| College | New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit | School of Social and Behavioral Sciences | |
| Document | Bylaws | |
| Approved by the faculty | | Date: |
| Reviewed by the dean | | Date: |

**Provost office approval**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Deborah Clarke, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel** | **Date** |

**BY-LAWS**
**School of Social & Behavioral Sciences**

**New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences**

**Arizona State University**
**Approved: March 31, 2013**
**Provost Approved:  June 26, 2013**

### *Table of Contents*

## I.   Name and Structure

The School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) is organized in two ways -- by program and by academic degree.

Programs are formed by faculty in the same or similar disciplines.  The purposes of a program are to promote cooperation and task sharing among faculty with common disciplinary concerns/practices and to facilitate communication with the director.   At this time, SBS includes three programs: Behavioral Sciences, Communication, and Social Sciences.  For purposes of curriculum quality and assessment, SBS is also organized by academic degree.  Tenured and tenure track faculty members who teach courses within a degree program are empowered to review and propose courses, assess student learning, and suggest modifications within that degree.  Currently, SBS degree programs include majors in Social and Behavioral Sciences, Political Science, Psychology, Communication, and Sociology.  Minors are available in Communication, Interdisciplinary Organizational Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Public Relations & Strategic Communication, Sociocultural Anthropology, Social & Behavioral Sciences, and Sociology.  A certificate program is offered in Family Communication.

The School hosts an M.A. degree in Communication Studies and an M.S. in Psychology and its faculty participate in the M.A. programs in Interdisciplinary Studies (MAIS) and Social Justice & Human Rights (SJHR) as well as other disciplinary and interdisciplinary graduate programs hosted by New College and across ASU.  The faculty are not restricted from participation in graduate programs elsewhere at ASU where they may have the appropriate expertise and meet the requirements for graduate membership as laid out by the graduate college.

## II.   Mission and Goals

The School of Social and Behavioral Sciences fosters excellence in scholarship and teaching consistent with the expectations of a research university. Faculty members produce high quality intellectual and creative work while also engaging in service to their disciplines and to the broader community.  SBS students are encouraged to explore and value the diversity of disciplines, theoretical perspectives, and methods of inquiry of the social and behavioral sciences.  SBS students are taught to apply theory, think critically and creatively, communicate effectively, and use multiple methods for observing and interpreting individual and social processes.  Our graduates are expected to be ethically-aware, engaged, and globally-informed citizens.

The hallmarks of SBS are (1) engagement of students as partners in research with significant consequences for the communities to which they belong, (2) dedication to understanding the processes that organize human behavior and give it meaning, (3) a concerted effort to understand and articulate the practices that promote just, healthy, and productive relationships at all levels of social organization, (4) a commitment to facilitate "broad conversations" that cross subject boundaries and create interdisciplinary knowledge and theory to address shared social concerns, and (5) fostering of an open and encouraging learning environment.

The members of SBS are committed to the goals of the College and the University, as defined by university strategic plans and all updates thereof.

### *III. Voting Eligibility*

A.  Tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on all matters that come before SBS.  However they must be present to participate in the deliberations (or do so by phone or videoconference or similar technology).  Faculty associates may participate in discussions but are not eligible to vote. Lecturers and other non-tenure eligible faculty are eligible to vote on matters that do not appear in the list under section IIIB below.  SBS tenured/tenure-track faculty on sabbatical or other leave may not vote as they are prohibited from university service (ACD 705) and thus may not participate in deliberations at faculty meetings.

B.  Voting on the following issues is restricted to tenure-track and tenured faculty: hiring, promotion and tenure policies, curriculum, evaluation, appointments, and by-laws.

C.  *Numbers required to carry a vote*.  To pass, curriculum, hiring issues and by-laws require a majority (50% + 1) of votes of those tenured/tenure-track who participated in the meeting..

D.  *Quorum call*.  Any eligible faculty member can call for a quorum (50% of the tenured/tenure-track faculty) before a vote is taken at an SBS meeting.  If a quorum is not present, voting business must be rescheduled for a future SBS meeting.

