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| --- |
| **RESEARCH PROFESSORS** |

Research faculty members are non-tenure eligible faculty who are qualified to engage in, be responsible for, and oversee research projects and studies, both internally- and externally-supported, as principal and/or co-investigators. In SSFD, research faculty members typically will have a large proportion of their responsibilities allocated to research-related endeavors, but they may also carry teaching and/or service workload allocations. And, in some cases, workload allocations for teaching and/or service activities may be greater than workload allocations for research activities. As such, research-related activities will often carry the greatest weight when considering a candidate’s case for promotion; however, a candidate’s accomplishments should be evaluated with regard to workload. Weighting across all domains of a candidate’s workload will be commensurate with the candidate’s average allocation in that domain over the period of time in rank under evaluation, which is understood to vary within and across individuals’ positions and over time.

Promotion of research faculty members is warranted only when achievements are tangibly demonstrated. Thus, promotion is based neither on promise nor longevity, but on demonstrated and sustained excellence. It is natural for candidates to vary in the time required to attain the appropriate level of achievement.

In addition to meeting the criteria listed below in research, instructional, and service domains for promotions from Assistant to Associate level and from Associate to Full level, respectively, there are standard expectations at all levels of research professorship within the Sanford School. These include:

* Satisfactory performance (at a minimum) as indicated by the average of all annual evaluation ratings while in rank at ASU.
* Availability to, and professional demeanor and communication with, students, staff, faculty, and administration, as well as individuals external to the University, as applicable to the position.
* Adherence to unit, College, University, and Arizona Board of Regents’ policies and procedures.

**Criteria for Promotion of Research Professors**

For each domain of research, teaching, and service, there are **primary and secondary indicators**. To be considered, a promotion case **must include evidence of each of the primary indicators** (as relevant to a candidate’s workload allocations). In some cases, a candidate’s record in one primary indicator may be stronger relative to their record in another primary indicator. An especially strong record in one or two primary indicators can partially compensate for a weaker record in another primary indicator; still, there must be clear evidence of accomplishment in each primary criterion within a given domain. In the instance that a candidate is on the cusp of meeting the primary criteria within a domain, evidence from among the secondary criteria for that domain will be considered. However, strong evidence of secondary indicators cannot compensate for the absence of evidence in one or more of the primary indicators. Thus, although a promotion case **is not required to include evidence of secondary criteria to be eligible for advancement, evidence of secondary criteria will be considered.**

1. **Research Professors: Promotion from Assistant to Associate Level**

It is expected that candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor will typically have a minimum of five years in rank at the Assistant level (or comparable level/position) at ASU, and may count the year of application toward this eligibility requirement. In cases of extraordinary merit or under special circumstances, candidates may warrant earlier consideration as determined in consultation with the Director of the School.

**Research**

1.A. Commensurate with workload allocations, a case for promotion should demonstrate significant and substantial *contributions* to the research mission of SSFD.

***Primary Indicators***

1.A.i. **Scholarly disseminations** (including, but not limited to, journal articles, book chapters, encyclopedia entries, and conference presentations). Factors contributing to the weighting of disseminations include, but are not limited to, quantity, level/role of authorship, type (e.g., peer-refereed, publication vs. presentation), and impact/reach/visibility for the target audience. Evaluation of dissemination activity will be based primarily on quality and evidence of a habit of publication. That is, steadiness and quality of disseminations are more important than a precise number.

1.A.ii. **Lead and contributing roles in the preparation and submission of research grant proposals.** Factors contributing to the weighting of grant proposals include, but are not limited to, the role of the candidate in the proposals, whether the proposals were funded, and the amount of monetary award.

1.A.iii. **Involvement in SSFD research initiatives and activities** (e.g., project/grant execution, data analysis, program development). Factors contributing to the weighting of these contributions include, but are not limited to, candidates’ amount/level of involvement and their successes and achievements stemming from that involvement.

***Secondary Indicators***

1.A.iv. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to research and scholarship (e.g., co-authorship of student-led papers, supervision of research assistants). Factors contributing to the weighting of mentorship/supervision include, but are not limited to, the quantity of examples and amount/level of involvement.

1.A.v. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to research capacity (e.g., grant-writing workshop, training in a specific statistical analysis). Factors contributing to the weighting of professional development activities include, but are not limited to, evidence that professional development made tangible contributions to the candidate’s research activities.

1.A.vi. Research-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

1.A.vii. Contribution to the development of scholarly products (e.g., software, measures) and other scholarly activities (e.g., research-related consultation) not covered in 1.A.i. through 1.A.vi. above.

**Instruction**

1.B. For those whose workloads include instruction, a case for promotion should demonstrate high-quality contributions to the instructional mission of SSFD.

***Primary Indicators***

1.B.i. Above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all student-reported evaluation ratings while in rank.

1.B.ii. Above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all peer-observed teaching evaluation ratings while in rank.

1.B.iii. Use of high-quality pedagogical techniques (e.g., appropriate and current instructional technologies, learning principles, up-to-date/contemporary course materials).

***Secondary Indicators***

1.B.iii. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to instruction (e.g., Masters, Doctoral, comprehensive exam, and honors committee roles; honors contracts; teaching assistants/graders).

