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The Sidney Poitier New American Film School Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Evaluation Guidelines

# Statement of Principles for Academic Personnel Actions

The primary purposes of the SPNAFS Promotion, Tenure and Annual Evaluation Guidelines are to establish faculty and academic professional performance criteria, to reduce ambiguity in matters of evaluation, and to establish a coherent policy. The plan incorporates the Arizona Board of Regents guidelines for assessing performance of faculty and academic professionals (ABOR [6-211](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-211-Evaluation%20of%20Faculty.pdf) and [6-302](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-302%20Conditions%20of%20Service%20for%20Academic%20Professionals.pdf)), and the University [(ACD Manual)](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/index.html) and Institute guidelines for the tenure and post-tenure review process. For faculty, these guidelines include performance in: 1. Instructional Contributions (Teaching); 2. Research and Creative Activity; and 3.

Professional, Institutional, and Community Service; and contributions to unit justice, equity, diversity and inclusion practices are to be considered in all Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, and Service.

The secondary purposes of the SPNAFS Promotion, Tenure and Annual Evaluation Guidelines are to assist in professional development and to aid decisions concerning salary adjustment. Professional development serves to improve and/or enhance future performance as well as assess past performance. The emphasis in the evaluation process is on quality.

# Definitions

* 1. Faculty: also refers to academic professionals with teaching assignments
	2. Personnel Committee: The SPNAFS Personnel Committees, the Tenure-Track Personnel Committee (TTPC) and Fixed-Term Personnel Committee (FTPC) will be referred to in singular form in these guideline as the, “Personnel Committee.” This nomenclature in no way obviates the fact that the SPNAFS will have two Personnel Committees, one to evaluate tenure track faculty members and one to evaluate fixed term faculty members as per the bylaws. In this document, where the “Personnel Committee'' is referred to in connection with some action involving a faculty member, it is understood that the Personnel Committee referred to is the appropriate committee based on the faculty member’s appointment.

# Annual Evaluation Process and Procedures

## Overview

The Director is responsible for conducting annual performance evaluations for all tenured, tenure-track and fixed term faculty and for ensuring fair and equitable application of policy during annual performance evaluations. Annual performance evaluations are guided by [[ABOR](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-211-Evaluation%20of%20Faculty.pdf) [6-211](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-211-Evaluation%20of%20Faculty.pdf), [ABOR 6-302](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-302%20Conditions%20of%20Service%20for%20Academic%20Professionals.pdf), [ACD 506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html)], and serve the following purposes:

* + 1. To comply with the Arizona Board of Regents’ requirements for an annual review of all faculty with the purpose of encouraging the faculty member to establish goals for continued academic progress;
		2. To guide salary decisions.

## Faculty Responsibilities

* + 1. Annual Evaluation Documents

The annual performance evaluations will cover the past three-year period, with significantly more weight given to the most recent year, and will be a thorough review of the individual faculty member’s contributions through 1) Instruction 2) Research/Creative Activity, and 3) Service, with an emphasis on their quality.

Contributions to the unit’s justice, equality, diversity and inclusion goals may be factored into each of the other categories. The previous two (2) calendar years’ documents serve as contextual background and reference for the most current calendar year’s review.

Faculty will submit the following documents to the designated APA staff member by December 31st.

## Faculty Self Evaluation

Faculty members will write a document of no more than four (4) pages , that summarizes the faculty contributions over the last year. This summary should be provided as a list with narrative content as necessary to contextualize the activities.

## Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Current and complete as of the end of the last calendar year, by entering contribution information into ASU website such as ASU Vita (APARS).

## Student Evaluations

All student course evaluations for the last calendar year (Spring, Summer, Fall).

## Syllabi

All syllabi used in teaching for the last calendar year (Spring, Summer, Fall).

## Personnel and Director Evaluations

All personnel committee and director evaluations from the previous three calendar years.

## Peer Reviews

All peer teaching evaluations written during the previous three calendar years.

## Annual Responsibility Assignment (ARA)

ARAs (Distribution of Effort) forms from the past three calendar years.