E.  *Call for ballot vote*.  Any faculty member eligible to vote on an issue that comes up as "new business" on the agenda (i.e., that was not listed in advance on the agenda) can call for a ballot vote of all eligible faculty.  A ballot vote on the issue will then be conducted in lieu of a vote in the meeting.  The deadline for casting ballot votes must be a minimum of 48 hours from the distribution of the ballot and must be specified on the ballot.  Ballots may be distributed electronically or by paper but all voters should have the same mechanism for voting.

### *IV. Meetings and Timely Notification of Upcoming Votes*

Preliminary agendas will be distributed electronically 48 hours in advance of all meetings by the director for School meetings and by program liaisons for meetings of the programs*.*  As needed, there will be separate meetings of the Behavioral Science, Social Science, and Communication faculty.  The school director may be present at these meetings. It will be the responsibility of a representative of these programs to bring material to regular and timely meetings of the full faculty.

### *V. Appointment and Review of the School Director*

A.  Terms and Conditions

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

B. Faculty Participation in Review of Director

As noted in the New College by-laws Article IIID, faculty will provide feedback to the Dean in April of each year, as part of the director's annual review process.  All SBS faculty are eligible to provide this

feedback using the instrument provided by the Dean's office.  As indicated in New College by-laws, the SBS faculty may adopt other forms of review, with approval of the Dean's office.

*C. Appointment of Associate Director*

The school director, with the approval of the Dean, appoints an associate director to assist with the administrative duties of SBS.  The associate director must be a tenured SBS faculty member. The terms and conditions of the appointment will be responsive to the current conditions and needs of the unit as determined by the director, in consultation with the Dean.

## *VI.  School Committees*

### A. Standing Committees

 1. *Personnel Committee.*  The Personnel Committee will be composed of one tenured faculty member from each program. Members on the personnel committee will be elected by the faculty of their respective programs and will serve three-year staggered terms. The committee will provide an independent level of review during the annual review.  Its recommendations will be forwarded to the director in a timely manner to assure that all faculty members are evaluated in accordance with university deadlines. The Personnel Committee also advises the director on the post-tenure review process.   In that capacity, it will review the files of any tenured faculty identified as "unsatisfactory" in any of the three areas of teaching, research, or service for post-tenure reviews.  In cases of "unsatisfactory" performance it will work with the director and the candidate to devise Faculty Development Plans and Performance Improvement Plans, where appropriate, and in accordance with university policies (ACD 506-11).

Promotion and Tenure reviews are conducted by a peer review committee, appointed by the Dean, as specified in New College by-laws.

2. Teaching Advisory Committee. The Teaching Advisory Committee will review and make recommendations on all curricular issues in the School.  The committee will consist of three faculty members elected by the faculty in their respective programs. Members will serve staggered three-year terms. The committee will be chaired by the director of the School or another tenured designee. The committee's purpose is to advise and assist the director on curricular initiatives including revising and creating degree programs, considering new course proposals, disestablishing degree programs, creating/deleting courses and course prefixes, developing instructional resources, and supporting the teaching mission of the School. However, curricular issues unique to graduate programs will be addressed by the faculty associated with that program working in conjunction with the NCIAS office of graduate programs.

3. *Assessment Committee.*  The Assessment Committee will consist of assessment chairs for each SBS degree, to include majors, minors, and certificates.  The assessment chairs are responsible for coordinating the collection and reporting of annual assessment data for the degree, as indicated by the university's assessment plan.  This committee is organized by the associate director of the School. Assessment directors are elected by those faculty associated with the given degree program. They serve terms of three years.

4. *School Director's Advisory Council.* The Advisory Council will include one tenured member elected from each program. The charge of this committee is to serve liaison and advocacy functions between the school director and the faculty of the specific programs.

