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**Preamble**

These bylaws apply to Arizona State University’s School of Sustainability (SOS), which was founded in 2006 by the Arizona Board of Regents. The bylaws describe the procedures by which SOS self-governs and carries out the responsibilities and privileges entrusted to SOS. The bylaws are junior to policies and procedures laid out in ASU’s Academic Affairs Manual (ACD). In case of conflicts, the policies and procedures of ASU and the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) take precedence.

SOS leadership and its faculty embrace ASU’s mission as being a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but rather by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves. SOS leadership and its faculty embrace ASU’s mission as being a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but rather by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves. We support and foster a culture of inclusiveness, tolerance, and respect that promotes equal opportunity and diversity among SOS faculty, staff, and students and through our engagement with diverse communities within and beyond the University.

**Article I. Organization**

1. **Leadership**
2. **Director**

The SOS Director is the school’s chief administrative officer and reports to the College of Global Futures Dean.

1. **Associate/Deputy Director(s)**

Associate/Deputy Director(s) are appointed by the Dean to serve one-year renewable terms. The Director of SOS determines the responsibilities of Associate/Deputy Directors(s).

**B. Representative Bodies**

1. **Academic Assembly**

The SOS Academic Assembly, as defined in ACD 505, includes all individuals in the School holding:

* Tenured or tenure-track faculty notices of appointment;
* Full-time, fixed-term faculty;
* Multi-year, probationary or continuing status academic professionals.

The Academic Assembly has shared governance responsibilities as provided for in the Academic Constitution and the ASU’s ACD, including the provisions in ACD 111-01, “Faculty Voting Rights”, and ACD 111-03, “Faculty and Academic Professional Participation in Evaluation of Academic Administrators”, and ACD 505, “Appointments and Positions.”

1. **Senate**

SOS senators will be elected by the SOS Academic Assembly in the spring, and as needed, to represent SOS on the University Senate. Senators must be a member of the SOS Academic Assembly and will serve a three-year term following the spring election. Senators are expected to attend all Senate meetings (or arrange for a substitute in the event of absence), to represent the interests of SOS through the Senate, to report to the Assembly on Senate and University issues, and to perform other duties appropriate to University Senators.

1. **Faculty Advisory Committee**

The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) is an elected body (see Article VII) that is empowered by the School Assembly to serve an advisory role to the Director.

**C. Voting Privileges of Academic Assembly Members**

1. **Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty**

All tenured or tenure-eligible faculty as defined in ACD 505-2 who have at least 50% of their academic FTE in SOS have full voting privileges in the School. All SOS tenured and tenure-eligible faculty, regardless of appointment size, may attend SOS Assembly meetings.

Individuals who are SOS appointed tenured or tenure-track faculty with less than 50% of their academic FTE in SOS and who have had appointments in SOS for at least two years may qualify for voting rights via petition. Petitions require a justification for becoming a SOS voting member and should demonstrate contributions to the SOS community beyond teaching. Petitions should be submitted to the SOS FAC (see Article VII). The SOS FAC chair will present all petitions to the Academic Assembly for a vote. Faculty petitions that receive a 2/3 majority vote of the Academic Assembly will receive voting rights for a period of three years. SOS appointed faculty with less than 50% of their academic FTE in SOS may continue to receive voting rights provided that they re-petition the SOS FAC after their voting term expires.

1. **Fixed-Term Faculty**

Faculty on fixed-term appointments as defined in ACD 505-2, (including, but not limited to, lecturers of all ranks, research professors of all ranks, professors of practice of all ranks, and clinical faculty) who have at least 50% of their academic FTE in SOS have full voting privileges. All SOS fixed-term faculty, regardless of appointment size, may attend SOS Assembly meetings.

Individuals who are SOS appointed fixed-term faculty with less than 50% of their academic FTE in SOS and who have had appointments in SOS for at least two years may qualify for voting rights via petition. Petitions require a justification for becoming a SOS voting member and should demonstrate contributions to the SOS community beyond teaching. Petitions should be submitted to the SOS FAC (see Article VII). The SOS FAC chair will present all petitions to the Academic Assembly for a vote. Faculty petitions that receive a 2/3 majority vote of the Academic Assembly will receive voting rights for a period of three years. SOS appointed faculty with less than 50% of their academic FTE in SOS may continue to receive voting rights provided that they re-petition the SOS FAC after their voting term expires.

1. **Other Faculty, Academic Professionals and Post-Doctoral Fellows**

Other faculty (including, but not limited to, professors emeriti, affiliated faculty, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, faculty associates, faculty research associates, instructors, and visiting scholars), academic professionals, and post-doctoral fellows not included in subsections 1 and 2 above do not have voting privileges but may attend SOS Assembly meetings.

**Article II. Meetings**

1. **Frequency**

The SOS Assembly shall meet at least once each semester during the academic year, although once per month is more typical. The Director or Associate/Deputy Director shall preside. At any time, a majority of the Assembly may request that the Director convene the Assembly. Upon receiving the request, the Director must convene the Assembly within ten business days.

1. **Attendance**

All members of the SOS Academic Assembly, as defined in Article I.B.1 of these bylaws, as well as relevant staff and elected graduate student representatives have the right to attend Assembly meetings. However, any voting member of the Assembly may request that discussion of a particular agenda item be limited to voting members of the Assembly.

1. **Notification**

Except for urgent business that requires an immediate response, the Director must announce meetings with a written notice at least three business days in advance with an agenda distributed at that time. Assembly members may submit additional agenda items that must be included on the agenda if they are received in time to be included and distributed with the meeting announcement. Assembly members may request that any agenda item be discussed in closed session with only voting members. However, notification of such a request should be submitted to the Director prior to the assembly meeting.

**Quorum**

A quorum consists of more than one-half of the number of voting Assembly members, minus the number of those on sabbatical, leaves of absence, and full-time administrative appointments external to the School. If no quorum call is requested, then all votes taken at a properly called meeting are considered valid. Any member of the SOS voting Assembly may request a quorum call, in which case the request must be granted.

1. **Voting**

Voting should normally be done by a show of hands, but any voting member may request the use of a secret ballot on any vote. All requests for a secret ballot will be honored. A simple majority will decide a vote except where otherwise stated in the bylaws (e.g., bylaws revisions). An item of new business can be discussed as long as there is a quorum and a majority of those present approve. However, new business cannot be voted upon until a subsequent meeting of the Academic Assembly, with proper notification provided.

**Article III. Rights and Responsibilities of the Voting Assembly**

1. **Responsibilities of the Voting Assembly Which Require Consideration and Action**

1. Proposals for significant changes in SOS objectives, organization or spending priorities. Examples include, but are not limited to, the establishment of new degree programs, creation or dissolution of recognized positions or units within SOS, and establishment of formal relations with other organizations;

2. Curriculum (i.e., required courses, course sequences, prerequisites, degree requirements, etc.);

3. Policies and procedures governing admission, advising, evaluation and retention of students;

5. Faculty recruiting;

6. Recommendations for appointment or termination of Faculty members prior to the tenure decision;

7. Policies, criteria, and procedures related to evaluation of Assembly members;

8. Policies concerning appointment and management of Faculty Associates;

9. Adoption of bylaws or the amendment of existing bylaws;

**Article IV. Bylaws**

1. **Adoption**
2. These bylaws shall be adopted when they are approved by a two-thirds vote of the relevant Academic Assembly, providing that a quorum is present.
3. Upon adoption, all faculty members shall receive online access to the bylaws.
4. **Amendments**
5. After their initial adoption, bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty, provided that a copy of any proposed amendment has been made available to all faculty at least one week prior to the meeting and the amendment is listed on the agenda in advance of the faculty meeting.
6. It is the responsibility of the SOS Dean to maintain an up-to-date version of the bylaws reflecting all changes and amendments.
7. **Formal Review/Revision**

SOS bylaws shall be formally reviewed in their entirety and appropriate amendments recommended to the Assembly every five years by an ad-hoc committee appointed by the Director in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). The ad-hoc committee will recommend any revisions to the voting Assembly for its action.

**Article V. Academic Program Committees**

1. **Graduate Committee**

The Graduate Committee is the governing body for all SOS graduate programs.

1. **Graduate Committee Director Roles and Appointment**

The Graduate Director is a tenured SOS faculty member who is appointed annually by the SOS Director and in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). The Graduate Director can be reappointed for up to three consecutive years and serves until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. Graduate Director’s responsibilities are to:

1. Oversee activities of the SOS graduate programs;
2. Liaise between the Sustainability Graduate subcommittees and the Subject Specialty Committees;
3. Convene the Graduate Committee twice per semester and as needed;
4. Report to faculty at assembly meetings about ongoing committee activities;
5. Liaise with Student Services on graduate student financial support, based on input from the graduate committee and in consultation with the Director;
6. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.
7. **Graduate Committee Roles and Appointment:**

The Graduate Committee consists of appointed chairs of the SOS graduate subcommittees (see Article V.A.3), and directors of SOS subject specialty committees (see Article V.B). Additional committee members may be added at the Director’s discretion and in consultation with the SOS Director. The Graduate Committee responsibilities are to:

1. Coordinate across all graduate programs (degree programs and certificates) and ensure associated subcommittees are supported in meeting their objectives;
2. Advise the Graduate Director on graduate student financial support decisions (e.g. teaching assistantships, recruitment fellowships);
3. Complete periodic assessments of program learning outcomes;
4. Liaise with graduate students, including the graduate representatives;
5. Provide guidance on and assist with recruitment strategies;
6. Approve graduate faculty application requests to advise students in SOS graduate programs;
7. Convene twice per semester and as needed;
8. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.
9. **Sustainability Graduate Subcommittees**

SOS has three graduate subcommittees:

* Sustainability Graduate Degrees Subcommittee (MA/MS/PhD/CASS/GSS/Certificate)
* Sustainability Leadership Programs Subcommittee (EMSL/MSL)
* Masters of Sustainability Solutions Subcommittee (MSUS)
  1. **Chair Roles and Appointment**

The Graduate Subcommittee Chairs are SOS faculty members who are typically tenured and who the Director appoints in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). Chairs serve annual appointments that can be renewed for up to two consecutive years. Graduate Subcommittee Chairs serve until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. Chairs’ responsibilities are to:

1. Oversee activities of the subcommittee;
2. Serve as final signatory on petitions and grievances (in coordination with the Graduate Committee);
3. Convene the relevant subcommittee twice per semester and as needed;
4. Report to faculty at assembly meetings about ongoing committee activities;
5. Coordinate with the Graduate Director about final decisions on graduate student financial support;
6. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.
   1. **Subcommittee Roles and Appointment**

Graduate Subcommittees consist of at least two other SOS faculty members (one assistant professor and one associate or full professor), and at least one SOS staff member who helps administer the relevant programs. The Director appoints subcommittees in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII) and other relevant faculty. Committee members serve one-year terms. Appointments can be renewed.

The responsibilities of all Graduate Subcommittees are to:

* 1. Govern academic programs within their respective area;
  2. Propose changes to existing curriculum and processes that improve student learning;
  3. Liaise with graduate students and graduate student representatives;
  4. Provide guidance on and assist with recruitment strategies;
  5. Review applications to relevant programs;
  6. Address relevant student grievances in consultation with the Graduate Director;
  7. Consult the SOS faculty and staff when the committee proposes any curricular changes;
  8. Annually review students within their graduate degree programs;
  9. Convene twice per semester and as needed;
  10. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

The MSUS Subcommittee is also responsible for:

* 1. Providing feedback on MSUS student proposals and final deliverables.

1. **Subject Specialty Committees**

SOS’s subject specialty committees uniquely govern academic programs at both the graduate and undergraduate level that focus on a specialized sustainability subject. SOS has two subject specialty committees:

* Sustainable Energy Committee (PhD, certificate)
* Sustainable Food Systems Committee (BS, MS, FSSL, certificate)

**1. Subject Specialty Director Role and Appointment**

Subject Specialty Directors are SOS faculty members who are typically tenured and who the Director appoints in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). Subject Specialty Directors serve annual appointments and until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. Their responsibilities are to:

1. Oversee activities of their relevant committee;
2. Serve as final signatory on petitions and grievances for subject specialty programs, in coordination with the Graduate Director;
3. Liaise with the Graduate Director and Undergraduate Director;
4. Convene the committee twice per semester and as needed;
5. Report to faculty at assembly meetings about ongoing committee activities;
6. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

**2. Subject Specialty Committee Roles and Appointment**

Subject Specialty Committees consists of at least two faculty members (one assistant professor and one associate or full professor), and at least one SOS staff member who helps administer the relevant programs. The Director appoints committees in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). Additional committee members may be added at the Director’s discretion and in consultation with the SOS Director. Committee members serve one-year terms. Appointments can be renewed. Subject Specialty Committees’ responsibilities are to:

1. Govern academic programs within their subject specialty;
2. Propose changes to relevant graduate and undergraduate curricula and processes that improve student learning;
3. Review applications for admission to their relevant graduate programs;
4. Address relevant student grievances in consultation with the Graduate Director;
5. Advise the Graduate Director on graduate student financial support decisions (e.g. teaching assistantships, recruitment fellowships);
6. Liaise with graduate students and graduate student representatives;
7. Provide guidance on and assist with recruitment strategies;
8. Address student grievances and make recommendations to either the Graduate Committee or the Undergraduate Committee, whichever is relevant;
9. Consult the SOS faculty and staff when the committee proposes any curricular changes;
10. Oversee annual reviews of graduate degree students within their degree programs;
11. Convene twice per semester and as needed;
12. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.
13. **Undergraduate Committee**

The Undergraduate Committee is the governing body for all SOS undergraduate programs. It is composed of a director, at least two other SOS faculty members (one assistant professor and one associate or full professor), and at least one relevant staff member who helps administer the undergraduate program. Relevant directors of Subject Specialty Committees should also be represented (see Article V.B). Additional committee members may be added at the Director’s discretion and in consultation with the SOS Director.

