Policies and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure  
In the College Of Liberal Arts And Sciences  
(Approved March 5, 2008)

This document is consistent with the policies and procedures of the university and elaborates on the promotion and tenure (P&T) policies and procedures that are specific to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The university policies and procedures for promotion and tenure are stated in the current Faculty Handbook, which is available on the Web.

The first section of this document presents the college’s promotion and tenure policies. The second section describes the departmental promotion and tenure document and the third section specifies some departmental procedures. Sections IV and V pertain to recommendations from the department and present guidelines for documentation in support of those recommendations. Expectations and evaluations at the college level are described in Sections VI and VII. The last section specifies when and by whom candidates are informed about the recommendations that pertain to them. Appended to this document are important policies and guidelines for evaluating faculty with formal joint appointments in an interdisciplinary program.

I. College Promotion and Tenure Policies

As stated in the university policy on promotion and tenure, evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires excellence in scholarship that establishes the person as a significant contributor to their field with potential for national distinction, as demonstrated by the candidate’s quantity and quality of scholarship, trajectory of scholarship, and evidence of increasing national stature based on scholarship. Promotion to professor requires national distinction in scholarship, as documented by the candidate’s record of scholarship and wide acknowledgement for outstanding contributions to the field.

Faculty members are also evaluated in all areas of assigned responsibilities, including institutional service. Effectiveness in all areas of position responsibilities and behavior that is consistent with the values, guidelines, and professional ethics of the university and the candidate's discipline is required for promotion to any rank. In addition, satisfactory institutional service is required for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and significant institutional service is required for promotion to professor.

A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual's current position responsibilities 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 P&T evaluation should assess the full range of the faculty member's contributions to the university, including contributions to interdisciplinary programs.

Promotion in academic rank is awarded on the basis of achievements appropriate to the advanced rank. Satisfactory performance at one rank is not a sufficient basis for promotion; such performance must be accompanied by growth of the individual to the performance level of the higher rank. The level of performance sufficient to justify tenure will correspond to that expected for the rank of associate professor, and the granting of tenure will ordinarily accompany promotion to that rank.

An individual recommended for promotion to the rank of associate professor typically will be in the sixth year of the probationary period, and an individual recommended for promotion to the rank of full professor typically will have spent five or more years at the rank of associate professor. Such periods of time in rank are necessary for most faculty members to demonstrate that the requirements for promotion to the higher rank have been met, but do not preclude earlier promotions. Neither Iowa State University nor the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences require a minimum length of time in rank prior to promotion.

To avoid undue or unfair influence, each eligible faculty member may vote on a P&T case only once. Specifically, under this policy: (1) if a faculty member votes on a P&T decision as a member of a departmental P&T 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) If a faculty member votes in a P&T decision at the departmental level, that faculty member may not vote again on the decision at the college or other levels. (If on the college P&T committee, that faculty member would abstain on cases from his or her own department.) (3) Since the chair of the department independently evaluates P&T decisions, he or she may not also vote on the decision at the departmental faculty, college, or other levels. (4) Administrators participating in a P&T 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.
II. The Departmental P&T Policy Document

University and college policies require each department to have a document that sets forth the standards and procedures governing promotion and tenure of faculty within the department. The departmental document must specify the criteria used to judge excellence or national distinction in scholarship and effectiveness in position responsibilities. Criteria for satisfactory and significant 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 promotion and tenure must be consistent with university and college promotion and tenure policies and procedures. In particular, the departmental document must require a vote of the eligible voting faculty in the department (faculty holding rank above the candidate’s current rank) and be consistent with the university's recently adopted policy of prohibiting eligible faculty members from voting more than once on any P&T case.

The departmental document must specify the procedures the department faculty used to arrive at the departmental recommendation for promotion and tenure. (Throughout this document, the "departmental recommendation" refers to the promotion and/or tenure recommendation that results from faculty evaluation at the departmental level. In addition, the department chair provides his or her recommendations to the Dean.)

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

- The process and circumstances under which a review may be postponed.
- The composition and means of selection of the departmental promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure 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 obtaining external evaluations used by the department in evaluating the performance of candidates.
• 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.

III. Departmental and Department Chair Recommendations

The departmental promotion and tenure committee reports the departmental recommendation to the department chair in writing, including all formal votes. A formal vote of the eligible voting faculty (EVF) in the department is required by the college. It is recommended that the department promotion and tenure not vote as a committee so that the members of the committee may participate in the vote of the EVF. If the committee does vote or make a formal recommendation to the faculty prior to the EVF vote, then the committee members may not participate in the EVF vote, consistent with university policy against double voting. 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 include his or her recommendation and letter, along with the departmental recommendation and report, in all cases that are forwarded to the college. Cases shall be forwarded to the college for review if one or more of the conditions below are met:

1. the review is mandatory, regardless of whether the recommendations at the department level were positive or negative. (A mandatory tenure decision is required for any tenure-track faculty member who is in the penultimate year of the probationary period, as specified in the individual’s letter of intent; such a person must either be granted tenure or placed on a terminal appointment.)

