Department of Management
Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures

This document describes the purpose, procedures, and standards for managing the performance of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Specifically, this document focuses on policies and procedures for performance review and feedback for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. These evaluation activities covered in section VI are categorized into six categories, namely, (A) on-going annual reviews of all faculty, (B) preliminary reviews of all untenured tenure track faculty, (C) promotion and tenure reviews, (D) post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty, (E) contract extensions for non-tenure track faculty, and (F) promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

All review and evaluation procedures will follow accepted university guidelines as specified in the Faculty Handbook. In the absence of specific departmental guidelines, college guidelines will take precedence and in the absence of college guidelines or in case of conflict, university guidelines will take precedence.

Deliberations relating to all reviews are highly sensitive, requiring openness and candor of all involved in the review process. Therefore, the confidentiality of these deliberations shall be maintained by each person involved in the review process.

All review reports and recommendations will be provided to the faculty member as soon as practical. The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the department’s recommendations before they are submitted to the dean. This communication will include the department faculty committee report and vote as well as the Department Chair report.

I. Purpose
Each faculty member’s performance must be reviewed and managed on the basis of achievements in four areas. Specifically, the tenured and tenure track faculty members are expected to participate in two primary endeavors: 1) inquiry and research and 2) learning and teaching. In addition, they are expected to contribute to 3) extension and professional service and 4) institutional service. Faculty’s behavior and performance in these four areas are deemed necessary for achieving the mission of the department, the college and the university. In fact, these four broad performance roles describe the faculty of the department and are explicitly to be sought, nurtured, developed, and recognized. This suggests mutual responsibilities and expectations for the individual faculty and the Department Chair. To help achieve
departmental expectations of a faculty and to assist individual faculty in contributing to these expectations, position responsibility statements must be established for all faculty.

II. Position Responsibility Statement (PRS)
Position responsibility statements describe expectations of faculty performance as they relate to their appointments in their departments. This is a shared statement between the individual faculty and his/her Department Chair. The university’s Evaluation/Review Document defines the PRS as a “tool that allows for a flexible and individualized system of faculty review, particularly within the promotion and tenure process” (emphasis added). The PRS should describe expectations and criteria that emphasize behaviors and outcomes, are related to goals and measures of goal achievement, and are clearly understood by faculty member. The responsibility statement should allow both the faculty member and his/her Department Chair to understand the basis of the academic appointment and to place that into context with all review criteria. It should be brief but may include details important to the department and/or the faculty member. The PRS is, however, not intended to spell-out each and every activity of the faculty member. Nor is it intended to provide specific and quantitative measurement indices.

While the PRS should accommodate the varying nature of assignments and responsibilities found across the college, it must be consistent with the department guidelines and standards for reviews and evaluation as well as the mission and strategic goals of the College. The PRS should include expectations/goals in all four performance roles, with varying importance assigned to each area, which is mutually agreed to by the faculty member and the Department Chair. This recognizes the view that faculty members in the department have different expectations and responsibilities and that such differences shall be reflected in all review processes. These differences are typically a function of one’s rank and specific appointments. In any case, the Department Chair has to ensure that the faculty member has and receives the necessary resources to satisfy the PRS expectations.

The PRS is basically a means to manage the behavior and performance of the faculty member. It is designed to promote individual performance and his/her contributions to the mission and goals of the department. Therefore, given the typical emphasis on research and teaching performance for promotion and tenure decisions, it is suggested that the PRSs of assistant professors and associate professors should clearly state the primary expectations in the areas of 1) inquiry and research and 2) teaching and learning. Typically, assistant professors are expected to earn tenure and promotion by demonstrating excellence in research scholarship. Individuals can also earn tenure and/or promotion by demonstrating excellence in teaching scholarship. In either case, the individual’s primary emphasis area must have been clearly specified on the PRS. These expectations, however, should not ignore the citizenship responsibilities of professional and institutional service.

The position responsibility statement cannot be changed unilaterally by either the Department Chair or the faculty member. Disagreements between the faculty member and the Department Chair in developing or revising the PRS should be resolved through mediation by his/her peer
group of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department, the Dean’s Office and/or grievance procedures outlined by the Faculty Handbook.

III. Position Responsibility Areas and General Criteria for Evaluation

There are four responsibility areas of a faculty member. These responsibilities become the basis for describing one’s expectations and for reviewing one’s performance. In each of the six types of reviews, the focus is for managing faculty performance, and performance evaluation is the primary apparatus to help achieve that purpose. Each review should be based on the PRS and supported by detailed description and assessment of the quality of a faculty member’s role performance.

While quality teaching and quality research are not easily measured, the reviews should not, because of such difficulty, eliminate the college’s obligation for such measurement. In addition, while quantitative measures of evaluations are readily available and useful, it is important that primary focus be placed on performance excellence, namely, quality, significance and long-term impact/contribution of one’s accomplishments. In other words, quality, however difficult it may be to measure, is of greater value to academic endeavors than mere numbers.

The following paragraphs provide general descriptions of these areas and general criteria for evaluation of a faculty member.

A. Scholarship in Research: Research is an integral and significant part of the academic enterprise. Achievement in research is demonstrated through a record of original contributions in venues appropriate to one’s discipline. Evidence of effective and quality research is most convincingly shown by papers in premier refereed journals in the discipline of management. The department believes that research scholarship forms the basic infrastructure for any academic enterprise and so expects high quality scholarship in research from its faculty. To fulfill the mission and goals of the department and college, faculty members are expected to make significant and long-lasting contributions to the disciplinary areas of the department and the college. High quality research should be publishable in high quality, peer-refereed journals.

