
College of Design's Guide to: Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This document is a
supplement to
Departmental Governance
Documents and the
University Faculty
Handbook to guide College
of Design Faculty Members
and Department Chairs
through the University
Promotion and Tenure
(P&T) Review Process

Updated: June 2017

Table of Contents

Purpose of a Promotion and Tenure Review	2
Process for a Promotion and Tenure Review.....	3
Timeline.....	3
Review Materials (Tabs 1, 2 and Supporting Materials).....	3
Factual Information.....	3
Departmental Review Committee’s Evaluation (Tab 3).....	4
Department Chair’s Evaluation (Tab 3, cont.).....	4
Letter.....	4
Notification	5
College Review Committee’s Evaluation (Tab 4)	5
Dean’s Evaluation (Tab 4, cont.)	6
Letter.....	6
Notification	6
External Review Letters (Tab 5)	6
Selection of External Reviewers.....	6
Qualification of External Reviewers.....	7
Materials to be sent to External Reviewers.....	7
Submission to the Provost Office.....	8
University Review and Final Approval	9
Additional Resources	10
Calendar	10
Template	11

The purpose of this document is to assist tenure-eligible faculty preparing for their promotion and tenure review. The materials contained in this document have been collected from the following sources:

- [Iowa State University Faculty Handbook](#), Chapter 5,
- [College of Design Governance Document](#), Chapter 4,
- [Faculty Advancement and Review](#) page on the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost web site
- College of Design [Faculty Promotion and Advancement](#) web page.

All review and evaluation procedures will follow accepted university guidelines as specified in the Faculty Handbook, College of Design Governance Document, and applicable departmental governance documents. In the absence of specific guidelines or in case of a conflict, university and/or college policies will take precedence.

Faculty are advised to read sections pertaining to promotion and tenure reviews in the Faculty Handbook, the College of Design Governance Document, and in their department's governance document.

This document is a work in progress. If you have concerns, edits, etc., please contact the Senior Associate Dean.

Purpose of a Promotion and Tenure Review

The purpose of a promotion and tenure review is to assess whether a faculty member has met their position responsibilities and whether their accomplishments and impact meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure as defined in the ISU Faculty Handbook, the College of Design Governance Document, and the respective department's governance document.

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.

A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual's 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.

For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the focus of the review should be on the last five years of work (at ISU or elsewhere). For promotion to full professor, the focus of the review should be on accomplishments since appointment to associate professor (at ISU or elsewhere).

Process for a Promotion and Tenure Review

Timeline

It is the department chair's responsibility to notify and begin working with faculty members who will be going through a Promotion and/or Tenure Review. In most circumstances, this notification needs to be given by January 1st of the faculty members fifth year of employment. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to hand-in their Promotion and Tenure Review packet to the Administrative Specialist for their respective area according to departmental guidelines and deadlines. The Administrative Specialist will then work with the respective department chair to begin the departmental review. A complete calendar of events is listed at – [Additional Resources, Calendar](#)

Review Materials (Tabs 1, 2 and Supporting Materials)

The faculty member is responsible for providing the following information for the review process:

1. Tab 1: PRS and Vita:
 - a. [Factual Information Summary](#) is a quantitative summary of the faculty member's accomplishments. The summary is completed by the faculty member and reviewed for accuracy by the department chair and departmental review committee.
 - b. All PRS in effect during the review time period
 - c. Updated Vita organized according to the College of Design Promotion & Tenure Vita Guidelines
2. Tab 2: Promotion and Tenure Portfolio:
 - a. The main goal of the promotion and tenure portfolio is to demonstrate the candidate's accomplishments, impact, and that the criteria for tenure and/or promotion have been met.
 - b. Maximum of 25 pages
 - c. Contents must follow the College of Design's Template for Tab 2 included at the end of this document and on the college's [web site](#).
3. Supporting Materials can be submitted at the discretion of the review candidate and department chair, in accordance to departmental governance and guidelines. This information will be reviewed at the department, college, and Dean's level but will not be forwarded to the Senior Vice President and Provost (SVPP).

Review materials can be submitted electronically via a CyBox folder that is set up by the HR Liaison and maintained by the Administrative Specialist; or in a bound paper form (at the discretion of the faculty member and the department chair). If the faculty member chooses to have their review materials uploaded into a CyBox folder, they must speak with the HR Liaison and Administrative Specialist by January 30th, so proper arrangements can be made.

Factual Information

Materials presented in Tabs 1 and 2 constitute the "factual record." The review candidate has the option to review these two tabs prior to the dossier being forwarded to the college and SVPP. Tabs 3, 4, and 5 are confidential and are not shared with the faculty member under review.

