

**School of Education
Faculty Appointment and Review
Manual**

Table of Contents

Faculty Appointment Policies and Procedures.....	4
Faculty Appointments.....	5
Departmental Non-tenure Track Faculty.....	5
Type of Appointment.....	5
Appointment Privileges.....	7
Nomination and Approval Procedures.....	7
Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement Policies.....	7
Criteria for Eligibility.....	7
Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement Procedures.....	8
Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Adjunct Faculty.....	9
Administrative Arrangements.....	9
Courtesy Appointments.....	9
Procedures for Courtesy Appointments.....	9
Expectations and Rights.....	9
Position Responsibility Statements.....	10
Statement of Purpose.....	10
Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.....	10
Fixed-Term Faculty.....	11
Differential Work Loads.....	11
Evaluation.....	11
New Faculty Members.....	11
School Director.....	11
Negotiation of Position Responsibility Statements.....	12
Disagreements on Position Responsibility Statements.....	12
Faculty Review Process.....	12
Annual Review.....	13
Third-Year Review.....	13
Candidate’s Preparation of Materials—TYR.....	13
School-level Review—TYR.....	14
Director Review—TYR.....	14
Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures.....	15
Candidate’s Preparation of Materials.....	16

Identification and selection of external reviewers	16
School-level Review.....	17
How candidates are identified for review.....	17
The composition and voting eligibility of the P&T committee	18
The role of the Director in the review process	19
The circumstances under which faculty members may decline to be reviewed	19
Post-Tenure Review and Guiding Principles	20
Candidates Reviewed—PTR	20
Tenured Faculty’s Preparation of Materials—PTR	20
Review Schedule—PTR	21
Procedures—PTR	21
Initial Contact.....	21
Review	21
Director Action	21
Mechanism for Faculty Member Response.....	22
Recommended timeline for post-tenure reviews	22

FACULTY APPOINTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The strength of the university is the creative energy and diversity of its faculty members. The underlying philosophy is that individual faculty members contribute to the mission of the university in many different ways and that their individual responsibilities may change over time to reflect the needs of the university, their own expertise, productivity and interests, and new opportunities to enhance the overall quality of the academy and the broader community that it serves.

The creation of School of Education Governance Document was guided by attention to a number of core values and commitments, which are defined in the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure document. Attention to these commitments should underline the promotion and tenure processes in practice.

Fairness. A commitment to fairness is evidenced by, among other things, prompt and open dissemination of promotion and tenure policy documents that provide clear and consistent information regarding criteria, expectations, and processes. Fairness is also evidenced by thorough, equitable review processes that involve careful and judicious interpretation and application of policies and criteria to individual promotion and/or tenure cases. Fairness is also assured in that each eligible faculty member is permitted only one vote during the full course of review of any one case. Candidates who suspect lack of fairness at any level in the review process should have ready access to formal appeals channels.

Confidentiality. A commitment to confidentiality, which should be ensured to the maximum extent allowable, is intended to foster frankness and candor in all aspects of the review process. Confidentiality should be accorded to the candidate, the writers of external review letters, and all individuals participating in discussions and meetings convened for promotion and tenure review purposes. Confidentiality should be protected by the School Director, individual faculty members, and all other individuals involved in review processes.

Integrity. A commitment to integrity is intended to yield not only fair processes but predictable processes—although not necessarily predictable outcomes. Consistent with the ISU Faculty Handbook section 8.2.3 regarding conflict of interest, individuals should strictly avoid being in a situation to influence a university decision that could result in personal gain. Individual faculty members should refrain from participating in the review of any promotion and/or tenure case that presents a personal conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest include conflicts arising out of personal relationships, family relationships, and those arising out of activities outside of work. See also ISU Faculty Handbook, Section 5.2.4.1.3.

Respect. A commitment to respect provides for civil and considerate treatment of promotion and/or tenure candidates and of faculty members participating in the review process. Respect within the promotion and/or tenure review processes includes, but is not limited to, ready availability of promotion and tenure informational documents and guidelines to reduce candidate uncertainties or anxieties, and to prompt sharing of information with candidates by

designated representatives (to the extent allowed by relevant policies) that apprise candidates of their candidacies at each level of the review process.

Faculty Appointments

When a vacancy in the faculty is to be filled, the guidelines to be followed are:

1. The duties and qualifications to be included in the position description will be based on consultations with the program coordinator and the faculty of the area in which the vacancy exists.
2. The "Notice of Vacancy" announcement must be approved by the Director, the Dean of the College, the Recruitment and Employment/Equal Opportunity and Diversity Offices, and the Executive Vice President/Provost.
3. The search committee will be comprised of no fewer than three faculty members appointed by the Director and must include members from the area in which the vacancy exists. The chair of the committee will be appointed by the Director.
4. The search committee, together with the faculty of the program area, will play an active role in the evaluation of applicants and should share their views with the Director. The faculty's and the Director's recommendations are then sent to the Dean.
5. Final negotiations associated with offers of employment are handled by the Director and the Dean of the College of Human Sciences.

