



<b>College</b>	<b>W. P. Carey School of Business</b>	
<b>Unit</b>	<b>School of Accountancy</b>	
<b>Document</b>	<b>Faculty Review Procedures</b>	
<b>Approved by the faculty</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Reviewed by the dean</b>		<b>Date:</b>

**Provost office approval**

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

**Office of the University Provost**

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



## **SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY**

**PERSONNEL ADVISORY TEAM  
(SAPAT)**

# **FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES\***

**Approved April 21, 2006  
Amended August 18, 2008**

*\*See also ASU Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual and W. P. Carey School of Business Faculty Evaluation Policies, Guidelines and Procedures.*

## **I. THE SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY PERSONNEL ADVISORY TEAM (SAPAT)**

### **A. Responsibilities of SAPAT**

The School of Accountancy Personnel Advisory Team (SAPAT) is charged with evaluating faculty and advising the Director of its evaluations and recommendations.<sup>1</sup> These evaluations include

1. Annual evaluations of faculty members (Section II of this document).
2. Annual post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members (Section III).
3. Periodic evaluations of untenured faculty for the purposes of assessing progress toward promotion and tenure and making retention recommendations based on faculty progress (Section IV).
4. Evaluations of proposals requesting sabbatical leave (Section V).
5. Other reviews as requested by the Director of the School of Accountancy.

### **B. SAPAT Composition Details**

SAPAT shall consist of five tenured faculty members and shall meet the following conditions:

- Members shall be elected by a vote of the tenure track members of the faculty.
- At least two members shall be “full” professors.
- Members of the Director’s Advisory Team may serve on SAPAT.
- Faculty expected to be on sabbatical leave during the next academic year may serve on SAPAT but must excuse themselves from any deliberations involving sabbatical leaves.
- All tenured faculty are eligible for election to the team with the exception of:
  - Those who are not Academically Qualified (AQ) as determined by the W.P. Carey School of Business and School of Accountancy guidelines; and criteria established by the School of Accountancy Director.
  - Those who have not served on the School of Accountancy faculty for at least two years.
  - Those being considered for promotion in the next academic year.
  - The Director and members of any decision making group that acts on matters which would be considered and acted on by the team, such as a member of the W. P. Carey School Personnel Advisory Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this document the term “School” refers to the School of Accountancy and the term “W. P. Carey School” refers to the W. P. Carey School of Business.

- Members on sabbatical leave. Those members must resign their position at the beginning of their sabbatical and an election will be held to replace them for the remainder of the term to which they had been elected.
- Untenured tenure track faculty members may elect a member from their group to attend and observe actions of SAPAT relating to periodic evaluations of untenured faculty for the purposes of assessing progress toward promotion and tenure and making retention recommendations (section I. A, point 3 above). Similarly, non-tenure track faculty members may elect a member from their group to attend periodic evaluations of non-tenure track faculty for purposes of considering promotion and retention (not annual reviews).
- The chair of SAPAT shall be elected by the members of SAPAT.
- Election to the team is for a two-year term. Membership is overlapping with three members elected in one year and two in the next.

**C. Replacement of SAPAT Members**

A replacement to fill the remainder of the term of a member who resigns from SAPAT will be elected in the same manner described above.

**D. Standards of Conduct for SAPAT Members and Observers**

The deliberations of SAPAT are confidential—both members and observers (if any) shall maintain confidentiality. This confidentiality is essential to ensure full and open discussion of all positive and negative aspects of each petition considered. Each member should feel obligated to state his (her) views as an integral part of the discussion, evaluation, and recommendations. If the member believes he (she) cannot honestly state his (her) views, that member should resign from the team. Should a member or observer violate the requirement of confidentiality, that individual can be removed from SAPAT by a vote of the majority of the tenure-track faculty in the School.

Should a member of SAPAT disagree with the majority decision of the Team, after having expressed his (her) opposing position during a Team session, that member has the option to write a memorandum to the Director. S/He will also provide a copy of this memo to the School's representative on the W. P. Carey School Personnel Advisory Committee. (A copy of the memo will be forwarded to that committee as part of the file of the faculty member being evaluated.) The memo should indicate that

member's reasons for disagreement with the majority decision. Under no circumstances will this memorandum contain information that will compromise the confidential nature of SAPAT deliberations.

#### **E. Overall Approach for SAPAT**

The Director and SAPAT will review and evaluate each individual faculty member applying the appropriate current criteria for each of the areas listed in Point I. A. of this document. Those specific current criteria are summarized as "Guidelines" for each area later in this document.

