluations (e.g., percentage of students indicating the faculty member’s teaching was effective or ineffective).
   * Following prescribed ASU procedures and policies.

*Other evidence of teaching excellence may include:*

* + Effective teaching as evidenced by peer evaluations.
  + Utilization of innovative teaching and learning modalities or technologies (e.g., online teaching and learning).
  + Contribution to the enrichment of student learning through collaborative student- faculty research and involvement in Barrett: The Honors College programs.
  + Teaching with appropriate rigor as evidenced by graded examinations, papers, pro- jects, project reports, challenging tests and meaningful assignments, etc. and suffi- cient evidence to demonstrate that the coursework is rigorous enough to discriminate between high, medium, and low performers.
  + Awards and recognition for teaching performance and innovation.
  + External funding for teaching activities. The prestige of the awarding agency will be considered.
  + Assessments from graduates and employers.
  + Mentoring of graduate students.
  + Mentoring others on teaching.
  + Supervision of student projects and/or independent studies.
  + Supervision of industry sponsored projects.
  + Curriculum development.
  + Involvement in degree program administration (e.g., graduate committee; undergrad- uate committee, etc.).

1. *Research and Scholarship activities* by School faculty may be in either applied or basic research areas consistent with the missions of the Morrison School of Agribusiness and the W. P. Carey School of Business. Research and scholarship refer to activities associated with making contributions to the literature and knowledge in one’s academic

discipline or a discipline of the college and the impact of these contributions on academics and practitioners. It entails discovery, integration, and application and dissemination of the results of these activities.

*Criteria to evaluate research achievement and effectiveness may include:*

* + Peer reviewed journal articles. Assessment of scholarship is based in part on the quality and quantity of articles. Publication in refereed journals is essential with a strong preference for those listed (and related procedures for documenting impact) described in the *Morrison School of Agribusiness Journal List.*
  + Scholarly books
  + Book chapters
  + Conference proceedings
  + Externally funded research, research grants, contracts, and other funding from outside the university. Prestige, size, and nature of the research, as well as whether the fund- ed research supports the School’s and College’s mission and strategic goals will be considered.
  + Receipt of patents.
  + Research awards. The prestige of the awarding agency will be considered.
  + Invited research presentations.
  + Collaboration with industry and the mentoring and/or supervision of industry spon- sored research projects.

*Evidence of national recognition in research and scholarship may include:*

* + A significant record of scholarly contributions in high quality, refereed journals, or externally funded research grants, or other recognized scholarly contributions.
  + Significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge in one’s field. This evi- dence shall include citation analyses and/or external reviewer letters.
  + Research is held in high regard by the research leaders in the candidate’s academic area. This evidence might include implementation or application of one’s research findings, external reviewer letters or invited presentations.
  + Research grants and contracts.
  + External review boards.
  + Outstanding external review letters from credible outside reviewers such as those who are national leaders in the candidate’s area of scholarship.

*Other evidence may include:*

* + Being invited to give presentations on one’s research to national associations, organi- zations, or universities worldwide.
  + Quantity and quality of citations.
  + Selection to high-quality, editorial review boards or journal editorship(s).
  + Awards for “Best” article, book or other creative work from nationally recognized or- ganizations.
  + Positive reviews of a faculty member’s scholarly activities that appear in prestigious outlets.