* + 1. Personnel Committee

As members of the School Assembly, faculty are responsible to nominate and elect representatives to the committee.

* + 1. Review Evaluation Process Annually

As members of the School Assembly, faculty are responsible to review and if necessary, suggest revisions through the processes outlined in the Bylaws.

## Personnel Committee Responsibilities

* + 1. The Personnel Committee will review the annual evaluation documents for each faculty member at the beginning of each calendar year. All faculty receiving salary from the university will be evaluated, including those on sabbatical.
		2. The Personnel Committee will rate each faculty member’s performance in each of the contribution areas 1) Instruction 2) Research/Creative Activity, and 3) Service, and 4) contributions to the unit’s justice, equality, diversity and inclusion practices with one of five ratings, exceptionally meritorious, highly meritorious, meritorious, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and assign an overall rating.
		3. The Personnel Committee will submit the completed Annual Faculty Evaluation forms, with appropriate sections completed, and a written letter of evaluation to the Director for each faculty member by February 28th of each calendar year.
		4. As discussed in Subparagraph D(2) just below, the Personnel Committee will hold discussions with the Director if the scores awarded by the Director differ from those awarded by the Personnel Committee.

## Director Responsibilities

* + 1. The Director will conduct an independent review of each faculty member’s performance in each of the contribution areas: 1) Teaching 2) Research/Creative Activity, and 3) Service, and 4) contributions to the unit’s justice, equality, diversity and inclusion practices with one of five ratings, exceptionally meritorious, highly meritorious, meritorious, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and assign an overall rating.
		2. If the scores awarded by the Director differ from those awarded by the Personnel Committee, the Director must share their evaluation with the Personnel Committee for discussion of the differences before both evaluations are provided to the faculty member.

## Annual Evaluation Letters and Scores

* + 1. Faculty will always and without fail be provided in full their individual evaluations from the Director and the Personnel Committee at the same time by May 30th of each year. At the request of the faculty member, the Director will arrange an individual meeting to discuss in detail the year’s work, the evaluations received, and the merit assignments.

## Unsatisfactory Performance

If performance in teaching, research, or service is determined to be unsatisfactory in a given year, the Director and faculty member will develop a written, signed plan designed to improve performance. The implemented plan will include specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress at specified intervals. If the faculty member and Director are unable to develop a plan that both can sign, an appeal of the evaluation may be filed.

## Evaluation Appeals Process

All appeals of performance evaluations are directed to the next higher administrator above the

evaluator [ACD 506-10](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html). As noted in ACD 506-10, the request for an appeal must be made within 30 working days (excluding summer) of being notified of the Director's evaluation. The final decision lies with the appeal review administrator who must complete the review and notify the appellant within 30 working days (excluding summer) after the receipt of the appeal. Individuals may also file a complaint regarding their annual performance evaluation in accord with [ACD](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd401.html) [401](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd401.html), “Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Non Retaliation”.

Should a faculty member object to an evaluation score given by the Director and want to appeal the score per the preceding paragraph, the faculty member may, prior to making their appeal, first bring the dispute before the Personnel Committee, and should the Personnel Committee ultimately disagree with the Director’s scoring, then when the faculty member actually formally appeals the Director’s evaluation, both the Director’s comments and the Personnel Committee’s comments must be communicated to the next higher administrator at same time.

## Evaluation of Joint and Affiliated Appointments

* + 1. Joint Appointments with Majority Effort within SPNAFS

Faculty with joint appointments in other units where the majority of effort (as determined by the Memo of Joint Appointment completed by both units during the hiring process) is within the Sidney Poitier New American Film School will be evaluated and promoted according to the policies, procedures, and criteria outlined in this document. A letter of evaluation will be requested from the chair or director of each minority-effort unit and appended to the materials submitted for evaluation.

* + 1. Joint Appointments with Majority Effort in Other Units

Faculty with joint appointments in other units where the minority of effort is within the Sidney Poitier New American Film School will be evaluated and promoted according to the policies, procedures, and criteria of the majority-effort unit.

* + 1. Affiliated Appointments with Other Units

SPNAFS faculty who hold Affiliated Faculty status with other units may request that letters of evaluation from the chair or director of those units be appended to the materials submitted for evaluation.

