The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation for the implementation of a new degree program – M.S. in Clinical Research Management (CRM).

Rationale:
The rapid development of the bioscience research infrastructure in Arizona requires graduate level degree holders who can manage complex, federally and internationally regulated clinical research operations and support the growing life science industries in the state. No other similar educational advanced degree exists in the Arizona University system to formally educate clinical research managers to support this economic growth industry.

The Master of Science in Clinical Research Management is designed to be full or part time hybrid/online degree for students working and living at a distance. This program is an initiative led by the ASU CONHI.

The CRM Master’s degree offers a multi-disciplinary educational approach for the management of the growing clinical research global industry. Students accepted into this program will learn new clinical research developing technologies and methodologies, project management processes, study designs, trends in global trial operations, complex regulatory requirements for healthcare regulated product development and clinical research process improvement techniques.
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1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval

2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

3 for the implementation of a new degree program, Ph.D. in Applied Mathematics for the Life & Social Sciences

Rationale:

The proposed Ph.D. degree in Applied Mathematics for the Life and Social Sciences is intended to provide the students entering the environmental, life, health mathematical, and social science fields the quantitative, scientific and analytical skills that are becoming critical, but are currently lacking as a broad background necessary in the social, life and mathematical sciences. This rapidly developing field investigates complex areas in the life sciences and social systems through mathematical models and computational tools.

The proposed program builds upon foundations already established in mathematical epidemiology, population dynamics, ecology, genomics, bioinformatics, mathematical analysis, nonlinear dynamic, computational sciences and the social science fields by offering new courses that enhances interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary exchanges and collaboration among the faculty and students interested in addressing questions of social relevance.
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE requests suspension of the rules for this resolution 4/21/08

Resolution for Continuing Use of ACD and ACDW Personnel Policies

Be it hereby resolved that:

1. Until such time as a single ACD Manual is adopted by the ASU Senate and approved by the University President, each campus will be governed by the existing ACD or ACDW manual in force on its campus before adoption of the new Academic Assembly Constitution. Amendments to the ACD by the new University Senate will, with the approval of the University President, apply to all manuals continuing in force.

2. For faculty and academic professionals with cross-campus appointments, the manual of their ‘home’ administrative units will apply to personnel decisions affecting them.

3. Sunset Provision: This resolution will expire on May 29, 2009, at which time the ACD manual, with amendments accepted by the University Senate, will apply to all campuses. The responsible Senate Committee’s recommendations for amendments will all be made by March 2, 2009.
ACD 110: Reporting Lines for Centers and Institutes

Purpose

To explain the policy regarding appointments in centers and institutes and provide recommendations on reporting lines

Sources

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University
Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs

Applicability

Faculty and Academic Professionals

Policy
General

Centers and institutes should not generally offer courses, instructional programs for credit, or degrees, although members of centers may participate in such activities through the academic units in which they hold their academic appointments. Centers and institutes should be primarily research enterprises, and should be continued only as long as they fulfill the purposes for which they were established.

Appointments and Reporting Lines

1. Each tenured or tenure eligible faculty member at ASU must have an academic unit home. That is, the tenure of a faculty member resides only in an academic unit.
2. A corollary to this principle is that faculty members cannot hold tenure in centers or institutes. At the time a faculty member is hired jointly between an institute or center and an academic unit, the decision rules regarding the budgetary transfer of that individual from the center/institute must be stated in writing so all administrative parties and individuals taking part in this decision are informed of these rules and are aware of the budget implication—both present and future. Additionally, in joint appointments, the fraction of full-time equivalencies (FTE) assigned to the two units should match the responsibilities and activities of the faculty member.
3. At the time a faculty member is hired with a joint appointment between an academic unit and center/institute, a decision will be made regarding the appropriate parties to evaluate and recommend tenure, but the final decision on a tenure recommendation must reside with the academic unit, in accordance with principle No. 1 above. Normally, unless stipulated in a memorandum of understanding, the primary responsibility for all other evaluations resides with the academic unit. See ACD 505-??, “Transfer, Joint and Affiliated Faculty and Academic Professional Appointments” for more information about joint appointments.
4. All appointments of faculty members in centers or institutes at ASU will be joint appointments; that is, faculty members in the tenure system will be expected to participate concurrently in a program, academic unit, division, school, or college.
5. Teaching assignments, schedules and other instructional responsibilities shall be carried out under the direction of the president, normally by the dean or chair/director, in consultation with the center or institute director.
6. Appointments in centers should not be permanent.
7. Each academic professional or fixed term faculty member must have a home in an academic unit or center. They would thus report to the Chair/Director/Head of the unit.

Recommendations on Reporting Lines
Intracollegiate Centers and Institutes

Centers and institutes whose work is within the disciplinary mission of a single college should report to the dean of that college, and through the dean to the executive vice president and provost of the university. All budgets related to such units will be distributed through the executive vice president and provost of the university to the appropriate dean in the course of the regular college and academic unit budgeting process.

Intercollegiate Centers and Institutes

Centers and institutes whose work crosses college lines may report to the vice president for research and economic affairs, provided that arrangement is acceptable to the executive vice president and provost of the university and to the deans.

Graduate Assistants

Centers and institutes may employ graduate students as graduate assistants. All graduate assistants must be admitted to and enrolled in an academic degree program offered by a department, division, or school.

Note: Graduate assistants include graduate assistants and associates, graduate research assistants and associates, and graduate teaching assistants and associates.

Center and Institute Reviews

A committee appointed by the Executive Vice President and University Provost conducts center and institute reviews. In keeping with ABOR policy, the centers and institutes are reviewed every five years.

Cross References

ACD 202    Faculty Responsibilities

ACD 507-02 AP Responsibilities ???

ACD 301    Workloads
ACD 111–02: Unit Bylaws

Purpose

To describe the role of bylaws in academic units

Sources

Academic Senate
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Applicability

Faculty
Academic professionals

Policy
All colleges and academic units must have bylaws, approved by a majority of the unit faculty. With the consent of all college Deans to which a unit reports, the faculty of the unit may choose to utilize the college’s bylaws as their unit bylaws. Bylaws outline the structural framework of colleges and academic units and are considered to be the permanent rules under which they operate. Additional operating procedures will be written as standing rules. Bylaws must be consistent with Board of Regents and university policies and bylaws. Prior to approval, bylaws should be reviewed for consistency by the supervising dean(s) and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. If problems are identified, the bylaws will be returned to the unit for reconsideration and must be resubmitted to the Dean(s) and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University for approval. The current version of unit bylaws must be distributed to all faculty and academic professionals and must be on file in the offices of the Academic Senate and the executive vice president and provost of the university.

Bylaws must establish the organizational framework for the academic unit’s internal management in which administrators, faculty, and academic professionals share responsibilities and obligations; clarify procedures; and specify the mechanism by which the bylaws can be amended. The unit's bylaws must provide that: bylaws cannot be changed in a single meeting; be changed by a simple majority vote; conflict with those of any superior authority; or extend the power or authority of the unit making the bylaws.

