



**Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
Standards of Academe**

Approved by the faculty on May 2016

Approved by the Dean on February 13, 2017

Preamble

This document provides an overview of the standards, criteria, and procedures to be used in faculty members' personnel reviews relative to annual performance evaluations as well as decisions on reappointment, promotion, and tenure at Arizona State University's (ASU) Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC). It should be understood that the specific appraisals relative to reappointment, promotion, and tenure should occur within a more general context of continuing annual performance evaluations aimed at the improvement of individual faculty members' performance over time. That is, all faculty members should maintain regular communication with college faculty and division directors concerning their goals and aspirations as per these Standards of Academe (SoAs) in the realms of scholarship, teaching, and service to the college, university, community, and the profession.

1.0 Purpose

Over the course of their careers, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service. Non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and as appropriate service.

According to the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD) members of the faculty include all employees of the Arizona Board of Regents involved in scholarship, teaching, or service whose notice of appointment is as lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, Regents Professor, professor of practice, research professor, or clinical professor, or whose notice of appointment otherwise expressly designates a faculty position. Tenured or tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members are those who are appointed as assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, visiting professor, research professor, adjunct professor, professor of practice, or other such titles as may be designated by the university are referred to as non-tenure-eligible (NTE) faculty. Aspects of these standards pertain to all TTE and NTE faculty, although differences between the two groups are noted throughout the Standards of Academe (SoAs) where relevant.

The SoAs represent MLFTC's policies and procedures for recommendations regarding continued probation, promotion, tenure, sabbatical proposals, and annual performance evaluations, while serving both summative and formative purposes:

- to assess TTE/NTE faculty members' progress through the academic ranks, and
- to provide feedback to TTE/NTE faculty throughout the evaluation procedures.

Responsibilities of TTE/NTE faculty are determined by their annual goals and in consultation with their division directors. Responsibilities of NTE faculty are determined by their annual workload assignments, which often involve participating in specialized university functions (i.e., service). NTE faculty are expected to meet the same qualities of teaching and (where appropriate) service described in the SoAs for all MLFTC faculty, although the quantity of teaching and service may vary according to individual annual workload assignments.

See also: [ACD 505–02: Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles](#), [ACD 505–03: Academic Professional Status, Ranks, Titles, and Appointment Categories](#)

Academic Affairs Manual (ACD)

The [Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual \(ACD\)](#) provides information for ASU faculty members and academic professionals and their administrators on academic organizations, governance, personnel, and programs. ACD information applies directly to faculty members, faculty members with administrative appointments, academic professionals, and academic professionals with administrative appointments.

In the event that these SoAs are unclear or silent on matters that pertain to policies and procedures, TTE/NTE faculty members should defer to ACD, as ACD takes precedence over the college's SoAs.

See also [ACD 002: Definitions](#) for all commonly used terms and definitions.

Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy Manual

The [Arizona Board of Regents \(ABOR\) Policy Manual](#) constitutes the complete and official body of policies for the governance and operation of the Arizona University System, and takes precedence over the Academic Affairs Manual and the SoAs.

2.0 Procedures

This section discusses the procedures for each personnel action in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC).

2.1 Annual Goals

On or before December 31st at the end of every academic year, all tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members must recommend to their division director annual goals for the coming year. The recommended annual goals must include goals in scholarship (as aligned with sections 3.0, only for TTE faculty), teaching and (where appropriate) service (as aligned with sections 4.0 and 5.0 in the SoAs respectively), as well as suggested indicators of success for each stated goal. Recommended goals should be appropriate to the terms of the faculty member's annual workload assignment, and aligned with the SoAs.

Division directors have the final authority on determining acceptable goals, and the division director's approval of annual goals is based on the degree to which faculty members' proposed goals align with the SoAs and reflect allocation of effort that is in alignment with division and college goals. Faculty members are encouraged to work closely with their division director on setting goals, but the division director has the ultimate responsibility of determining those goals. Once approved, the division director will sign the faculty member's goals, keep them on file, and return a signed/approved copy to the faculty member.

Faculty members must also indicate how they addressed their goals at the end of every year as part of their annual performance evaluation (see Section 2.2).

See also [ACD 506-10: Annual Evaluations of Faculty](#)

2.2 Annual Performance Evaluation

In compliance with ABOR and ASU's Academic Affairs Manual (ACD) procedures, on or before the last Monday of January all tenured/tenure eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members must submit to the division director a portfolio for their annual performance evaluation of the previous year. This portfolio is to contain:

- Annual Goals approved and signed for the year under review.
- Division Director Evaluations (as available) from up to two years prior.
- Annotated Vitae Supplement (AVS) including information for the current year and two years prior (or for as many years the faculty member has been employed in the college) in the area of scholarship (NTE faculty members are exempt).
- Personal Statement highlighting achievements, for the annual review year only, in scholarship (NTE faculty members are exempt), teaching, and as appropriate service.