Indicators of quality research include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Publication in the premier and high quality journals, according to the departmental journal list. Such publications are the most important indicators of quality research.
- Publication in journals read by peers who do similar research.
- Publication of academic monographs and books (including textbooks and book chapters).
- Leadership and individual contributions in research scholarship.
- Frequent citation of one’s papers.
- Obtaining external peer-reviewed grants for research and successful completion of them.
- Presentation of papers at national and international conferences.
- Editor, associate editor or member of editorial board of major journals in management.
• Awards and recognition for one’s research achievements from peers beyond the college and university.
• Creation of intellectual property

Faculty members using scholarship in research as their primary basis for promotion and tenure should demonstrate the ability to fulfill a variety of these indicators. Contributions in scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g., cases published in textbooks) may supplement disciplinary research contributions and are evaluated by the same criteria.

B. Scholarly Teaching: Effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is important to the department. Evidence of effective and quality scholarly teaching is most convincingly shown by activities both inside and outside the classroom with substantial emphasis on the development of students.

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the teaching and learning goals of the department and the college. Performance measures that focus only on in-class accomplishments are useful but inadequate to describe scholarly teaching. Averages of student ratings are not sufficient to demonstrate effective teaching. If comparisons across faculty rely on student ratings, it is imperative that the student evaluation procedure be administered in a standardized manner.

Indicators of quality teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:
• Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period of time. This is evidenced by outstanding student ratings, student statements, outcomes assessment data, graduate exit data, and peer reviews.
• Evidence of multiple courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level. This is evidenced by course expectations and conduct, syllabi and assignments, teaching materials, grading practices, and student learning.
• Documented application of insights from scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), including one’s own SoTL efforts as well as the journal literature, to improve teaching and student development.
• Development of new courses, programs etc.
• Peer-reviewed external funding for teaching/instruction and student development activities.
• Development, use and evaluation of innovative methods, materials and tools.
• Chairing thesis and dissertation committees.
• National awards and recognition for one’s teaching achievements from peers beyond the college and university.

Documenting excellence in scholarly teaching requires a variety of these indicators and must include formal peer assessment of teaching.
C. Scholarly Extension and Professional Service: Faculty should play a role in advancing and improving the profession and society in which they are members. Extension service is expected of those who have significant and formal responsibilities in delivering extension programs to the citizens of the state. Evidence of effective professional service include participation in and, more importantly, contribution to local, regional, national and international business and professional associations; serving as editor and on editorial boards of journals; serving as referee for journals and conferences; and consulting activities that show a direct and tangible benefit to the institution and profession.

In accordance with the land-grant mission of the university, faculty who have extension responsibilities are expected to disseminate discipline-based information and know-how to the Iowa public beyond the ISU campus. Moreover, all faculty should have the obligation to improve and contribute to their professional associations.

Indicators of effective extension and professional service include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Organizing and leading workshops, conferences and training programs.
- Giving advice and counsel to businesses.
- Presentations to major practitioner groups.
- Presentations in executive development programs.
- Officer positions in professional organizations.
- Editor or editorial board member for journals.
- Referee for journals or conferences.
- Participating in professional meetings as chairperson, moderator, panel member or discussant.

D. Institutional Service: Institutional service is vital for the effective functioning of the department, college and university. A faculty member’s involvement in this role is evidenced by his/her participation in and contribution to faculty governance and committee assignments within the department, college and university; student advisement and placement activities; and guiding student clubs and organizations.

All faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the effective functioning of the department, college and university. Faculty with administrative responsibilities should have significant expectations in this area.

Indicators of effective institutional service include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Administrative leadership role within the college and university.
- Officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Chair of major department, college and university committees.
- Advisor to student organizations.
- Generation of funds for non-research and non-teaching activities.
- Projects carried out for the college or university.
- Member of college and university committees.

While both extension and professional service and institutional service are necessary and valuable contributions, faculty members typically will not be promoted or granted tenure solely for their performance in these areas. At the same time, a faculty member’s indifference to these roles/expectations should adversely impact his/her review.

IV. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

The primary responsibility of this committee is to review and evaluate faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion (including non-tenure track faculty members). The committee provides a written report evaluating the candidate’s performance in the areas identified in his/her PRS and makes a recommendation to the Department Chair of the department. In the case of a divided vote, the reasons for disagreement should be explained. Committee members voting in the minority must be afforded the opportunity to have their views stated to their satisfaction in the committee report or in a separate minority report. The committee also reviews and evaluates probationary faculty performance under the three-year review process. Each year in the Fall, this committee also elects the department’s representative to the College P&T Committee.

The committee is composed of all tenured associate and full professors in the department. The chairperson of the department P&T Committee is elected by the members of the committee. All members of the department committee participate in the discussions of the candidates. In order to vote on a candidate, members must participate in the discussions on the candidate. Faculty members who are on leave, on Professional Development Assignment or away from campus during the time period of promotion and tenure discussions, may participate via electronic means. If they are unable to participate, members may provide an assessment on the candidate, but may not vote. Only full professors are eligible to vote on candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full professor. The departmental representative to the college committee votes with the faculty at the department level but does not vote on candidates from the department at the college level, as mandated by the university Faculty Handbook section 5.2.4.3. Faculty holding administrative appointments cannot serve on this committee.