More information can be found about appointment policies and procedures in the [Faculty Handbook](#), Sections 3.1-3.4.

Departmental Non-tenure Track Faculty

The School of Education does not consider non-tenure track faculty appointments to be a "right" or in any sense "automatic" upon meeting some set of criteria. Decisions are made on an individual basis where it is considered mutually beneficial to both the school and the candidate. The following sections define these appointments and the procedures to be followed in making such appointments.

Type of Appointment

Adjunct appointments can be made at any academic rank from lecturer through professor. Appointments can be made for up to three years. The purpose of adjunct appointments is to address special circumstances related to teaching, research, service, or all three.

Persons considered for adjunct status should have:

- Professional expertise and practical experience needed by the program areas.
- An earned doctorate.
- Eligibility to serve on the graduate faculty.

Adjuncts should demonstrate evidence of quality and productivity by:

- Obtaining student evaluations for each class they teach.
- Participating in a review process with the Director, which should include a self-evaluation provided to the Chair, with copies of syllabi of any courses taught, a list of

committees upon which the adjunct has served, and a reflective statement of the adjunct's contributions to the school.

Adjuncts are eligible for promotion but cannot be granted tenure. If an adjunct volunteers to teach a night class, he or she will be compensated similarly to part-time lecturers. In the rare instance where an adjunct is used to teach classes during the day, arrangements for payment will be made by the Director with the sending agency.

Visiting appointments are normally intended to provide special input into the teaching or research program of the school. A visitor is usually a member of the faculty of another institution and is appointed at the rank held at that institution. A visitor may, however, also come from business, industry, or government, in which case the appointment is at a rank consistent with the individual's professional experience.

A visiting appointment is normally for one academic year but may be for a shorter period of time. The person is not considered to be tenured at Iowa State, nor does the visiting appointment count as a part of a probationary period leading to a promotion and tenure decision.

Lecturers and Clinicians are limited term, full- or part-time renewable appointments of no less than one semester and no more than three years.

Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians are limited term, full- or part-time renewable appointments not to exceed five years, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew. To be eligible for appointment as Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician the individual shall have served as a Lecturer or Clinician or its equivalent for a minimum of six years or completed 12 semester FTEs of employment.

Affiliates are persons appointed to the faculty without financial obligation on the part of the university to carry out scholarly activities from which both the individual and the school will benefit. Affiliates are not employed on a regular basis outside the university. Ordinarily an affiliate appointment is initially made at the rank of assistant professor, although it may be made at other ranks if appropriate. It is typically made for at least one year but it may be made for up to three years. The conditions of the appointment, including the extent to which the school will provide support services for the individual, are stated in a written agreement signed by both parties at the time of the appointment. An affiliate is not tenured, and time spent in affiliate status is not considered to be service in a probationary period leading toward tenure.

Collaborators are persons appointed to the faculty with no financial commitment on the part of the university. Typically they are persons whose special expertise is deemed useful to the university in connection with a particular teaching or research program. A collaborator is not tenured, does not serve a probationary period leading toward tenure, and does not participate in the university's benefits program.

The use of **Part-time Instructors** should be limited. Use part-time personnel only for special expertise, and when purchasing time of faculty for grants and contracts.

Appointment Privileges

All of the above appointments are subject to review by the school at any time. None of these appointments include the voting rights pertaining to promotion and tenure of tenured and tenure-track appointments. Appointees are encouraged, but not required, to attend faculty meetings.

Nomination and Approval Procedures

Nomination for appointments can be made by any member of the faculty but usually would be put forward by several individual faculty or a program area. Nominations would include (a) a statement of the rationale for the appointment that includes the expected benefits for the appointee as well as the school, (b) suggested type of appointment, rank, and term, and (c) a resume or vita and any relevant support documents.

The Director will then formulate a recommendation, notify faculty of any intent to recommend an appointment, and make available appropriate materials (e.g., vita, area's statement of rationale) for faculty review at least one week before an initial faculty meeting discussion.

Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement Policies

Non-tenure eligible faculty positions are term appointments eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the unit. They are subject to approval by the dean and provost. Individuals appointed to these positions will be evaluated for compensation and advancement using established criteria appropriate to their positions.

Evaluations for renewal appointment will be conducted by an appropriate faculty committee and recommended by the department chair/school at the time of reappointment. Additionally, performance evaluations conducted by a faculty member should be completed at least every six semesters of employment for those who will be considered for future re-appointment and shall be based on the individual's Personal Responsibility Statement (PRS). See the Faculty Handbook, Section 5.1.1.2, for related information on annual reviews.

