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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. SOS is a standalone school and college at ASU. 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. **Dean**

The SOS Dean is the school’s chief administrative officer and reports to the Provost.

1. **Associate Dean(s)**

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

**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 Dean or Associate Dean shall preside. At any time, a majority of the Assembly may request that the Dean convene the Assembly. Upon receiving the request, the Dean 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 Dean 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 Dean 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;

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

**Article IV. The 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 Dean 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 Dean 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 Dean;
6. Complete other duties as requested by the Dean.
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 Dean. 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 Dean.
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 Dean 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 Dean.
	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 Dean 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 Dean.

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 Dean 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 Dean.

**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 Dean 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 Dean. 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 Dean.
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 Dean.

**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 Dean 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 Dean 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 Dean.

**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 Dean 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 Dean;
	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 Dean with the committee’s annual review assessments;
	12. Complete other duties as requested by the Dean.
1. **Personnel Committee Roles and Appointment**

The Dean 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 Dean 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 Dean;
	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 Dean 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 Dean.
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* (see Appendix 1) and the *Guidelines for Fixed-Term Faculty Promotions* (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 Dean. 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 SOS 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 Dean by the designated deadline (in accordance with ASU’s ACD) and reviewed by the Personnel Committee. The Committee offers a recommendation to the SOS Dean. 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 Dean 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* (see Appendix 1) and the *Guidelines for Fixed-Term Faculty Promotions* (see Appendix 2). The committee submits its annual performance evaluations to the SOS Dean based on the *Provost’s Schedule of Personnel Actions* and in consultation with the SOS Dean. Annual evaluations of faculty and merit raise assessments are the ultimate responsibility of the SOS Dean.

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 Dean. 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 Dean 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 Dean may appoint one additional tenured faculty member with the goal of maintaining diverse representation of views/disciplines on the committee. The Dean and Associate Dean(s) are ex officio FAC members.

Either the FAC Chair or the Dean 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 Dean;
2. Establish agenda items for discussion with the Dean;
3. Liaise with the faculty and Dean and communicate faculty concerns;
4. Complete other duties as requested by the Dean.
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 Dean on strategic planning;
2. Serve as a resource for the Dean to quickly consult about pressing issues that require feedback and assistance;
3. Liaise between the faculty and the Dean and about ways to improve SOS;
4. Consult with the Dean concerning the selection of committee members for the academic program committees and the personnel committees;
5. Consult the Dean regarding faculty meeting agenda items;
6. Convene with the Dean 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 Dean.

****

**Appendix 1:**

**General Outline for Candidates on How to Achieve Promotion and Tenure**

**Based on University Guidelines**

**August 2010**

**Revised and Approved by SOS Faculty Assembly and Dean January 2014**

**1. General Preamble**

The faculty members of the School of Sustainability (SOS) are trained in, work across, and contribute to a broad range of related fields that explore sustainability challenges, dynamics, and solutions. Faculty are drawn from a wide variety of disciplinary backgrounds that span the social and natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, arts and humanities, public policy, health sciences, law, and business. Within the school, faculty are engaged in research and education that is strongly inter-disciplinary, problem- and solution-oriented, and tied to real world concerns. SOS faculty necessarily use a very wide range of theory, methods, and modes of scholarship.  They may variously employ research methods that are laboratory-based, field-based, quantitative, qualitative, archival, contemporary, future-oriented, ethnographic, experimental, biological, participatory and stakeholder-based, model and simulation-based, or driven by client demand. Scholars within SOS may disseminate research results in a broad range of venues: single- and multi-authored books, monographs, reports, journal articles, book chapters, or creative exhibits, depending on the norms in their area of enquiry and intended audiences. SOS faculty thus work both from and across a wide range of disciplines with different scholarly norms that recognize different standards of distinction. For example, while it may be a norm in engineering for the most productive scholars to produce a larger number of multiple co-authored articles in a given research cycle, the most productive senior scholars nationally in many of the social sciences produce two to three single-authored articles per year on average. For those whose work articulates with creative fields, the expected and normal modes of scholarship may include public performances and exhibits. In business, consulting and authoring reports on real world problems is a measure of productivity. Thus, no single ranking of publication outlets, forms of productivity, or external funding is entirely appropriate or adequate to assess research productivity across all faculty. The standards of performance for the purposes of promotion and tenure in SOS need to be flexible, permitting all faculty members to meet the norms for achievement in their own research areas while demonstrating excellence in scholarship and professional distinction, and a commitment to meeting the educational, research, and service goals of SOS. *To this end, it is critical that junior faculty in particular develop pre-tenure plans that prepare them to be assessed in terms of (i) their own disciplinary standards for excellence; and/or (ii) inter-disciplinary excellence in sustainability.*

**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. The criteria for promotion and tenure consider the realms of research, instruction and mentoring, and service as outlined below.

