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The mission of the School of Applied Sciences and Arts is to support the College of Integrative Sciences and Arts in providing students with opportunities for career-connected, experiential, and integrative learning, with a focus on research in applied natural sciences and interdisciplinary humanities and social sciences.

# Article 1: Introduction and Definitions

This document provides guidelines and criteria for tenured and tenure-track faculty promotion and faculty annual review processes. It condenses practices and specifies details for these processes. It should also be read in the context of university policies, the ASU ACD, and the ABOR Handbook. The policies of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR), the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD), and the College of Integrative Sciences and Arts (CISA) Bylaws are higher authority documents than the SASA Bylaws; should any of those conflict, the order of precedence will be ABOR policy, ACD policy, followed by CISA Bylaws

These definitions for terms are used throughout this criteria document. Unless otherwise stated, these definitions provide a standard meaning:

Unit: School of Applied Sciences and Arts (SASA).

Workload Agreement: An agreement that defines and modifies the duties and responsibilities of a faculty member over a specified period. These agreements may entail a course release, modification of teaching, service, or research duties, modification of service duties, or any other substantive change to a faculty contract.

Promotion Committee: for the tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be the SASA Tenure Faculty Personnel Committee (TFPC), as constituted by the membership defined in the SASA Operations and Policies Manual.

Appropriate Members of the Promotion Committee: The term “appropriate members” of the Promotion Committee refers to all members of the Promotion Committee (TFPC) at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires and the appropriate working subgroup that aligns with the candidate’s discipline: the Humanities, Communications, and Social Sciences Sub-Committee (THumSub) or the Natural Sciences, Physics, and Mathematics Sub-Committee (TSciSub). There must be at least three appropriately ranked members of the sub-committee from the candidate’s discipline to form a committee of at least three; another appropriately ranked committee member may be recruited from the TFPC or the SASA faculty at large. If a sufficient number of appropriately ranked members within SASA is not available, the school director shall locate an alternative committee member from another school or college of Arizona State University.

Appropriate Members of the Faculty: The term “appropriate members” of the tenured or tenure-track faculty refers to all members at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. When a candidate is considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the “appropriate members”consist of the tenured faculty at that rank or above. When a candidate is considered for tenure and promotion to full professor, the “appropriate members” for promotion consist of the tenured faculty at the rank of full professor.

# Article 2: General Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

For tenure-track faculty, the latest version of the university promotion and tenure policies applies. The policies are described in [ACD 506–05: Faculty Promotion](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html).

General Principles for the Review: SASA faculty leaders and all faculty members are encouraged to educate themselves about persistent biases that may impact research, teaching, and service/outreach, and should apply a nuanced perspective to evaluating candidates’ contributions with an awareness of these biases.

Timeline for Application for promotion and tenure, for tenure or for promotion:

1. Requests for promotion and tenure, for tenure, or for promotion should occur at the time specified by university and college policies.
2. Probationary faculty are automatically considered for promotion and tenure unless the faculty member requests in writing that the consideration process be halted in accordance with university policy governing such action.

The School Director will inform all eligible faculty of:

1. The procedures for consideration of a promotion, tenure, or promotion and tenure, request
2. A date, no sooner than two weeks after the initial notification of the procedures, by which they must notify the School Director of their desire to be considered for promotion, tenure, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.
3. The date by which all materials must be submitted for consideration of the specific request.

Required Materials for Evaluation of Candidates: Materials supplied by the candidate: Tenure-track faculty desiring promotion and tenure, tenure, or promotion, shall supply the School Director with all the materials as specified in the university promotion and tenure policies by the date specified by the Director.

External Reviewer Letters for Candidates for Tenure or Promotion: All external reviewers should have sufficient experience in the discipline to judge the candidate’s research; for example, an assistant professor should not be asked to review a candidate’s work for an associate professor. Professor reviewers are strongly preferred even for those considered for associate professor and/or tenure. Most of the external reviewers must be at approved peer institutions. The list of exceptions for potential reviewers typically includes the candidate’s Ph.D. advisor, postdoc advisor(s), and the candidate’s co-authors or co-PIs. Further constraints on acceptable external evaluators may be specified in the latest version of the university promotion and tenure policies and by the college.