Bylaws are binding upon current and future administrative officers and members of the academic unit or college. If either faculty or administrators wish to deviate from procedures outlined in the bylaws, they must go through the specified amendatory procedures that are included in the bylaws. If members of a unit believe there has been a violation of bylaws, a complaint may be brought to the Governance Grievance Committee following the usual grievance policies and procedures (see ACD 509–02, “Grievance Policy for Faculty,” and ACD 509–03, “Grievance Policy for Academic Professionals”).

If the Governance Grievance Committee finds that there has been a violation of bylaws, the committee must report its findings in writing to both the president of the university or designee and the president of the Academic Senate.

Cross References

University Probationary, Tenure and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws
University Probationary, Continuing Appointment and Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws
University Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws
University Fixed-term Academic Professional Promotion Requirements for Academic Unit Bylaws
506-??: Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles

Purpose

To describe and define faculty membership, appointment categories, ranks, and titles.

Sources

Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual - 6–201, 6–208
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Policy
Faculty Membership

Faculty include all employees of the Arizona Board of Regents, for and of Arizona State University, engaged in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, or service whose Notice of Appointment is as lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor, assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice, research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor, or persons who are otherwise designated as faculty on the Notice of Appointment. Graduate students who serve as assistants/associates, or otherwise are academic appointees, as well as graduate students, but are not members of the faculty.

College Faculty

College faculty shall consist of the dean of the college and all faculty members of the academic units and divisions assigned to that college. The right to vote in college matters shall be determined by college bylaws and policies. The president and executive vice president and provost of the university shall be nonvoting ex officio members of all college faculties. A college faculty may consider, among other matters, all questions of educational policy affecting the college, including requirements for entrance and graduation, majors, and prescribed subjects of study.

Faculty Appointment Categories

Appointments to the faculty are tenured, tenure eligible, and fixed-term as defined below.

Tenured Appointment

Tenure is awarded by the president to a faculty member who has demonstrated excellence in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service in accordance with standards established by the university and academic units. Tenured appointments are only made to associate professors or professors. An assistant professor may be awarded tenure with a promotion to associate professor. Tenure creates a legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment unless the tenured faculty member retires, resigns, or is dismissed or released in accord with ACD 501, “Conditions of Faculty Service.” The Notice of Appointment of a faculty member shall carry the designation “with tenure.” See ACD 506-04, “Tenure” for more information about tenure.

Tenure-eligible Appointment
This appointment means that the faculty member may be reviewed for the award of tenure. Tenure-eligible appointments may be made to faculty with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The Notice of Appointment for a faculty member shall carry the designation of “tenure-eligible.” See ACD 506-03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments” for more information about tenure-eligible appointments.

**Fixed-Term Appointment**

A fixed-term appointment is for a specified period of time as noted below and will not lead to consideration for tenure. All faculty titles of visiting, clinical, research, professor of practice, instructor, lecturer, faculty research associate and faculty associate will be in this appointment category. Academic unit bylaws specify eligibility for academic unit committees, graduate supervisory committees, and other roles within the unit. Appointments terminate at the end of the period stated in the offer letter or Notice of Appointment and may be eligible for renewal. Renewal is conditional upon satisfactory job performance, the continued availability of funds, and the needs of the academic unit and the university. Where applicable, the offer letter shall state that the appointment is dependent for continuation upon funding from a specific source other than state appropriations and that the appointment may terminate prior to the expiration of the appointment if funding is no longer available. The Notice of Appointment for a fixed-term faculty member shall carry the designation of “nontenured.”

Persons with fixed-term appointments of less than 50 percent time generally do not receive a Notice of Appointment and work at the discretion of the university as long as performance is satisfactory, services are needed, and funding is available. In general, faculty working less than 50 percent time do not qualify for such employment benefits as subsidized insurance and university fee waivers, see ACD 600, “Benefits” for more information.

**Annual Appointment**

An annual appointment is for a period of one academic or fiscal year or a portion thereof and may be renewed.

**Multiple-Year (MY) Appointment**

A multiple-year appointment is for a term of more than one academic or fiscal year but not more than three academic or fiscal years and may be renewed.

**Rolling Multiple-Year (RMY) Appointment**

Upon a determination of satisfactory performance by the college dean, the current three-year multiple-year appointment may be renewed annually with a new three-year multiple-year appointment conditional upon availability of funds, the needs of the unit and the university, and the approval of the college dean.
Faculty on MY and RMY appointments whose annual performance is unsatisfactory in one category may be put on an improvement plan for the succeeding year, absent conduct that would fall within the grounds for dismissal for just cause under Board of Regents’ policy. If performance returns to a satisfactory level, the individual will be reappointed to an annual, MY, or RMY appointment. If performance does not improve to a satisfactory level by the next annual evaluation, the individual may receive a 90 day notice of termination.

Written notification of nonrenewal is required 90 days prior to the end of an MY or RMY appointment; if notice is provided later than 90 days prior to the end of the appointment, the individual shall be compensated for the 90-day period immediately following the date of the notice but shall not be entitled to another appointment.

**Academic Ranks and Titles**

**Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor**

Faculty who hold the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are either tenured or tenure-eligible (see the policies ACD 506-03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments” and ACD 506-04, “Tenure”).

**Regents’ Professor**

The title “regents’ professor” shall be conferred on selected tenured full professors who are sustaining the highest level of distinction by their exceptional contributions to the mission of the university in research, scholarship, or other creative activity, and who have made significant professional contributions in teaching and public service.

In accord with Board of Regents’ policy (6-208 B.), regents’ professors will receive salary increments added to their base salaries at the time of appointment, subject to approval by the Board of Regents. The candidate’s home academic unit will also receive additional monies to support the individual’s scholarly activity, dependent on availability of funds. Appointment to this position involves service to other state universities in Arizona. The service may include lecturing, consulting on curriculum and research matters, advising administrative officers, or other similar activities.

In recognition of the special honor and upon approval by the Board of Regents, the university shall name as regents’ professor no more than 3 percent of the total full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. The complement of regents’ professors should reflect the excellence of the strongest scholars within the university without regard to their distribution within specific disciplines. See [http://www.asu.edu/provost/committees/RPNC.html](http://www.asu.edu/provost/committees/RPNC.html) for information about the selection committee.

**President’s Professor**

The title “president’s professor” may be conferred by the president on selected tenured full professors who have made outstanding contributions in undergraduate and master’s level teaching at Arizona State University. President’s professors are chosen based on a
variety of criteria: mastery of subject matter; enthusiasm and innovation in the learning and teaching process; ability to engage students both within and outside the classroom; ability to inspire independent and original thinking in students to stimulate students to do creative work; innovation in course and curriculum design; and scholarly contributions. For more information see, http://www.asu.edu/provost/presidentsprofessors/nomination_form.pdf

Professor Emeriti

The president may/will confer upon retired faculty members who have served the institution for a substantial length of time the title of “emeritus.” To initiate the process for this designation, the college dean must forward notices of retirement to the executive vice president and provost of the university. For more information about emeritus status see ACD 607-01, “Emeritus Status.”

