Department of Marketing
Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures

This document describes the purpose, procedures, and standards for managing the performance of the marketing faculty. Specifically, this document focuses on policies and procedures for performance review and feedback for both untenured and tenured faculty in the marketing department. These evaluation activities are classified into four categories, namely, (1) on-going annual reviews of all faculty, (2) three-year reviews of all untenured faculty, (3) promotion and tenure reviews, and (4) periodic reviews of all tenured 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 DEO will inform the faculty member about 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 DEO report.

I. Purpose
Each faculty member's performance must be reviewed and managed on the basis of achievements in four areas. Specifically, the faculty member is expected to participate in two primary endeavors: 1) research and 2) teaching. In addition, the faculty member is expected to contribute to 3) extension or professional service and 4) institutional service. Faculty's performance in these four areas is 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 DEO. To help achieve departmental expectations of a faculty and to assist individual faculty to contribute 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 DEO. 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 the faculty member. The responsibility statement should allow both the faculty member and his/her DEO 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 are mutually agreed to by the faculty member and the DEO. 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 DEO has to ensure that the faculty member has and receives the necessary resources to satisfy the PRS expectations.

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. 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 DEO or the faculty member. Disagreements between the faculty and the DEO 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 four 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 scholarship and publication, including original contributions in venues appropriate to one’s discipline. Evidence of effective and quality research is most convincingly shown by papers in top-tier refereed journals in the discipline of
marketing.

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 leading/top-tier journals (based on documented ranking)
- Publication in journals read by peers who do similar research.
- Publication of academic monographs and books.
- Leadership and individual contributions in research scholarship.
- Frequency 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 and must include external peer assessment of research scholarship.

B. Scholarship in Teaching: Effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is important to the department. Evidence of effective and quality teaching is most convincingly shown by activities both inside and outside the classroom with substantial emphasis on the development of students and contributions to the advancement of pedagogy in one’s discipline. Like research, true teaching excellence mandates external peer visibility.

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 teaching scholarship. 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 scholarship of teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Publications concerning teaching in the leading/top-tier teaching journals.
- Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period of time. This is evidenced by outstanding student ratings, student statements, and peer reviews. If comparisons across faculty rely on student ratings, it is imperative that the student evaluation procedure be administered in a standardized manner.
- Teaching courses at a rigorous and challenging level as evidenced by course expectations and conduct,
syllabi and assignments, teaching materials, grading practices, and student learning. If comparisons across faculty rely on student ratings, it is imperative that the student evaluation procedure be administered in a standardized manner.

- Development of new courses and/or programs.
- Presentation of teaching-oriented papers at national and international conferences.
- Obtaining external peer-reviewed grants for teaching/instruction and student development activities.
- Development of innovative instructional methodologies and materials.
- Editor, associate editor or member of editorial board of major teaching-oriented journals.
- Chairing thesis committees.
- National awards and recognition for one's teaching achievements from peers beyond the college and university.
- Creation of intellectual property

Faculty members using scholarship of teaching as their primary basis for promotion and tenure should demonstrate their ability to fulfill a variety of these indicators and must include external peer assessment of teaching scholarship. Performance measures that focus only on in-class accomplishments are useful but inadequate to describe the scholarship of teaching. Averages of student ratings are not sufficient to demonstrate the scholarship of teaching.

C. Scholarship in 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 state, 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. Scholarship in 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. 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 Chair of the department. A minority report may be written, if desired. 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 and vote on 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 the committee's discussions, may participate via electronic means. If they are unable to participate, members may provide an assessment of the candidate, but cannot vote. 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. Faculty holding administrative appointments cannot serve on this committee.

V. External Reviewers
The basic intent of soliciting external reviews is to get an external peer assessment of scholarship performance from recognized individuals in the discipline. All tenure and promotion assessments shall include external reviewer letters. The external reviewers should generally be tenured professors who are widely recognized in the field. In general, reviewers should be neither the candidate's co-authors nor his/her dissertation chair.

The department P&T committee is responsible for soliciting letters from appropriate and recognized peers in the field. Four reviewers are chosen from a list of at least five names submitted by the candidate and supplemented
by the department committee. 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. All individuals used as external reviewers must be acceptable to both the candidate and the department committee. 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. At least four but no more than six papers 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 V and Section X) 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 on page 13 be used to solicit all external reviews.