# Annual Evaluation Areas of Contribution

## Instructional Contributions (Teaching and Mentorship)

* + 1. Course Work

Moving from both the premise that the school’s assessment practices reflect our values, and that the function of measurement and evaluation is to further the school’s aims and mission, excellence in teaching/mentorship shall be defined as both micro and macro practices supporting the mission of the school and the growth and individual achievement of students.

Our teaching practices are broad and diverse. They include classroom-based methods such as lectures and discussions, production practices, online material delivery and

interaction, and formal and informal individualized and small group mentorship. Excellence in teaching is not determined by specific methodology, format or venue but rather by the quality of faculty input and student outcome.

Excellent teaching:

* + - 1. Creates a positive environment where students are inspired, encouraged and supported to take risks and explore possibilities
			2. Fosters collaborative and cooperative learning communities
			3. Enhances student motivation
			4. Supports students from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds, of differing abilities, and with diverse K-12 educational experiences
			5. Grows students’ intellectual and creative agility
			6. Increases students’ personal and professional capacities
			7. Encourages professional integrity, artistic responsibility and social engagement
			8. Holds students to high standards of intellectual and artistic achievement

Excellent teachers share many practices; for example, excellent teachers:

1. Prepare thorough and challenging course syllabi, course materials and assessments
2. Integrate current thinking and evidence-based practices
3. Try new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom
4. Understand how students’ individual experiences and particular courses fit into the school’s arc of intellectual and creative discovery
5. Attend seminars or colloquia for improvement
6. Share successful techniques with colleagues
7. Are available to students outside class time for discussion and counseling
8. Provide opportunities for students to learn from each other to enrich their understandings
9. Engage students in routine reflection about what they learned, how they learned it, and what it means to them
10. Treat students with respect
11. Respect their subject matter and aesthetic practices
12. Use self-assessment to grow their own teaching and creativity
	* 1. Mentoring

Each faculty member will be expected to mentor a minimum of 5 students per semester in one or more of the following ways:

* + - 1. By serving as Senior Project mentor or in a similar role in future student projects
			2. By instructing students in Individualized Instruction classes
			3. By overseeing Cross-Disciplinary-Research Projects, including but not limited to Barrett Honors Thesis Projects.
			4. By other means should they be available now or become available in the future that provide students with a similar educational experience.

## Research/Creative Activity Contributions

Measuring success and excellence in the arts is by definition a difficult task and cannot be easily compared to the same measures in other fields. Clearly, the measure of success and excellence in creative activity in the arts, as opposed to traditional scholarly research, presents unique challenges. Both traditional scholarship/research and creative activity are vital, as both inform teaching and contribute to the fields of film, media and related fields.

The measure of success for SPNAFS faculty is excellence in both scholarship/research and scholarship/creative activity. To help define what constitutes excellence in scholarship/research and scholarship/creative activity, SPNAFS compares faculty achievement and performance to the acknowledged best in one’s field on a national/international level.

SPNAFS recognizes excellence in research and creative activity can be manifested in a wide variety of endeavors, including but not limited to:

* + 1. Film, television and/or media development, production and/or marketing –– evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of quality and significance, whether local, regional, national/international. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to:
			1. Letters of evaluation
			2. Letters of recommendation by established members of the industry
			3. Press and/or reviews
			4. Publications commenting upon one’s work
			5. Exhibitions of one’s work
			6. Contracts for consultancy or advisement with professional organizations, companies or individuals
			7. Options or writing contracts on written work
			8. Evidence of credit on a television series or mini-series, TV special or TV film
			9. Peer evaluations, internal and/or external
			10. Evidence of awards or some other recognition
		2. Publication –– book, script, article or review published in a recognized venue (whether now existing or established in the future).
		3. Invitations to and/or participation in professional or educational organizations to discuss disciplinary theory, practice, pedagogy, and/or research.
		4. Membership in professional guilds, associations or organizations recognized in core or related industries.
		5. Professional certifications and/or licenses granted by organizations in core or related industries.
		6. Continued professional contributions to productions or practices, including, but not limited to, consultancies.
		7. Developing, training and coaching of peers.
		8. Development of and engagement in community initiatives.