Members of the advisory council serve liaison and advocacy functions to further the aims of each program and assist the SBS director. The separate faculty members of the respective Social Sciences, Behavioral Sciences, and Communication Programs shall meet in the spring of each year to nominate an advisory council member for each program. If the nominee is acceptable to the Director, she or he will serve in that capacity for the following year. If any program is unable to name a nominee, the Director may select a committee member. Terms shall be for one year.

### B. Ad Hoc and Search Committees

1. *Ad hoc committees*. As issues arise that require faculty consultation, the school director may establish ad hoc committees. The director shall appoint the committee chair. Committee members may be elected, appointed, or volunteers.

2. *Search committees.* Search committees will be formed in a manner consistent with university guidelines as noted in (ACD 111-01.) The Dean will be responsible for constituting a search committee. At least half of the members of the search committee shall be elected by the faculty. The remaining members of the search committee may be appointed by the Dean. One or more members of a search committee should take the available diversity training and all members are expected to assure equal opportunity through affirmative action in the search process.

## VII. Representation on Standing College Committees

The School will have representatives on all non-appointed college committees. Individuals will make their preferences to work with a particular committee known to the director, and there will be a School vote when there is more than one candidate for a position.

## VIII. Probationary, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews

*A. Introduction*

The personnel review policies of Social and Behavioral Sciences are designed to provide standards by which the interdisciplinary scholarly and creative activities, teaching, and service of a diverse faculty can be fairly and consistently evaluated. An interdisciplinary faculty requires the application of criteria that encompass a more diverse range of scholarly and creative activities, teaching approaches, and service contributions than those of a single discipline. Consistent with the policies of the New College and of Arizona State University, these standards are designed to assure and reward excellence in the faculty of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Probationary reviews are designed to provide timely evaluations and feedback that will assist the faculty member in achieving a successful review for promotion and tenure. Although excellence is required in research, teaching, and service for promotion and tenure, it is recognized that a probationary faculty member will not necessarily earn top scores in all three areas in every review. The normal rhythm of academic life suggests that one area may figure more prominently

at one review than another.  Probationary reviews will provide feedback to enable a candidate to balance these areas of professional life so that excellence is achieved in all three by the time of the promotion and tenure review.

The receipt of tenure and promotion should reflect both the highest levels of past achievement *and* the promise of future excellence.   As written in ACD 506-10, "annual evaluations do not accumulate into tenure, promotion, termination, or release decisions. For probationary faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with probationary review.  Annual feedback on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty may occur at the same time as the annual performance evaluation, but probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit's estimate of the candidate's future promise. Thus, the procedures and standards used in annual performance evaluations are different from those used in retention, promotion, and tenure reviews.  "

*B. Goals and Criteria for the Probationary Review*

Probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit's estimate of a candidate's future promise.  Probationary faculty members are reviewed during the third and sixth years of their service. The purpose of the first review is to give the university and the candidate an accurate appraisal of the progress being made toward continuing status with the university.  Procedures for probationary reviews are found in ACD 507-05.

*C. Definitions of Excellence for the Purposes of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*

As a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary school, the members of SBS acknowledge that there is no single route to excellence. The standards identified here are seen as typical accomplishments for an individual who is successful in his or her field at a level that is consistent with the expectations of the New College and Arizona State University, viewed within the context of the university's aspirational peer institutions. The categories of review are not substitutable, but the content is determined by the goals laid out by the candidate and the school director during the years prior to review, in keeping with expectations in the faculty member's scholarly field and available resources.  Content may vary according the norms of the program, but evaluation standards must be consistent with expectations of excellence recognized by the higher levels of review. While the candidate's entire portfolio is of relevance in assessing the individual's accomplishments, there must be substantial evidence of continued progress toward excellence since joining the faculty at ASU.