**1. Undergraduate Director Roles and Appointment**

The Undergraduate Director is a tenured SOS faculty member who is appointed annually in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII). The appointment can be renewed for up to three consecutive years and begins the Monday prior to the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. Undergraduate Director’s responsibilities are to:

* + 1. Oversee activities of the undergraduate committee;
    2. Serve as final signatory on relevant petitions and grievances;
    3. Meet with the undergraduate committee twice per semester and as needed;
    4. Liaise with Subject Specialty Committee directors;
    5. Advise the Director on undergraduate student financial support decisions (e.g. teaching assistantships, recruitment fellowships) based on input from undergraduate committee;
    6. Report to faculty at assembly meetings about ongoing committee activities.

**2. Undergraduate Committee Roles and Appointment**

The Director appoints the committee in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII) and other relevant faculty. Committee members serve one-year terms. Appointments can be renewed. The undergraduate committee’s responsibilities are to:

1. Govern the sustainability undergraduate programs (degree programs, minors, modular learning, and certificates);
2. Propose changes to relevant graduate and undergraduate curricula and processes that improve student learning;
3. Complete periodic assessments of program learning outcomes;
4. Advise the Undergraduate Director on undergraduate student financial support decisions;
5. Review relevant undergraduate student petitions or grievances;
6. Liaise with the SOS Sustainability Undergraduate Research Experience Program Director;
7. Coordinate with Barrett Summer School (in consultation with SOS’s Barrett Honors Representative) and other relevant sustainability summer recruitment programs with respect to program content;
8. Liaise with SOS undergraduate council;
9. Provide guidance on and assist with undergraduate recruitment strategies;
10. Consult the SOS faculty and staff when the committee proposes any curricular changes;
11. Meet twice per semester and as needed;
12. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

**Article VI. Personnel Committee**

The Personnel Committee is the governing body for SOS faculty personnel matters, including probationary reviews, tenure and promotion, sabbatical leaves, and annual reviews. It is composed of at least five tenured SOS faculty members holding regular appointments (two associate professors and three full professors).

1. **Personnel Committee Director Roles and Appointment**

The Personnel Committee Director is a full professor who is elected by the personnel committee. The director serves a one-year term until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. The Director’s responsibilities are to:

* 1. Be informed of Provost rules and schedules for relevant faculty personnel actions;
  2. Inform relevant SOS faculty (including continuing fixed-term) of expected deadlines related to probationary review, tenure and promotion, sabbatical leave, and annual reviews;
  3. Ensure that the personnel committee has dossiers for probationary review and tenure and promotion candidates at least one week prior to any relevant meeting;
  4. Convene meetings with the relevant voting Assembly members to receive feedback on candidates’ dossiers for probationary review and tenure and promotion;
  5. Remind eligible voting faculty members that it is their responsibility to review probationary review and tenure and promotion materials prior to voting on any relevant personnel case;
  6. Liaise with relevant SOS Director regarding relevant personnel procedures;
  7. Promote a culture of inclusiveness that encourages equal opportunity and diversity;
  8. Communicate the Personnel Committee’s probationary review, tenure and promotion, and sabbatical application recommendations to the SOS Director;
  9. Coordinate annual review processes and ensure that the Personnel Committee has access to faculty reports a week prior to any relevant meeting;
  10. Initiate improvements to SOS annual reporting processes and SOS guidance on probationary review, tenure and promotion, if needed;
  11. Provide SOS Director with the committee’s annual review assessments;
  12. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

1. **Personnel Committee Roles and Appointment**

The Director appoints the Personnel Committee in consultation with the SOS FAC (see Article VII) and other relevant faculty. Committee members serve overlapping two-year terms. The relevant Associate/Deputy Director is an ex officio sixth member of the Personnel Committee.

During any year in which SOS anticipates a promotion decision regarding a Lecturer, a Senior Lecturer should be appointed to the Personnel Committee. This representative should serve a one-year term and participate in all discussions that relate to the promotion review of eligible Lecturers. For these discussions, the appointee will have full voting rights.

The Personnel Committee’s responsibilities are to:

* 1. Review faculty sabbatical requests and offer a recommendation to the SOS Director;
  2. Process faculty sabbatical reports;
  3. Coordinate faculty probationary reviews (third-year review), tenure, and promotion processes by developing an assessment letter for each candidate’s file;
  4. Offer recommendations to the faculty on reappointments, promotions, and tenure, and transmit final votes to the Director in their recommendation letter;
  5. Coordinate continuing appointment and promotion requests for continuing fixed-term faculty;
  6. Conduct annual faculty performance assessments and ensure that faculty information is collected and made available to committee members prior to the review;
  7. Convene twice per semester and as needed and in accordance with the schedule established by the Dean's Office for recommending sabbaticals, promotion, tenure, and reappointment;
  8. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

1. **Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment**

For purposes of decisions relating to promotion, only faculty at or above the rank of the individual being considered are eligible to vote. For the purposes of decisions relating to tenure and reappointment, only faculty with tenure are eligible to vote.

The Personnel Committee is responsible for ensuring that the appropriate information is collected and made available for faculty review. The committee Director consults with faculty members being reviewed to ensure that the relevant information is available to the committee for assessment. Evaluation criteria are described in the *SOS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track/Tenured Faculty* (see Appendix 1) and the *SOS Promotion Guidelines for Fixed-Term Faculty* (see Appendix 2).

The Personnel Committee is responsible for drafting a letter that assesses the candidate’s case for promotion, tenure, or reappointment. The letter should contain an introductory statement and an assessment of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. Related to the research assessment, if necessary, the Personnel Committee may consult with other senior ASU faculty (at the request of the candidate) to ensure that the statement is accurate. Once drafted, a meeting of voting faculty will be held to provide input to the Personnel Committee’s letter and to conduct a faculty vote of the candidate under review. The draft letter is to be revised based on faculty input prior to finalizing the Personnel Committee’s letter to the SOS Director. The results of the vote must be included in the final letter along with a recommendation on the reappointment, tenure, or promotion case. See also ACD 506: Faculty Personnel Actions.

1. **Procedures for Sabbatical Leave**

In compliance with Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and ASU’s ACD procedures, tenured/tenure-eligible faculty members who wish to petition for a sabbatical leave should consult with the CGF Dean about their eligibility. The awarding of sabbatical leave is dependent on the faculty member’s current status, quality of their sabbatical proposal, availability of resources, and the teaching, scholarship, and service needs of SOS and the university. Eligibility is not a guarantee that a sabbatical leave will be awarded. But if it is determined that the faculty member is eligible, then the faculty member must prepare and submit a sabbatical application in accordance with university guidelines. Applications are submitted to the SOS Director by the designated deadline (in accordance with ASU’s ACD) and reviewed by the Personnel Committee. The Committee offers a recommendation to the SOS Director. See also ACD 705: Sabbatical Leave.

1. **SOS Annual Performance Reviews**

In compliance with ABOR and ASU’s ACD procedures, on or before the last Monday in January all tenured/tenure eligible and fixed-term faculty members must submit to the SOS Director an activity report of their activities for the prior calendar year.

The Personnel Committee will use these activity reports to conduct an annual performance evaluation of each member of the SOS faculty, including joint appointments. Criteria for annual reviews include (1) research excellence and impact, (2) effectiveness of teaching/mentorship and contributions to pedagogy, and (3) service to SOS, the University, and the profession. In assessing faculty activity reports, the Committee should use a minimum of four distinct measurements that distinguish between the highest achievement (e.g., exemplary performance) and the lowest achievement (e.g., unsatisfactory performance), in accordance with ACD-506-10 Annual Evaluations of Faculty. Evaluation criteria are described in the *SOS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track/Tenured Faculty* (see Appendix 1) and the *SOS Promotion Guidelines for Fixed-term Faculty* (see Appendix 2). The committee submits its annual performance evaluations to the SOS Director based on the *Provost’s Schedule of Personnel Actions* and in consultation with the SOS Director. Annual evaluations of faculty and merit raise assessments are the ultimate responsibility of the SOS Director.

The accumulation of a faculty member’s annual performance reviews is not a guarantee of a favorable or adverse tenure and promotion decision. While annual performance evaluations address a specific period of performance, promotion and tenure decisions are more comprehensive, taking into account a faculty member’s entire career. Promotion and tenure evaluations also include evaluations by external reviewers that are both retrospective and prospective. (See also ACD 506–01: Faculty Status; ACD 506–04: Tenure; ACD 506–05: Promotion).

**Article VII. Faculty Advisory Committee**

The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) is an elected body that serves an advisory role to the SOS Director. The FAC consists of at least four elected SOS faculty members holding regular appointments (one fixed-term appointment, one tenure-track assistant professor, and two tenured professors). Near the end of the Spring semester, the Director will prepare a ballot that includes all eligible members of the SOS faculty (e.g., those not on leave or not subject to term limit). Eligible members of the faculty will be given the option to remove their names from the ballot prior to voting. The ballot will be separated into fixed-term, tenured and untenured faculty, with one from the fixed-term faculty, one from the untenured faculty, and two members elected from the tenured faculty. Faculty receiving the highest number of votes will be elected to the FAC. The FAC Chair will be elected by the FAC members. After the election, the Director may appoint one additional tenured faculty member with the goal of maintaining diverse representation of views/disciplines on the committee. The Director and Associate/Deputy Director(s) are ex officio FAC members.

Either the FAC Chair or the Director is authorized to call a meeting of the FAC. At least two of the elected FAC members must be present for a quorum.

1. **FAC Director Roles and Appointment**

The FAC Director is a tenured professor who is elected by the FAC. The director serves a one-year term until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term. The FAC Director’s responsibilities are to:

1. Coordinate regular meeting times with the FAC and Director;
2. Establish agenda items for discussion with the Director;
3. Liaise with the faculty and Director and communicate faculty concerns;
4. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.
5. **FAC Committee Roles and Appointment**

The FAC members are each elected for one two-year term. Exception: for the initial election, the two tenured members will draw lots to determine the one among them who will serve a one-year term, thus insuring election of at least one new tenured member each year. Elections should be completed no later than May 1 for installment during the next academic year. FAC members are ineligible to serve a consecutive term. The incumbent FAC members to serve until the until the Monday preceding the first official day of classes for the ensuing Fall term.

The Committee’s responsibilities are to:

1. Advise the Director on strategic planning;
2. Serve as a resource for the Director to quickly consult about pressing issues that require feedback and assistance;
3. Liaise between the faculty and the Director and about ways to improve SOS;
4. Consult with the Director concerning the selection of committee members for the academic program committees and the personnel committees;
5. Consult the Director regarding faculty meeting agenda items;
6. Convene with the Director at least once monthly during the academic year and whenever issues arise;
7. Present a report of its activities at faculty meetings;
8. Complete other duties as requested by the Director.

****

**Appendix 1:**

**SOS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track/Tenured Faculty** Approved by the Faculty Assembly and Director

August 2010

Revised May 17, 2021

**1. General Preamble**

* 1. SOS’ vision is to empower and build capacity for transformation toward a thriving, sustainable world. The School is committed to ASU’s Charter and its focus on research and discovery, academic access and success, and engagement with society to advance sustainability. We seek to promote inclusion and diversity in our research, teaching and service activities. Since its beginning, SOS has continually improved its structure, curricula, and societal impact. This reflexivity has allowed SOS to adapt and evolve through learning and experimentation. The School expects faculty to address the complex sustainability challenges facing society and encourages collaborations between faculty and organizations outside the university who put sustainability solutions into practice. Our faculty learn from practitioners on the front lines of sustainability challenges. We collaborate domestically and internationally with cities, nonprofits, public agencies, and businesses to provide educational opportunities for our students and help infuse sustainability thinking into these organizations.

1. The SOS P&T Guidelines are designed with two purposes. The first is to establish expectations and processes for SOS faculty as they are considered for tenure and promotion. For this purpose, it sets out school-specific expectations and evaluation criteria, within the context of ASU expectations, and those of the broader academy. The second purpose is to establish SOS as a community based on mutual reciprocal obligations of learning and advancement. It sets out processes to share, discuss and support what each faculty aspires to be as a scholar, and how such aspirations meet the expectations of the School.
2. All promotion and tenure policies and procedures within SOS comply with Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) policies and procedures.

**2. Relevant ASU policies and guidance documents**

* 1. ACD 506–01: [Preamble for Promotion and Tenure](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-01.html)
  2. ACD 506–04: [Tenure](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html)
  3. ACD 506–05: [Faculty Promotion](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html)
  4. ACD 506–03: [Faculty Probationary Appointments](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html)
  5. [Personnel Processes](https://provost.asu.edu/academic-personnel/personnel-processes) – Office of the University Provost
  6. Faculty Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws ([P3](https://provost.asu.edu/policies/procedures/p3))
  7. Process Guide for Promotion and/or Tenure - tenure-eligible faculty ([P5](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-promotion-tenure.pdf))

**3. School Mission and Objectives**

* 1. The School of Sustainability’s mission is to foster innovative research, impactful education, and engage with society to achieve economic viability, environmental integrity, social equity, and wellbeing.
  2. Within this mission, the SOS has three primary objectives, that embrace ASU’s design aspirations:

Research and Discovery - faculty generate new knowledge and insights through research, scholarship, and creative activities, including those that transcend conventional disciplinary boundaries, leverage interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary collaborations, or benefit from novel synergies between areas and modes of expertise and understanding;

Academic Access and Success - faculty empower individuals (at all stages of their professional and personal lives, and regardless of background) to learn through effective instruction and mentorship and through the service activities of faculty to the School and University;

Engagement with Society - faculty contribute to sustainability in society through knowledge production, translation, and mobilization, in cooperation with professional associations, government agencies, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and others.

1. Faculty support the School’s mission and objectives through the three categories of work, i.e., research, teaching and service, each of which is expected to align with the School’s commitment to fostering justice, diversity, equity and inclusion (JEDI).

