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I. Initial Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments

Some initial appointments at Iowa State University in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will be at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure. Such appointments will have continuous contracts with all the responsibilities and privileges of tenured faculty. Appointments to tenured positions are made only when consistent with the approved Notice of Vacancy and with the explicit approval of both the dean and the provost. Furthermore, all candidates for a tenured position must meet with both the dean and the provost during the on-campus interview.

The majority of initial appointments will be “tenure-eligible” term appointments, most often at the rank of assistant professor. Assistant professors will generally receive initial tenure-eligible term appointments for four years, with the possibility of renewal for another three years. The combined seven-year period is referred to as the full probationary period. Occasionally, initial appointments will be at the rank of associate professor or professor without tenure. These initial tenure-eligible appointments will also be for a specified term, which will constitute the probationary period.

II. Time Line for the Probationary Period and Probationary Reviews

Most new faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are hired as assistant professors in tenure-eligible term appointment. The purpose of the full probationary period is to provide sufficient opportunity for the candidate to achieve the credentials required for promotion and tenure. The length of the full probationary period is specified in the Letter of Intent at the time of the initial appointment. Unless prior work at another university is formally credited on the Letter of Intent (LOI), the full probationary period is seven years (the probationary period can be extended under some exceptional and documented circumstances, as specified in the university’s Faculty Handbook). This seven-year period is split into two contracts, the initial probationary contract, generally for four years, and the renewal probationary contract, generally for three additional years.

In addition to annual written reviews from the department chair, probationary faculty members will be formally reviewed in the penultimate year of their initial probationary contract (generally the third year of the initial four-year probationary appointment). One purpose of this review is to provide constructive and developmental feedback to probationary faculty members. A second purpose is to inform the decision of whether or not to reappoint the faculty member for the second term of his or her probationary period; consequently, this review is often referred to as the contract-renewal or preliminary review. Renewal of the probationary contract is dependent on a positive preliminary review.
If the outcome of the preliminary review is negative, the faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her penultimate year of the initial probationary contract that his or her contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming and last year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. If the outcome of the preliminary review is positive, the faculty member will be awarded a contract for a second probationary term (generally three years) that will extend to the end of the full probationary period. Faculty members whose probationary contracts are renewed will receive a promotion and tenure review in the penultimate year of this second contract. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

The exact length of first-term and second-term probationary contracts and the timing of the preliminary review vary somewhat depending on whether or not the faculty member is formally credited for work at prior universities, as documented on the LOI. The following subsections describe the lengths of probationary contracts and the timing of the preliminary review given different amounts of time formally credited on the LOI.

**A. Time Line for Faculty Members Receiving No Credit for Prior Work**

The initial probationary contract for new tenure-eligible assistant professors who do not formally receive credit for prior work at another university will be for four years. These probationary faculty members will be formally reviewed in the third year of their initial four-year probationary contract. If the outcome of this review is negative, the faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her third year of the initial probationary contract that their contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming fourth year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. If the outcome of the preliminary review is positive, the faculty member will be awarded a contract for a second probationary period of three years. The faculty member would receive a promotion and tenure review in the second year of the second probationary contract (sixth year at ISU). A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (seventh year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

**B. Time Line for Faculty Members Receiving One Year Credit for Prior Work**

For faculty members who formally receive one year of credit for prior work at other universities, the initial probationary period will be for four years and the contract renewal review will occur during their third year of employment at ISU. If the outcome of this review is negative, the faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her third year of service that their initial probationary contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming fourth year of the initial
appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. This is exactly the same time line as for faculty not receiving credit for prior work. The one year of credit is given in the second term of the probationary period. Consequently, faculty members who receive one year of credit and have a favorable preliminary review will receive a two-year contract for the second term of their probationary period, reflecting the one year of credit on the tenure clock that they received. The promotion and tenure review for these faculty members will occur during their fifth year at ISU. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (sixth year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