The TTE and NTE Personnel Evaluation Committees (PECs) evaluate the portfolio and assign ratings for scholarship (NTE faculty are exempt), teaching, service, and overall performance using the scale below. Thereafter, the PECs in their advisory roles, forward their scores and written comments (in particular support of junior faculty members), rationales for the assignment of the ratings (if applicable), and collegial notes (if applicable) to the division directors for review. The division directors then evaluate each faculty member's portfolio, the recommendations advanced by the PECs, and assign the final ratings for scholarship (NTE faculty exempt), teaching, service, and overall performance using the same scale.

5 = Position responsibilities exceeded in a sustained and outstanding manner.

4 = Position responsibilities exceeded.

3 = Position responsibilities fulfilled.

2 = Position responsibilities marginally fulfilled.

1 = Unsatisfactory - Position responsibilities not fulfilled.

Copies of the evaluations from the PEC and from the division director are filed and forwarded to the faculty member after the procedure is complete.

Note that the accumulation of each year's annual performance review is not a guarantee of a favorable or adverse tenure and promotion decision. While annual performance evaluations address a specific period of performance, promotion and tenure decisions are more comprehensive, taking into account a faculty member's entire career. Promotion and tenure evaluations also include evaluations by external reviewers that are both retrospective and prospective.

See also [ACD 506-01: Faculty Status](#); [ACD 506-04: Tenure](#); [ACD 506-05: Promotion](#).

2.3 Continued Probation

A recommendation for continued probation is based on a tenure-track faculty member's cumulative accomplishments. The recommendations for continued probation by the tenured/tenure track (TTE) Personnel Evaluation Committee (PEC) and division directors should be made on the basis of accomplishments by the faculty member in keeping with the Standards of Academe (SoAs) and appropriate for continued probation. The faculty members' record of

achievement in scholarship, teaching, and service must forecast continued high levels of accomplishment in these three areas over an academic career.

See the University Provost's "[Personnel Processes](#)" site and look under Faculty Process Guides for more information. See also [ACD 506–03: Faculty Probationary Appointments](#)

2.4 Promotion and Tenure of Tenured/Tenure-Track (TTE) Faculty

In compliance with ABOR and ASU's Academic Affairs Manual (ACD) procedures, tenured and tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members have the opportunity to submit a portfolio for promotion. The recommendation for tenure should be made on the basis of accomplishment in scholarship, teaching, and service as delineated in the Standards of Academe (SoAs). The record must be consistent and forecast continued accomplishment. The recommendation for promotion to associate professor must include a recommendation for tenure. Similarly, a recommendation for tenure must include a recommendation for promotion.

Tenure is recommended in the context of college, division, and programmatic needs, and on the basis of excellence and the anticipation of continued excellence. The provost is responsible for promulgating the overall institutional processes for review of faculty members for promotion and tenure. In the event of any direct conflict between the processes described herein for promotion and tenure and those processes declared by the provost's office, the latter process statements are to take precedence over those described herein.

In addition, the recommendation for promotion with tenure must never be made on the basis of time in rank. Granting promotion with tenure signifies that a TTE faculty member is expected to continue to produce high levels of performance in scholarship, teaching, and service as further specified in the SoAs.

In terms of review procedures, by the date specified on the Schedule of Academic Personnel Actions of the academic year in which the candidate is to submit his/her papers for review for promotion with tenure, the candidate must submit the names, titles, and contact information of 10 external reviewers to provide external letters that will inform the college's and university's evaluation process thereafter. The dean, in consultation with the division director, selects and solicits five peer reviewers from the list submitted who reside outside the university. The dean, in consultation with the division director, also solicits five additional confidential reviewers and their written reviews. This process will yield a total of ten external reviewers. The identity of the external reviewers is to remain confidential. In addition, the candidate is not to have any contact with the reviewers the college solicits or the faculty member recommends during the evaluation process, as all contact with potential reviewers is to occur only by the dean, in consultation with the division director.

Once the candidate submits all information to the college, the initial review of each candidate's portfolio is made by the TTE Personnel Evaluation Committee (PEC), which prepares a written report, that outlines the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the SoAs, and that also provides a recommendation for or against continued promotion along with reasons for this recommendation. The vote of the committee must be indicated in the written report. If the PEC's vote for promotion with tenure is not unanimous, the report should reflect these judgments and provide both majority and minority opinions. This written report should be

reviewed and discussed by the entire committee prior to being signed by the PEC and sent to the appropriate division director. The division director then conducts his/her own review of the candidate's portfolio and prepares a report that outlines the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the SoAs and that also provides a recommendation for or against promotion with tenure along with the reasons for this recommendation. The division director then forwards to the dean his/her report along with that of the PEC for the faculty member undergoing the promotion with tenure review. The dean provides an evaluation and forwards the promotion and tenure portfolio, which includes these recommendations, to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University for a final decision.