**2.1 Research**

It is expected that the candidate will have established him/herself as a credible research scholar with an emerging national profile through:

• The development of a coherent and sustained research trajectory,

• Publication in peer-reviewed national and/or international journals relevant to the candidate’s areas of expertise, relevant to the interdisciplinary mission of SOS, and/or by other creative acts (e.g., major edited works, museum exhibits)

• Submission of grant applications for external funding to establish and pursue a research program and/or creative activities.

An expected level of productivity could be publication of one to two scholarly publications/products per year (averaged over time in rank) along with obtaining adequate outside funding to support her/his research program. Peer-reviewed books, edited or co-edited volumes, chapters in books, and articles are all considered scholarly publications. Online publications count equally with print publications towards satisfying these criteria if they appear in recognized and professionally refereed on-line locations. Research products may include reports developed in formal association with government agencies, if these reports are available to the public.

Research conducted by some faculty will result in research products of significant intellectual accomplishment other than publications in national or international journals. Candidates with this form of research trajectory should include documentation explaining the nature of their research profile. Research products could include museum exhibits and catalogs, or major edited works.

Some scholarly publications/products may have very broad impacts as indicated by internal and external peer evaluations (such as a significant book published by a prestigious press); the requirement of one to two publications per year may be waived in these cases. Evidence of emerging national recognition for research in the form of reviews, citations, awards, external letters of assessment, and other forms can help demonstrate the candidate’s level of recognition.

Research products that advance the interdisciplinary mission of the School of Sustainability count equally to research within the candidate’s areas of expertise.

**2.2 Instruction and Mentoring**

It is also expected that the candidate be a competent instructor, as evidenced by:

• Adequate scores on teaching evaluations

• An evaluation of teaching by a peer faculty member

• Submitted instructional materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, web-based courses)

On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, and participation in school and/or college or university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in limited mentoring of graduate students’ work and supervision of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

**2.3 Service**

Junior faculty are not encouraged to devote a substantial time and energy to service activities, but are expected to provide limited service on School committees, and, if asked to serve, limited service on campus committees or governing bodies. Service is interpreted to include activities that contribute to the life of the School, the University, the Academy and the community defined broadly. Participation or leadership in professional organizations meets these criteria. Service may be reflected in reports developed in formal association with government agencies, in the case of reports archived by the government. At least one form of professional service (i.e., service to the profession beyond ASU, excluding reviews of manuscripts or grant proposals) is expected.

**3. Promotion to Professor**The rank of Professor is the highest attainable in the academy. Therefore, candidates for promotion to Professor should have achieved national and, ideally, international prominence in their scholarly career. The criteria for promotion consider the realms of research, instruction and mentoring, and service as outlined below.

**3.1 Research**

Faculty who qualify for promotion to Professor must have an established research program with national or international impact including,

• 1 to 2 scholarly publications per year (on average) while an Associate Professor,

• Adequate external funding to support their research program while an Associate Professor,

• Significant work in progress,

• The elements above should be in addition to those included in the portfolio submitted for promotion to Associate Professor.

Peer-reviewed books, edited or co-edited volumes, chapters in books, and articles are all considered scholarly publications. Online publications count equally with print publications towards satisfying these criteria if they appear in recognized and professionally refereed on-line locations.

Research conducted by some faculty will result in research products of significant intellectual accomplishment other than publications in national or international journals. Candidates with this form of research trajectory should include documentation explaining the nature of their research profile. Research products could include museum exhibits and catalogs, or major edited works.

Some scholarly publications/products may have very broad impacts as indicated by internal and external peer evaluations (such as a significant book published by a prestigious press); the requirement of one to two publications per year may be waived in these cases. Evidence of national or international recognition for research in the form of reviews, citations, awards, external letters of assessment, and other forms can help demonstrate the candidate’s level of recognition.

Research products that advance the interdisciplinary mission of the School of Sustainability count equally to research within the candidate’s areas of expertise.

