



College	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	
Unit	School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning	
Document	Policies and Procedures	
Approved by the faculty		Date:
Reviewed by the dean		Date:

Provost office approval

Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Date

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning

Policies and Procedures

DRAFT 7/27/09, Revised 11/12/09, Revised 3/25/10, 10/11/11, 08/28/12

I. Promotion and Tenure Review

1. Procedures

At the end of an appropriate period of time as specified in ACD 506-03, 506-04 and 506-05 and CLAS regulations, full-time tenure-track faculty may be expected to be considered for promotion to the next higher rank. This consideration will be initiated by the faculty member. Assistant Professors on a probationary appointment are evaluated for continuing employment during their third year of service. They must be evaluated for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure by their sixth year of service. In extraordinary circumstances, faculty may request an additional year for review at the beginning of the fall semester of the fifth year of service. This request must be made in writing to the School Director and must be approved by the Office of the Provost and Vice President.

The timetable for the promotion and tenure review is set by CLAS policies. Typically, faculty need to provide their materials in a timely fashion to the Director in spring so that outside evaluators may be chosen and be contacted over summer. All required materials are due in final form by July 1 of the fifth year of service.

The file to be considered shall be prepared by the candidate in the format required by university and CLAS guidelines, and it should contain at minimum the following elements:

- an up-to-date vita
- a statement of:
 - o research interests and achievements
 - o teaching philosophy and achievements
 - o activities in the area of service
 - teaching evaluations
 - copies of four publications
 - evidence of research impact, including but not limited to citation records and impact measures, using at the minimum ISI and Google Scholar data bases
 - a description of service activities at the university level
 - a description of service at the regional, national and international level
 - any other documentation as required by college and university regulations

The following documents will be appended by the School:

- external evaluation of a candidate, obtained in accordance with university guidelines from outside reviewers
- analysis of candidate teaching evaluation scores relative to unit scores in 100-to graduate level courses
- peer review material of candidate teaching

Outside evaluation will be kept in a single location and can only be viewed in that location by the members of the Review Committee. All other materials will be provided in electronic format.

2. Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

For the purposes of promotion and tenure review and probationary review of Assistant Professors, the “Unit Committee” will consist of all faculty at and above the rank to which the candidate would be promoted as specified in the SGSUP Bylaws, Article IX.

At the beginning of Fall Semester of the Academic Year the Director will provide the Unit Committee with a list of all reviews that need to be completed and the time frame for completion as determined by CLAS regulations and directives.

The Unit Committee will elect a Chair, who will be responsible for ensuring a timely completion of all reviews.

For each case to be considered, the Unit Committee will elect a subcommittee of three members, at least two of them shall be from the candidate’s program area. The subcommittee will be charged with preparing a draft letter detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The subcommittee will elect a Chair, who will be responsible for preparing the final draft of the “unit report” which spells out the strengths and weaknesses of the case, following the format guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost and Vice President and CLAS.

Each case will be reviewed by all faculty in the Unit Committee. The discussion of each case will be led by the subcommittee Chair. Only faculty of the Unit Committee that are present during the meeting either in person or through conference call/skype in which a case is discussed are allowed to contribute to the unit report.

The unit report represents the majority view of the Unit Committee. Should there be a minority view, faculty supporting that view may prepare an addendum to the unit letter with their signatures attached. There should be a vote shown in the report showing strongly supporting, supporting, not supporting, or abstaining.

The unit report and addendum must be forwarded to the Director within the time frame agreed upon between the Director and the Unit Committee.

For faculty with joint appointments, a procedure to incorporate the input from the multiple units involved will be spelled out in a Memorandum of Understanding.

3. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The period during which the candidate is an Assistant Professor should be regarded as a time of personal and intellectual development, and a period of establishment in the academic profession. During these years expectations held by the School at the time of initial appointment should be beginning to be realized in the form of a sustained record of scholarly production of high quality. By the end of this period of probation, the candidate should demonstrate the abilities and achievements required for promotion to associate professor in terms of all three dimensions of research, teaching and service. Specific expectations are outlined below.

Research

There should be evidence of a continuing and sustained level of excellence in research, commensurate with expectations at a leading research university. It should be clear that the candidate is able to establish and defend the coherence of her/his own research program whether this program is carried out alone or in collaboration with others.