V. External Reviewers

The basic intent of soliciting external reviews is to get an impartial, objective assessment of scholarship performance from recognized individuals in the discipline. All tenure and promotion assessments shall include external reviewer letters. The external reviewers for tenure track faculty should generally be tenured professors who are widely recognized in the field. External reviewers should be at the rank to which the candidate aspires (or higher) and be from prestigious institutions (our peer institutions or better). Reviewers should be neither the candidate’s co-authors nor his/her dissertation committee members.
The candidate and the department P&T committee with input from the department chair are responsible for developing independent lists of potential external reviewers. Six reviewers are chosen from these two lists. The candidate should submit a list of 6-8 names of faculty whom they feel comfortable being asked to serve as external reviewers. It is the department chair’s responsibility to assess the appropriateness of the nominated evaluators. The candidate should also submit a list of any names of faculty for which they believe a conflict of interest exists and who therefore should not be contacted to serve as external reviewers. The department P&T committee working with the department chair will develop an independent list of potential external reviewers who are well known in the candidate’s research areas. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should at no time have direct contact with external reviewers about the process. It is the responsibility of the chair of the Department of Management P&T committee or the chair of the Department to contact any selected external reviewers to determine their willingness to serve in that capacity. Once an external reviewer indicates their availability, they may be selected as an external reviewer. Appropriate materials will then be sent to them formally asking them to serve in this capacity along with a date for returning materials should they be unable to do so. A minimum of two reviewers is selected from the candidate’s list. When submitting names, the candidate shall include a statement describing reasons for choosing each individual as well as his/her relationship to each individual. Faculty seeking promotion to full professor who recommend external reviewers used as external reviewers in their earlier promotion and tenure decision are advised to provide reasons for the repetition. Only those persons involved in the promotion and tenure process will have access to the external reviewer letters.

Each external reviewer should receive a letter from the chair of the department committee outlining the specific areas requiring his/her evaluation and comment (see appendix one for sample letter). At least four but no more than six articles written by the candidate should be submitted to the reviewers. The candidate will identify the articles to be sent. In addition, the reviewers should receive the candidate’s curriculum vitae, personal statement and relevant parts of this document (Section III) that describe general criteria and standards used here. The external reviewer should be asked to provide a brief (1 to 2 pages) biographical profile or curriculum vitae that will help faculty and administrators in other disciplines to better understand the reviewer’s qualifications and stature in his/her field. For the sake of uniformity in the review process, it is recommended that the sample letter provided in this document be used to solicit all external reviews.

VI. Categories of review

A. Annual Reviews of Tenured, Tenure Track, and Non Tenure Track Faculty

Purpose: Annual reviews of faculty are conducted to measure and evaluate one’s behavior and accomplishments during the year. This process is intended to systematically describe a faculty member’s performance including his/her position-relevant strengths and weaknesses. The
information gathered in this process is intended for two purposes - one, to serve as a basis for
“merit” increases and two, to serve as a basis for performance improvement and development.

Procedures: The annual review is conducted by the Department Chair based on the faculty
member’s PRS and PRR – the annual reporting mechanism. The Department Chair provides a
written statement regarding the faculty member’s performance during the previous calendar
year, and meets with the faculty member to discuss the report and to reaffirm or re-write the
PRS. Faculty, who feel aggrieved in their annual reviews, may appeal the Department Chair’s
evaluation using grievance procedures established in the Faculty Handbook.

Standards: The fundamental basis for assessment of a faculty member’s behavior and
accomplishments is the Position Responsibility Statement. The faculty member’s performance is
reviewed in the context of his/her PRS and is evaluated in relation to the general criteria in
Section III.

B. Preliminary Review of Probationary Untenured Faculty

Purpose: In addition to annual reviews, all untenured faculty are evaluated towards the end of
the third year of the probationary term unless a different year is specified in a faculty member’s
appointment letter or at the time an extension of the probationary period is granted. The
primary purpose of this evaluation is to assess their progress toward promotion and tenure.
This review should go beyond the “potential” criteria typically used in hiring new faculty. On
the basis of this review and evaluation, a determination is made as to whether the probationary
period should be continued or terminated.

Procedures: This review is initiated by the department and carried out by the department chair
and the P&T committee. This should result in two independent assessments (a Department
Chair’s letter to the candidate and a faculty report) of the faculty member. These reports are
forwarded to the Dean. The reports should include an evaluation of the faculty member’s
strengths and weaknesses, his/her progress towards tenure, and his/her continued match with
the institution.

These assessment reports are used as input by the Dean in making his/her decision concerning
the continuation of the faculty member’s probationary period at Iowa State University.

All these assessments should be based on the faculty member’s PRS and should be consistent
with the criteria and standards used for promotion and tenure in the department and college.
The faculty member is expected to provide a copy of his/her current curriculum vitae, copies of
all research and teaching publications, and copies of papers under review including letters from
editors. Annual review reports indicating his/her accomplishments on all the performance
dimensions of the PRS are included in the dossier. External letters are not normally expected
as part of this review. Personal statements on both teaching and research are required.
Standards: This review should be guided by the PRS that was developed when the faculty member was hired. While the PRS provides for some flexibility in individual expectations and academic freedom, it should clearly and explicitly state that the primary role expectations of an untenured faculty member are to promote 1) inquiry and research and 2) teaching and learning.

The faculty member, by the end of his/her preliminary review year, should be making reasonable progress toward obtaining tenure. Evidence of progress in terms of scholarly publications, papers under review and working papers should be shown. The various assessment reports should clearly indicate the faculty member’s potential for significant contributions to scholarship in teaching and research and potential for achieving tenure. General criteria identified in Section V provide guidelines for these assessments.