Collaborative research/creative activity and co-teaching are valued as highly as individual effort.

## Service Contributions

All faculty members are expected to perform service at the unit, college, and university level. The amount of service to be performed by any faculty member will be strictly based on that faculty member’s distribution of effort as determined by their Annual Responsibility Assignment (ARA).

* + 1. Examples of Service include, but are not limited to:
			1. Unit/School
				1. Serving in a leadership/administrative appointment
				2. Serving on a standing or ad hoc committees
				3. Participation in justice, equity, diversity and inclusion practices
				4. Student recruitment and retention activities
				5. Outreach activities for the general public, local schools, and community colleges
			2. Institute/College
				1. Serving in a leadership/administrative appointment
				2. Serving on the HIDA Personnel or Research committees
			3. University
				1. Serving in a leadership/administrative appointment
				2. Serving as an academic senator or other academic government or policy post
			4. Community
				1. Film Festival Juror
				2. Board Member, film related organization
				3. Film-related conference chair
				4. Editor of film-related academic journals
				5. Participation in or execution of initiatives that foster community engagement

# Annual Evaluation Scoring

Faculty performance in the contribution areas will be rated separately by the Personnel Committee and by the Director as demonstrating “exceptionally meritorious,” “highly meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory” performance.

Until the Herberger Institute creates rubrics detailing what specifically constitutes “exceptionally meritorious,” “highly meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” and “unsatisfactory” conduct in teaching, research/creative work and service, these terms lend themselves to unacceptable subjectivity, and provide little to no guidance to faculty members to gauge what they must do to earn a specific score.

# Workload/Performance Assignments and the Evaluation Process

## Weighting

The areas of contribution will be weighted for evaluation purposes according to the individual faculty member’s distribution of effort as designated in the Annual Responsibility Assignment. Distributions of effort may vary depending on individual faculty assignment and circumstances, but should generally align with:

* + 1. Tenure-track faculty: 40% Teaching, 40% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service. The 40/40/20 distribution is widely recognized by the university as standard for tenure-track and tenured faculty. However, a tenure-track appointment with Annual

Responsibility Assignment distributions that are weighted differently from the standard, especially for additional Teaching or Service, may have a negative impact on the tenure and promotion process.

* + 1. Tenured faculty: 40% Teaching, 40% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service
		2. Lecturers: 80% Teaching, 20% Service
		3. Professors of Practice: 50% Teaching, 30% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service
		4. Clinical Professors (of any rank): 40% Teaching, 10% Research and Creative Activity, 50% Service
		5. Instructors: 100% Teaching.

The process of determining annual faculty workload assignments begins with appropriate assignments for Teaching. For example, in a traditional tenured or tenure-track distribution (40-40-20), 40% Teaching represents teaching 15 credit hours per year. Since faculty teach students outside of regularly scheduled group classes, including but not limited to mentoring senior projects, teaching individualized instruction courses, overseeing Honors Theses and Honors Contracts, developing courses and course curricula, and by other means of mentoring students, a methodology will be created to equate such instruction with credit hours taught."

## Negotiations of Assignments Between Faculty, the Director and Personnel Committee

The negotiation process will begin at the end of each calendar year and will be revised each spring semester immediately following the review of the previous year’s annual report for each faculty member.

The Director in consultation with the Personnel Committee and each faculty member will negotiate the workload/performance assignments for all faculty for the coming year. All faculty will receive, in writing, the nature of weighting for their performance for the following year in the form of the Annual Responsibility Assignment (or Distribution of Effort), which shall be signed by the faculty member and the Director and submitted as a guiding document in the annual evaluation process.