Criteria for Eligibility

Lecturer and Clinician: a limited term, full or part-time appointment from one semester to three years and renewable. After a minimum of six years of the completion of 12 semester FTEs of employment, the individual has the right to be reviewed for advancement by the appropriate department/school committee. Criteria for advancement shall be based on the quality of work relative to the individual's PRS. The three outcomes of this review include recommendation for advancement to Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician; continuation of appointment as Lecturer or Clinician; or non-renewal of contract. Individuals who are not recommended for advancement are eligible to reapply in subsequent years. An outcome of the review process should be to provide constructive feedback to the individual regarding progress in meeting departmental/school criteria for advancement.

Senior Lecturer and Senior Clinician: a limited term, full or part-time renewable appointment not to exceed five years, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew. To be eligible for appointment as Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician the individual shall have served as a Lecturer or Clinician or its equivalent for a minimum of six years or completed 12 semester FTEs of employment.

Adjunct appointment: a limited term, full or part-time renewable appointment not to exceed five years for each appointment, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew except when the appointment is for a year or less.

Professional and Scientific (P&S) non-tenure-eligible appointment: employees on the P&S status may be appointed to limited term, renewable appointments, from one to five years, to carry out faculty duties as specified in the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.2.5.

Tenured and tenure-eligible faculty shall be responsible for selecting, reviewing, and renewing non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments, consistent with the principles of shared governance, and in accordance with each unit's governance document. This purview includes all personnel carrying out instructional duties providing course credit.

Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement Procedures

In addition to the above policies established in conjunction with the faculty senate, the following practices apply to Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Clinicians, and Adjunct appointments:

- Since the appointment of Lecturers and Clinicians is for a specified period of time, no special notice of intent not to renew is necessary.
- Persons on appointment as Lecturers and Clinicians may be reviewed for advancement to Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician and may be advanced without a search.
- Persons on adjunct appointment may be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee for advancement to Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor using established criteria appropriate to the position.
- Persons appointed as Senior Lecturer and Senior Clinician must receive notice by May 15 of the year preceding the end of the term appointment (or at least 12 months in advance of the end of the term appointment when the appointment end date is not May 15) of intent to renew or not renew.
- Renewal of Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians or adjunct appointments must be approved by the dean and the provost. Request for approval should include a summary of the review results and a statement regarding the continuing need of the unit.
- Both full-time and part-time non-tenure-eligible faculty will receive annual reviews as well as a review by a faculty committee at least every six semesters of employment.
- Review of individuals in these positions will be based on the Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) derived from the advertised position. At each renewal time, the PRS may change, depending on the continuing and/or changing needs of the unit. The PRS will be discussed and disagreements negotiated at that time as a part of the renewal agreement. The agreed upon PRS will be signed by both parties.

Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty is eligible for advancement in accordance with university promotion policies.

Administrative Arrangements

Members of the faculty of the program are budgeted in one of four ways:

1. Totally within the school
2. Partially within the department and partially within another university unit which is not an academic department
3. Partially within the school and partially within another academic unit
4. Totally within another university unit which is not an academic unit

Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments are university appointments to faculty members who receive no portion of the school budget for salary but who are recognized as contributing to school's programs and activities upon request and mutual agreement. Such appointments are controlled by the Provost's Office and are under the policies of the ISU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.7 – Joint Appointments. Such appointments may be made either coincidental with, or subsequent to, the individual's original appointment.

Procedures for Courtesy Appointments

To initiate the process, the applicant, in collaboration with the SOE Director, must submit a request and a current vita to the faculty. The Director will indicate in writing the role the faculty member will play in the school including their research, teaching, service, and/or outreach activities using the Professional Responsibility Statement and a Letter of Intent. After discussion by the faculty and a simple majority vote, the appointment is granted. The courtesy appointment will be for a period of three to five years, at the discretion of the faculty and the Director. Applications and any subsequent renewals require a two-thirds majority acceptance of the voting eligible faculty for passage.

The Letter of Intent for a courtesy appointment must be signed by the chair of the faculty member's "home" department and the SOE Director, the dean or deans of the college(s) involved, and the provost. The individual's primary department is the faculty member's home department for purposes of evaluation, review, and initiating personnel actions. A letter from the SOE Director may be included as supplemental material in Promotion and Tenure dossiers submitted to the faculty member's primary department. The faculty member's tenure is assumed to reside in the primary department only. Committee and teaching assignments must be agreed upon by the faculty member, the SOE Director, and the department chair of the department in which the faculty member has a primary appointment. Courtesy appointments are reconsidered every three to five years, as stipulated in the Letter of Intent, for reappointment or termination. The participation of faculty members with courtesy appointments in SOE is reviewed annually by the department chair.

Expectations and Rights

Faculty members with courtesy appointments are expected to participate in school activities, which may include some or all of the following: a) teach or team-teach one or more courses in

the department (this may include courses in the faculty member's home department that are cross-listed with courses in SOE); b) participate on a major grant or research activity that would be jointly beneficial to both the school and the faculty member to be associated administratively in the SOE; c) serve as major professor for graduate students in SOE; d) serve on student POS committees; e) attend SOE faculty meetings, program area meetings, and school retreats as time allows; f) serve on SOE committees or take on other service assignments Faculty who hold courtesy appointments will not have voting rights on issues for which a faculty vote is required.