[Flagged for Senate Discussion]

Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Scholar

Research faculty are fixed-term faculty members who are qualified to engage in, be responsible for, or oversee a significant area of research or scholarship. They may also serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. Research faculty who are hired on or supported by research grants or contracts are not guaranteed space, facilities, or services beyond those approved for currently active grants or contracts.

Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor

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.

Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Assistant Professor of Practice

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. The responsibilities of this position are teaching courses, seminars, and independent studies to undergraduate and graduate students or other duties that the dean determines are consistent with this definition.

Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer
Lecturers are fixed-term faculty members with responsibilities that may include teaching service responsibilities, supervising supplemental kinds of student learning, professional development, and/or administrative duties related to teaching. A Senior Lecturer generally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of five years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience. A Principal Lecturer generally holds a doctorate degree (or appropriate terminal degree) and has a minimum of seven years of college-level teaching experience or equivalent qualifications and experience.

**Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Scholar, Visiting Scientist, Visiting Artist, Visiting Writer**

Visiting faculty are faculty with annual, fixed-term appointments who are normally expected to return to their own institutions at the expiration of the appointment. Visiting faculty are not members of the Academic Assembly.

**Instructor and Instructor, ABD**

Instructor and instructor, ABD are annual, fixed-term appointments. Instructor may appointments to positions with teaching assignments, and limited service and/or professional development responsibilities. Instructor, ABD must be used as a temporary designation for newly hired individuals who, upon completion of their dissertations or other final terminal degree requirements, will be ranked as assistant professors. See ACD 506-03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments” for more information on the instructor, ABD appointment.

**Faculty Research Associates**

Faculty research associates are appointed on annual, fixed term appointments, are not eligible for promotion, and are not members of the Academic Assembly. Persons appointed to this rank usually hold an advanced degree and are employed to work on a research grant or contract. Faculty research associates may also engage in teaching as part of their responsibilities.

**Faculty Associates**

Faculty associates are appointed on annual, fixed term appointments, are not eligible for promotion, and are not members of the Academic Assembly. Individuals in this rank are qualified by training and experience to teach university-level courses.

**Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty appointments are unpaid, usually part-time positions for limited (not more than one-year) renewable terms. Adjunct faculty are not part of the Academic Assembly. The appointments are made by deans to individual academic units or to such units as interdisciplinary degree or certification programs. Appointments are made in order to facilitate the adjunct faculty member’s professional association with the university for the benefit of the individual and the university in such roles as supervising clinical practice students, assisting with research efforts, and occasionally teaching.
CROSS REFERENCES

1. ACD – 506-03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments”
2. ACD – 506-04, “Tenure”
3. ACD 505-?? (new number for 506-09) Transfer, Joint and Affiliated Appointments
4. ACD 607-01, “Emeritus Status”
ACD 506–03: Faculty Probationary Appointments

Purpose

To describe probationary appointments

Sources

*Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual* - 6–201
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Applicability

Tenure-eligible Faculty
Faculty appointed at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor may receive a probationary appointment. The purpose of probation is to provide the tenure-eligible faculty member with an opportunity to develop and demonstrate the ability to meet the criteria for tenure at the institution and to provide the institution with the opportunity to evaluate the abilities of the faculty member.

Except as provided below, the probationary period begins with the initial appointment. If an individual’s appointment begins in the spring semester; the tenure clock begins in the following fall semester.

Individuals hired for assistant professor positions who have not completed their dissertation or other terminal degree requirements by the start of employment will be appointed at the rank and salary of instructor, ABD and must complete the degree requirements within the first year of employment. If they fail to do so, they may be terminated at the end of the first year of appointment. If they complete the degree requirements during the fall semester of the first year, the instructor, ABD may choose one of two options:

1. rank and salary change to that stated in the initial offer letter and prorated to the date of degree completion; this becomes the first year of the probationary period, or
2. remain as an instructor, ABD for the fall semester, with rank and salary changing at the beginning of the spring semester; the first year of the probationary period starts with the following fall semester.

**Duration of the Probationary Period**

All 100 percent FTE faculty appointed at the assistant professor rank have a maximum of six years in which to apply for tenure. Normally appointments at the associate or full professor rank have a maximum of four years in which to apply for tenure. An individual working in a tenure eligible position at less than 100 percent FTE for one or more years may have the probationary period extended. In such a case, the quality of contributions should be the same as those for individuals with a regular probationary period, but the quantity of contributions should be proportional to the FTE effort.

At the time that approval for less than a 100 percent FTE appointment is given, an agreement must be prepared and signed by the faculty member, chair/director of the academic unit, and the supervising dean, stating the individual is working for tenure as a specific FTE appointment, the expectations for tenure and promotion, the time limit for the probationary review (if appropriate), and the maximum time limit for the tenure review.

Faculty members, who desire to be considered for tenure earlier than the year designated in their offer letters, should consult with their chair/director and/or deans about the possibility of being reviewed and recommended for tenure prior to their final probationary year. If an application for early tenure is denied, the faculty member remains in probationary status until the mandatory tenure review is completed. See ACD 506-04, “Tenure” for information about tenure reviews.
Extension of the Probationary Period

Under special circumstances, the president or the president’s designee may extend the probationary period. Faculty members may request, no later than the fall semester of the year prior to the year their tenure review is scheduled, an extension of the probationary period. If such a request is granted, the faculty member shall not be subject to additional requirements at the time of the tenure decision. The request typically will be made in writing to the chair/director of the academic unit and supervising dean, who will consult with relevant personnel committees, (if specified in bylaws) and forward the request, with recommendations, to the executive vice president and provost of the university. The approval process must include an agreement for the timing of the probationary review (if appropriate) and the tenure review.

The request for an extension could be based on the following circumstances:

1. A one-year or one-semester unpaid leave of absence granted for personal reasons and having no significant relationship to the professional activity of the faculty member may be exempted from the probationary period.

2. A one-year, good-cause extension of the probationary period granted while continuing employment. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, serious illness, or other disability and/or exceptional family care responsibilities such as pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, or being the primary caregiver of a minor child or other individual who requires extraordinary care and depends upon the employee for that care.

A one-year leave granted for professional reasons such as fellowships, visiting appointments, and research grants will not interrupt the sequence of probationary years, unless an exception is requested and approved by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. Individuals may apply for more than one extension and a leave may be extended upon approval of the president or president’s designee.

Review of Probationary Faculty

Annual Feedback on Progress Towards Tenure

The chair/director of the academic unit, after consulting with unit faculty, is responsible for annually meeting with and providing feedback to each probationary faculty member about his or her professional development and progress towards earning tenure. The chair/director of the academic unit will provide a written summary of the feedback to the faculty member, the unit personnel committee, and the supervising dean. This feedback will typically occur at the same time as and be based upon the same materials submitted for the annual performance evaluation. However, feedback on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty is distinct from the annual performance evaluation. The former addresses the academic unit’s estimates of future promise. The annual performance evaluation summarizes performance over the prior one to three years.