1. The candidate shall provide a list of the required number of names of potential external evaluators to the School Director.
2. The TFPC provides the School Director with the required number of recommendations for external evaluators.
3. Taking the recommendations of the TFPC under advisement and consulting with the Dean, the School Director selects the required number of external reviewers, exactly half of whom come from a list of external reviewers proposed by the candidate.
4. The School Director contacts the external reviewers according to the latest version of the university promotion and tenure policies.
5. An integral part of the process by which the School Director contacts the external reviewers is the letter of invitation to these reviewers, drafted in consultation with senior faculty members in the same discipline as the candidate. This letter shall describe the specific mission of the School of Applied Sciences and Arts, and general contextual information such as the nature and role of graduate student education at SASA within the candidate’s area of expertise if applicable. The objective of this letter is to provide guidance to the reviewers in aiding them to place the candidate’s work and accomplishments within the appropriate context. The School Director’s instructions for the external reviewer will include specific disciplinary guidelines regarding tenure and promotion expectations. Each faculty group will assist in developing research promotion criteria for SASA, relevant to its disciplines. The research promotion criteria shall be housed in the school director’s office. These criteria shall be provided by the office of the school director to the faculty member upon their request and be posted electronically for faculty to access.

SASA Review Process:

1. A TFPC subcommittee of at least three members of appropriate rank and disciplinary affiliation will provide the first level of review and evaluation of the candidate’s portfolio. If there are not at least members of appropriate rank, the TFPC chair and school director may seek an advisor member from outside the faculty group to consult. Before the evaluation begins, the chair of the TFPC will inform the School Director and the candidate of the names of the reviewers, which may include the entire disciplinary subcommittee or a portion of that subcommittee: the candidate has the opportunity to request a substitution if there is a conflict in the membership of the evaluating TFPC committee.
2. This TFPC committee prepares a letter to the School Director providing the rationale for its decision by taking into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record and (2) the reports of the external reviewers. The TFPC sub committee will decide whether to recommend the candidate for promotion and tenure, tenure, or promotion. The letter shall also clearly articulate any committee member’s dissenting opinion. Members of the subcommittee are required to sign the recommendation letter, but individual votes are not identified.
3. Independently, but informed by the recommendation of the Promotion Committee (TFPC), the School Director decides whether to recommend each candidate for promotion and tenure, tenure, or promotion, and prepares a separate recommendation letter for each candidate providing the rationale for this decision. These recommendations take into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates, the recommendations of the external reviewers, and the evaluation of the TFPC. In accordance with the HR schedule, the School Director meets with the candidate to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio and the candidate decides whether or not to move to the next level of review.

Notification of Recommendations and Final Decision:

The latest version of the university promotion and tenure policies applies.

Confidentiality:

To allow for a full and frank discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, the deliberations of the appropriate members and the Promotion Committee must be kept confidential. In particular, for track faculty, the detailed comments of external reviewers and the identity and affiliation of these persons must be kept confidential. Violations of the principle of confidentiality as it applies to personnel concerns constitute a severe breach of professional ethics and seriously jeopardize the ability of the School to conduct its affairs effectively and professionally.

# Article 3: Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

## 

Tenure-Eligible Faculty Not Seeking Promotion

Faculty members must maintain a record of excellence and creativity in scholarly research or creative activity, demonstrate excellence in teaching, and participate in service to the University, the profession, and the community. Research and teaching are weighted more heavily than service in assessing the merits of a candidate’s record. An excellent record in teaching or research can compensate for a positive but not outstanding record in the other; however, an outstanding record in one area cannot offset a poor record in the other.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

For tenure-eligible candidates seeking tenure separate from promotion, faculty members must maintain or establish a record of excellence and creativity in scholarly research or creative activity in keeping with their current rank, demonstrate excellence in teaching, and participate in service to the University, the profession, and the community. Research and teaching are weighted more heavily than service in assessing the merits of a candidate’s record. An excellent record in teaching or research can compensate for a positive but not outstanding record in the other; however, an outstanding record in one area cannot offset a poor record in the other.