2. the review is elective and there is a positive recommendation from the department and/or the department chair, unless the candidate withdraws.

3. the review is elective and the candidate requests that the dossier be forwarded despite negative recommendations from both the departmental committee and the department chair.
IV. Documentation of Departmental Recommendations

For purposes of review of departmental and department chair recommendations at the college and university levels, the current LAS P&T Dossier Template, which is available on the college’s web site or by request, must be used in constructing promotion and tenure dossiers. Use of this template will ensure that critical information is included and that the dossier conforms to college and university expectations.

V. 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 effectively execute their position responsibilities. Consequently, demonstrated effectiveness in all areas of position responsibilities, as defined in a faculty member’s PRS, is a requirement for promotion to any rank. In addition, satisfactory institutional service is a requirement for promotion to associate professor, and significant institutional service is required for promotion to professor. All faculty members have position 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. 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 mission.

The following sub-sections outline expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of effectiveness within each professional domain. Required documentation within each area of position responsibilities is specified in the LAS P&T 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, major overhauls of outdated courses, and other curriculum management initiatives) should also be noted. The assessment methods chosen by the department, including student evaluations, peer evaluations based on classroom observations, and evaluation of pedagogical contributions, should be clearly described in the departmental document.

As described in the LAS P&T 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 materials such as teaching philosophy, teaching materials, evidence of student learning, and student and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The methods used to evaluate teaching effectiveness should be documented and compared to departmental norms. Scholarship of teaching is addressed in Section VI 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 evaluated and valued by their peers within and outside the university 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, and excellence in scholarship is a requirement for promotion and/or tenure (see Section VI 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 or 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, 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 P&T Dossier Template. Scholarship of extension and/or professional practice is evaluated in Section VI.

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. Satisfactory institutional service is required for promotion to associate professor, and significant institutional service is required for promotion to professor. Satisfactory institutional service is usually demonstrated by competently discharged duties as a member of major departmental committees, although some assistant professors may also serve on college and university committees. Significant institutional service is demonstrated by effective performance as a member and chair of major committees in the department and at the college and/or university level.

As described in the LAS P&T 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.

VI. College Expectations for Scholarship

Promotion and Tenure evaluations are based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. A faculty member’s scholarship may be in one or more of these domains; there is no requirement for scholarship in more than one domain. Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires excellence in
scholarship that establishes the person as a significant contributor to their field with potential for national distinction, as demonstrated by the candidate’s quantity and quality of scholarship, trajectory of scholarship, and evidence of increasing national stature based on scholarship. Promotion to professor requires national distinction in scholarship, as documented by the candidate’s record of scholarship and wide recognition for outstanding contributions to the field.

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 a product, often referred to as intellectual property, which is shared with appropriate audiences (e.g., as a journal article, book chapter, book, exhibit, software program, musical score, professional presentation, 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 within each professional domain. Required documentation within each area of scholarship is specified in the LAS P&T Dossier Template. Again, scholarship is not required in more than one domain, so “not applicable” can simply be listed under any domain in which the candidate has not produced scholarship.

A. Scholarship of Teaching.

Nearly all faculty members have teaching and advising responsibilities and must demonstrate effectiveness in this area because of the centrality of teaching to the university’s mission, as described in Section V. Some faculty will also produce scholarship in the area of teaching and advising, which focuses on the discovery of knowledge about teaching and learning in higher education. Scholarship of teaching generates products that are appropriately shared with academic and/or educational audiences. Scholarship of teaching 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 books, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may provide additional evidence for scholarship of teaching and/or its visibility and impact under some circumstances, depending on the nature of selection, participation, and products produced.

If the candidate’s dossier includes scholarship of teaching, 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, as described in the LAS P&T Dossier Template. This evaluation should draw heavily on external reviews of the candidate’s work.

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 scholarly products 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 provide additional evidence for scholarship of research/creative activity and/or its visibility and impact under some circumstances, depending on the nature of selection, participation, and products produced.
If the candidate’s dossier includes scholarship of research or creative activity, the department is expected not only to summarize the candidate’s contributions to the scholarship in this area, but to also address the quality and impact of this work, as described in the LAS P&T Dossier Template. This evaluation should draw heavily on external reviews of the candidate’s work.

C. Scholarship of Extension and/or Professional Practice.

Because Iowa State University is a land-grant university with a focus on science with practice, a number of 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 practices 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 and 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 adoptions 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 provide additional evidence for scholarship of extension/professional practice and/or its visibility and impact under some circumstances, depending on the nature of selection, participation, and products produced.

If the candidate’s dossier includes scholarship of extension or professional practice, the department is expected not only to summarize the candidate’s contributions to the scholarship in this area, but to also address the quality and impact of this work, as described in the LAS P&T Dossier Template. This evaluation should draw heavily on external reviews of the candidate’s work.
VII. College Level Review

The mandate given the LAS College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee by the LAS Representative Assembly is as follows:

The committee shall concern itself with general modes and procedures for faculty promotions and tenure, and act as a review and advisory panel to the Dean on departmental promotion and tenure recommendations. It will not be as a P&T appellate committee for individual faculty members. (Approved by Representative Assembly, October 12, 1977.)

