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# **000 INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL**

The University College (hereafter referred to as "UC ") Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual provides information for UC [faculty](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#facultymember) and [academic professionals](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#academicprofessional) and their [administrators](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#administrator) on academic organizations, governance, and personnel. This information applies directly to faculty, faculty with administrative [appointments](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#Appointment), academic professionals, and academic professionals with administrative appointments.

This manual is intended to be consistent with the [Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual (ACD)](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html) and the Board of Regents' [*Conditions of Faculty Service*](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-201-Conditions%20of%20Faculty%20Service.pdf)and [*Conditions of Service for Academic Professionals*](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-302%20Conditions%20of%20Service%20for%20Academic%20Professionals.pdf), the policies under which faculty and academic professionals at the College are employed.

Whenever federal or state law, the Board of Regents, or the president of ASU makes revisions in policy, the Dean of University College's Office will issue revisions to this manual.

Corrections, changes, or suggestions should be communicated to the manager of Academic Services at UCAcademicServices@asu.edu.

In the event of an inconsistency or conflict, applicable law and Board of Regents' policies supersede university policies, and university policies supersede College or lower-unit bylaws, policies, or guidelines.

For the purpose of this manual the following definitions should be considered standard:

University College will be abbreviated as UC. Any mention of “days” means working calendar days excluding ASU recognized holidays.

UC reserves the right to add, amend, or revoke any of the contained [rules](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#rule), policies, regulations, and instructions or incorporate additional ones, with notice, as circumstances or the College community's good may require.

**100 INTRODUCTION**

*Revised:*

### **PREAMBLE**

The University College policy and procedure manual is intended to provide the structural framework and operational policies and procedures for University College's academic units at Arizona State University. These rules are considered the permanent rules under which University College and its academic units operate according to [ACD 111-02](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd111-02.html).

### **ARTICLE I. Mission Statement and Design principles**

Using a design culture to accelerate positive social outcomes through cutting edge technological innovation and scalability:

* We design personalized learning experiences to end achievement disparities for students of all backgrounds.
* We design for an integrated work and learning future.
* We design services to support learners at scale by using design thinking, analytics, automation, and intelligent systems.

The design principles utilized by University College are:

* Learners First – Begin with a focus on the learner's needs.
* Be Bold – The problems we are working on demand it.
* Simplify – Remove the unnecessary.
* Personalize – 1:1. Connect. Care. Create value for the learner.
* Collaborate – Radically. We are in this together.

### **ARTICLE II. Committees**

A. Standards and Appeal Committee

The Standards Committee's primary function is to review petitions from students in any UC program and make a recommendation to the University Standards Committee. The committee's goal is to help ensure that students are treated fairly and that they have every reasonable opportunity to succeed. The committee shall consist of at least five members. Committee members shall hold two-year staggered terms. Eligible members of the Standards Committee include academic success specialists and other advising staff and contract or tenured/tenure-track faculty from all campuses where UC offers academic programs. The Dean of UC will appoint members to the standards committee.

The committee should meet monthly. Each meeting should occur at least two weeks before the University Standards Committee's monthly meeting because petitions regarding any university standard will need to be forwarded with UC recommendations to the University Standards Committee. In emergency situations (e.g., if the decision will determine whether a student may register for classes in a term that begins that week), the Standards Committee may conduct its business electronically.

The standards committee's secondary function is to address concerns that may arise from students enrolled in University College courses who submit appeals due to the belief that they have been unfairly or improperly graded or accused of an issue involving academic integrity.

In all instances, the Dean of University College retains the ability to provide alternative decisions as noted within applicable university policy involving academic integrity or grade appeals on courses that aren't mapped to an ASU major.

**Section 2. Other Committees**

Due to the size of the UC faculty group, the Dean of UC will appoint other committees as needed. The Dean of UC will attempt to include representation on such committees from each group affected by the committee's work. However, the Dean reserves the right to invite relevant ASU faculty and staff that are not employed by UC. The Dean of UC may appoint a committee chair or ask that the members elect a chair. Each committee chair is responsible for calling meetings and may be required to submit a report for the committee at the Dean of UC's request.

### **ARTICLE III. Amendments**

Amendments to this document can be submitted to the Manager of Academic Services at *UCAcademicServices@asu.edu*, which will be shared with the Dean of University College, who will develop a committee which includes representatives of the group affected by the suggestion. The committee will provide recommendations for the Dean's consideration, and they will approve or deny the suggested amendment.

**ARTICLE IV. UC Structure and Administration**

**Section 1. UC Structure**

In accordance with ACD 505-02, UC is led by a Dean and consists of faculty members who are appointed to departments that may include degree-granting and non-degree-granting levels of academic instruction. UC consists of both academic and service units. Each academic Unit is led by a Director who may assist all persons with a teaching, administrative, or research appointment within the area. Each Unit may establish internal committees, policies, or procedures through which the Unit may function within the range of its authority and responsibility. In the absence of unit-level documents, college level documents will take precedence under the UC dean’s direction. No Unit - level policies or procedures may conflict with those of UC, Arizona State University, or the Arizona Board of Regents.