SASA policies and procedures will comply with further considerations for the award of tenure as described in ACD 506-404.

Research and Creative Activities

A candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure is expected to have a strong record in research and to show promise of becoming a leading researcher and scholar.

Tenure-eligible faculty members not seeking promotion are expected to have strong records in research in keeping with their current ranks.

The objectives of the review of research are to evaluate the creativity and significance of the individual publications and to ascertain whether the body of work constitutes a substantial and continuing contribution to the research area. Written evaluations of the research provided by external reviewers, especially those in peer institutions, who are experts in the candidate’s research area play an essential role in the review by evaluating the quality and the standards of research, publication, and creative activity in a candidate’s discipline.

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, SASA requires that candidates present evidence of a continuing program of scholarly research and/or creativity that is focused and sustained, has progressed beyond the candidate’s doctoral dissertation and indicates the candidate’s potential for achieving national or international recognition. By the end of the candidate’s probationary period, this program must have resulted in refereed publications of high quality. Research or creative productivity is indispensable for candidates for promotion and tenure. Particular emphasis is placed on the quality of publications, as judged by specialists in the relevant field (the external referees) and by the candidate’s TFPC.

As the faculty groups of SASA are interdisciplinary, the most appropriate and most highly valued types of scholarly production will be different for faculty in differing fields. Each faculty group will assist in developing research promotion criteria for SASA relevant to its disciplines. In general, peer-reviewed publications and creative activities carry the most weight in demonstrating scholarly production. The research promotion criteria shall be housed in the school director’s office. These criteria shall be provided by the office of the school director to the faculty member upon their request.

While quality is stressed over quantity, a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor will have produced a sufficient number of high-quality publications as is appropriate to the discipline. The faculty member should clearly demonstrate a steady and productive research output as well as evidence of an ongoing research agenda. Because the period of time between the acceptance of a manuscript and its publication is often lengthy, works in press, with appropriate documentation, may be considered evidence of scholarly productivity, though not carrying as much weight as published work.

Candidates for promotion will normally have presented papers at professional conferences or have given public readings, but conference participation and reading do not take the place of publication. The quality of research and creative activities are measured by indicators such as the scholarly standards reflected in the work; its impact on intended audiences; the importance, innovativeness and relevance of the work as suggested by external peer reviewers or other appropriate authorities; the quality of the journals, publishers, conferences or other communicative outlets; citations of the work; and other similar indicators appropriate to the discipline and academic faculty group.

Depending on the field and discipline, it is also expected that the candidate will have actively engaged in seeking external grant support from major organizations and agencies. The faculty recognize that appropriate levels of external funding support vary widely across disciplines, and it is expected that successful candidates will meet or exceed funding expectations for their specific area of research or creative activity.

Teaching

Successful candidates for tenure are expected to have demonstrated excellence in teaching. The primary criterion for teaching excellence is the candidate’s performance in teaching courses in the School of Applied Sciences and Arts.

Quality of teaching and instruction are assessed through multiple indicators as described in IV.B. By ABOR policy, student evaluations must form part of the evidence for assessing teaching excellence. However, student opinion surveys should never become the sole or even primary criterion offered as evidence of excellence in teaching Examples of evidence in teaching are provided on the Provost’s website [ACD 202–01: Faculty Responsibilities](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd202-01.html). Peer evaluations are strongly recommended.

Activities that are recognized as contributing to instructional activities include, but are not limited to:

1. Substantive written evaluations by peers based on online, traditional classroom, and/or seminar visitations
2. Local and national awards for teaching
3. Co-authorship with students
4. Development of new courses and curriculum development
5. The development of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, laboratory manuals, online materials) used by other instructors of in-person or online courses
6. Publication of textbooks and instructional materials in both printed and electronic form, if not part of research or scholarly activity
7. Workshops conducted for teachers and/or graduate students
8. Mentoring, and advising all trainees/mentees, including trainees/mentees from traditionally underrepresented groups
9. Directing and serving on a committee for independent studies projects, honors theses, masters projects and theses, and doctoral dissertations
10. Participating in extended education and distance learning
11. Participating in or leading activities designed to broaden the impact for diverse groups of students, including adapting teaching styles and class formats
12. Obtaining external funding for the development of instructional materials
13. Advising student organizations
14. Participation in instruction involving education at the elementary and secondary levels, including the education of prospective and practicing elementary and secondary teachers.