The probationary review may serve the purpose of the annual feedback on progress toward tenure for the year it is scheduled.
Probationary Review

In addition to the annual feedback on progress towards tenure, all probationary faculty must receive a formal probationary review midway through their probationary period (e.g. third year of a six year probationary period; or as noted in an agreement). The purpose of the probationary review is to give faculty members multiple appraisals of their progress toward earning tenure and assess whether retention is appropriate. The review process is confidential.

The probationary review should closely resemble the actual tenure review, except that external evaluation letters are not sought. The academic unit personnel committee, the academic unit chair/director, the college personnel committee, and the supervising dean all review materials. For information about university probationary review requirements for academic unit bylaws, see University Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements. For information about probationary review file content requirements see Probationary or Conditional Review File Contents.

Reviewers at each level write formal, independent assessments. Faculty members under probationary review may be informed orally by the chair and/or dean of the recommendations being made. Upon completion of the probationary review, the dean will notify chair/director in writing whether the faculty member will be retained, retained conditionally, or given a terminal appointment for the succeeding year. The dean must forward the reviews of individuals recommended for a terminal appointment to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University for approval; notification of retention decisions shall not be communicated to faculty until all decisions, including terminal appointments approved by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, have been made.

Faculty who undergo probationary reviews will be informed of the results in writing by their academic unit chairs/directors no more than 30 days after the chair/director have received written notification of retention decisions from the dean. At the time that faculty members are informed of the retention decisions, they must also be given a copy of the written reviews submitted by each level in the probationary review process, e.g., faculty personnel committee, academic unit chair/director, college personnel committee, and college dean.

Conditional Retention

A faculty member who is recommended for a conditional appointment must be notified by his or her dean no later than April 10. The faculty member will have 30 calendar days to petition the dean with reasons for a review of the decision. If the petition is not received by May 10, the conditional contract will not be reconsidered.

If a conditional appointment is offered to a faculty member, the dean must provide a written statement to the faculty member of the conditions that must be met within a specified period of time (generally one year) in order to return to probationary status following the conditional year. The dean must send a list of faculty given conditional appointments and the specific conditions for each faculty member to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University.
When a conditional appointment is offered to a faculty member, a review must be conducted at or near the end of the period specified in the statement of conditions to determine if they have been met. If the conditions have been met, the faculty member will receive a probationary appointment for the following year. If the conditions have not been met, the faculty member will receive a terminal appointment for the following year.

See Probationary or Conditional Review File Contents for information about materials that must be submitted for the review.

Notification of Termination

Faculty who will not be retained or who receive a terminal appointment will be notified in writing by the executive vice president and provost of the university or designee.

Note: Decisions of nonretention are not restricted to the years of the probationary reviews; they may be made in any year during the probationary period.

Faculty who receive a notification of termination or terminal appointment are not permitted to apply for tenure.

Notice of termination or terminal appointment shall be given in writing in accordance with the following schedule:

1. First academic year of service: not later than March 1 if the appointment expires at the end of that year. If a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least 90 days notice will be provided. If the notice is given after March 1, the faculty member will be compensated for the 90-day period immediately following the date of the notice but shall not be entitled to another appointment.

2. Second academic year of service: not later than December 15 if the appointment expires at the end of that year. If the notice is given after December 15, the faculty member will be compensated for the 150-day period immediately following the date of the notice but shall not be entitled to another appointment.

3. Two or more years in the institution: at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment. If the notice is given after May 15, the faculty member will be given a terminal year appointment and compensated, while employed at ASU, for the next academic or fiscal year (depending on the appointment) but will not be entitled to another appointment beyond that year. The contract for this year should read “terminal contract.” If the decision is not to give tenure, the individual should be notified by May 15 of the sixth year of 100 percent equivalent full-time service. The contract for the seventh year will read “terminal contract.”

Grievance
Individuals may file a complaint regarding the probationary review in accord with ACD 509-02, “Grievance Policy for Faculty,” or ACD 403, “Procedure for Resolving Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination.”

Cross-References

1. ACD 506-??, “Faculty Membership, Ranks, Titles, and Appointment Categories”
2. ACD 506-04, “Tenure”
3. ACD 506-05, “Faculty Promotion”
4. ACD 506-10, “Annual Evaluations of Faculty”
University Faculty Probationary, Tenure and Promotion Requirements
For Academic Unit Bylaws

Academic unit and college by-laws and/or personnel policies must include specific information regarding probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews, which must be included as part of the candidate’s package submitted for review.

Written policies and procedures recommended by the academic unit faculty, approved by the dean, and executive vice president and provost of the university must include:

1. academic unit mission statement and objectives, i.e. the context within which individual faculty contributions can be measured

2. definition of the categories of faculty work to be evaluated, i.e. teaching and instruction, research, scholarship, and/or creative activities, and service to the profession, university and community, which may include the unit’s/university’s affirmative action goals and student diversity recruitment and retention efforts. Specifically, this must include:

   a. quality of teaching and instruction assessed through multiple indicators, including at least the following: a summary of student evaluations collected and reported in accord with university and academic unit procedures, and a peer or supervisory review of instructional materials (such as syllabi, assignments, and Web-based courses). The evaluation of instructional materials must take into account relevant factors such as student learning, the appropriateness of course content, curriculum development, program development, and the contribution of the course to the unit’s curriculum, pedagogy, and the scholarship of instruction. It may involve peer observation of teaching. The academic unit also must require that two products demonstrating quality of teaching and instruction be submitted for review by higher levels.

   b. quality of research and creative activities measured by indicators such as the scholarly standards reflected in the work; its impact on intended audiences; the importance, innovativeness, and relevance of the work as suggested by external peer reviewers or other appropriate authorities; the quality of the journals, publishers, conferences, or other communicative outlets; citations of the work; its longevity of influence; and other similar indicators appropriate to the discipline and academic unit. The scholarly aspects of all professional responsibilities undertaken on behalf of the academic unit, including instructional activities and service, may be assessed within this category if provided for in academic unit policy. Academic unit policy must require four products provided by the faculty member for review by higher levels.
c. quality of service to the academic profession should be assessed in terms of the significance of the recognition brought to
the individual and the university, the impact on the field, and the extent to which the service promotes the national distinction
of the academic unit in the profession. Service to the university should include assessment of contributions to: faculty
governance; the work of the academic unit, college, and university; collegial working environments; and professional behavior
toward peers and academic unit chairs/directors. The evaluation of public/community service must be based on the quality and
relevance to the academic unit mission of the service rendered as well as the value of that service from the perspective of the
community organization or partner. Academic unit policy must specify the types of information about service that are needed
for each type of review, and must specify processes for obtaining such information. Academic units for whom public and
community service is an important part of their mission may require faculty to provide at least two but not more than four
products reflecting the quality of their public service. These products must be provided for higher level reviews.

