

Guidance on Documenting Scholarly Activity

The table below sorts examples of scholarly activities into three columns.

- **Column 1: Direct Evidence** These activities provide clear, external validation of quality scholarship, thus they directly and unequivocally document scholarly activity as defined in Section I.
- **Column 2: Indirect Evidence** While still valued and encouraged by the Department, an activity from this list is less likely to merit consideration as a single product sufficient for documenting progression toward promotion or tenure. Faculty whose scholarship relies on activities in Column 2 should be prepared to provide significant, detailed justification of external validation and impact of those activities if they wish to present them as significant products for promotion or tenure.
- **Column 3: Scholarly Service** The third column presents activities that demonstrate a faculty member’s ability to apply scholarly knowledge within teaching or service experiences. An activity from this Column may be used to contextualize the breadth of a faculty member’s scholarship but does not typically merit consideration as a significant product sufficient for documenting progression towards promotion or tenure.

Direct Evidence	Indirect Evidence	Integrated Scholarly Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author or co-author of peer reviewed articles, including those in journals or proceedings of regional, national or international conferences or organizations • Author or co-author of professionally published monographs, book chapters, and textbooks • PI or significant co-PI on significant externally funded grants or contracts from state, regional or national agencies • Invited speaker for plenary presentations at national or international conferences • Principal participant in development of patented, commercialized, or otherwise externally validated software • Passing an actuarial exam at the fellow level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editor of a scholarly journal or academic press • Member of a review panel for regional or national grants • Presenter or co-presenter of posters, talks, seminars or workshops at regional, national or international meetings • Mentor for a student whose scholarship is published in a peer-reviewed medium • Reviewer or referee for a scholarly journal or academic press • Member of a regional, national or international committee related to the discipline • Author or co-author of self published materials with documented impact • PI or co-PI on well reviewed, unfunded significant grants • Passing an actuarial exam at the associate level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenter in a department colloquium • Officer or other leadership role in a regional, national or international professional organization • Senior personnel on grants or contracts • Mentor for students on honors theses, directed research, or capstone research projects • Consultant within or outside ASU • Author or co-author of articles in newsletters, weblogs of professional organizations, entries in encyclopedias

Faculty are encouraged to seek additional guidance on interpreting the items in this table from the Chair, who may consult with the Dean. As noted above, faculty whose scholarship relies in part on activities in Columns 2 or 3 should be prepared to provide significant, detailed justification of external validation and impact of those activities.

Meeting Expectations for Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Post-tenure Review:

Faculty seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor are strongly encouraged pursue activities listed in Column 1, meeting expectations by production of a minimum of four (4) artifacts prior to application. At reappointment, faculty should be prepared to document progress toward meeting this goal.

Faculty seeking *promotion to professor* must be outstanding in at least one of scholarship or service in addition to providing evidence of quality and effective teaching. To meet expectations in scholarship (below outstanding), these faculty should demonstrate continued accomplishments in research by producing at least two (2) additional artifacts from Column 1 in the 5 years leading up to requesting promotion to professor. For these faculty to be considered **exceeding expectations** or **outstanding** in the area of scholarship, the rubric below should be considered. In addition, faculty seeking promotion to professor should provide evidence that they have assumed a significant role in activities listed in Columns 2 and 3.

Faculty at the rank of associate professor (who do not seek promotion to professor) and professor are encouraged to continue to pursue an active scholarly agenda. Because senior faculty are expected to assume wider responsibility with service to the department, college, university, and discipline, faculty undergoing *post-tenure review* will meet department expectations on scholarship by documenting artifacts from Columns 2 and 3 and producing at least one (1) artifact from Column 1 in the five years preceding review.

Exceeding Expectations / Outstanding:

- Faculty who meet 150% of the minimums listed above will be considered to be exceeding expectations for scholarship.
- Faculty who meet 200% of the minimums listed above will be considered outstanding scholars.

Note on Collaborative or Interdisciplinary Scholarship:

The mathematical sciences disciplines lend themselves to collaboration within the field and also to participating in interdisciplinary scholarship with professionals in a broad range of related fields. The Department values such scholarly endeavors.

It is important that faculty engaging in activities that involve collaboration or in activities that are more customary in other fields be prepared to document the scope of their individual contributions and/or the significance of activities not common as products in the mathematical sciences.