**Section 2. University Senators**

The number of the college’s university senators is determined by the rules of the constitution and bylaws of the university senate, which is empowered by the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 112-01](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd112-01.html). When it has been determined that UC is eligible for representation in the University Senate as outlined in the university senate constitution and bylaws (*Article II.A.1. & II.A.1.f),* the college’s university senator(s) shall be elected from among the current college-voting faculty as defined in ACD 112-01 section I.A. Each senator’s primary duties will be to attend university senate meetings, represent the college to the senate, and report on issues of importance to the college faculty. University senators should be elected by May 1 for a term beginning the next academic year.

**ARTICLE V. Faculty Responsibilities**

UC encourages their faculty members to achieve a healthy balance in their commitments to academic activities, which includes teaching, service and research/creative activity appropriate to rank and job title. Such activities are considered integral parts of the university’s mission and purpose. All members of UC share in the responsibility for their success. The faculty is responsible for the quality of the instructional programs and for making curricular decisions within the context of university initiatives. General responsibilities of the faculty are outlined in Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201, *Conditions of Faculty Service*.

UC’s faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the College community by working to achieve both individual goals and UC/faculty goals. It is the responsibility of the faculty heads to ensure that workloads are appropriately negotiated with faculty and allocated.

The faculty may be responsible for conducting substantive reviews of their peers’ performance annually. The reviews will be in keeping with the goals and objectives of UC and according to the framework and criteria described in Appendix A, College-wide Guidelines for Annual Review. Annual reviews will be used as input on contract renewal decisions. Each Unit within UC will decide how to review its non-faculty academic appointees (e.g., faculty associates, teaching assistants, or associates, course managers and course coordinators).

**ARTICLE VI. Parliamentary Authority**

This policy and procedure manual provides the organization by which UC may function within the range of its authority and responsibility, as prescribed by state law, Arizona Board of Regents policies and Arizona State University’s Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures (ACD policies). If any policy or procedure in this manual should be found to conflict with policies or procedures of Arizona State University or the Arizona Board of Regents, the policies and procedures of the latter two bodies shall take precedence.

**200 PERSONNEL POLICIES FOR CONTRACT FACULTY**

*Revised:*

Contract faculty in University College refers to faculty who are not tenure-track and have fixed-term appointments, e.g., clinical faculty, research faculty, academic professionals, instructional professionals, lecturers, instructors and faculty associates.

Section 200 deals primarily with policies and procedures for the promotion of contract faculty. For further details on promotion of contract faculty and promotion file contents, see ACD 506-05 Faculty Personnel Actions: Faculty Promotion and Process and P6, Process Guide for Promotion and Fixed Term Faculty. The date when promotion files are due in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University is specified annually in the schedule of personnel actions released by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

**201: Contract Faculty—Lecturers**

Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers are nontenured, nontenure-track faculty members whose responsibilities, as defined by the Dean of UC, may include teaching graduate, undergraduate, or clinical courses, or supervising supplemental kinds of student learning as defined by the supervising Dean of UC. Lecturers are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

**201-01: Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

A senior lecturer typically holds a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and has a minimum of five years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience (ACD 505-02). The lecturer’s request for promotion is not based on time in rank, and the candidate must meet all conditions and include all materials specified in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, ACD 506-05.

The five years of college-level experience should be a full-time faculty appointment. College-level teaching experience must have occurred at an accredited university or college. Faculty members can apply for promotion to senior lecturer in their fifth year. For those who have three or more years of a successful full-time faculty appointment before coming to ASU, requests for promotion to senior lecturer typically can be made during their second year at ASU.

Lecturers requesting promotion to senior lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of excellence in teaching and service. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in ACD 506-05 and P6, Process Guide for Promotion and Fixed Term Faculty.

The UC personnel committee reviews the materials for contract faculty that includes academic Unit Directors or Director’s designee; and the Dean of UC. The recommendations are forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, evidence of equity-conscious pedagogical practices, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction.

*Other possible indicators might include:*

* Peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials
* Student evaluations
* Participation in teaching workshops
* Teaching awards and honors.

Candidates may provide evidence of outstanding student mentoring to help advance the overall mission of UC.

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Service to the university is assessed in terms of contributions to the work of the academic unit, college and university and its impact on the well-being of UC and Arizona State University. Peers and faculty heads assess contributions to fostering diversity and inclusiveness, recruitment and retention of students, faculty governance, collegial working environments, and professional behavior.

The evaluation of public/community service is based on the quality of the service rendered, its applicability to the candidate’s teaching responsibilities, the quality, and relevance to the academic unit's mission, and the value of that service from the perspective of the community organization or partner. The quality of service to the academic profession is assessed in terms of its overall value for the national distinction of UC, the significance of the recognition brought to the individual and the university and the impact of the service on the field.

**201-02: Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer**

A principal lecturer typically holds an appropriate doctorate or terminal degree and has a minimum of seven years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience (ACD 505-02). Normally, candidates for principal lecturer will have been at the rank of senior lecturer for three years full time or more. However, the request for promotion is based not on time in rank or years of service but rather on exceptional teaching, service and leadership. Senior lecturers requesting promotion to principal lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of exceptional teaching, service and leadership. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from senior lecturer to principal lecturer by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in ACD 506-05 and P6, Process Guide for Promotion and Fixed Term Faculty.

The materials are reviewed by the UC personnel committee for contract faculty that includes academic unit Directors or Director’s designee; and the Dean of UC. The recommendations are forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, evidence of equity-conscious pedagogical practices workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction.