3. criteria for the evaluation of work, including attention to interdisciplinary work as appropriate.

4. explanation of how cases of joint and/or affiliated appointments will be evaluated; in particular, inclusion of evaluative comments
from affiliated units, input from the other unit in selection of external reviewers.

5. benchmarks by which quality of contributions can be measured.

6. identification process for objective external reviewers, including

   a. a statement that the chair/director must consult with the dean in determining his/her list of possible external reviewers

   b. a requirement for a list of objective external reviewers from aspirational peers or other highly respected institutions. While a
specific number of reviewers is not required, a sufficient number is needed to assure the candidate’s file is thoroughly
reviewed. Typically there should be a minimum of five external evaluators who are professors in highly respected
colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers may not have a close professional or personal
connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee). Both the candidate
and academic unit must provide names from which the final selection will be made. The selection by the chair/director will
include half from the candidate’s list of suggested reviewers and half from the chair/director’s list of suggested reviewers.

   c. (at the option of the candidate) a list of possible reviewers who the candidate believes cannot provide an objective review, with
reasons for possible exclusion of those reviewers from the review process.

7. types of evidence/file contents to be submitted by candidates under review. (See Probationary File Contents and/or Tenure and
Promotion File Contents)

8. compliance with university and Board of Regents policies and procedures.
ACD 506-04: Tenure

Purpose

To describe appointments with tenure and the review for tenure

Sources

Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual - 6–201
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Applicability

Faculty

Policy
Tenure is a property right authorized by the Board of Regents and, through Board of Regents’ delegation of authority, granted by the president to individuals. An individual’s tenure at Arizona State University is located in a specific academic unit. Tenure is not transferable except as provided through university policy and procedure.

**Appointments** with tenure are those with a legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment unless the tenured faculty member retires, resigns, or is dismissed or released in accord with ACD 501, “Conditions of Faculty Service.” Attainment of tenure can only occur through specific notification from the president and may not result from inaction or inadvertence. If a tenure-eligible faculty member applies for early tenure and the decision is negative, the faculty member remains in probationary status. Assistant professors reviewed for tenure (regular or expedited process) must be reviewed for promotion at the same time.

Tenure is awarded on the basis of excellence, and the promise of continued excellence, which is measured not only by individual achievement but also by contributions to the academic unit’s and university’s current and future mission and objectives; thus the tenure review process of necessity takes into account the mission and objectives of each academic unit and the university during the assessment of the professional accomplishments of the faculty under review. See ACD 202, “Faculty Responsibilities,” for information related to responsibilities that are part of the review for tenure.

The rapidly changing character of research and its methodologies make it impossible for a university, even one of considerable size, scope, and resources, to have tenured faculty in every discipline. Therefore, appointments to tenure are offered to only those scholars whose disciplinary contributions are deemed excellent and whose ability to contribute to university priorities is also highly developed.

**Review for Tenure**

The tenure review is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. This process is conducted in the following order, assuming each level exists: the academic unit personnel committee, academic unit chair/director, college personnel committee, supervising dean, university tenure and promotion committee, executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. Each of these units or individuals makes independent recommendations that are informed by previous recommendations. The president ultimately makes the decision for the award of tenure.

The review process involves assessment of the performance of faculty responsibilities including teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service to the university, profession and community. Candidates must be reviewed for tenure no later than the date indicated in the original offer letter or date amended by an authorized probationary period extension. For information about university tenure review requirements for academic unit bylaws, see [University Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements](#).

Specific information is required of candidates being reviewed for tenure. The material reviewed includes information provided by candidates, external evaluation letters solicited by the academic unit, and any additional information required by an individual or committee to clarify or explain information provided at an earlier stage. Recommendations for external reviewers are made equally by the candidate and the academic unit chair/director; the selection of reviewers will be equally divided between the candidate’s and the chair/director’s list. The chair/director also consults with the supervising dean about her or his list of external reviewers. Typically there
should be a minimum of five external reviewers who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers typically will not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee). For information about file content requirements see Tenure and Promotion File Contents.

Notification of Recommendations and Final Decision

Academic unit level: the chair/director shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the academic unit level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

College level: the supervising dean shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the college level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.

University level: no notification is made by the university committee

Final decision: the final decision regarding the award of tenure is made through written notification to the candidate by the president

Review/personnel committee members at every level shall not discuss deliberations with candidates. External review letters shall not be shared with candidates.

Denial of Tenure

The denial of 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. Faculty who believe that denial of tenure was in violation of ASU policy may file a grievance in accord with ACD 509-02, “Grievance Policy for Faculty.”

Expedited Review for Tenure

Current Faculty
The university reserves the right to conduct an expedited review for awarding tenure to a faculty member when such action will serve the best interests of ASU. The decision to conduct an expedited tenure review is an exception to the regular tenure review described above and will be approved only in extraordinary circumstances, which could include, but are not limited to:

1. the decision of the university to respond to an offer of other employment to a current faculty member whom ASU desires to retain;
2. the receipt of an extraordinary award or honor by a faculty member that is likely to generate offers of employment or brings distinction to the individual and the institution

and

3. other circumstances that the executive vice president and provost of the university determines warrant expedited tenure review.

ASU has no obligation to consider or approve an expedited review at the request of the faculty member even under the circumstances listed above. For information about the expedited review procedures see Expedited Review for Tenure and/or Promotion Procedures.

Every effort will be made to conclude an expedited review within 14 calendar days following the initiation of the review or as soon as possible thereafter.

**Denial of Tenure**

If the expedited award of tenure is denied, the faculty member will be reviewed under ACD 506–03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments” during probation, under ACD 506-10, “Annual Evaluation of Faculty,” and if otherwise eligible may be considered for tenure under the regular tenure review described in this policy.

**University-Level Review of New Hires with Tenure**

**Candidates with Tenure at Peer or Peer Aspirational Institutions**

For candidates employed at universities defined as academic unit/college peers or aspirational peers and who currently hold the rank at which they would be hired, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president will review the curriculum vitae and reference letters or notes from reference calls.

**Candidates with Tenure at Non-Peer or Non-Peer Aspirational Institutions**
For candidates employed with tenure at a university that is not a peer or aspirational peer of the unit/college, and who would be hired at the same rank that they now hold, the curriculum vitae and reference letters (or notes from reference calls) will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. The academic unit chair/dean should provide a letter detailing the academic unit/college vote and rationale for supporting the hire with tenure and contextualizing the candidate’s curriculum vitae for university level reviewers.

**Candidates without Tenure at the Time of Hire**

For candidates who are not tenured at their current university, an expedited tenure review will be conducted, including faculty and administrative review(s) at all levels. To accommodate the need for prompt decision-making:

1. the college personnel committee review may be bypassed so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels

   and

2. the university faculty review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee. The review will include external review letters solicited from the candidate’s and the unit head/dean’s lists.

See [Expedited Review for Tenure and/or Promotion Procedures](http://www.asu.edu/provost/personnel/actions) for more information about this review.