The collection of supporting materials pertinent to all personnel matters is the responsibility of the individual faculty member, except that the Director will solicit confidential evaluation letters for promotion and tenure actions. A list of materials to be provided by the faculty member for retention, promotion, and tenure is given in Appendix A. An example of a suggested format for a summary of teaching evaluations for all personnel actions are given in Appendix B.

After a review of the materials submitted by the individual and any appropriate input from Associate Deans relative to programmatic contributions, SAPAT will advise the Director in writing of its evaluation. All faculty are to be provided with (a) SAPAT's evaluation of performance and (b) the Director's evaluation. The Director will review (1) the SAPAT recommendation on the individual, (2) materials submitted by the individual faculty member, (3) confidential evaluation letters (where appropriate), and (4) input from by Associate Deans relative to programmatic contributions, when provided.

SAPAT shall communicate to the Director recommended corrective actions for those faculty members deemed not to be making adequate progress toward the tenure decision. The Director shall, in turn, inform the individual of his/her weakness and identify specific corrective steps to be taken.

## **II. GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY**

An evaluation of each faculty member shall be performed at least once every 12 months. The objectives of the SAPAT annual evaluation are to (1) assist faculty in their professional development, (2)

provide a basis for compensation adjustments and workload assignments, and (3) institute the first step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.

#### **A. Standards of Performance**

The annual evaluation shall be based on an assessment of the faculty member's achievement in the areas of (1) teaching and other instructional activities (teaching), (2) research and other scholarly activities ("research") and, (3) service and institutional commitment (service). An elaboration of activity areas follows:

**1. Teaching and Other Instructional Activities.** The emphasis of the review shall be on the scope and quality of an individual's teaching performance. The elements to be considered shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Student evaluations and other input from students.
- Evidence of course development and innovative practices.
- Course load, including new and repeat courses, graduate and undergraduate courses, class size, nature of the courses taught, and availability of grading assistance.
- Other forms of student development, including contributions to undergraduate honors theses and doctoral dissertation committees, facilitation of graduate student research and publications, and participation in curriculum development.

**2. Research and Other Scholarly Activities.** Basic and applied research contributes to the body of knowledge in an area through (a) theoretical analysis, or (b) systematic collection, classification, or analysis of data, including that made for the purpose of generating improvements in business/economic/social practice or decision-making. It includes the presentation of new idea(s) and the synthesis of existing ideas. Other applied scholarly activities include communication of existing ideas to a new audience. The following provide evidence of basic and applied research:

- Refereed journal articles
- Reports resulting from sponsored grants

- Papers presented at academic meetings, including research workshops and symposia
- Books
- Monographs
- Cases
- Working papers

The following are examples of other applied scholarly activity:

- Textbooks
- Presentations at practitioner meetings
- Publication of non-refereed journal articles

For purposes of promotion and tenure, publications in leading refereed academic journals are necessary. In general, co-authorship is not viewed as a negative attribute. However, if most publications are co-authored with the same individual(s), recognition for research achievement in these instances should be based on knowledge of the individual's contribution.

For purposes of annual evaluations, primary consideration should be given to contributions that have been made in the area of basic and applied research. Other scholarly activity should be considered as well, but less weight should be assigned to these contributions. Refereed articles generally receive much more credit than do non-refereed articles, institutional publications, industrial association publications, or newsletters. Generally, invited papers, presentations at academic and practitioner meetings, publication of books/monographs, and cases will not be evaluated as highly as refereed journal articles.

### **3. Service**

Service<sup>2</sup> encompasses those professional activities of faculty other than teaching and research. For purposes of this document we divide services into two areas—external service and internal service.

---

<sup>2</sup> Service is referred to by a variety of terms, including “Institutional Service” and “Institutional Commitment.”

**a. External Service.** Factors to be considered in assessing external service include: (1) professional presentations and consulting, (2) other service to professional organizations, (3) service to the community, (4) personal development, and (5) salary inequities.

(1) **Service through professional presentations and consulting.** Illustrations of this area include:

- Invitational public service in a faculty member's area of expertise
- Speeches to groups in a faculty member's area of expertise
- Consulting. Consulting is defined as those activities, normally compensated, performed for a public or private organization, institution or association at their request. Not all consulting activities, however, constitute external service. Faculty members seeking service recognition for consulting activities are encouraged to provide evidence of benefit to the discipline to facilitate appropriate evaluation.