|  |
| --- |
| * Publication of an influential scholarly book (e.g., market share, large volume sales, prestigious adoptions, citations).   C. *Service to the School, University and community* refers to positive participation in the School, College and University including serving on School, College, campus, and University committees, service to the profession, and service to the community.  This service category also includes mission-related leadership and citizenship. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate organizational citizenship by showing commitment to the achievement of the Morrison School of Agribusiness and W. P. Carey School of Business mission and strategic plan, making constructive and productive contributions to the W. P. Carey School of Business, and adhering to high ethical standards.  *Evidence for service may include the following:*   * Active and collegial participation in School, College, and University governance. * Active participation in University, campus, College, and School committees. * Mentoring and serving as a positive role model for untenured faculty members. * Mentoring and advising students. * Participating in curriculum innovation and active involvement in the continuous im- provement of academic programs. * Strengthening partnerships with units across ASU campuses, the community college system, businesses and other educational and governmental groups. * Increasing the connections among academic units within the ASU system, especially in relation to fostering and participating in collaboration in research and learning ac- tivities. * Consulting with organizations which may lead to enhancement of teaching, curricu- lum development, research, and community engagement consistent with the missions of the W. P. Carey School of Business and the Morrison School of Agribusiness. * Making invited presentations to community organizations. * Active participation and leadership in professional organizations. * Active participation in hiring, developing and retaining excellent faculty. * Reviewing papers for academic conferences. * Reviewing journal articles for peer-reviewed journals. * Serving as an outside reviewer for individuals at other universities. * Serving on program committees for high profile conferences. * Helping obtain contracts, grants, and philanthropy. |
| **III. Promotion and Tenure Review** |
| A. General Policies  In all cases, ACD and W. P. Carey School of Business policies regarding promotion and/or granting of tenure shall prevail. In particular, tenure decisions for faculty are governed by ACD Manual Section 506 and 507 (as hereafter amended or the replacements or successor sections thereof). |

B. Eligibility Information and Required Reviews

Eligibility for promotion, tenure, or continuing status, and the deadlines for documentation and notification is governed by the ACD Manual and the requirements of the office of the University Provost. It is the responsibility of the Director to notify candidates of their eligibility in a timely fashion, and to summarize the application and review process during the semester prior to the deadline for submission of materials. Upon appointment, all tenure track or tenured faculty, academic professionals, non-tenure track faculty or other members of the faculty assembly with the possibility of continuing status appointments shall be informed of these *Morrison School Faculty Review Procedures* and criteria for retention and relevant promotions. Each must receive a performance review annually and on the schedules outlined in the ACD manual, the Provost or the Dean’s offices as applicable.

C. Faculty Petitions for Personnel Actions

1. A faculty member intending to file a petition for sabbatical, leave of absence, promotion, or tenure during the coming year, must notify the Director of his or her intentions by the prescribed deadline of the current year.
2. Faculty members submitting promotion and/or tenure petitions in any calendar year must provide the materials required for external reviews by the prescribed deadline of that year. All additional materials required for the review of such petitions must be provided by the prescribed deadline of that year. That date is also the deadline for all materials related to sabbatical and/or leave of absence petitions.

D. General Evaluation Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion

Evaluation criteria for faculty tenure and/or promotion minimally include teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and quality of other creative activities and services to the School, College, University, and Community. Individual faculty performance will be evaluated by a general set of criteria weighted to consider each faculty member’s specialty, job description and work plan.

Multiple measures shall be used in assessing excellence in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service consistent with the Standards of Performance outlined above. Measures of impact and recognition shall be emphasized. Emphasis on impact and recognition measures will be more pronounced for promotion to full professor.

The requirement of service excellence includes that faculty members cooperate and collaborate with W. P. Carey School of Business faculty and staff as well as internal and external constituents, embrace tolerance and affirm diversity, and display personal integrity in all they do. For promotion to full professor, “anticipated role as a senior member of the faculty,” shall be explicitly considered. This role entails exercising leadership that displays initiative and commitment in reaching the School’s and College’s

strategic goals as well as a demonstration of leadership in their profession and a national reputation for research and scholarship. Emphasis on service to the community, School, University and/or profession will be more extensive for each increase in rank.

*National recognition* means that one’s activities in research and scholarship have consistently and significantly been cited by, or influenced, the activities of national peers and/or practitioners, or such research and scholarship have had a significant measurable impact in society or the profession. Awards and recognition for scholarly performance and innovation from organizations will also be recognized.

The general criteria for promotion are as follows:

1. *Evaluation of Assistant Professors for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor* should be within the following general context:

An assistant professor, to achieve promotion or tenure, will present evidence of having established a strong teaching record and evidence of achievement indicative of a growing reputation for appropriate scholarly contribution and predictive of their ability to achieve and maintain national recognition as scholars. The primary standard for excellence in scholarly contributions is the quality and quantity of refereed journal articles in premier scholarly journals or their equivalent (as defined in the *Morrison School of Agribusiness Journal List*). Emphasis is placed on the development of scholarly teaching and research, with less emphasis on service, unless the faculty member has been hired to work in a specific area or on a specific program. Willingness to contribute to collegial functions of the School, College, and University should also be considered.