Service

At the time of consideration for tenure, a candidate shall have developed a record of effective service in the faculty group, SASA, the college, the university, the profession, or the community. Service to the university includes the individual’s expected contribution to: internal committee work and faculty governance activities; a collegial atmosphere at all levels of interaction within the university; departmental and/or diversity goals and student retention; and ethical/professional behavior as defined in Board of Regents, university, or academic unit.

Service to the academic profession includes conducting external reviews for journals, academic presses, foundations, and other scholarly and creative venues; holding offices in academic professional organizations; and pursuing other activities as determined by the faculty group.

Public/community service is an extension of the faculty member’s research and teaching activity to the larger community outside the university.

Activities that are recognized as contributing to service activities include, but are not limited to:

1. Participation in, and/or chairing of, faculty group, School, College, or University committees
2. Serving as editor or associate editor for refereed journals
3. Serving as officer in a national or international scholarly society
4. Organizing a national or international conference, or sessions at such conferences
5. Editing or co-editing conference proceedings
6. Reviewing articles or chapters for books, proceedings volumes, and journals, including review journals
7. Reviewing proposals for external funding agencies
8. Developing internship programs
9. Consulting for other members of the University, other universities, both governmental and non-governmental institutions, and the industrial community
10. Peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials and or evaluation of materials in teaching workshops.
11. Participation in governmental or institutional review panels, including editorial committees
12. Administration and/or writing of graduate qualifying and comprehensive examinations
13. Performing learning outcome assessment activities and other instructional or pedagogical innovations appropriate to the faculty group’s delivery of coursework
14. Participation in programs improving education at the elementary, secondary, or college level
15. Course coordination in multi-section classes
16. Managing or assisting in the implementation of on-line homework and/or instructional materials for the benefit of other instructors and students
17. Participation in outreach programs to the community
18. Participating in training/mentoring sessions for new faculty and/or teaching assistants on tasks such as effective teaching strategies and appropriate use of technology in the curriculum
19. Contributions to service and outreach activities promoting diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging and the participation of traditionally underrepresented groups

# Article 4: Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A candidate for promotion to professor is expected to satisfy the criteria in above sections, but at a higher level than that expected for promotion to associate professor. Examples of such criteria for promotion to professor include (but are not limited to): a broadening or deepening of the candidate’s research program since promotion to associate professor; increased visibility on the national or international scene, as indicated by: Invited talks, research visits, major grants, editorial work. Supervision of graduate student research, when appropriate to the faculty group, may be weighted more heavily for promotion to professor than for promotion to associate professor. Written evaluations of the research provided by external reviewers, especially those in peer institutions, who are experts in the candidate’s research area play an essential role in the review for promotion to full professor by evaluating the quality and the standards of research, publication, and creative activity in a candidate’s discipline.

Specific examples of higher-level engagement include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Sustained involvement in undergraduate education, advising, and mentoring
2. Sustained involvement in graduate education when appropriate to the candidate’s position, including mentoring of graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, a record of successful mentoring of graduate students to degree completion, and evidence of successful career placement after graduation
3. Recognition as a leading contributor in one or more significant areas of research or creative activity as demonstrated by examples from the following list: (a) A substantial body of refereed publications in leading journals for the field, in peer-reviewed books and proceedings volumes, and/or in general journals, reporting research that has contributed significantly to the field, publication of a peer-reviewed single-authored monograph, sharing original research; and/or creative works in recognized and respected venues. (b) appropriate grant support from one or more of the major funding agencies with the candidate playing a major role, (c) invited presentations (including lectures, plenary talks, and keynote addresses) at some of the important meetings and conferences of the investigator's field and/or at major research universities and institutions; invitations to contribute to widely recognized review publications, compendia, scholarly anthologies or collections, or research projects, (d) service on important scientific review boards and/or panels, editorial and advisory boards and committees, and in professional organizations, (e) awards of United States and international patents, (f) editing a special issue of a journal or a collected volume by leading scholars in a field.
4. Involvement in leadership activities in the university, including chairing important committees at the faculty group, college or university level; demonstration of leadership roles in professional societies, such as chairing or organizing sessions at national symposia, memberships on national committees, holding offices in professional societies; appointments to important review bodies for governmental agencies, such as review panels; important editorial assignments for respected journals or other publications in the discipline, including service on editorial boards.

