

## PROFILES FOR 3rd Year Probationary Review

The T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics, the College, and the University must make probationary 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 committees in evaluating 3rd-year probationary status, and in making recommendations that may help faculty members prepare for tenure and promotion reviews.

Probationary evaluations 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. The criteria outlined below identify ways in which faculty may demonstrate excellence in performance.

In addition to the criteria outlined below, 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.

### **Materials Candidates Must Prepare and Submit for Review**

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences determines the deadline for candidates to submit materials for their 3rd year probationary review. Several months prior to submission, the Sanford School Director will inform candidates of the deadline, the materials required for submission, and their format. These materials normally include:

1. A Table of Contents for the submitted materials.
2. A statement written by the candidate that characterizes achievements in research, teaching and service, puts past scholarly work into perspective, and outlines 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.
3. The candidate's current curriculum vita presenting such information as research publications, other scholarship and/or creative achievements, funded grants (specifying internal and external), conference and invited presentations, service and committee work, 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).

4. Copies of representative publications or other material reflecting the research, scholarship and/or creative activities of the candidate. A portfolio documenting creative activity may be submitted as part of the evidence.
5. A summary table of the candidate's teaching evaluations for all courses taught since arriving at ASU.
6. Samples of teaching materials from the candidate's courses.
7. Information on student mentoring, including participation as chair or member of dissertation, thesis, and comprehensive exam committees.

Candidates are also encouraged to consult the ASU and The Sanford School promotion and tenure guidelines.

### **Criteria for Evaluation of Probationary Faculty**

#### I. Research and Scholarly Activity

##### Establishing a Successful Research Program

Research productivity is evidenced by scholarly publications and presentations, grants, and receipt of honors or awards for scholarly research. Work-in-progress and proposals may be examined; however, *refereed publications, in-press 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 encouraged to provide evidence of the stature of the outlet as well as the nature and importance of the contribution.

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.

##### A. Research Publications

The number of publications of faculty members in The Sanford School is partly determined by the nature and length of the research projects. 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. To be specific, the steadiness and quality of publications are more important than the precise number. Potential indicators of these dimensions include the frequency of publication, the quality of the journals in which one publishes (e.g., as indicated by journal impact ratings), the frequency with which one's scholarship is cited by others, and the significance or innovation of the ideas conveyed in one's scholarship.

All faculty members are expected to produce scholarly work. For faculty members who write journal articles, the goal is to approach an average of about two publications a year during the probationary period (and previous faculty positions, if appointment at ASU is less than five 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. Sole authored books, depending on the quality of the publishing house, can be considered the equivalent of multiple journal articles (Note: textbooks will not be construed as scholarly work, but may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness).

The candidate must show evidence of leadership in this work – either through sole authorship or lead authorship. At the same time, the School of Social and Family Dynamics 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.

In addition to published scholarly work, presentations of papers at international, 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 The Sanford School research (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 applications 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 a 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.

#### 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.

#### II. Teaching

Faculty members are expected to teach required courses in the undergraduate and/or graduate curricula. The School also expects the candidate to participate in the training of graduate students, by serving on thesis and dissertation committees, and by providing questions for and evaluating

comprehensive examinations. Thus, teaching is a multifaceted activity. For purposes of promotion and tenure review in The Sanford School, teaching effectiveness and quality are important considerations, and are judged on the basis of 3 components:

- A. high quality classroom teaching and demonstrated 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 and updating courses, curricula, and materials related to classroom instruction.

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, number of students per course, course load, level of courses, new courses developed, variety of courses, number of students mentored, and type of mentoring activities.

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

### III. Service

The Sanford School holds reduced service expectations for pre-tenure faculty, especially for those who exhibit substantial research activity. Service can take the form of university service, professional service, or community service, although non-tenured faculty are generally not expected to serve on College and University committees. Nonetheless, there should be some evidence of active service.

Professional service is expected. Examples of active participation include attendance at annual meetings, chairing, organizing, or being a discussant on a panel or a symposium, manuscript and/or grant reviewing, memberships on councils, holding office, and committee service.

Community service may count for promotion if it meets certain criteria. To be considered, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge. Examples of community service include consultation, technical assistance policy analysis, program evaluation, public speaking, and the like. Activities paid at a market rate are not considered service.