(2) **Other service to professional organizations.** Examples include:

- Editorial activities with academic or professional journals
- Referee for academic journals
- Reviewer of books
- Moderator, panel member, discussant, or some similar activity at a meeting of a professional association
- Committee member of a professional organization

(3) **Service to the Community.** Community Service is admirable and deserving of recognition. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that such activities were of direct benefit to the academic discipline.

(4) **Personal Development.** AACSB accreditation standards require that "The accounting faculty, as a whole, is actively involved in making intellectual contributions in the area of discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, and learning and pedagogical research, consistent with the academic unit's mission. The academic unit has a clearly



defined process to evaluate individual faculty members' contributions to the unit's mission." In annual performance reports, it is accordingly important for faculty to provide such information with annual evaluation materials so as to allow SAPAT to assess evidence of continuing development as teachers or intellectual contributors to the discipline. This category is referred to as "Personal Development."

Faculty should have current knowledge of both theory and practice related to phenomena about which they teach and conduct research, and this knowledge should be demonstrably evident in research conducted, course development, effective teaching, instructional innovation, and involvement with business and professional organizations. Evidence of personal development in support of teaching and research should be included in the annual performance report and considered by SAPAT.

- (5) **Salary Inequities.** Included in this category are salary problems such as salaries below external market value, the lack of past rewards for meritorious performance, salary compression and inversion (where such compression or inversion has not been due to lower performance).

**b. Internal Service.** Internal service activities include those activities of the faculty, other than teaching, research, that enhance the prestige and reputation of the School, the W. P. Carey School, and the university or increase the effectiveness of institutional programs. Evaluation of internal service activities shall be based on performance and results achieved. Individuals are encouraged to present evidence of achievement (results) and of expenditure of time and effort (commitment). No single service activity shall be required of all faculty members.

Internal service activities may be classified into two categories: (1) internal service and (2) contributions to Regents' mandated affirmative action. Internal service activities shall include but not be limited to:

- Administration -- serving on a budgeted assignment. Administrative superiors shall evaluate administrative performance. Individuals serving as part-time administrators on budgeted assignments shall be evaluated on the basis of the same criteria as those applied to other faculty members. However, the quantity (but not quality) of their service requirements shall be proportionate to their assignment to non-administrative duties during the period(s) when engaged in such activities. Therefore, their performance in the budgeted administrative role shall not be a factor in the evaluation of service.
- School, W. P. Carey School or university service (team, committee) assignments, including elected positions.
- Student activities (such as advising student organizations)
- Continuing education activities
- Contributions to overhead and graduate student support from funded research  
Sponsored research and non-research fund raising activities
- Special service assignments

Evaluating faculty performance in these activities is a complex process involving both qualitative and quantitative factors. Also, faculty members may serve the School, W. P. Carey School and university in many ways, and the specific nature of the contributions from an individual faculty member may change over time. Evaluation procedures must recognize this and must be structured so that both qualitative and quantitative factors are considered. For all personnel actions (compensation, retention, promotion, and tenure) the evaluation shall be based on the guidelines adopted by School faculty as presented in this document and relevant college and university documents.

## **B. Compensation Review**

Assessment of faculty performance and translation of faculty evaluations into salary increase recommendations are among the most sensitive activities and one of the most timely methods of responding to performance in which the School engages. Any salary increase system based on accomplishment must be carefully implemented. Events can easily result in a salary structure that does not accurately reflect relative worth to the School. Specifically, consideration should be given to teaching, research, and service.

