

PROFILES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

College and University promotion and tenure committees must make recommendations for faculty members in numerous disciplines, despite disciplinary differences in definitions of high performance in scholarly production, teaching, and service. The profiles described in this document are presented in order to assist these committees and the CLAS dean in making recommendations about the tenure and promotion of faculty in the T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics (The Sanford School).

The criteria outlined below specify a variety of ways in which faculty may demonstrate excellence in performance. Importantly, these criteria are to be regarded as standards toward which we are evolving.

Criteria for Assistant Professors for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

I. Research

A. Research Publications

The number of publications of faculty members in The Sanford School is partly determined by whether they engage in research which can be undertaken and completed swiftly or in research projects that take longer to complete. In part this is determined by whether faculty members write books or articles and whether they engage in qualitative or quantitative research. Although the discussion below involves quantification of productivity, evaluation of scholarly activity is based primarily upon quality and evidence of a habit of publication and research activity. In other words, the steadiness and quality of publications are more important than the precise number.

For faculty members who write journal articles, the goal is to approach an average of about two articles a year during the probationary period (and previous faculty positions, if appointment at ASU is less than 5 years). The majority of these articles should be in peer refereed journals. Of these, greater weight will be given to articles in the major national journals and to leading journals in one's area (s) of specialization. The remainder may appear in edited volumes or series as chapters, essays, or invited papers.

The candidate must show evidence of leadership in this work – either through sole authorship or lead authorship for most of the articles (unless the output greatly exceeds expectations). The Sanford School is an interdisciplinary program and recognizes and values the importance of collaborative research. As such, we strongly encourage collaborative work – and in fact, highlight this kind of work as a reflection of a candidate’s ability to work in teams that address important and critical questions.

Presentations of papers at national, regional, and special area conferences also will be considered in evaluating productivity. A pattern of paper presentations signifies recognition and involvement in one’s area (s) of specialization.

B. Research Grants

Some methods and techniques of research in The Sanford School (e.g., surveys) demand extensive funding for effective pursuit, while other methods do not. For example, secondary analysis or historical studies simply require that existing data or archives, respectively, be available and ethnographic research usually is conducted by a single investigator. Consequently, the number and size of research grants can vary considerably for equally productive investigators. Nevertheless, information on research grants is useful for evaluating the candidate’s excellence in research and there should be some evidence of potential success in this area for promotion and tenure.

Obtaining external funding is an increasingly extraordinary validation of the soundness and promise of the candidate’s research program and scholarly accomplishments. The high degree of competitiveness associated with awarding of grants by external agencies evokes confidence in the candidate’s work. Moreover, where the candidate is the Principal Investigator, the receipt of external funding shows confidence in the candidate’s reliability in administering the research project effectively and contributes to the School’s national reputation.

Sometimes candidates who engage in collaborative research are listed as Co-Principal Investigators rather than Principal Investigators on research grants. In some instances, the Co-Principal Investigator may have played as important a role as the Principal Investigator in securing or executing a grant and this should be recognized, especially considering the interdisciplinary and collaborative environment of the School.

Work-in-progress and proposals may be examined, however, *refereed publications or in-progress works and research grants obtained (especially competitive grants)* represent the primary evidence of the candidate's research contributions. In the case of work disseminated through channels where evaluators are unlikely to know the quality of outlets (e.g., journals in other fields, new or uncommon journals, proceedings, or sponsored research reports), the candidate is expected to provide evidence of the stature of the outlet and the nature and importance of the contribution.

C. Recognition of Accomplishment

Nomination for and receipt of awards and honors from professional associations and from the University for accomplishment in research and scholarship will be considered in validating the quality of the candidate's productivity.

It is important that faculty exhibit continuous research productivity that systematically adds to the creation of knowledge in a given area. That is, research efforts should be programmatic and focused, and should add to the general body of knowledge in an area of inquiry. Clearly, evaluating this activity requires the highest level of professional judgment on the part of the evaluators, not only because of the difficulty of the judgments involved, but because the judgment being made concerns not only the contributions *per se*, but the candidate's likely future career, especially when tenure is under consideration.

A candidate is considered as *Above Average* in research when the evidence indicates that her/his contributions rank in the top one-third of those made by her/his designated peers (persons within the same subject matter area) nationally and within the department; *Average* if in the middle one-third; and *Below Average* if in the lowest third.