C. Time Line for Faculty Members Receiving Two Years Credit for Prior Work

For faculty members who formally receive two years of credit for prior work at other universities, the initial probationary period will be for three years and the contract renewal review will occur during their second year of employment at ISU. The research programs of faculty members given two years of credit will be sufficiently mature to justify review in the second year of employment at ISU. If the outcome of this review is negative, the faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her second year of service that their initial probationary contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming third year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. For these faculty members, a favorable preliminary review will result in a two-year contract for the second term of their probationary period. The promotion and tenure review for these faculty members will occur during their fourth year at ISU. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (fifth year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

D. Time Line for Faculty Members Receiving Three or More Years Credit for Prior Work

Faculty members who receive three or more years of credit will receive one contract for the entire probationary period, and there will be no preliminary/contract renewal review. The promotion and tenure review for these faculty members will occur in the penultimate year of their single contract for the entire probationary period. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the probationary contract becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.
III. General Policies Governing Preliminary Reviews

Preliminary reviews and decisions about contract renewal are based primarily on performance in scholarship and in any assigned position responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and/or institutional service. A faculty member is expected to perform effectively in all areas of professional activity and to uphold the values and follow the guidelines of professional ethics from the university and the discipline. In addition, a faculty member is expected to establish a foundation and trajectory in scholarship during the first probationary period that, if continued, should lead to documented excellence in scholarship at the time of the promotion and tenure review.

A key tool in the preliminary review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (1) teaching, (2) research/creative activities, (3) extension/professional practice, and (4) institutional service. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member's scholarly achievements. The PRS should reflect any commitments to interdisciplinary programs, and the preliminary evaluation should assess the full range of the faculty member's contributions to the university, including contributions to interdisciplinary programs.

Preliminary reviews are initiated in the tenure-home department. Each department must have a governance document that details the process for conducting preliminary reviews in the department. Generally, the processes for preliminary reviews in the department parallel those for promotion and tenure reviews; however, external referees are not solicited or used for preliminary reviews. In most departments, an elected review committee oversees the review and recommendation process at the departmental level. In most departments, the full eligible faculty votes on the departmental recommendation. For preliminary reviews, the eligible faculty is comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department. The department chair makes a separate administrative recommendation, and the recommendations of the department and the department chair are forwarded to the college.

To avoid undue or unfair influence, each eligible faculty member may vote on a preliminary review case only once. Specifically, under this policy: (1) if a faculty member votes on a preliminary review decision as a member of a departmental review committee, that faculty member may not vote again on the same decision at the departmental, college, or other levels. (A number of possibilities are offered in the university policy, but the college recommends that the P&T committee present the case to the voting faculty without a recommendation, which would be the equivalent of a vote. This procedure preserves the right of committee members to vote with the rest of the eligible voting faculty in the department.) (2) Since the chair of the department independently evaluates preliminary review decisions, he or she may not also vote on the decision at the departmental faculty, college, or other levels. (3) Administrators participating in a preliminary decision may only participate at one level and are allowed
to vote only once on the decision, which would be at the level appropriate for their administrative rank.

IV. The Departmental Preliminary Review Policy Document

University and college policies require each department to have a document that sets forth the standards and procedures governing preliminary reviews of faculty within the department. The departmental document must specify the criteria used to judge or determine the candidate’s effectiveness in position responsibilities and the quality of scholarship in the relevant areas defined by the PRS. Criteria for satisfactory institutional service must also be specified. The departmental standards may exceed those of the college or university, provided that they do not conflict with either.

The departmental document on preliminary reviews must be consistent with the university and college policies and procedures. In particular, the departmental document must be consistent with the university’s recently adopted policy of prohibiting eligible faculty members from voting more than once in any review.

The departmental document must specify the procedures the department faculty used to arrive at the departmental recommendation regarding contract renewal. (Throughout this document, the “departmental recommendation” refers to the contract renewal recommendation that results from faculty evaluation at the departmental level. In addition, the department chair provides his or her recommendation to the Dean.)

The departmental document must, at a minimum, specify the following with respect to the department's preliminary review procedures:

- The process under which a review may be postponed based on exceptional and documented circumstances.
- The composition and means of selection of the departmental review committee and of any other department committees that may be involved in the review process, including any quorum and voting requirements.
- The role of the department chair in the department's preliminary review process.
- The procedures established to ensure that there is only one vote for each eligible faculty member at the department level.
- The definition of conflict of interest operative in departmental review.
- The procedures to be followed by the departmental review committee and related committees in conducting the reviews.
- The types and sources of information that the departmental review committee will consider in conducting its review.
- The means by which persons being considered submit information and documentation for the review process at the departmental level.
- The definition of the factual information in the dossier subject to review by the faculty member before it is advanced from the department.
- The procedures for handling discussions and votes in instances of multiple candidates for promotion and/or tenure.
• The procedures for reviewing and modifying the departmental document.
• The procedures for communicating review results.