## Overload of Work

From time to time, in order to satisfy important SPNAFS teaching and service needs, faculty members are sometimes asked, or volunteer, to take on teaching and/or service responsibilities that are more extensive than is required by their distribution of effort. When a faculty member exceeds their distribution of effort requirements, such as, by way of example, mentoring more

than five students per semester or teaching more courses that is required by their appointment requirements, or undertaking an overload of service work, the Director and Personnel Committee must, as a consequence of the faculty member doing this excess work, increase annual evaluation scores to reflect this overload of work. No action by the faculty member is required for the increased scores to be recorded; it will be incumbent on the Personnel Committee and Director to assess a faculty member’s workload, and where excessive work obligations are apparent, to ensure evaluation scores reflect this.

It is a fact, however, that both the Personnel Committee’s evaluation and the Director’s evaluation are written only *after* an overload of work has already been completed. This can lead to burdens on faculty members that become unduly exhausting or unsustainable.

Therefore, faculty members who are assigned responsibilities that they believe exceed their distribution of effort must have the means to challenge such excess responsibilities *before* they are performed, and they must be able to raise such challenges in a safe and caring environment where there can be **absolutely no negative employment repercussions** because a challenge has been raised. Of course, should the faculty member so desire, they are always free to challenge their assigned responsibilities directly with the Director. However, should the faculty member prefer not to do this, and until such time, if any, when other administrative procedures are put in place, a faculty member who feels they are being asked to perform an excessive amount of work will be entitled to inform the Personnel Committee, and should the Personnel Committee agree with the faculty member, the Personnel Committee will then raise the issue directly with the Director.

## Faculty Peer Observation

Each tenured and fixed-term faculty member who earns "meritorious," "highly meritorious,” or “exceptionally meritorious” teaching ratings in their annual evaluations will be evaluated once every three years by another rank-appropriate tenured or fixed-term faculty member observing their teaching. All other tenured faculty members and each non-tenured faculty member will be evaluated once each semester by another rank-appropriate tenured or fixed-term faculty observing their teaching. Observers will be selected randomly by the Personnel Committee. The observers will negotiate with the faculty members the specific dates and times of the observations. Any faculty member may request additional observations by peers for professional development or to enhance their teaching portfolio. The Personnel Committee evaluates all peer reviews.

Within a reasonable time after the observation, the observer will prepare a written evaluation, a copy of which will be given to the faculty member who was observed. The faculty member may choose to meet with the observer to discuss the evaluation. The observer will then submit the evaluation, which includes a summary of the post-observation meeting (where applicable), to the Personnel Committee. The faculty member observed is entitled to submit a written response to the Personnel Committee.

Once each year, the Director of the School will observe the teaching of each non-tenured

member of the faculty. The Director will observe tenured faculty teaching, at the Director’s discretion, at least once every three (3) years.

## Faculty Administrative Evaluation

Should a faculty member have significant departmental administrative or supervisory duties, such as serving as Associate Director, or Assistant Director, Curriculum Coordinator, or SAFE Set Coordinator, or some other similar administrative position, the faculty member will receive a separate evaluation of their administrative work by the Personnel Committee and the Director, having solicited the input of the faculty, staff and students.

## Salary Issues

In those years where discretionary raises are available, the Personnel Committee will meet to determine both the salary issues to be addressed (e.g., merit, external and internal markets, equity, salary compression and inversion), and the priority order in which they are to be addressed within University guidelines. The Director, guided by faculty recommendation for the priority of salary issues to be addressed, and by the Personnel Committee’s evaluations of faculty performance, will determine the amount of salary increase for each faculty member.

# Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures

The Director shall notify those standing for tenure and promotion of the current university requirements. Each faculty member is required to submit a file folder dossier with appropriate documentation evidencing excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service.

For the final review of a faculty member prior to the recommendation for tenure of that faculty member, the Personnel Committee shall convene all tenured faculty to vote on the decision. For promotion to full professor, the Personnel Committee shall convene all full professors to vote on the decision. Those who vote will have access to the same materials used by the Personnel Committee in their evaluations, except solicited letters from outside reviewers. The faculty member being evaluated may request to be present at this meeting. The results of this vote will be included in the Personnel Committee’s recommendation to the Director. One-half of the tenured faculty shall be considered a voting quorum.