Suggested Time Frame for Probationary Untenured Faculty Review -
December 20  Candidate submits personal statement, CV, and copies of papers published, accepted, under review and in-progress
January/February  Departmental reviews
February 28  Departmental and Department Chair reports submitted to the Dean

C. Promotion and/or Tenure Review

Purpose: Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and tenure are granted to a faculty member on the basis of an assessment of the faculty member’s cumulative achievements in his/her personal responsibility areas.

Procedures: The department committee reviews all promotion and tenure cases. It provides a written report on each case evaluating the candidate’s scholarship performance in accordance with the candidate’s PRS and criteria discussed in Section III of this document. This report along with the committee’s recommendations and vote is submitted to the Department Chair and becomes a part of the candidate’s dossier.

The Department Chair also reviews and provides an independent written report on each candidate in accordance with the candidate’s PRS and criteria discussed in Section III of this document. The Department Chair’s report is added to the dossier which is submitted to the dean of the college.

Each dossier submitted to the college committee shall include the following materials –
• The Department Chair Report providing an evaluation of the candidate’s performance in each of the four PRS areas, with particular emphasis given to scholarship.
• The Departmental P&T Committee Report providing an evaluation of the candidate’s performance on each of the four PRS areas, with particular emphasis given to teaching and research scholarship. The report should provide a recommendation concerning the tenure and/or promotion decision and a tally of the vote of the tenured faculty of the department. In the case of a divided vote, the reasons for disagreement should be explained. Committee
members voting in the minority must be afforded the opportunity to have their views stated to their satisfaction in the committee report or via a separate minority report.

- **Letters of Evaluation** from a minimum of four external reviewers. The intent of this process is to receive external, impartial, objective assessments of the candidate’s credentials.

  This section of the dossier should also include the following:
  - a list of reviewers provided by the candidate along with their association with the reviewer and those identified by the department committee.
  - a brief statement from the department committee identifying the academic/professional stature of the reviewers and providing the reasons for the selection of the reviewers.
  - a copy of the letter sent to the external reviewers requesting their assessment of the candidate.

- **Curriculum Vitae and Personal Statement** - The personal statement allows each candidate to summarize his/her goals, accomplishments and future plans with regard to teaching, research, extension and professional service, and institutional service. A rationale for the application, including the timing of the application, should be included as part of this personal statement.

- **Faculty Portfolio** providing important and supplemental materials describing the candidate’s activities and achievements in each of the four PRS areas. Particular emphasis is placed on the candidate’s scholarship in teaching and research. The portfolio allows the candidate to identify and document peer recognition and impact/contribution of one’s scholarship accomplishments such as professional reviews, citation counts, peer acceptance of scholarship, and awards. These materials may be presented in the following form:
  - a teaching portfolio that contains various measures of teaching performance, any indication of student learning, peer acknowledgements and other evidence consistent with the general criteria in Section III.
  - a research portfolio that contain summaries of completed, current and proposed research (supplemented by scholarship of teaching and learning, if applicable), peer assessments of one’s contributions to the field, and other evidence consistent with the general criteria in Section III.
  - an extension and professional service portfolio describing activities and achievements in this area. This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in Section III.
  - an institutional service portfolio describing activities and achievements in this area.

  This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in Section III.

All publication entries should provide the names of co-authors in the order in which they appear in the publication, the page numbers, and in the case of books and monographs the total number of pages. Papers under review should be clearly identified and the submission and review time-line should be provided.

**Standards:**

**Promotion to Associate Professor** with tenure is based on an assessment of the faculty member’s achievements in research scholarship and scholarly teaching. Normally, the
emphasis of this assessment is placed on one’s research performance because of the initial hiring and PRS expectations. The faculty member should have both a strong academic record and demonstrate promise of further development and productivity in his or her academic career. He/she should clearly demonstrate excellence in scholarship of research. In addition, the faculty member must show evidence of effective teaching, normally across more than one course and preferably in the graduate program, along with satisfactory service. Exceptions to these normal expectations should be documented in the candidate’s PRS. The criteria listed in Section III and the PRS form the basis for determining performance in these areas.

Promotion to associate professor and tenure decisions are typically considered simultaneously. Assistant professors are typically reviewed in the sixth year of their probationary period at Iowa State University. Faculty with previous experience may typically bring in up to three years of credit for similar tenure-track experience at other universities which reduces the length of their probationary period. In line with faculty who begin their career at Iowa State University, faculty bringing in years of experience will be evaluated on their previous five years of work (not counting the year in which they apply for promotion and tenure). For faculty with more than five years of previous experience, work done prior to the five year evaluation period will be considered as accomplishments that help establish their record, but more emphasis will be given to accomplishments produced in the most recent five year period. Earlier awarding of promotion and tenure requires, according to university guidelines, truly exceptional accomplishments.

**Promotion to Professor** is granted to a faculty member who has an established and well-regarded national/international reputation for scholarship. A faculty member seeking promotion to professor is also expected to demonstrate effectiveness in all areas of position responsibilities, including significant institutional and professional service is expected. A recommendation for promotion to full professor must be based on an assessment of the candidate’s contributions since his/her last promotion.

**Suggested Time-Frame for the Promotion and Tenure Review Process** -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Candidate provides letter of intent to Department Chair and submits a list of names of 6-8 external reviewers and the list of any external reviewers who should not be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Departmental P&amp;T committee meets to select and initiate contact with external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>The candidate submits the P&amp;T vita and Faculty Portfolio (including the personal statement and other materials) to the department chair. The department P&amp;T committee begins consulting with the candidate about the sample of scholarly products to be sent to the external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>Letter and materials (Vita, PRS, personal statement, and the sample of scholarly works) sent to external reviewers (See appendix 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Receive letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process is primarily a faculty review process that is meant to assess the quality of the faculty member’s performance and is fundamentally seen as a developmental activity designed to recognize and enhance the performance of tenured and continuously appointed faculty. The review process focuses on the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service consistent with the faculty member’s position responsibility statement.