See also [ACD 506–01: Faculty Status](#); [ACD 506–04: Tenure](#); [ACD 506–05: Promotion](#)

2.5 Promotion of Non-Tenure-Eligible (NTE) Faculty

In compliance with ABOR and ACD procedures, Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty (NTE) Faculty members seeking promotion submit a portfolio that provides convincing evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service. The recommendation for promotion should be made on the basis of accomplishment in teaching and (as appropriate) service as delineated in the Standards of Academe (SoAs) and appropriate MLFTC Promotion Criteria for Fixed-term Faculty. The record must be consistent and forecast continued accomplishment. In addition to demonstrating accomplishment in teaching and service, the NTE faculty member must also demonstrate academic leadership and work that has had a demonstrable impact and has received recognition.

Lecturers can seek promotion to senior or principal lecturer and clinical assistant professors can seek promotion to clinical associate or full professor. NTE faculty who are considering seeking promotion should initiate the process by speaking to the dean and their division director by the date specified on the Schedule of Academic Personnel Actions, and familiarize themselves with the promotion process and university's portfolio submission requirements outlined within the provost's promotion and tenure guidelines.

NTE faculty members seeking promotion submit a portfolio to the dean, who forwards it to the chair of the Personnel Evaluation Committee (PEC) for NTE Faculty for review. The NTE PEC prepares a written report that outlines the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the SoAs, and that also provides a recommendation for or against promotion along with reasons for this recommendation. The vote of the committee must be indicated in the written report. If the committee's vote for promotion is not unanimous, the report should reflect these judgments and provide majority and minority opinions. This written report should be reviewed, discussed, and signed by the entire committee prior to placing it in the faculty member's file.

The chair of the committee then forwards this report to the division director, who conducts her/his own review of the candidate's portfolio and prepares a report that outlines the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the SoAs, and that also provides a recommendation for or against promotion along with the reasons for this recommendation. The division director forwards to the dean her/his report along with that of the NTE PEC for the non-tenure eligible faculty member undergoing a promotion review.

The portfolio must include confidential written reviews from two internal reviewers. The internal reviewers should be at a rank higher than that of the candidate. One of the internal reviewers must be from the same area of expertise (e.g., elementary education, special education) as the candidate seeking promotion. The other reviewer must be from outside the candidate's area of expertise. The dean chooses one internal reviewer. The dean also chooses the second from a list of 3-5 names of eligible internal reviewers submitted by the candidate to evaluate and report on the candidate's teaching and service, and provide supplemental information to the portfolio in this evaluation process.

The division director and the PEC for NTE Faculty will consider all information presented in the faculty member's portfolio and information from reviewers. In the case where additional information is needed, the division director and/or committee chair will make a request to the Dean for such information and, if provided, it will then become part of the faculty member's portfolio.

Additional information may be requested. Please see the University Provost's "[Personnel Processes](#)" site and look under Faculty Process Guides for more information on file requirements.

See also [ACD 506–01: Faculty Status](#); [ACD 506–05: Promotion](#)

2.6 Sabbatical Leave

In compliance with Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and Academic Affairs Manual (ACD) procedures, tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members who wish to petition for a sabbatical leave should consult with the dean about their eligibility. The awarding of sabbatical leave is dependent on the faculty member's current status and quality of the sabbatical proposal; the availability of division, college, and university resources; and the teaching, scholarship, and service needs of the division, college, and university. Eligibility is not a guarantee that a sabbatical leave will be awarded. But if it is determined that the faculty member is eligible, then the faculty member must prepare and submit a sabbatical application and request in accordance with university guidelines. This application is to be submitted to the dean.

Please see the University Provost's "[Personnel Processes](#)" site and look under Faculty Process Guides for more information. See also [ACD 705: Sabbatical Leave](#)

2.7 Post-Tenure Review

The awarding of tenure comes with both the privilege to extend and expand one's work in new directions, and the responsibility for continued excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service. The central purpose of the post-tenure process is to monitor and recognize this continued excellence. The annual performance evaluation constitutes the post-tenure review for tenured faculty. The division director's final report on each tenured faculty member shall take into account the division director's prior two (or only one if that is all that is available) annual reviews of that faculty member.

Please see the University Provost's "[Post-Tenure Review Process](#)" site for more information. See also [ACD 506–11: Post-Tenure Review](#)

2.8 Promotion to Full Professor

The Provost's office is responsible for promulgating the overall institutional processes for review of requests by faculty members for promotion to the rank of full professor. In the event of any direct conflict between the processes described herein for promotion to the rank of full professor and those processes promulgated by the Provost's office, the latter process statements are controlling.