## Faculty Promotion

The purpose of promotion is to recognize and reward accomplishment. Promotion is awarded on the basis of proven excellence rather than a lack of deficiencies. Demotion does not occur. The collection of supporting materials pertinent to all such decisions is the responsibility of the faculty member, except that the Personnel Committee and the Director will collect supplementary, confidential evaluations letters where required.

* + 1. Support Materials for Promotion
			1. [ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html): Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles
			2. [Process Guide Review for Renewal of Multi-Year Appointments](http://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure/multiyear)
			3. [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html): Faculty promotion
			4. [Process Guide for Promotion of Fixed-Term Faculty](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ProcessGuideFixed-TermFacultyPromotion_0.pdf)

## Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

* + 1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A record of excellence and the potential for continued excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activity in one or more areas of specialization as outlined below with an additional record of service as deemed appropriate for an assistant professor.

* + 1. Promotion to Full Professor

To receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor the candidate must have established a national reputation in his/her field of endeavor and be evaluated as having been—over a sustained period of time:

* + - 1. An effective and inspiring teacher
			2. An effective mentor
			3. A leader in curricular innovation
			4. A producer of a substantial record of creative activity and/or research that significantly enriches their area(s) of expertise
			5. A major influence in one or more areas of research or creative activity
			6. A possessor of a record of effective service within the university and his or her larger professional communities including leadership positions

## Promotion and Tenure Appeals Process

If any faculty member feels they have been evaluated unfairly, this matter should be discussed in detail with the Director and/or the Personnel Committee.

The appeals process will start at the departmental level. If the issue is not resolved at the departmental level, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, or other appropriate university administrators, for re-evaluation or adjustment of the evaluation. The Director shall write a summary letter putting forth reasons for their recommendations; provided, however, that when the Director’s evaluation and the Personnel committee’s evaluation differ, the Personnel Committee shall also write its own summary letter and both the Personnel Committee’s evaluation and summary letter shall be provided to both the faculty member and the Dean or other appropriate university administrators at the same time as the Director’s summary letter is provided to the Dean or other appropriate university administrators. Additionally, if the faculty member so desires, they may also submit a summary letter to the Dean or other appropriate university administrators.

## Peer and Aspirational Schools

We look toward peer and aspirational universities/programs within the Promotion process. Candidates provide a list of external reviewers from Film Programs around the world.

* + 1. Peer: Various ABOR policies require Arizona State University to use a set of

[ABOR-approved peers](https://www.azregents.edu/arizonas-public-universities/peer-institutions) when preparing various analyses and proposals. The current sets

of peers were approved by the board in 2009. These peer sets provide benchmarks for the various analyses and assessments of the institutions.

* + 1. Aspirational: This list is not comprehensive of aspirational schools, and can change as Film/Media programs grow:
			1. New York University
			2. University of California, Santa Barbara
			3. University of California, Riverside
			4. Chapman University
			5. Loyola Marymount University
			6. San Francisco State University

# Fixed Term Promotion Process and Procedures

## Faculty Promotion

Individuals with fixed-term faculty appointments as lecturer and clinical faculty are eligible for promotion in rank. The purpose of promotion is to recognize and reward accomplishment.

Promotion is awarded on the basis of proven excellence rather than a lack of deficiencies. Demotion does not occur.

The collection of supporting materials pertinent to all such decisions is the responsibility of the faculty member, except that the Personnel Committee and the Director will collect supplementary, confidential evaluations letters where required.

* + 1. Support Materials for Promotion
			1. [ACD 505-02](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd505-02.html): Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles
			2. [Process Guide Review for Renewal of Multi-Year Appointments](http://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure/multiyear)
			3. [ACD 506-05](http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-05.html): Faculty promotion
			4. [Process Guide for Promotion of Fixed-Term Faculty](https://provost.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ProcessGuideFixed-TermFacultyPromotion_0.pdf)

## Promotion Criteria for Lecturer Rank

Lecturers are fixed-term faculty members with responsibilities that may include teaching and service responsibilities, supervising supplemental kinds of student learning, professional development, and/or administrative duties related to teaching. While teaching and service are typically the focus of lecturer appointments, research/creative activities can be a component of the appointment, especially as they increase effectiveness of instruction. Candidates for positions as Principal or Senior Lecturers generally hold terminal graduate degrees or equivalent professional practice experience appropriate to the assignment to be filled. To be considered for promotion to senior lecturer, a candidate must have five years or more of full-time service as a lecturer at ASU or a peer institution. For promotion to principal lecturer, the candidate must have seven years or more of full-time service as a senior lecturer at ASU or a peer institution.

However, promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in position effectiveness, including excellence in teaching, sustained involvement in school, university,

and/or community service, and if a component of the candidate’s negotiated Distribution of Effort, appropriate sustained accomplishments in research and/or creative activities.

Expectations for promotion include a record of accomplishments providing evidence that the applicant is capable of, and will continue to, contribute to the goals of the School, Institute, and ASU at a high level.

* + 1. The following are expected for promotion from **Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**:
			1. teaching effectiveness and innovation across a broad portfolio of courses that will include some combination of large classes, online classes, hybrid classes and innovative instruction
			2. sustained significant service to the school
			3. positive interactions and collaborations with students, faculty and staff
		2. The following are expected for promotion from **Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer:**
			1. include performing at a high level in the Senior Lecturer rank for a period of time sufficient to establish sustained excellence and impact plus;
			2. substantial leadership-oriented service contributions at both the school and HIDA level

Minimum Criteria

1. Academic Rank of Lecturer
	1. Candidate has a graduate degree or equivalent professional practice experience appropriate to the assignment to be filled.
	2. Candidate demonstrates commitment to and evidence of excellence in teaching and in service and/or administrative responsibilities related to teaching.
	3. There is evidence of potential for effective teaching in the area of specialization.
	4. There is evidence of potential for effective service to the unit and school.
	5. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, then the candidate shows evidence of potentially establishing a program of research and/or creative activity.
2. Academic Rank of Senior Lecturer
	1. Candidate has a terminal degree or equivalent professional practice experience appropriate to the assignment.
	2. Candidate demonstrates evidence of at least five years of successful teaching in the unit or in a similar position at the rank of Lecturer or equivalent, and evidence of providing instructional innovation.
	3. There is evidence of effective teaching in the area of specialization for five years or more.
	4. There is evidence of effective service to the unit and school.
	5. Candidate has contributed to curriculum development in the candidate’s area of specialization.
	6. If research and/or creative activity is part of the assignment, then candidate has achieved a program of research and/or creative activity that is attracting regional attention.
3. Academic Rank of Principal Lecturer
	1. Candidate has a terminal degree or equivalent professional practice experience appropriate to the assignment.
	2. Candidate has demonstrated evidence of at least seven years of successful teaching in the unit or in a similar position at the rank of Senior Lecturer or equivalent, evidence of providing instructional innovation to the unit, and regional or national recognition for leadership in teaching and service related to teaching.
	3. There is evidence of ongoing effective teaching in the area of specialization for seven years or more.
	4. Candidate has provided leadership in curriculum development in the candidate’s area of specialization.
	5. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, then the candidate maintains a program of research and/or creative activity that remains well known within the region and at a national level.

## Promotion Criteria for Clinical Professor Rank

Clinical faculty are fixed-term faculty members who are qualified by training, experience or education to direct or participate in specialized university functions including teaching, student internships, training or other practice components of degree programs. Responsibilities of clinical faculty may encompass any area of professional practice and/or technical expertise and may include professional development. Candidates for positions as Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, or Clinical Professor appointments generally hold an appropriate terminal graduate degree or bachelor’s degree and equivalent professional practice experience appropriate to the assignment to be filled. To be considered for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, a candidate must have five years or more of full-time service as a Clinical Assistant Professor at ASU or a peer institution. For promotion to Clinical Professor, the candidate must have seven years or more of full-time service as a Clinical Associate Professor at ASU or a peer institution. However, promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal and is not based solely on time in rank. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in position effectiveness, including excellence in teaching, sustained involvement in school, university, and/or community service, and if a component of the candidate’s negotiated Distribution of Effort, appropriate sustained accomplishments in research and/or creative activities.