*(1) Scholarly Activity*

Consistent with New College performance criteria, SBS faculty members are expected to sustain an ongoing and coherent program of research resulting in significant scholarly contributions. A candidate for promotion to associate professor must present a portfolio of scholarly work that is indicative of excellence and progress toward the establishment of a national reputation in his or her field subsequent to the receipt of the doctorate. Within a social and behavioral sciences School, that is typically accomplished by the publication of material in peer-reviewed journals and/or recognized presses. The process of establishing a national reputation suggests that the portfolio will display both quantity and quality. To some extent these are substitutable—publication in less competitive journals [as determined by, for example, external reviewers] will demand greater quantity than publication in journals with the

very highest rejection rates. The overall mix must indicate to reviewers at all levels that the candidate has demonstrated progress toward establishing a national reputation within the context of the School and its commitments to interdisciplinary scholarship, excellence in undergraduate instruction, innovative M.A. programs, and effective university service.  Examples of scholarly portfolios that might indicate excellence in research and progress toward a national reputation appear below. In each case, it is expected that the candidate is a sole or lead author on a substantial proportion of the published work. The percentage contribution of the candidate to the publications should be delineated.

- 10 high quality publications (primarily refereed journal articles but may also include some refereed book chapters in high quality presses); or

- 2 books (one of which may be an edited volume) from recognized presses, in specialties in which a book is more usual; the second book might not be published but should ideally be under a firm contract following review; or

- 1 published book (which may be an edited volume) and 5 refereed articles or book chapters in fields where publication in varied outlets is usual.

- For faculty who conduct complicated/extended research projects (e.g., ethnographic fieldwork; extended laboratory studies) 1 book and/or several monographs.

The candidate is responsible for contextualizing the quality of the journals, presses, and other outlets and demonstrating that they are commonly accepted as respectable outlets of quality work. Presentations and published abstracts and proceedings of major professional meetings will be taken into consideration as part of the overall portfolio of professional involvement, but do not substitute for published journal articles or books.  Non-refereed publications of research results are weighted less heavily than refereed publications.  In most cases, textbooks cannot be substituted for the publication of research results (but textbooks are considered evidence of excellence in teaching).  Other presentations of research results will be judged according to disciplinary standards.

The pursuit of external funds in support of scholarly activity is encouraged when such activity supports the candidate's efforts to develop a coherent research program, achieve excellence, and make progress towards a national reputation in the discipline. Securing support will be considered in the context of the availability of funds, the existence of an appropriate infrastructure to support grant-writing efforts, and a successful publication record.  In research areas in which such activity is expected, evidence of submission would be sought. It is recognized that the availability of external funding varies considerably within and across disciplines and area of research focus.  However, the presence of grants cannot compensate for the absence of publications.

*(2) Teaching*

It is expected that candidates for promotion in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences will demonstrate a commitment to effective instruction. The form of that instruction will be dictated by the norms of the program, and may include work in the classroom, on-line or hybrid courses, research with students, field experiences, or Masters, Doctoral or honors theses, and internship supervision.

Successful candidates will show evidence of excellence in their instructional activities. Evidence should include numeric course evaluations and student comments, syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials. Additional evidence may include:

- the publication of peer-reviewed material related to teaching;

- publication of textbooks;

- submission of grant requests related to instruction to external agencies;

- measures of student success;

- other forms of recognition from students and peers, including peer assessments and nominations for awards that recognize instruction.

The evaluation of instruction is complex, and should consider teaching load, course difficulty, medium of instruction (on-line, face-to-face, hybrid), class size, the mix of required and elective classes, and similar variables. Reviewers expect that negative feedback from peers and/or students will be addressed during the probationary period. Candidates who receive negative feedback and who show no improvement in their teaching performance may be judged to be ineffective instructors. Persistently unacceptable performance on teaching evaluations or other measures of instructional effectiveness are an indication that teaching needs improvement. Work with student groups, with graduate students of all ranks and from all parts of the university system, and curricular innovation (both within courses, of new courses and of new degrees and/or programs) will be recognized as valuable and will be evaluated positively. However, such achievements cannot normally be substituted for excellence in instruction.

