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**I. Preamble**

The Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts (HIDA) *Policies and Procedures Manual* contains information regarding the regulations governing the actions of a large and diverse community of artists, designers, and scholars. The HIDA Academic Assembly functions within the range of its authority and responsibility as prescribed by the laws of the State of Arizona, the policies established by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR), including the Conditions of Faculty Service, and the policies established by Arizona State University (ASU), including the Arizona State University Academic Constitution and Bylaws, and the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual (ACD Manual).

In the event of an inconsistency or conflict, applicable law and Board of Regents’ policies supersede University policies, and University policies supersede the HIDA and school policies and procedures.

The University reserves the right to add, amend, or revoke any of the contained rules, policies, regulations, and instructions or incorporate additional ones, with or without notice, as circumstances or the good of the university community may require. The Academic Assembly, in accordance with the HIDA Bylaws and with Robert’s Rules of Order, may revise this document.

For University policy regarding post tenure review, see [ACD 506-11](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-11.html). Regarding performance improvement plan see [ACD 506-11](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-11.html); and regarding faculty appeals of annual evaluations, see [ACD 506-10](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html). Faculty grievance policies and procedures are addressed in ACD 509-01 and ACD 509-02**.** Procedures and policies for academic professionals in schools (and in the unit in the HIDA that is not a school) are similar to those for faculty, but there are no school faculty committees involved; see [ACD 507-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-05.html), [ACD 507-06](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-06.html), [ACD 507-07](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-07.html), [ACD 507-08](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-08.html), [ACD 507-09](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-09.html), ACD 509-01, and ACD 509-03 for policies and procedures for academic professionals.

**II. Personnel Committee**

***A. The HIDA Personnel Committee Purpose and Function***

The HIDA Personnel Committee fulfills the rights of the faculty as provided in [ACD 111](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd111-01.html) to make recommendations through the representative voting process on matters of the appointment, retention, and evaluation of faculty members and academic professionals as a part of the promotion, tenure, and the post-tenure review processes. The Personnel Committee also reviews and makes recommendations on faculty proposals for sabbatical leaves of absence.

***B. The HIDA Personnel Committee Membership***

1. Membership of the HIDA Personnel Committee is specified in the HIDA Bylaws.
2. Members may not serve concurrently on this committee and on any University or unit-level personnel committee ([ACD 111-01](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd111-01.html)).

**III. Promotion and Tenure**

This section describes the policies and procedures for review of tenure applications from tenure-eligible faculty members and promotion applications from tenure-eligible faculty members, tenured faculty members, clinical faculty members, lecturers, professors of practice, and research faculty members. Faculty membership, appointment categories, ranks and titles are defined in [ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html). Faculty members should consult the University Provost website for current guidance on the process for promotion or tenure, including the contents of the portfolio of materials to be submitted for review.

In carrying out its duty to make recommendations regarding applications for promotion and/or for tenure, the HIDA Personnel Committee will be bound by all relevant ABOR and ASU policies and procedures, and by the policies and procedures established by the HIDA. See [ACD 509-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd509-02.html) for information about grievances regarding tenure review.

The ASU university-level criteria for tenure are listed in [ACD 506-04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html), and the ASU university-level criteria for promotion to each rank are listed in [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html). Each School in the HIDA must develop and maintain school-level criteria for promotion and tenure specific to the discipline and for any sub-specialty of the discipline when appropriate. Each school must have specific promotion criteria for the specific rank sought by any candidate.

***A. School Committee for Promotion and Tenure***

Recommendations for tenure and/or promotion shall be prepared at the school level. School faculty members shall be involved in faculty tenure and/or promotion recommendations to the director of the school in one of the following three ways:

1. All faculty members at and above the rank to which the candidate would be promoted shall make tenure and/or promotion recommendations; or
2. A democratically elected committee, elected and operating by procedures set forth in the unit bylaws, shall make tenure and/or promotion recommendations; or
3. A combination of an elected committee and faculty votes may be used.

Each school shall decide in advance of any cases being considered which of the three procedures to use. In promotion and tenure cases, all voting members of the school committee must be tenured faculty. In cases where there are not enough senior faculty or an appropriately ~~diverse~~ representative committee, schools may appoint tenured faculty who are familiar with the discipline from other units at ASU to serve on a school personnel committee with the approval of the dean and University Provost. School bylaws shall specify which of these procedures it will use and which votes shall be communicated to the director of the school and the dean of the HIDA. Whichever procedure is selected, the director shall inform the dean in writing of the precise procedures and criteria used.