### **C. Procedural Guidelines for Annual Evaluations**

1. By February 1, each faculty member, including faculty on sabbatical or other leave, shall (a) submit evidence of performance of responsibilities, normally during the previous three calendar years and (b) file with the Director a plan of action for the coming academic year (including a tentative workload plan). A faculty member has discretion to submit data and plans in the form that he/she believes best represents the information; however, the workload plan, at a minimum, should include the information requested by the Standard School Workload Form—see Appendix C.<sup>3</sup> All data and plans should be sufficiently specific to allow for clear communications. Revisions to plans of actions and the post-tenure review workload plan may be necessitated by the needs of the School and/or mandated Post-Tenure Review Faculty Development (discussed in Section III). If revisions are needed to the workload plan, they will be negotiated by the Director and faculty member(s) and normally will be concluded by June 1.
2. By February 28 (or as needed), SAPAT shall review the evidence of performance for the past three-year record, as submitted by each faculty member. That three-year period will include any time spent on sabbatical or other leave. SAPAT shall categorize each individual's performance in the areas of research, teaching and service as (1) unsatisfactory, (2) satisfactory, (3) satisfactory—merit, (4) satisfactory—medium high merit and (5) satisfactory—high merit. In making the recommendation, SAPAT should strive to balance the following factors:
  - the result(s) of the annual evaluation(s) of faculty performance,
  - the contribution of the faculty member during the preceding period (if any) during which merit money was not available.
3. After reviewing SAPAT's evaluation report, the Director will discuss the report with that team.
4. By March 31, the Director shall convey in writing to each faculty member (a) the Team's evaluation of that faculty member's performance, and (b) the Director's preliminary evaluation of that faculty member's performance.
5. By April 30, the Director will meet with each faculty member to discuss past performance and expectations for the future. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she should note such disagreement.
6. A faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation of SAPAT or the evaluation of the Director may appeal to the Director in writing following the appeal procedures outlined in the next section.
7. In years when salary increment money is available, the Director will discuss his/her faculty compensation plan with SAPAT and seek continuing advice before forwarding recommendations to the Dean.
8. Following the Dean's actions on the Director's recommendations, faculty will be notified by letter of their salary adjustments (if any). The letter will include the exact amount of the adjustment being allocated in each of (1) teaching (2) research, and (3) service.

### **D. Annual Evaluation and/or Compensation Appeal Procedure**

---

<sup>3</sup> The faculty member often will have only very limited information relating to details of teaching and internal service requirements during the forthcoming year. Accordingly, the faculty member may choose to complete such details subsequent to or while meeting with the director. Although the timing on such a meeting is flexible, at the latest, the details of the workload plan ordinarily should be completed by April 30 in conjunction with step 5 below.

A faculty member who disagrees with the annual evaluation of SAPAT, the School Director, or both, may appeal. Such appeals shall be based on the faculty member's conclusion that the results of his or her annual evaluation and/or salary increment are inconsistent with the standards established in this document. The following procedures shall be followed:

1. A faculty member desiring review (the appellant) shall submit a written request to the School Director within 30 days of (1) meeting with the School Director to discuss SAPAT's and the Director's evaluation, or (2) receiving the letter of salary adjustment.
2. A review committee shall be assigned within one week of receiving a written request from an appellant. The committee shall consist of three tenured W. P. Carey School faculty members selected as follows:
  - One member selected by the appellant;
  - Two members selected by the School's representative to the W. P. Carey School Personnel Advisory Committee.
3. The review committee shall provide a written report of the results of its review and its recommendation to the School Director within 14 days of being appointed. The review committee shall have access to the appellant's written request and any supporting documentation provided and deemed necessary by the appellant, and the annual performance review and salary adjustment information on all other faculty members of the School for the year under appeal. As part of its deliberative process, the review committee may request to meet with the Director, the appellant, or the chair of SAPAT. The deliberations of the review committee are confidential.
4. Upon receiving the report of the review committee, the School Director shall issue a final written recommendation regarding the evaluation or salary adjustment. This recommendation and the review committee's report shall be promptly forwarded to the appellant.
5. If necessary, subsequent appeals by the appellant to the W. P. Carey School level shall be filed within 30 days of receipt of the School Director's final recommendation.

#### **E. Assessment Of Lecturers And Clinical Faculty**

Concurrent with the annual evaluation, the Director and SAPAT shall review and evaluate each lecturer and clinical faculty. Performance criteria applied shall be those contained in the individual's employment agreement with the School. The Director shall provide these letters to SAPAT as a basis for performance review.

The collection of supporting materials pertinent to the review is the responsibility of the individual lecturer and clinical faculty. Lecturers and clinical faculty should refer to Appendices A and

B for a list of appropriate supporting material and the appropriate reporting format for teaching evaluations

### **III. GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

The purpose of this section is to describe a set of mechanisms and procedures for the School's implementation of the post-tenure review (PTR) policy instituted by the Arizona Board of Regents. The overall aim of these mechanisms and procedures is to assure a rational and performance based PTR system that is fair and impartial and is consistent with the implementation guidelines of the W. P. Carey School and the University.

The post-tenure review process consists of two stages. The first stage coincides with the annual evaluation, in which SAPAT evaluates all faculty members in the areas of teaching, research and service activities using the same rating scale: (1) unsatisfactory (2) satisfactory, (3) satisfactory—merit, (4) satisfactory—medium high merit, and (5) satisfactory—high merit. An assessment of satisfactory, or higher, in each of the areas serves as sufficient evidence of satisfactory performance for purposes of post-tenure review.