# Article 5: Faculty Annual Review for T/TT Faculty

The Faculty Annual Review (FAR) process allows faculty to demonstrate their activities throughout the academic year, receive feedback and evaluation from their peers and supervisors, and receive a merit score for consideration in merit raise processes. This article describes the process for preparing, submitting, and receiving evaluations for faculty in general principles. Still, faculty should pay close attention to yearly announcements for dates and other details from human resources and the school director. FAR processes follow a calendar year and typically occur for the previous year at the beginning of the current year. Reviews are inclusive of material from the previous 36 months with an emphasis on the current year, per ACD 506-10.

## Section 1: Process Guide

All faculty should regularly keep track of their research/creative activities, teaching and service throughout the calendar year. These activities should be input regularly into the system ASU has created, the Academic Personnel Actions Reporting System (APARS). Regularly inputting these activities ensures that APARS is updated when the FAR process begins.

The School Director shall direct college human resources to communicate the opening of the FAR process and submission deadlines to the faculty at least one month before the FAR submission deadline for APARS reports and supplemental documents. A complete FAR packet for tenure-track and tenured faculty will consist of the following: (1) an activity report generated by the APARS system, (2) a research and creative activities portfolio, (3) an instructional contributions portfolio, (4) a service and professional development portfolio [as applicable], and (5) an annual FAR statement.

APARS Activity Report: This report is generated by Interfolio from the faculty activities entered throughout the year. Tenure-track and tenured faculty must report their activities in the appropriate categories, including research/creative activities, teaching, and service for the FAR in the APARS system. Faculty should ensure that entries reflect their work’s qualitative and quantitative nature through the description, timeframe, and other fields in APARS. Faculty should contact their reporting supervisor and college human resources for questions on reflecting the activity.

Annual FAR Statement: This statement should provide a clear and concise 500-750 word narrative summarizing a faculty member’s contributions in only the current year under review. This narrative should summarize 1) research and creative activities in the past year and future goals, 2) instructional activities in the past year and future goals, and 3) service and professional development contributions and future goals. This statement does not replace the documentation in the reports and portfolios; recorded contributions in other parts of the FAR packet should support the statement. The statement may also provide broader context on topics pertinent to the FAR process. Faculty members with administrative appointments or alternative workload agreements should describe them in the statement.

* Faculty should also include a traditional copy of their CV (in addition to the APARS CV).
* Faculty must also include the past two years’ annual FAR statements (exempting new hires or other gaps in the process) as separate files in this section, along with their current-year statement. Faculty members with administrative appointments or alternative workload agreements should describe them in the statement.

Research and Creative Activities Portfolio: This portfolio provides additional space to include evidence of research and creative activities. This supplemental section is not page-limited but should be a single PDF file.

Instructional Contributions Portfolio: This portfolio must include the following documents: (1) student opinion surveys (2) any peer observations that took place that year and that the faculty member chooses to include. This portfolio provides additional space to include evidence of instructional contributions. This supplemental section is not page-limited but should be a single PDF file. Materials may include examples of student mentoring, awards, and curriculum development

Service and Professional Development Portfolio: This portfolio provides a space for additional documents that demonstrate service and professional development. It may include letters recognizing service, examples of committee work, awards for service or scholarship, and any other material to demonstrate service and professional development. This supplemental section is not page-limited but should be a single PDF file.