In the case of a non-tenure eligible faculty member coming forward for promotion, those deliberating or voting must be at the same or higher rank than the rank applied for by the faculty member (e.g., senior lecturers and principal lecturers may vote on candidates for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, but only principal lecturers may vote on candidates for promotion from senior lecturer to principal lecturer). Any tenured faculty member may vote on the promotion candidacy of a non-tenure eligible faculty member, consistent with the membership on the School’s elected committee or voting procedures as described above and in the School’s bylaws.

***B. Review Materials***

After the tenure and/or promotion process is initiated, the individual faculty member is responsible for submitting documentation and evidence necessary for a complete review, consistent with Provost requirements and including any specialized material required for review, to the school. Faculty should follow guidelines established by the Provost’s office, the HIDA, and in particular, the respective school. For review for tenure, evidence should focus on accomplishments while on tenure track at ASU; evidence of experience and accomplishments prior to appointment at ASU may also be included. but the focus for tenure should be on accomplishments while on tenure track.

For promotion to professor, evidence of experience and accomplishments prior to appointment at ASU may also be included.

In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the school director shall obtain evaluations from external reviewers outside of ASU. The candidate plays a role in building a list of possible external reviewers with the school director, following guidelines from the Provost’s office and the school policies. The director must consult with the dean or associate dean in determining the list of possible external reviewers. The list of external reviewers should be submitted to the Dean’s office by mid-April.

External reviewers are typically from aspirational peers or other highly respected institutions, but cannot have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate. Appropriate material about the school and from the candidate’s application is sent to the external reviewer by the school. All evaluations or letters from external reviewers must be included in the materials sent forward in every step of the review process.

In addition, the school director must develop material regarding the quality of teaching and effectiveness of instructional activity by the faculty candidate. Consideration of teaching effectiveness must include, but should not be limited to, course evaluations from students. The school director should contextualize student course evaluation scores.

***C. Procedure***

The school committee reviews all the material submitted by the faculty candidate and collected by the director, and makes a recommendation to the Director. A single report from the school committee must include the range of views of the faculty members participating in the recommendation. Each participating committee member must sign the report.

The school director will consider the evidence and the recommendations of the school faculty, and write a detailed report and recommendation to the HIDA Personnel Committee and the dean. In the case of joint appointments, where the appointment is across academic units, where one of the two units is a school within the HIDA, input from the partner unit outside of the HIDA is required. See [ACD 505-04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-04.html) for additional information about joint appointments.

The HIDA Personnel Committee shall make recommendations to the dean on all faculty tenure and/or promotion applications. The HIDA Personnel Committee considers all material forwarded by the school and the recommendations of the school faculty and director. A single report from the HIDA Personnel Committee must be prepared for each candidate and must include the range of views of committee members. Each participating committee member must sign the report.

The dean then reviews the material, and the recommendations from the school faculty, the school director, and the HIDA Personnel Committee. The dean’s recommendation together with the lower level recommendations is forwarded for review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost. The ASU President makes the final decision.

Prior to submitting the portfolio, recommendations, and other materials to the dean, the school director will provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the tenure and/or promotion case to the candidate based on the reviews at the school level. The dean will similarly provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case after review at the HIDA level prior to submission to the Provost. The candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration by written statement to the dean either after the director's review or after the dean's review. Per ACD 505-06, a person who is unsuccessful in seeking tenure generally is ineligible for rehire in any capacity at ASU.

**IV. Probationary Review**

Faculty members who are tenure track but have not yet received tenure are referred to as [probationary faculty](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html). In accordance with [ACD 506-03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), school directors will consult with school faculty and provide feedback annually to probationary faculty about their progress towards tenure. The school director provides a written summary of the feedback to the faculty member and the dean.

This feedback may occur at the same time and be based on the same material submitted for the annual performance review, but is distinct from the annual evaluation. in that it is prospective and reflects the school’s estimation of future promise, whereas the annual evaluation is retrospective and summative. A progress toward tenure review is both prospective – reflecting the school’s estimation of future promise – as well as retrospective – assessing achievements during the full probationary period. By contrast, the annual evaluation emphasizes accomplishments within the most recent three years (with emphasis on the most recent year), is not guided by the criteria for tenure, and generally does not attempt to assess long-range future potential for achievement.

In addition, probationary faculty members must receive a formal and more detailed probationary review midway through their probationary period. For faculty members appointed as assistant professors, this review is conducted during the third year and the tenure review is conducted no later than the sixth year. For faculty members appointed as non-tenured associate or full professors, the probationary review is conducted midway through the probationary period; if the probationary period is four years, the review occurs in the second year, but if the probationary period is five or six years, the review occurs during the third year. Faculty members interested in early consideration for promotion and/or tenure prior to their final probationary year should consult with their director about the possibility of applying for tenure prior to their final probationary year.