*Other possible indicators might include:*

* Peer or supervisory evaluation of teaching performance and materials
* Student evaluations
* Participation in teaching workshops
* Teaching awards and honors.

Principal lecturers should have a distinguished, sustained, recognized record of exceptional contributions to discipline-based or interdisciplinary instructional content, teaching modalities, technologies, or outcome determined by student success. Candidates may provide evidence of outstanding student mentoring to help advance the overall mission of UC.

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Service to the university should be assessed in terms of contributions to the work of the academic unit, Colleges and university and its impact on the well-being of UC and the University. Peers and faculty heads assess contributions to fostering diversity and inclusiveness, recruitment and retention of students, faculty governance, collegial working environments, and professional behavior. The evaluation of public/community service is based on the quality of the service rendered, its applicability to the candidate’s teaching responsibilities, the quality and relevance to the academic unit's mission, and the value of that service from the perspective of the community organization or partner. The quality of service to the academic profession is assessed in terms of its overall value for the national distinction of UC, the significance of the recognition brought to the individual and the university, and the impact of the service on the field. Principal lecturers should have a distinguished, recognized record of exceptional service to the university, the community and the profession to develop or supervise practice components of degree programs or to perform other duties that the Dean of UC determines will significantly enhance clinical/ professional learning and advance the goals of the assigned academic unit or program in a substantial way. Multiple-year appointments must be approved by the Provost.

1. **Scholarship/Professional Development**—Evidence of continued professional development in relevant areas of the position. Efforts to keep abreast of current developments in areas of responsibility. Development of new capabilities, methods, and procedures, new knowledge, and/or instrumentation in area(s) of responsibility. Collaboration with faculty and students in facilitating, carrying out, and/or documenting innovative research, teaching, peer mentoring, supervision and/or service activities. Research, publications, presentation at conferences and grant writing. In general, these activities represent a commitment to the profession or the discipline beyond the daily duties of the position.

2. **Service**—Use of professional expertise to serve the interests of university college students (such as exploratory students), unit, university, community, discipline, and/or higher education. It is also recognized that some faculty may have greater opportunities for service than others.

**202 - Multi-Year Contracts for Contract Faculty**

ABOR and the Provost’s Office determines multi-year contracts’ eligibility criteria. Senior and Principal Lecturers, as well as Clinical Associate or Clinical Professors, are eligible for Multi-Year (MY) or Rolling Multi-Year (RMY) Contracts. Conditions for multi-year contracts are clarified periodically by the Provost’s Office in accordance with the ACD manual. ABOR limits the number of MY/RMY appointments to no more than 15% of the number of tenure-track/tenured faculty at that university.

*The Provost’s Office has established that:*

* Those at the Senior Lecturer or Clinical Associate Professor rank are eligible to apply for MY appointments. Lecturers and Clinical Assistant Professors seeking promotion may apply for MY appointments at the same time.
* Those at the rank of Principal Lecturer or Clinical Professor are eligible to apply for RMY appointments. Senior Lecturers and Clinical Associate Professors seeking promotion may apply for RMY appointments at the same time.

*Information that should be provided:*

* Name, current academic rank and unit of the person in question;
* Requested effective date of the new appointment;
* Explanation of how this person is uniquely qualified for a multiple-year appointment;
* Explanation of what unit need is being served by moving this person to a multiple-year appointment;
* Explanation of how budget flexibility will be preserved after the multiple-year appointment begins;
* Further evidence, if any, that this is a compelling need.

The Unit, Dean and Provost must approve all such appointments.

**300 ANNUAL REVIEW OF CONTRACT FACULTY—ALL LECTURERS/INSTRUCTORS** *Revised:*

The Arizona Board of Regents requires all Arizona State University faculty to be reviewed annually. The results of the annual review are tied to salary increases based on merit when funds for merit raises are available. Faculty members must turn in materials required for annual review to be eligible for merit pay. The following procedures outline the annual review process for all contract faculty teaching in UC.

It is the responsibility of the Directors to ensure that faculty workloads are appropriately managed and allocated.

The review process, in general, is designed to incorporate an element of peer review. Though it is recognized that the various Units within UC are in the best position to review their faculty, the compositions of some Units may be too small to provide for peer committee levels of review. Units will decide by consensus when they have sufficient numbers of full-time faculty to establish a faculty-level committee to conduct their peer reviews with procedures that mirror those in this document (adapted, where appropriate, with approval).

Units with insufficient faculty to establish their own faculty-level committee will invite appropriate faculty members from other units within UC to assist with the peer-review process.

**301: Outline of Procedures**

The Faculty-level Review Committee will forward faculty materials and recommendations for review scores to the Director by the date designated each year. The Faculty-level Review Committee’s performance evaluations and recommendations for ratings to the Director must consider the previous two calendar years’ activities per ACD 506-10, which states that annual reviews should cover the last 36 months, with substantial emphasis on the current year. A quorum of Faculty-level Review Committee members must be present to decide the recommendations for ratings. (Thus, if one person is absent, the others can decide on all faculty members except other Faculty-level Review Committee members. When a Faculty- level Review Committee member steps out to be reviewed, the others must be present to have a quorum.) In cases where there is not a majority vote (equal numbers disagree and agree), the split will be reported as is to the faculty head.