In all cases, the final decision on hire, rank, and tenure rests with the university president.

---

**Cross-References**

---

See:

1. ACD 202, “Faculty Responsibilities,”
2. ACD 506-03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments,”
3. ACD 506-05, “Faculty Promotion”
ACD 506–05: Faculty Promotion

Purpose

To describe faculty promotion

Sources

*Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual* - 6–201
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

Applicability

Faculty

Policy
The purpose of promotion is to recognize and reward accomplishment. Promotion is awarded on the basis of proven excellence. Tenure-eligible faculty members are promoted because they have demonstrated excellence in teaching and/or instructional contributions, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service (See ACD 202, Faculty Responsibilities.) Fixed-term faculty are promoted based on excellence in the specific area(s) of assignment. This excellence is achieved in the context of the program in which faculty members work. It is understood that academic units will have different criteria for promotion in rank that depend upon the unit’s mission, stature, and goals.

**Review for Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty**

Tenure-eligible assistant professors being reviewed for promotion must also be reviewed for tenure whether the review is early, mandatory, or expedited. Associate professors may be reviewed for tenure without also seeking a promotion in rank. Tenured associate professors may be candidates for promotion at any time after the award of tenure. Faculty members serving in administrative positions may have administrative contributions evaluated as a component of service to the university.

The promotion review is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. This process is conducted in the following order: the academic unit personnel committee, the chair/director, the college personnel committee, the supervising dean, the university tenure and promotion committee, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president. Each of these units or individuals makes independent recommendations that are informed by previous recommendations. The president ultimately makes the promotion decision. The promotion review process is a confidential process with specific notification requirements and restrictions at each stage of the process.

See *University Probationary, Tenure, and Promotion Requirements* for information about university promotion review requirements that must be in academic unit and college bylaws. Specific information is required of candidates being reviewed for promotion. The material reviewed includes information provided by candidates, external review letters solicited by the academic unit, and any additional information required by an individual or committee to clarify or explain information provided at an earlier stage. Recommendations for external reviewers are made equally by the candidate and the academic unit chair/director; the selection of reviewers will be equally divided between the candidate’s and the chair/director’s list. The chair/director also consults with the supervising dean about her or his list of external reviewers. Typically there should be a minimum of five external reviewers who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers typically will not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee). For information about promotion file content requirements see *Tenure and Promotion File Contents*.

**Notification of Recommendations and Final Decision**

Academic unit level: the chair/director shall provide an oral statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the academic unit level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point.
| College level:  | the supervising dean shall provide an **oral** statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the candidate based on the reviews at the college level; the candidate may choose to withdraw from further consideration at this point. |
| University level: | no notification is made by the university committee |
| Final decision: | the final decision regarding the award of promotion is made through written notification to the candidate by the president |

External review letters shall not be shared with candidates. Review/personnel committee members at every level shall not discuss deliberations with candidates.

---

**Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to associate professor requires an overall record of excellence and the promise of continued excellence. The candidate must have achieved excellence in teaching and instructional activities as well as in research, scholarship and/or creative activities. Service must at least be “satisfactory” or “effective.” Academic units in which public service is a central aspect of their mission also may require excellence in public service.

---

**Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to full professor must be based on an overall record of excellence in the performance of professional responsibilities (taking into account the distribution of effort as part of any negotiated flexible performance agreements). The candidate must also demonstrate continued effectiveness in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service since the promotion to associate professor. Generally, an overall record of excellence requires national and/or international recognition for scholarly and/or creative achievement.

---

**Expedited Review for Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-eligible Faculty**

**Current Faculty**
The university reserves the right to conduct an expedited review for awarding promotion to a faculty member when such action will serve the best interests of ASU. The decision to conduct an expedited promotion review is an exception to the regular promotion review described above and will be approved only in extraordinary circumstances, which could include, but are not limited to:

4. the decision of the university to respond to an offer of other employment to a current faculty member whom ASU desires to retain
5. the receipt of an extraordinary award or honor by a faculty member that is likely to generate offers of employment or brings distinction to the individual and the institution

and

6. other circumstances that the executive vice president and provost of the university determines warrant expedited promotion review.

ASU has no obligation to consider or approve an expedited review at the request of the faculty member even for the circumstances listed above. See information about the expedited review process see Expedited Tenure and/or Promotion Review.

Every effort will be made to conclude an expedited review within 14 calendar days following the initiation of the review or as soon as possible thereafter.

Candidates Requesting Promotion at the Time of Hire

For candidates who are requesting promotion to a higher rank, an expedited promotion review will be conducted, including faculty and administrative review(s) at all levels. To accommodate the need for prompt decision-making:

3. the college personnel committee review may be bypassed so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels

and

4. the university faculty review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the university promotion and tenure committee. The review will include external review letters solicited from the candidate’s and the unit head/dean’s lists.

See Expedited Review for Tenure and/or Promotion Procedures for more information about this review.

In all cases, the final decision on hire and rank rests with the university president.

Review for Promotion: Fixed-Term Faculty
Individuals with fixed-term faculty appointments as lecturer, professor of practice, clinical faculty, and research faculty are eligible for promotion in rank. The promotion review for fixed-term faculty is designed to ensure a fair and impartial process that is clear, unambiguous, comprehensive, and applied consistently and uniformly. The review is conducted in the following order, assuming each level exists: academic unit personnel committee, chair/director, college committee, supervising dean, and executive vice president and provost of the university. The executive vice president and provost of the university makes the final decision for promotion.

Due to the differences in types of work performed by persons in fixed term appointments, academic units must clearly define the criteria for promotion to each rank. For information about university promotion review requirements for academic unit bylaws, see University Fixed-Term Promotion Requirements. For information about promotion file content requirements see Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion File Contents. Promotion files are due in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University by October 1 each year.

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. Faculty who believe that denial of promotion was in violation of ASU policy may file a grievance in accord with ACD 509-02, “Grievance Policy for Faculty.” [Link]

Cross-References

See also:

1. ACD 505–02, “Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles
2. ACD 506–03, “Faculty Probationary Appointments.”
3. ACD 506-04, “Tenure”
Tenure and/or Promotion File Contents
Submitted to the
Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

The materials supporting the review of faculty are to be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University in unbound, hard-copy form. All supplemental materials such as additional publications, teaching portfolio materials or samples of professional or creative activity, etc., can be submitted in a stable electronic storage device. One storage device containing core materials, and a second such device containing supplemental materials, are required.

Send only ONE (original) file per faculty member; i.e., do not send duplicate academic unit and college files.

All college and university committees meeting to review tenure and/or promotion files must inform the chair/director or dean (as appropriate) if there are major faults or omissions in the material or if significant questions or possible misunderstandings arise. The chair/director or dean may send additional letters to the committee as the case progresses if there is a need to either clarify or provide additional information.