FAR PROCESS:

After faculty submit FAR packets, they will be distributed to the Tenure Faculty Personnel Committee (TFPC), and the appropriate TFPC subcommittee. The TFPC subcommittee chair shall assign committee members packets, ensuring the reviewers have sufficient disciplinary and instructional knowledge to evaluate the packet. All packets must have at least two committee members contribute to a close review. Reviewers shall have the appropriate disciplinary and instructional knowledge to perform a peer assessment. The personnel committees shall draft review letters, including a recommended merit score for each FAR packet. The TFPC, in consultation with the school director, may adopt worksheets or rubrics to aid in the scoring process as long as they align with school, college, and university policy. Finally, the TFPC chair and subcommittee chairs shall ensure the committee members assigned to each packet vote on each letter obtains a majority vote.

After the TFPC completes its letters, the FAR packets and committee recommendations will be forwarded to the school director. The school director shall consult any applicable intermediate supervisors to draft a final FAR report and merit score. The school director shall sign the FAR report and merit score and distribute it to college human resources and the faculty members individually.

## 

## Section 2: Evaluation Criteria

Per ACD 506-10, each faculty group must establish a minimum of five distinct ratings that distinguish levels of achievement. The following five rating standards will be used to evaluate individual research, teaching and service criteria and to determine an overall rating for each faculty member reviewed. The number indicated in parentheses is to be used, where needed, for calculations and merit processes.

High Merit (5): Outstanding. Faculty receiving this rating demonstrate excellent performance in their job duties, as evidenced by substantial achievement, innovation, or leadership in the area reviewed.

Merit Plus (4): Superior. Faculty receiving this rating demonstrate superior performance in their job duties, as evidenced by achievement, innovation, or leadership in the area reviewed.

Merit (3): Exceeds expectations. Faculty receiving this rating demonstrate very good performance in their job duties. All expected duties are fulfilled in an exemplary manner.

Satisfactory (2): Meets expectations. Faculty receiving this rating demonstrate acceptable performance in their job duties.

Unsatisfactory (1): Does not meet expectations. Faculty receiving this rating demonstrate poor or incomplete performance in their job duties.

The assessments in sub-categories (research/creative activities, teaching, and service) shall be adjusted based on the proportions of the category in the faculty member’s workload.

Research and Creative Activities

Activities that may be recognized as contributions to research include, but are not limited to:

1. Monographs, scholarly/creative books, publications in refereed journals.
2. Edited volumes, critical textbook editions, critical translations, special issues of refereed journals, innovative textbooks, anthologized works and technical reports.
3. Survey/review articles, book chapters, invited publications, articles included in published proceedings volumes.
4. Presentation of papers at professional meetings/conferences, invited presentations.
5. Colloquia and seminar talks at other universities and research institutions.
6. Proposals (funded and submitted) to seek funding for research both internally and externally with specified amount and role.
7. Textbooks and other instructional materials relating to topics within the faculty member’s disciplinary areas.
8. Honors and awards for research and creative activities in the faculty member’s discipline.
9. Sabbatical report.
10. Shows, performance, and exhibits.
11. Computer programs, databases, and technological innovation with scholarly/creative applications.
12. Other contributions, such as manuscripts in progress/under review, manuscripts in press, and/or any relevant materials that do not fall under the previously listed categories.

Teaching

Activities that are recognized as contributions to instructional activities include, but are not limited to:

1. Written evaluations/observations by peers in classroom teaching if applicable.
2. Courses taught, syllabi and relevant assignment samples.
3. Student course evaluations.
4. Local/national awards for teaching.
5. New course/curriculum development.
6. Development of instructional materials such as textbooks, lab manuals, online materials, used by other instructors.
7. Publication of textbook and instructional materials in printed or electronic form.
8. Workshops delivered to teachers and/or graduate/undergraduate students.
9. Student mentoring and advising, such as mentoring students in research projects, honors contracts, honors theses, master students projects/theses, doctoral students projects/dissertations, co-authoring with students, assisting students to present in conferences.
10. Participating in professional development and educational learning.
11. Evidence of course supervision and mentoring.