At the end of the evaluation period, the Director prepares and delivers to each faculty member a letter about his/her evaluation with the accompanying scores in each area and the overall evaluation rating. The faculty member’s materials also are returned at this time.

Reflective on the mentoring relationship between the faculty member and director, a meeting between the parties is suggested (but not required). Either party may request such a meeting, and if requested, these meetings should be held before the end of the semester.

**302: Evaluation Criteria and Calculations**

Teaching, training and supervision, administration, and service scores for all contract faculty will be determined from a series of sample indicators (rubrics) found in Appendix A. These materials are intended to aid faculty members and evaluators in interpreting the instructional, training and supervision, administration and service contributions of each faculty member during the period under evaluation. Faculty are encouraged to review each area’s indicators within their ASU Vita before filling out the Faculty Annual Report so that evaluators may use the report as an evidentiary guide to arrive at their ratings. Likewise, evaluators are encouraged to exercise the best professional judgment in their assessments. In all cases, emphasis should be placed on the most recent year’s activities, but these are contextualized by the two previous years’ accomplishments.

The annual review rating functions as a summary of the faculty member’s performance and as such, may be used by the Dean of UC and Director to determine merit award distributions, term renewals, and promotions in rank for clinical faculty. Details for the calculation of annual review scores and ratings are discussed in the next section.

**302-01: Lecturers and Instructors**

The general assumption is that all lecturers in UC will have an 80 percent teaching (75% instructional contributions; 5% student evaluations)/20 percent service load, both of which rely upon active and consistent professional development activities. Faculty-level committees or directors will evaluate progress in these areas by calculating separate scores for teaching, student evaluations, and service.

All instructors in UC will have a 100 percent teaching load, which relies upon active and consistent professional development activities. Faculty-level committees or directors will evaluate progress in this area by calculating separate scores for instructional contributions (95%) and student evaluations (5%).

These scores will be combined in a weighted calculation to arrive at an annual review score that corresponds to a yearly review rating (see section 502-03). The annual review rating functions as a summary of the faculty member’s performance and as such, may be used by the Dean of UC and Director to determine merit award distributions and faculty promotions, respectively.

**302-02: Determination of Annual review score**

Annual review scores will be determined from a series of indicators found in UC Criteria for Annual Review rubrics (see Appendix A). As described below, the student evaluation score will be converted from statistical summaries of student course evaluations. The rubrics and summaries together are intended to aid faculty members and evaluators in interpreting the instructional and (as appropriate) service contributions of each faculty member during the period under evaluation. Specifically, the indicators in UC Criteria for Annual Review rubrics should be applied in a context-dependent manner to reflect the best pedagogical practices of the subject matter being taught (e.g., best laboratory practices in the sciences, best classroom practices in language classes), though not all indicators need to be satisfied to achieve or assign a given rating. Faculty are encouraged to review each area’s indicators before filling out the Faculty Annual Report so that evaluators may use the report as an evidentiary guide to arrive at their ratings. Likewise, evaluators are encouraged to exercise the best professional judgment in their assessments. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, class size, percentage of enrolled students completing evaluations, upper versus lower-division courses and whether the course is required. In all cases, emphasis should be placed on the most recent year’s activities, but these are to be contextualized by the two previous years’ accomplishments.

**Teaching**: Overall teaching evaluation scores (the instructional contribution score; 75% for Lecturers, 95% for instructors) will take into account the following indicators (exclusive of student evaluations, which are calculated separately, as indicated below): effective teaching, curriculum development, professional development activities that enhance teaching, rigor, and quality of courses taught, whether courses taught were requirements or electives, class size (see Appendix A). Written comments from student course evaluations may be considered here as well.

**Student Evaluations:** Student evaluation scores (5% for Lecturers, 5% for Instructors) are calculated from scores that we receive from student course evaluations, which are based on a five-point scale (5=highest score, 1=lowest score). The average score from the course evaluations will correlate to the rating as indicated in the below chart.

**Average Range and Evaluation Score:**

| Range |  Rating Correlation |
| --- | --- |
|  4.51-5.00 |  (5) Significantly Above Average |
|  4.01-4.50 |  (4) Above Average |
|  3.51-4.00 |  (3) Average |
|  3.01-3.50 |  (2) Below Average |
|  Less than 3.0 |  (1) Significantly Below Average |

[**Link to Pre Configured spreadsheet for review scores**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1l2uGmf8oPyaCpIZSneYmMWJq5AAh2_Im6528h-Pv4Vk/edit?usp=sharing)

**Service (for faculty with service commitments)**: Overall service evaluation scores (20 percent of total score) will consider the following indicators: professional service and professional development activities that provide service to the profession as approved by chair/director. See Appendix A.