**3.2 Instruction and Mentoring**

In addition to being an effective classroom teacher and advisor (see 2.2 above), candidates for the rank of Professor should be successful graduate mentors, as indicated by a strong record of graduate student mentoring, graduate degree production and placement of graduates in academic or other professional positions. High quality graduate student training and research results from collaboration between faculty mentor(s) and graduate students, as junior colleagues. The mentoring provided by the candidate should include guidance regarding graduate student teaching responsibilities (e.g., writing exams, advising students) and research training (e.g., preparing competitive grant proposals, successful publications).

Finally, the candidate must be able to demonstrate that he/she has provided the kinds of post-degree support required for the newly-minted M.A./M.S. or Ph.D. to establish his/her research career and to find suitable employment. To accomplish these tasks, the candidate must have substantial stature in the field, must know others with whom to put the students in contact, and in general be able to assist the student to find his/her way in the professional world.

**3.3 Service**

Successful candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate active participation in the life of the School, the College, and the University by service on student, School, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in School activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the School, the discipline, the University, and the community broadly-defined. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

**4. Mentoring Candidates toward Promotion and Tenure**

All tenure-track professors will be assigned a Tenure Mentoring Committee, consisting of the dean and at least one other SOS graduate faculty member. Candidates may request or the dean may assign a third member, including faculty from outside the School, to serve on the committee. The purpose of this committee is to give the candidate advice in the areas of research, instruction and mentoring, and service as they pertain to achieving promotion and tenure according to School and University guidelines. The faculty members comprising a candidate’s Tenure Mentoring Committee will be appointed by the Dean following consultation with the candidate.

During the first semester the tenure-track candidate is employed, he/she will work with the Tenure Mentoring Committee and the Director to develop a general plan for achieving tenure according to their anticipated tenure review schedule. This schedule will take into account the guidelines for promotion and tenure above (see sections 2.1-2.3 above). The plan, which is developed entirely for the benefit of the candidate, should provide both a sense of the level and forms of expected productivity, and the ways in which excellence in performance will be assessed. The plan is to be understood as a “living document” in that it can be revised and reconsidered as necessary as the faculty member’s program of scholarship develops. If the department hires a faculty member whose research will involve research products or academic venues other than those accommodated by the guidelines presented here (e.g., resulting from an unusual research domain or conditions arising from a joint appointment or administrative responsibilities), the School Director and the candidate jointly should specify these special conditions in writing at the time of appointment. This statement should be included as part of the candidate’s general plan for achieving tenure.

**4.1 Examples of General Plans for Achieving Tenure (These are simply two of many possible plans.)**

**4.1.1 Example of Publication Timeline Following a Book Model**

Year 1: revise dissertation, write some articles from dissertation,

draft book prospectus

Year 2: send book prospectus to prospective publishers with sample chapters and table of contents; revise articles

Year 3: send complete book to press, start new project, and apply for fellowship /other funding

Year 4: book accepted, write and submit initial articles from new project to journals

Year 5: book reviews are published, revise articles from 2nd project

**4.1.2 Example of Publication Timeline Following a Scholarly Publications Model**

Year 1: revise dissertation, write some articles from dissertation, develop continuing research project

Year 2: apply for grant money for research (lab, field, etc.); revise articles

Year 3: Either continue field or lab work/begin field or lab work; begin preliminary reports (e.g. meeting papers) for research completed

Year 4: Write articles based on two previous years of research and preliminary report; apply for new grant money as necessary for continuation of project or for new project – consider funds that help develop projects.

Year 5: Further lab or field research, revise articles

**5. Third-Year Faculty Review**

**5.1 Purpose**

The purpose of a third-year review is to advise a tenure-track faculty member and SOS as to whether the faculty member in review is making adequate progress toward their tenure review.

**5.2 Third-year Review Packet**

The faculty member in review will submit a *curriculum vitae*, sample of publications, instructional materials (see above), and three brief “narratives” that address each of the three areas of employment (research, teaching, and research). These narratives and their accompanying materials should be selected in consultation between the candidate and their Tenure Mentoring Committee.

**5.2.1 Evaluation of Research.**

The candidate in review will submit a narrative that identifies their research, how they have developed their research agenda, the significance of the research, and the plans to build their scholarship further. (Narrative)

By their third year at ASU, the candidate should have begun to make a contribution to scholarship in their stated area of research. This contribution may take the form of peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or other products (as identified by SOS, see SOS guidelines above). The candidate may submit articles, book chapters, or other forms of scholarship that have been accepted for publication or are under review. (Additional materials)

**5.2.2 Evaluation of Teaching**

The faculty member in review shall identify their philosophy of instruction and the ways they have developed their own instructional abilities, thereby enhancing the teaching and mentoring missions of the School and the University. In addition to describing their teaching activities both within and outside of the classroom, the faculty member should identify teaching activities they would like to engage in, including new courses and innovative methods of instruction or mentoring. (Narrative)