Service

Activities that are recognized as contributions to service activities include, but are not limited to:

1. Membership on committees at the faculty group, school, college, and university levels, indicate those committees you are chairing.
2. Activities you organized/participated beyond assigned committee work at the university, such as faculty senator, coordinating joint programs, administrative positions, etc.
3. Academic activities to professional fields, e.g. serving as editor for refereed journals, serving as officer in national/international scholarly society, editing books and conference proceedings, organizing national/international conferences/sessions.
4. Reviewing articles/chapters for books, proceedings volumes, and journals.
5. Reviewing proposals for funding agencies.
6. Participating in outreach programs to the community.
7. Consultation and membership on community committees and boards.
8. Mentoring faculty and providing teaching observations.

## Section 3: Appeals

See ACD 506-10 for details on Faculty Annual Review Appeals

# Article 6: Review of Administrative Appointees

This article outlines the evaluation process for faculty in SASA holding administrative appointments. SASA has two types of administrative faculty: full directors and intermediate administrators. Both categories shall report their activities and assemble the materials for the Faculty Annual Review as appropriate to their rank and career track or tenured/tenure-track status. Routing reviews for administrative faculty shall follow a separate process from the regular FAR process in conforming with the ACD 111-03 and college-level bylaws. In conformity with these policies, the personnel committees shall not review administrative appointees’ packets.

Directors

Directors shall be evaluated by the processes outlined in ACD 111-03 and in any relevant CISA bylaws.

Intermediate Administrators

The SASA school director shall conduct the faculty annual review for intermediate administrators at the school-level, including any faculty member appointed as a faculty head, assistant school director, or associate school director who reports to the school director. The school director shall consider the intermediate administrators’ complete FAR packet and their completion of duties outlined in their notice of appointment. To allow for peer review, the school director shall appoint a peer review committee for the intermediate administrative faculty to supplement the director’s direct review. Every other year, the school director shall organize a method of receiving input from the faculty for the review of intermediate administrators, as required by ACD 111-03.

# Article 7: Statement on Student Course Evaluation in Review and Promotion

Student course evaluations (or student opinion surveys) are required by ABOR Manual 6-211. They are one instrument used to provide feedback on the instructional contributions of faculty. This policy outlines the appropriate use of evaluations while acknowledging their limitations and potential for bias.

Routinely, student opinion surveys often serve as proximate measures of instructor effectiveness, course design, and learning environment. They have traditionally been used to identify areas for improvement in teaching practice. Often, these student opinion surveys inform discussions and decisions regarding faculty development, promotion, and tenure. However, this use of student surveys must be considered carefully and only in the context of other evidence.

Personnel committees and administrators conducting reviews shall recognize that evidence suggests that using student surveys of teaching in personnel decisions is problematic as they are weakly related to other measures of teaching effectiveness and student learning, can be influenced by course characteristics like time of day, subject, class size, and whether the course is required, all of which are unrelated to teaching effectiveness. In addition, they are influenced by various forms of bias.

To address these concerns, reviewers shall consider the following approaches:

1. Compare student surveys over time within the dataset of the faculty under review. Avoid comparing faculty to means or medians of other faculty or department averages.
2. Consider the sample size, return rate, and standard deviation of student opinion survey results.
3. Student feedback should be considered part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness alongside other evidence such as peer teaching observations, submitted syllabi and assessments, and directly reviewed course materials.

# Article 8: Approval and Amendment Process

A tenured and tenure-track faculty quorum shall be required to approve, alter, amend, or repeal this promotion and criteria document. The quorum requirement shall be satisfied as long as over 50% of SASA faculty who are eligible participate in the voting. To vote on this document, faculty members must hold the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor and be over .50 FTE to vote.

Voting on this document is by electronic ballot, to be left open for five business days. For each vote, voters may choose between “approve,” “disapprove,” and “abstain.” An action is defined to be approved if at least two-thirds of the voters, excluding abstentions, vote “approve” (except if all voters abstain, then the action is not approved). Proposed amendments to this document must be distributed to voting-eligible faculty at least eight days before the opening of voting on the proposed amendments. A meeting on proposed amendments must occur before the opening of voting if at least two voting-eligible faculty rest it before the start of electronic voting.

This document and any future amendments will become effective upon approval by a tenured and tenure-track faculty quorum, consent by the school director and dean of the college, and approval by the University. The policies of this document are effective for all track faculty candidates. Faculty members beyond their third-year review may elect to use the previous version of the document.