POSITION RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENTS

Statement of Purpose

The Faculty Senate Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) policy, requires that tenured faculty members re-evaluate their position responsibilities with their chairs/directors, at least every five years, and provide for a school-level PRS Mediation Panel in cases where a faculty member and the Director disagree with a proposed change to the faculty member's PRS. The revised document also specifies that if an agreement between the faculty member and the Director does not emerge after the PRS panel issues an opinion on how the disagreement should be resolved, the matter will be forwarded by the party disagreeing with the proposed change to the faculty member's college where a mechanism is in place for further consideration and resolution. More information about PRSs can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#), Section 5.1.1.1.5.

This document sets policies at the school and college levels to: (1) provide a starting point from which to construct individual position responsibility statements, (2) incorporate a fixed term for position responsibility statements, and (3) supply a mechanism to arbitrate disagreements at the college level.

Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the School of Education have a prototype Position Responsibility Statement that is consistent with their research, teaching, engagement or other service responsibilities. The following serves as a default position responsibility statement:

A standard appointment for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School of Education is 40% research, 40% teaching and advising, 10% outreach, and 10% service to the institution or broader community. Faculty members with a 40% teaching appointment are expected to teach the equivalent of four (3-credit) lecture courses per academic year and advise students in a manner consistent with school practices. Faculty members are expected to provide an effective learning experience for students.

Faculty members with 40% research assignments are expected to maintain active research programs, supervise graduate students, present research findings at national and international conferences as appropriate, and publish research results on a regular basis in discipline-appropriate refereed outlets. Faculty members are expected to attempt to secure extramural funding programs to the extent necessary to sustain their research program and support graduate students. Tenured faculty members

provide leadership at the local and national levels to research areas and educational programs.

Faculty members are expected to provide service, as needed, for the efficient operation of the school, the college, and the university, and to contribute to professional societies and the public as a natural outcome of their activities.

The above is simply a default PRS to be adopted if no other statement is in effect. The PRS for each faculty member will reflect their own talents and interests and the expectations and needs of the school, the college and the university.

Fixed-Term Faculty

Faculty Position Responsibility Statements for fixed-term faculty members should not exceed three years. Given typical changes in faculty member interests and opportunities, as well as school needs, it is appropriate to revise PRSs on a regular basis. The Faculty Handbook requires that they be reviewed at least every five years. At the time of initial hire and at appropriate intervals afterward, the Director and the faculty member will develop an individualized PRS reflecting the interests and expertise of the faculty member, the needs of the school and the university, research productivity, outreach opportunities, and other considerations.

Differential Work Loads

Flexible Position Responsibility Statements are based on the concept of differential workloads within and among units. In some disciplines, a faculty member with an active research program may teach two classes per year, while another faculty member in the School of Education may teach eight courses per year and devote little time to research/scholarship or other time-intensive activities. Similarly, in another academic unit, a faculty member may teach one class per year, manage several large external grants, or serve as Director of a center. Thus, PRSs are to be developed in accordance with the differing norms and individual expectations with respect to teaching, research, and service.

Evaluation

Faculty members will be evaluated based on their PRSs; a person with a large commitment to research in their PRS would be expected to publish more and direct more graduate students than a person whose PRS commits a small part of their effort to research with a greater commitment to outreach, teaching, and other activities (e.g., administration).

New Faculty Members

New assistant professors will have a three-year term for their initial PRS and third-year review. They will negotiate a second PRS with the Director upon completion of the third-year review. In most cases, the initial statement will remain in effect until the tenure review.

School Director

The SOE Director will have a Position Responsibility Statement, written by the Director and the dean, describing the administrative and other school responsibilities of the position.

Negotiation of Position Responsibility Statements

At the time of initial hiring, with the expiration of a PRS, or at other times as desired by the faculty member or the Director, an individual faculty member and the Director will discuss a new PRS for the faculty member. An agreed upon new PRS with a new fixed term would be effective immediately upon signing by both parties. If there is not agreement on a new PRS, the old PRS will be in force until a new agreement is reached or until the mediation process as outlined in the Faculty Handbook has run its course, whichever occurs first.

Below are some examples of changes in Position Responsibility Statements:

- An increase in teaching or research appointment for individuals whose relative allocation of time to teaching and research changes. It is not necessary to negotiate a new PRS for minor adjustments in teaching loads or research commitments, but this should be done when base teaching loads are increased or decreased beyond that indicated by an existing PRS.
- A decrease in general teaching and/or research responsibilities may be warranted in cases where a faculty member assumes major administrative commitments on behalf of the school, college, or university.

Disagreements on Position Responsibility Statements

The Faculty Handbook specifies that if either the faculty member or the Director disagrees with a proposed change to the faculty member's PRS, either party may refer the matter to a school-level PRS Mediation Panel. The procedures specified by the Faculty Handbook for handling such a disagreement follow Faculty Handbook section 5.1.1.5.1

Disagreements on changes in PRS statements that are not able to be resolved at the school following the procedures in the Faculty Handbook, will be handled by a college-level PRS Arbitration Panel.

