MEMO TO: All Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

FROM: Cory Hansen, Director, Division of Teacher Preparation
      Sherman Dorn, Director, Division of Educational Leadership and Innovation
      Dale Baker, Chair, Tenured/Tenure-eligible Personnel Evaluation Committee (PEC)

DATE: December 12, 2014

RE: Annual Review Guidelines 2014

The purpose of this memo is to provide information about the annual review process for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty.

**Rationale:** Arizona Board of Regents’ (ABOR) policy requires an annual review of all faculty members. Each academic unit has bylaws and Standards of Academe that specify review policies aligned with ABOR policy. The policies and bylaws require that an elected committee (PEC) evaluate each faculty member based on the Standards of Academe and provide a written review to the Division Director. To carry out these reviews in a consistent manner, and to assure compliance with policies, the PEC and Division Directors provide the following procedures to faculty for the completion of the portfolios covering the 2014 calendar year. For faculty who served only part of the year (for example, fall semester) the procedures also apply except where modifications are noted. Please note that the 2009 Standards of Academe are the basis for these reviews as the recently approved standards have not yet been approved by the provost’s office.

**Due Date:** The annual review is due Friday, **January 30, 2015** (last Friday in January as required by the Standards of Academe).

**Time Period:** The evaluation period covers January 1, 2014, to December 31, 2014, or the portion of that year the faculty member was employed at ASU.

**How to Submit:** The Blackboard shell is ready to accept submissions. Access the shell at Blackboard > Organizations > MLFTC Annual Reviews Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty Members and follow the directions posted on the Announcements page.

**What to Submit:** The Standards of Academe require a personal statement, annual vita supplements (AVS) for the prior three years, goals for 2014 signed by the Division Director, course syllabi, and course evaluation scores. There is a change to the AVS requirement (see below).

Please save these files under the appropriate titles as noted below. You can find the templates for these forms in the Document Templates folder available on Blackboard:
✓ Personal Statement saved as Lastname2014PersonalStatement [for more information on this statement, please see below]

✓ Annual Vita Supplements covering the last three years (or for as many years as you have been employed in the College). Please do not create a new AVS for 2014, but add to your 2013 AVS and retitle it. Please save as Lastname2012-14AVS. (Unlike in previous years, we now have a single AVS.)

✓ Goals for 2014 signed by the Division Director saved as Lastname2014Goals [use pdf from Director with signature or scan and submit].

✓ Student Evaluation Summary Table saved as Lastname2014EvaluationSummaryTable
  - Access course evaluation information here: http://www.asu.edu/evaluate
  - Do not include summer courses
  - Note that the template automatically calculates the mean scores for you

✓ Syllabi for all courses taught in 2014 saved as Lastname2014SyllabusXXXnnn (course prefix and number).
  - One syllabus is sufficient for multiple sections of the same course
  - Do not include summer course syllabi, as the evaluation covers the academic year only
  - All syllabi should follow the MLFTC Syllabus Template for either certification courses or non-certification courses. If syllabi are not in current template form, please follow the MLFTC Syllabus Template for all future courses.

✓ Annual evaluations from the Division Director (should already be in Blackboard shell).

**What should be included in the Personal Statement?**

- In terms of scholarship, highlight the significant scholarly accomplishments and culminations for the annual review year (2014). The key indicators of scholarly productivity include publications, presentations, reports, awarded competitive grants, sponsored projects, electronic media or programs, and leadership of collaborative scholarly endeavors (SOA 5.4 - note levels of culminations I-IV). The key criteria for evaluating faculty members in the area of scholarship are: 1) an active, sustained, and reasonably focused program of scholarship dealing with significant issues and problems; 2) scholarly productivity and culminations; and 3) nationally recognized accomplishments and impact (SOA 5.4; SOA 5.1). Faculty members should supply evidence their scholarship has impact and has received national validation. To do this provide details of the scope of dissemination, the character of the receiving audience, and/or the significance of the validating authority. Publication evidence should also include supporting information when available concerning the extent and type of readership, acceptance rate for submissions, and relationship to the field (SOA 5.4). The nature of one’s role in research projects and other joint efforts should also be clearly described. The scholarship section must be relevant to the faculty member’s goals and consistent with the
Standards of Academe (SOA 3.4; SOA 4.0; SOA 5.3; SOA 5.4), and faculty members are encouraged to link their scholarship with their teaching and/or service (SOA 6.1).

- In terms of teaching, include your thoughtful interpretations of student evaluation scores (submitted in the Student Evaluation Summary Table) including what changes you made or are making in response. Also include other indicators of teaching effectiveness, excellence (SOA 6.3), and leadership in teaching and instruction (SOA 6.4) for the annual review year (2014). The narrative on teaching must be relevant to the faculty member’s goals and consistent with the Standards of Academe (SOA 3.4; SOA 4.0; SOA 5.3; SOA 5.4), and faculty members are encouraged to link their teaching with their scholarship and/or service (SOA 6.1; SOA 7.2). Faculty members who wish to include student comments from course evaluations should print the entire list of student comments. Selected comments are not allowed.

- For service, include a detailed narrative regarding all service activities at a) institutional, b) professional, and c) governmental or community levels (SOA 7.0) for the annual review year (2014). The quality of service rendered is more important than the quantity of service level of activity and time commitment, products created and impact of the service should provide evidence of quality (SOA 7.1). In addition, the expectation is that service should entail regular participation and consistent contributions (SOA 7.2). Include in the narrative other indicators of leadership in service (SOA 7.3) and other lines of evidence (SOA 7.4) as needed. The narrative on service must be relevant to the faculty member’s goals and consistent with the Standards of Academe (SOA 3.4; SOA 4.0; SOA 5.3; SOA 5.4), and faculty members are encouraged to link their service with their scholarship and/or teaching (SOA 7.2). Also note that, “Meaningful service may be strategic to the faculty members’ interests, teaching, and/or scholarly agenda, but must be in support of the general good rather than private or commercial interests” (SOA 7.1).