The purpose of the annual progress toward tenure review and of the formal, more detailed probationary review is to give a tenure-track faculty member multiple appraisals of the person’s progress toward earning tenure.

The formal probationary review at midway through the probationary period should closely resemble tenure review except that external reviewer letters are not required. The school committee, the school director, the HIDA Personnel Committee, and the dean must review materials prepared by probationary faculty members according to instructions received from the Provost.

The materials required of such faculty members closely resemble the Faculty Activities Report that faculty members submit for annual performance evaluation, but additional supporting materials or examples of research, creative activity and scholarship should be added. The University Provost’s website should be consulted for guidance on what the portfolio should contain and the details of the process. School procedures and instructions from school directors should guide probationary faculty members about the format of these additional materials to be submitted, in keeping with the faculty discipline. Faculty members should follow Provost guidelines carefully.

See [ACD 506-03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html) for further information about faculty probationary appointments, extension of probationary periods, probationary review, conditional retention, and termination. See [ACD 509-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd509-02.html) for information about grievances regarding probationary review.

**V. Annual Performance Evaluation**

1. ***Overview***

The Annual Performance Evaluation (hereafter “evaluation”) is a thorough review of an individual faculty member’s contributions through teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service. In accordance with [ACD 506-10](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html), each unit within the HIDA will conduct an evaluation of all faculty members and academic professionals with an appointment of 50 percent FTE or greater each year. Faculty members with less than a 50 percent FTE appointment may or may not be evaluated annually at the dean’s discretion. Faculty membership, appointment categories, ranks, and titles are defined in [ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html).

The evaluation must be conducted by faculty peer review and by the school director, with further review by the dean of the HIDA. Within the guidelines established by the university and ABOR policy, schools are to devise their own procedures as a part of the schools’ policies and procedures. The dean and the provost must approve school procedures for evaluation. The evaluation serves three purposes: to encourage faculty to establish goals for continued academic progress; to guide decisions about salary adjustments; and to institute the first step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty. Although the evaluation occurs annually, a 36-month review period is considered for purposes of compensation and post‑tenure review with substantial emphasis on the current year (ACD 506-10). The Annual Performance Evaluation is retrospective and is a process independent of the promotion and tenure process.

The school director is responsible for conducting the evaluations for all 50% FTE or greater faculty members whose Notice of Appointment indicates they are appointed as a as lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice, research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, per [ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html), and for ensuring that there is a process in place that includes peer review. The relative weights given to teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service in the evaluation are set by the annual responsibility assignment. Flexible responsibility assignment agreements for tenured faculty members will emphasize the different skills of each faculty, provided that these skills contribute to productivity and to achievement of the goals of the school and of the HIDA. Flexible responsibility assignment agreements may not be available to probationary faculty members, depending on school policies. The school director is also responsible for ensuring that all faculty members are knowledgeable about the evaluation criteria and that all who participate in the peer review process understand how the criteria are to be applied. Further, it is the director's responsibility to see that the annual evaluations are completed by the due date annually as defined by the dean’s office based on Provost office deadlines in each academic year.

The peer review must include evaluations of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service. Schools must devise the means by which thoughtful, meaningful evaluation can occur, and they must identify the data and/or observation on which such evaluations will be based.

1. ***The Ratings***

Through the evaluation process, separate ratings will be given to the faculty by the peer reviewers and the school director in each of three areas: teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service. An overall rating will also be given, combining the three area ratings weighted by the distribution of effort assigned to each.

Schools will use [five distinct ratings](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html): (5) exceptionally meritorious, (4) highly meritorious, (3) meritorious, (2) satisfactory, and (1) unsatisfactory. Ratings from the two prior years in each category of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, service, and overall must be included in the summary document provided with the director’s evaluation.

1. ***Definitions of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship, and Service***

The following definitions of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship, and Service provide a broad framework for the faculties and schools within the HIDA. More specific guidelines for each school and for areas within each school should be developed by the faculty of each school to provide additional guidance to faculty members. Such guidelines must be approved by the director of the school and by the dean of the HIDA.

1. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching and instructional activity shall broadly consider the ways in which a faculty member contributes in a professional manner to the engagement of students with their discipline in the school, the HIDA, the University, and the community. Teaching loads and course distributions for each faculty member are determined by the school director and faculty in consultation, who will consult with each faculty member regarding load and assignment. Teaching loads and course distributions are confirmed in writing annually using the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form modeled after the example appearing in Appendix A. Annual evaluations of teaching completed by faculty peer groups and school directors will consider both the quantity and quality of teaching/instructional performance, in the context of the faculty workload assignment as documented on the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form. Student evaluations of instruction must also be used in assessing performance in the area of teaching/instruction.

1. Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship

Research/creative activity/scholarship shall broadly encompass the ways in which a faculty member remains current with and contributes to his or her discipline. Research/creative activity/scholarship is regarded as the inquiry into and/or the production and transmission of knowledge discovery culminating in dissemination of that knowledge and/or outcomes of that research/creative activity/scholarship. Annual evaluations of research/creative activity/scholarship completed by faculty peer groups and school directors will consider both the quantity and the quality of performance in the context of the faculty workload assignment as documented on the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form.

1. Service

The evaluation of service shall broadly consider the ways in which a faculty member contributes to his or her professional expertise to the school, the HIDA, and ASU, to local, regional, national, and international communities, and to various other constituencies. As degrees of involvement in service activities may vary substantially, the faculty member must provide information addressing the scope of involvement in each activity cited. Annual evaluations of service completed by faculty peer groups and school directors will consider both the quantity and quality of performance in the context of the faculty workload assignment as documented on the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form.

Faculty members may provide a statement of diversity in the form of contributions to minority recruitment school and institute recruiting goals and/or cultural diversity. The statement of diversity This contributions statement may be incorporated as a category of its own, or may be included within any one of the other three categories.

General distinctions as to quality and quantity expected in each category of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service, as well as the value and significance of different kinds of research/creative activity/scholarship, and preferred methods of peer review of scholarship differ by disciplines within the Schools of the HIDA. Guidelines developed by the faculty of each school and included in the School’s Bylaws and Policies and Procedures documents should be consulted in each evaluation process. Such guidelines must be approved by the director of the school, the dean of the HIDA, and the University Provost.

***D. Evaluation Operational Principles***

1. Annual performance evaluation for each member of a School’s faculty:
	1. should cover the previous 36 months with substantial emphasis on the current year;
	2. must provide an assessment and rating of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service; and a summary assessment and rating that is weighted according to the distribution of effort;
	3. must include a distribution of effort based on a written agreement negotiated by the individual and the applicable workload assignment agreed upon by faculty member and the school director (as described in section V. C. 1 above) within school and ASU mission and guidelines, and recorded annually on the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form;
	4. must include a systematic assessment of student opinion as one, but not the only, component of assessment of teaching, as well as other feedback from students;
	5. may include a statement of activity towards school, HIDA, and ASU diversity and affirmative action goals;
	6. must be submitted to the Dean's office in a timely fashion according to the deadlines set each year by the Dean’s office based on deadlines set by the Provost.

2. The evaluation submitted to the dean’s office must include the following:

1. the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form for the calendar year under review;
2. a negotiated the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form for the next year;
3. the faculty peer group’s review and ratings;
4. and the school director's review and ratings.

***E. Evaluation Operational Procedures***

1. The school director, in accordance with procedures developed within the school, shall request annually that faculty members provide information documenting their efforts and achievements with respect to teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service based on their Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form and any suggestions for improvement from prior evaluations.

2. Faculty members are responsible for preparing all materials required by their school for their annual performance evaluation (see Appendix B). The school director notifies the faculty of what performance evaluation materials are needed and of the deadline for submission. The faculty peer group and director conduct the evaluation. If a faculty member fails to submit evaluation materials by the school deadline, the school director shall notify the faculty member of the missed deadline and allow an additional 10 days for the faculty member to submit an appropriate report. If a faculty member does not submit the required materials, the faculty member will receive an unsatisfactory rating the evaluation will be performed using materials on hand at the time of the deadline. Any appeal of the resulting rating must be based on the materials on hand at the time of the deadline.

If a faculty member is scheduled to be on sabbatical when the report and materials are due, the faculty member must submit the report and materials before the sabbatical leave begins. The faculty member then has Faculty members on sabbatical must submit annual evaluations by the deadlines. Faculty members on sabbatical leave have 30 days upon return from sabbatical leave to receive the evaluation and acknowledge receipt by signature.

3. Faculty who participate as [affiliated faculty](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-04.html) (see ACD 505-04) in another unit (department, center, institute, or program) or who hold a joint appointment must document their contributions to these programs. These contributions will be taken into account in the annual performance evaluation.

4. The faculty peer group described in the school bylaws and procedures receives the Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form and the information contained in Appendix B, Faculty Activities Report, documenting the faculty member’s performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service.

5. Based on the criteria set forth in the school’s policies and following the procedures developed within the school and the HIDA, the faculty peer will group complete their evaluation and rating for each faculty member and forward their decisions to the school director by written and signed report.