*(3) Service*

Service is ordinarily recognized in the following areas: 1) School; 2) college; 3) campus/university; 4) community; and 5) appropriate regional, national, or international professional organizations. Members of the School are expected to undertake basic levels of service consistent with its needs but this occurs with the understanding that the faculty member is focused upon the development of research and instructional abilities prior to tenure. Service is evaluated not just by membership on various committees, but based on evidence of the quality of the member's contribution. Examples of quality service would include attending scheduled meetings, being prepared for meetings, and assuming a reasonable share of committee tasks. Reviewers will look for evidence of committee work within the school and college (levels 1 & 2). Service at the campus/university levels (3) will be rewarded, however it is recognized that such opportunities are limited and not available to all faculty within a given year. Service to the community (4) and to professional organizations (5) can be evidence of an integration of research and teaching and can be seen as extensions of one or both. Work with community organizations of all types may have value for students and further the mission of the university. Service to professional organizations as a program chair, manuscript reviewer or editorial board member, are examples of professional service. A strong service record cannot be substituted for weaknesses in the research or teaching portfolios.

*D. Definitions of Excellence for Promotion to Full Professor*

After a successful post-tenure career, an individual may opt to be reviewed for promotion to full professor. The goal of this review will be to assess the continuing progress of the candidate, the continued demonstration of excellence and leadership in teaching and service, and the extension of his or her reputation in scholarship. As noted in New College by-laws (Article IVA1b), promotion to full professor is based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions to a field that sustain or enhance national or international recognition.

The same categories of performance will be taken into consideration as were considered for promotion to associate professor. Excellence, quality, and impact will be defined as in the earlier section of this document. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate the attainment of a national or international reputation within his or her field. A record of excellence for promotion to professor would include an established, mature, and productive research program with evidence of sustained impact in the field . When appropriate within the discipline, the candidate's success in attracting external funding will be considered. Teaching should continue to meet high standards with evidence of curricular impact. Service is expected to be more substantial with the candidate exhibiting leadership at the school and campus/university levels. Service to the community and profession would be more visible and typically would include substantive work as an editor or on editorial boards, officer roles in professional organizations, significant organizing roles in the discipline or community, and other impactful forms of service. Awards, fellowships and similar forms of recognition would be considered additional evidence of national or international recognition.

## IX. Annual Reviews

The review shall cover the immediately preceding 36 month period, with the emphasis on the evaluation of teaching, service, and scholarship in the last twelve months and weighted in relation to the agreed upon distribution of workload. In considering a three-year time span, the process recognizes that some forms of faculty work, such as data collection by field researchers and the writing of scholarly books unfold over longer than one year. The process provides feedback to the faculty member who is in a probationary period prior to tenure review, and it also serves as a post-tenure review for tenured faculty members. The evaluation also assesses how the individual has helped advance the goals of the School through his or her activities. At the school level, performance ratings are assigned by the director, based in part on the recommendations of the Personnel Committee. Appeals are decided by the Dean. The scores awarded in the annual review are part of the input used to reward performance (when merit funds are available). The faculty member is responsible for providing evidence and information for the three preceding calendar years in order to provide a full context for the review, prior to a deadline established each year.

The annual review process will consider both the quantity and quality of scholarly work. For example, in teaching, the assessment should consider student comments, syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials in addition to numeric course evaluations. Additional examples of evidence that support excellence in teaching are provided in Section VIIIC(2).

*A. Levels of performance*

The review involves a five-point scale, where 1 is "unsatisfactory performance," 2 is "partially meets expectations", 3 is "meets expectations," 4 is "exceeds expectations," and 5 is "exceeds expectations in

a sustained manner." A level 1 performance evaluation will trigger additional review for faculty members undergoing post-tenure review. There is no limit in the School as to the number or proportion of faculty members who can receive any given score.