Any tenured associate professor has the opportunity to submit a portfolio for promotion to full professor. Promotion to full professor is the highest recognition that Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) may recommend for faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

The evidence presented in requesting promotion to full professor should clearly demonstrate continued significant contributions in each of these three areas (see also Sections 3.2, 4.2, and 5.2 of these Standards of Academe (SoAs). In addition, the faculty member must show evidence of academic leadership and work that has had a demonstrable national/international impact and has received national/international recognition through external validation at the national level (see Sections 3.3, 4.3, and 5.3). Thus, the candidate for this level of promotion should have achieved a degree of professional stature and be recognized as making a significant contribution to high-quality and high-impact scholarship in the college and the profession at large.

In terms of review procedures by the date specified on the Schedule of Academic Personnel Actions of the academic year in which the candidate is to submit his/her dossier for review for promotion to full professor, the candidate must submit the names, titles, and contact information of 10 external reviewers to provide external letters that will inform the college's and university's evaluation process thereafter. The dean, in consultation with the division director, selects five peer reviewers from the list submitted who reside outside the university. The dean, in consultation with the division director, also solicits five additional confidential reviewers and their written reviews. This process yields a total of ten external reviewers. The identity of the external reviewers is to remain confidential. In addition, the candidate is not to have any contact with the reviewers the college solicits or the faculty member recommends during the evaluation process, as all contact with potential reviewers is to occur only by the dean, in consultation with the division director.

By the date specified on the Schedule of Academic Personnel Actions of the same academic year, each faculty member must submit a portfolio to the dean that aligns with that which is required by the University Office of the Provost. Once the candidate submits all information to the college, the initial review of each candidate's portfolio is made by the Personnel Evaluation Committee (PEC), which prepares a written report that outlines the evaluation in relation to the SoAs and that also provides a recommendation for promotion to full professor with reasons for this recommendation. The vote of the committee must be included in the written report. If the PEC's vote is not unanimous, the report should reflect these judgments and provide both majority and minority opinions. This written report should be reviewed and discussed by the entire committee prior to being signed by the PEC and sent to the appropriate division director. The division director then conducts his/her own review of the candidate's portfolio and prepares a report that outlines the evaluation in relation to the SoAs and that also provides a

recommendation for or against promotion to full professor with the reasons for this recommendation. The division director then forwards to the dean his/her report along with that of the PEC for the faculty member undergoing the review. The dean provides an evaluation and, if deciding on promotion to full professor, forwards this recommendation to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University for a final review and decision.

While the procedure for promotion to full professor is principally the same as that for promotion to associate professor, only full professors may participate in the college-level review process. If the current PEC does not include members who are all full professors, the dean shall assemble the needed cadre of full professors from within the college, on an ad-hoc basis to complete the review.

Please see the University Provost's "[Promotion and Tenure](#)" site for more information. See also [ACD 506–01: Faculty Status](#); [ACD 506–05: Promotion](#)

3.0 Scholarship

3.1 Guiding Principles

Scholarship in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) reflects the range of theoretical perspectives, disciplinary and interdisciplinary backgrounds, interests, and contributions of the faculty members of the college and is broadly defined. All tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members are expected to develop and maintain active, sustained, and reasonably focused programs of scholarship. TTE faculty members are expected to demonstrate scholarly productivity through high quality contributions and share their scholarship with the wider academic, educational, and professional communities. In addition, TTE faculty members are expected to contribute to strengthening the connections between their research agendas with their teaching and service activities/portfolios. All non-tenure eligible faculty (NTE) are exempt from participating in and/or contributing in the area of scholarship.

Scholars in education pursue a variety of aims across a range of scholarly and other communities (e.g., local, regional, national, international). For example, scholarly contributions may be empirical, conceptual, methodological, pedagogical, and/or theoretical in nature. Scholars can foster connections among existing knowledge bases within and/or across disciplines to provide new understandings and insights. Scholars can also engage in reflective action and leadership that applies current knowledge to address significant problems in the field, or engage in the critical examination of teaching and learning to facilitate innovative and effective educational practices.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

Regardless of focus (e.g., empirical, conceptual, methodological, pedagogical, and/or theoretical), the key criteria for evaluating scholarly contributions should be demonstrated, sustained evidence of impact and external validation. All TTE faculty are accordingly expected to produce scholarly contributions commensurate in quantity and quality comparable to similarly ranked faculty members in MLFTC's aspirational peer colleges and universities (see Section 6.0 for college and university peers).