6. The school director makes an independent evaluation and rating of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service, and a weighted overall rating for each faculty member, and writes a report that comments on strengths, weaknesses, needed improvement, opportunities for growth, and expectations for future distribution of effort and performance.

7. Completed school evaluations are shared with the individual faculty member by the school director. The faculty member acknowledges receipt of the performance evaluation by signing the school director’s report. The entire performance evaluation is then forwarded to the HIDA dean. A faculty signature on the school evaluation does not indicate that the faculty member concurs with the director’s evaluation; a signature does start the 30 working day deadline for a faculty member to appeal the director’s evaluation to the dean (ACD 506-10, Appeals section).

**VI. Sabbatical Leaves**

Faculty members with tenure who have completed six years of full-time continuous service (since their last sabbatical) with the rank of assistant professor or higher at ASU are eligible to apply for [sabbatical leave](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd705.html) (assistant professors are eligible contingent on the awarding of tenure in their sixth year). Academic professionals with continuing status and six years of full-time continuous service at ASU are also eligible. A sabbatical leave is not deferred compensation and is not granted automatically, but is granted or denied on the merits of the proposal and the needs of the HIDA and ASU. A report addressing accomplishment of the purposes stated in the application for sabbatical leave is required after the sabbatical is completed in order to maintain the integrity of the process. See [ACD 705](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd705.html) for more information on activities allowed during sabbatical leaves, obligations to ASU during sabbatical leaves, duration and timing of sabbatical leaves, changes to approved sabbatical leaves, compensation and supplemental pay during sabbatical leave, and obligations upon return to service at ASU. Consult the Provost’s website for details on the process used for applying for sabbatical leave.

Faculty members considering applying for a sabbatical leave will discuss their intent with their school director before the end of the spring term in the academic year preceding the application for proposed sabbatical leave. In determining the eligibility of the faculty member for a sabbatical leave the school director will take into consideration the staffing needs for the various curricula of the school, and the potential changes to course offerings, teaching assignments, and schedules that will need to be made to accommodate the sabbatical leave.

Sabbatical application forms appear in this document as Appendix C. In addition to the application form, the faculty member will supply a brief (two page) description of the sabbatical project, current curriculum vitae, and a report of the outcomes of any prior sabbaticals. Supplementary materials may be provided under separate cover. Completed applications are due to the school director by the start of the academic year preceding the academic year for the proposed sabbatical leave. The director, at his or her discretion, may seek external consultation regarding the sabbatical application.

The faculty peer group will evaluate the sabbatical proposal and any supplementary materials. The school committee should evaluate the application according to: (1) the potential value to the school’s teaching programs, (2) probable enhancement of the applicant’s effectiveness as a member of the faculty, (3) potential value to the reputation of ASU, (4) contribution to knowledge in the discipline, and (5) the greatest possible service to the university. The faculty peer group will provide a written and signed recommendation to the school director.

The school director will consider the recommendation of the faculty peer group, evaluate the application and the school’s needs, and provide a written recommendation regarding the application to the dean’s office within 30 days after the beginning of the academic year before the requested leave. The director must also indicate in writing to the dean the ability of the school to cover the teaching and student supervisory needs of the school without additional funding.

The HIDA Personnel Committee will conduct an independent review of sabbatical applications. The review will include the sabbatical application, the recommendation of the faculty peer group, and the recommendation of the school director. The HIDA Personnel Committee will provide a written and signed recommendation to the dean.

The HIDA dean reviews sabbatical applications, including the recommendations of the faculty peer group, the school director, and the HIDA Personnel Committee. If the faculty peer group, school director, or HIDA Personnel Committee recommendation is to not approve the application, the applicant will be informed by the dean and provided an opportunity to respond within 10 days. If the applicant responds, the dean will consider the response as part of the application. The dean forwards recommendations for sabbaticals to the Provost.

No later than the end of the first semester after completing the sabbatical leave, the individual must submit a concise final report to the director (or supervisor) and to the dean addressing accomplishment of the purposes stated in the application for sabbatical leave. The dean will acknowledge the receipt of sabbatical reports and send a copy of that acknowledgment to the executive vice president and provost of the university. These reports will also form part of the file to be reviewed for future sabbatical application by the same faculty member.

Other leaves of absence are discussed in [ACD 701](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd701.html), [ACD 702-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd702-02.html), [ACD 702-03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd702-03.html), [ACD 702-04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd702-04.html), [ACD 703](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd703.html), [ACD 704-01](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd704-01.html), [ACD 706](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd706.html), [ACD 707](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd707.html), [ACD 708](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd708.html), and [ACD 710](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd710.html).