**4. Types of Personnel Actions**

* 1. **Probationary or Conditional Review** (also referred to as Contract Renewal or Third Year Review) - All tenure track faculty hired prior to tenure are subject to a probationary or conditional review during their probationary period, typically in their third year after hire. This review assesses whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward their tenure review, in line with their specific goals as outlined in the Statement of Professional Plans (SPP) (see 5.1) and the evaluation categories and criteria described in Section 7 and 8 below. The process and materials required for Probationary or Conditional Review are detailed in [ACD 506-03: Faculty Probationary Appointments](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html) and the [Provost Process Guidelines for Probationary or Conditional Review](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-probationary-review-faculty_2018.pdf).
  2. **Promotion to Associate Professor** - Promotion to Associate Professor is normally coupled with the award of tenure. However, an untenured Assistant Professor may be promoted, but not tenured. Likewise, an Associate Professor hired without tenure may be considered for tenure only. Faculty should review [ACD 506–04: Tenure](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html) for the University procedures for Tenure review, and the [Provost’s Process Guide for Promotion and/or Tenure](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-promotion-tenure_040519.pdf) for the process and materials that must be submitted for review. Evaluation categories are described in Section 7 and 8 below.
  3. **Promotion to Professor** - The rank of Professor is the highest attainable in the academy. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have achieved national and, ideally, international prominence in their scholarly career. Faculty should review [ACD 506-05](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html) for the University procedures for promotion, and the [Provost’s Process Guide for Promotion and/or Tenure](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-promotion-tenure_040519.pdf) for the process and materials that must be submitted for review. Evaluation categories are described in Section 5 below.

**5. Administrative Procedures**

1. **Statement of Professional Plans** 
   1. Due to the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of scholarship among SOS faculty, no single set of quantitative indicators define excellence in research, teaching, and service in pursuit of the School’s mission and objectives. A custom approach to faculty assessment is needed.
   2. During the first year following appointment, the faculty member, and the Director of the School, with input from the Personnel Committee, are encouraged to develop a general plan for achieving tenure according to their anticipated tenure review schedule, and with respect to the evaluation criteria described in these guidelines. This is the Statement of Professional Plans (SPP), serving to provide annual feedback to faculty to identify strengths and potential shortcomings as candidates progress towards tenure and promotion.
   3. The SPP will detail the faculty member’s goals associated with research, teaching, and service, and how these goals contribute to their professional development in relation to the School’s mission and objectives, and the School’s expectations for promotion. The SPP should outline each faculty member’s aspirations in relation to scholarship goals and identity, the nature of their scholarly products and what constitutes indicators of sufficient productivity, and the ways in which excellence in performance will be assessed. The plan should also specify how the faculty member’s work fulfills the specific content focus/knowledge delivery expectations of the position which they occupy in the School.
   4. In annual evaluations, with input from the SOS Personnel Committee, the candidate will receive feedback from the SOS director, and the SPP will be amended accordingly, as necessary, to ensure a mutually beneficial and shared relationship of obligations, both from the faculty member to the School, and the School to the faculty member. These annual evaluations take place with the understanding that being a faculty member involves engaging in continual learning and that this learning is part of the School’s constant transformation and fulfilment of evolving aspirations.
   5. The SPP should be used by the faculty member as a basis for preparing promotion materials, i.e., in articulating the focus of research, and explaining the impact and excellence of scholarship to both internal and external reviewers of promotion dossier materials.
2. **Mentoring Candidates toward Promotion and Tenure**
   1. In consultation with the tenure-track professor, SOS Director will assign at least one formal mentor to each tenure-track junior faculty member within the first year of their hire, although typically tenure-track faculty seek two or three mentors.
   2. The purpose of the mentor(s) is to offer the candidate advice in the areas of research, teaching, and service in pursuit of the School’s mission and objectives, as they pertain to achieving promotion and tenure according to SOS and University guidelines.
3. **External Letters**
   1. Candidates being considered for either promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor requires letters requested from external reviewers.
   2. The candidate submits to the SOS director a list of at least 10 names of people recommended to serve as potential external reviewers. Candidates submit their list of 10 names early in the spring semester, following unit and college deadlines. (From the [Process Guide for Promotion and/or Tenure](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-promotion-tenure_040519.pdf))
   3. All external reviewers should have an arms-length relationship to the candidate; e.g., these reviewers may not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., collaborator, co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee) to avoid potential conflicts of interest (see [ACD-506-04](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html)). Five of the 10 names provided by the candidate must be at approved peer or aspirational peer institutions.
   4. Approved peer or aspirational peer institutions:
      1. [List of ABOR-approved peer institutions](https://www.azregents.edu/arizonas-public-universities/peer-institutions)
      2. [Association of American Universities](https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are/our-members) (also considered to be peer/aspirational institutions)
      3. For non-US institutions, the [Times Higher Education World University Rankings](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/content/world-university-rankings) may be used where the institution ranks above ASU.
   5. The SOS Personnel Committee creates a complementary list of 10 suggested external reviewers and submits these recommendations to the SOS Director for consideration. The Director may add to the SOS Personnel Committee’s list.
   6. As delegated by the Dean, the SOS Director selects and solicits 5 external reviewers from the candidate's list, and 5 external reviewers from the SOS Director/Personnel Committee list to review the candidate’s dossier, as described in the [Process Guide for Promotion and/or Tenure.](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/process-guide-promotion-tenure_040519.pdf)
   7. All selected reviewers by the candidate and the Director must meet eligibility requirements as described in [ACD506-04](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html).
   8. Helpful resources
      1. [Guide for preparing external letters](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/guide-preparing-external-letters.pdf)—highly recommended reading
      2. [General Guidelines for the Solicitation of External Review Letters](https://provost.asu.edu/academic-personnel/personnel-processes/external-review)—worth reading

4. **SOS Faculty Evaluation**

* 1. The SOS Personnel Committee will evaluate all relevant information on the candidate’s research, teaching and service against the School’s mission and objectives.
  2. The committee prepares a letter of recommendation, as per the procedures described in SOS Bylaws Article VI, C.
  3. The final recommendation letter and voting results are then submitted to the Director, including the committee’s collective recommendation that contract renewal (in the case of an assistant professor), tenure (in the case of an untenured Associate Professor) or promotion and tenure (in the case of an Assistant Professor) be granted or denied.
  4. Faculty discussion of the candidate’s case is confidential. SOS faculty should not communicate the voting results to the candidate.

5. **SOS Director Evaluation**

* 1. The SOS Director will evaluate all relevant information related to the candidate’s research, instruction and mentoring, and service, including the candidate’s packet, the SOS Personnel Committee’s letter and recommendation, and the external evaluation letters.
  2. The SOS Director shall not communicate the results of the faculty vote to the promotion candidate. The Director should communicate any weaknesses or strengths of the promotion case to the candidate prior to the Director’s submission of the letter to the Dean of the College of Global Futures.
  3. The candidate, at this time, may decide to withdraw their request for promotion. If the candidate is coming up for tenure and promotion early, the candidate may reapply the following year.
  4. The Director shall write their own letter of evaluation to the Dean of the College of Global Futures, including a recommendation for either granting or denying contract renewal, promotion and/or tenure.
  5. On the completion of the promotion process and approval of promotion, the Director shall inform the candidate of the promotion outcome and provide a brief summary of the strengths and weaknesses highlighted in the promotion process.

6. **College and University Review**

* 1. The candidate’s packet, the SOS Personnel Committee letter, and SOS Director letter will be submitted to the Dean of the College of Global Futures (CGF) and reviewed by the College-level Personnel Committee, which discusses the case and develops a letter of recommendation prior to casting and recording an anonymous vote.
  2. The final recommendation letter and voting results are submitted to the Dean, including the committee’s collective recommendation that the personnel action be granted or denied.
  3. In the case of contract renewal, the Dean will compose a letter of evaluation and recommendation for award or denial of contract renewal.
  4. In the case of tenure/promotion, the Dean and the University P&T Committee each will compose letters of evaluation and recommendations for award or denial of promotion and/or tenure.
  5. The ASU Provost and/or President will consider the candidate’s packet, the recommendations of the SOS Promotion Committee, the GCF Dean, the University P&T Committee, and write their own evaluation, including a decision to award or deny promotion and/or tenure to the candidate.

7. **Process for joint appointments**

* 1. Where a faculty member whose primary academic unit is SOS has a joint appointment with other units, the school will solicit input from the Chair, Director or Dean of the relevant unit that specifically deals with those parts of the faculty member’s workload that are assigned to that unit through the Memorandum of Understanding (see [ASU Guidelines for Join and Affiliated Appointments](https://provost.asu.edu/academic-personnel/resources-chairs-directors/joint-appointments)). The timeline and expectations around providing review material to affiliated units and receiving the relevant feedback will be negotiated and agreed on in writing between the units ahead of the SOS promotion and tenure process. This will include the process by which affiliated units will contribute to the selection of external reviewers, and the collection and inclusion of evaluation comments from affiliated units in the review process.

**6. Process and timeline**

* 1. As per [ACD 506-03](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “All 100 percent FTE faculty appointed at the assistant professor rank have a maximum of six years in which to apply for tenure.”
  2. Under special circumstances, the President or the President’s designee may extend the probationary period. Faculty members may request, no later than the fall semester of the year prior to the year their tenure review is scheduled, an extension of the probationary period. ([ACD 506-03](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html))
  3. Faculty members who desire to be considered for tenure earlier than the year designated in their offer letters should consult with their chair/director and/or deans about the possibility of being reviewed and recommended for tenure the year prior to their early review. ([ACD 506-03](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html))
  4. There is no fixed timeline for promotion from associate to full professor. Nevertheless, faculty should meet with the SOS Director in their third year following tenure to discuss the appropriate timeline for advancement. See [ACD 506-05](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html).

**7. Categories of work for evaluation**

* 1. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated within three categories of work: research, teaching, and service. In line with ASU’s Charter and the School’s mission and objectives, engagement with society is expected to be featured, to different extents according to each faculty’s profile, in all three domains of faculty activity.
  2. A typical balance of effort between the three categories is: 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service. This balance may vary among faculty members and with rank. Substantial changes in this distribution should be agreed in writing with the Director, and should be reflected in the candidate’s SPP.
  3. Engagement with Society
     1. In line with the School’s mission and objectives, faculty are expected to engage with society in research, teaching, and service to advance sustainability. Engagement with society means addressing sustainability challenges for the benefit of, and ideally in collaboration with, groups and organizations external to the university (private, public, civil society) or the public at large.
     2. Engagement with society may be conducted synergistically across two or all three categories of work or concentrated in one. The onus is on each faculty member to articulate how engagement with society manifests in their work, according to the definition provided above.

**8.** **Evaluation Criteria**

* 1. **Assistant to Associate**
     1. **Research**
        1. The candidate should have clearly articulated research goals in alignment with a specific research program.
        2. Evidence of a coherent research program leading to advances in knowledge and understanding in the domain of sustainability scholarship and reflecting the School’s mission and objectives.
        3. Evidence of sustained interdisciplinary collaboration and, where appropriate, with non-academic individuals and organizations (engagement with society).
        4. Evidence of efforts to enhance, promote or contribute to justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion (JEDI) through research, e.g., through research management and mentoring, participation in training and/or the thematic focus of research efforts.
        5. Efforts to acquire funding to support research activities and student collaborators, commensurate with the nature of the faculty member’s work.
        6. The nature of research contributions can vary widely depending on the candidate’s field. This may include traditional peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or books, but also exhibits, films, patents, and other products. Given this wide variation, the nature of research contributions must be agreed upon with the candidate, the Director, and the Personnel Committee, and outlined in the SPP (Section 5.1).
        7. The number of research contributions can vary depending on the candidate's field; the aim is to demonstrate sustained, high-quality, productive activity that is beginning to receive national and/or international recognition over the period of evaluation. For traditional scholars in the sciences, this will typically range from 2-3 publications a year, taking into consideration the quality and impact of the publication, and the faculty’s leadership role in these products; or a book manuscript every 5-6 years for more traditional fields. It may also include one or more exhibitions, films or other creative outputs a year. Given this variability, expectations for research output must be agreed upon with the candidate and the Director and outlined in an SPP (Section 5.1), with input from the Personnel Committee.
        8. Quality: research outputs should be published in outlets considered of high quality in the candidate’s field of scholarship. Metrics of quality (e.g., the reputation of the publication / press, impact factors and bibliometrics, awards and recognition) and excellence should be described in the SPP and must be compatible with these guidelines (Section 5.1).
        9. Research that engages with society needs to adhere to scholarship criteria and be responsive to the interdisciplinary and disciplinary critique and review necessary to demonstrate excellence. Examples may include:
* Research that co-designs, -implements, and -evaluates action programs with external partners to advance sustainability.
* Research that responds directly to a specified sustainability challenge articulated by a particular external group (or groups), and typically produces knowledge for broader public benefit.