Evidence of sustained research activity includes an established and consistent research agenda, a significant record of high impact peer reviewed work, evidence of extramural research funding, and frequency of citation by other researchers. The ultimate test, however, shall be the intrinsic quality of the career publication record as determined by the School, in collaboration with the evaluations provided by outside reviewers.

For the purposes of outside review, the candidate must provide four publications which the candidate believes represent the most important aspects of the research conducted. For a regular review, these publications must pertain to the period of review, i.e., the period since the candidate was hired. For an expedited review, preference is given to publications since the candidate was hired, although exceptional publications preceding the hire may be considered.

Teaching

The candidate should provide evidence of high quality teaching, including an ability to deal both with classes which are "basic" or "survey" in nature (e.g., 100 level courses) as well as those which reflect the integration of research perspectives into more specialized teaching (upper division and graduate level courses), and mentoring of graduate students (master's and doctoral committees). Evidence of teaching ability shall consist of student evaluations, and annual peer reviews coordinated/assigned by the director. The peer reviews will be oriented especially toward ascertaining that the structure of the course, and its content, reflect contemporary trends in the area of the discipline concerned. However, in no way is it intended that such peer reviews constitute a diminution of the academic freedom of the candidate concerned, or of that candidate's right to select the material to be presented in class.

Service

The candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to School governance as evidenced by service on committees and participation in School affairs. There should also be evidence of professional service in the form of referee activity, editorial board memberships, involvement in national (or international) scholarly and professional organizations, community engagement and other equivalent outreach activities. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to professional service through refereeing for journals or funding agencies, service to the community through scholarship-related lectures, seminars, and committees, service on professional society committees, organizing sessions, and editorial service.

In all categories, awards and other exceptional recognition provide additional evidence in favor of the candidate's strength in that area.

4. Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

After serving for a period of time as associate professor a faculty member may be considered for promotion to the rank of professor. In order to demonstrate the qualities appropriate for this promotion the candidate should be able to demonstrate a degree of maturity and leadership in research and teaching evidenced by national and international recognition. This maturity should be shown by a sustained record of outstanding research activity, which, as well as revealing a process of ongoing investigation into significant problems in the field of specialization, should demonstrate a contribution to significant advances in the field. Such maturity will also be demonstrated by an ability to integrate the candidate's research perspectives into a wide range of courses taught at all levels in the School.

The candidate is expected to demonstrate excellence in research and teaching and a significant contribution to service as outlined below.

Research

There should be evidence of a continued and sustained level of excellence in research leading to national and international recognition, commensurate with expectations at a leading research university. It should be clear that the faculty member has established a coherent research program whether this program is carried out alone or in collaboration with others. There should be evidence of significant contributions to the field.

Evidence of sustained research activity includes an established and consistent research agenda, a significant record of high impact peer reviewed work, significant extramural research funding, and frequency of citation by other scholars. The ultimate test, however, shall be the intrinsic quality of the career publication record as determined by the School, in collaboration with the evaluations provided by outside reviewers.

For the purposes of outside review, the candidate must provide four publications which the faculty believes, represent the most important aspects of the research conducted. For a regular review, these publications must pertain to the period of review, i.e., the period since promotion to associate professor. For an expedited review, preference is given to publications since promotion to associate professor or since the faculty hire, although exceptional publications preceding the hire may be considered.

Teaching

The candidate should provide evidence of high quality teaching, including an ability to deal both with classes which are "basic" or "survey" in nature (e. g. 100 level courses) as well as those which reflect the integration of research perspectives into more specialized teaching (upper division and graduate level courses). In addition, significant mentoring of graduate students (masters and doctoral committees, both as chair and as member) and a contribution to post-doctoral training is expected. Evidence of teaching ability shall consist of student evaluations, and peer review by other designated faculty members in the School. This peer review will be oriented especially toward ascertaining that the structure of the course, and its content, reflect contemporary trends in the area of the discipline concerned. However, in no way is it intended that such a peer review constitute a diminution of the academic freedom of the candidate concerned, or of that candidate's right to select the material to be presented in class.