A faculty member's performance will be evaluated based upon written expectations for the distribution of teaching, research, and service workload as assigned by the director after consultation with the faculty member.  These expectations must be defined within the goals and mission of the School and college, the context of the School's aspirational peer institutions and available resources.  The assignment of performance expectations will account for differences in appropriate work expectations between pre-tenure and post-tenure faculty, and within each of these categories.  In cases where the faculty member and director cannot agree on work expectations, the faculty member may appeal to the dean.

Overall evaluation:  Each year faculty receives workload assignments for research, teaching, and service. Loads may vary from year to year depending on assignments made by the director after consultation with the faculty member from year to year.  A faculty member's overall rating should take into account: (1) the faculty member's rating on research, teaching, and service for that year (see section IXb below on factors that should be considered before ratings are assigned), (2) the faculty member's workload assignments, and (3) the pattern of performance during the three year window.

There are two steps to computing a faculty member's rating for a given year. First, the faculty member is scored in terms of research, teaching, and service. A faculty member will receive the following scores depending on which level they were placed in regards to research, teaching, and service.

Level 5 = 5
Level 4 = 4
Level 3 = 3
Level 2 = 2
Level 1 = 1

In the second step, the overall rating is calculated using the formula:

( (research workload % * research rating) + (teaching workload % * teaching rating) + (service workload % * service workload)) = overall score

For example, if a faculty member's load was .40 for research, .40 for teaching, and .20 for service and the faculty member received a rating of 5, 4, and 3 respectively, the formula would be:

((.40 * 5) + (.40 * 4) + (.20 * 3) = 2 + 1.6 + .6= 4.2

*B. Qualifying Factors in Performance Reviews*

1. Teaching evaluation scores shall not be the only measure considered in evaluating teaching performance.  Among the additional measures that may be used are peer observation; evaluation of syllabi; creation of new courses; research that directly contributes to enhancing teaching; instructional innovations; examples of student work in classes; examples of independent study projects or honors' theses; etc.  Evaluation of teaching will take into account the context of the course – whether it is

required or is an elective; the amount of quantitative and methodological content; and the class size, and other factors.

2. The performance review should take into consideration faculty members' assigned workloads, which may specify different levels of expected effort in teaching, research, and service.

3. It is recognized that some forms of scholarship, such as field research or the writing of academic books, are conducted over relatively lengthy periods of time.  The annual review should take this into account by contextualizing the candidate's performance over the entire three year period.  At the same time, candidates should provide evidence each year that their scholarship is progressing toward peer-reviewed publication. Evidence of progress can take a variety of forms, such as funding requests, conference papers or posters that report on in-progress fieldwork, interim reports to funders or project sponsors, a prospectus, or chapters of a larger book project.

4. The final performance evaluation score should consider the three-year performance window.  In this way, a faculty member's performance evaluation should recognize that some forms of scholarship develop over longer periods of time.  Examples include, but are not limited to a book project, field research, or the development of a new or particularly challenging course.  Successful completion of interim steps in these projects should be considered as evidence in the evaluation, as should the completed products. At the same time, the evaluation should acknowledge sustained levels of inadequate performance, such as an ongoing pattern of poor teaching, persistent failure to publish research or a continuing record of limited service.

5. For purposes of annual evaluation, articles, books, creative works in print or accepted for publication (in press) will be considered under the category of "publications." Works in progress or under review will be considered as evidence of an ongoing research publication program and should be referred to in the self-evaluation (but will not replace publications accepted). In cases where publication delays or other extenuating circumstances would unfairly penalize a faculty member, evidence of a publication commitment would be considered and should be explained in the self-evaluation. If a faculty member chooses to have a manuscript considered which has been accepted for publication but is not yet in print, the burden is on the faculty member to present evidence that the journal/publisher has accepted the manuscript.

6. It also should be noted that the example criteria listed below for Annual Review are activities that would typically take place within a single academic or calendar year and reflect an assigned  workload distribution of 40% teaching (4 courses per year), 40% research, and 20% service. Faculty contracted under divergent workload distributions will be evaluated accordingly.