1. **Teaching** 
   1. The candidate should have demonstrated high-quality teaching and instruction to ASU students through formal classes and other educational settings.
   2. Because of the wide diversity of faculty in SOS, teaching expectations must be negotiated between the candidate and the Director and outlined in an SPP (Section 5.1), with input from the Personnel Committee.
   3. Contribution to the School’s curriculum through contributions to improvements in existing courses and/or development of one or more courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
   4. Teaching core classes within the School’s curriculum.
   5. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and quality through, for example, student and peer evaluations or external recognition.
   6. Evidence of promotion of sustainability competencies in teaching and mentoring.
   7. Evidence of success in student mentoring at undergraduate and/or graduate levels.
   8. Efforts to enhance justice, diversity, equity and inclusion (JEDI) in teaching and mentoring are highly valued by the School and can be highlighted in promotion materials, e.g., through participation in training and/or the thematic focus of teaching efforts, course modifications and enhancements, lecture design and construction, teaching engagement opportunities.
   9. Teaching that engages with society needs to exemplify the focus of the university on inclusive and accessible capacity building to advance sustainability. Examples may include:

* Co-design, -implementation, and -evaluation of sustainability education opportunities for ASU students with outside partners for reciprocal gain and mutual benefit
* Co-design, -implementation, and -evaluation of sustainability service learning projects to benefit outside partners
* Co-design, -implementation, and -evaluation of project-based sustainability learning in collaboration with external partner for reciprocal gain and mutual benefit
* Co-design, -implementation, and -evaluation of capacity building or training activities in sustainability for the benefit of non-ASU partners or populations

1. **Service**
   1. The candidate should have made service contributions to relevant academic and non-academic communities. Those communities include ASU, from school level committees to university wide assignments, professional communities, and could include other types of communities such as government, business and non-profit organizations, the broader public, K12 students, and others. Because of the wide diversity of faculty in SOS service expectations must be agreed upon with the candidate and the Director and outlined in an SPP (Section 5.1), with input from the Personnel Committee.
   2. Early-career faculty are not expected to devote significant time and energy to service activities. Service within SOS is limited and generally provided to create connections between early-career faculty and other SOS colleagues.
   3. Contribution to SOS’s operations, mission, and culture through serving on standing and ad hoc committees and participating in school initiatives.
   4. Contribution to the broader activities of the academy through (for example) peer review, serving on editorial boards, and participation in and leadership within academic committees and organizations.
   5. Service that engages with society needs to communicate, translate, and mobilize research findings or educational material to/for non-academic audiences. This may include:

* Sustainability talks to the public (e.g., speaking on climate change to faith-based organizations or participating in educational activities in public schools);
* Voluntary contribution of expertise to sustainability-related plans, projects, public processes (e.g., providing expert testimony; participating in commission to make knowledge accessible to public policy actors);
* Preparation and dissemination of sustainability education materials/ curriculum for public (beyond academia) use (e.g., preparing K-12 curriculum on specific topics);
* Voluntary contribution of time in service of public good provisioning on behalf of University/ School (e.g., “extension” service, production of a technology/ design of a product for public benefit/ to solve sustainability challenges).

1. **Associate to Full**
   1. As per [ACD 506-0](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html)5 promotion to full professor must be based on an overall demonstration of continued excellence and effectiveness in research, scholarship and/or creative activities, teaching, and service since the promotion to associate professor and evidence of contributions at a level beyond that reflected in the promotion decision to associate professor. Generally, an overall record of excellence requires national and/or international recognition for scholarly and/or creative achievement. *In addition to the criteria described in 8.1*, candidates will provide:
   2. **Research**
      1. Demonstration of leadership and excellence in relation to intellectual contributions in sustainability scholarship.
      2. Demonstrate national and global recognition and impact of one’s expertise, research, and discovery.
      3. Demonstrate clear and cohesive trajectory of research and intellectual contributions since achieving tenure.
      4. Demonstration of interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary collaboration in sustainability networks and communities, locally, nationally and/or internationally.
      5. Demonstration of leadership in scholarly networks, project administration, and research communities in term of agenda-setting and / or shaping domain(s) of knowledge in sustainability
      6. Demonstration of sustained effort to seek funding in support of research activities, students, and institutional collaborations, commensurate with the nature of the faculty’s work.
      7. The nature of contributions will differ according to each faculty’s profile and as articulated in each faculty member’s SPP. For promotion to full, scholars will demonstrate a record of sustained and/or increased productivity in terms of the quality and recognition associated with research outputs. Research outputs will demonstrate the nature, scope, and reach of collaborative endeavors, the socially engaged nature of research activities and how the candidate is contributing to shaping the domain(s) of knowledge in sustainability.
2. **Teaching**
   1. Demonstrate innovation and excellence in teaching and curriculum development.
   2. Demonstrate effective mentorship of students at all levels, both within the school, and with other units, as appropriate
   3. Demonstrate commitment to student success, illustrating, where appropriate, efforts to enhance justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion (JEDI).
   4. Leverage diverse and innovative pedagogical methods in ways that engage diverse voices and expertise to succeed and support an inclusive environment for learning.
   5. Engage in, or lead, programs within the School and ASU that strengthen justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion (JEDI) in teaching and mentoring.
   6. In addition, candidates seeking promotion to full professor may exemplify several of the following in their dossier
      1. Support the development and delivery of innovative instruction to non-degree seeking students, K-12 students, and professionals, as appropriate.
      2. Establish innovative ways of scaling how SOS’s sustainability competencies are taught, both within formal classes and informal activities.
3. **Service**
   1. Provide leadership within SOS’s operations, mission and culture through chairing and serving on standing and *ad hoc* committees and participating in school initiatives.
   2. Support ASU through serving on university committees and participating in and leading university-wide initiatives.
   3. Demonstrate leadership in engagement with researchers, professionals, decision makers and influencers, and others, across multiple disciplines and sectors.
   4. As appropriate to candidate’s profile:
      1. Engage constructively with non-academic organizations, including government, business, and nonprofit. organizations, as appropriate to candidate’s profile
      2. Partner to create sustainability solutions that are relevant to non-academic audiences, including members of the public, policy makers, businesses, nonprofits, K-12 students, and others.
      3. Engage with stakeholders to diffuse sustainability solutions to a broad non-academic audience.

**9. Type of Evidence to be Provided**

* 1. In order for the different levels of external and internal evaluators to assess the candidate, a portfolio is created that supports the accomplishments of the candidate. The following types of information can be included:
  2. Narrative that articulates how the candidate advanced the knowledge and discovery in the field of inquiry, emphasizing the period of employment after joining SOS faculty.
  3. Evidence of excellence in research and discovery can include the venue of publications (impact factor, rejection rates), citation metrics and research awards. Regarding research engaged with social and public issues and groups, evidence may include specifics about the engagement process, the significance of the venue, the outputs generated (e.g., editorials, policy brief, action plan, intervention manual), or, if available, the outcomes achieved (e.g., restored ecosystem, saved resources, avoided GHG emissions, sustainable technology implemented, sustainable behavior adopted).
  4. Evidence of excellence in teaching and instruction can include teaching assessments by peers, student evaluations, progress of undergraduate and graduate students mentored by the candidate, and development of new teaching material. Regarding teaching engaged with society, evidence may include specifics about the engagement process (e.g., # people involved; # educational events organized; type of education), the outputs generated (program designed, course developed, other educational material), and the outcomes achieved (capacity built).
  5. Evidence of excellence in service can include participation in SOS committees and university committees, organization of academic events, editing special issues, peer-review activities, engagement with non-academic audiences, and leadership within professional organizations.
  6. A Diversity Statement, articulating the faculty member’s approach and actions in support of enhancing JEDI principles and goals in their professional work (e.g., curriculum design, pedagogy, research implementation and management, mentoring, service and/or the specific thematic emphases of research).
  7. Articulation, through personal statement, c.v., and/or through inclusion of supplementary material, how the Mission of SOS and the ASU Charter are reflected in scholarship, teaching and/or service work.

**10. Examples of Profiles of Faculty Considered for Promotion & Tenure**

We provide profiles of hypothetical SOS faculty members pursuing promotion as illustration of how tenure and promotion criteria may be exhibited in faculty activities at two distinct stages in the promotion process. These examples are indicative only and should be used as a starting point for considering what a successful trajectory may look like. 

1. **Faculty with strong affiliations with humanities, philosophy, and interpretative scholarship.**

1. **Assistant Professor, at time of submission of tenure dossier**

In the period following the start of your employment as Assistant Professor at ASU, you have demonstrated growing national and international recognition for your scholarship as manifested by, for example, a published monograph by a respected internationally recognized press, as well as several (3-4) book chapters and/or lead-authored peer-reviewed articles. The recognition of your work may be less evident through journal impact metrics (e.g., H-scores etc.), than through the recognition documented in published reviews of your monograph and invitations to give seminars and talks at peer institutions. You may require little extramural funding for your intellectual work, nevertheless, you have applied for and acquired sufficient intra- and extramural funding to forward interdisciplinary engagements, intellectual collaborations, or venues for co-production and engagement with non-academic entities (e.g., to organize symposia, workshops, or public events). In the spirit of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary engagement, you are demonstrating how your work is salient to different debates among colleagues at ASU and beyond, through for example, invitations for you to participate in collaborative initiatives led by other scholars, through co-authored publications, the organization of interdisciplinary panels or edited volumes. You have begun to cultivate key partnerships and/or non-academic audiences for your scholarship, demonstrating your commitment to community engagement. Your teaching portfolio allows you to reliably contribute to core program objectives of SOS, while expressing your specific expertise and knowledge. You are demonstrating effort and success (as indicated in peer teaching and student evaluations) in innovative pedagogical approaches that contribute to education of SOS students in sustainability competencies, with attention to student diversity and inclusion, though, for example, participating in JEDI training and attention to your curriculum and pedagogy. You have demonstrated a capacity for undergraduate and graduate mentoring through participating on 3-4 committees of SOS students, as well as directly chairing one or more graduate committees. You have shown your willingness to participate in SOS committees, while being careful that your obligations are not excessive (e.g., 1 committee/year) in order to concentrate on establishing your research trajectory. You are, however, engaged in a few distinct service activities outside the University, such as organizing a conference panel, engaging with non-academic audiences, initiating a special issue of a key journal, or taking leadership in organizing a workshop to forward your research agenda. These latter activities are instrumental in building your academic and non-academic network of collaborators, partnerships and thus enhancing the social impact of your work.

1. **Associate Professor, at time of submission of promotion dossier**

You have established a national or international reputation in your domain of scholarship. You have maintained a continued trajectory of publications – monographs, chapters and/or peer-reviewed journal articles – since acquiring tenure, demonstrating your leadership in your scholarship domain (e.g., as editor of volumes, through citation metrics, or the academic reception of your outputs). Since tenure, you have expanded an inter- or transdisciplinary network of collaborators. Your leadership in this network illustrates the ways in which your work is speaking to distinct domains of knowledge and knowledge application. You are both an active contributor to and generator of research agendas and sustainability solution pathways, through for example, your participation and/or leadership in agenda-setting research initiatives at the national or international level. You are able to provide evidence of the impact of your scholarship in debates and activities within and beyond academia, whether that is in terms of specific project activities and outputs, the uptake of your scholarly work in public policy or decision processes, or your direct contributions to public discourse, media or other communicative channels. You have developed a program of work that is aligned with the mission and vision of the school, and the design aspirations and charter of the university. You have established yourself as a strong and consistent mentor and instructor of undergraduate and graduate students, making efforts to foster an inclusive learning environment in which all can thrive; you are demonstrating a commitment to JEDI principles in teaching, mentoring and/or research. You are actively supporting students’ research endeavors and supporting their academic success in publications; many have graduated and are successfully employed in work related to their domain of study. You have made a significant contribution to the SOS curriculum through your teaching of core courses as well as through the development and teaching of courses in your specific knowledge domain. You have demonstrated your ability to teach sustainability competencies through your specific pedagogical approach and particular teaching innovations. You are contributing substantially through service positions in SOS and ASU; you have taken leadership in specific service domains or institution-building initiatives (e.g., a Center or Institute, or other initiative of ASU). You are contributing nationally and/or internationally through service on working groups and/or committees in your knowledge area, and/or are holding editorial positions in respected journals. You are providing clear evidence of engagement, sustainability solutions research and research communication outside of academia; such evidence (e.g., in the form of letters of support, extended peer-reviews of your scholarship by non-academic partners) is included as supplementary materials in your promotion dossier.

1. **Faculty with strong affiliations with social and natural sciences**
   1. **Assistant Professor, at time of submission of tenure dossier**

There is evidence of growing scholarship and recognition nationally and internationally, as manifested by, for example, 10-12 peer-reviewed articles (likely 5-7 lead-authored) in a variety of respected journals, both specialized and broader interdisciplinary international journals, and/or book chapters/ impactful reports as part of international networks of research activities. Your publication portfolio demonstrates your capacity for intellectual leadership (e.g., in impactful lead-authored articles) as well as your participation in productive, collaborative, and interdisciplinary scholarly networks. The recognition of your work is evident through journal impact metrics (e.g., H-scores etc.) and through invitations to give seminars and talks at peer institutions nationally and internationally. Your international work requires building international networks and you participate in international professional organizations. You have demonstrated a capacity to acquire and sustain the extramural funding necessary for your research implementation either as co-PI or PI in research initiatives. You have applied for and acquired sufficient inter- and extramural funding to forward international collaborations (e.g., to travel, do fieldwork). In line with ASU’s and SOS’s interest in engagement, you are demonstrating how your work is salient to different debates among colleagues at ASU and beyond, through for example, invitations for you to participate in collaborative initiatives led by other scholars, and through co-authored publications, and participation in national and international organizations. You present clear evidence of a program of work that is aligned with the mission and vision of the school, and the design aspirations and charter of the university. You have begun to cultivate key partnerships with NGOs and other civil-society organizations. You have developed your teaching portfolio in a way that both allows you to reliably contribute to core program objectives of SOS, while expressing your specific expertise and global reach. You are demonstrating effort and success (as indicated in peer teaching and student evaluations) in innovative pedagogical approaches that contribute to education of SOS students in sustainability competencies and foster an inclusive learning environment. You have demonstrated a capacity for undergraduate and graduate mentoring through participating on 3-4 committees of SOS students, as well as directly chairing one or more graduate committees. You have shown your willingness to participate in SOS committees, while being careful your obligations are not excessive (e.g., 1 committee/year) in order to concentrate on establishing your research trajectory. You are, however, engaged in a few distinct service activities outside the University, such as organizing a conference panel, a special issue of a key journal, or taking leadership in organizing a workshop of colleagues to forward your research agenda.