The annual performance evaluation of faculty by the Department Chair is a key element in the post-tenure review process. In addition to any other necessary, desirable and appropriate developmental and evaluative remarks, the Department Chair will annually state whether each faculty member’s overall performance is satisfactory. It is understood that a satisfactory rating implies that the faculty member’s base salary will be at least the minimum mandated by the President, Provost or Dean for faculty who meet position expectations.

The basic post-tenure review shall be augmented by a peer review under one of the following circumstances:

- When the Department Chair rates the faculty member’s performance as unsatisfactory for two consecutive years.
- When requested by a faculty member who has received an unsatisfactory rating from the Department Chair.
- When requested by a faculty member, but not more often than every five years unless the Department Chair rates the faculty member’s performance as unsatisfactory.
- At least once every seven years, each faculty member will be reviewed by the peer review policies and procedures outlined below. A departmental review for promotion, regardless of whether the promotion is granted or denied, will substitute for the mandatory 7-year post-tenure review (i.e., the 7-year time clock for mandatory review will begin anew following a review for promotion).

Notes: A faculty member requesting a peer review must do so within 45 days after being notified by the Department Chair of his or her annual performance evaluation results. Individuals scheduled for the seven year review in the fall term shall be notified by the end of the prior spring semester.

Policies and Procedures
(1) The Post-Tenure Review (PTR) committee shall consist of all tenured faculty in the department. From this group, a subcommittee of three faculty shall prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member subject to review. One member of the subcommittee is to be designated by the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review and the other two
members to be designated to serve by the Post-tenure Review Committee. One of the two PTR designated subcommittee members should be from the discipline of the candidate under review (OB/HRM or Strategy/Entrepreneurship) and the other from an outside area, but within the Department of Management. The Department Chair and other university administrators are not eligible to serve on the PTR committee.

(2) The peer review will be completed by the PTR subcommittee. If the unanimous consensus of the subcommittee is that the faculty member meets expectations, the full PTR committee will normally be by-passed. The subcommittee will make the report available to members of PTR Committee. The report will only be considered by the full PTR if requested so by either the candidate or if any member of the full PTR committee disagrees with the “meets expectations” conclusion of the PTR subcommittee. In those instances where a faculty receives a superior rating, a below expectations rating, or those cases in which the subcommittee is not in unanimous agreement that the faculty member meets expectations, the report of the subcommittee will be brought to the whole PTR committee for review, discussion, and a vote reflecting the level of departmental agreement with the subcommittee’s report. The involvement of the full PTR committee in these cases is to determine support for a meritorious raise recommendation for those receiving a superior rating and as a check and balance for those receiving either a below expectations rating, or a divided conclusion on whether they meet expectations. This report, and the vote (if necessary), is then given to the Department Chair who will, in turn, give the PTR report to the faculty member and schedule a developmental review with the faculty member within two weeks. If a developmental action plan is recommended by the PTR Committee, the PTR subcommittee Chair and the Department Chair will work together to develop the particulars of such a plan. Prior to the time of the developmental review meeting, the faculty member being reviewed will have the opportunity to respond in writing to the PTR report, in terms of correcting any errors in fact. The Department Chair will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the report and its recommendations (if any). Following the developmental meeting between the Department Chair and faculty member, the PRS, the faculty’s self-evaluation, CV, PTR report and the faculty members response (if there is one) will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office, along with the Department Chair’s recommendations (if any). The time span for completing this process shall be 9 weeks from the time the faculty member submits his or her materials.

(3) The peer review will be based upon the faculty member’s Position Responsibility Statement, annual Personal Responsibility Reports for the time since the last PTR (excluding Department Chair summary evaluations), any previous PTR reports, current vita (CV), and a written self-assessment statement from the person being reviewed. These materials are to be given to the PTR committee within two weeks after the start of the spring semester. The candidate’s self-assessment statement should summarize and evaluate professional activities in light of the faculty member’s career goals and Position Responsibility Statement. The PTR committee may also request additional information relevant to the review.

(4) The PTR committee will:
• Provide a written summary evaluation of the faculty member’s performance over the preceding 7 years, including strengths and weaknesses
• The report will include an overall rating of the faculty member’s performance as either **superior, meets expectations** or **below expectations**, as well as ratings on the faculty member’s performance in each of areas of the faculty member’s position responsibility statement. A cover sheet for post tenure review is provided by the Office of the Provost for this purpose. (See Appendix 3 at the end of this document.)
• A faculty member at the rank of Professor receiving a superior evaluation (reflecting excellence in performance over the past seven years in all three responsibility areas (research, teaching and service) may warrant a recommendation by the Department Chair of a post-tenure review salary increment.
• A “meeting expectations” overall rating by the PTR committee should be accompanied by recommendations for receiving a superior performance evaluation.
• For faculty members receiving a below expectations assessment (in any aspect of his/her PRS) a developmental action plan is to be developed by the Department Chair and PTR committee chair, in consultation with the faculty member. The action plan must include (1) a justification for the plan, (2) a specific time-table for the evaluation of acceptable progress on the plan, and (3) a description of possible consequences for not meeting the expectations by the stipulated timeline. If agreement on the action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated using PRS mediation procedures (Section 5.1.1.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook). Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next academic year’s annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as outlined in the Faculty Conduct Policy (Section 7.2.2.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook).