The second stage of post-tenure review applies only to tenured faculty members who receive an assessment of unsatisfactory in one or more of the areas of teaching, research and service. Faculty receiving an assessment of unsatisfactory will then be given the opportunity to provide additional evidence to demonstrate that their performance is satisfactory. After the faculty member has had the opportunity to provide additional information, within two weeks following notification of the tentative assessment, SAPAT will make a final evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Consistent with W. P. Carey School and University guidelines, an overall assessment of satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be determined from the individual assessments of teaching, research and service. A normal workload is essential for satisfactory and should be determined by the Director. An overall rating of unsatisfactory will result from unsatisfactory performance in teaching. An overall

rating of unsatisfactory may result from unsatisfactory performance in research or service depending upon the emphasis assigned to the areas in the faculty member's workload plan.

Faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will enter the W. P. Carey School Performance Improvement Process. Faculty who receive an unsatisfactory assessment in service or research, but not an overall assessment of unsatisfactory, will participate in a unit level Faculty Development Plan.

### **A. Teaching**

The primacy of this function is demonstrated by the fact that an assessment of unsatisfactory performance in teaching will lead to an assessment of overall unsatisfactory performance.

Teaching performance is evaluated according to the Faculty Review Procedures of the School, and the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines of the W. P. Carey School and the University. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to present evidence of satisfactory performance.

Unsatisfactory teaching may be evidenced by any combination of factors that result in unacceptable levels of qualitative and/or quantitative performance. It is not possible to enumerate an exhaustive and explicit set of conditions that define unsatisfactory performance. However, the following illustrations may be useful.

A consistent and repeating pattern of overall incompetency that impedes student learning as evidenced by

- unsatisfactory preparation or delivery,
- unsuitable pedagogy,
- unsatisfactory student evaluations,
- outdated content or subject matter,
- failure to stay current in the course subject matter,
- capricious or irresponsible grading standards,
- uncivil treatment of students,
- inappropriate performance expectations.

A consistent and repeating pattern indicative of a faculty member's inability or unwillingness to develop and/or teach course materials required by the curriculum in the general area of the faculty member's expertise.

## **B. Research and Other Scholarly Activities**

Faculty members are expected to be current and familiar with developments in the field. A broad interpretation of this expectation is taken to mean knowledge of the contemporary literature and the consequential patterns and trends.

Evidence of faculty scholarship is required for a satisfactory performance rating. Diverse forms of evidence are appropriate. Demonstrated acceptable outcomes are required in one or more of the following categories: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching.<sup>4</sup> Faculty are evaluated as unsatisfactory for failure to document acceptable outcomes in at least one of these categories.

## **C. Service**

Service includes internal and external contributions to the achievement of School goals and objectives that are not classified as teaching or research activities. Service contributions may include external service, professional institutional commitment, community service, and internal service to the School, the W. P. Carey School, and University. These various forms of contribution are described in Section II.A.3 of this document. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the contribution of these activities to the academic discipline and/or to the School, W.P. Carey School, or University. Assessment will be based upon the outcomes of activities rather than the activities themselves.

Service shall be deemed unsatisfactory if a faculty member repeatedly demonstrates an unwillingness or inability to make a positive contribution to the governance structure of the School, the

---

<sup>4</sup> These categories and definitions thereof are contained in Ernest J. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation, 1990), pp. 16-23.

W. P. Carey School, or University. Also, failure to contribute externally to the academic discipline may lead to unsatisfactory service performance if not compensated for by service and commitment.

#### **IV. GUIDELINES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE GUIDELINES OF UNTENURED, TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS**

The success of the School depends on faculty achievement in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research, (3) service as presented in Section II.

ASU requires periodic reviews of untenured faculty members. Those periodic reviews should be conducted by SAPAT by considering faculty member progress towards a tenurable and promotable record. During a periodic review, SAPAT members must consider faculty member record and arrive at a recommendation as to whether the faculty member should be issued an unconditional contract for the coming year, a conditional contract, or a terminal contract. The conditions relating to each of these contracts should be based on University guidance.

Achievement in these areas is a goal which permits ample opportunity for individual differences to exist. In the assessment of a faculty member's contribution to the School, personnel evaluation guidelines shall not be regarded as rules that demand rigid adherence to a particular scheme or mold to which each faculty member must conform.