Examples of scholarly contributions include but are not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings)
- Editorially-reviewed publications (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings, policy briefs, professional development resources)
- Books (e.g., solo-authored, co-authored, edited)
- Conference presentations (e.g., peer-reviewed, invited, keynote)
- Research grants (e.g., internal, external)
- Developmental grants (e.g., sponsored projects, teaching, professional development)
- Digital media (e.g., blogs, software applications, courseware, video production)

5 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded in a sustained and outstanding manner

To attain a rating of 5, the faculty member would have had ratings of 4 (or 5) for each of the past two years and the rating for this year must be sufficient to warrant a rating of 5. An exceptional record of accomplishments that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have included, but not be limited to, published works, including refereed research and/or professional articles, books, book chapters, textbooks, monographs, funded and unfunded grants, refereed conference presentations (possibly with published proceedings and/or abstracts); and/or other scholarly work, such as editorship for a refereed journal, and a record of involvement in policy development, and/or change. A positive scholarly trajectory would be clearly evident. Finally, the attainments for the year should have been consistent with stated goals for the period.

4 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded

To attain a rating of 4, the faculty member would have demonstrated considerable attainments. An excellent record of accomplishments that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have included, but not be limited to, published works, including refereed research and/or professional articles, books, book chapters, textbooks, monographs, funded and unfunded grants, refereed conference presentations (possibly with published proceedings and/or abstracts); and/or other scholarly work, such as editorship for a refereed journal, and a record of involvement in policy development, and/or change. Convincing evidence of scholarly trajectory would also have been provided. Finally, the attainments for the year should have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

3 - Responsibilities of the position fulfilled

To attain a rating of 3, the faculty member would have demonstrated clear attainments. An acceptable record of accomplishments that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have included, but not be limited to, published works, including refereed research and/or professional articles, books, book chapters, textbooks, monographs, funded and unfunded grants, refereed conference presentations (possibly with published proceedings and/or abstracts); and/or other scholarly work, such as editorship for a refereed journal, and a record of involvement in policy development, and/or change. Convincing evidence of scholarly trajectory would also have been provided. Finally, the attainments for the year should have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

2 - Responsibilities of the position marginally fulfilled

To attain a rating of 2, the faculty member would report a modest record of published works that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field that includes refereed research and/or professional articles; books, book chapters, textbooks, monographs, funded and unfunded grants, refereed conference presentations/published (possibly with published abstracts and/or proceedings); and/or other scholarly work, such as editorship for a refereed journal, and a record of involvement in policy development, and/or change. The demonstrated record would have provided little convincing evidence of a positive scholarship trajectory. The scholarly work would have been minimal in quantity and quality. Finally, the attainments for the year may not have been entirely consistent with the stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

1 - Unsatisfactory—Responsibilities of the position not fulfilled

To attain a rating of 1, the faculty member would have demonstrated minimal or no scholarly productivity of any kind and would have provided no convincing evidence of a positive scholarship trajectory. Published, refereed research and/or professional articles; books, book chapters, textbooks, monographs, funded and unfunded grants, refereed conference presentations (possibly with published proceedings and/or abstracts); or other scholarly work, such as editorship for a refereed journal, and a record of involvement in policy development, and/or change would have been absent, or so minimal as to not have demonstrated progress toward scholarly attainment. Finally, the attainments for the year would not have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

For MLFTC reviews specific to promotion with tenure, given the wide variety in faculty members' portfolios that MLFTC encourages and expects, it is difficult to specify the exact quantity of scholarly contributions necessary for a faculty member to be granted tenure and promotion after the usual probationary period. Portfolios should contain a range of scholarly contributions that evidence excellence, impact (e.g., article-level-metrics, journal-level-metrics, external citations, reviews, awards/distinctions), and academic leadership and collaboration. Please note that historically during promotion/tenure reviews, peer-reviewed publications are preferred both internally and externally. Please also note that indicators of excellence, impact, and academic leadership and collaboration should be appropriate to one's scholarly area of inquiry. In any collaborative work, the scholarly effort of the individual being evaluated must be articulated.

External validation and evidence of excellence and impact are most persuasive when provided by expert external reviewers who can provide disinterested judgments. These external reviewers must be university professors at higher ranks from peer institutions, who would likely have similar roles as scholars and/or teacher educators.

Note: A faculty member seeking promotion with tenure is expected to demonstrate excellence and the promise of continued excellence during the faculty member's probationary period at ASU. Demonstrated excellence prior to becoming a faculty member at ASU is acknowledged and is important, but greater emphasis will be placed on demonstrated excellence *while at ASU*.

3.3 Academic Leadership

TTE faculty members within MLFTC are expected to be educational leaders who influence their colleagues and programs in significant scholarly ways. Academic leadership in scholarship involves activities such as tenured faculty mentoring tenure-eligible faculty in matters of scholarship, serving as editor or as an editorial board member for a research journal, serving as consultant in writing legislative proposals to develop/change policies that directly affect education, etc. Such activities should be aimed at influencing the college, the educational community of Arizona State University (ASU), the state of Arizona, the region, the nation, and/or the profession.