Departmental Review Committee's Evaluation (Tab 3)

The department chair must inform the candidate in writing of the identity of the members of the department review committee.

The departmental review committee is responsible for preparing a letter addressed to the department chair that analyzes the candidate's performance and impact based on the criteria in the P&T document and disciplinary expectations.

The letter should not be a statement of advocacy or recitation of the vita, but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance addressing concerns directly and clearly. When appropriate the letter should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators. The evaluation letter should include the following:

- evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship,
- evaluation of the candidate's performance in his/her areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and/or institutional service,
- evaluation of the candidate's prospects for future contributions to the field and department, and
- assessment of the candidate's role and contributions to department and college missions.

The departmental review committee should also assure that the Factual Information Summary is accurate with questions or concerns directed to the Department Chair.

The review committee's letter must include the names and ranks of the faculty members who reviewed the case; a brief summary of the departmental P&T evaluation process (including voting eligibility); the department review committee's vote and recommendation; and, when applicable, the recommendation from other programs or departments with whom the candidate is affiliated.

Department Chair's Evaluation (Tab 3, cont.)

Letter

The department chair is responsible for conducting an independent, analytical review of the faculty member in question, based on the candidate's performance and impact as compared with P&T criteria and disciplinary expectations. The department chair's evaluation must be detailed in a letter addressed to the dean that addresses both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance addressing concerns directly and clearly. When appropriate the letter should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators. The department chair's evaluation should include the following:

- evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship,
- evaluation of the candidate's performance in his/her areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and/or institutional service,
- evaluation of the candidate's prospects for future contributions to the field and department, and

- assessment of the candidate's role and contributions to department and college missions.

The department chair's evaluation may draw from annual performance evaluation reports and the preliminary (third-year) review.

Notification

The chair forwards departmental evaluation letters and recommendation forms to the college dean and informs the departmental promotion and tenure review committee of his or her recommendations. In addition, the chair must prepare and forward to the college dean negative departmental recommendations for persons for whom tenure decisions are mandatory.

The chair will inform the candidate in writing before the department's recommendations are submitted to the college, whether a recommendation will be forwarded and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. Persons who are not being recommended by either the promotion and tenure review committee or the chair, or both, will be informed by the chair 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.

College Review Committee's Evaluation (Tab 4)

The College Review Committee is required to write an evaluation letter addressed to the dean, detailing the review committee's evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments, impact, and whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

The review committee's letter should not be statements of advocacy or recitation of the vita, but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance addressing concerns directly and clearly. When appropriate the letter should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators. The evaluation should include the following:

- evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship,
- evaluation of the candidate's performance in his/her areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and/or institutional service,
- evaluation of the candidate's prospects for future contributions to the field and department, and
- assessment of the candidate's role and contributions to department and college missions.

It is essential that the college evaluation committee provide an independent analysis and interpretation of the candidate's record, not a restatement and summary of departmental evaluations.

The letter must include the names and ranks of the faculty members who reviewed the case; a brief summary of the college P&T evaluation process (including voting eligibility); and the college review committee's vote and recommendation.

Dean's Evaluation (Tab 4, cont.)

Letter

The dean is responsible for conducting an independent, analytical review and writing an evaluation letter addressed to the Senior Vice President and Provost. The evaluation letter must detail the candidate's performance and impact identifying and analyzing strengths and weaknesses and addressing concerns directly and clearly. The primary purpose of the letter is to assess whether the candidate meets the qualification for promotion and/or tenure based on the criteria in university, college, and departmental P&T documents as well as disciplinary expectations. The letter should not be a review of the process, recitation of the CV, or a restatement of departmental and college evaluation letters. The dean's letter is accompanied with the recommendations and votes of the college and department committees, the chair reports, and supporting material and documentation.

Notification

The dean will inform in writing each candidate and the respective chair and the college committee whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the senior vice president and provost and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If the recommendation is contrary to the departmental, chair, and/or college committee recommendations, the dean will summarize in writing the reasons as part of his/her recommendation. The chair will forward the dean's recommendation and summary to the department promotion and tenure committee.

External Review Letters (Tab 5)

The chair and/or the department review committee solicits letters from qualified reviewers with the understanding that, insofar as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion and tenure decision. All solicited letters are treated as part of the evaluation process and must be forwarded on to college and university review levels. External letters are confidential. They are to be available for review by all those individuals who evaluate candidates either in a formal vote or advisory capacity as part of the promotion and/or tenure process as defined in). These letters are not to be shared with others.

