

College of Engineering-specific aspects for successful preparation of P&T dossiers

This is a college supplement to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost Document

Process

- Department chairs have overall responsibility for preparing P&T dossiers that are timely, and that meet departmental, college, and university guidelines.
- The chair should meet with the departmental P&T committee at the start of the process to deliver the committee's charge and to review expectations, conflict of interest (see the CoE conflict of interest guidelines at <https://www.engineering.iastate.edu/hr/files/2018/07/CoE-PandT-COI-Final-June-2018.pdf>), and process.
- Once the entire P&T review process is concluded and final decisions delivered, the chair should again meet with the committee to review outcomes and to assess expectations and process, with an emphasis on continuous improvement.

Dossier elements

College templates and guidelines: All documents, templates and guidelines for the college of engineering (adapted from the Provost's documents) are available on the college website at <https://www.engineering.iastate.edu/hr/faculty-advancement/>

- Candidates should use their college's standard templates for the CV (Tab 1) and portfolio summary (Tab 2). Note the page limit for the portfolio for COE is 10 pages (not 25 as stated by the Provost's office). It is helpful if the CV and portfolio clearly distinguish accomplishments and activity since the last promotion or initial appointment (in cases for which this is the first ISU P&T action) at ISU. Candidates are strongly encouraged to use the [Exemplar](#) to explain their role in collaborative work.
- **Updates to the CV** can be submitted in a consolidated fashion **THRICE** during the submission timeline using the [template on the college website](#):
 - Once after dossiers have been submitted to external letter writers, but before submission of dossier to the college (department sets dates and process)
 - Once after the dossier is submitted to the college (Dec 15 or next working day)
 - Once after the dossier is submitted to the Provost's office (January 25 or next working day)

These updates should be collected at the department level, reviewed, approved and forwarded to the college by the department chair. For updates prior to dossier reaching the college, the department chair will provide clarification which must include when the information became available and which evaluators have considered it in their deliberations. The department chair will provide all information and submit to the Dean's office for review.

- Candidates will prepare and submit a "Factual Summary" as part of Tab 1 of their P&T package. The college of engineering template of the "Factual Summary" with embedded instructions is posted on the College of Engineering website. This is an internal document (not sent to external reviewers). While it is the responsibility of the faculty member to

generate the data, it is highly recommended that the review process in the department review it and work with the faculty member to address discrepancies.

- The Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) should be unique to each faculty member. The PRS should accurately reflect the expectations for each area of responsibility preferably using weighted percentages. The PRS serves as the benchmark for gauging faculty productivity when evaluating promotion and tenure cases.

Chair Letters

- While it may not be possible for the department chair to address the exact reason for negative votes, the chair should make some effort to address the reasons and/or provide some context where appropriate.
- If there are loose ends in the case, such as the status of a Ph.D. student who is expected to graduate soon or who may have graduated, or a pending grant or publication, the chair should conduct the necessary fact-finding and include that information in his/her letter.
- The chair's letter should clearly state what the standard expectations are for scholarship in the candidate's particular discipline (e.g., "the gold standard is" published conference proceedings, juried exhibits, single-authored journal articles, case studies, etc.) and provide an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments compared to these disciplinary norms or expectations.
- The chair's letter to the dean must be analytical, candid and evaluative. It should point out, discuss, and analyze any weaknesses in the case, and any aspects of the process that are unusual or of concern. We suggest the following format: 1) description of departmental review process; 2) synopsis of case; 3) evaluation of any concerns; and 4) chair's recommendation on the case.
- The issue of timing of the promotion should be addressed in the chair's letter, particularly if the promotion can be considered early (fewer than six years in rank) or if the interval between promotions is lengthy.
- When there are concerns in a candidate's case, the chair's letter should describe feedback given to the candidate through the written annual or preliminary (third-year) reviews, mentoring interventions, and proactive measures taken by the candidate (for instance, receiving training from CELT to address low teaching scores).

Updated August 2022