



College/ Independent Unit	New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Academic Unit/ Department, if any**	
Choose document type (bylaws or criteria Document?): Promotion Criteria Tenure/Tenure Track	
If bylaws, does it include criteria for promotion/continuing status/tenure?	
Please concisely list the ranks included in the criteria (if relevant). Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	

Unit and college approval

Date of approval by the faculty and/or academic professionals	May 1, 2025
Date of review by the dean (or lead of independent unit)*	May 9, 2025

Provost office approval

	Patricia Friedrich	8/12/2025
Signature	Name	Date

*Per ACD111-02, 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.

**Academic units are usually departments and schools, not research centers or programs. Academic units, in this context, have criteria for promotion which were approved by its faculty and/or academic professionals.

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (Tenured and tenure track faculty)

The purpose of promotion and tenure reviews in NCIAS is to ensure a fair and impartial process for review and evaluation of each candidate. A candidate is promoted, granted tenure, or retained on the basis of excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence, in scholarship and artistic activity, teaching, and service.

Faculty responsibilities for NCIAS faculty at Arizona State University are described in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD 202-01).

NCIAS uses a peer review process to evaluate a faculty member's contributions. Faculty colleagues (i.e. peers within the same or a related discipline) typically are the most knowledgeable about a candidate's field. The peer review process is designed to foster excellence and high standards, to recognize distinctive abilities and accomplishments of individual faculty members, and to make informed recommendations for promotion and tenure and for probationary evaluations. Schools, with the approval of the Dean, are free to develop standing personnel committees to conduct reviews in lieu of a peer review committee system.

These bylaws on "Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure" complement university policy, as described in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD 506-04: Tenure), by defining the areas of evaluation and describing the appropriate criteria and evidence for them. NCIAS faculty have school bylaws in which they define the standards, criteria, and evidence specific to their interdisciplinary and disciplinary areas. These school bylaws provide the most specific standards to guide the peer review process; evaluation narratives are expected to explicitly address these standards and demonstrate how a candidate's record does/does not comply.

1. Scholarly and Artistic Activity

a. Definition

Scholarly/artistic activities are essential to the mission of creating knowledge and art. A faculty member's scholarly/artistic activity is evaluated in a primary discipline, a related discipline, or in an interdisciplinary/intercultural field(s) of study.

Within the context of school standards, scholarly/artistic activities include but are not limited to the following: contributions to disciplinary/interdisciplinary/inter-cultural field(s) of study, artistic presentations/performances, and appropriate studies that create, integrate, or apply knowledge within or related to the faculty member's field(s) of specialization.

b. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to sustain an ongoing and coherent program of research or creative work resulting in significant scholarly/artistic contributions. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on evidence of scholarly/artistic achievement that indicates a growing reputation in a field and the potential to achieve national or international recognition. Promotion to Full Professor is based on evidence of significant scholarly/artistic contributions to a field that sustain or enhance national or international recognition.

c. Evidence

Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following: published books or monographs articles or book chapters, grants, creative literary or juried artistic works, exhibits, performances, productions, patents, products taken to market, start-ups, and similar. Candidates should review the standard established for promotion and tenure in the past few years as operationalized by successful candidates within the school and the departments, schools or colleges among our peer and aspirational peer institutions.

External letters are part of the process of evaluation of research, publication, and creative activity. Please see appropriate passages in the ACD Manual (ACD 506-04) and the Provost's website for more detail.

2. Teaching

a. Definition

Teaching in its various modes is essential to the College's educational mission. Being responsible for the intellectual development of students requires faculty members to be proficient, committed, and inclusive teachers. Teaching involves imparting knowledge to students, developing critical skills that enable students to weigh arguments and evidence, fostering in students the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge.

b. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to teach students inclusively and effectively and to maintain current scholarly command of the

professional field(s) appropriate to their academic assignment. The proficient teacher exemplifies a commitment that is reflected in instructional materials, classroom performance, and student mentoring and advising consistent with ASU's commitment to inclusive excellence.

c. Evidence

Evidence guidelines can be found within the Process Guide located on the Provost website.

3. Service

a. Definition

NCIAS expects faculty commitment to building the University and its programs. Service to the College, therefore, as well as to the academic profession and to the community at large, is an essential part of every faculty member's record. Service is manifested in institutional development, collegial contributions, professional contributions, and community (local, state, national or international) contributions in which the faculty member represents the College. Service to underrepresented and underserved communities is particularly valued, as well as those efforts that prioritize access, impact, and excellence in and outside of the University.

b. Criteria

Evaluation of service requires the assessment of quality as well as quantity. Thus, evaluation of service must include an examination of the individual's contributions to internal committee work and to faculty governance activities. Service to the public should be an extension of the faculty member's research and teaching activity to the larger community outside of the College. Service to the profession is also important to the evaluation.

c. Evidence

Service to the College may include the following: committee work (at the level of the school, college, campus or university), faculty governance activities, and activities related to the preservation of a collegial atmosphere at all levels within the university. Service to the larger community may include any activity where the faculty member serves a representative of the university to community

organizations (e.g., public, non-profit, community-based). Service to the profession may include the following: editorial activities, referee services for artistic presentations or performances, office-holding in professional organizations. Service commitments must be listed on the CV.