Selection of External Reviewers

Letters should be solicited from appropriate professionals in the field and 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 investors. When necessary, however, these individuals should be solicited to detail the nature of collaborative projects or to respond to specific questions.

The department chair is responsible for requesting a list of potential evaluators from the candidate. At the same time, the chair should also request a list of any individuals with potential conflicts of interest

(dissertation advisor and committee members, post-doc advisors, co-authors, major collaborators, etc.) so that these individuals are not contacted as evaluators. The department chair has the responsibility to check that those solicited to write evaluations are not major collaborators (now or in the past) and that they have appropriate credentials and positions. It is the department chair's job to assess the appropriateness of the nominated evaluators. A candidate should NEVER have direct contact with external evaluators about the process.

At least one of the reviewers, but not all, should be suggested by the candidate. Candidates may consult with ISU colleagues about appropriate reviewers and their institutions. Candidates may submit a list of up to three people in their field who will not be contacted as reviewers. This request, if made, must be put forward at the same time candidates submit names of potential reviewers.

The Faculty Handbook specifies that a maximum of six (6) letters from external reviewers may be submitted with the promotion and tenure dossier. Four (4) letters are usually not enough. Submitting fewer than five external review letters may have an adverse impact on assessment of the candidate's P&T package.

Qualification of External Reviewers

External evaluators should be well-known for their scholarship and should have a focus similar to that of the candidate. External evaluators may be selected for their expertise in scholarship of teaching and extension/professional practice as well as in scholarship of research. In some cases, an evaluator may only be able to speak to a portion of the candidate's scholarly record.

The majority of evaluators should be from institutions similar to or more prestigious than ISU. If an evaluator is from a less prestigious institution, the department must explain why this individual has been chosen. While evaluators are usually academics, it may be appropriate to draw occasionally from industry and government, again explaining the rationale for this choice.

External evaluators should be of a higher rank than the candidate being reviewed. The majority of evaluators should be at the rank of full professor. Emeritus reviewers should be avoided, except in cases of on-going disciplinary distinction.

If an evaluator knows the candidate, they should not be closely allied. Letters should not be solicited from those who have worked closely with the candidate, including members of a dissertation committee, post-doc advisors or co-authors.

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

Materials to be sent to External Reviewers

Material sent to external evaluators is developed by the department chair or department P&T review committee in consultation with the candidate. The following documents should be sent:

- Candidate's PRS
- Candidate's vita

- Faculty Portfolio (Tab 2) (or some shorter candidate statement)
- A sample of scholarly products (from the period under review)
- Summary of the ISU Faculty Handbook sections on P&T (available at <http://provost.iastate.edu/faculty-and-staff-resources/advancement>)

Accompanying the above items, the department chair should include a letter to each external reviewer that:

- Remains completely neutral about the quality of the candidate's work
- Clarifies the time period the candidate is being reviewed
- If the candidate has had a tenure clock extension, the reason behind the clock extension should not be included
- It is not required for external reviews to comment on whether or not the review candidate would be tenured and/or promoted at their institutions

External review letters should primarily focus on the aspects of the candidate's work that qualify as scholarship. While in some cases this might mean a focus on one area such as teaching or research, in others it might entail a focus on a mixture of scholarship in teaching, research/creative activities and/or extension/professional practice. Letters soliciting outside review of a candidate's work must make clear what is to be covered by the reviewer. These letters sent by the department soliciting external reviews may optionally include or exclude asking reviewers their opinions about whether candidates would or should receive tenure and/or promotion at the reviewer's institution or at Iowa State University. The department must make any request regarding this summative question consistent for all candidates and all reviewers.

Submission to the Provost Office

Upon completion of the review process, the HR Liaison will compile the following documents into one PDF to be forwarded to the Provost's Office.

1. Coversheet – detailing the outcome of the evaluation process and terms of the renewal (prepared by HR Liaison)
2. Faculty Member's PRS
3. Faculty Member's CV
4. Faculty Member's Personal Statement
5. Departmental Evaluation
6. Department Chair Evaluation
7. College Evaluation
8. Dean's Evaluation
9. Log of External Reviewers (prepared by HR Liaison with assistance from Department Chair)
10. External Reviewer Biographies
11. External Review Letters

University Review and Final Approval

Review for promotion and/or tenure concludes at the university level.

The senior vice president and provost makes his/her recommendations to the president of the university. The senior vice president and provost will inform in writing each candidate and the respective chair and dean whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the president and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If the senior vice president and provost's recommendation is contrary to the dean's recommendation, the senior vice president and provost will summarize in writing the reasons as part of his/her recommendation. The chair will forward the senior vice president and provost's recommendation and summary to the departmental promotion and tenure committee.