The annual review score will be calculated according to the following examples (note that the weighing factors applied to the Teaching and Converted Student Evaluation scores combined, account for the 80 [Lecturers] or 100 [Instructors] percent load attributed to teaching-related contributions):

**General Formula-Lecturers Specific Example**

Teaching Score = 0.75 (75% instruction) \*4.00 (rating score from Appendix A) = 3.00

+

Converted Student Evaluation Score = 0.05\*1 (Rating Correlation) = .05

+

Service Score = 0.20\*2.00 (rating score from Appendix A) = .40

Annual Review Score **3.45**

**General Formula-Instructors Specific Example**

Teaching Score = 0.95\* 3.00 (rating score from Appendix A) = 2.85

+

Converted Student Evaluation Score = 0.05 \* 4 (Rating Correlation) = .2

+

Annual Review Score **3.05**

[**Link to Pre Configured spreadsheet for review scores**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1l2uGmf8oPyaCpIZSneYmMWJq5AAh2_Im6528h-Pv4Vk/edit?usp=sharing)

*Notes:* While it appears we are using a strict algorithm for determining the overall performance rating, there may be a divergence from it. The Director can adjust an overall rating to better reflect all aspects of faculty work, not necessarily as a mathematical combination of the ratings received in teaching, student evaluations, and service. Thus, the formula above and the guidelines listed below suggest the rating boundaries, but do not rigidly define them. In some cases, it may also be necessary to alter the 80/20 load distribution for Lecturers; the Director and the faculty member should determine these alterations, ideally in advance of the academic year. This will assist the Director in evaluating performance in relation to the distribution of agreed-upon effort. Should opportunities or obstacles arise that would suggest altering that agreement, both parties would discuss this to do so. Faculty on joint and/or affiliated appointments will be evaluated according to the provisions of their Joint Appointment Memorandum of Understanding.

*Remark for Faculty Members with Administrative Responsibilities:* Faculty members who perform ongoing administrative services for UC and are not compensated with supplemental payment will have reduced requirements in other departmental work areas. Their administrative work should be documented and will be evaluated by the faculty head. The individual should report teaching and service activities on their Faculty Annual Report as performance in teaching and service are subject to the same standards as all other faculty. Thus, the Faculty-level Review Committee would review those with administrative loads as they would any other (assigning simple teaching and service scores, but taking into account the time and energy spent on administrative duties) and the resulting score would be combined with the evaluation of administrative work made by the Director according to the predetermined proportions. For example, someone with a 50-percent administrative load would be evaluated by his/her administrative supervisor for that work. The faculty member’s other 50 percent (dedicated to teaching and service) would be evaluated by the Faculty-level Review Committee as indicated below and those two scores would be combined to get an annual review score.

**403: Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging Principles**

Per ACD 506-10, the Faculty-level Review Committee and the Director will also be guided diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging (DEIB) efforts in the evaluation process. Those faculty members contributing actively to DEIB aims of UC and the University in their pedagogical, research, creative, professional development and service activities should note these contributions appropriately.

**404: Appeal Process**

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her annual review scores and/or rating must notify their Director in writing within 30 working days (summer excluded) of receiving evaluation results. The faculty member may submit additional information with his/her notification as deemed necessary. Faculty should also be mindful of dates for bringing grievances to the University level (see ACD 509-02 and P17 ASU Policies and Procedures).
2. The faculty member will meet with the Director and a member of the Faculty-level Review Committee (typically the committee chair, unless precluded for some reason). If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.
3. In the event of such an appeal, a three-person ad hoc Committee of Review will be appointed from UC Assembly, excluding the Director and members of the Faculty-level Review Committee. The appellant, the director, and the Dean of UC each will select one member of the Committee of Review. At the beginning of its deliberations, the Committee of Review will meet with the chair of the Faculty-level Review Committee to obtain information regarding the context of the evaluation in question, but then will excuse the chair and conduct its own independent review. The Committee of Review then will submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the faculty head.
4. The Director will consider all evidence to determine whether to amend or retain the original performance evaluation. The appellant maintains all rights to file a grievance following the completion of this appeal procedure.
5. If the aggrieved faculty member still is not satisfied with the faculty head’s recommendation after having received input from the ad hoc committee, the faculty member may seek relief through UC faculty grievance process at the next higher level (Dean of UC). According to ACD 506-10 ―Annual Evaluations of Faculty, the request for such a review must be made within 30 working days (summer excluded) after the individual receives the faculty head’s final written evaluation. The final decision lies with the Dean of UC, who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (summer excluded) after it is requested. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member. There are no procedures for additional appeals or hearings.

**500 STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES**

*Revised:*

Students who are enrolled in a University College course and believe they have been unfairly or improperly graded may be assured of just treatment and fair consideration through the processes described in this document. Any such grievance must be started within the regular semester immediately following the course at issue, whether the student is enrolled in the university or not.

The grievance procedures do not deal with matters that properly belong in personnel proceedings.

**501: Primary Procedures**

1. Initially, the aggrieved student should communicate with the faculty member concerned and discuss the problem openly.
2. If this discussion does not result in a satisfactory resolution, the student may appeal in writing, providing documentation to the Director to resolve the grievance.