2. **Associate Professor, at time of submission of promotion dossier**

You now have established a national and/or international reputation for your domain of scholarship. Since tenure, you will have demonstrated your contribution through a continued trajectory of interdisciplinary/ transdisciplinary publications – peer-reviewed articles in respected international journals, as well as more applied reports or other forms of science dissemination. These publications demonstrate your leadership in your scholarship domain as well as the salience of your work in adjacent knowledge domains and/or for decision-making and policy (e.g., as editor of special issues, through citation metrics, or the academic reception of your outputs). You will have an expanded international network of collaborators to pursue your science and application of your research findings. You will have demonstrated a capacity to both be an active contributor to and generator of research agendas, through for example, your participation and leadership in agenda-setting research initiatives. You are able to provide evidence of the impact of your scholarship in activities within and beyond academia, whether that is in terms of specific project activities and outputs, the uptake of your research in policy, or your contributions to public or international discourse, media or other communicative channels. You present clear evidence of a program of work that is aligned with the mission and vision of the school, and the design aspirations and charter of the university. You have established yourself as a strong and consistent mentor and instructor of undergraduate and graduate students, making efforts to foster an inclusive learning environment in which all can thrive, and demonstrating your commitment to JEDI. You are actively supporting students’ research endeavors and supporting their academic success in publications; several have graduated and are successfully employed in work related to their domain of study. You also have contributed to mentoring international visitors. You have made a significant contribution to the SOS curriculum through your teaching of core courses as well as through the development and teaching of courses in your specific knowledge domain. You have demonstrated your ability to teach sustainability competencies through your specific pedagogical approach and innovations. You are contributing substantially through service positions in SOS and ASU; you have taken leadership in specific service domains. You are contributing nationally and/or internationally through service in working groups, professional associations in your knowledge area, and/or are holding editorial positions in respected journals. You are providing clear evidence of engagement, translation. and communication outside of academia; such evidence if available is included as supplementary materials in your promotion dossier.

3. **Faculty with Engaged Scholarship**

1. **Assistant Professor, at time of submission of tenure dossier**

There is evidence of your growing scholarship and recognition in the region or community of practitioners you are active in as well as nationally. This evidence manifests in, for example, 7-10 peer-reviewed journal articles (half or more as lead-author) published in applied sustainability journals. In addition, you have produced 5-6 documents of practical relevance that have been disseminated and subject to external review, including, but not limited to, project reports with actionable recommendations, handbooks, white papers, policy briefs, etc. The recognition of your work may be less evident through conventional journal impact metrics (e.g., H-scores etc.) than through these reports and invitations to public panels, expert hearings, and continued project partnerships. However, you might be involved in efforts to demonstrate engaged scholarship through social impact metrics. You have applied for and acquired sufficient project funding to advance practical solutions in your area of expertise. In line with ASU’s and SOS’s interest in engaged scholarship, you are demonstrating how your work is salient to different professional and public debates, through for example, invitations to participate in applied projects and outreach activities that have yielded recognizable results beyond the individual cases and sites. You present clear evidence of a program of work that is aligned with the mission and vision of the school, and the design aspirations and charter of the university. You have begun to cultivate external partnerships and non-academic audiences for your scholarship. You have developed your teaching portfolio in a way that both allows you to reliably contribute to core program objectives of SOS, while expressing your specific expertise in engaged scholarship. You are demonstrating effort and success (as indicated in peer teaching and student evaluations) in action-oriented, participatory, collaborative, and/or project-based pedagogical approaches that contribute to education of SOS students in sustainability competencies, including professional skills such as stakeholder engagement and project management. You have demonstrated a capacity for undergraduate and graduate mentoring through participating on 3-4 committees of SOS graduate students, as well as chairing one or more. You are integrating JEDI principles into your teaching, engagement, mentorship, and curriculum. You have shown your willingness to participate in SOS committees, while being careful your service obligations are not excessive (e.g., 1 committee/ year) in order to concentrate on establishing your research trajectory. You are, however, engaged in a few distinct service activities outside the university, such as organizing practitioners’ workshops, exchanges among engaged scholars, and/or an international summer school on engaged scholarship for PhD students as well as serving on expert commissions such as a city’s Sustainability Commission to forward your research and/or teaching agenda. The quality of your engaged scholarship is not only recognized by peers within academia but also in communities of professionals which can be demonstrated through tenure letters as part of an ‘extended peer review’ process.

2. **Associate Professor, at time of submission of promotion dossier**

You now have established a national and/or international reputation for your domain of scholarship. You will have demonstrated your contribution through a continued trajectory of publications – peer-reviewed journal articles and documents of practical relevance – since acquiring tenure. These publications demonstrate your leadership in your scholarship domain (e.g., as editor of volumes, through advanced impact metrics, or the wider public reception of your outputs). You will have an expanded network of professional partnerships, illustrating the ways in which your work is speaking to distinct domains of knowledge application. You will have demonstrated a capacity to both be an active contributor to and generator of solution-oriented research agendas, through for example, your participation and/or leadership in agenda-setting research initiatives. You provide evidence of the social impact of your scholarship in debates and activities within and beyond academia, through contributions to professional practices, public discourse, media or other communication channels. You present clear evidence of a program of work that is aligned with the mission and vision of the school, and the design aspirations and charter of the university. You have established yourself as a strong and consistent mentor and instructor of undergraduate and graduate students; students are participating in your professional products as co-authors. You are actively supporting students’ research endeavors and supporting their success in professional networks; several have graduated and are successfully employed in work related to their domain of study. You have made a significant contribution to the SOS curriculum through your teaching of core courses as well as through the development and teaching of courses in your specific domain of applied knowledge. You have demonstrated your ability to teach sustainability competencies through your action-oriented, participatory, collaborative, and/or project-based pedagogical approach and innovations. You are contributing substantially through service positions in SOS and ASU; you have taken leadership in specific service domains. You are contributing nationally and/or internationally through service professional committees in your knowledge area, and/or are holding editorial positions in respected journals of applied sustainability. You are providing clear evidence of engagement, translation, and communication outside of academia.

**11. Statement of Professional Plans**

It is the aim of the School of Sustainability that each faculty member feels supported, shares a strong sense of purpose with the School and is enabled to achieve their aspirations in relation to their own professional development as well as the School’s Vision and Mission. The Statement of Professional Plans (SPP) reflects the mutual commitment of each faculty member and the School to this objective. The SPP is intended to outline each faculty member’s aspirational values in relation to scholarship goals and professional identity. The SPP specifies how each faculty member’s work fulfills the specific content focus/ knowledge delivery expectations of the position which they occupy in the School and the specific duties assigned by the Dean via their letter of appointment/MOU, how such work meets the guidelines for tenure and promotion articulated in the Promotion Guidelines. It is expected that the School and professional development trajectory of each faculty member will co-evolve; this SPP will be updated periodically (e.g., annually, for pre-tenure/junior-level faculty) to reflect this evolution. The SPP will likely be no more than 2 pages in length and can be presented in outline format.

Not all categories of work will apply to all faculty members; the categories below should map to the expected allocation of work for each faculty member according to their appointment letter and rank. Faculty may also outline aspirational goals in work categories that do not correspond to their formal responsibilities in their work (e.g., research aspirations for a senior lecturer). These may be important to outline as a means for the faculty member to discuss how personal, professional, and institutional expectations and goals can be best aligned.

### **Research**

This section outlines how the faculty member will obtain excellence in research (scholarship), in line with the criteria established in the Promotion Guidelines, as appropriate to rank and position. These research objectives will also take into consideration the position of ASU in the ecosystem of large research universities with similar missions. This includes research (scholarly) output, research (scholarship) quality, and research (scholarship) impact (within and outside the academy). Faculty may also outline aspirational goals in work categories that do not correspond to their formal responsibilities in their work (e.g., research aspirations for a senior lecturer). These may be important to outline as a means for the faculty member to discuss how personal, professional, and institutional expectations and goals can be best aligned.

1. What will be the focal thematic emphases of your work over the next 3 years? Describe the primary domains of scholarship in which you are aiming to make substantive contributions in advance of tenure. Explain how your goals exemplify the thematic emphasis of the position you were hired to fill in the School, the ASU Charter and the School’s Mission.
2. Where will you be disseminating your work? What specific venues and fora do you expect to participate in? Justify these venues (e.g., specific journals, conferences, etc.) in terms of how they will enhance the impact and recognition of your contributions.
3. How do you expect to fund your research agenda? Describe the specific sources of funding and support (intra- and extramural) that you will seek, the competitiveness of such funding sources, and alternative strategies given the uncertainty in funding environments.
4. How will the impact and quality of your productivity be evident? Describe the specific metrics, standards, evaluations, peer-recognition that will capture the academic rigor and quality, as well as the academic and real-world impact of your work. How do your metrics of impact and quality meet the expectations as articulated in the School’s Guidelines for Promotion?
5. Describe nationally or internationally recognized scholars in your field, and/or communities of scholars, or scholarly associations with whom you would aspire to interact with, and how you expect to work towards interaction with those scholars and communities in your plans for networking, scholarship dissemination and collaborations.
6. Describe what steps you will take to consider and advance JEDI concerns in your research program (e.g., this could be in terms of content/ focus or research/ lab management)

### **Teaching**

This section should articulate the teaching and mentoring expectations as negotiated with the Director and as defined as core responsibilities in your letter of appointment/MOU. This section should include clear expectations for how you will achieve excellence and a discussion of how you plan to meet these goals given your field and scholarship modality. How do your teaching aspirations meet the expectations of your letter of appointment/MOU and the criteria articulated in the School’s Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure? Include indications of how you will forward JEDI principles in your teaching goals, e.g., in relation to your curriculum development, pedagogy, or professional capacity building in teaching. Faculty may also outline aspirational goals in work categories that do not correspond to their formal responsibilities in their work (e.g., research aspirations for a senior lecturer). These may be important to outline as a means for the faculty member to discuss how personal, professional, and institutional expectations and goals can be best aligned.

### **Service**

This section should include clear plans for the level and type of service expected, commensurate with the faculty member’s core responsibilities as defined in your letter of appointment/MOU. This section should include clear expectations for how you will achieve what constitutes excellence in Service and a discussion of how you plan to meet these goals. Articulate how these plans fulfill expectations for promotion, as articulated in the School’s Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. As relevant, describe how your service goals may address JEDI interests and concerns. Faculty may also outline aspirational goals in work categories that do not correspond to their formal responsibilities in their work (e.g., research aspirations for a senior lecturer). These may be important to outline as a means for the faculty member to discuss how personal, professional, and institutional expectations and goals can be best aligned.

****

**Appendix 2:**

**SOS Promotion Guidelines for Fixed-Term Faculty**

Approved by the Faculty Assembly and Director

January 2014

Revised May 19, 2021

1. **General Preamble**
   1. The School of Sustainability (SOS)’s vision is to empower and build capacity for transformation toward a thriving, sustainable world. SOS is committed to ASU’s Charter and its focus on research and discovery, academic access and success, and engagement with society to advance sustainability. We seek to promote inclusion and diversity in our research, teaching and service activities. Since its beginning, SOS has continually improved its structure, curricula, and societal impact. This reflexivity has allowed SOS to adapt and evolve through learning and experimentation. SOS expects faculty to address the complex sustainability challenges facing society, and encourages collaborations between faculty and organizations outside the university who put sustainability solutions into practice. Our faculty engage with practitioners on the front lines of sustainability challenges. We collaborate domestically and internationally with cities, nonprofits, public agencies, and businesses to provide educational opportunities for our students and help infuse sustainability thinking into these organizations.
   2. The SOS Guidelines for Fixed-term Faculty are designed with two purposes. The first is to establish expectations and processes for fixed-term SOS faculty as they are considered for promotion. For this purpose, it sets out school-specific expectations and evaluation criteria, within the context of ASU expectations, and those of the broader academy. The second purpose is to establish SOS as a community based on mutual reciprocal obligations of learning and advancement. It sets out processes to share, discuss and support what each faculty aspires to be as a scholar, teacher, and as an engaged member of the community, and how such aspirations meet the expectations of SOS.
   3. All promotion policies and procedures within SOS are intended to be coherent with Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) policies and procedures; in cases of inconsistencies, ABOR policies take precedence.
2. **Relevant ASU policies and guidance documents**
   1. 2.1 ACD 505-02: [Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html)
   2. [ACD 505–03: Academic Professional Status, Ranks, Titles, and Appointment Categories](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-03.html)
   3. ACD 506–01: [Preamble for Promotion and Tenure](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-01.html)
   4. ACD 506–05: [Faculty Promotion](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html)
   5. [ACD 507-06: Continuing Appointment for Academic Professionals](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-06.html)
   6. [ACD 507-07: Academic Professional Promotion](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-07.html)
   7. [Process Guide for Promotion of Fixed-term Facult](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/p6-process-guide-_fixed-term-faculty-promotion-20200513.pdf)y
3. **School mission statement and objectives**
   1. SOS’ mission is to foster innovative research, impactful education, and engaged communities to achieve environmental integrity, social equity, and wellbeing.
   2. Within this mission, the SOS has three primary objectives, which embrace ASU’s design aspirations:

* Research and Discovery - SOS faculty generate new knowledge and insights through research, scholarship, and creative activities that transcend conventional disciplinary boundaries, leverage transdisciplinary collaborations, and benefit from unconventional synergies between areas and modes of expertise and understanding;
* Academic Access and Success - SOS faculty strive to create opportunities for empowerment (for students at all stages of professional and personal development, and regardless of background) through effective instruction and mentorship;
* Community Engagement - SOS faculty support academic societies, policy makers, businesses, nonprofits, and other communities, in advancing sustainability. We make knowledge and insights accessible and positively impacting and empowering individuals and organizations, through effective communication, engagement, and knowledge translation and mobilization. We promote and enable social justice and equity, especially as it relates to sustainability.