The president makes his/her recommendations for the university to the Board of Regents. Only positive recommendations will be sent to the Board for action. The president will inform in writing each candidate, the respective chair and dean, and the senior vice president and provost of the whether a positive recommendation is being sent to the Board of Regents. If the presidential recommendation is contrary to the senior vice president and provost's recommendation, the president will summarize the reasons for his/her recommendation in writing. The chair and dean will forward the president's recommendation and summary to the respective promotion and tenure committees.

Following the Regents' action, the senior vice president and provost provides official notification to the candidates and their chairs and deans.

With a positive outcome from the SVPP and Board of Regents, the HR Liaison will prepare an updated LOI for the faculty member, detailing the terms of the renewal contract. This LOI must be accepted and signed by the faculty member before May 15th.

Additional Resources

Calendar

January 1 st	Department Chair notifies faculty member of upcoming review.
January 31 st	Determination date for paper or electronic copy
Depending upon Departmental Guidelines	Faculty member provides Department Chair with list of potential, and conflict of interest, external reviewers
Depending upon Departmental Guidelines	Faculty member submits Promotion and Tenure Review Packet to HR Liaison
September 1 st	Departmental Review begins, and write a letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair
October 1 st	Department Chair review begins, and writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the faculty member
October 15 th	College Promotion and Tenure Committee review begins, and writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the Dean
December 15 th	Dean's review begins, and writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the Provost
January 14 th	Final decision is forwarded to the Provost Office, for further reviews by the President's Office and Board of Regents

** If due date fall on a weekend or holiday, the information is due the day prior to the due date.

Template

Instructions for Tabs 1 and 2 of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

College of Design, Iowa State University

Approved 22 March 2016 by the College of Design Faculty Development Council

Modified July 2016 and October 2016 with the addition of a Factual Summary Sheet in Tab 1. required by the Office of the Provost

Context

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

Tab 1: Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and VITA

Tab 2: Documentation of candidate's scholarship and performance

Tab 3: Department Evaluations

Tab 4: College Evaluation

Tab 5: External Letters

While supplementary materials may be sent to external reviewers and made available to departmental and college review committees, only the materials included in these five tabs are forwarded to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Materials in Tabs 1 and 2 constitute part of the "factual record" which the candidate prepares and reviews before it is forwarded to the college and the SVPP (FH 5.2.4.2.6). Contents of Tabs 1 and 2 are:

Tab 1: PRS and VITA

1. Factual Information Summary

<http://www.provost.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/faculty%20resources/advancement%26review/Factual%20Summary%20for%20PT%20-%202016.pdf>

This quantitative summary is required by the Office of the Provost and aims to present reviewers with a standard set of factual information relative to the candidate's activities during the review period. This summary of faculty information (Tab 1) contains the key facts of the candidate's promotion and tenure case (5.2.4.2.6). The narrative portfolio summary (Tab 2) prepared by the candidate articulates the specific context of the case, and highlights the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, trajectory, and impact. This factual information summary shall be completed by the candidate and reviewed by the department chair. The candidate has final responsibility for its accuracy.

2. Position Responsibilities

Include copies of both current PRS and any prior PRS statements operative during the period of review. Describe any changes in your PRS during this evaluation period or since your last promotion.

3. Vita

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

- The vita should be organized by standard categories and in reverse chronological order (most recent items listed first).
- When listing publications, candidate should include page numbers for all items in print.
- The candidate's role in any collaborations—whether teaching, grants, publications, or other activities—must be clearly explained.
- If listing graduate students, candidate should indicate graduation dates.

Tab 2: Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

Tab 2 – Promotion and Tenure Portfolio – comprises up to 25 pages in which candidates make their case for promotion. Tab 2 is the primary text used by external reviewers, departmental and college reviewers, and the Provost to review P&T cases. It is the primary means of demonstrating that the criteria for advancement, as defined in the ISU Faculty Handbook, the College of Design Governance Document, and one’s departmental governance document, have been met.