The LAS P&T Committee is comprised of six professors, two from each of the college’s three divisions (humanities, sciences, and social sciences). The Executive Committee of the LAS Representative Assembly is responsible for identifying candidates for the college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. The Executive Committee prepares a list of candidates for each vacancy on the college P&T Committee and submits to the Dean nominations for each opening. The Dean, at his/her discretion, may request additional nominations from the Executive Committee. After discussing all of these recommendations with the Executive Committee, the Dean selects the new LAS P&T Committee members and submits the appointments for ratification by the Representative Assembly. If any appointment fails to receive the approval of a majority of the Assembly, it is returned to the Executive Committee and the selection process begins anew.

It shall be the function of the committee to judge the merits of cases and to advise the Dean as to which candidates should be approved for promotion and/or tenure. Judgments will be based on the candidate’s PRS and on the criteria and standards identified in the university and the college documents as well as those specified in the approved departmental document.

The committee’s evaluations will be limited to review of those materials submitted by the department. Questions or requests for additional materials will be transmitted through the Dean’s office; there shall be no direct communication between the committee and departments or candidates after a departmental recommendation has been submitted to the college.

The committee shall determine its own working rules and procedures and shall make available a written statement of these to faculty members through the Dean’s office and the Representative Assembly.

The Dean will review the recommendations from the department, department chair, and the college review committee for each candidate and then write his or her own recommendation. The Dean’s recommendation, along with the recommendations from the department, department chair, and college committee, will be forwarded to the Provost if any of the following conditions are met:
1. the review is mandatory, regardless of whether the recommendations at the department level and college level were positive or negative.

2. the review is elective and there is a positive recommendation from the college committee and/or the Dean, unless the candidate withdraws.

3. the review is elective and the candidate requests that the dossier be forwarded despite negative recommendations from both the college committee and the Dean.

VIII. Informing the Candidates

Each person for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the college will be given the opportunity to review the factual information therein (Tabs 1 and 2 of the P&T Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

Each person reviewed for promotion and/or tenure shall be informed in writing by the department chair, before the department's recommendations are submitted to the college, as to whether a recommendation will be forwarded for that person and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. Faculty who are not being recommended for promotion and/or tenure 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 and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the department's criteria for promotion and tenure.

The Dean shall inform in writing each candidate and the respective department chair and the college committee of the recommendation being forwarded to the Provost. When the Dean's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is not the same as the departmental, department chair, or college P&T Committee recommendation, the Dean's recommendation and the reasons for the discrepancy shall be forwarded promptly in writing by the Dean to the department chair and to the candidate.

Addendum Regarding the P&T Evaluation of Core Faculty in Interdisciplinary Programs

Evaluations of faculty who have formal responsibilities and salary in an interdisciplinary program require additional considerations and actions to ensure that evaluations fairly and appropriately encompass all of the faculty member’s contributions. Such faculty members are hereafter referred to as “core faculty.” This addendum addresses the evaluation procedures for core faculty members. Procedures governing the hiring, mentoring, annual review, and promotion and tenure review procedures for core faculty members are provided in “Policies and
Procedures on the Governance of Interdisciplinary Programs with Core Faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences,” a document that is available on the college’s web site or by request.

Core faculty members of an interdisciplinary program are responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program, have position responsibility statements that reflect a specific contractual level of obligation to and participation in the program, and have budgeted salaries that are divided by percentage between an interdisciplinary program and a tenure-granting department. Currently, the relevant programs include the Ethnic Studies Programs in the Center for American Intercultural Studies, the Women’s Studies Program, and the Human Computer Interactions Program.

Faculty members employed at ISU may become core faculty and acquire co-appointments (core memberships) in an interdisciplinary program by obtaining permission from the department and the program. Any change in faculty status, either into or out of a program, would require agreement by the faculty member, the program and the department, and would be reflected in the Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and in the budgeted salary.

**P&T Evaluation**

Untenured faculty members will be reviewed annually by the department chair and the program director in accordance with policies and procedures in the respective units. The department chair and program director will jointly make salary decisions and provide written feedback on the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure.

For P&T evaluations, the program and the department will jointly appoint a review committee and prepare a written review of the candidate’s performance (scholarly production and performance in teaching, research/creative activity, extension or professional practice, and institutional service). The program and the department will agree to equitable representation of each unit on the review committee. In addition, the department chair will consult with the program director in determining the list of external reviewers. The list must include experts in the candidate’s interdisciplinary research area. The department chair and the program director will have access to all external letters associated with the Promotion and Tenure Review.

The review committee’s report will be submitted to the department chair and to the program director to be used in accordance with the established procedures of each. The department chair and the program director will also make separate administrative recommendations. All recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure and supporting documentation will be forwarded to the college.
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