If either party is dissatisfied with the proposed resolution at this point, he or she may file a complaint through normal grievance procedures to the Dean of the College. The PRS approved by the college PRS Arbitration Panel will be in effect during this process.

FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS

The faculty review process is intended to serve essential formative and summative functions at each step, and it is also developmental. Each step in the SOE faculty review process is intended to build upon the previous steps and to promote successful outcomes for faculty members. Therefore, whenever possible, consistent information, documentation, and format are requested at each step.

Annual Review

The Director will set the timeline and conduct in accordance with the date established by the Dean of the College of Human Sciences. The faculty member should provide the Director with requested information by the date established. In order to begin building the information necessary for Third-Year and Promotion and Tenure Reviews, faculty members and the Director are encouraged to use the [College of Human Sciences CV template](#) to convey this information. Although the annual review specifically considers faculty work during the previous three-year period to assess performance, faculty members are encouraged to consider the CV as cumulative and simply add information each year.

Third-Year Review

Third-Year Reviews (TYR) of pre-tenure faculty members will be conducted in accordance with university guidelines and will follow university procedures. The primary review of pre-tenure candidates will be conducted by a three-person subcommittee of tenured faculty. The subcommittee will consist of three members of the SOE faculty at the rank of associate (with tenure) or above, with at least one member with full professor rank. The subcommittee members must not be on the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee members also must not be formal mentors of the pre-tenure faculty member under review. The committee will make their report to the Director, which will be shared with all tenured faculty members.

The purpose and tenor of TYR should be developmental, with the emphasis on assisting pre-tenure faculty members in assessing their progress toward Promotion and Tenure and encouraging corrective action as necessary. This is in accordance with the [Faculty Handbook](#), Section 5.1.1.3, which states,

Probationary faculty members are typically reviewed by their departments in the second or third year of their appointments. The purpose of this review is to provide constructive, developmental feedback to probationary faculty regarding progress in meeting departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure. This review also informs the decision to reappoint during the probationary period.

The TYR process is designed to mirror the Promotion and Tenure process. The materials requested for the TYR will assist in creating the Promotion and Tenure Narrative.

Candidate's Preparation of Materials—TYR

The candidate has the primary responsibility for preparing TYR materials in consultation with the SOE Director. The SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, or its Chair, may also advise the candidate with preparation of the materials.

Once the candidate has established a file for TYR, no material may be added to that file without the candidate's consent.

It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure:

- All materials are submitted for review according to the guidelines outlined in the SOE governance document, the Provost's Office website, and the ISU Faculty Handbook.
- The accuracy and completeness of all information in the non-confidential material to be forwarded for review. The candidate should alert the Director of any inaccurate and/or incomplete information.

Each TYR file should include the following materials:

- A 10-12 page reflective summary statement that (a) documents major activities related to the responsibilities of research, teaching, extension/outreach, and professional service; (b) reflects on your accomplishments since your initial appointment; and (c) articulates future plans and directions with respect to teaching, research, outreach, and service.
- Candidate's Position Responsibility Statements since your initial appointment
- Candidate's CV (using the College of Human Sciences' CV template)
- Copies of two publications or other scholarly products

School-level Review—TYR

The SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, or subcommittee thereof, will review each candidate's TYR materials by January 15 each year in order to allow time for the Director to complete their review and meet with each candidate. Once a candidate's materials have been reviewed by the committee, the chair of the committee will prepare an evaluative memo to the Director. The memo should include the name of the chair of the committee and names of the faculty members who served on that committee. The evaluation should be analytical, and not just a review of process, recitation of the CV, or a summary statement. The evaluation should point out, discuss, and analyze strengths and weaknesses in the case. It is a best practice to put concerns up front and deal with them directly and clearly. The memo should conclude with a recommendation to the Director of the reappointment status of the candidate (see four possible status recommendations below). Candidates will meet with the committee to discuss the memo and recommendation put forward to the Director.

Director Review—TYR

The Director shall prepare a letter to the candidate based on the candidate's materials and the information provided by the committee that reviewed the candidate. That letter should provide clear and constructive feedback about accomplishments, set forth expectations toward meeting the standard for subsequent Promotion and Tenure, and clearly identify areas where performance improvement is needed.

The letter from the Director to the faculty member must indicate whether the pre-tenure faculty member is being reappointed, along with the terms of the reappointment (for instance, a one-year renewal, two-year renewal, etc.).