1.B.iv. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to instructional capacity (e.g., attendance at a teaching institute, training in a specific pedagogical approach).

1.B.v. Teaching-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

1.B.vi. Involvement in other instructional activities not covered in 1.B.i. through 1.B.v.

**Service**

1.C. . For those whose workloads include service, a case for promotion should demonstrate significant contributions to the service mission of SSFD.

***Primary Indicator***

1.C.i. Membership contributions to SSFD, College, and/or University committees, councils, boards, groups, panels, events, etc.

***Secondary Indicators***

1.C.ii. Membership contributions to non-ASU local, regional, state or national boards, committees, councils, or groups.

1.C.iii. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff in activities not related to research or instruction (e.g., advising student organizations; advising regarding job or program applications).

1.C.iv. Participation in scholarly reviewing activities (e.g., manuscript reviewing, grant reviewing).

1.C.v. Participation in translation efforts (of research and/or unit or university initiatives and activities to lay or professional audiences).

1.C.vi. Service-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

1.C.vii. Involvement in other service activities not covered in 1.C.i. through 1.C.vi.

1. **Research Professors: Promotion from Associate to Full Level**

A case for promotion must be linked to excellence and will demonstrate the candidate’s leadership, and must demonstrate a substantial and sustained record of excellent performance since the previous promotion. The majority of that service should be at ASU. At this level of promotion, it is the onus of the candidate to provide evidence from among the domains outlined in sections 2.A., 2.B., and 2.C. that clearly reflects sustained contributions in each area commensurate with workload allocations, and when warranted, an increase in the breadth, quantity, quality, impact, and/or level of involvement since promotion or appointment as an Associate Research Professor in SSFD. Excellence may be demonstrated by multiple examples from among the following:

**Research**

2.A. A case for promotion should demonstrate significant and substantial leadership in the research mission of SSFD, commensurate with workload.

***Primary Indicators***

2.A.i. **Sustained program of scholarship.** Evidence of new scholarly disseminations throughout the period in rank as Associate Research Professor is required. As with the prior level of promotion, factors contributing to the weighting of scholarship include, but are not limited to, quantity of publications, authorship position and leadership in the research (publications in which the candidate demonstrates leadership will be weighted more heavily than those in which the candidate takes a supportive role), type of publications (e.g., peer-refereed publications will be weighted more heavily than non-refereed, publications), and impact/reach/visibility for the target audience (the quality if the outlets will be considered). It is important to note that, in our fields, first authored papers carry as much weight as sole-authored papers and sole-authored papers are not required.

2.A.ii. **Leadership roles in applying for and obtaining grant funding.** At this level of promotion, a record of success in applying for grant funding as PI or Co-PI since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment is expected. Exceptions may be made for candidates with specialized expertise who play critical leadership roles on multiple grants but who may not be PI on any (e.g., methodologist).

2.A.iii. **Visibility, stature, and leadership in the field.** Evidence of distinctive contributions to nationally or internationally recognized scholarship and/or evidence of nationally or internationally recognized expertise since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment is required.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.A.iv. Successful management of a research laboratory or related facility.

2.A.v. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, junior researchers, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to research and scholarship.

2.A.vi. Leadership in the development of regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized scholarly products (e.g., software, measures) and other scholarly activities (e.g., research-related consultation) not covered in 2.A.i. through 2.A.v.

**Instruction**

2.B. For those whose workloads include instruction, a case for promotion should demonstrate ongoing high-quality contributions to the instructional mission of SSFD

***Primary Indicators***

2.B.i. Sustained evidence of above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all student-reported evaluation ratings since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.B.ii. Sustained evidence of above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by peer-observed teaching evaluations since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.B.iii. Sustained evidence of use of high-quality pedagogical techniques (e.g., appropriate and current instructional technologies, learning principles, up-to-date/contemporary course materials) since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.B.iv. Lead or contributing roles in the design, development, refinement, and/or dissemination of new or existing courses, curricula, or pedagogies (e.g., textbooks, archival course materials, or online teaching materials available to others; preparing a face-to-face course for online delivery or vice versa; developing a new course for instruction).

2.B.v. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, or junior scholars and/or employees/staff as it pertains to instruction .

2.B.vi. Teaching-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

2.B.vii. Involvement in other instructional activities not covered in 2.B.i. through 2.B.vi.

**Service**

2.C. For those whose workloads include service, a case for promotion should demonstrate sustained contributions to the service mission of SSFD.

***Primary Indicators***

2.C.i. Evidence of leadership contributions to SSFD, College, and/or University committees, councils, boards, groups, panels, events, etc., since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.C.ii. Evidence of leadership in or contributions to non-ASU local, regional, state, national, or international boards, committees, councils, institutions, organizations, or groups related to the candidate’s discipline/field of study since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.C.iii. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to activities not related to research or instruction.

2.C.iv. Participation in translation efforts (of research and/or unit or university initiatives and activities to lay or professional audiences).

2.C.v. Service-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

2.C.vi. Involvement in other service activities not covered in 2.C.i. through 2.C.v.