Service

The candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to School governance as evidenced by service on committees and participation in School affairs as well as the larger university community. There should be evidence of significant national professional service in the form of editorial board memberships, involvement in national (or international) scholarly and professional organizations and other equivalent outreach activities. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to professional service through refereeing for journals or funding agencies, service to the community through scholarship-related lectures, seminars, and committees, service on professional society committees, organizing sessions, and editorial service.

In all categories, awards and other exceptional recognition provide additional evidence in favor of the candidate's strength in that area.

II. Annual Performance Review

Annual performance evaluations are carried out following the regulations spelled out in ACD 507-08 (academic professionals) and 506-10 (Faculty) and the guidelines provided by CLAS (<http://clas.asu.edu/academicpersonnel/forms>).

The performance review is for a three year calendar year moving window. The performance review is carried out following the completion of the last calendar year in the review period using the time frame defined by CLAS procedures.

The review regards a faculty's performance in research, teaching and service/outreach using the relative contribution of each as defined by the workload percentages. Workload percentages are agreed upon for each year of service between the faculty and the School Director.

A standard workload for Associate and Full Professors consists of 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. For Assistant Professors, the standard workload consists of 30% teaching, 50% research and 20% service. Deviations (such as leaves, disability requests) must be agreed upon in writing between the faculty and the School Director. The Personnel Committee may play an advisory role to the Director in workload agreements.

CLAS defines three categories of performance:

- unsatisfactory (1),
- satisfactory (2),
- above satisfactory (3).

The expectation is that faculty meet satisfactory performance, which is described below. Any rating of unsatisfactory in any one area of assigned responsibility will result in a written developmental plan at the unit level per guidelines of ACD 506-11. For an overall unsatisfactory rating on the annual performance evaluation, a mandatory enhanced review will occur which involves the unit and the Dean. An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory (for example, teaching) depending on the emphasis assigned to that area in the goal-based agreement and the extent of the deficiency (ACD 506-11). The steps in this formal review are spelled out in ACD 506-11.

Criteria for Satisfactory Performance

Research

All faculty are expected to conduct scholarly research, present findings at professional meetings, and publish at a sustained level and regular pace. Research findings should appear in leading refereed journals, books, and/or monographs. All faculty are expected to obtain research funding, but it is recognized this is more readily available in some specialties than others.

Teaching

The expectation of satisfactory teaching performance for a 40% workload is a teaching load of 4 courses per year, consisting of a mix of undergraduate and graduate courses, including one large enrollment or required course. In addition, a sustained contribution to graduate mentoring or in its absence, to undergraduate advising is expected. The quality of teaching as gauged by student and/or peer evaluations should be at the unit's norm. Continued curriculum updating and refinement is expected, as is the occasional instructional innovation, development of new courses and/or introduction of new pedagogical approaches. Faculty with increased research and/or service workload percentages may decrease their teaching workload % at the rate of one course per 10%.

Service

The expectation of satisfactory service performance for a 20% workload is significant participation in the governance of the School, College and University. In addition, continued professional and outreach service is expected in the form of regular referee tasks for journals and/or grant proposals, participation in review panels, editorial boards, organization of sessions at scholarly or professional conferences, participation in local and national professional organizations, and community engagement.

Criteria for Other Performance Categories

The designation “*unsatisfactory*” is given when there is a clear lack of performance in the given category, such as insufficient high impact peer reviewed research work, continued inadequate teaching activity (an insufficient number of classes, or consistently small classes), poor teaching evaluations, or significant lack of engagement in the service activities of the school, the university or the profession.

The designation, “*above satisfactory*” is given when faculty clearly exceed the criteria for satisfactory performance. For example, for research this may include multiple (more than two per year) articles in refereed journals, a book published with a major publisher, a major research grant, important awards or recognition; for teaching this would include outstanding student (and/or peer) reviews of teaching (beyond the unit norm), teaching awards, significant innovation and development of new courses, or overload teaching; for service this would include service on major university committees, important professional service (such as editorship in a major journal, leadership position in professional or scientific organizations, service on major national committees), major outreach activities (public presentations, community engagement), or major awards and recognition for professional service

Post tenure review will be carried out following the guidelines spelled out in ACD 507-09. For the purposes of post-tenure review, the unit considers unsatisfactory to correspond to an unsatisfactory score (1) on the faculty activity report.