4. Peer Review Committees

NCIAS Peer Review Committees shall be composed of at least three elected individuals. The committee shall include a minimum of two faculty members from NCIAAS. One member may be selected from a unit of Arizona State University outside of NCIAAS. The chair of the peer review committee must be from the NCIAAS faculty. The director of the candidate's school may serve on the peer review committee but in so doing cannot make an additional, separate evaluation (in such cases a substitute for the Director's Review will be designated by the Dean).

5. Review Procedures

a. Peer Review

In NCIAAS, a peer review committee is composed of individuals selected consistent with the principles stated in the sections immediately preceding. The peer review committee completes its evaluation and makes an overall recommendation.

b. School Director's Review

After receiving the peer committee's evaluation, the school director writes an independent evaluation of the candidate's file and, after consideration of the previous reviews, makes an overall recommendation.

c. NCIAAS Promotion and Tenure Committee Review

The Committee makes its independent recommendation based on the candidate's record and after consideration of the previous reviews.

d. Dean's Review

The Dean makes an independent recommendation and evaluation based on the candidate's record and after consideration of the previous

reviews. All materials are then forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Post-Tenure Reviews

Applicability: All tenured faculty.

1. Post-Tenure Performance Evaluation Principles, Policies, and Procedures are the same as for Annual Reviews.
2. Outcomes and Consequences of Post-Tenure Reviews:
 - a) Satisfactory performance in all three areas maintains the faculty member in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises;
 - b) Overall Satisfactory with a single area of Unsatisfactory leads to an academic Unit Development Plan at the school level;
 - c) Overall Unsatisfactory resulting from two or more single areas of Unsatisfactory or also may result from one area of Unsatisfactory depending on the weights assigned to an area in the Performance Agreement negotiated between the faculty member and the school Director. Overall Unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan that must be implemented no later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.
3. Addressing Unsatisfactory Performance in Post-Tenure Review:

ACD 506-11 "Post Tenure Review," describes post-tenure review and the principles that guide it, while Provost procedure P7: Post-Tenure Review dictates the process.

 - a) Any rating of unsatisfactory in any area of assigned responsibility will result in an academic Unit Development Plan, which the school Director develops for the faculty member with specific, measurable definitions of satisfactory performance, and the individual faculty member's mix of assigned responsibilities. This developmental plan will have goals for the faculty member to achieve, within one year, with appropriate interim monitoring and feedback. The school Director will seek the input of the faculty member in the development of this Plan, but the school Director retains final authority for establishing the Plan's content.

If the goals are satisfactorily met, the individual returns to the annual review process. If the goals are not met, the individual enters the performance improvement process. The determination about whether the goals have or have not been met rests with the school Director;

- b) A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is formulated by the school director and the dean. The faculty member will have the opportunity to provide input and may request the plan be reviewed by the NCIAS Personnel committee.
- c) Performance Improvement Plans identify, at a minimum, the following points:
 - 1) specific deficiencies that led to the unsatisfactory performance rating;
 - 2) Specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies;
 - 3) an outline of activities to be undertaken to achieve the outcomes;
 - 4) the time period for the improvements to take place;
 - 5) milestones with specific criteria so that progress toward goals or outcomes can be measured periodically;
 - 6) reasonable resources that can be made available to assist the faculty member in the achievement of goals.

Deficiencies in teaching or position effectiveness generally shall be addressed through a one-year performance improvement plan. For a research/creative activity or professional contribution deficiency, the duration of the plan should be as brief as possible. Under no circumstances, however, should it be longer than three years. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Dean and by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. Once a Performance Improvement Plan has been established, progress will be monitored in accordance with Provost procedures

Individuals whose performance is rated satisfactory or better according to terms of their Performance Improvement Plans return to the regular annual evaluation process. The judgment about whether the goals have been met

rests with the School Director.

As stated in ACD 506-11, "Only after the faculty member has clearly not achieved these goals or when a faculty member chooses not to enter into a PIP should dismissal for cause be considered."

4. Appeal Processes in Post-Tenure Reviews:

As stated in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD), "A faculty member who believes that the post-tenure review process involved a material procedural violation may file a grievance in accord with ACD 509-02, "Grievance Policy for Faculty." If a dismissal for cause is recommended, faculty may contest that recommendation through the administrative hearing process specified in ACD 501, "Conditions of Faculty Service."