**VII. Curriculum Committee**

The HIDA Bylaws call for a Graduate Curriculum Committee and an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Membership on these committees is specified in the HIDA Bylaws.

***A. Graduate Curriculum Committee***

The Graduate Curriculum Committee reviews and evaluates existing and proposed curricula (new degree program proposals, current degree program modifications, disestablishment of degree programs; new concentration proposals, current concentration modifications, disestablishment of concentrations; new certificate program proposals, current certificate program modifications, disestablishment of certificate programs; new courses, course modifications, course deletions) for all graduate degrees and concentrations and graduate certificates in the HIDA and makes recommendations regarding for approval to the dean. As part of its examination, the committee will review new or revised curricula for duplication of or omissions in courses and programs.

Schools submit the required materials either via the course approval system for courses or to the associate dean for other curricular/program proposals. The associate dean forwards materials within four weeks to the Graduate Curriculum Committee for review during either the fall or spring semester. These reviews are conducted electronically when possible. Committee members have two weeks to provide feedback on the request and vote via email. Once the committee has finished its review, the associate dean reviews and takes appropriate action on behalf of the dean for the HIDA.

For the procedure regarding the role of the Graduate Curriculum Committee in student grievances, please go to section VIII of this document.

***B. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee***

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviews and evaluates existing and proposed curricula (new degree program proposals, current degree program modifications, disestablishment of degree programs; new concentration proposals, current concentration modifications, disestablishment of concentrations; new certificate program proposals, current certificate program modifications, disestablishment of certificate programs; new courses, course modifications, course deletions) for all undergraduate degrees and certificates in the HIDA and makes recommendations regarding for approval to the dean. As part of its examination, the committee will review new or revised curricula for duplication of or omissions in courses and programs.

Schools submit the required materials either via the course approval system for courses or to the associate dean for other curricular/program proposals. Advisors submit standards petitions on behalf of the student to the assistant associate dean for students success.

The associate dean forwards curricula materials within four weeks to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for review during the fall or spring semester. These reviews are conducted electronically when possible. Committee members have two weeks to provide feedback on the request and vote via email. Once the committee has finished its review, the associate dean reviews and takes appropriate action on behalf of the dean for the HIDA.

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee also reviews all undergraduate standards petitions for students wishing to substitute a course required for the degree with another, receive general studies credit for a course that does not carry the designation, take a course for the third time, follow an alternate catalog year, or pursue concurrent degrees.

The assistant dean for student success forwards standards petitions to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee at the beginning of each month during the fall or spring semester. These reviews are conducted electronically. Committee members have two weeks to provide feedback on the request and vote via email. Once the committee has finished its review, the assistant dean for student success reviews and takes appropriate action on behalf of the dean for the HIDA.

For the procedure regarding the role of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in student grievances, please go to section VIII of this document.

**VIII. Student Grievances**

***A. Introduction***

The Herberger Institute follows the [ASU grievance policy](https://catalog.asu.edu/index.php?q=appeal).

A grievance may be filed when a student feels he or she has been unfairly graded or has any other academically-related complaint against a faculty member. The student should first follow an informal procedure, as indicated below. If the problem is not resolved informally, the student may then follow the formal grievance procedure. A grievance must be filed by the last day of classes in the semester following the semester in which the alleged grievance occurred. Grievances concerning incidents occurring in the fall semester must be filed by the last day of classes in the spring semester. Grievances concerning incidents occurring in the spring semester or any summer session must be filed by the last day of classes of the following fall semester. Formal appeals cannot be processed during the summer months or recognized breaks in the University calendar vacation periods.

***B. Informal Procedure***

1. Students with grievances should first consult with the faculty member in an effort to resolve the problem. If the student justifiably fears reprisal or mistreatment might arise from speaking with the faculty member directly, this step should be skipped.

2. If this meeting does not result in a satisfactory resolution of the problem or if the student justifiably fears reprisal or mistreatment as described above, the student may next consult the director of the school or other appropriate chair or coordinator of the area within the school (if any), who should advise the student of the availability of an ombudsperson (<https://provost.asu.edu/committees/oc>) to assist in the resolution of the matter.

3. If no resolution is reached at this level the student may then confer with the associate dean for student success in the HIDA, who will review the case. If no resolution is achieved, the assistant dean will refer the case to the appropriate HIDA Curriculum Committee.

***C. Formal Appeals Procedure***

If no resolution is achieved through the Informal Appeals Procedure described in the previous section, the student may initiate a Formal Appeals Procedure described herein by contacting the associate dean for student success and notifying the associate dean in writing that he or she desires a formal appeal of a grievance.