All information received after the file has left the unit/department is forwarded on through each review level to the executive vice president and provost of the university to be added as an Appendix to the candidate’s file. A brief statement should be written at each review level stating whether or not the new material would change their earlier recommendation in any way. Also, the executive vice president and provost of the university should be notified that additional materials are on their way to be added to the candidate’s case file.

Materials submitted must include:

1. The Request for Academic Personnel Action form (www.asu.edu/provost/forms), along with any additional forms used by the college.

2. Table of Contents for the materials in candidate’s submission. Include a listing of four publication titles or titles of the other documentation of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

3. A statement of not more than four pages written by the candidate to put past work into perspective and to outline future goals. The statement should help reviewers see relationships among the individual’s teaching, research, and service and how these activities have built the foundation for continued professional growth. An optional supplemental statement by the candidate on one of the three areas listed in #2 (up to 2 pages in length) may be included. The statement should be labeled “Supplemental Statement on___________” (e.g. Teaching)

4. The candidate’s current curriculum vita presenting such information as research publications, scholarship and/or creative achievements, service, grants, and papers presented, etc. Refereed and non-refereed publications should be distinguished. Joint authors of articles should be listed in the order in which they appear, and the nature of one’s role in research projects and other joint efforts should be clearly described.
5. A copy of four publications or other material reflecting the research, scholarship and/or creative activities of the candidate. A portfolio documenting creative activity may be submitted as one of the four pieces of evidence. If local units have looked at a greater quantity of material, the candidate should be consulted about weeding the material to fit the restricted space requirements (nothing larger than a letter-size banker’s box – 12” x 15” x 10”) at the University level.

6. Review materials of teaching and instructional activity:
   a. A summary table of courses taught, the number of students in each, and a summary of student evaluations including scale, mean, and standard deviation;
   b. Instructional materials as specified by the unit
   c. Supplemental materials providing evidence of instructional effectiveness may be submitted for up to two (2) courses, e.g. syllabi, copies of major tests and assignments, reading lists, websites, CDs, etc. with each course submission fitting into a file folder.

7. Internal evaluation letters and committee recommendations (omitting identification of external reviewers).
   a. Academic Unit Personnel Committee evaluation of performance in relation to unit/department criteria.
   b. Chair/Director’s independent evaluation and recommendation.
   c. College Personnel Committee evaluation and recommendation.
   d. Dean’s independent evaluation and recommendation.

   Internal evaluation letters should explicitly address the following:
   a. analysis of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, which may include instructional contributions such as curriculum development and program development
   b. detailed evaluation of the candidate’s research, scholarship, and/or creative activities including assessment of the quality and impact of the work;
   c. evaluation of the volume of research, scholarship and/or creative activities and expected future contributions;
   d. unit/departmental expectations and disciplinary culture regarding individual and joint authorship of publications, grant activities and the norms regarding order of authorship in the field;
   e. clear specifications of the candidate’s contributions to collaborative projects (including external funding) and/or to interdisciplinary work;
   f. comparative analysis of the candidate’s standing in the field, relative to national peers; and
   g. if the committee vote is not unanimous, the evaluation letter must explicitly state the minority view in the letter.

   A substantive evaluation of the case at each level of review must be provided and questions arising at earlier levels of review directly addressed. Do not repeat case details that have already been described in earlier letters. Rather, evaluate the case, correct misstatements, substantiate or challenge claims, and provide additional perspectives and information.

   Provide evidence and documentation for important assertions about the case. For example, if the candidate has received a major award specify the importance of that award in the discipline. Similarly, identify the top journals in the field and provide some evidence of their
quality.

8. External Evaluation Letters
   a. All original external evaluation letters received must be included with the file. If possible, academic unit chairs/directors and deans should explain any troublesome or confusing statement made by an external reviewer in their internal evaluation letter.
   b. Submit the Record of Outside Letters Form [http://www.asu.edu/provost/forms/recordofoutsideltrsgrid.doc]. This is a list of all external evaluators sent letters requesting an evaluation. If a letter has not been received, note this on the grid. Include detailed information about each reviewer’s qualifications, stature in the field, and familiarity with the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative activities. If reviewers are not from peer/aspirational peer institutions or are not full professors, explain why they were selected. Include identifying information about the reviewers only on this grid/form.
   c. Submit the curriculum vitae of each external reviewer.
   d. Submit a copy of the letter used to request the reviews. Academic unit chairs/directors may contact potential reviewers prior to the formal solicitation to identify those potential reviewers most likely to respond. Additional reviewers may be contacted in an attempt to secure a sufficient number of external evaluations so that quality and impact of the candidate’s work and his/her standing in the field can be assessed. Typically there should be a minimum of five external evaluators who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers typically will not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee).
   e. If provided by the candidate, submit the list of possible reviewers who the candidate believes cannot provide an objective review, with reasons for possible exclusion of those reviewers from the review process.

[Senators—‘e.’ is a new provision.]

9. An evaluative statement from any additional units if the faculty member has a joint appointment.

10. An evaluative statement from any additional units may be provided if the faculty has an affiliated appointment(s).

11. A current copy of the academic unit’s and college’s approved promotion and tenure review process criteria.

The dean should provide a cover list of the names of all faculty in the college going through the review process, listed by academic unit, who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure this cycle.
Expeditied Review for Tenure and/or Promotion Procedures

These procedures apply to current ASU faculty, and to finalists for ASU faculty positions who are not tenured at their current institution or who are requesting promotion at the time of hire.

Request

1. The dean submits a request to the executive vice president and provost of the university for an expedited review.
2. Include with the request the most current curriculum vitae of the faculty member and documentation establishing extraordinary circumstances to support an expedited review.
3. The executive vice president and provost of the university or designee will make every effort to approve or deny the request for an expedited review within 48 hours after receipt. The dean or designee will notify the unit head and the faculty member immediately of the decision regarding the request.
4. If the request is approved, the unit head will request from the faculty member, a personal statement, no longer than four pages identifying his or her qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, and any supplemental material (e.g., no more than four copies of publications, evidence of teaching effectiveness).

External Review

1. The chair/director and the dean will provide a list of potential external reviewers and the faculty member will provide a list of potential external reviewers, which will be rank ordered to select an equal number of reviewers from each list. There must be a sufficient number of external reviews from colleagues capable of providing objective professional evaluations so that the impact and quality of the candidate’s work may be assessed. Typically there should be a minimum of five external reviewers who are professors in highly respected colleges/universities (e.g. peer or aspirational peer institutions). These reviewers typically will not have a close professional or personal connection with the candidate (e.g. co-author, co-PI, or member of the candidate’s dissertation committee).
2. The chair/director will contact these six reviewers to determine whether they can provide a written review to the unit head within ten calendar days following the request. If an external reviewer cannot provide a review within ten days, the chair/director will contact the next external reviewer from the combined list and this process will continue in an effort to obtain a sufficient number of external review letters within the timeline.
3. The chair/director will send the curriculum vitae, personal statement, and examples of the faculty member’s research or creative activity, along with a copy of the unit/college criteria for tenure and/or promotion after the reviewer agrees to provide an external
review letter. See the executive vice president and provost of the university website (http://www.asu.edu/provost//personnel/actions/forms/outsiderevltrfac_1.doc) for the external letter template.