In addition, to meeting the minimum criteria for assistant clinical faculty members, associate clinical professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

* + 1. The equivalent of five years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the

SPNAFS assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of five years may be reduced on a case-by-case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarly research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience.

* + 1. Teaching: Candidates for promotion should present a record of sustained long- term excellence and diversity in teaching (see criteria outlined in the Annual Review section). Candidates for promotion should summarize their record in the form of a teaching portfolio that describes their contribution to the teaching mission of the school, presents evidence of excellence in the areas noted above and any other areas relevant to their teaching role, and includes a statement of teaching philosophy.
		2. Service – Internal and External Contributions: Candidates for promotion should present evidence of sustained service contributions to the mission of the department, college, and/or university (internal service) and to the profession and community at large (external service). The roles assigned by the department will be considered in evaluating the magnitude of accomplishment expected in service overall, and in internal and external service.
		3. Scholarship of Teaching: Candidates for promotion should present evidence of scholarship competence and accomplishment. However, all candidates will present evidence of a continuing commitment to the scholarship of teaching (see criteria outlined in the Annual Review section).

In addition to meeting the minimum criteria for associate clinical professors, clinical professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

1. The equivalent of 12 years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the Sidney Poitier New American Film School assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of 12 years may be reduced on a case-by-case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarship research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience.
2. Continued excellence on the dimensions of Teaching, Service, and Scholarship of Teaching as outlined above.

Minimum Criteria

1. Academic Rank of Clinical Assistant Professor
	1. Academic and/or professional qualifications: Bachelor’s degree required. Master’s or terminal degree in the area of specialization preferred.
	2. There is evidence of effective teaching in the subject field of the candidate’s training and experience and a potential for effective service to the unit.
	3. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate shows evidence of potentially establishing a program of research and/or creative activity.
2. Academic Rank of Clinical Associate Professor
	1. Academic and/or professional qualifications: Bachelor’s degree required. Master’s or terminal degree in the area of specialization preferred.
	2. There is evidence of excellent teaching in the subject field of the candidate’s training and experience, and excellent service to the unit and school over at least five years.
	3. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate shows evidence of excellence in research and/or creative activity.
3. Academic Rank of Clinical Professor
	1. Academic and/or professional qualifications: Bachelor’s degree required. Master’s or terminal degree in the area of specialization preferred.
	2. There is evidence of sustained excellence teaching in the subject field of the candidate’s training and experience that has gained national awareness in the candidate’s field of expertise and that extends for at least seven years.
	3. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate has demonstrated sustained excellence in research or creative activity that has gained national and/or international awareness in the candidate’s field of expertise.

## Promotion Criteria for Professor of Practice Rank

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.

Minimum Criteria

* + 1. Academic Rank of Assistant Professor of Practice
			1. Teaching: Evidence of effective teaching is expected. Potential for effective service to the unit and the school is expected.
			2. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate shows evidence of potentially establishing a program of research and/or creative activity.
			3. Academic and/or professional qualifications: A degree in area of expertise is desired. Demonstrated professional practice experience desired. Where professional experience is substantial, no specific degree is required.
		2. Academic Rank of Associate Professor of Practice
			1. Teaching: Excellent teaching is expected. Excellence in teaching effectiveness is measured in student evaluations, peer evaluations, student achievements and curricular innovations.
			2. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate should demonstrate current and ongoing excellence in research and/or creative activity leading to an established regional reputation.
			3. Effective service to the unit and the school is expected.
			4. Academic and/or professional qualifications: No specific degree required. A degree in an area of expertise is desired.
		3. Academic Rank of Professor of Practice
			1. Teaching: Superior, masterful teaching is expected. Excellence in teaching effectiveness is measured in student evaluations, peer evaluations, student achievements and curricular innovations.
			2. If research and creative activity is part of the assignment, the candidate should demonstrate current and ongoing excellence in research and/or creative activity leading to an established national reputation.
			3. Ongoing effective service to the unit and the school is expected.
			4. Academic and/or professional qualifications: No specific degree required. A degree in an area of expertise is desired.

## 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 provost 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](https://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-09.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.