**502: Secondary Procedures**

1. If the area’s procedures have not successfully cleared the grievance, the student may make a written request to the Director that the grievance be referred to the office of the Dean. The Dean (or designee) will recommend whether an academic grievance hearing is warranted.
	1. The Dean (or designee) may request any additional documentation to determine whether an academic grievance hearing is warranted. The student and faculty member shall have at least fourteen (14) days to provide that documentation.
	2. Upon review the Dean (or designee) will either deny the request for a hearing or recommend a hearing be convened.
	3. If the Dean (or designee) recommends a hearing, the grievance will be referred to the UC standards committee. The committee will convene for the specific purpose of hearing the student's academic grievance. For grade appeals, 3 faculty committee members will hear the case. For cases involving academic integrity, the standards committee will hear the case.
2. If the Dean (or designee) refers the student grievance to UC Grade Appeal and Academic Integrity Committee and appoints a hearing committee chair, the chair or designee will:
	1. Notify the student that all further communication related to the grievance should be made with the chair of the panel.
	2. Forward a copy of the grievance to the faculty member against whom the grievance is filed and request the instructor to file an electronic copy of a written response with the panel chair within seven (7) days after receiving a copy of the grievance.
	3. Forward a copy of the student grievance and faculty response to the Director of the area offering the course and ask that administrator to provide an opinion on the case at hand to the committee within seven (7) days after receiving a copy of the two documents.
3. The committee chair or designee will:
	1. Forward copies of the grievance, the instructor’s response to the student, and the response from the Director to the other members of the panel.
	2. Schedule a hearing, which may consist of one or more meetings with the student and the instructor, to hear the positions of the student and instructor respectively, related to the grievance. The first meeting will be scheduled no later than 30 days after the panel chair receives the grievance.
4. If the student or instructor believes a member of the panel should not participate, based on perceived or actual bias or conflict of interest, the student or instructor may request, in writing, that the panel member be excused and the Dean (or designee) may appoint another member of the Grade Appeal and Academic Integrity Committee to serve on the hearing panel. If a designated committee panel member believes he or she has a bias or conflict of interest which would negatively impact the ability to decide the grievance fairly; then the panel member will excuse himself or herself, notify the Dean, and the Dean will appoint a new panel member.
5. The student and instructor may provide documents to the panel for review and consideration if three (3) copies of the documents are provided to the panel chair at least 10 days before the first scheduled date of the hearing. However, the panel chair will advise the student and the instructor that the panel will only consider documents that specifically relate to the grievance and response. The panel chair will retain one set of documents and forward the other two sets to the other two panel members at least seven (7) days before the hearing.
6. In keeping with the Family Education and Privacy Rights Act, if the grievance involves the grievant’s grade, other matters, or information contained in the grievant’s academic or educational records maintained by ASU, it is presumed that the student has consented to the review of such information by the filing of the grievance. In the event any information will be reviewed or provided to the panel related to grades or information contained in the educational records or academic files of students other than the grievant, such information is considered confidential under the Family Education and Privacy Rights Act and the panel shall proceed as follows:
	1. The panel will obtain the written consent of the students involved (other than the grievant) to review grades or information from their educational records; OR
	2. The chair of the panel will redact any identifying information such as names, social security numbers, addresses, and any other identifying information from the education records of the students involved (other than the grievant).
7. The panel chair’s hearing shall be conducted and closed. Participants may be accompanied by an advisor of their choice. Advisors may make an oral statement on behalf of, and confer with, their advisee. Advisors may not directly address the committee or other participants. Arrangements for the order of appearance, for submission of materials, testimony, and related matters should be made through and by the panel chair.
8. At the hearing, the grievant will present his or her position first and try to do so within 30 minutes, including the presentation of witness testimony and documentation. The chair may extend the time if necessary. The members of the panel may question the grievant during the presentations of their testimony. The instructor may question the student at the end of the presentation, but questioning should be limited to approximately 10 minutes or less. The chair may require the instructor to direct questions to the grievant through the chair.
9. The same process will be followed with the presentation of the instructor’s case.
10. All questions should be related to the specific allegations of the grievance or statements in the response and the chair has final authority to judge relevancy.
11. The chair of the panel will digitally record the hearing and the digital file will be maintained by University College for two years after the decision on the grievance is made. The student and/or instructor may record the meeting at their own expense and with their own equipment.
12. After the presentations of the grievant and instructor have concluded, each will be excused while the panel deliberates.
13. The chair of the panel shall prepare a written report with the recommendations of the majority of the panel for the Dean. If there is disagreement among the panel, a minority report and recommendation may be submitted by the dissenting panel member to the Dean. The report shall include:
	1. Identity of student grievant and instructor involved in the grievance.
	2. Date grievance and response were filed with the committee.
	3. Identity of the panel members who heard the grievance.
	4. The date the panel met to conduct the grievance.
	5. Summary of the positions of the student and instructor.
	6. Summary of the testimony and documents presented.
	7. Conclusions of the panel.
	8. Recommendations of the panel.
14. The Dean will take final action in each case after fully considering the hearing committee's recommendation. The Dean may make grade changes if any are recommended. The Dean (or designee) shall inform the student, the instructor, the appropriate faculty head, the registrar, and the grievance committee of any action taken.

**APPENDICES**

**(RUBRICS FOR FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW)**

**APPENDIX A:** Contract Faculty

*Revised:*

**APPENDIX A1-01: CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF ALL LECTURERS** *Revised:*

**CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

Faculty achieving a given level will exhibit the characteristics typical of those listed by category below. These characteristics provide general guidelines for performance, not an exhaustive list.

**Significantly Above Average (5.0)-Assumes fulfillment of merit Plus requirements**

Demonstrates high-quality teaching through all of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self-development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes, (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning)
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests)
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network)

And at least TWO of the following:

* Supervises research or projects (e.g., directs/codirects thesis, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Provides more than two extra learning opportunities for students (e.g., honors contracts, internships, service learning).
* Achieves widely recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching/supervision award at the local, state or national level.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy, or training in local, state or national professional venues.
* Leads professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course (e.g., converting a face to face course to hybrid or online delivery).
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for two or more colleagues.
* Instructional Team Leader overseeing multiple sections of students and instructors inside the classroom for one semester.
* Directs study abroad program.