The letter should state specific reasons for the decision and, if appropriate, suggestions for performance improvements. The letter should specifically indicate that one of four possible decisions has been made:

- Reappointment with no reservation

- Reappointment with no strong reservation, but with specific issues that need to be addressed
- Reappointment with reservation and specific steps to be taken (may entail a one-or two-year renewal with an additional review scheduled before the mandatory tenure review)
- Non-reappointment with specific reasons (contract will be extended for one year)

The Director should schedule a meeting with the candidate to deliver and discuss all materials that will be forwarded to the dean, including the memo from the TYR Committee, the Director’s decision on reappointment, and any necessary corrective action. In all cases, the candidate should receive detailed evaluation of his/her strengths and weaknesses including clear and constructive advice on expectations for the Promotion and Tenure Review. The timeline for the TYR process is as follows:

Third-Year Review Process Timeline	
May 1	SOE Director alerts all candidates of required third-year reviews to be completed in following academic year
Jan 15	Materials due to SOE Director for distribution
Feb 15	Committee completes review and forwards memo to Director
Feb – Mar	Committee meets with candidate
Apr 1	Director prepares and sends letter to candidate
Apr 8	Director Meets with candidate
Apr 15	All materials forwarded to Dean’s Office
May 1	All materials forwards to Provost’s Office

PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

All Promotion and Tenure policies and procedures within the School of Education are consistent with those presented in the Faculty Handbook, Sections 5.1-5.3, and the [Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure](#) published on the Provost’s Office website. The purpose of this document is to present the procedures that are used at the school level.

Candidate's Preparation of Materials

The candidate has the primary responsibility for preparing Promotion and Tenure materials in consultation with the SOE Director. The SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee may also advise the candidate with preparation of the materials. The candidate should submit documentation as identified in Section 5.3.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.

Once the candidate has established his or her file for review, no material may be added to that file without the candidate's consent. In any non-mandatory case, a candidate may withdraw his or her file from consideration at any level of the review process.

It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure:

- All materials are submitted for review according to the guidelines and outlined in the SOE Promotion and Tenure document, the Provost's Office website, and the ISU Faculty Handbook
- The accuracy and completeness of all information in the non-confidential material to be forwarded for college review of his or her promotion and/or tenure. The candidate should alert the Director of any inaccurate and/or incomplete information.

The candidate should submit documentation as identified in Section 5.3.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook and in the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure policies and guidelines.

- **Candidate Information:** Section 5.3.1.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook. This should include all Position Responsibility Statements since date of employment.
- **Promotion and Tenure Vita:** The vita should be inclusive of the faculty member's scholarship, activities and accomplishments. The format of the vita is not specified, but it should reflect the norm within the discipline and be organized to present the candidate in a positive perspective. SOE faculty members are strongly encouraged to use the CHS CV template. See Section 5.3.1.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.
- **Scholarship:** See Sections 5.3.1.3 and 5.3.2.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook for a list of suggested activities and accomplishments.
- **Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities:** See Sections 5.3.1.4 and 5.3.2.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook for a list of suggested activities and accomplishments in the four areas of faculty activity.
- **Faculty Portfolio Narrative:** See Section 5.3.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.
- **Teaching Evaluations:** Include evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as student and peer reviews. See Section 5.3.2.2.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.

Identification and selection of external reviewers

Solicited letters of evaluation from recognized scholars in a candidate's field, but outside of the university, serve as essential data in the promotion and tenure process. The policies for identification, selection, and solicitation of external review letters are governed by the Faculty Handbook Section 5.3.3.1 and described below.

The candidate provides a list of up to six potential external reviewers to Director. The Director, in consultation with appropriate SOE faculty will generate additional possible reviewers. The Director is responsible for selecting individuals from the combined list of possible reviewers and

soliciting external review letters. Candidates can submit a list of up to three people who will not be contacted as reviewers. If made, this request must be put forward at the same time as the candidate forwards the list of possible reviewers.

Reviewers are chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's activities and accomplishments impartially. They should generally be tenured professors at peer institutions or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. These individuals should be independent of the faculty member being reviewed (co-authors, co-principal investigators, dissertation/thesis advisors, or others with similarly close association should be excluded). Individual exceptions may be granted for small disciplines or other circumstances when it is not possible to exclude all co-authors or co-principal investigators. When necessary, however, these individuals should be solicited to detail the nature of collaborative projects or to respond to specific questions.

A maximum of six external review letters can be included for each candidate. At least one of the reviewers, but not all, should be from the list suggested by the candidate. In instances when a potential reviewer is suggested by both the candidate and the Director, all attempts should be made to include this reviewer in those solicited for a letter; in such a case, this individual is not considered to be from the list suggested by the candidate.

The names of those reviewers providing external review letters and the content of those letters are confidential and available for review only to faculty members eligible to vote on the candidate's promotion and tenure case. Letters and names of external reviewers are not shared with the candidate.

School-level Review

According to the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure document, each unit must have a Promotion and Tenure Committee of faculty members to review candidates. Any member with a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate cannot participate in reviewing that candidate. (ISU Faculty Handbook, Section 5.2.4.1.3.) Each unit must also have a document that sets forth the standards and procedures governing promotion and tenure of faculty within that unit. The unit document may specify standards that exceed those of the university or college, provided that they do not contradict university or college standards. The unit procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review must be approved by the tenured and probationary faculty of the school, the Director, the Dean, and the Provost.