1. **Fixed term faculty work expectations and terms of promotion**
   1. Work expectations. SOS fixed term faculty are employed in a variety of positions. The specific expectations for each faculty member will be determined through their appointment letter/ Memorandum of Understanding provided at the time of appointment, and will likely evolve over time in response to the professional development of the faculty and the needs of SOS. This evolution will be reflected in their Statement of Professional Plan (section 5), which they are encouraged to develop and amend as needed. For promotion, however, there are a suite of activities that represent the primary focus of the position of employment. While other activities may be pursued in agreement with the SOS leadership and the faculty member, as reflected in their updated Statements of Professional Plan (section 5), the primary expectations for promotion in each position are described below (section 10). Unless otherwise specified as part of the faculty member’s appointment letter/ Memorandum of Understanding, additional tasks and activities beyond what is described as core responsibilities for the position will not be required for the faculty member to be eligible for promotion.
   2. In all positions, SOS would expect greater evidence of leadership in teaching/mentorship activities, research and/or service (as applicable) for faculty seeking promotion to more senior positions of their respective employment category.
   3. Terms of appointment. Typically, fixed term faculty are initially appointed to one-year terms. As described below (4.4) multiple-year and rolling-multiple year terms are also possible.
   4. Pending Director, Dean, and Provost approval, multi-year contracts may be available to fixed-term faculty (see [ACD505-02](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html)). To build the case for a multi-year contract, the unit must provide the following additional information, with particular emphasis on items 3 - 5, below:
2. Name, current academic rank, and unit of the person in question;
3. Requested effective date of the new appointment;
4. Explanation of how this person is uniquely qualified for a multi-year appointment;
5. Explanation of what unit need is being served by moving this person to a multi-year appointment;
6. Explanation of how budget flexibility will be preserved after the multiple-year appointment begins;
7. Further evidence, if any, that this is a compelling need.
8. **Administrative Procedures** 
   1. Statement of Professional Plans
      1. Following appointment, the faculty member and the Director of SOS, with input from the Personnel Committee, are encouraged to develop a general plan for promotion according to their anticipated promotion review schedule. This is the Statement of Professional Plans (SPP), serving as a mentoring document, helping faculty identify professional goals, strengths and potential shortcomings as they progress towards promotion.
      2. The SPP provides the opportunity for faculty members to articulate their goals associated with research, teaching and service (as applicable to their specific professional position), and how these goals contribute to their professional development in relation to SOS’s mission and objectives and the expectations of their position.
      3. In annual performance evaluations, with input from the SOS Personnel Committee, the candidate will receive feedback from the SOS Director, and the SPP can be amended accordingly, if necessary, to ensure a mutually beneficial and shared relationship of obligations, both from the faculty member to SOS, and SOS to the faculty member. It is not expected that the SPP will be revised annually, but rather only as needed to document a change in prioritization, goals or focus of work. These revisions to the SPP take place with the understanding that being a faculty member involves engaging in continual learning and that this learning is part of SOS’s constant transformation and fulfilment of evolving aspirations.
      4. The SPP should be used by the faculty member as a basis for preparing promotion materials, i.e., in articulating the focus of faculty activities and effort, to best exemplify the impact and excellence of the faculty’s work in anticipation of the promotion process and each faculty’s personal development goals. The SPP supports, but does not supplant, the expectations of productivity and excellence described in the Fixed Term Faculty Guidelines for Promotion.
   2. Mentoring Candidates toward Promotion
      1. In consultation with the candidate, the SOS Director will assign at least one formal mentor to each junior fixed-term faculty member within the first year of their hire, although typically fixed-term faculty seek two or three mentors.
      2. The purpose of the mentor(s) is to offer the candidate advice in the areas relevant to their contract, including research, teaching and service in pursuit of SOS’s mission and objectives, as they pertain to achieving promotion according to SOS and University guidelines.
      3. After consulting with the Director, the faculty member initiates the application for promotion by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html) and the process guide for promotion of fixed term faculty: (<https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ProcessGuideFixed-TermFacultyPromotionP6.pdf>).
   3. SOS Faculty Evaluation
      1. The SOS Personnel Committee will evaluate all relevant information on the candidate’s research, teaching and service as it relates to the candidate’s appointment category, see ACD 505-02: Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles. This information will also be evaluated against SOS’s mission and objectives, and the criteria described in this document.
      2. The committee prepares a letter of recommendation, as per the procedures described in SOS Bylaws Article VI, C.
      3. The final recommendation letter and voting results are then submitted to the Director, including the committee’s collective recommendation that promotion be granted or denied.
      4. Faculty discussion of the candidate’s case is confidential. SOS faculty should not communicate the voting results to the candidate.
   4. SOS Director Evaluation
      1. The SOS Director will evaluate all relevant information related to the candidate’s research, instruction and mentoring, and service, including the candidate’s packet and the SOS Personnel Committee’s letter and recommendation.
      2. The SOS Director shall not communicate the results of the faculty vote to the promotion candidate. The Director should communicate any weaknesses or strengths of the promotion case to the candidate prior to the Director’s submission of the letter to the Dean of the College of Global Futures.
      3. The candidate, at this time, may decide to withdraw their request for promotion.
      4. The Director shall write their own letter of evaluation to the Dean of the College of Global Futures, including a recommendation for either granting or denying promotion.
      5. On the completion of the promotion process and approval of promotion, the Director shall inform the candidate of the promotion outcome and provide a brief summary of the strengths and weaknesses highlighted in the promotion process.
   5. College and University Review
      1. The candidate’s packet, the SOS Personnel Committee letter, and SOS Director letter will be submitted to the Dean of the College of Global Futures (CGF) and reviewed by the College-level Personnel Committee, which discusses the case and develops a letter of recommendation prior to casting and recording an anonymous vote.
      2. The final recommendation letter and voting results are submitted to the Dean, including the committee’s collective recommendation that the personnel action be granted or denied.
      3. In the case of promotion, the Dean and the University P&T Committee each will compose letters of evaluation and recommendations for award or denial of promotion and forward to the Provost.
      4. The ASU Provost will consider the candidate’s packet, the recommendations of the SOS Promotion Committee, the GCF Dean, the University P&T Committee, and write their own evaluation, including a decision to award or deny promotion to the candidate.
   6. Process for joint appointments
      1. Where a faculty member whose primary academic unit is SOS has a joint appointment with other units, SOS will solicit input from the Chair, Director or Dean of the relevant unit that specifically deals with those parts of the faculty member’s workload that are assigned to that unit through the Memorandum of Understanding (see ASU Guidelines for Join and Affiliated Appointments). The timeline and expectations around providing review material to affiliated units and receiving the relevant feedback will be negotiated and agreed on in writing between the units ahead of the SOS promotion process. This will include the process by which affiliated units will contribute to the selection of external reviewers, and the collection and inclusion of evaluation comments from affiliated units in the review process.
9. **Lecturers**
   1. Position description: Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers are fixed-term faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching undergraduate and graduate courses, supervising supplemental kinds of student learning, professional development, and/or administrative duties related to teaching. A Senior Lecturer generally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of five years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience ([ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html)). A Principal Lecturer generally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of seven years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience. Workload for lecturers is generally expected to be 80% teaching and 20% service.
   2. Position core responsibilities.Lecturers’ primary responsibilities are to teach courses in SOS degree programs and mentor students enrolled in these courses. Senior lecturers’ teaching responsibilities expand to include responsibilities for developing courses and curriculum and could include mentoring junior level instructors (e.g., graduate instructors, new faculty associates). Principal lecturers provide leadership roles in high-quality instruction, and also may devote a portion of their effort to curriculum development and programmatic responsibilities. Service responsibilities at the junior rank focus on lecturers’ expertise and primary work responsibilities in teaching, such as serving on curriculum committees in SOS, or, at the senior level, coordinating other instructors of a course. Additional activities, such as mentoring graduate students, serving on graduate committees, and research-related work should be discussed with the Director if these are to become part of the expected work of the Lecturer at any rank, and thus subject to evaluation in promotion matters.
   3. Eligibility for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.Eligibility for promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on time in rank as well as demonstrated excellence in both teaching and service. Lecturers are eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer in their fifth year. The five years of college-level experience should be a full-time faculty appointment. Lecturers who have served in a less than full-time capacity will be considered on a case by case basis. Lecturers requesting promotion to Senior Lecturer will also be evaluated with respect to evidence of excellence primarily in teaching and secondarily in service (see section 9, Evaluation Criteria for details).

* 1. Eligibility for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer.Seven years of teaching and service as Senior Lecturer is expected for this promotion. Candidates for the promotion should demonstrate evidence of continued excellence and effectiveness in teaching, service, and leadership. Leadership is also expected in course curriculum development and improvement. The seven years of college-level experience should be a full-time faculty appointment. Senior Lecturers who have served in a less than full-time capacity will be considered on a case by case basis.

1. **Research Faculty**
   1. Position Description. Research Faculty are fixed-term faculty members who are qualified to engage in, be responsible for, or oversee a significant area of research or scholarship. A completed doctoral or appropriate terminal degree is necessary for appointment. They may also serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university or take on other appropriate responsibilities. Research Faculty who are hired, on or supported by research grants or contracts are not guaranteed space, facilities, or services beyond those approved for currently active grants or contracts. Appointments are at the assistant, associate, and full (professor) levels.
   2. Position core responsibilities. Research Professors are typically hired to support specific research projects and initiatives within SOS or College, without expectations of service or teaching. The appointment letter specifies the expectations on the type of research outputs needed, and whether any additional activities such as student mentoring and teaching or service are expected in the position. Responsibilities thus typically include the pursuit and production of research outputs (papers, reports, patents, etc.), support for the pursuit of extramural funding, and participation in specific research networks within SOS, College or University. Depending on the nature of appointment, the Research Professor may also be involved in mentoring undergraduate and graduate students as well as technical staff in the research environment, and/or special instructional activities associated with research initiatives (workshops/ summer schools). Service activities may also be part of appointment, particularly related to the specific expertise of the research faculty. Senior Research Professors would be expected to take greater leadership roles in funding, research networks and initiatives, with corresponding levels of research productivity.
   3. Eligibility for Promotion to Associate**.** Assistant Research Professors are eligible for promotion typically after 5 years of service in SOS of Sustainability. Candidates seeking promotion to Associate Research Professor are substantially and significantly contributing to the research productivity aims of the research programs and initiatives in which they are involved, through their outputs and activities.
   4. Eligibility for promotion from Associate to Full Research Professor. 7 years of service at the associate level is expected. Candidates for promotion to Full should demonstrate leadership over a substantive research/ scholarship program, funded largely through extramural support, which forwards SOS’s Mission and ASU’s Charter.
2. **Practice Faculty**
   1. Description of position.Professors of Practice are fixed-term faculty members whose expertise, achievements and reputation developed over a sustained period of time qualify them to be distinguished professionals in an area of practice or discipline, although they may not have academic credentials or experience. Professors of Practice are valued in SOS for their ability to bring practical experience, connections with external organizations and knowledge to students and faculty, forwarding SOS’s mission of socially-engaged and solution-oriented work.
   2. Position core responsibilities. Professors of Practice (PoP) may lead or make contributions in all areas of the University mission, including teaching, research, service, administration and leadership. While the specific activities among a PoPs may vary, and will be specified in a Memorandum of Understanding at time of hire and upon renewal, typically they will be engaged in teaching courses in degree programs, mentoring students (e.g., serving on thesis committees, or in relation to independent projects or coursework), and supporting SOS’s efforts to integrate practitioner knowledge into courses, curriculum and training. They can serve on standing and ad hoc School, College and University committees, and may take leadership roles, especially for purposes of connecting SOS and its students and faculty to external organizations and initiatives, including research, educational program development, student internships, thesis and capstone projects or initiatives that entail integration of practitioner perspectives and partnerships with external organizations. Professors of Practice in SOS are expected to help students and faculty understand and connect to institutions, businesses and communities beyond the academy. They should bring current “real world” perspectives on sustainability leadership, challenges, opportunities, and solutions to teaching, research projects, committee assignments and university initiatives, in order to bridge gaps between research and practice.
   3. Eligibility for contract change. University policy is to appoint Professors of Practice only at the Full (professor) level which effectively removes the traditional incentive for promotion in academic positions (i.e., assistant to associate to full). Professors of Practice may be eligible for a multi-year contract, as described in section 4 above.
3. **Clinical Faculty**
   1. Position description.Clinical faculty are qualified by training, experience, or education to direct or participate in specialized university functions (ACD 505-02), including project-based learning and other advanced training programs, sustainability community service, applied solution-oriented research programs and engaged scholarship, or other functions. They are appointed as clinical assistant professors, clinical associate professors, or clinical professors. These positions may be part-time or full-time. The appointment letter specifies the type of functions expected; any changes to functions and work allocation should be kept up to date in the faculty member’s SPP. As designated by SOS’s Director, each Clinical Faculty may also be assigned a specific workload distribution related to applied research and engaged scholarship or program administration/coordination or any other relevant category.
   2. Position core responsibilities.Clinical Professors’ primary teaching responsibilities at the junior level include teaching degree and non-degree (e.g., professional development) courses/ workshops, developing curriculum catered to professional development needs, and mentoring, commensurate with the teaching load. Service responsibilities should be associated with the position’s orientation towards professional development and outreach. Scholarship and research outputs are not expected, but may be pursued as part of the faculty’s work in professional development, outreach and education. Senior Clinical Professors’ responsibilities may expand to mentoring of graduate students and serving on graduate student committees, designing and coordinating courses and curriculum, taking on leadership roles in School committees, and serving in / leading University and College committees. While scholarship/creative innovation is not a required or typical component of this position; an individual workload distribution of effort agreement may be modified to reflect a scholarship expectation. Expansion of activities and leadership expectations following promotion should be specified in the faculty member’s SPP.
   3. Eligibility for promotion.After the completion of five years in rank at ASU, the individual may elect to be considered for promotion from Assistant to Associate Clinical professor, and after seven years for promotion from Associate to Full clinical professor.
4. **Evaluation Criteria for All Fixed Term Faculty**
   1. Faculty members will be evaluated in relation to the expectations associated with their appointment, and job descriptions. The criteria described below encompass teaching, service and research. Not all criteria will apply to all positions, given the differences in core responsibilities associated with each position. The faculty’s diverse contributions to SOS and University will be considered in light of the evolution of the faculty member’s work in relation to School and University expectations.
   2. Efforts to enhance justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion (JEDI) in teaching and mentoring, research and service are highly valued by SOS and should be highlighted in promotion materials. As SOS develops training materials and provides resources for faculty professional development in relation to JEDI principles, faculty members can refer to the use of these resources in their research, teaching, and service work. Qualitative evidence can be presented in a narrative form in the personal statement as well as the dossier materials submitted for promotion.
   3. Teaching criteria
      1. Excellence in teaching is evaluated in relation to SOS’s mission and ASU’s Charter. Fixed term faculty engaged in teaching would be assessed in relation to the following criteria, always commensurate with their core responsibilities and written agreement with SOS:

* Develop and deliver high quality of teaching to ASU students through formal classes, and less formal educational activities, such as for non-degree seeking students.
* Contribute to SOS’s curriculum through developments and/or improvements of courses at undergraduate or graduate levels, as described in the letter of appointment.
* Create an inclusive and supportive environment, engaging in diverse voices and expertise, such that students of all backgrounds and capacities can thrive with explicit attention to JEDI concerns.
* Establish diverse and innovative ways of ensuring the achievement of SOS’s sustainability competencies among students, including, for example, lecture-based, project-based, and interactive group activities, attentive to JEDI concerns and the approaches tools that can enable diverse students to learn and excel.
  + 1. For promotion from Associate to Full (Senior to Principal). Candidates shall demonstrate that they have excelled in the criteria listed for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Associate Research/Clinical Professor rank. Candidates are expected to demonstrate that they have taken personal initiative and assumed leadership roles in pursuit of those criteria, achieving recognition for their efforts. Efforts to publish innovations and/or publicly disseminate the outcomes of pedagogical experiences and associated initiatives is strongly encouraged.
    2. Type of Evidence to be Provided. Any candidate whose position description includes an expectation of teaching shall include evidence of excellence in teaching and mentoring. Evidence of teaching excellence is normally included in the promotion request dossier (see [Process Guide for Fixed Term Faculty Promotion](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/p6-process-guide-_fixed-term-faculty-promotion-20200513.pdf)), which should include at least three different types of evidence of teaching excellence, and one of which must be the candidate’s Summary of Student Evaluation as required by ABOR policy. Candidates should work with the SOS Director to identify appropriate materials that would effectively demonstrate an engaged effort to improve/sustain excellence in teaching and mentoring. The types of evidence may include, but are not limited to:
* Two recent, objective and substantive peer evaluation of teaching
* Teaching or mentoring recognition/honors/awards
* Scholarship with a focus on pedagogy, teaching innovations, or curriculum design
* Evidence of student success in courses taught
* Evidence of successful mentoring, both in formal (e.g., committee assignments) and informal settings
* Evidence of student career success related to the candidate’s teaching or mentoring
* Examples of effective teaching innovation by the candidate (course, curriculum, or program)
* Explicit attention to JEDI concerns through participation in training and/or the thematic focus of teaching efforts, course modifications and enhancements, lecture design and construction, teaching engagement opportunities, and mentoring of underrepresented students.
  1. Service criteria
     1. Service refers to activities and engagement on behalf of SOS and University with a wide spectrum of organizations and actors, ranging from school level committees to university wide assignments, professional communities, and potentially other types of communities such as government, business and non-profit organizations, the broader public, and K12 students.
     2. Service also may include participationand leadership in professional associations, serving on research councils or committees, proposal evaluations, editorial work and other academy activities. The type of service undertaken will be commensurate with the faculty member’s position, rank and work expectations.
     3. Service in relation to non-academic entities may involve, for example, the communication and translation of University or School outputs (research or educational materials) for different publics; service as advisor or expert in public or non-academic processes and activities; or service as a liaison or broker between the University and external organizations in relation to research partnerships, educational endeavors, professional development or other collaborative activities.
     4. Type of Evidence to be Provided: Any candidate whose position description includes an expectation of service shall include evidence of excellence in service. The evaluation of service accounts for the role assumed in the committee, the activities carried out while serving on the committee and the contributions made for SOS, the University and the community. The evidence of service excellence is normally included in the promotion request dossier (promotion materials), which should include at least three different types of evidence of service excellence, one of which can be the candidate’s narrative of their service contributions. Candidates should work with the SOS Director to identify appropriate materials that would effectively demonstrate an engaged effort to improve/sustain excellence in service. The types of evidence may include, but are not limited to:
* Documentation of participation in SOS committees and university committees, engagement with non-academic audiences, leadership within professional organizations, as well as organization of academic events, and extended peer-review activities
* Description of the number of service obligations, nature, frequency and intensity of activities undertaken, role in service obligations, and impact of service contributions for the University, School, professional associations or community at large, as commensurate with position and rank
* As appropriate to position expectations, evidence may include examples of editorial and/or research evaluation services, organization of research panels or other activities in research administration
* Supplemental evidence of engagement and social impact may include letters describing service outputs or impact from external actors / organizations with whom the faculty has worked
* Faculty may include statements as to how their service activities worked to enhance SOS and University’s commitment to JEDI principles and goals.
  + 1. In cases of promotion to Principal Lecturer, Full Clinical or Full Research Professor rank, service contributions will be evaluated in terms of the criteria above, with the additional expectation that the faculty member seeking promotion will provide evidence of leadership in service activities. Such leadership may be exemplified, for example, in relation to coordination of curriculum design, development, or administration, community outreach activities and events, voluntary service in or leadership of ad-hoc committees pertinent to the faculty’s job responsibilities, and service designed to forward institutional development for SOS, College or University. Leadership may also be evident in recognition by external actors for contributions to non-academic processes, committees, or councils or leadership in the academy nationally or internationally; some of which might involve scholarship activities to support evidence-supported processes or decision-making.
  1. Research criteria
     1. For promotion from Junior to Seniorrank (Assistant to Associate), the faculty member will be evaluated on general metrics of productivity, impact and excellence in research outputs, and capacity in developing and participating in research initiatives.
        + Should research activities form a core component of the faculty member’s work program, the candidate should provide clearly articulated research goals in alignment with a specific research program and expectations of the position, leading to advances in knowledge and understanding in the domain of sustainability scholarship applicable to the faculty member, and reflecting SOS’s mission and objectives.
        + Evidence of sustained collaboration within academic research networks, within ASU and with other academic institutions and, where appropriate, with non-academic individuals and organizations (engagement with society) in solution-oriented research.
        + Evidence of efforts to enhance, promote or contribute to justice, diversity, equity and inclusion (JEDI) through research-related activities, e.g., through research/lab management and mentoring, participation in training and/or the thematic focus of research efforts.
        + Efforts to acquire funding to support research activities, commensurate with the nature of the faculty member’s work allocation and position.
        + Evidence of sustained, high-quality research output. The nature of research contributions can vary widely depending on the candidate’s field and employment expectations but may include traditional peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or books, but also exhibits, films, patents, software and other products, including publications in news media or professional and popular magazines. The specific types of research outputs should be defined at the time of appointment, and outlined in the SPP.
        + The number of research contributions can vary widely depending on the candidate's field and expectations of the position, including the time allocation expected for research activities. Given this variability, expectations for research output must be defined at the time of employment and updated regularly to reflect any changes in expectations.
        + Quality and excellence of research outputs should be apparent through, for example, the outlets/ venues through which outputs are published or disseminated including both peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed; these should be widely recognized as high quality in the candidate’s field of scholarship.
        + Research that engages with society needs to adhere to scholarship criteria and be responsive to the interdisciplinary and disciplinary critique and review necessary to demonstrate excellence. Examples may include:
        + Research that co-designs, -implements, and -evaluates action programs with external partners to advance sustainability.
        + Research that responds directly to a specified sustainability challenge articulated by a particular external group (or groups), and typically produces knowledge for broader public benefit.
     2. For advancement from Associate to Full, beyond the criteria described above, the candidate should exhibit:
* Leadership in research networks, collaborations, project management, development of sustained research networks, and acquisition of substantive research funding
* National/ international recognition for sustained productivity in research outputs of quality, excellence and societal impact.
  + 1. Type of evidence to be provided. The evidence of research excellence is included in the promotion request dossier (see [Process Guide for Fixed Term Faculty Promotion](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/page/1562/p6-process-guide-_fixed-term-faculty-promotion-20200513.pdf)). Thequality, excellence and impact may be in the form of citation metrics, academy and/or practitioner recognition and awards, the acquisition of competitive and prestigious funding, the demonstrable quality of the venues for the dissemination of research products and outputs (e.g., rankings of peer reviewed journals; invited participation on recognized panels/ conferences or other such events), and qualitative evidence of the societal interest and impact of the work produced (media attention, presenting/ testifying in commissions and councils, policy uptake, etc.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Effective:** 7/1/1982 | **Revised:** 7/1/2011 |

horizontal rule]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASU logo] | ACD 506–04: Tenure |

horizontal rule]

## Purpose

horizontal rule]

To describe appointments with tenure and the review for tenure
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## Sources
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*Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual* - 6–201

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University
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## Applicability
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Tenure-eligile and tenured faculty
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## Policy
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Tenure is a property right authorized by the Board of Regents and, through Board of Regents’ delegation of authority, granted by the president to individuals. An individual’s tenure at Arizona State University is located in a specific academic unit. Tenure is not transferable except as provided through university policy and procedure. See [ACD 505–04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-04.html), “Transfer, Joint, and Affiliated Faculty and Academic Professional Appointments.”

Appointments with tenure are those with a legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment unless the tenured faculty member retires, resigns, or is dismissed or released in accord with [ACD 501](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd501.html), “Conditions of Faculty Service.” Attainment of tenure can only occur through specific notification from the president and may not result from inaction or inadvertence. If a tenure-eligible faculty member applies for early tenure and the decision is negative, the faculty member remains in probationary status. Assistant professors reviewed for tenure (regular or expedited process) must be reviewed for promotion at the same time.

Tenure is awarded on the basis of excellence and the promise of continued excellence, which is measured not only by individual achievement but also by contributions to the academic unit’s and university’s current and future mission and objectives; thus the tenure review process of necessity takes into account the mission and objectives of each academic unit and the university during the assessment of the professional accomplishments of the faculty under review. See [ACD 202–01](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd202-01.html), “Faculty Responsibilities,” for information related to responsibilities that are part of the review for tenure.

The rapidly changing character of research and its methodologies make it impossible for a university, even one of considerable size, scope, and resources, to have tenured faculty in every discipline. Therefore, appointments to tenure are offered to only those scholars whose disciplinary contributions are deemed excellent and whose ability to contribute to university priorities is also highly developed.

## Evaluation for Tenure

The tenure review is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. This process is conducted in the following order where they exist: the academic unit personnel committee, academic unit chair/director, college personnel committee, supervising dean, university tenure and promotion committee, executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. Each of these units or individuals makes independent recommendations that are informed by previous recommendations. The president ultimately makes the decision for the award of tenure.

The evaluation process involves assessment of the performance of faculty responsibilities, including teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and community. Candidates must be evaluated for tenure no later than the date indicated in the original offer letter or date amended by an authorized probationary period extension. For information about university tenure review requirements for academic unit bylaws, see [P3](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “University Faculty Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws.”

Specific information is required of candidates being reviewed for tenure. The material reviewed includes information provided by candidates, external review letters solicited by the academic unit, and may include additional information requested by an individual or committee to clarify or explain information provided at an earlier stage that has been approved by the next-level administrator. Recommendations for external evaluators are made equally by the candidate and the academic unit chair/director; the selection of reviewers will be equally divided between the candidate’s and the chair/director’s list. The chair/director also consults with the supervising dean about her or his list of external reviewers. Typically there should be a minimum of five external evaluators who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g., peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers may not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee). For information about file content requirements, see [P5](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Tenure and/or Promotion Process Guide.”

**Notification of Recommendations and Final Decision**

**Academic unit level**: the chair/director shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the academic unit level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

**College level**: the supervising dean shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the college level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

**University level**: no notification is made by the university committee.

**Final decision**: the final decision regarding the award of tenure is made through written notification to the candidate by the president.

Review/personnel committee members at every level shall not discuss deliberations with candidates. External evaluation letters shall not be shared with candidates.

**Denial of Tenure**

The denial of tenure or retention need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance on the candidate's part. Considerations such as the need for a different area of specialization or for a new emphasis within the unit, the lack of a continuing position, the need to shift a position or resources to another department, or the opportunity for a more vigorous program in teaching, research, or service may dictate that the individual not be retained or granted tenure. Faculty who believe that denial of tenure was in violation of ASU policy may file a grievance in accord with [ACD 509–02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd509-02.html), “Grievance Policy for Faculty.”

**Final Decision**

The final decision on promotion, tenure, or retention is made by the president or designee. Notification of the decision is provided by May 12 of the review year.

## Expedited Review for Tenure

**Current Faculty**

The university reserves the right to conduct an expedited review for awarding tenure to a faculty member when such action will serve the best interests of ASU. The decision to conduct an expedited tenure review is an exception to the regular tenure review described above and will be approved only in extraordinary circumstances, which could include, but are not limited to:

1. the decision of the university to respond to an offer of other employment to a current faculty member whom ASU desires to retain
2. the receipt of an extraordinary award or honor by a faculty member that is likely to generate offers of employment or brings distinction to the individual and the institution

and

1. other circumstances that the executive vice president and provost of the university determines warrant expedited tenure review.

ASU has no obligation to consider or approve an expedited review at the request of the faculty member even for the circumstances listed above. For information about the expedited review procedures, see[P4](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Expedited Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty Process Guide.”

Every effort will be made to conclude an expedited review within 21 calendar days following the initiation of the review or as soon as possible thereafter.

**Decision**

The president of the university will make the decision to award or deny expedited tenure and appropriate faculty rank and will notify the executive vice president and provost of the university and dean orally as soon as possible after decision is made. The dean will notify the unit head and the faculty candidate as soon as possible thereafter. The president will provide a written notice of the decision within ten days to the same university administrators and the unit head and faculty member.

**Denial of Tenure**

If the expedited award of tenure is denied, the faculty member will be reviewed under [ACD 506–03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “Faculty Probationary Appointments” during probation, under [ACD 506–10](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html), “Annual Evaluations of Faculty” and, if otherwise eligible, may be considered for tenure under the regular tenure review described in this policy.

## University-Level Review of New Hires with Tenure

**Candidates with Tenure at Peer or Peer Aspirational Institutions**

For candidates employed at universities defined as academic unit/college peers or aspirational peers and who currently hold the rank at which they would be hired, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president will review the curriculum vitae and reference letters or notes from reference calls.