**Above Average (4.0)-Assumes Fulfillment of Merit requirements**

Demonstrates high-quality teaching in two of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self- development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning).
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests).
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network)

*AND at least TWO of the following:*

* Supervises or participates in research or projects (e.g., serves as thesis committee member, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Provides two extra learning opportunities for students (e.g., honors contracts, internships, service learning).
* Achieves recognized teaching, such as receiving a local, state or national award or nomination for an award requiring multiple sources of support.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy, or training in local, state or national professional venues.
* Leads or attends significant professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course.
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for a colleague.
* Directs study abroad program.

**Average (3.0)-Assumes fulfillment of satisfactory requirements**

Demonstrates quality teaching, through at least two of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self-development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning).
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests).
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network)

*AND at least ONE of the following:*

* Supervises or participates in research or projects (e.g., serves as thesis committee member, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Achieves recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching/supervision award, or nomination for an award requiring multiple sources of support.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy in local, state or national professional venues.
* Attends professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course.
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for a colleague.
* Requests and receives a peer review of teaching
* Teaches a first-time prep or has three or more preps per semester.
* Directs study abroad program

**Below Average (2.0)**

Demonstrates acceptable teaching with pedagogically sound instructional practices including the following:

* Creates an environment of belonging and provides support to students.
* Provides an adequate learning environment.
* Distributes an appropriate syllabus (as defined by the Unit, Colleges and University) at the first meeting of the class.
* Meets with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.
* Incorporates context and functional area requirements (e.g., APA standards) into appropriate courses as defined by UC and the Unit's curricular missions.
* Incorporates library and computer resources into appropriate courses as defined by UC and the Unit's curricular missions.
* Being accessible to students according to university policy.
* Returns graded examinations and assignments and supervisory feedback in a timely manner.
* Posts final course grades in a timely manner.

**Significantly Below Average (1.0)**

* Demonstrates unsatisfactory teaching through many of these characteristics:
* Demonstrates poor quality teaching.
* Fails to meet satisfactory criteria detailed above.
* Violates the professional student-teacher relationship.

**CATEGORY 2. SERVICE**

Note: If job requirements match particular categories listed below, they should be weighed more heavily in evaluating performance. See ―Remark for Faculty Members with Administrative Responsibilities in the Procedures document.

**Significantly Above Average (5.0)**

Meets two of these at High Merit Level and at least two others at Merit Plus Level or higher.

* Committee Service—Makes vital service contributions to or takes a leadership role in University/Colleges. Colleges’ committees or community; membership often by faculty election or Dean appointment; serves on state, regional, national, or international committees.
* Community Outreach/Service—Takes leadership role in forging wide-ranging community partnerships.
* Administrative Service/Duties—Creates and/or implements new administrative programs or procedures or training and supervision techniques that benefit the unit, Colleges, university and profession.
* Mentoring—Participates in the quality review and improvement of mentorship models.
* Editorial Activities–Leadership role as Editor/Associate Editor of a peer-reviewed journal, edits a book with a scholarly press.
* Professional Development Activities—Disseminates new ideas in the discipline(s), through publications (e.g., invited to write a chapter in a widely used text or peer-reviewed journal article as lead author) and special recognition at conferences (e.g., invited keynote speaker). Submits and receives grants for teaching, training and supervision and/or community engagement.
* Other—At least one of the following: applies for and received community-based grants or awards, participates in special community projects; non-committee service to the profession at state, regional or national levels (e.g., officer in professional organization), etc. Leadership role as Editor/Associate Editor of a peer-reviewed journal, edits a book with a scholarly press.

**Above Average (4.0)**

Meets two of these at Merit Plus Level (or one at Merit Plus and one at High Merit level) and at least one at Merit Level.

* Committee Service—Makes meaningful contributions to time- consuming committees, with crucial roles.
* Community Outreach/Service—Initiates and develops community outreach activities.
* Administrative Service/Duties— Makes vital contributions to administrative programs or procedures or training and supervision techniques that benefits the unit, Colleges, university and profession.
* Mentoring—Initiates helping and mentoring colleagues in a structured and systematic manner; serves as external reviewer for promotion cases, awards.
* Editorial Activities – Serves on an editorial or textbook review board, edits thematic edition of a peer-reviewed journal.
* Professional Development Activities—Disseminates new ideas and content through seminars, conference presentations and workshops; publishes in peer reviewed journals as co-author; submits proposals for grants; development work promoting enhancement of teaching and student learning.
* Other—Applies for community-based grants and awards; non-committee service to the profession at the university level. Serves on an editorial or textbook review board, edits thematic edition of a peer-reviewed journal.

**Average (3.0)**

Meets at least three of these at Merit level (or two at Merit and one at Merit Plus or higher).