The candidate should include summary teaching evaluations of all courses, copies of student comments as appropriate, evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring as appropriate, and a peer-review of teaching in the form of a letter from a colleague at ASU. (Additional materials; see SOS guidelines above)

**5.2.3 Evaluation of Service**

Service is defined broadly and includes contributions to the School (committees within SOS), University (committees within the university), professional societies, and the community (public talks, etc.). The faculty member in review will submit a narrative that describes their service contributions and outlines their plans for service in the future. (Narrative)

**5.3 Third-year Review Procedure**

A faculty member in third-year review will submit their packet of materials to the Personnel Committee by approximately November 1 (or earlier if possible) for review. The Personnel Committee writes an assessment, which is submitted to the Dean by approximately December 1. The Dean reads the Personnel Committee assessment and writes her/his own assessment. The Personnel Committee will prepare their review with an eye as to how to present the record of each faculty member in review most effectively to the Provost’s office (and eventually to the ASU President when they come up for tenure), and to make suggestions as to what that tenure-track faculty member should do in the years leading up to tenure review to strengthen their case for tenure.

**6. Tenure Review**

**6.1 Purpose**

The purpose of the tenure review (narrowly stated) is to ascertain whether a tenure-track professor has met the criteria for tenure in SOS. The larger purpose of the tenure review is to assess the prospects for the future success of a tenure-track professor as a tenured Associate Professor at ASU in accordance with SOS Criteria for Promotion.

**6.2 Tenure Review Packet**

The candidate for tenure will submit a *curriculum vitae*, sample of publications, teaching materials (see above), and three brief “narratives” that address each of the three areas of employment (research, instruction and mentoring, and research). Electronic files of the candidate’s packet (for example, *curriculum vitae*, publications, grants, teaching evaluations, degree production, service record) is made available on a secure web site (e.g. Blackboard) in the weeks prior to the deliberations of the Promotion Committee, so that its members, and the SOS Dean can familiarize themselves with the candidate’s credentials.

**6.2.1 Evaluation of Research.**

The candidate will submit a narrative that identifies their research, how they conduct their research, the significance of the research, and the plans to develop their scholarship further. (Narrative)

The candidate should have established a clear academic profile in their stated area of research that is recognized within and beyond ASU. The products of their research may appear as peer reviewed journal articles, a book, book chapters, or other forms of scholarly contribution (as identified by SOS, see SOS guidelines above). The candidate may submit articles, book chapters, or other forms of scholarship that have been accepted for publication or are under review. (Additional materials)

N.B. As part of their materials to be evaluated by the SOS Promotion Committee and SOS Dean the candidate may submit a sample of publications or other research products deemed appropriate by the candidate and their Tenure Mentoring Committee. However, the candidate must select at least two and no more than four of these products as part of the candidate’s packet to be evaluated beyond SOS (see discussion below).

**6.2.2 Evaluation of Teaching**

The candidate should have established an instructional and mentoring profile within SOS. They should characterize their philosophy of instruction and the ways they have developed their own instructional abilities. The candidate should identify the ways in which their instructional profile articulates with the teaching and mentoring missions of SOS and the University. (Narrative)

The candidate should include summary teaching evaluations of all courses, copies of student comments as appropriate, evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring as appropriate, and a peer-review of teaching in the form of a letter from a colleague at ASU. (Additional materials, see SOS guidelines above)

**6.2.3 Evaluation of Service**

Service is defined broadly and includes contributions to the School (committees within SOS), University (committees within the university), professional societies, and the community (public talks, etc.). The candidate will submit a narrative that describes their service contributions and outlines their plans for service in the future. (Narrative)

**6.3 Tenure Review Procedure**

The School procedures for promotion and/or tenure are structurally the same for all faculty, regardless of rank. The faculty member will be evaluated on research, instruction and mentoring, and service. The following guidelines apply to ranked faculty (i.e., those tenured or tenure-track, budgeted at >50% in the School). Academic Professionals are evaluated on job performance, professional development, and service.

Faculty members in SOS will provide a recommendation to the SOS Dean, and to the Provost, based on a full vote of the Promotion Committee. A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure will proceed as follows:

**6.3.1 Promotion Committee**

Each candidate will be reviewed by the Promotion Committee. The Promotion Committee will be comprised of all SOS faculty at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. The Promotion Committee will be responsible for evaluating the candidate’s application for promotion and will prepare a recommendation to support or deny the candidate’s application.