The departmental document must be approved by the tenured and probationary faculty of the department, by the Dean of the college, and by the Provost. If the Dean does not approve a departmental document as submitted by a department, the Dean will communicate with the department chair and with the departmental faculty concerning any changes the Dean considers necessary to gain approval.

V. Departmental and Department Chair Recommendations

The departmental review committee reports the departmental recommendation to the department chair in writing, including all formal votes. The department chair writes a separate letter of recommendation that may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation, and the departmental review committee shall be informed of the department chair's recommendation. The department chair will forward his or her recommendation and rationale to the college, along with the departmental recommendation and report, for all preliminary reviews.

Recommendations will generally fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Renew contract for second probationary term with no reservations or concerns.
2. Renew contract for second probationary term with reservations and identify areas requiring remediation.
3. Do not renew the contract for a second probationary term, with reasons specified.

VI. Supporting Documentation for Departmental Recommendations

For purposes of review of departmental and department chair recommendations at the college and university levels, the current LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, which is available on the college’s web site or by request, must be used in constructing preliminary review dossiers. Use of this template will ensure that critical information is included and that the dossier conforms to college and university expectations.

VII. College Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities

The continued growth and well-being of the college and the university require that faculty members faithfully and competently execute their position responsibilities. Consequently, effective performance in all position responsibilities, as defined in a faculty member’s PRS, is a requirement for contract renewal. All faculty members should have responsibilities in the area of institutional service. Indeed, the principle of faculty governance rests squarely on the expectation for faculty participation on department, college, and/or university committees, task forces, etc. For tenure eligible faculty, institutional service will most likely occur at the department level. Nearly all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members in this college have responsibilities for research and
creative activities that further discovery and generation of new knowledge in the college and university. Most faculty members also have significant teaching responsibilities, which are critical for the university to fulfill its teaching mission. Finally, some faculty members also have extension/professional practice responsibilities, consistent with the university’s “science with practice” orientation and its land-grant university mission.

The following sub-sections outline expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of effective performance within each domain of position responsibilities. Required documentation within each area of position responsibilities is specified in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template.

A. Teaching

Teaching and advising are scholarly and dynamic endeavors that cover a broad range of activities, and most faculty members have significant teaching and advising responsibilities. For these faculty members, the quality of their teaching and advising is a major factor in evaluating their overall performance in position responsibilities.

Each department is expected to utilize an appropriate method of general and continuing review of the teaching effectiveness of its faculty members. Although the evaluation of teaching may differ somewhat across disciplines, student evaluations of instructors and peer evaluations of instructors, based on classroom observations, must be part of the evaluation of teaching in all instances. Similarly, evaluation of the candidate's advising performance should be based on parallel methods of review. In addition, contributions to the curriculum (e.g., development of new courses, new materials for courses, etc.) should also be noted. The methods chosen by the department, including student evaluations, peer evaluations based on classroom observations, and contributions to the curriculum should be clearly described in the departmental document.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, the department is expected not only to summarize its evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance but also to submit documentation supporting the evaluation. This documentation should include evidence of student learning, including student and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness, and information relevant to curricular development. The methods used to evaluate teaching effectiveness should be documented and compared to departmental norms. Note that achievements in the scholarship of teaching is addressed in Section VIII of this document.

B. Research or Creative Activities.

Nearly all faculty members are expected to engage in research/creative activities that make original contributions to their chosen area of specialization. All faculty with research responsibilities in their PRS are expected to be fully engaged in the discovery/creativity process as evidenced by production of research/creative products that are respected by their peers and through the supervision of student
research/creative work. Faculty with position responsibilities in research/creative activities are also expected to make efforts to secure external funding to support their research.

Generally, achievements in research and creative activities will be evaluated under scholarship (see Section VIII of this document).