While there is no single formula by which a faculty member should be evaluated, an effective faculty member should participate in all three activities to some degree. Higher ranking faculty members, because of their experience level, are expected to assume a disproportionate role in service activities.

Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure require an overall record of excellence and the promise of continued excellence. The candidate must have achieved excellence in both teaching as well as in research. Service must at least be "satisfactory." Granting of tenure prior to a faculty member's normal tenure date shall be made only in exceptional circumstances. To qualify for an early



tenure grant, the faculty member must meet the standards expected of a faculty member for the normal tenure period.

Promotion to professor must be based on an overall record of excellence in the performance of professional responsibilities and the promise of continued effectiveness in professional development. Normally, an overall record of excellence requires national or international recognition for scholarly achievement in one or more areas of faculty endeavor.

## **V. GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF SABBATICAL LEAVE**

SAPAT will review sabbatical leave proposals and will advise the Director in writing of its evaluation. The Director will make a recommendation to the Dean of the W. P. Carey School and will include an indication of how the integrity of the teaching, advisement, graduate research direction, research, and administration of the program within the School will be maintained during the faculty member's absence.

Criteria to be applied by SAPAT are contained in the University Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual (ACD), which states, in part (ACD 705):

A sabbatical leave is not deferred compensation to which an administrator, faculty member, or academic professional is entitled after six years of institutional commitment, but is granted or denied on the merits of the individual proposal upon the recommendation of the university . . . .

The applicant will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. potential value to the teaching program of the department
2. probable enhancement of the applicant's effectiveness
3. potential value to the reputation of the institution
4. contribution to knowledge and
5. provision of outstanding public or professional service at a local or national level.

In evaluating sabbatical requests, SAPAT shall consider whether the application convincingly demonstrates incremental benefit to the School beyond normal faculty workload expectations, based on one or more of the listed criteria. Additionally, SAPAT shall review the applicant's record on previous

sabbaticals in arriving at its recommendation. The collection and submission of supporting materials pertinent to the sabbatical decision, including reports filed regarding previous sabbaticals, is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.

## **VI. ASSESSMENT OF DIRECTOR**

The Dean of the W. P. Carey School (or his or her delegate) will conduct an annual evaluation of the Director. In addition, a majority of SAPAT can request an evaluation by the Dean (or his or her delegate) at any time.

# APPENDICES

## **APPENDIX A:**

### **MATERIALS TO BE PROVIDED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE EVALUATIONS**

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide the following materials:

1. An updated vita, detailing the candidate's activities in teaching, research and other scholarly activities, contributing to the academic discipline, and contributing to the School, the W. P. Carey School, or university.
2. A summary analysis of teaching evaluations including, but not limited to, summaries of student evaluations.
3. A copy of four publications or printed materials reflecting the scholarly endeavors of the faculty member. These copies become part of the file that is forwarded to the W. P. Carey School Personnel Advisory Committee. Access to ALL publications and other evidence of scholarly endeavors should be made readily available.

**APPENDIX B:**

**A SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR SUMMARY OF TEACHING EVALUATIONS**

The following format is preferred for presentation of summary data from student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Data are taken from the current evaluation form being used in the college.

		DISTRIBUTION OF SCALE RATINGS					AVERAGE RATING	STANDARD DEVIATION OF MEAN RATING		
SEMESTER/ COURSE	ITEM	DISTRIBUTION					MEAN RATING	STANDARD DEVIATION	SAMPLE SIZE	
		1	2	3	4	5				
Fall	19XX									
ACC	YYY	Q .8	0.55	0.36	0.09	0.00	0.00	1.55	0.66	33
		Overall	0.64	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.37	0.18	
ACC	YYY									
Spring	19XX									
ACC	YYY									
ACC	YYY									
Summer	19XX									
ACC	YYY									
ACC	YYY									

**APPENDIX C**

**STANDARD SCHOOL WORKLOAD FORM**

**FACULTY NAME**

**20XX-XX ACADEMIC YEAR PROPOSED WORKLOAD PLAN**

---

**TEACHING – XX%**

Fall: \_\_\_\_\_

Spring: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**RESEARCH – XX%**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**SERVICE – XX%**

SOA: \_\_\_\_\_

WPC: \_\_\_\_\_

ASU: \_\_\_\_\_

External: \_\_\_\_\_

***Workload plans are subject to change to meet School needs***

Faculty Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Director Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_