According to the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure document, each unit's Promotion and Tenure document must specify each of the following aspects of the Promotion and Tenure process:

How candidates are identified for review

The Director will meet with assistant professors who are subject to mandatory review for Promotion and Tenure no later than May 1st of the year prior to the review. In this meeting, the Director will clarify the process and timeline for the Promotion and Tenure Review.

The composition and voting eligibility of the P&T committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of all tenured members of the school faculty. Voting eligibility is dependent on the status or promotion available for each candidate. If the candidate is seeking a promotion/tenure from assistant professor to associate professor, both tenured associate professors and professors may vote. If the candidate is seeking a promotion from associate professor to professor, then only faculty with the rank of professor are eligible to vote.

All voting faculty will review the candidate's portfolio and then meet to discuss the material. The chair of the committee, who is elected by the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will present a letter to the SOE Director, which indicates the vote and documents the reasons for the vote.

In order to avoid undue or unfair influence in promotion and tenure decisions, promotion and tenure procedures must ensure that the guiding principle of “one-person—one-vote” is compiled with a vote, or the equivalent of a vote, is defined as a vote, advice, or a recommendation on the specific question of whether or not a candidate should receive tenure and/or promotion.

Specifically:

- If a faculty member votes on a promotion and tenure decision as a member of a departmental/school promotion and tenure committee, that faculty member may not vote again on the same decision at the department, school, college, or other levels.
- If a faculty member votes on a promotion and tenure decision at the departmental/school level, that faculty member may not vote again on the decision at the college or other levels.
- Since the chair/director of the department/school independently evaluates promotion and tenure decisions, he or she may not also vote on the decision at the departmental/school faculty, college, or other levels.
- Administrators participating in a promotion and tenure decision can only participate at the appropriate administrative level and are allowed to vote only once on the decision.

The timeline for Promotion and Tenure Review procedures is as follows:

Promotion and Tenure Review Process Timeline	
May 1	Election of School P&T committee chair by voting eligible faculty. Communication from the School of Education Director to assistant professors subject to mandatory review as well as those candidates who have requested review to clarify timeline and process, including committee and candidate responsibilities
May 15	School P&T committee solicits list of up to six potential external reviewers from candidates. The Director, in consultation with appropriate SOE faculty members, generates list of additional names
Jun 15	Candidates submit materials that are needed for external review (including current vita, 25-page narrative summary, and three representative publications). Director contacts external reviewers and sends materials

Sept 1	Candidates submit full set of materials to the Director
Oct 1	School P&T committee completes review of materials and submits recommendation to eligible voting faculty
Oct 15	Meeting of eligible voting faculty held to vote on recommendations from School P&T committee. The School P&T committee will provide a written report of their recommendation, including all School vote tallies, to the Director
Nov 1	Committee recommendation, faculty vote, and Director recommendation submitted to College

The role of the Director in the review process

The Director shall:

- Prepare a Director Promotion/Tenure Evaluation Report Form for each School faculty member under review that must be forwarded in mandatory Promotion and Tenure cases and in cases that are not mandatory where the faculty member elects to have the recommendation forwarded.
- Inform the School's Promotion and Tenure committee of the Director's recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure.
- Include with the Director's Promotion/Tenure Evaluation Report form all School vote tallies and report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as his or her own recommendation.
- Inform each candidate in writing (before recommendations are forwarded to the college) if he or she shall be recommended for promotion and/or tenure and clarify the substance of the recommendations.
- Notify in writing any candidate not recommended by the school committee, or the Director, or both, of the reasons for the decision. The communication should be constructive in tone and content.
- Provide each candidate for whom a recommendation is forwarded, the non-confidential information that will be submitted to the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee (CHSPTC).
- Submit Promotion and Tenure documents to the Dean's Office.

The Director shall use the following guidelines for the preparation of materials:

- Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers (provided by the school): See Section 5.3.3.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.
- Evaluations (provided by the school and Director): See Section 5.3.3.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook.
- Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure Form (provided by the Director): See Appendix B of the College of Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure Document.

The circumstances under which faculty members may decline to be reviewed

The university also has policies to allow for longer probationary periods, to accommodate a variety of situations and to allow tenure-eligible faculty the possibility of working less than full time. These policies include the extension of the probationary period (5.2.1.4 in the Faculty Handbook) and the decision to work part-time on either a temporary or permanent basis (this policy is integrated into all relevant sections of chapter 5).

POST-TENURE REVIEW AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Candidates Reviewed—PTR

Tenured faculty and continuous adjunct faculty will be reviewed in compliance with the school's Post-Tenure Review schedule policy. Joint appointment faculty members will be reviewed formally by their primary department. However, advice will be solicited from the secondary department(s). If a faculty member's appointment is 50% in two different departments, the Chairs of both departments and the faculty member will decide which will serve as the primary department. University Policies about Post-Tenure Review can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#), Section 5.3.5.