1. *Evaluation of Associate Professors for Tenure* should be within the following general context:

An associate professor, to achieve tenure, must meet the same standard as that for assistant professors outlined above.

1. *Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor* should be evaluated within the following context:

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion to professor are expected to achieve and maintain excellence in all three areas: teaching, research, and service. In order to be promoted to full professor, faculty members are expected to achieve significant national and/or international recognition for their scholarly contributions. Additionally, those faculty members who are aspiring to the rank of full professor must demonstrate a significant level of guiding, directing, or leading in, and exemplary citizenship, in the Morrison School of Agribusiness and the W. P. Carey School of Business in accomplishing its mission and goals.

E. Evaluation Criteria of Non-tenured Positions (Lecturers or Instructors or Academic Professionals)

Evaluation criteria for fixed-term faculty as defined by ACD 506-05 shall be evaluated by teaching effectiveness, creative activities and service to the School, College, University, and community. Individual faculty performance will be evaluated by a defined set of criteria weighted by specialty and rank.

Lecturers or Instructors are expected to have established an excellent teaching record as evidenced by a productive and well-focused teaching portfolio. Therefore, Promotion of Lecturer or Instructor to Senior Lecturer/Instructor should be evaluated within the context of Section D (*Teaching activities*) above. Emphasis is also placed on service to the School, College, University and Community. Willingness to contribute to collegial functions of the School, College and University should also be considered.

For Academic Professionals, the Director is responsible for an annual evaluation of the quality of performance of all Academic Professionals in the School, with criteria similar to that for tenured faculty but focused on the professional’s job description. After the promotion process is initiated, the individual academic professional shall submit separately all documentation necessary for a complete and fair review to the Director, who shall forward the package to the Personnel Committee, and the review process will proceed as provided herein.

F. Additional Promotion Policies and Procedures

The University criteria for appointment or promotion to each rank are listed in ACD 505 (Appointments and Positions), 506 (Faculty Personnel Actions). Reviews of the traditional areas of teaching, service, and scholarship are an effort to search for these qualities in whatever faculty endeavors they may be found. The use of external reviewers shall be governed by the regulations listed in the ACD 506-04. In the W. P. Carey School of Business, letters of recommendation from external reviewers are a required part of the process. All letters from outside reviewers received by the School shall be forwarded to the Dean.

After the promotion process is initiated, the individual faculty member shall submit separately all documentation necessary for a complete and fair review to the Director, who shall submit the documentation to the Morrison School Personnel Committee. Upon consideration and review, such documentation shall be forwarded along with the recommendations of the Personnel Committee and the Director to the Dean.

G. Probationary Reviews

Probationary reviews of faculty shall occur at the times specified by the ACD Manual and/or College guidelines.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **IV. Post-Tenure Review** |
| 1. General   The ASU Academic Affairs Manual (ACD 506–11) states:  “When a faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, a college level Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required. An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas with unsatisfactory ratings in consecutive years or may result from one area with an unsatisfactory rating (for example, teaching) depending on the emphasis assigned to that area in the faculty member’s goal-based work load agreement and the extent of the deficiency.”  “If an individual’s performance becomes unsatisfactory, the faculty member has a re- sponsibility, shared with the university, to improve performance. Every attempt should be made to support the faculty member through a college level PIP that provides specific and unambiguous goals, timelines and milestones for achieving the goals. Only after the faculty member has clearly not achieved these goals or when a faculty member chooses not to enter into a PIP should dismissal for cause be considered.”   1. Morrison School Process   A rating of unsatisfactory in any of the areas of teaching, research, or service will trigger a faculty development plan (FDP). FDPs are negotiated with the Director and will have specific, measurable goals for satisfactory performance to be achieved within one year. A failure to meet the FDP goals and particularly an unsatisfactory performance rating in the same area will result in the faculty member entering the performance improvement process (PIP).  As indicated above PIPs are college level processes. Similar to an FDP, the Director and the Dean or the Dean’s delegate develop a set of specific, measurable goals necessary to improve performance and a timeline (usually one year) in which to accomplish those goals. Monitoring the PIP involves members of the WPC Personnel Committee. If the faculty member fails to participate or fails to meet the PIP goals, the dismissal for cause process is initiated (ABOR Policy 6-201). |