**Suggested Time Frame for Post-Tenure Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Department chair informs the tenured faculty of those among them who are slated for a post-tenure review in the spring semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2</td>
<td>Faculty being considered for PTR submit the name of the faculty they elect to have serve on the PTR subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8</td>
<td>Tenured faculty select two members to serve on PTR subcommittee(s) and the subcommittee(s) elect a chair. The name of the subcommittee is to be submitted to faculty subject to PTR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Faculty member submits personal statement, CV, Professional Responsibility Statement and Professional Responsibility Reports to the department PTR subcommittee chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Subcommittee submits report to department chair. (This deadline includes time needed to meet with the full PTR Committee, if necessary.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>PTR report given to faculty member. Faculty member has one week to submit a written response correcting any errors in fact. Department chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and PTR Subcommittee chair begin work on developmental plan, if necessary.

March 8  Department chair and faculty meet to discuss the PTR report (and developmental plan, if necessary).

March 15  PTR report (including the development plan if necessary) submitted to the Dean’s office.

E. Renewal of Contract for Non-tenure Track Positions

Preface: In the Department of Management, non-tenure eligible faculty primarily support tenure-track in the area of teaching. To ensure and encourage quality performance, the department will conduct systematic assessments through annual reviews and during reappointment and advancement opportunities for all non-tenure-track faculty.

Non-tenure-track faculty positions are term appointments eligible for renewal based on the quality of performance, the continuing need of the department, and are subject to approval by the Dean and the Provost. Individuals appointed to these positions will be evaluated for compensation and advancement using established criteria appropriate to their positions. Evaluations for renewal of appointment will be conducted by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and recommended by the department chair. Two types of non-tenure-track appointments are applicable:

- Lecturer or Clinician: a limited term full or part-time appointment of from one semester to three years and renewable for no more than a total of six years.

- Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician: a limited term full or part-time 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/Clinician, the individual shall have served as a Lecturer/Clinician or its equivalent for six years.

General Guidelines for Reviews:
Deliberations relating to all reviews are highly sensitive, requiring openness and candor of all involved in the review process. Therefore, the confidentiality of these deliberations shall be maintained by each person involved in the review process.

Results of all reviews and recommendations must be provided to the individual being reviewed as soon as practical. In the case of reappointment and/or advancement to Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician, the Department Chair must inform the individual of the department’s recommendation and the Department Chair’s recommendation before they are submitted to the Dean. The Dean must also inform the individual of the college’s recommendation after the Dean has completed his/her review.

Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and Guidelines for Annual Review:
Each non-tenure-track faculty member’s performance must be reviewed on the basis of teaching, and additional responsibilities as outlined in their PRS, if any, to help achieve
department and college expectations and to assist the individual in contributing to these expectations. The PRS, as defined in the *Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures* page 2 item III paragraph one (April 17th 2002), must be established for all faculty including non-tenure-track faculty.

At the beginning of each calendar year each non-tenure-track faculty member must submit a completed Professional Responsibility Report (PRR) to the Department Chair. An outline of the items contained in the PRR is found in the Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures pages 14-15. While the PRR allows flexibility such that a faculty member can make note of accomplishments in all areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and institutional service), individuals need to complete only those sections relating to their own duties as specified in their individual PRS. This would include, but not necessarily be limited to, the faculty member's student evaluations for the reporting year. More specific criteria to evaluate non-tenure-track faculty are found in departmental *Policies and Procedures for Annual Review, Reappointment and Advancement for Non-tenure-track Faculty* documents.

The Department Chair will review the PRRs and prepare a written evaluation of the individual’s performance. The Department Chair and the individual will subsequently review these documents in a face-to-face meeting prior to the end of the Spring semester or at the end of the individual’s contract period whichever is earlier. The documents will become part of the individual's personnel record.

**Reappointment:**
Prior to the time at which a non-tenure-track faculty member must be reappointed, a review of the individual's performance will be conducted by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPTC) or a sub-committee thereof. Details as to the composition of the committee are found in each department’s Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures document. Deadlines for all components of the evaluation will be the responsibility of the Department Chair, who will notify all parties of these deadlines.

**Assessment processes:** The non-tenure-track faculty member must submit a package consisting of his/her own personal statement containing a self-assessment of performance in the area of teaching over the previous appointment period, and any other areas specified in his/her PRS. Depending on the PRS of that faculty member, the assessment should include information about teaching (including student evaluations of instructors), service, and research expectations. The self-assessment needs to highlight both outcomes of the performance dimension as well as the processes used to achieve those objectives (such as approach to classroom pedagogy). To evaluate teaching, the committee may also ask the faculty member for additional information such as grade distributions, syllabi, tests, sample term papers, sample overheads or slides, may observe the NTT faculty member’s in class performance and talk to students in the class about a teacher’s performance. In addition, all PRRs that were submitted over the previous appointment period should also be included. To evaluate service, the committee may also ask the faculty member to provide the names and contact information of those who were provided services.
Assessment report: In the report to department chair, the committee will comment on the content of course material, classroom performance standards, and student assessments of teaching performance. The committee will then make a recommendation to the department chair about the length of contract renewal and the next time performance evaluations will be conducted (at least once every three years) and all teaching evaluations. The Department Chair shall communicate the report to the NTT faculty member and become a permanent part of the report.

Based on the Department Chair’s assessment and the recommendation of the DPTC, the Chair will make a recommendation to the Dean regarding the candidate’s reappointment. The Dean will then make a decision regarding reappointment, notify the Department Chair as to his/her decision, and forward his/her recommendation and appropriate documents to the Provost’s Office for a final decision.

