

## Process Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review: Preparation and Submission of Candidate Materials

Iowa State uses a five-tab format for submission of candidate materials throughout the promotion and tenure review process. The labels used are:

- Tab 1: Factual Information Summary, Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and VITA
- Tab 2: Documentation of candidate's scholarship and performance
- Tab 3: Department-level Evaluation
- Tab 4: College-level Evaluation
- Tab 5: External Letters

Each candidate's promotion and tenure package must be accompanied by a **Checklist** which ensures that each step in the process has been completed and documented. Included in each package is the standard university **Candidate Cover Sheet** and **Voting Record**. These materials are available on the [Promotion and Tenure Review website](#) under Forms and Materials for Promotion and Tenure Process. The following provides guidance for the preparation of each candidate's promotion and tenure package.

### Tab 1: Factual Information Summary, PRS and VITA

Each candidate package forwarded must include the Faculty Information Summary, all official PRS(s) and an updated VITA, prepared in accordance with college standards.

- Factual Information Summary, a quantitative summary that aims to present internal reviewers with a standard set of factual information relative to the candidate's activities during the review period. This document is not shared with external reviewers.
- PRS(s): Include copies of all of the candidate's official, signed PRS(s), including all PRSs operative during the review period. The current PRS must be signed and downloaded from Workday.
- VITA: A listing of the candidate's faculty activities and accomplishments put together by the candidate (See [Faculty Handbook 5.3.3.1.1](#) for details on what to include).
  - The vita is organized by standard categories and in reverse chronological order (most recent items listed first).
  - When listing publications, candidate includes page numbers for all items in print.
  - The candidate's role in any collaborations—whether teaching, grants, publications, or other activities—must be clearly explained.
  - If listing graduate students, candidate indicates graduation dates.

Materials in Tab 1 constitute part of the “factual record,” which the candidate reviews before it is forwarded to the college and the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost ([Faculty Handbook 5.2.4.2.6](#)).

### Tab 2: Documentation of Candidate’s Scholarship and Performance

This tab contains the Faculty Portfolio which is the candidate’s documentation of their scholarship and performance and its impact ([Faculty Handbook 5.3.2](#)). Material in this section can include **up to a maximum of 25 pages**. Candidates will be asked to prepare a more extensive portfolio, including primary materials, for use at the department and/or college level. Only the 25-page narrative is forwarded to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

The Faculty Portfolio (Tab 2) is developed by the candidate with input and review from a faculty mentor, or by the department with involvement of the candidate. As the *Faculty Handbook* specifies, the portfolio “provides a clear understanding of the candidate’s accomplishments within scholarship and their areas of faculty activities.” The portfolio must include “an overall statement of the candidate’s accomplishments in scholarship as they relate to teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice” ([Faculty Handbook 5.3.2](#)). The *Faculty Handbook* offers an extensive listing of items which may be reviewed or included in the portfolio. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost requires the following materials to be incorporated into the Faculty Portfolio (Tab 2):

- A statement of teaching philosophy
- A statement of research/creative activities accomplishments and future scholarly agenda.
- Evidence of performance of position responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service.
- Teaching materials must include, in tabular form, student ratings of teaching data with comparative department or college norms.

Organization of the candidate’s materials will vary depending on the position responsibilities and achievements of the candidate. Each college uses a college-specific standardized template for organization of materials in Tab 2. Candidates must consult with their department or college for updated information on this template.

The main goal of Tab 2 is to demonstrate impact. There are many excellent ways to demonstrate the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. Faculty Portfolios often include a table, summary, or detailed explanation of: grant activity, scholarly impact, synergy among various responsibilities, future plans, courses taught each semester with enrollment numbers, peer evaluation of teaching, and/or collaborations with students. The candidate’s role in any collaborations—whether teaching, grants, publications, or other activities—must be clearly explained.

Material in Tab 2 constitutes part of the “factual record” which the candidate reviews before it is forwarded to the college and the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost ([Faculty Handbook 5.2.4.2.6](#)).

### Tab 3: Department-level Evaluation

Department-level review of each candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure is an extremely important and a required component of the process. The departmental review provides an assessment of the candidate's performance and impact based on their position responsibilities, the criteria articulated in the Faculty Handbook, and disciplinary expectations. The local mechanism and procedures for this review are described in the departmental governance document and may vary from department to department. The [Faculty Handbook 5.2.4.2](#) describes what is included in this level of review. Items that must be included in Tab 3 are:

- Brief summary of the departmental promotion and tenure evaluation process (including voting eligibility)
- Department promotion and tenure committee recommendation and vote (if part of the department procedures)
- Department faculty recommendation and vote (if part of the department procedures)
- Recommendation and vote from other program(s) or department(s) for candidates with a formal joint appointment. Check with colleges for specific process.
- Department Chair's recommendation and vote, separate from the department recommendation or vote.