II. Teaching

Teaching is a multifaceted activity. For purposes of promotion and tenure review in The Sanford School, teaching effectiveness is considered to be made up of 3 components:

- A. classroom teaching and command of subject matter;
- B. serving as a mentor in the cases of master's theses, doctoral dissertations, post-doctoral candidates, senior theses, and nonthesis-research with graduate and undergraduate students;
- C. developing courses, curricula, and materials related to classroom instruction.

Peer review of curriculum materials such as syllabi and assignments will be an additional mechanism to evaluate quality. Evidence of innovative methods of teaching will also be evidence of teaching excellence.

The candidate is expected to help maintain an acceptable student-faculty ratio in The Sanford School and to teach required courses in the undergraduate and graduate curricula. The Sanford School also expects the candidate to participate in the training of graduate students. In addition to teaching graduate courses, the candidate is expected to serve on thesis and dissertation committees, provide questions for and evaluate comprehensive examinations, and serve as the Graduate Dean's representative when

called upon. However, Assistant Professors are generally not expected to chair dissertation committees.

Each of the three components of teaching is rated individually.

The determination of teaching effectiveness is difficult and involves substantial professional judgment. Consideration will be given to such factors as student evaluations, student and course load, level of courses, new courses developed, variety of courses, number of students mentored, and type of mentoring activities.

A candidate will be judged *Above Average* in teaching if classroom teaching and mentoring are judged to be above average and the remaining component is judged to be at least average when compared to other faculty within the department.

A candidate will be judged *Average* in teaching if classroom teaching and mentoring are judged to be average.

A candidate will be judged *Below Average* if either classroom teaching or mentoring are judged to be below average.

III. Service

There should be evidence of continual active service within the university, although it is not expected that non-tenured faculty will serve on College and University committees. Membership and active participation in professional associations is encouraged.

Community service may count for promotion if it meets certain criteria. To be considered scholarship (as distinct from good works or citizenship activities), service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Included are activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor and are carried out through unpaid consultation, technical assistance policy analysis, program evaluation, public speaking, and the like. In documenting these kinds of community service, faculty should include evaluations of those who received the service, if possible. The service will be evaluated by The Sanford School with respect to promotion in light of the following questions: Is the activity directly related to the academic expertise of the professor? Have project goals been defined, procedures well planned, and actions carefully recorded? In what way has the work not only benefited the recipients of such activity but also added to the professor's own understanding of her/his field?

Membership and active participation in professional associations is expected. Examples of active participation include attendance at annual meetings, membership on editorial boards, memberships on councils, holding office, and committee service.

Service inside the university and outside the university are rated on the basis of quality and quantity.

A candidate is judged *Above Average* in service if the evidence indicates a contribution that is substantially beyond that of a designated peer group (e.g., faculty within the same rank) in service.

A candidate is judged *Average* in service if evidence indicates a contribution that is approximately equal to that of the designated peer group in service.

A candidate is judged *Below Average* in service if the evidence indicates a contribution below that of a designated peer group in service.

Evaluation of Candidate for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be considered for positive recommendation for interim evaluations or for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in The Sanford School, the candidate must be evaluated above average ranking in research and teaching, and at minimum average in service. Furthermore, all faculty are expected to conform to a high standard of personal and professional ethics. The ASU Faculty Code of Ethics is described in the Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Manual. Failure to adhere to this code could result in disciplinary action and/or denial of tenure and promotion. More specifically, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires demonstration of the following:

- Refereed publications
- Creativity and leadership in research, evidence of success in obtaining external funding is expected
- Demonstrated competence in subject matter commensurate with graduate level teaching evidenced through teaching and/or mentoring
- Effective service to School, College, University, and community
- Evidence of professional service and activity (e.g., active participation in related professional associations, editing/reviewing for professional journals, speeches, presentations at national professional conferences)
- National recognition (e.g., recognition by established leaders in the candidate's field of her/his contributions, service on editorial boards or on professional organizations' boards, service of review panels for professional organizations or the government)

Promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure are based upon both past performance and future potential. Effectiveness in pending professional contributions may be considered, but may not be substituted for proof of a sustained independent program of research, teaching, and service. Nominations are based on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the candidate's cumulative record, not on seniority.