*Level 1: Unsatisfactory Performance*

An absence of substantive scholarly activity as indicated by an inactive research program, poor performance in teaching or failure to perform expected levels of service. Examples of unsatisfactory performance might include:

- Consistently poor quality teaching as evidenced by a pattern of negative student comments, poorly prepared teaching materials, or assignments that fail to promote student learning and engagement.  Or, failure to maintain, in the majority of courses taught, scores on  student evaluations that are consistent with School norms for "meets expectations";

- Failure to perform essential service activities at the professional, university, college, or division level as assigned by the dean or school director; failure to perform duties  on faculty committees; and

- Insufficient scholarly activity. This criterion would be defined in terms of a failure to produce sufficient evidence of research progress as noted under "meet expectations" below.

Level 2: Partially Meets Expectations

This level of scholarly activity means that the faculty member's performance currently fails to fully satisfy minimum expectations for SBS faculty performance but shows convincing evidence of improvement, progress, potential, and/or partial success.  Examples of performance in teaching and service that partially meet expectations might include:

- Acceptable scores on teaching evaluations in some of the courses taught but not others; a mixed record of positive and negative student comments that suggest conscientious effort and acceptable performance in some aspects of teaching but not others; teaching materials and practices that are consistent with some school norms for preparation and the promotion of student learning and engagement, but not others.

- A mixed record in performing essential services at the professional, university, school, or college level (as agreed to by the faculty member with the dean or the director); assumes some service roles but fails to contribute at expected levels in some of these.

The models of scholarship presented below are meant to serve as examples of performance that partially meets expectations.  These examples are neither exhaustive nor definitive; the requirements would be tailored to the individual faculty member's workload, as assigned by the director after consultation with the faculty member.

- Model I: submission of conference paper to a national or regional meeting (relevant to the individual's research) that is not accepted; partial completion of a grant request to an internal or external competition; partial completion of a manuscript intended for submission to a scholarly journal;

- Model II:  submission of a proposal for a book chapter or essay;

- Model III: completion of major research tasks on a project intended to be submitted for publication or external funding;

- Model IV: Substantive revision of a manuscript or grant request previously rejected by a journal or funding source.

*Level 3: Meets Expectations*

This level of scholarly activity means that the faculty member meets expectations for SBS faculty performance in teaching, research, or service. The faculty member provides evidence of substantive

progress in research, conscientious teaching, and sufficient service.  Examples of performance in teaching and service that meets expectations might include:

- Acceptable scores on teaching evaluations, in the majority of courses taught; a mostly positive pattern of student comments; and teaching materials and practices that are consistent with school norms for preparation and the promotion student learning and engagement.
- Adequate performance of essential services at the professional, university, school, or college level as agreed to by the faculty member with the dean or the director; assumes an equitable share of the service duties required of faculty in the program or school.

The models of satisfactory scholarship presented below are meant to serve as examples that could encompass academic expectations at aspirational peer institutions for the different disciplines that comprise the School.  These examples are neither exhaustive nor definitive; the requirements would be tailored to the individual faculty member's workload, as assigned by the director after consultation with the faculty member.

- Model I: presentation of a conference paper at a national or regional meeting relevant to the individual's research; submission of a grant request to an internal competition (when available), and submission of an original manuscript in a scholarly journal;
- Model II: revision of a conference paper presented at a national meeting for submission to a recognized journal or completion of a book chapter following editorial invitation, and completion of one or more book review essays following invitation to do so; or
- Model III: submission of a high-quality proposal seeking external funding to support field research and presentation of a conference paper at a national meeting relevant to the individual's research.
- Model IV: Completion of a new chapter of a book manuscript that had previously been contracted for publication based on a prospectus along with other evidence of scholarly engagement, such as a conference presentation.