5. Dean's Level Audit of Post-Tenure reviews:

- a) Each year one school shall submit their entire faculty's post-tenure review files for audit so that all files will be audited over a three-year period;
- b) The Audit Committee shall be members of the College Personnel Committee, excluding the member(s) of the school being audited. The member(s) whose school is being audited shall be replaced by the Alternate on the College Personnel Committee, unless of course the Alternate is from the same school.
- c) The audit report is provided to the Dean who reports their findings and recommendations to the school director. The school director responds in writing to the comments and recommendations and meets with the Dean to further discuss any outstanding issues.

C. Annual Feedback on Progress Toward Tenure

The school director, after consulting with unit faculty, is responsible for meeting with and providing feedback to each tenure-eligible faculty member about their professional development and progress toward earning tenure. These meetings will occur annually except in the first year and during the year in which the faculty member receives a formal probationary review (see next section). The school director will provide a written summary of the feedback to the faculty member. 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.

D. Probationary Review

All probationary faculty must receive a formal probationary review midway through their probationary period, which is typically in the third year of the probationary period (ACD 506-03). Where the progress toward tenure review looks forward, the Probationary Review is both an appraisal of progress to date and an assessment of one's trajectory toward promotion and tenure. The Probationary Review is similar to the Promotion and Tenure review except it does not require external letters. Reviewers at each level write formal, independent assessments. Upon completion of the probationary review, the dean will notify the school director whether the faculty member will be retained, retained conditionally, or given a terminal appointment for the succeeding year. Probationary Review materials for individuals recommended for a terminal appointment are forwarded to the Office of the Provost of the University for approval.

E. Annual Reviews for Faculty

The procedures for annual reviews of the NCIAS faculty follow from the policies outlined in ACD 506-10 and apply to all Faculty appointed with FTE 50% or greater.

1. It is the responsibility of every faculty member to have updated curriculum vitae from APARS/ASU Vita available by January 31st.
2. Annual review of faculty in NCIAS primarily takes place between the faculty member and the school director. While the summary evaluation is based on the previous three years of performance, special emphasis is placed on the previous year. Following the schedule provided by the college and the unit, NCIAS faculty members will provide their school directors with information and documentation about their teaching, research, and service accomplishments for the prior year and developmental goals for the coming year. In consultation with the school personnel committee, the school director will compose a narrative summary evaluating their accomplishments and assign the standard summary evaluation rating. Specific evaluations about teaching, research, or service expectations will be included with this summary. The summary and evaluation must be reviewed by the faculty member and the results by both parties before being forwarded to the Dean. Faculty may request a face-to-face meeting with the school director to discuss the summary results.
3. Annual Performance Review Evidence and Annual Performance Evaluations for Faculty shall include:
 - a) Updated Curriculum Vitae, and

- b) Documentation for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service activities as determined by each NCIAS School.

Faculty will be evaluated for each of the following areas in which they have assigned workload:

- a) excellence in teaching;
- b) excellence in scholarly and creative activity;
- c) excellence in service;

Proportionally to assigned workload, excellence in the above areas contributes to an evaluation of:

- d) excellence in overall performance.

4. Levels of Annual Performance Ratings: there shall be five levels for annual performance ratings

- a) Unsatisfactory performance – responsibilities of the position not fulfilled (1),
- b) Partially meets expectations (2)
- c) Meets expectations (3);
- d) Exceeds expectations (4);
- e) Exceeds expectations in a sustained and outstanding manner (5).

The ratings given tenured and tenure-eligible faculty and career track faculty measure performance in each area are based on the three most recent years of activity, with an emphasis on the past 12 months. For each rating level the expected quantity of work will be adjusted proportionally to assigned workload.

5. Definitions of Unsatisfactory Performance for tenure track/tenured faculty: Unsatisfactory performance in Teaching is demonstrated by a failure to meet the responsibilities expected in school policies with respect to instruction, mentoring, or supervision of students, including students' evaluations of instruction that indicate unsatisfactory performance on the

college instrument's rating scale and unsatisfactory performance identified from other evidence defined by the policies of the faculty member's school. Unsatisfactory performance in the area of Scholarship/Creative Activity shall consist of failure to meet the criteria of satisfactory performance in scholarship/creative activity as defined in school policy or a violation of the principles of academic integrity such as engaging in academic dishonesty by intentionally misappropriating the scholarly or creative activity of others. Unsatisfactory performance in the area of Service includes failure to meet the responsibilities of faculty governance, among other things it includes no evidence of service contributions as defined in a school's policy and consistently poor quality of contributions, as defined by school standards, in those activities an individual has agreed to perform.

6. If the faculty member does not agree with the Director's evaluation, the individual may appeal to the NCIAS Dean per ACD 506-10, whose decision is final. A faculty member must appeal the school director's evaluation within 30 working days (excluding summer) of receiving that evaluation.

7. Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and promotion decisions. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective and summative, whereas tenure and promotion reviews are prospective and summative.