Note: A faculty member seeking promotion is expected to meet the SOAs currently in place when the case goes forward unless there are circumstances that qualify that another expectation should be met (e.g., the SOAs changed appreciably in the college or the faculty member was moved from one college to another in which expectations were significantly different). In such cases, differences should be discussed by the Division Director and the candidate.

See also: [ACD 202–01: Faculty Responsibilities](#); [ACD 506–05 - Faculty Promotion](#)

4.0 Teaching

4.1 Guiding Principles

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) values challenging education programs that prepare successful and highly qualified PreK-20 teachers and professionals interested in advanced study and research leading to careers in PreK-20 education. To accomplish these goals, tenured/tenure eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty are expected to be committed to engaging in excellent teaching that is collaborate, innovative, and relevant to the educational challenges of the 21st century.

Teaching and instruction include, but are not limited to (see also [ACD 202-01: Faculty Responsibilities](#)):

- Classroom teaching
- Mentoring and advising students
- Directing student research, independent studies, theses, and dissertations
- Participating in curriculum, course, and program development
- Instructional design and technology integration
- Participating in extended education and distance, online learning
- Clinical supervision
- Instructional or pedagogical innovations appropriate to the division/college
- Assignments related to teaching (e.g., course coordination)
- Other teaching activities in the interest of the college/university as legitimate partial equivalents of class instruction given the demands upon a faculty member's time

Teaching is a complex task and warrants evaluation using multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness (see Section 4.2 for key criteria and indicators), and faculty members seeking continued probationary status, promotion, or tenure must demonstrate excellence in teaching

as per these indicators. While MLFTC values faculty endeavors that integrate scholarship, teaching, and service in ways that lead to significant contributions across the three areas, having a sustained, excellent teaching record, is essential for recommendation for promotion or tenure.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

Excellence in teaching and graduate student advisement are important aspects of faculty performance, especially in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC). All MLFTC students deserve to experience a diversity of effective teaching styles. So as a matter of primary professional principle, all MLFTC tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members should be reflective about their teaching and skillful at improving it. Effective and scholarly teaching is directly linked to productive scholarship, inasmuch as it will entail a grasp of large bodies of historical and contemporary knowledge, relating these to practical concerns, and instilling all students with the scholarly attitudes appropriate to their professions. Another aspect of teaching, which does not relate solely to enrolled students, but which is an important function nonetheless, is the persuasive interpretation of one's area of expertise to a larger professional audience and/or the public at large.

The required minimum indicators of teaching effectiveness include student/course evaluation data at or above the college average of 3.5 and peer evaluation data; however, these data alone are not sufficient to establish excellence in teaching. Faculty members must provide other indicators that illuminate the activities associated with teaching excellence including, but not limited to teaching or mentoring honors/awards, scholarship with a focus on pedagogy, participation in or facilitation of workshops on learning outcome assessment or other pedagogical topics, evidence of student success through a sequence of courses, list of student theses and dissertations mentored to completion, objective peer evaluations of teaching, evidence of student career success related to the candidate's mentoring, teaching statement or philosophy or other evidence (e.g., syllabi) determined to be appropriate by the division director. Evidence should not include student comments on evaluations.

5 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded in a sustained and outstanding manner

To attain a rating of 5, the faculty member would have had ratings of 4 (or 5) for each of the past two years and the rating for this year must be sufficient to warrant a rating of 5. A clear pattern of exceptional teaching would have included, but would not have been limited to peer reviews of teaching (applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses), evidence of graduate student mentoring (if applicable), new course development, course revisions, infusion of new methods and/or technologies, evidence of refinement of teaching, development and delivery of professional development (i.e., in-service) workshops, development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs as appropriate/possible. Student Course Evaluation scores were consistently above the college's averages (with consideration for class size, course type, prior experience with teaching the course, etc.) across years. Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

4 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded

To attain a rating of 4, the faculty member would have demonstrated considerable attainments. A clear pattern of excellent teaching would have included, but would not have been limited to peer reviews of teaching (applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses),

evidence of graduate student mentoring (if applicable), new course development, course revisions, infusion of new methods and/or technologies, evidence of refinement of teaching, development and delivery of professional development (i.e., in-service) workshops, development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs as appropriate/possible. Most Student Course Evaluation scores were at or above the college's averages (with consideration for class size, course type, prior experience with teaching the course, etc.). Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