## *Level 4: Exceeds Expectations*

Exceed expectations means that the faculty member exceeds average/expected levels of performance in teaching, research, or service as described above. The faculty member provides evidence of notable accomplishment in research, teaching, and service.   Examples of performance that exceeds expectations might include:

- Scores on teaching evaluations, in the majority of courses taught, that are consistently high; a positive pattern of student comments in courses for which the faculty member has had adequate training and experience; teaching materials and practices that exhibit high levels of preparation, foster student learning, and promote student engagement.
- Assumption of appropriate leadership roles in essential service activities at the professional, university, college, or school level as negotiated by the individual faculty member and the dean or director; assumes a substantive share of the service duties required of faculty in the program or school.

The models of scholarship presented below are meant to serve as examples that could encompass academic expectations at aspirational peer institutions for the different disciplines that comprise the

school. These examples are neither exhaustive nor definitive; the requirements would be tailored to the individual faculty member's workload, as assigned by the director after consultation with the faculty member. Successful performance might include:

- Model I: publication of a paper in a recognized high-quality journal or of a book chapter in a recognized high-quality press, and additional scholarly work such as presentation of a conference paper at a national or international meeting, submission of an internal grant request (when available), or completion of an invited book review essay;

- Model II: Receipt of a grant submitted to an external agency where the individual is a member of a collaborative team or a co-investigator, and presentation of a conference paper at a national meeting relevant to the individual's research.

- Model III: Completion of two new chapters of a scholarly book previously contracted for publication based on a prospectus along with other evidence of scholarship, such as a conference paper.

## Level 5: Exceeds Expectations in a Sustained Manner

To be ranked at Level 5 faculty members must give evidence that performance exceeds one or more of the standards for Level 4 (see above). The record should provide evidence of outstanding accomplishment. The models of scholarship presented below are meant to serve as examples that could encompass academic expectations at aspirational peer institutions for the different disciplines that comprise the School. These examples are neither exhaustive nor definitive; the requirements would be tailored to the individual faculty member's workload, as assigned by the director after consultation with the faculty member. Examples of performance that would receive the highest scores might include:

- Teaching evaluation scores that consistently approach the highest possible rating; a pattern of very positive student comments; outstanding pedagogical achievement as indicated by high quality curriculum development, instructional innovations, exceptional mentoring, teaching award, or other indicators of sustained excellence.

- Assumption of significant and effective leadership roles in essential service activities at multiple levels (professional, university, college, or school), as negotiated by the individual faculty member with the dean or the director. Significant professional service might include serving as program chair at a regional or national meeting or frequent and consistent participation in reviewing for professional journals.

High scholarly performance might include:

- Model I: publication of two or more papers in recognized high-quality journals or of a paper and a peer-reviewed book chapter; or

- Model II: publication of a book by a recognized high-quality press; or

- Model III: receipt of a grant submitted to an external agency where the individual is the sole or lead investigator and one peer-reviewed publication.

### X. Post Tenure Review

Post-tenure reviews will be conducted by the director, based in part on recommendations by the Personnel Committee.  In SBS, the review will be conducted at the same time as the annual performance review.  Detailed criteria and procedures for post-tenure review are articulated in the NCIAS by-laws (Article IVC) and university documents (ACD 506-11).  In cases of unsatisfactory review, the candidate may appeal in writing to the Dean.  Criteria for unsatisfactory performance are as documented above.

## XI. Amending the By-laws

The process of amending the School by-laws will require these steps:

1. Changes in the by-laws must be initiated by a petition signed by a minimum of 20 percent of the full-time faculty. The petition shall be submitted to the director at least ten days prior to the next faculty meeting.

2. The director shall circulate the petition to the faculty at least five days prior to the faculty meeting at which it will be discussed and voted on.

3. Faculty shall vote on the petition/changes to the by-laws.

Amendments to the by-laws require a majority (50% + 1) of votes by all eligible tenured/tenure-track SBS faculty to pass.

Following ACD 111-02, amended by-laws would then need to be reviewed by the Dean, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, and the Office of General Counsel prior to final approval.