The associate dean (dean) will notify the student (grievant) and the faculty member (if the grievance is against a faculty member) of the request for a formal appeal, and appoint the appropriate Grievance Committee.

A panel of three will act as a Grievance Committee for a Formal Appeal of a grievance by a student. The dean will appoint two faculty members from the appropriate curriculum committee to the Grievance Committee. The third member of the panel will be a student appointed by the dean. The Grievance Committee will elect a chair from the faculty membership.

The dean will notify both parties of membership of the Grievance Committee, and will also notify both parties that a formal grievance hearing does not constitute a formal legal procedure.

The student who is grieving and the respondent faculty member (if the grievance is against a faculty member) will have one opportunity to request the withdrawal of no more than one member of the Grievance Committee. In addition, members of the Grievance Committee will be given the opportunity to recuse themselves. If a faculty committee member withdraws, another member of the appropriate curriculum committee will be appointed by the dean to replace that member. In the event of the withdrawal of the student member of the committee, the dean will appoint a replacement.

The formal grievance then proceeds as follows:

1. The student grievant will submit a written statement of the grievance to the chair of the Grievance Committee. Copies of the statement will be distributed to the faculty member involved in the grievance, the members of the Grievance Committee, and the dean.
2. Subject to the limitations noted above in section VIII.A, within fourteen calendar days of receipt of the grievance, the respondent faculty member must submit a written response to the chair of the Grievance Committee that will be distributed to the members of the Grievance Committee, the student, and the dean.
3. Within fourteen calendar days of the distribution of the faculty member's reply, a meeting will be held to consider the grievance. Both parties in the grievance will have the opportunity to present their positions to the committee in person and/or in writing. The student grievant and the respondent faculty member should be present throughout the meeting(s) in order to allow for immediate response to testimony. The student grievant will appear before the committee first. In the event that the student grievant or respondent faculty member is away from campus, this hearing can be held via phone conference. Up to three additional witnesses for either side may appear at the meeting.
4. The meeting will be closed. Neither party may be represented by legal counsel. A tape recording will be made of the meeting and will be retained by the dean's office for two years. The chair of the Grievance Committee may schedule additional meetings if necessary.
5. A written report of the recommendation of the Grievance Committee will be submitted to the dean of the HIDA no later than thirty calendar days after the hearing. Copies of the committee's recommendation to the dean will be distributed to the student and faculty member.
6. The dean will make a final decision after consideration of the Grievance Committee's recommendation within twenty-one calendar days of receiving its report. Written notification of the dean's decision will be sent to the student grievant and the respondent faculty member. Grade changes recommended by the committee will be made by the respondent faculty member. In the absence of the respondent faculty member caused by such things as death, resignation, termination, retirement, or prolonged illness, the dean is authorized to change a grade. The dean shall have authority to take action as is deemed necessary by the case and shall so inform the grievant student, respondent faculty member, school director, and the ASU Registrar of action taken.
7. Timelines delineated in this document may be extended by the assistant associate dean for students success in the HIDA and his or her designee, in consultation with the chair of the Grievance Committee.

Appendix A – Model Form

**Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts**

**Annual Faculty Responsibility Assignment Form**

Report of the activities of:

Name of School (or Unit):

For the purpose of the faculty responsibility assignment, the term faculty member includes those appointed as lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice, research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor, or persons otherwise designated as faculty on the Notice of Appointment. All faculty will have this signed agreement in place no later than December 15 for the following calendar year. If this agreement needs to be adjusted during the calendar year, a new agreement will be completed and signed. Both the original agreement and the revised agreement will be submitted with the annual evaluation materials.

Responsibility Assignment

Related to the annual performance evaluation is this responsibility assignment form that establishes the distribution of effort toward teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service. Faculty members are to consult with their school director (and academic professionals with their unit director or supervisor) on the percentage of effort to be undertaken for each kind of activity and to be accordingly evaluated. Such distributions for most faculty are: teaching 40%, research/creative activity/scholarship 40%, and service 20%. The weightings may be adjusted to fit the needs of schools and faculty member’s interest or ability. This form, when completed, is to be submitted along with additional materials required for the annual evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review Year | Teaching | Research/ Creative Activity/Scholarship | Service | Total |
|  |  |  |  | 100% |

Contributions to minority recruitment and cultural diversity may be incorporated as a category of their own, or may be included within any one of the other three.

Provide on a single additional page details (list) of anticipated activities in each of the three categories: Teaching; Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship; Service.