**Candidates with Tenure at Non-Peer or Non-Peer Aspirational Institutions**

For candidates employed with tenure at a university that is not a peer or aspirational peer of the unit/college, and who would be hired at the same rank that they now hold, the curriculum vitae and reference letters (or notes from reference calls) will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. The academic unit chair/dean should provide a letter detailing the academic unit college vote and rationale for supporting the hire with tenure and contextualizing the candidate’s curriculum vitae for university level reviewers.

**Candidates without Tenure at the Time of Hire**

For candidates who are not tenured at their current university, an expedited tenure review will be conducted, including faculty and administrative review(s) at all levels. To accommodate the need for prompt decision-making:

1. the college personnel committee review may be bypassed so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels

and

1. the university faculty review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee. The review will include external review letters solicited from the candidate’s and the unit head/dean’s lists.

See [P4](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Expedited Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty Process Guide” for more information about this review.

In all cases, the final decision on hire, rank, and tenure rests with the university president.

The [schedule of personnel actions](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/schedule.html) is available on the provost’s Web site.
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To describe faculty promotion
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*Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual* - 6–201

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University
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The purpose of promotion is to recognize and reward accomplishment. Promotion is awarded on the basis of proven excellence. Tenure-eligible faculty members are promoted because they have demonstrated excellence in teaching and/or instructional contributions, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service (see [ACD 202–01](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd202-01.html), “Faculty Responsibilities.”) Fixed-term faculty are promoted based on excellence in the specific area(s) of assignment. This excellence is achieved in the context of the program in which faculty members work. It is understood that academic units will have different criteria for promotion in rank that depend upon the unit’s mission and goals.

## Review for Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Tenure-eligible assistant professors being reviewed for promotion must also be reviewed for tenure whether the review is early, mandatory, or expedited. Associate professors may be reviewed for tenure without also seeking a promotion in rank. Tenured associate professors may be candidates for promotion at any time after the award of tenure. Faculty members serving in administrative positions may have administrative contributions evaluated as a component of service to the university.

The promotion review is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. This process is conducted in the following order where all of the constituent levels exist or are stated in unit bylaws (e.g., some colleges do not have departments and may only have two levels of review): the academic unit personnel committee, the chair/director, the college personnel committee, the supervising dean, the university tenure and promotion committee, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. Each of these units or individuals makes independent recommendations that are informed by previous recommendations. The president ultimately makes the promotion decision. The promotion review process is a confidential process with specific notification requirements and restrictions at each stage of the process.

See [P3](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “University Faculty Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws” for information about university promotion review requirements that should be in academic unit and college bylaws. Specific information is required of candidates being reviewed for promotion. The material reviewed includes information provided by candidates, external review letters solicited by the academic unit, and may include additional information requested by an individual or committee to clarify or explain information provided at an earlier stage that has been approved by the next-level administrator. Recommendations for external reviewers are made equally by the candidate and the academic unit chair/director; the selection of reviewers will be equally divided between the candidate’s and the chair/director’s list. The chair/director also consults with the supervising dean about her or his list of external reviewers. Typically there should be a minimum of five external reviewers who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers typically will not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee). For information about promotion file content requirements, see [P5](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Tenure and/or Promotion Process Guide.”

**Notification of Recommendations and Final Decision**

**Academic unit level:** the chair/director shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the academic unit level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

**College level:** the supervising dean shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the college level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point. In units without departments or similar types of units (e.g., divisions), deans should advise candidates for promotion and/or tenure of the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

**University level:** no notification is made by the university committee.

**Final decision:** the final decision regarding the award of promotion is made through written notification to the candidate by the president.

External review letters shall not be shared with candidates. Review/personnel committee members at every level shall not discuss deliberations with candidates.

**Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to associate professor requires an overall record of excellence and the promise of continued excellence. The candidate must have achieved excellence in teaching and instructional activities as well as in research, scholarship and/or creative activities. Service must at least be “satisfactory” or “effective.” Academic units in which public service is a central aspect of their mission also may require excellence in public service.

**Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to full professor must be based on an overall record of excellence in the performance of responsibilities. The candidate must also demonstrate continued effectiveness in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service since the promotion to associate professor and evidence of contributions at a level beyond that reflected in the promotion decision to associate professor. Generally, an overall record of excellence requires national and/or international recognition for scholarly and/or creative achievement.

## Expedited Review for Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-eligible Faculty

**Current Faculty**

The university reserves the right to conduct an expedited review for awarding promotion to a faculty member when such action will serve the best interests of ASU. The decision to conduct an expedited promotion review is an exception to the regular promotion review described above and will be approved only in extraordinary circumstances, which could include, but are not limited to:

1. the decision of the university to respond to an offer of other employment to a current faculty member whom ASU desires to retain
2. the receipt of an extraordinary award or honor by a faculty member that is likely to generate offers of employment or brings distinction to the individual and the institution

and

1. other circumstances that the executive vice president and provost of the university determines warrant expedited promotion review.

ASU has no obligation to consider or approve an expedited review at the request of the faculty member even for the circumstances listed above. For information about the expedited review process, see [P4](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Expedited Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty Process Guide.”

Every effort will be made to conclude an expedited review within 21 calendar days following the initiation of the review or as soon as possible thereafter.

**Candidates Requesting Promotion at the Time of Hire**

For candidates who are requesting promotion to a higher rank, an expedited promotion review will be conducted, including faculty and administrative review(s) at all levels. To accommodate the need for prompt decision-making:

1. the college personnel committee review may be bypassed so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels

and

1. the university faculty review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee. The review will include external review letters solicited from the candidate’s and the unit head/dean’s lists.

See [P4](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Expedited Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty Process Guide.” for more information about this process.

In all cases, the final decision on hire and rank rests with the university president.

## Review for Promotion: Fixed-Term Faculty

Individuals with fixed-term faculty appointments as lecturer, clinical faculty, and research faculty are eligible for promotion in rank. The promotion review for fixed-term faculty is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. The review is conducted in the following order, assuming each level exists: academic unit personnel committee, chair/director, college committee, supervising dean, and executive vice president and provost of the university. The executive vice president and provost of the university makes the final decision for promotion.

Due to the differences in types of work performed by persons in fixed term appointments, academic units must clearly define the criteria for promotion to each rank. For information about university promotion review requirements for academic unit bylaws, see [P3](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “University Faculty Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws.” For information about promotion file content requirements, see [P6](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/procedures.html), “Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion Process Guide.” 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](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/schedule.html) released by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

## Denial of Promotion

The denial of promotion, tenure, or retention need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance on the candidate's part. Considerations such as the need for a different area of specialization or for a new emphasis within the unit, the lack of a continuing position, the need to shift a position or resources to another department, or the opportunity for a more vigorous program in teaching, research, or service may dictate that the individual not be retained or granted tenure. Insufficient evidence of or lack of proven excellence may lead to a decision to deny promotion.

Decisions of the president on the granting or denying of promotion are final unless the faculty member alleges that a material violation of regular university procedures occurred in the review or decision, or that the results were based on the discriminatory or other unconstitutional grounds, as outlined in [ACD 509–02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd509-02.html), “Grievance Policy for Faculty.”

Grievance based solely on claims of discrimination are to be initially referred to the Office of Equity and Inclusion for investigation.
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**Purpose**
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To provide for expedited tenure and/or promotion review and to describe the procedures for this action

To provide for review of faculty hires with tenure and/or at a specific rank consistent with the scholarly review of faculty attaining rank and tenure at ASU
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**Sources**
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*Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual* - 6–201

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Academic Senate
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**Applicability**
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Faculty
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**Policy**
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The university may conduct an expedited review of a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion in accordance with this policy.

The university may hire faculty with tenure at a specific rank in accordance with this policy.

**Expedited Review in Extraordinary Circumstances**

The university reserves the right to conduct an expedited review for awarding tenure and/or promotion to a faculty member when such action will serve the best interests of ASU. The decision to conduct an expedited tenure and/or promotion review is an exception to the regular tenure and promotion review process described in ACD 506–06, “Probationary Appointments” and [ACD 506–06](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-06.html), “Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion,” and will be approved only in extraordinary circumstances, which could include, but are not limited to:

1. the decision of the university to respond to an offer of other employment to a current faculty member whom ASU desires to retain
2. the receipt of an extraordinary award or honor by a faculty member that is likely to generate offers of employment or brings distinction to the individual and the institution

and

1. other circumstances that the dean and the provost determine warrants expedited tenure.

ASU has no obligation to consider or approve an expedited review at the request of the faculty member or for any other circumstances, including the circumstances listed above.

If a college dean and the unit head desire to initiate an expedited review for a faculty member, the following procedures will be followed.

**Initiation of Expedited Review**

The dean will submit a request through the campus provost (if relevant) to the executive vice president and provost of the university for an expedited review. The dean will attach to the request the most current curriculum vitae of the faculty member and documentation establishing extraordinary circumstances to support an expedited review. The executive vice president and provost of the university or designee will make every effort to respond, either approving or declining the request within 48 hours after receipt. The dean or designee will notify the unit head and the faculty member immediately of the provost’s decision regarding the request.

If the provost approves the request for an expedited review, the unit head will request from the faculty member a current curriculum vitae, a personal statement that is no longer than four pages discussing his or her qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, and any supplemental material (e.g., copies of publications, evidence of teaching effectiveness).

**External Review Letters**

The unit head and the dean will provide a list of five names and the faculty member will provide a list of five names, for a total of ten names of external reviewers who are qualified to evaluate the faculty member’s research or creative activities. The unit head and the dean will rank-order reviewers from this list, selecting three reviewers from each list. The unit head will contact these six reviewers to determine whether they can provide a written review to the unit head within ten calendar days following the request.

If an external reviewer cannot provide a review within ten days, the unit head will contact the seventh ranked external reviewer from the combined list and this process will continue in an effort to obtain six external review letters within the timeline.

The unit head will send the curriculum vitae, personal statement, and examples of the faculty member’s research or creative activity, along with a copy of the unit/college criteria for personnel decisions after the reviewer agrees to provide an external review letter.

The external reviewer will be asked to evaluate such factors as the scholarly standards reflected in the work; its impact on intended audiences; the importance, innovativeness, and relevance of the work; or the quality of the journals, publishers, conferences, or other communicative outlets in which the work is presented; citations of the work; and other indicators appropriate to the discipline.

**Internal Review**

Simultaneously with selecting external reviewers, the unit head will request the available representatives of the unit promotion and tenure review committee to provide an expedited review of the candidate’s teaching, research or creative activities, and service, and the dean will request the available representatives of the college promotion and tenure review or advisory committee to provide an expedited review of the candidate’s qualifications.

The dean and the unit head will provide all available information on the candidate’s qualifications to the respective peer review committees. Teaching materials must include student evaluations and course syllabi and may include the candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy or other evidence of teaching effectiveness. The unit head and the dean will also prepare their own independent reviews simultaneously or as soon as possible after receipt of the peer reviews from the unit and the college committees.

The unit head will provide copies of the external review letters to the dean as they are received. The unit head and the dean will provide a secure location to review the external letters so that committee members may access the letters as the committees conduct their reviews.

The tenure portfolio with the unit level reviews and external review levels (“materials”) will be submitted to the dean as expeditiously as possible. The college level reviews will be added to the materials and forwarded to the university level.

The available representatives of the university promotion and tenure committee will review the case and provide a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost of the university. If the candidate is employed at the Downtown Phoenix, Polytechnic, or West campus, the campus provost will receive a copy of the university committee’s recommendation and will provide his/her recommendation to the executive vice president and provost of the university. The executive vice president and provost of the university will review the entire package and forward a recommendation with the materials to the president for decision.

**Decision**

The president of the university will make the decision to award or deny expedited tenure and appropriate faculty rank and will notify the executive vice president and provost of the university and campus provost, if applicable, and dean orally as soon as possible after decision is made. The dean will notify the unit head and the faculty candidate as soon as possible thereafter. The president will provide a written notice of the decision within ten days to the same university administrators and the unit head and faculty member.

**Timing of the Review**

Every effort will be made to conclude an expedited review within 14 calendar days following the initiation of the review or as soon as possible thereafter.

**Effect of Denial**

If the president denies the expedited award of tenure, the faculty member will receive a regular probationary contract for the following year and will be reviewed under [ACD 506–03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “Probationary Appointments” during probation and under [ACD 506–06](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-06.html), “Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion,” for tenure and promotion.

**University-Level Review of New Hires with Tenure**

**Candidates with Tenure at Peer or Peer Inspirational Institutions**

For candidates employed at universities defined as unit/college peers or inspirational peers and who currently hold the rank at which they would be hired, the campus provost (if relevant), the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president will review the curriculum vitae and reference letters or notes from reference calls.

**Candidates with Tenure at Non-Peer or Peer Inspirational Institutions**

For candidates employed with tenure at a university that is not a peer or inspirational peer of the unit/college, and who would be hired at the same rank that they now hold, the curriculum vitae and reference letters (or notes from reference calls) will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee, the campus provost (if relevant), the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. The department chair/dean should provide a letter detailing the department/college vote and rationale for supporting the hire with tenure and contextualizing the candidate’s curriculum vitae for university level reviewers.

**Candidates without Tenure or Requesting Promotion at the Time of Hire**

For candidates who are not tenured at their current university or who are requesting promotion to a higher rank, an expedited promotion and/or tenure review will be conducted, including faculty and administrative review(s) at all levels. To accommodate the need for prompt decision-making:

1. the college personnel committee review may be bypassed so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels

and

1. the university faculty review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee. The review will include external review letters solicited from the candidate’s and the unit head/dean’s lists.

In all cases, the final decision on hire, rank, and tenure rests with the university president.
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**Cross-References**
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For more information on evaluation for tenure and promotion, see:

1. [ACD 506–03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “Probationary Appointments”
2. [ACD 506–05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html), “Promotion”

and

1. [ACD 506–06](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-06.html), “Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure.”