**6.3.2 Promotion Subcommittees and Promotion Committee Evaluation**

Three subcommittees comprised of members from different concentrations in SOS will be established by the Promotion Committee. These subcommittees will evaluate, respectively, all relevant information on the candidate’s research, instruction and mentoring, and service, and make recommendations to the Promotion Committee as a whole. The Promotion Committee will transmit the results of its deliberations in the form of a letter to the SOS Dean, including the committee’s collective recommendation that tenure (in the case of an untenured Associate Professor) or promotion and tenure (in the case of an Assistant Professor) be granted or denied.

**6.3.3 External Evaluation Letters**

The Dean will solicit external evaluations of the candidate’s research. Appropriate external sources may be defined variously depending upon whether a faculty member or Academic Professional is being evaluated. A faculty candidate for promotion and/or tenure will submit to the SOS Dean a list of six to ten appropriate reviewers from outside ASU. The Promotion Committee also will submit to the SOS Dean a list of six to ten appropriate reviewers from outside ASU. The SOS Dean will consult these two lists and compose a final list of six to ten external reviewers, normally including half of its members from the candidate’s list and half from the Promotion Committee’s list.

**6.3.4 SOS Dean Evaluation**

The SOS Dean will evaluate all relevant information on the candidate’s research, instruction and mentoring, and service, including the candidate’s packet, the letter and recommendation of the Promotion Committee and the external evaluation letters. The Director will write their own letter of evaluation to the Provost, including a recommendation for granting or denying promotion and/or tenure.

**6.3.5 ASU Evaluation Chain beyond SOS**

The candidate’s packet (including at least two, but no more than four publications or other research products), the evaluation letter of the SOS Promotion Committee, and the evaluation of the SOS Dean will be submitted to the ASU Promotion and Tenure Committee (University P & T Committee), and the ASU Provost and/or President. The DFAC, 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. The ASU Provost and/or President will consider the candidate’s packet, the recommendations of the SOS Promotion Committee, the SOS Dean, the DFAC and 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. Informal Advice for Candidates Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure**

**7.1 Understanding the criteria for P&T**

1. Review the SOS by-laws and criteria with general information on what is required for promotion and tenure. Keep up to date with ASU policies and materials on the Provost’s website

2. Talk to senior faculty members about informal expectations

3. SOS faculty designated as peers or and inspirational peers (by concentration) may provide comparisons for the purpose of reviewing vitae from recently tenured colleagues

4. Review the ASU ‘stellar examples’ issued by the Provost’s office

5. If you have a joint appointment, make sure a memorandum of understanding is crafted and signed at the beginning of your appointment. You may seek advice from colleagues who are or have been in a similar position.

6. Obtain dossiers of recently promoted faculty in SOS and c.v.s of those in inspirational peer departments who work in areas or modes of enquiry similar to your own.

**7.2 How to Get Promoted and Tenured**

1. Demonstrate that you are doing high quality work in comparison to your peers, *as judged by more senior professionals in your field.* Combined, these elements demonstrate that you are making an impact.

2. Contribute to your field in important ways that are clearly visible

3. Establish yourself as an effective instructor and mentor.

**7.3 How do you do this? Tips and Best Practices**

*The following advice is necessarily brief. Consider consulting more extensive sources such as the Chronicle of Higher Education’s columns on “Career Talk”, “C.V. Doctor,” “Ms. Mentor,” and so on.*

1. **Publish/present creative activities** in outlets where your work influences others and becomes known to the field.

a. An easy short hand in this regard is to publish in the journals that other faculty members

esteem as evidenced, for example, by their own publications in the journal or the use of a

journal’s articles in the classroom. Other ways of strategizing article placements include the

rankings of journals/competitions in your field. Editors can usually provide this information;

see also citation indexes for journal rankings.

b. Consider the types of venues (e.g., juried, competitive, commissioned, national gallery) typical for your field as well as the visibility of these venues and the frequency of presentations expected.

c. Consider the more prestigious funding agencies/foundations in your field. Are certain grants expected in your discipline? What funding level is expected?

d. Consider scholarly awards for which you can apply or ask colleagues to nominate you for them (e.g., “best dissertation” or “best first book” awards)? Many associations and their sub-sections have such awards.

e. Consider applying for career development awards, such as NSF early career awards

f. Think carefully about the community of scholars to which you see your scholarship

contributing as a means to determine how to accomplish the above steps. This community

will also be a natural place to look for letter writers for your tenure application.