Faculty Signature\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Director Signature\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B

**Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts**

**Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

**Faculty Activities Report**

Each [faculty member](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html#facultymember) of Arizona State University, in accordance with ABOR policy, undergoes an annual performance evaluation. As stated in [ACD 506-10](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html), the annual performance evaluations “serve to comply with Board of Regents’ requirements for an annual review of all faculty with the purpose of encouraging the faculty member to establish goals for continued academic progress; to guide decisions about salary allocation; and to institute the first step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty”. For the purpose of the evaluation, the term faculty member includes those appointed as lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice, research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor, or persons otherwise designated as faculty on the Notice of Appointment. Faculty with less that 50% of full time appointment may be required to undergo the evaluation at the discretion of the dean. Academic professionals also undergo an annual evaluation.

If a faculty member is scheduled to be on sabbatical in the spring semester in which the faculty activities report is due to the school, then the faculty activities report, along with other materials required by the school, must be given to the school before the sabbatical starts. This would normally be late in the fall semester. The school committee and director will conduct the evaluation. The faculty member then has 30 days upon return from sabbatical leave to receive the evaluation and acknowledge receipt by signature.

Instructions

Faculty members are responsible for preparing a report and supporting materials for their evaluation. This should include activities for the past calendar year in the following categories: teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service. This can also include confirmed anticipated activities into the following calendar year. Faculty members who were on sabbatical during the time period should report according to their unit's guidelines. Please be certain that the information is as complete as possible, including importance of listing. The following guidelines are suggestions of relevant listings to be included on the activities report, but faculty are to include any relevant information not specifically requested.

A. Teaching

1. List the courses taught by course name and number; indicate the credit hours of each course and the number of students enrolled.
2. List additional instruction, e.g., studio mentoring, independent study, undergraduate capstone, student presentations supervised per week, by term.
3. List doctoral/theses committee as committee chair or committee member.
4. List courses developed or in development in the past/current academic year.
5. Identify teaching activities as a guest for other courses in the school, the HIDA or university.
6. Identify teaching activities as a guest outside of ASU.
7. List positions held by recent former students and awards and honors achieved by former students not previously reported, insofar as you have knowledge of them.
8. For the purpose of contextualizing the diverse range of efforts of the faculty, a focused narrative may be included here.

B. Research/Creative Activity/Scholarship

1. List the creative work or professional achievements during the calendar year that you consider most significant.
2. List publications and indicate whether peer reviewed.
3. List awards, fellowships, grants, commissions, or other recognition received.
4. List ongoing or proposed research projects.
5. List grants for research or development or for instructional or program improvement.
6. List appearances or activities as a speaker both on and off campus.
7. List other forms of recognition unique to your field of specialization.
8. List anticipated and confirmed creative and professional activities and research for the next calendar year.
9. For the purpose of contextualizing the diverse range of efforts of the faculty, a focused narrative may be included here.

C. Service

1. Indicate the number of undergraduate/graduate students advised and their disciplines.
2. List by name any faculty members for whom you are serving as official mentor, and describe the extent of the assistance you have provided.
3. Indicate service as department chair, area coordinator, or division head; and list other administrative duties or leadership initiatives on behalf of the HIDA including participation in examinations for students outside your department, program, or school.
4. List service on committees within the University and indicate if chair.
5. List service in elective or appointed leadership roles in professional associations.
6. List non-routine contributions to recruiting, fund-raising, or public relations efforts on behalf of the University not listed elsewhere.
7. List instances of professional contributions at conferences, symposiums, etc.
8. For the purpose of contextualizing the diverse range of efforts of the faculty, a focused narrative may be included here.

Appendix C

**Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts**

**Application for Sabbatical Leave**

Submit with supporting material to school director no later than the beginning of the academic year the year before the requested leave. School directors should forward applications together with supporting material to the HIDA dean’s office no later than 30 days after the beginning of the academic year the year before the requested leave.

Applicant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Semester(s) for which sabbatical leave is requested: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

List below all positions held at ASU including the percentage of full-time, and whether the position was academic year or fiscal year. Start with the latest position and include all leaves (sabbatical and leave without pay). Each year should be accounted for:

List any additional compensation expected or applied for during proposed sabbatical leave. Include grant sources and amounts:

Supply a brief summary description of the sabbatical leave project proposed:

For evaluation purposes, in no more than 2 pages, describe the proposed sabbatical project. Give all pertinent information, goals, procedures, and the post-sabbatical benefits to be achieved – publications, teaching methods, etc. Additional supporting material may also be submitted.

If granted a sabbatical leave, I agree to abide by the terms of the sabbatical leave policy as set forth in the current Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual ACD 705 (as revised 7/1/2011). I also agree to resign from all campus obligations, including committees, during the term of the sabbatical. I will submit a final report to the dean of HIDA during the first semester after returning from the sabbatical leave.

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

Signature Date