Advancement to Senior Clinician or Senior Lecturer:
Purpose: Promotion to Senior Lecturer is granted to a non-tenure track faculty member on the basis of an assessment of the faculty member’s cumulative achievements in his/her personal responsibility areas.

Standards: Promotion to Senior Lecturer will, unless otherwise noted in the faculty member’s PRS, be based on the faculty member’s teaching performance, supplemented with information on his/her service to the department, college and university.

Procedures: Six months prior to the date at which a non-tenure-track faculty member becomes eligible for advancement, the candidate notifies the Department Chair of his/her intention to seek advancement. The department promotion and tenure committee reviews all applications for NTT promotion to Senior Lecturer. It provides a written report on each case evaluating the candidate’s performance in accordance with the candidate’s PRS and criteria discussed in Section III of this document. This report along with the committee’s recommendations and vote is submitted to the Department Chair and become a part of the candidate’s dossier.

The Department Chair also reviews and provides an independent written report on each candidate in accordance with the candidate’s PRS and criteria discussed in Section III of this document. The Department Chair’s report is added to the dossier which is submitted to the dean of the college.

Each dossier submitted to the college committee shall include the following materials –
- *The Department Chair Report* providing an evaluation of the candidate’s performance on each of the relevant PRS areas, with particular emphasis given to teaching performance.
- *The Departmental P&T Committee Report* providing an evaluation of the candidate’s performance on each of the relevant PRS areas, with particular emphasis given to teaching. The report should provide a recommendation concerning the promotion decision and a tally of the vote of the tenured faculty of the department. Minority reports, if applicable, are to be included.


- **Curriculum Vitae and Personal Statement** - The personal statement allows each candidate to summarize his/her goals, accomplishments and future plans with regard to each applicable area of responsibility as outlined in the NTT faculty member’s PRS. A rationale for the application, including the timing of the application, should be included as part of this personal statement.

- **Faculty Portfolio** providing important and supplemental materials describing the candidate’s activities and achievements in each of the relevant PRS areas. Particular emphasis is placed on the candidate’s teaching performance. The portfolio allows the candidate to identify and document peer recognition and impact/contribution of one’s accomplishments. These materials may be presented in the following form:
  
  - all PRRs, recommendations and student evaluations accumulated prior to becoming a candidate for advancement.
  - a teaching portfolio that contains various measures of teaching performance, any indication of student learning, peer acknowledgements and other evidence consistent with the general criteria in Section III.
  - a research portfolio (if applicable) that contain summaries of completed, current and proposed research, peer assessments of one’s contributions to the field, and other evidence consistent with the general criteria in Section III.
  - an extension and professional service portfolio (if applicable) describing activities and achievements in this area. This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in Section III.
  - an institutional service portfolio (if applicable) describing activities and achievements in this area. This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in Section III.

All publication entries (if applicable) should provide the names of co-authors in the order in which they appear in the publication, the page numbers, and in the case of books and monographs the total number of pages. Papers under review should be clearly identified and the submission and review time-line should be provided.

The Department Chair’s independent assessment of the faculty member's performance will conclude with a recommendation and be included in a final package that, with the DPTC’s report outlined in Section IV above, is submitted to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPTC) by the Dean.

The CPTC will review the candidate's advancement package, including the Department Chair’s and DPTC’s recommendations, and submit their recommendation to the Dean. The deadline for the submission of the department’s package to the Dean and the CPTC’s recommendation to the Dean is February 1. The Dean will make his/her decision as to advancement and will notify the Department Chair in writing, by February 20. The package, including the Dean’s report and decision, will then be forwarded to the Provost for a final decision regarding the candidate’s advancement.

A reappointment decision, if appropriate, would be made independently of the advancement decision and should be based solely on the process outlined in sections I-III.
A description of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee along with their responsibilities can be found in the *College of Business Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures* document dated April 17, 2002. The appeals process for any of the activities described above and other particulars not specifically described above will follow the guidelines also set forth in the College document.

**Five-Year Reviews of Senior Clinician or Senior Lecturer:**
In the year prior to the fifth anniversary of contract appointment to Senior Lecturer/Clinician, the individual will undergo a detailed performance review. During spring semester of the fourth year of appointment, the individual will submit a package containing a self-assessment of performance in the area of teaching and any other areas specified in his/her PRS. The Department Chair and the DPTC will review this material and all PRRs submitted since the last Five-Year Review or since advancement, if this is the first review since then. The Department Chair and the DPTC will then submit independent assessments of the individual’s performance with constructive recommendations, if necessary, as to how the individual might improve performance. This package, with Department Chair and DPTC reports and recommendations, PRRs and personal statement, will be forwarded to the Dean prior to the end of the semester.

**Use of P&S Employees as Non-tenure Track Faculty:**
When P&S employees are used to undertake work similar to that of a department’s Lecturers or Clinicians, then the title of Lecturer or Clinician is appropriate to them as well. Consequently, the above policies and procedures hold for such P&S employee appointments with the following exceptions/adjustments:

- Individuals holding a full or part-time P&S position may have no more than 30% of their total work responsibilities assigned as non-tenure-eligible faculty responsibilities.
- All titles (e.g., Lecturer, Senior Lecturer) can be given for terms not to exceed five years, when a department foresees a continuing need for the P&S employees’ service in faculty roles. There is no required notice of intent not to renew for the non-tenure-eligible titles given to P&S employees and termination of the P&S appointment will also mean the termination of the non-tenure-eligible appointment.
- While the P&S employee will not have a Position Responsibility Statement, the department chair should specify in writing, at the time of appointment, the responsibilities associated with the non-tenure-eligible appointment,
- For P&S employees with non-tenure-eligible appointments, there is no minimum or maximum time in rank. For example, an employee may continue with the title of “Lecturer” for an indefinite time, with appropriate review.
- The P&S employee assigned a non-tenure-eligible title does not have voting rights as a faculty member.
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External Reviewer Letter – A Sample

Dear : 

(Name) is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor/professor at Iowa State University. The promotion and tenure review committee requests your candid assessment of his/her scholarly contributions to the field of _______.