**7.4 Protect the time devoted to your scholarship/creative activities**

1. Learn to say no and not feel guilty about it.

2. Seek advice/support from the Directorate, Dean, Associate Dean, and senior faculty for protecting your time, using time wisely, and learning what service activities and student supervision you should do and what you shouldn’t do at this time.

3. Think about maintaining a calendar that documents both *how* you use your time as well as upcoming appointments. List absolutely everything. During what time period did you grade papers? Write that article for publication? Go to that faculty meeting? Work on that committee assignment? The calendar helps you measure where you might be more efficient with your time. The calendar will also help you say ‘no’ to additional service requests by demonstrating the fullness of your schedule.

4. Get help to use your time more productively. For example, producing publications or

giving conference presentations with graduate students simultaneously shows evidence of

mentorship and productive research.

**7.5 Make unbreakable appointments with yourself to write, research, do field work, etc.**

1. This is a priority; don’t put it off.

2. Figure out when you work most effectively on different kinds of tasks and block these

times off in your calendar.

**7.6 Network**

1. *Networking outside the University*: This is especially important for the moment when you come up for tenure when you will be asked to nominate ~6 names of senior scholars in your field to act as referees of your scholarship. These should be people with whom you do not have any close relationship, but it is advantageous if they are at least aware of you and your work. Networking helps them to know you but also helps you know better who might be the most effective evaluators of your work.

a. Attend conferences, get to know senior scholars

b. Participate in professional organizations. Think carefully about how to do this most productively.

1. For example, nominating committees in many professional organizations don’t take much time, but you will meet some of the leaders in your area.
2. By organizing conference panels you can both expand your c.v. and invite select people whom you’d like to meet.

c. Send copies of your articles to people relevant to your field with a brief note introducing

yourself, or drop an email telling them how highly you regarded a recent piece of work.

 d. Write a complimentary book review and send the pre-print along to the book’s author

 e. Have grad school friends invite you to give a talk on their campus; return the favor.

 2. *Networking within the university*: helps you develop relationships with senior faculty in other schools and units who can act as safe neutral sounding boards, and sources of advice (work/life balance, dealing with administration, etc).

 a. Your university assigned mentor is a good place to begin as is the Faculty Women’s

Association. Junior colleagues in other departments can also be able to steer you toward

helpful senior colleagues.

b. Choose one or two research centers and participate in their activities

c. Have friends invite you to give a talk in their department’s colloquium/brown bag series; return the favor.

**e. Develop a plan for ongoing improvement in and documentation of your instructional effectiveness**

1. Develop a relationship with staff at the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence on the ASU campus, and work with them to identify a plan to develop and document your effectiveness. Consider attendance at CLTE teaching workshops.

2. You can ask senior colleagues for tips, and consider co-teaching courses with those with outstanding instructional records. Co-teaching can then serve as a peer evaluation of your teaching.

3. Consider teaching a course that has already been offered by a senior colleague in order to allow external reviewers to contextualize your teaching evaluations in comparison to existing ones.

4. Recognize time spent developing instructional *content* may not be as influential on

standard measures of teaching effectiveness, as pedagogically valuable, or as interesting as

spending time rather in developing instructional *strategies.* For example, concentrate energy

on meeting learning goals in every lecture and course, rather than on being bound to

cover specific material.

5. Learn to mentor graduate students as future teachers. By training them in teaching, you

can assign TAs more substantial tasks and cultivate competent TAs to work with you in

future semesters.

**f. Make use of all university policies and resources** available to you that will help you succeed.

 1. Ask if you need resources, time, or help. The Dean and your senior colleagues want to

help you succeed. For example, if you have children invoke the tenure clock and parental

leave policies (men too, not just women). Ask senior colleagues for support to make sure

policies are applied to your full advantage.

**g. Keep track of it all**

1. Keep anything and everything that provides documentary evidence of your effectiveness

in any area of your work (research, service, teaching) – even notes from students or requests

for reprints from colleagues. This portfolio is sometimes known as a ‘tenure diary’ and can

include copies of your contract and records of conversations with your chair and advocacy

committee regarding tenure expectations.

