

Meeting Minutes
Executive Committee of the AFSE
January 16, 2026, in Zoom

Present: Barbara Smith (SBHSE), Avi Wiesel (SSEBE), , Yanchao Zhang (ECEE), Dianne Hansford (secretary *pro tem*-SCAI), Nancy Cooke (TPS), Shaopeng Wang (SBHSE), Hyunglae Lee (SEMTE), Treavor Boyer (SSEBE), Xi Yu (MSN), Ted Pavlic (SCAI), Xiangyu Guo (MSN), Guoliang Xue (SCAI)

Absent: Brian Atkinson (TPS), Yong-Hang Zhang (ECEE), Ron Calhoun (SEMTE)

Guests: Kelli Haren, Dean Kyle Squires

1. Minutes unanimously approved from the meeting on December 5, 2025.

2. Faculty Service

Kyle asked the EC to create a process, guiding principles, and guardrails for evaluating faculty service. We want greater transparency and support the faculty. Service will vary by discipline, rank and role. We need flexibility at the school level. Any approach needs to be practical for chairs and review committees. Kyle brought up many questions around evaluating faculty service.

What “counts” as service? Examples include governance and leadership, academic and professional service, student-focused service, institutional and community engagement. Are all these areas covered by the tenure and promotion processes?

When it comes to service, what are the pain points or confusing issues?

Responses from EC members included variability, subjective, measurability, time scales of impact of service.

What service work is currently invisible or undervalued?

Responses: Students choose faculty, so it is not possible to dictate how many students one might mentor. Writing tenure and promotion letters and recommendations for students.

One day a week of service adds up to 30 days of service in an academic year. That is a significant amount of time. Those who are involved in service tend to be asked to do more service. How do we govern this and spread the service work around?

Where do evaluation inconsistencies often occur?

How do we assess it or measure it? Bias is a problem. Subjective nature of assessment.

What kind of service is hardest for chairs and committees to assess?

For example, membership on a committee does not give insight into the amount of effort. Was the faculty member active or did they just show up for defense?

Writing tenure and promotion letters should be valued because it does help with ASU reputation.

Should evaluation of service be different for yearly evaluations versus P&T evaluation?

Thinking about process

*) Alignment around process principles. What does success look like?

Service expectations are explicit/transparent.

Faculty have visibility into how their service is assessed.

Evaluations consider impact and effort (not just quantity).

Highly regarded journal review might require much more effort than for another journal.

How can effort be communicated without needing to give details of activity that might be best not shared?

Schools implement locally, but with shared FSE-wide guidelines.

*) What process elements are needed to achieve those outcomes?

*) What tools would help support those outcomes?

*) What additional input is needed from the broader faculty community?

Timeline: Today identify a working group. (Guiding principles, key questions or decision points requiring broader faculty input), process framework, but not final guidance.

February meeting: Working group reports back. EC provides alignment on what are the next steps and direction.

Late February: Working group revises materials based on EC feedback.

March: EC reviews guidance.

Mid-March: Guidance shared with FSE leadership.

Spring: Gather feedback from review committees and FSE leadership, Consider tools or documentation supports, identify longer term improvements.

Avi: Should we define what is sufficient service and exceptional service?

Faculty are not promoted based on service, but promotion can be denied based on service.

Ted: Should there be two sets of guidelines – yearly expectation versus expectations for a portfolio of service recorded for T&P?

Opportunity for service at journal level can depend on faculty member's rank. Evaluation needs to take this into consideration. Quantity and quality based on position.

Ad-hoc committee: Treavor, Ted, Larry, Barbara

3. Faculty Evaluations

How can we improve evaluations? Get rid of ASU Vita! The numerical scores are unclear, but the comments are helpful. The scores are part of the ACD, so they need to be used. How can the EC provide additional guidance on how to score?

Persistence and retention of online students is lower and different than on campus. How do we evaluate online teaching, especially when the content is not the faculty member of record?

4. Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting:

Friday, February 6, 2026

12:00 – 1:00pm in [Zoom](#)