* Committee Service—Serves actively on Unit or Colleges’ committees with specific or purpose-driven functions; enhances faculty profile; volunteers for service such as convocation, etc.
* Community Outreach/Service—Actively and regularly participates in community outreach activities.
* Administrative Service/Duties—Actively participates in administrative programs or procedures or training and supervision techniques that benefit the unit, Colleges, university and profession.
* Mentoring—Contributes positively and regularly to the professional development of colleagues.
* Editorial Activities – serves as an Ad Hoc reviewer for conference abstracts, peer reviewed journals, reviews book proposals or manuscripts for scholarly press.
* Professional Development Activities—Shares knowledge with colleagues through formal and informal means (e.g., publishes in non- peer reviewed journal, book reviews). Collaborates on proposals and workshops.
* Other— serves as an Ad Hoc reviewer for conference abstracts, peer reviewed journals, reviews book proposals or manuscripts for scholarly press.

**Below Average (2.0)**

Meets at least three of these at Satisfactory level (or two of these if one meets Merit or higher).

* Committee Service—Serves actively on Unit or Colleges’ committees, participates in a supportive faculty environment, attends meetings, etc.
* Community Outreach/Service—Participates in community outreach activities.
* Administrative Service/Duties—Completes duties in a satisfactory manner.
* Mentoring—Contributes to the professional development of colleagues.
* Professional Development Activities—Attends workshop or conference related to discipline(s).

**Significantly Below Average (1.0)**

Demonstrates unsatisfactory service by:

* Failing to meet satisfactory criteria detailed within the servicer standards.
* Not completing professional service that benefits the community as it relates to the ASU Charter.

**APPENDIX A1-02: CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF ALL INSTRUCTORS**

**CATEGORY 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

Faculty achieving a given level will exhibit the characteristics typical of those listed by category below. These characteristics provide general guidelines for performance, not an exhaustive list.

**Significantly Above Average (5.0)-Assumes fulfillment of merit Plus requirements**

Demonstrates high-quality teaching through all of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self-development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes, (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning).
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests).
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network).

*And at least TWO of the following:*

* Supervises research or projects (e.g., directs/codirects thesis, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Provides more than two extra learning opportunities for students (e.g., honors contracts, internships, service learning) or mentoring of students (e.g., instructional aides).
* Achieves widely recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching/supervision award at the local, state or national level.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy, or training in local, state or national professional venues.
* Leads professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course (e.g., converting a face to face course to hybrid or online delivery).
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for two or more colleagues.
* Instructional Team Leader overseeing multiple sections of students and instructors inside the classroom for one semester.
* Directs study abroad program.

**Above Average (4.0)-Assumes Fulfillment of Merit requirements**

Demonstrates high-quality teaching in two of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self- development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning).
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests).
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network).

*AND at least TWO of the following:*

* Supervises or participates in research or projects (e.g., serves as thesis committee member, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Provides two extra learning opportunities for students (e.g., internships, service learning).
* Achieves recognized teaching, such as receiving a local, state or national award or nomination for an award requiring multiple sources of support.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy, or training in local, state or national professional venues.
* Leads or attends significant professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course.
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for a colleague.
* Directs study abroad program.

**Average (3.0)-Assumes fulfillment of satisfactory requirements**

Demonstrates quality teaching, through at least two of the following (documentation could be via qualitative or quantitative measure of student learning or outcomes, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi and assignments and self-development critical review):

* Designing instruction aimed to enhance learning outcomes (e.g., experiential learning activities, independent projects, community based learning projects, service learning).
* Measuring student learning outcomes (e.g., exam scores, performance on assignments, portfolios, and analysis of student work products, pre/post tests).
* Identifying strategies to enhance student success (e.g., engaging students in self reflection, overseeing peer group mentoring, support of student success initiatives in collaboration with other University College units like LEAD, Work+, AISSS, Student Success Center, Experiential Learning Network).

*AND at least ONE of the following:*

* Supervises or participates in research or projects (e.g., serves as thesis committee member, directs community engagement/service learning projects).
* Achieves recognized teaching success, such as receiving a teaching/supervision award, or nomination for an award requiring multiple sources of support.
* Presents or publishes innovations related to teaching pedagogy in local, state or national professional venues.
* Attends professional development opportunities related to teaching, pedagogy or training.
* Develops and successfully delivers a new course at the request of the Unit or Colleges or significantly redesigns an existing course.
* Acts as a peer reviewer of teaching for a colleague.
* Requests and receives a peer review of teaching
* Teaches a first-time prep or has three or more preps per semester.
* Directs study abroad program

**Below Average (2.0)**

Demonstrates acceptable teaching with pedagogically sound instructional practices including the following:

* Demonstrates support and respect to students (e.g., a letter of recommendation).
* Provides an adequate learning environment.
* Distributes an appropriate syllabus (as defined by the unit, Colleges and University) at the first meeting of the class.
* Meets with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.
* Incorporates context and functional area requirements (e.g., APA standards) into appropriate courses as defined by UC and the Unit's curricular missions.
* Incorporates library and computer resources into appropriate courses as defined by UC and the Unit's curricular missions.
* Being accessible to students according to university policy.
* Returns graded examinations and assignments and supervisory feedback in a timely manner.
* Posts final course grades in a timely manner.

**Significantly Below Average (1.0)**

Demonstrates unsatisfactory teaching through many of these characteristics:

* Demonstrates poor quality teaching.
* Fails to meet satisfactory criteria detailed above.
* Violates the professional student-teacher relationship.