Enclosed is a packet of (Name)’s recent publications, curriculum vitae, his/her personal statement, and relevant parts of our promotion and tenure document. We would like your assessment of his/her works and your answers to these specific questions –

• Do you know (Name) and if so, for how long and under what circumstances?
• How would you assess the contribution to the discipline made by (Name)? Which publications would you judge to be most significant and why?
• How would you assess (Name)’s development as a scholar/researcher/teacher?

We would greatly appreciate any additional comments you might provide us.

Please note that (Name) has/has not waived his/her right to see the review letter written by you. Members of the review committees and department and college administrators who see your letter as part of the review process will hold your comments in confidence.

For your comments to receive full consideration, we request that your letter reach us no later than (date). While a facsimile would be appropriate by that date, a letter with your signature a few days later is needed. If you are unable to provide your assessment by this date, please let me know as soon as possible.

Please enclose a brief (1 to 2 pages) biographical profile or curriculum vitae so that faculty and administrators in other disciplines, who will review this candidate, can better understand your qualifications as an external reviewer. If you have questions, please call me at (515) 294.xxxx.

Sincerely,
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PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY REPORT

NAME: _______________________________ DATE: _______________________________

RANK: _______________________________ REPORTING YEAR: _______________________________

Instructions: Please provide information for the current year only unless specified.

I. RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP PORTFOLIO

All citations should be complete including the proper order of authorship.

A. Refereed Journal Articles

Current Year

Previous Year

B. Non-refereed Journal Articles

Current Year

Previous Year

C. Book, Chapters in Books, and Monographs (including textbooks, cases in texts)

D. Other Publications including proceedings

E. Presentations and Conference Participation (identify and describe type of participation)

F. Research Papers and SoTL Papers under Review (indicate journal and stage of review process, include dates)

G. Research Papers and SoTL Papers in Process (indicate title and pages and targeted journal)

H. Awards and Honors in Research and Publication

I. Research and SoTL Grants and Proposals (list all proposals and describe results of your efforts)

J. Creation of Intellectual Property

II. TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP PORTFOLIO

All citations should be complete including the proper order of authorship.

A. Significant Curriculum and Course Development Work

B. Courses Involved in Outcomes Assessment Activities (Indicate any courses you taught that were selected to be used for college, departmental or major-related outcomes assessment activities and state the degree of involvement)

C. Release Time Granted (describe purpose and outcomes)

D. Student Development

1. Advising Students

2. Undergraduate Honors Committees (indicate chair or member)
3. Independent Study Courses (indicate course, semester, and student name)
4. Graduate Student Committees (indicate student name and whether chair or member of the committee and whether it is a doctoral dissertation, master's thesis, or master's creative component)
5. Leadership and involvement in student case competitions, business plan development competitions, leading study abroad and study tour groups, and other events of a similar nature
6. Student Publications (indicate role)
7. Student Organizations (indicate role, e.g., advisor)
8. Placement of Students at All Levels of Study (indicate role)

E. Awards and Honors in Teaching
   f. Summary of Student Evaluations
      Ratings on file with department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course (i.e., ACCT 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Teaching Evaluations from Continuing Education and Extension Programs
H. Teaching Grants (other than SoTL grants reported earlier) and Proposals (list all proposals and describe results of your efforts)
I. Application of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to Courses and Student Development
J. Other

III. OUTREACH/PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PORTFOLIO
A. Continuing Education and Workshop Activities
B. Consulting (for pay or no pay)
   1. Iowa Companies, Communities, and Non-Profit Organizations (including government agencies)
   2. Outside of Iowa
C. Other Outreach Activities (e.g., Research involving organizations from which the organization might benefit, student and/or faculty projects for organizations, etc.)
   1. Iowa Companies, Communities, and Non-Profit Organizations (including government agencies)
   2. Outside of Iowa
D. Professional Service
1. Editorial Board Activities
2. Referee or Reviewer Involvement
3. Association Activities
E. Awards and Honors for Professional Service
F. Other

IV. INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE PORTFOLIO
A. Department, College and University Committees (identify and describe role)
B. Generation of Funds from Non-research Activities
C. Special Assignments (identify and describe role)
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Cover Sheet
Post Tenure Review

College of _________________________________
Department of ______________________________

Faculty Name:  
_________________________________________________________________

Faculty Rank:  
_________________________________________________________________

Assessments:

Teaching:
[ ] Superior
[ ] Meets Expectations
[ ] Below Expectations

Research/Creative Activities:
[ ] Superior
[ ] Meets Expectations
[ ] Below Expectations

Service:
[ ] Superior
[ ] Meets Expectations
[ ] Below Expectations

Other:
[ ] Superior
[ ] Meets Expectations
[ ] Below Expectations

Overall Recommendation:
[ ] Superior
[ ] Meets Expectations
[ ] Below Expectations

Department Chair Supportive of “Superior” Salary Increment:  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Dean Supportive of “Superior” Salary Increment:  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]