Tenured Faculty's Preparation of Materials—PTR

At a minimum, the faculty member under review will submit a vita and a portfolio that documents activities beyond those contained in the vita. The portfolio should contain activities related to responsibilities in the areas of: teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice activities, and institutional service. The portfolio should also include a personal reflection on accomplishments in the Post-Tenure Review time period and plans for the future. A more detailed description of PTR materials can be found in section 7.2.8. Recommended submission materials for PTR include:

- A summary of Major Career Highlights since the last PTR. The Governance document describes this as a portfolio. The document should speak to Honors, Research, Teaching, Outreach/Engagement, Service. Do indicate the date of that review, or if you have not received a PTR, then the date of your last promotion.
- A copy of the most recent prior post tenure review report (if a prior PTR was conducted.)
- A copy of the candidate's complete Vita
- Copies of Position Responsibility Statements since the last PTR (or promotion if no prior PTR.)
- Copies of materials submitted for annual reviews since the last PTR. It is assumed that these materials submitted for annual review include summaries of teaching evaluations (student or peer), lists of graduate students supervised and graduated, information on outreach/ engagement and service to the university and to the profession. Such materials should be added if not available in the materials submitted for annual review.
- Copies of the Chair's annual reviews since the last PTR.
- A statement of the candidate's future plans and directions with respect to teaching, research, outreach, and service.
- Copies of no more than two publications, presentations, or other scholarly products since the last review.

- Any other additional information the candidate wishes to submit.

Review Schedule—PTR

Associate professors are to be reviewed formally by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in their sixth year after promotion to that rank and every seventh year thereafter. Such review will constitute post-tenure reviews and/or reviews for promotion consideration. Continuing adjunct faculty and professors are to be reviewed formally by the committee every seventh year. Such reviews will constitute required post-tenure reviews. Post-tenure reviews may be postponed in the event of extenuating personal or professional circumstances. Should such a situation arise, the faculty member must discuss the need for postponing the review with the Chair. The Chair's support is essential for granting an extension.

Procedures—PTR

The procedures used for the post-tenure review is as follows:

Initial Contact

At initial meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Director presents the names of the people for whom post-tenure review is required. The Committee will make recommendations to the appropriate faculty with respect to procedures and materials for reviews.

Review

Reviews should be based upon the position responsibilities of faculty members and other activities that relate to faculty appointments. Materials for each person to be reviewed are gathered, and committee members are asked to review these carefully. After committee members have seen the materials, the committee discusses each person being reviewed. In light of the evidence in hand, the committee composes a written summary statement including comments that might be helpful to the Director in discussing the results with the individuals reviewed. The faculty member must have an opportunity to check the formative review report for factual errors before the report is finalized and communicated to the Director.

Director Action

The Promotion and Tenure Committee's post-tenure review summary statement is forwarded to the Director. The Director and the Committee meet together with the faculty member to discuss the review, thus providing an opportunity for an exchange of ideas that would benefit the individual and the department. Recommendations for enhancing the performance of the faculty member will be made by the Committee and Director, including a plan for future development. Where appropriate, a recommendation concerning the modification of the faculty member's position responsibility may be made. The Director will include an assessment of the implementation of the improvement plan in subsequent annual reviews.

The Director will forward a copy of the Committee's summary statement, the Director's evaluation and comments concerning the development plan, and a copy of the faculty member's response, if any, to the Dean's Office.

Mechanism for Faculty Member Response

The faculty member will receive a written copy of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's summary statement and the Director's evaluation and comments concerning the development plan.

If the faculty member believes that she/he has been evaluated unfairly, a written response should be presented to the Director. The Committee and the Director will address the faculty member's concerns and respond to the faculty member in writing. If the faculty member continues to believe that he/she has been evaluated unfairly, the faculty appeals process should be followed.

Recommended timeline for post-tenure reviews

The purpose of this timeline is to facilitate the timely development of post-tenure review materials and to give faculty sufficient time to prepare those materials. This timeline may be changed yearly by the Director with approval of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to meet college or university requirements or to improve the efficacy of the Post-Tenure Review process.

The timeline for the Post-Tenure Review procedure is as follows:

Review Process Timeline	
Aug 15	The Director prepares any changes needed in the rotating schedule and announces changes to the department faculty
Sep 1	The Director informs the P&T committee of the candidates for PTR for the current academic year
Sep 15	The Director of the P&T Committee informs the candidates for PTR of the expected materials to submit and the submission deadline
Feb 1	Candidates for PTR submit materials to the Director
Feb 15	The P&T Committee plans its work and plans meetings with candidates for PTR to be completed by the end of the spring semester
Mar 25	The P&T Committee completes review of the candidates and submits recommendations to candidates for review as specified above
Apr 1	The P&T Committee makes any revisions in recommendations and submits them to the Director
Apr 20	The P&T Committee, Director, and Candidates meet as specified above