**C. Extension or Professional Practice.**

Some faculty members in the college have position responsibilities in extension/professional practice. These faculty members often have a portion of their appointment in extension or have significant responsibilities to utilize their professional expertise to help improve the knowledge and skills of clients outside the university, or the environment in which their clients live and work. Examples of these activities include teaching extension courses; preparing informational and instructional materials; conducting workshops and conferences; consulting with public and private groups; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; and participating in activities that involve professional expertise for appropriate technical and professional associations. These activities may be local, regional, national, or international in scope.

A departmental evaluation of effectiveness in extension/professional practice should include an assessment of the quantity and quality of the candidate’s extension and/or professional practice activities. Documentation supporting a departmental evaluation of a candidate’s contributions in this area should include a description of the activities, the materials relevant to these activities, and a detailed assessment of the quality of the contributions and the level of professional expertise and impact demonstrated by the candidate, as described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template. Scholarship of extension and/or professional practice is addressed in Section VIII.

**D. Institutional Service.**

While service contributions cannot be the sole basis for a promotion and/or tenure recommendation, every faculty member is expected to be involved in institutional service, and each promotion and tenure recommendation must provide evidence of such contributions. As noted earlier, the principle of faculty governance rests squarely on the expectation for faculty participation on department, college, and/or university committees, task forces, etc.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, documentation should include an enumeration of department, college, and university committee memberships and chairships, as well as administrative assignments. It is critical that an assessment of the quality as well as the quantity of the service activities of a candidate be included in the departmental evaluation and recommendation. Although
all faculty members should have some institutional service assignments, it is understood that the service commitments of probationary faculty in their first term will be modest and occur primarily at the departmental level.

VIII. College Expectations for Scholarship

Contract renewal decisions are based primarily on evidence of a foundation and trajectory in scholarship that would predict the achievement of excellence in scholarship by the time of the promotion and tenure review. Scholarship may occur in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Although the nature and evidence of scholarship varies somewhat across these scholarly domains and across departments in the college, there are at least three common features of all types of scholarship. A critical feature of all scholarship is that it produces products, often referred to as intellectual property, that are shared with appropriate audiences as journal articles, book chapters, books, exhibits, software programs, musical scores, professional presentations, etc. A second important feature of all scholarship is that it is subject to “peer review,” a critical evaluation of the product by those qualified to judge it. Finally, scholarship demonstrates a solid foundation in one’s field and original contributions to that field.

Because expectations for the type, level, and amount of scholarship varies across departments in the college, evaluation of a candidate’s scholarship should be based on the candidate's performance relative to his or her PRS and the standards and goals of the relevant department, as stated in the approved departmental document. However, in all cases, college and university minimum expectations for scholarship must be met or exceeded.

The following sub-sections outline expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of scholarship performed substantially at ISU within each professional domain (this would include books and other major works based on the dissertation but written at ISU). Required documentation within each area of scholarship is specified in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template.

A. Scholarship of Teaching.

Nearly all faculty members have teaching and advising responsibilities, and some faculty members will also produce scholarship in the area of teaching and advising. Scholarship of teaching focuses on the discovery of knowledge about teaching and learning in higher education. Scholarship of teaching generates products that are appropriately shared with professional audiences, and it must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. Scholarship of teaching products often include research on teaching, learning, and outcomes assessment/program evaluation; textbooks and other curricular materials; and innovative teaching methods that have been appropriately evaluated. The most common forms of dissemination for scholarship of teaching would be through refereed journals, scholarly books and
chapters, text books and chapters, and professional presentations and workshops. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the teaching scholarship of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. Additional indicators of the quality of teaching scholarship may include reviews and/or adoptions of the candidate's research, curricular materials, and text books, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship of teaching under some circumstances.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, the department is expected not only to summarize the candidate’s contributions to the scholarship of teaching, but to also address the quality and impact of this work. Unlike promotion and tenure reviews, preliminary reviews should not solicit or use external referees.