Key elements are:

- *Candidate Statement on Scholarship – the core of the 25 pages – where the case for national distinction is articulated.*
- *Summary of Accomplishments and Impacts.*
- *Sections on each area of one’s PRS to establish effectiveness in the following order: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, Extension/Professional Practice/Engagement, and Institutional Service.*

Tab 2 need not repeat information included in the CV and should focus on work accomplished during this evaluation period or since one’s last promotion. Faculty seeking promotion to full professor may include earlier work to provide context for their promotion case. Tab 2 must follow the outline below using the same titles and order. *Italicized text is included for guidance and should not be include in the version submitted. Tab 2 must not exceed 25 pages in length including the “table of courses taught.” The “table of courses taught” will be prepared and provided by staff in the college’s Administrative Services Office. Questions about this table should be referred to the college’s HR Liaison. Cover pages and table of contents are unnecessary and reduce the number of pages available for text. Please use 10 point or larger text and include page numbers.*

Date:

Name:

Department:

Current Rank:

1. Candidate Statement on Scholarship

Provide a statement describing your scholarship which weaves together all of your areas of performance into a coherent narrative and highlights your most significant contributions to your field.

Section 5.2.2.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook defines scholarship as encompassing research, creative activities, teaching, extension, and professional practice.

2. Summary of Accomplishments and Impacts

Summarize the most significant and impactful accomplishments in all areas of responsibility and describes the quality and audience of venues in which your work has been published, exhibited, presented, etc. Highlight works that best illustrate excellence in scholarship as well as any awards, honors, etc. received for this work.

3. Teaching

ISU Faculty Handbook Section 5.2.2.3 defines teaching including the scholarship of teaching and learning.

A. Responsibilities

Summarize your responsibilities for teaching, advising undergraduate students, and advising graduate students as defined in your PRS.

B. Teaching Philosophy

C. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe the most impactful accomplishments in teaching and advising, e.g. textbooks authored, innovative teaching methods developed, assessment methods developed, courses developed, curriculum development work, advising undergraduate and graduate students, etc.

D. Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

A table that includes all courses you taught during this review period with student ratings of teaching effectiveness will be prepared by college staff using the format shown below and provided to you as a PDF for inclusion in this Portfolio Summary. This table can be attached to the end of the Portfolio Summary but will be included in the 25-page count. For faculty seeking promotion to full professor, this table will include courses taught during the last seven years. Use this section to discuss any courses where instructor/course ratings are lower than departmental averages.

Term – most recent first	Course Number	Course Title	Enrollment	Number who Responded	Credits	Contact Hours	Instructor Overall Rating*	Dept. Average*	College Average*	Course Overall Rating*	Dept. Average*	College Average*

* 5 = excellent, 1 = very poor

E. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, organizations, and events related to teaching.

F. Other Assessments of Teaching and Advising Effectiveness

Describe other external measures of teaching and advising effectiveness, e.g. peer evaluation of teaching, awards, honors, presentations on teaching methods, awards received by students for work completed under your supervision, etc.

4. Research/Creative Activities

ISU Faculty Handbook Section 5.2.2.4 defines Research/Creative Activities.

A. Area(s) of Focus

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe in detail the most impactful accomplishment in research/creative activities along with importance of the peer-reviewed venues in which the work was published, presented, exhibited, etc. Report impact and citation metrics for publications, exhibitions, completed works, etc. when available. Describe sponsored funding supporting research/creative activities and the significance of the funding organization.

C. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, journals, foundations, organizations, and events related to research/creative activities.

D. Other External Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe other external measures of excellence and impact, e.g. awards, honors, patents, invitations to present/exhibit work, etc.

5. Extension/Professional Practice/Engagement

Include this section only if it is an element in your PRS.

ISU Faculty Handbook section 5.2.2.5 defines Extension/Professional Practice. In addition to this definition, the college also recognizes “engagement” as part of this area. Community Engagement as defined by Carnegie Foundation’s Classification for Community Engagement is “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” Source: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Community Engagement Classification (http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=618)

A. Area(s) of Responsibility

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe in detail the most impactful accomplishment in extension/professional practice/engagement along with importance of the peer-reviewed venues in which the work was published, presented, exhibited, etc. Report impact and citation metrics for publications, exhibitions, completed works, etc. when available. Describe impact of the work on communities, organizations, the general public, etc. Describe sponsored funding/commissions supporting extension/professional practice/engagement and the significance of the funding organization.

C. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, organizations, communities, governmental agencies, and events related to extension/professional practice/engagement.

D. Other External Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe other external measures of excellence and impact, e.g. awards, honors, invitations to present/exhibit work, etc.

6. Administration

Included only if administration is a PRS element.

A. Areas of Responsibility

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

C. Measures of Excellence and Impact

7. Institutional Service

ISU Faculty Handbook section 5.2.2.6 defines institutional service.

A. Institutional Service Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe the most impactful accomplishments in institutional service including leadership roles on significant department/college/university councils/committees, search committees, accreditation preparation teams, etc.

B. Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe honors, awards, etc. received for service.