**h. Anticipating strong external letters**

1. Selection of reviewers

a. Select reviewers from units identified as peers or inspirational peers. Note that while

your school colleagues will be most impressed by people of strong reputation in your field, people reviewing your portfolio, without this insider knowledge, tend to be impressed by the institution on the letterhead.

b. If a reviewer is not from a peer school, explain why this person was selected to your advocacy committee who can include such information in promotional materials sent to college and university

c. Full professors or other exceptionally well qualified evaluators are best

d Who *not* to ask:

i. Anyone who has a close relationship with candidate (e.g., dissertation committee

member, co-author)

ii. People of similar rank as candidate (i.e., newly minted associate professors).

iii. The greater the relational distance with the candidate, the better

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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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.

![horizontal rule]]()

## Cross-References
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1. [ACD 202–01](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd202-01.html), “Faculty Responsibilities”
2. [ACD 506–03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “Faculty Probationary Appointments”
3. [ACD 506–05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html), “Faculty Promotion”
4. [ACD 505–04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-04.html), “Transfer, Joint, and Affiliated Faculty and Academic Professional Appointments.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Effective:** 7/1/1982 | **Revised:** 7/1/2011 |
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## Purpose
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To describe faculty promotion
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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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## Policy
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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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## Cross-References
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1. [ACD 505–02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html), “Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles”
2. [ACD 506–03](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html), “Faculty Probationary Appointments”
3. [ACD 506–04](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-04.html), “Tenure.”
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|  |  |
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| **Effective:** 5/1/2006 | **Revised:**  |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ASU logo] | **ACD 506–06A: Expedited Review for Tenure and/or Promotion and Faculty Hires with Tenure** |
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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.”

****

**Appendix 2:**

**Guidelines for Fixed-Term Faculty Promotions**

**Approved by faculty assembly of the school, 12/20/2017**

**Approved by the Dean 12/20/2017**

Fixed term faculty in the School of Sustainability refers to faculty who are nontenured or nontenure-track and who have fixed-term appointments as lecturers, research faculty, practice faculty, and clinical faculty. The School of Sustainability greatly values fixed term faculty for their role in educating students, developing innovative research projects, and expanding learning and discovery through engagement with communities and organizations beyond the university. Fixed term faculty bring a wealth of expertise, experience, knowledge, and insight along with a firm commitment to the mission of the School of Sustainability. As such, fixed term faculty are important members of the academic community of the school. The purpose of this document is to explain how fixed term faculty can be recognized and promoted for their achievements.

**Lecturers**

Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers are fixed-term faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching undergraduate and graduate courses.

**Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

A senior lecturer normally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of five years of college-level teaching experience at Arizona State University ([ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html)). The lecturer’s request for promotion is not based solely on time in rank, and the candidate must meet all conditions and include all materials specified in the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html).

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. Faculty members are eligible to apply for promotion to senior lecturer in their fifth year.

Lecturers requesting promotion to senior lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of excellence primarily in teaching and secondarily in service. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer 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>).

The materials are reviewed by the SOS promotion committee, which makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean’s recommendation is forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Candidates must demonstrate measurable excellence in teaching. Review of instructional materials should consider relevant measures and factors such as student learning, student evaluations, the quality of course content, contributions to curriculum and program development, pedagogical innovations, and student mentoring. Service will be evaluated primarily on the contributions to the educational mission of the school and the university, to the broader community, and to the candidate’s professional organizations.

**Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer**

A principal lecturer normally 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 ([ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html)). Normally, candidates for principal lecturer will have been at the rank of senior lecturer for seven years full time or more. However, the request for promotion is not based solely on time in rank or years of service but rather evidence of exceptional teaching, service, and leadership.

Senior lecturers requesting promotion to principal lecturer will be evaluated with respect to evidence of exceptional teaching, service, and leadership. The faculty member initiates the application for promotion from senior lecturer to principal lecturer by submitting a portfolio of materials specified in [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html) (and the link to P6 in this section).

The materials are reviewed by the SOS promotion committee, which makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean’s recommendation is forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university, who makes the final decision.

Review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, student evaluations, the quality of course content, contributions to curriculum and program development, pedagogical innovations, and student mentoring. Service will be evaluated primarily on the contributions to the educational mission of the school and the university, to the broader community, and to the candidate’s professional organizations. Principal lecturers should have a distinguished, recognized record of exceptional contributions to the educational and service mission of the school and university and show evidence of leadership in the university, community, or professional organizations that forward those goals.

**Research Faculty**

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. 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. A completed doctoral or appropriate terminal degree is necessary.

**Appointment to Assistant Research Professor**

Assistant research professor is an entry level rank, usually from a post-doctoral position. Candidates must show evidence of being able to develop a substantial research program supported through external grants. Within 3 to 5 years, 100 percent of the assistant research professor’s salary should be covered through external grants. However, promising research professors may seek salary from the university to cover a gap year in between external grants. A record of peer-reviewed publications and evidence of leadership on publications and research is required. Service to professional societies and the school is required. Teaching is permitted but not required.