Internal Review

1. Simultaneously with selecting external reviewers, the chair/director will request the academic unit promotion and tenure review committee (or subcommittee thereof) to provide an expedited review of the candidate’s teaching, research or creative activities, and service, and the dean will request the college promotion and tenure review or advisory committee (or subcommittee thereof) to provide an expedited review of the candidate’s qualifications.

2. The dean and the chair/director will provide all available information on the candidate’s qualifications to the respective peer review committees. Expedited reviews for new hires may bypass the college personnel committee review so long as there is faculty review at the unit and university levels. Teaching materials must include student evaluations and course syllabi and may include the candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy or other evidence of teaching effectiveness. The chair/director and the dean will also prepare their own independent reviews simultaneously or as soon as possible after receipt of the peer reviews from the academic unit and the college committees.

3. The chair/director will provide copies of the external review letters to the dean as they are received. The chair/director and the dean will provide a secure location to review the external letters so that committee members may access the letters as the committees conduct their reviews.

4. The tenure portfolio with the unit level reviews and external review letters will be submitted to the dean as expeditiously as possible. The college level reviews will be added to the materials and forwarded to the university level.

5. The university promotion and tenure committee (or a subcommittee thereof) will review the case and provide a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost of the university. The executive vice president and provost of the university will review the entire package and forward a recommendation with the materials to the president for decision.

Decision

The president of the university will make the decision to award or deny tenure and will provide verbal notification to the executive vice president and provost of the university and dean as soon as possible after the decision is made. The dean will notify the unit head and the faculty candidate as soon as possible thereafter. The president will provide a written notice of the decision within ten days to the same university administrators and faculty member. If tenure is not awarded through an expedited review, the faculty member remains in probationary status or may only be offered a probationary appointment.
The materials supporting the review of faculty are to be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University in unbound, hard-copy form. Form and medium of transmission of materials should be negotiated by the

Send only ONE (original) file per faculty member; i.e., do not send duplicate academic unit and college files.

All college and university committees meeting to review tenure and/or promotion files must inform the chair/director or dean (as appropriate) if there are major faults or omissions in the material or if significant questions or possible misunderstandings arise. The chair/director or dean may send additional letters to the committee as the case progresses if there is a need to either clarify or provide additional information.

All information received after the file has left the unit/department is forwarded on through each review level to the executive vice president and provost of the university to be added as an Appendix to the candidate’s file. A brief statement should be written at each review level stating whether or not the new material would change their earlier recommendation in any way. Also, the executive vice president and provost of the university should be notified that additional materials are on their way to be added to the candidate’s case file.

Materials submitted must include:

1. The Request for Academic Personnel Action form [http://www.asu.edu/provost/forms/], along with any additional forms used by the academic unit.

2. Table of Contents for materials in the candidate’s submission

3. A self-assessment statement provided by the candidate (up to 4 pages in length); optional supplemental statement by the candidate on a specific area of responsibility (up to 2 pages in length). Statement should be labeled “Supplemental Statement
on___________” (e.g. Teaching)

4. A current curriculum vitae for the candidate.

5. Summary from the candidate of job and/or teaching effectiveness, including both student (as appropriate) and peer (as appropriate) evaluations.

6. Evaluation(s) by academic unit and college personnel committee(s).

7. Transmittal/evaluation letters of the chair/director and dean(s) of the home unit (additional letters from joint or affiliate appointments may be added, where applicable).

8. A current copy of the academic unit’s and college’s approved promotion and renewal review process criteria.

A cover list from the dean should be provided of all clinical faculty, lecturers, research faculty, and/or professors of practice in the college listed by academic unit who are currently being reviewed.
Arizona State University requires academic unit and college bylaws to include specific information regarding fixed-term promotion reviews. The promotion review criteria must be included as part of the promotion package submitted to the executive vice president and provost of the university for review.

Written policies and procedures recommended by the unit and approved by the executive vice president and provost of the university or designee must include:

1. unit mission statement and objectives, i.e. the context within which individual faculty contributions can be measured

2. definition of the categories of faculty work to be evaluated

3. criteria for the evaluation of work, including attention to interdisciplinary work as appropriate

4. explanation of how cases of joint and/or affiliated appointments will be evaluated, e.g. inclusion of evaluative comments from affiliated departments

5. types of evidence/file contents to be submitted by candidates under review (See Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion File Contents)

6. compliance with university and Board of Regents policies and procedures
Resolution on Open Access Textbooks

Whereas faculty and students share a concern about textbook affordability,

Be it hereby resolved that

As faculty members, we affirm that it is our prerogative and responsibility to select course materials that are pedagogically most appropriate for our classes. We also affirm that it is consistent with this principle to seek affordable and accessible course materials for our classes whenever possible. This includes “open textbooks,” which are textbooks offered online to students at no cost.

http://maketextbooksaffordable.org

Seek and consider open textbooks and other open educational resources when choosing course materials,
Give preference to a low or no cost educational resource such as an open textbook over an expensive, commercial textbook if it best fits the needs of a class
Encourage institutions to develop support for the use of open textbooks and other open educational resources.
RESOLUTION ON REPEATED CRITICAL TRACKING COURSES
Tempe-Downtown Academic Senate
First Reading: March 24, 2008
Second Reading and Amendment: April 21, 2008

WHEREAS each academic unit has developed a list of critical tracking requirements for first time freshman entering Arizona State University on or after August 15, 2007; and

WHEREAS some academic units have included in their critical tracking requirements at least one course in which a grade (of B-) higher than D must be earned; and

WHEREAS current university policy only permits students to repeat a course or courses if they have earned a grade of D or E; and

WHEREAS a grade (of C-, C or C+) higher than D but less than the grade required in such a critical tracking course (or courses) would not satisfy the critical tracking requirement; and

WHEREAS a student in such a circumstance would not be permitted to repeat the course under current university policy; and

WHEREAS some critical tracking courses are offered outside of the academic unit which has established the critical tracking requirements for their majors; therefore be it

RESOLVED that each academic unit which has imposed a (B-) minimum grade requirement in one or more critical tracking courses above the grade of D must establish appeals policies and procedures for students who receive grades (of C or C+) above the grade of D but below those required to meet critical tracking requirements in such courses—whether taught inside or outside the academic unit—to determine whether these students will be allowed to repeat such courses; and be it further

RESOLVED that the opportunity to repeat a critical tracking course, if an appeal is approved, be subject to course availability at the time the student attempts to register for the repeated course; and be it further

RESOLVED that the impact on a student’s cumulative GPA of any course repeated under this policy be processed by the Registrar’s office in the same manner that all repeated courses are processed in determining the student’s end-of-semester cumulative grade point average.

Submitted by the Student Faculty Policy Committee
(with italics) denotes words omitted by the amendment.
Boldface denotes words added by the amendment.