3 - Responsibilities of the position fulfilled

To attain a rating of 3, the faculty member would have demonstrated clear attainments. A clear pattern of appropriate teaching would have included, but would not have been limited to peer reviews of teaching (applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses), evidence of graduate student mentoring (if applicable), new course development, course revisions, infusion of new methods and/or technologies, evidence of refinement of teaching, development and delivery of professional development (i.e., in-service) workshops, development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs as appropriate/possible. Student Course Evaluation scores were at or close to the college's averages (with consideration for class size, course type, prior experience with teaching the course, etc.). Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

2 - Responsibilities of the position marginally fulfilled

To attain a rating of 2, the faculty member would have demonstrated a pattern of modest teaching that included minimal evidence in the form of peer reviews of teaching (applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses), evidence of graduate student mentoring (if applicable), new course development, course revisions, infusion of new methods and/or technologies, evidence of refinement of teaching, development and delivery of professional development (i.e., in-service) workshops, development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs as appropriate/possible. The majority of Student Course Evaluation scores were below the college's averages (with consideration for class size, course type, prior experience with teaching the course, etc.). Finally, the attainments for the year may not have been consistent with the stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

1 - Unsatisfactory—Responsibilities of the position not fulfilled

To attain a rating of 1, the faculty member would have demonstrated *minimal to very low* levels of teaching performance with little to no evidence such as peer reviews of teaching (applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses), evidence of graduate student mentoring (if applicable), new course development, course revisions, infusion of new methods and/or technologies, evidence of refinement of teaching, development and delivery of professional development (i.e., in-service) workshops, development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs as appropriate/possible. Student Course Evaluation scores were consistently below the college's averages (with consideration for class size, course type, prior experience with teaching the course, etc.). Finally, the attainments for the year would not have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

See also [ACD 305–08: Academic Advisement](#)

4.3 Academic Leadership

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty members and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members in the lecturer or clinical faculty categories are encouraged to make substantive contributions in teaching via academic leadership, teaching innovations, and instructional initiatives. Academic leadership occurs beyond the purview of a faculty member's assigned roles and responsibilities, and academic leadership in teaching can occur at institutional professional, and governmental or community levels. Examples of academic leadership in teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Development and delivery of local, state, regional, national, or international professional development workshops on teaching
- Demonstrated leadership in professional organizations related to the improvement of teaching and instruction
- Application, receipt, implementation, and/or analysis of external teaching-related grants
- Evidenced adoption and external recognition of new teaching paradigms, frameworks, and/or innovative approaches
- Development of new undergraduate, graduate, and/or certificate programs

See also: [ACD 202–01: Faculty Responsibilities](#); [ACD 304–09 - Evaluation of Teaching](#); [ACD 304–10 - Course Syllabus](#); [ACD 305–08 - Academic Advisement](#); [ACD 506–05 - Faculty Promotion](#)

5.0 Service

5.1 Guiding Principles

Service requires active participation and special expertise of its faculty members for its own operation and continued development. In Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC), all tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members in the lecturer and clinical faculty members' categories are expected to demonstrate service of high-quality and high-impact, and to serve in a wide range of activities that provide service to and visibility in education and other professions. NTE faculty members with the title Instructor with teaching assignments have limited service responsibilities.

Service may be demonstrated in three areas:

- institutional,
- professional, and
- governmental or community.

The MLFTC encourages faculty members to maintain an appropriate balance between service to the College and university and service that reflects special contributions to the broader profession and community. Faculty members, in consultation with division directors, may wish to emphasize different types of service at different points in their careers.

Service may be of two types:

- That which is associated with the standard requirements of good citizenship as this type of service helps to accomplish and meet the basic obligations of the ongoing important work of the college, campus, and university. These service endeavors are essential to

the vitality of the College as they extend professional knowledge that result in the improvements of professional practice. Further, they contribute substantively to the College's local, national, and international reputation and influence. Service to the College, therefore, is an expectation of all TTE and NTE faculty members to ensure the continued effective functioning of the College.

- That which is associated with special contributions based on faculty members' expertise or scholarship and that may be provided within the college, campus, and university, but also more widely at the levels of the profession and government or community. Service as a special contribution is often selected by faculty members, because they are committed to the values of the endeavor or because they have been invited or requested to provide their particular expertise to an endeavor. Although these endeavors are sometimes within the university, they more typically arise in broader professional, governmental, or community contexts. In general, service as a special contribution and leadership of service as citizenship demonstrate a higher level of quality than ordinary service as citizenship.

Service activities and endeavors may include, but are not limited to:

- college and university service,
- serving on review panels,
- journal editorships,
- officers in professional organizations,
- consultants to schools and school districts, and
- consultants to external organizations and agencies.