**B. Scholarship of Research or Creative Activities.**

Faculty members who engage in research/creative activities are expected to make original contributions to discovery/creativity in their chosen area of specialization, and to disseminate those contributions through appropriate methods. Documentation supporting a departmental evaluation of a candidate's research or creative scholarship will vary among the different departments. In most disciplines within the College, evidence of research primarily consists of publications in refereed journals, scholarly books, monographs, and chapters in scholarly books. External funding to support research and creative activities is important in all disciplines, and it is a very high priority for the sciences.

Other forms of dissemination of research results include oral presentations of such work to the academic community at other universities and at regional, national, and international meetings and seminars. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the scholarly work of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputations. In areas such as the arts, public performances and exhibitions are appropriate channels for the demonstration of creative activity. Additional indicators of the quality of the research or creative activity may include reviews of the candidate's papers, books, performances and exhibitions, and summary figures showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship in the area of research or creative activity under some circumstances.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, the department is expected not only to summarize the candidate’s contributions to research and creative scholarship, but to also address the quality and impact of this work. Unlike promotion and tenure reviews, preliminary reviews should not solicit or use external referees.
C. Extension and/or Professional Practice.

Because Iowa State University is a land-grant university with a focus on science with practice, some faculty are actively engaged in the scholarship of extension/professional practice. Scholarship of extension/professional practice focuses on the discovery of knowledge that informs practitioners in the faculty member’s discipline (e.g., development of new diagnostic or treatment techniques), has direct applications to policy or practice in the public or private sectors of the community, and/or informs methods for developing and optimally distributing and evaluating methods of bringing information to the public. Scholarship of extension/professional practice generates products that are appropriately shared with professional and public audiences. Scholarship of extension/professional practice must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. Scholarship of extension/professional practice products often include research on applications of science to public policy and everyday problems in the community, development of new public or commercial products, and development of new methods for the exchange of information with the community. Often, a program evaluation component is associated with such products. The most common forms of dissemination for scholarship of extension/professional practice would be through refereed journals; scholarly books and chapters; professional presentations and workshops; and expert testimony and technical reports for judicial, public, and/or private entities. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the extension/professional practice scholarship of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. Additional indicators of the quality of extension/professional practice scholarship may include reviews and/or adoptations of the candidate's research, public policy recommendations, extension or workshop materials, and books, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship of extension/professional practice under some circumstances.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, the department is expected not only to summarize the candidate’s contributions to the scholarship of extension/professional practice, but to also address the quality and impact of this work. Unlike promotion and tenure reviews, preliminary reviews should not solicit or use external referees.

IX. College Review

Based on a thorough review of the departmental recommendation, department chair recommendation, and all supporting documentation, the Dean will make a decision about contract renewal. This decision may or may not agree with the recommendations from the department and the chair. The Dean will communicate his or her decision to the department chair in writing. If the Dean’s decision differs from the recommendations
from the department and chair, his or her rationale for the different judgment will be included in the written notification to the chair.

X. Informing the Candidates

Each candidate for contract renewal will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2 of the Preliminary Review Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate. The department chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the college before the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for renewal by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.

After receiving the Dean’s decision, the department chair will write a letter to the faculty member communicating the outcome of the preliminary review. The letter will clearly state the decision regarding contract renewal and the reasons for that decision. If the contract will be renewed, the letter will also provide suggestions for improvement in preparation for the later promotion and tenure review. The Dean will be copied on this letter. For contract renewals, a new Letter of Intent for the second term of the probationary period will be attached to the copy of the chair’s letter that is forwarded to the college. For negative decisions, the chair’s letter will clearly communicate that the contract will not be renewed and that the remaining year on the active contract will be the candidates last year of employment at ISU. The chair should also inform the eligible voting faculty of the outcome of the review.

XI. Materials Forwarded by the College to the Provost

The Dean will communicate the review decision and forward to the Provost the complete Preliminary Review Dossier and a copy of the letter from the chair to the candidate communicating the outcome of the review to the candidate.

XII. Timeline for Review Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to March 31</td>
<td>Department conducts preliminary review of candidate according to department, college, and university policy, and communicates the departmental and chair’s recommendations to the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Departmental recommendation, chair’s recommendation, and complete dossier are submitted to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22</td>
<td>Dean communicates college decision to chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>Department chair communicates outcome of review to candidate, per Section X of this document, copying Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Required materials are forwarded to the Provost, per Section XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of this document.