

P5: Tenure and/or Promotion File Contents Submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Effective Date: March 23, 1987

Revised Date: July 1, 2011

The materials supporting the review of faculty are to be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University in one original unbound, hard-copy form and on 2 (unprotected, PDF formatted) CD ROMs as listed below.

Materials submitted on CD#1 (prepared by the candidate) must include:

1. table of contents for the materials in candidate's submission. Include a listing of four publication titles or titles of the other documentation of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities
2. the candidate's current curriculum vitae presenting such information as research publications, scholarship and/or creative achievements, service, grants, and papers presented, etc. Refereed and non-refereed publications should be distinguished. Joint authors of articles should be listed in the order in which they appear, and the nature of one's role in research projects and other joint efforts should be clearly described (e.g., use an asterisk to identify the author making the major contribution to the paper or project)
3. a statement of not more than four pages written by the candidate to put past work into perspective and to outline future goals. The statement should help reviewers see relationships among the individual's teaching, research, and service and how these activities have built the foundation for continued professional growth
4. review materials of teaching and instructional activity:
 1. a summary table of courses taught, the number of students in each, and a summary of student evaluations including scale, mean, and standard deviation
 2. peer evaluations if available
 3. See item 6d. below in supplemental materials
5. a copy of four publications or other material reflecting the research, scholarship, and/or creative activities of the candidate. A portfolio documenting creative activity may be submitted as one of the four pieces of evidence
6. supplemental materials (optional) may include materials providing evidence of instructional effectiveness for up to two courses, e.g., syllabi, copies of assignments, reading lists, websites, CDs, etc., additional publications, individual student evaluations or comments. An optional supplemental statement by the candidate on one of the other areas of responsibility (up to two pages in length) may be included. The statement should be labeled "Supplemental Statement on _____" (e.g., Teaching, Research and Service)
7. Contents of external review packets submitted to the unit/college to be sent to external reviewers:
 1. current curriculum vitae
 2. personal statement
 3. a copy of up to four publications or other material reflecting the research, scholarship and/or creative activities of the candidate (a portfolio documenting creative activity may be submitted as one of the four pieces of evidence);
 4. criteria of the unit and college

Materials submitted on CD#2 (prepared by the Dean's Office or appropriate administrative office) must include:

1. the complete [Request for Academic Personnel Action](#) form along with any other forms used by the college
2. all unit/college evaluation letters
 1. Academic Unit Personnel Committee's independent evaluation of performance in relation to unit/department criteria
 2. chair/director's independent evaluation and recommendation
 3. College Personnel Committee's independent evaluation and recommendation
 4. dean's independent evaluation and recommendation

Internal evaluation letters and committee recommendations (omitting identification of external reviewers) should explicitly address the following:

1. analysis of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, which may include instructional contributions such as curriculum development and program development
2. detailed evaluation of the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activities including assessment of the quality and impact of the work
3. evaluation of the volume of research, scholarship and/or creative activities and expected future contributions
4. unit/departmental expectations and disciplinary culture regarding individual and joint authorship of publications, grant activities, and the norms regarding order of authorship in the field
5. clear specifications of the candidate's contributions to collaborative projects (including external funding) and/or to interdisciplinary work
6. comparative analysis of the candidate's standing in the field, relative to national peers
7. if the committee vote is not unanimous, the evaluation letter must explicitly state the minority view in the letter

A substantive evaluation of the case at each level of review must be provided and questions arising at earlier levels of review directly addressed. Do not repeat case details that have already been described in earlier letters. Rather, evaluate the case, correct misstatements, substantiate or challenge claims, and provide additional perspectives and information.

Provide evidence and documentation for important assertions about the case. For example, if the candidate has received a major award specify the importance of that award in the discipline. Similarly, identify the top journals in the field and provide some evidence of their quality.

1. an evaluative statement from any additional units if the faculty member has a joint appointment
2. an evaluative statement from any additional units may be provided if the faculty has an affiliated appointment(s)
3. External evaluation letters
 1. all original external evaluation letters received must be included with the file. If possible, academic unit chairs/directors and deans should explain any troublesome or confusing statement made by an external reviewer in their internal evaluation letter
 2. Submit the [Record of Outside Letters](#) form. This is a list of all external evaluators sent letters requesting an evaluation. If a letter has not been received, note this on the grid. Include detailed information about each reviewer's qualifications, stature in the field, and familiarity with the candidate's scholarship and/or creative activities. If reviewers are not from peer/aspirational peer institutions or are not full professors, explain why they were selected. Include identifying information about the reviewers **only** on this grid/form
 3. submit the curriculum vitae of each external reviewer
 4. submit a copy of the letter used to request the reviews. Academic unit chairs/directors may contact potential reviewers prior to the formal solicitation to identify those potential reviewers most likely to respond. Generally we seek a total of 10 responses from external reviewers because we want to ensure at least 5 strong letters are in the file. Additional reviewers may be contacted in an attempt to secure a sufficient number of external evaluations so that quality and impact of the candidate's work and his/her standing in the field can be assessed. 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)
4. a current copy of the academic unit's and college's approved promotion and tenure review process criteria

All college and university committees meeting to review tenure and/or promotion files must inform the chair/director or dean (as appropriate) if there are major faults or omissions in the material or if significant questions or possible misunderstandings arise. The chair/director or dean may send additional letters to the committee as the case progresses if there is a need to either clarify or provide additional information.

All information received after the file has left the unit/department is forwarded on through each review level to the executive vice president and provost of the university to be added as an Appendix to the candidate's file. A brief statement should be written at each review level stating whether or not the new material would change their earlier recommendation in any way. The deadline for additional submissions to the case file for candidates seeking tenure is December 1 of each year. Any additional materials after that time require the dean to seek approval from the provost's office for submission. Candidates for promotion only must have their file complete by the deadline established by the college for submission to begin the review process. There will be no additional materials accepted for candidates seeking promotion to full professor as they should have their case intact prior to making application. If a significant new achievement occurs, the dean can discuss the possibility of those materials being added with the provost's office. The dean should provide a cover list of the names of all faculty in the college going through the review process, listed by academic unit, who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure this cycle.

See [ACD 506-04, "Tenure"](#) or [ACD 506-05, "Faculty Promotion"](#) for more information.

Office of the University Provost

Arizona State University is a top ranked research university in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area.

[Contact Us](#)

Academics

[Academic Integrity](#)

[Academic Accreditation](#)

[Academic Advisors](#)

[Academic Partnerships](#)

[Committees](#)

[eAdvisor™](#)

[University Senate](#)

Faculty and Staff

[Academic Personnel](#)

[Business and Finance](#)

[Curriculum Development](#)

[Faculty Excellence](#)

Initiatives

[Campus Safety](#)

[Inclusion](#)

[The LEAD Project](#)

About

[Leadership](#)

[ASU Facts](#)