The Department Chair may draw from annual performance evaluation reports and preliminary (i.e., third-year) review reports to clarify faculty member's prior evaluation.

### Tab 4: College-level Evaluation

College-level evaluations provide an independent analysis and interpretation of a candidate's record, not a restatement and summary of department input. [Faculty Handbook 5.2.4.3](#) describes the components to be included in the college-level review of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure:

- College promotion and tenure committee recommendation and vote
- Dean's Cabinet recommendation and vote (if applicable)
- Dean's recommendation

A brief summary of the college evaluation process (including voting eligibility) is provided.

### Tab 5: External Evaluations

Vital to any promotion and tenure review is the assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and impact by eminent scholars in the candidate's discipline who are external to Iowa State. Tab 5 must include the following documents related to this external evaluation:

- Log of External Letters that lists name, title, and institution of each evaluator; a template is available under the heading, [Forms and Materials for Promotion and Tenure Process](#). The template must clarify which evaluators were suggested by candidate the department (chair/committee).
- Very brief summary statement of each reviewers' qualifications. **Do not attach CVs.**

- Copy of departmental letter sent to external reviewers requesting their evaluation. A sample letter may be found under the heading, [Forms and Materials for Promotion and Tenure Process](#).
- Copies of all letters received from external evaluators.

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that six (6) letters maximum may be submitted with the promotion and tenure dossier. Four (4) letters are usually not enough and may have an adverse impact on assessment of the candidate's case.

### *Selection of External Evaluators*

The department chair or promotion and tenure committee chair requests a list of potential evaluators from the candidate. At the same time, the department chair or promotion and tenure committee chair also requests a list of any individuals with potential conflicts of interest (e.g., dissertation advisor and committee members, post-doc advisors, co-authors, major collaborators, etc.) so that these individuals are not contacted as evaluators. For additional information, review [Guidelines for Determining Conflicts of Interest in Faculty Review Processes](#).

The department chair has the responsibility to check that those solicited to write evaluations are not major collaborators (now or in past) and have appropriate credentials and positions. It is the department chair's job to assess the appropriateness of the nominated evaluators. A candidate is NEVER to have direct contact with external evaluators about the process.

### *Qualifications of External Evaluators*

External evaluators are well-known for their scholarship and have a focus similar to that of the candidate. External evaluators may be selected for their expertise in scholarship of teaching, extension/professional practice, and research. In some cases, an evaluator may only be able to speak to a portion of the candidate's scholarly record. The majority of evaluators are from peer institutions or more prestigious institutions than Iowa State. If an evaluator is from a less prestigious institution, the department must provide an explanation as to why this individual was chosen. While evaluators are usually academics, it may be appropriate to draw occasionally from industry and government, again explaining the rationale for this choice.

External evaluators are of a higher professorial rank than the candidate being reviewed. The majority of evaluators are at the rank of Professor. Emeritus reviewers are avoided, except in cases of disciplinary distinction. If the department selects reviewers for promotion to professor who were reviewers for promotion to associate, please indicate reasons for the repetition. Such repetition is kept to a minimum.

### *Letter and Materials Sent to External Evaluators*

Material sent to external evaluators is developed by the department chair or department promotion and tenure review committee chair, in consultation with the candidate. The following documents are sent:

- Candidate's PRS

- Candidate's VITA
- Faculty Portfolio (Tab 2) (or some shorter candidate statement)
- A sample of scholarly products (from the period under review)
- Excerpts from the Iowa State Faculty Handbook sections on promotion and tenure are available under the heading, [Forms and Materials for Promotion and Tenure Process](#).

The department letter to the external evaluators must be completely neutral about the quality of the candidate's work. The department letter to evaluators needs to include all of the categories of information included in the [sample letters to external evaluators](#), although the wording is flexible. The Iowa State promotion and tenure policy and process needs to be explained and a copy provided to the evaluators.

The department letter clarifies the time period under review. For promotion and tenure to Associate Professor, the focus is on the last five years of work (at Iowa State or elsewhere). For promotion to Professor, the focus is on the body of work (at Iowa State or elsewhere).

If a candidate for tenure was granted a tenure-clock extension(s), this is noted to external evaluators. The letter does not provide a reason for the extension(s), just the fact that an extension(s) was/were granted. It is explained clearly that the extra time does NOT bring with it the expectation of additional accomplishments. Standards regarding what constitutes a record deserving of tenure are not raised to adjust for a tenure-clock extension of any length.

There is no requirement that external evaluators comment on whether or not the candidate would be tenured and/or promoted at their institutions.

*Revised June 2024*