**Promotion to Associate Research Professor**

Associate Research Professors have achieved national stature in their research programs. They have achieved a substantial research program supported through external grants. Typically, 100 percent of their salary should be covered through external grants. They demonstrate team leadership in designing and delivering a research program with collaborators. A significant body of well-cited peer-reviewed research is required. Invited presentations and colloquia are expected at this rank. Membership and leadership in professional societies and service on university committees is expected. Teaching is not required but is permitted. Participation in curriculum development is welcome. Promotion is not based solely on time in rank, but typically promotion to associate research professor occurs after 5 years of service as assistant research professor.

**Promotion to Research Professor**

Research Professors have achieved international stature in their research programs. They have achieved a substantial research program that has led to highly original and impactful scholarship. External grants should support 100 percent of their salary and partial or full salary support of their research teams. For promotion from associate to full research professor, 7 years of service at the associate level is expected. Research Professors must be effective leaders of research teams and mentors to student researchers. They must provide evidence of a significant body of high impact, peer reviewed scholarship. Invited presentations at major universities, scholarly societies, and national or international events are expected. Election to professional societies and special awards for research contributions are examples of service leadership. Teaching is permitted but not required. Student mentoring and participation in curriculum development is welcome.

**Practice Faculty**

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. The responsibilities of this position are teaching courses, seminars, and independent studies to undergraduate and graduate students or other duties that the dean determines are appropriate. Although appointments may be made at the assistant, associate, and full (professor) levels, the requirements of experience and distinction typically result in appointments at the rank of Professor of Practice.

**Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty are qualified by training, experience, or education to direct or participate in specialized university functions, including student internships, training, or other practice components of degree programs. They are appointed as clinical instructors, clinical assistant professors, clinical associate professors, or clinical professors. These positions may be part-time or full-time.

Generally, assistant clinical professors are appointed to one-year terms. Associate clinical professors and clinical professors may be appointed to one-year or multiple-year terms of up to three years. Specific terms depend on the extent to which associate or full clinical professors possess the experience, expertise or qualifications established over a sustained period of time that qualify them to develop or supervise practice components of degree programs or to perform other duties that the Dean determines will significantly enhance clinical/professional learning and advance the goals of the school and its programs in substantial ways.

**Promotion Reviews for Clinical Faculty**

After the completion of five years in rank at ASU in the current position, 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. The annual performance review will form a significant part of the promotion review documentation. The three primary areas to be considered in the evaluation are:

1. **Job Performance**—Fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities of the position held as detailed in the job description and in the workload agreement. The focus of the review will be on the relevant domains for each clinical faculty member and may include: teaching and instruction, training and supervision, administration, and service.
2. **Scholarship/Professional Development**—Evidence of continued professional development in relevant areas of the position. Efforts to keep abreast of current developments in areas of responsibility. Development of new capabilities, methods and procedures, new knowledge, and/or instrumentation in area(s) of responsibility. Collaboration with faculty and students in facilitating, carrying out, and/or documenting innovative research, teaching, supervision, and/or service activities. Research, publications, presentation at conferences, and grant writing. In general, these are activities that represent a commitment to the profession or to the discipline beyond the daily duties of the position.
3. **Service**—Use of professional expertise in serving the interests of the school, unit, university, community, discipline, and/or higher education. It is also recognized that some clinical faculty may have greater opportunities for service than others.

**Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty**

The fulfillment of the workload assignment and responsibilities is expected to be a major factor in decisions relating to promotion. The following are criteria for performance at each rank. Promotion to a higher rank requires performance at the appropriate level.

1. Assistant—Must meet degree or other training requirements and show promise of excellent performance, leadership, independence, and initiative.
2. Associate—Demonstrated sustained excellence in day-to-day performance and expertise in all **job performance** responsibilities, regular participation in **scholarship and professional development**, sustained evidence of initiative, demonstrated leadership and managerial capability, and a commitment to **service** activities.
3. Full—Outstanding performance of duties and fulfillment of all **job performance responsibilities**, internationally-recognized excellence in chosen field; evidence of substantial **scholarship and professional accomplishment;** contribution to school, unit or university programs; and proven commitment to **service**.

**Annex I: ACD 505–02: Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles**

**Annex II: ASU Process Guide for Promotion of Fixed-Term Academic Professionals**