The quality and impact of service rendered is more important than the quantity of service. In addition, the level of activity and time commitment of the service rendered, as well as the products created and the influence of the service rendered, provide further evidence of the quality of service. Accomplishment and significance of the service are what are most valued in judging the quality of service for the purposes of the various levels of personnel review. And while this meaningful service may be strategic to the faculty members' interests, teaching, and/or scholarly agenda, service must be in support of the general good rather than private or commercial interests.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

All tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty members are provided the opportunity to present a narrative description of service activities addressing the outcomes of their efforts in regard to the levels of expectation with respect to service. The narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's service and rationale for an expected rating.

Evidence for service quality must be documented and can include, but is not limited to:

- Culminations or products with the faculty member's contribution clearly delineated
- Letters of appointment to leadership positions
- Letters from committee or division directors, deans, or knowledgeable others that describe specific contributions
- Notice of awards or recognition for service

Service that exceeds expectations should be accompanied by evidence (see above) that indicates the faculty member's special contributions and/or leadership accomplishments. TTE and NTE faculty members seeking promotion (or tenure in the case of TTE faculty) should be strategic in their selection of and commitment of time to service activities, and they should be certain to demonstrate the quality of service associated with special contributions and leadership roles they exercise in fulfilling their service endeavors. Faculty members are encouraged to be strategic in their selection of service by connecting service goals to scholarly activities or teaching as well.

5 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded in a sustained and outstanding manner

To attain a rating of 5, the faculty member would have had ratings of 4 (or 5) for each of the past two years and the rating for this year must be sufficient to warrant a rating of 5. A clear pattern of exceptional service that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have been exhibited. Accomplishments would have included, but would not have been limited to program, division, college, university, professional, and public or community service. Examples include serving as a leader on college, university, or professional organization committees including efforts leading to recognition of MLFTC programs; mentoring of other faculty in the college; refereed journal associate editorship and/or refereed journal reviewer; leadership in national, regional, state, and/or professional associations, educational agencies and organizations. Leadership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be expected from senior faculty members. Membership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be seen among junior faculty members. Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

4 - Responsibilities of the position exceeded

To attain a rating of 4, the faculty member would have demonstrated a clear pattern of excellent service that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have been exhibited. Accomplishments would have included, but would not have been limited to a mix of program, college, university, professional, and public or community service. Examples include serving as a leader on program, division, college, university, or professional organization committees including efforts leading to recognition of MLFTC programs; mentoring of other faculty in the college; refereed journal associate editorship and/or refereed journal reviewer; leadership in national, regional, state, and/or professional associations, educational agencies and organizations. Leadership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be seen among senior faculty members. Membership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be seen among junior faculty members. Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

3 - Responsibilities of the position fulfilled

To attain a rating of 3, the faculty member would have demonstrated a clear pattern of appropriate service that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field would have been exhibited. Accomplishments would have included, but would not have been limited to a mix of program, division, college, university, professional, and public or community service. Examples of evidence may include some of the following: Serving as a leader on program, college, university, or professional organization committees including efforts leading to recognition of MLFTC programs; mentoring of other faculty in the college; refereed journal associate editorship and/or refereed journal reviewer; leadership in national, regional, state, and/or

professional associations, educational agencies and organizations. Leadership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be seen among senior faculty members. Membership on committees, task forces, etc. more likely would be seen among junior faculty members. Finally, the attainments for the year would have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

2 - Responsibilities of the position marginally fulfilled

To attain a rating of 2, the faculty member would have demonstrated only a modest amount of service that reflects impact, influence or contribution to the field. Service (and leadership within that) would have been limited in terms of quantity and quality, across the program, division, college and/or the profession levels. Additionally, the attainments for the year would not have been consistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

1 - Unsatisfactory—Responsibilities of the position not fulfilled

To attain a rating of 1, the faculty member would have demonstrated minimal to no service engagement of any kind. Additionally, the attainments for the year would have been inconsistent with stated and agreed upon goals for the period.

5.3 Academic Leadership

All tenured/tenure-eligible (TTE) and non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty (except instructor) in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) are expected to provide leadership in service. Example contributions that may demonstrate leadership in service in the MLFTC include, but are not limited to leadership in:

- campus activities through committees, work groups, and so forth at the division, college, campus, and university levels, including efforts leading to the recognition of MLFTC programs;
- schools and other educational agencies and organizations; and
- local and national professional associations.

See also: [ACD 202–01: Faculty Responsibilities](#); [ACD 305–11 - Commencement](#); [ACD 506–05 - Faculty Promotion](#); [ACD 510–01 - Notification of Consulting or Other Outside Business Activities or Arrangements for Faculty and Academic Professionals](#)

6.0 Peer Institutions

College Level Peer Institutions

- Columbia University, Teachers College
- Florida State University
- Michigan State University
- The Ohio State University, Main Campus
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- University of Oregon
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of Virginia
- University of Washington

University-Level Peer Institutions

See ASU's Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Approved University Peer List [here](#)