

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: 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** (<https://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty-success/advancement/promotion-and-tenure>) which ensures that each step in the process has been completed and documented. Included in each package is the standard university **Coversheet** ([CoverSheetPT2014-2.pdf](#)).

The following provides guidance for the preparation of each candidate's promotion and tenure package.

Tab 1: PRS and VITA

Each candidate package forwarded must include the candidate's PRS(s) and an updated VITA prepared in accordance with college standards.

PRS: Include copies of current PRS and all prior PRS statements operative during the period of review.

VITA: The vita is a listing of the candidate's faculty activities and accomplishments put together by the candidate. (See [Faculty Handbook 5.3.1.1](#) for details on what to include.)

- The vita should be organized by standard categories and in reverse chronologic order (most recent items listed first).
- When listing publications, candidate should include 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 should indicate 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 ([FH5.2.4.2.6](#)).

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 Senior Vice President and Provost.

The Faculty Portfolio (Tab 2) is developed by the candidate with input and review from a mentor or senior faculty member, or by the department with involvement of the candidate. As the *Faculty Handbook* specifies, the portfolio should "provide a clear understanding of the candidate's accomplishments within scholarship and his or her 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" (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 responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service.
- Teaching materials must include, in tabular form, teaching evaluation data (i.e., student evaluations) 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 should 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 (FH5.2.4.2.6).

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 should provide 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 should be included in this level of review. Items that must be included in Tab 3 are:

- Brief summary of the departmental P&T evaluation process (including voting eligibility)
- Department P&T 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 college-level review of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure:

- College P&T 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) should be 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 (template available at <https://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty-success/advancement/promotion-and-tenure>) that lists name, title, and institution of each evaluator.

Must clarify which evaluators were suggested by candidate and which were suggested by 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 (sample available at <https://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty-success/advancement/promotion-and-tenure>).
- 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 or P&T committee chair should request from the candidate a list of potential evaluators. At the same time, the chair should also request a list of any individuals with potential conflicts of interest (dissertation advisor and committee members, post-doc advisors, co-authors, major collaborators, etc.) so that these individuals are not contacted as evaluators. 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 should NEVER have direct contact with external evaluators about the process.

Qualifications of External Evaluators

External evaluators should be well-known for their scholarship and should have a focus similar to that of the candidate. External evaluators may be selected for their expertise in scholarship of teaching and extension/professional practice as well as in scholarship of 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 should be from peer institutions or more prestigious institutions than ISU. If an evaluator is from a less prestigious institution, the department must provide an explanation 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 should be of a higher professorial rank than the candidate being reviewed. The majority of evaluators should be at the rank of full professor. Emeritus reviewers should be avoided, except in cases of disciplinary distinction.

If the department selects reviewers for promotion to full who were reviewers for promotion to associate, please indicate reasons for the repetition. Such repetition should be kept to a minimum

Letter and Materials Sent to External Evaluators

Material sent to external evaluators is developed by the department chair or department P&T review committee in consultation with the candidate. The following documents should be 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 ISU Faculty Handbook sections on P&T (available at <https://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty-success/advancement/promotion-and-tenure>)

The letter from the department 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 Provost Office's sample letters (see website), although the wording is flexible. The ISU P&T policy and process needs to be explained and a copy provided to the evaluators.

The department letter should clarify the time period under review. For tenure/promotion to associate, the focus should be on the last five years of work (at ISU or elsewhere). For promotion to full, the focus should be on accomplishments since appointment to associate professor (at ISU or elsewhere).

If a candidate for tenure has had an extension of the tenure clock, this should be noted to external evaluators. The letter should not provide a reason for the extension just the fact of the extension. It should be explained clearly that the extra time does NOT bring with it the expectation of additional accomplishments.

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