VI. Annual Reviews
Purpose: Annual reviews of faculty are conducted to measure and evaluate one's 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 DEO based on the faculty member's PRS and PRR - the annual reporting mechanism (see pages 14-15) and formerly known as the PDR. The DEO 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 DEO's evaluation using grievance procedures established in the Faculty Handbook.

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

**VII. 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. 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 of the department. This should result in two independent assessments (a DEO report 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's PRS and should be consistent with the criteria and standards used for promotion and tenure in the department and college. The faculty 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 third 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's potential for significant contributions to scholarship of 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 DEO reports submitted to the Dean

VIII. 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. The granting of tenure should be based primarily on one's quality of scholarship in research and/or scholarship of teaching.

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 DEO and become a part of the candidate's dossier.

The DEO also reviews and provides a written report on each candidate in accordance with the candidate's PRS and criteria discussed in Section III of this document. The DEO'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 DEO 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 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 scholarship in research and/or scholarship of teaching. 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. Minority reports, if applicable, are to be included.
• Letters of Reference from four external reviewers. The intent of this process is to receive independent outside assessments of the candidate's credentials. This section of the dossier should also include the following:
  • a list of reviewers provided by the candidate 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 research and scholarship of teaching. 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 contains 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 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 and teaching scholarship. Normally, the emphasis of this assessment is placed on one's research performance because of the initial hiring and PRS expectations. The faculty should have both a strong academic record and demonstrate promise of further development and productivity in his or her academic career. S/he should clearly demonstrate excellence in scholarship in research or scholarship of teaching. In addition, the university document also suggests that the faculty member show satisfactory institutional service. The criteria listed in Section III and the PRS form the basis for determining performance in these areas.

A strong record of scholarship in research and/or teaching, as defined by the criteria in Section III, must be achieved for promotion and tenure. In either of these scholarship areas, significant contributions as judged by external peers are necessary. Excellent performance in scholarship in either of these two areas should be complemented with competent performance in the other areas of PRS responsibility. As an example, faculty demonstrating excellence in scholarship in research should also provide evidence of competence in teaching.

Promotion to associate professor and tenure decisions are typically considered simultaneously. Assistant professors are typically reviewed in the sixth year of their probationary period, with up to three years of credit given for similar tenure-track experience at other universities. 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 in either research or teaching. While national reputation in one of the areas is necessary, a faculty member seeking promotion to professor is also expected to demonstrate effectiveness in all areas of position responsibilities and significant institutional service is expected.

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

September 1    Candidate provides letter of intent to DEO and submits personal statement, CV, and list of names of five external reviewers
September/October    Departmental reviews
September 15    Letter and materials sent to external reviewers
October 15    Receive letters from external reviewers
November 10    Departmental and DEO reports submitted to the Dean

D. Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process 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 Department Chair will establish a standing Post-Tenure Review (PTR) committee prior to the start of the fall term each academic year. This committee will consist of three tenured or continuously appointed faculty members (not undergoing a PTR), with two members serving two-year staggered terms. The third committee member will be nominated by the person being reviewed from tenured or continuously appointed marketing faculty. Department Chair and other university administrators are not eligible to serve on this committee.

(2) The peer review will be completed by the PTR committee. The PTR committee will share an oral report of the review with the Department P and T committee (for informational purposes only) and give the written report to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will give the PTR report to the faculty member and schedule a developmental review with the faculty member within 8 weeks after being given the materials. This report shall become a permanent part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

(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, a written assessment by the Department Chair, 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 Department Chair report should provide an assessment of the faculty member’s career progress over the prior seven years. The 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 peer review committee will:

- Provide a written summary evaluation of the faculty member’s performance over the preceding 7 years, including strengths and weaknesses
- Indicate whether there is need for improvement in the faculty member’s performance of any of his or her position responsibilities. When a need for improvement is noted, the committee shall provide specific suggestions for development, which may include revisions in the faculty member’s Position Responsibility Statement.
- Offer recommendations for future personnel actions, awards, or recognitions (e.g., university professorships, equity adjustments
Reviews of Non-tenure-eligible faculty
In the Department of Marketing, 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.

II. 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.

III. 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 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.

IV. 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.

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. In addition, all PRRs that were submitted over the previous appointment period, as well as a summary of all student evaluations over the period, should also be included.

The DPTC will review these documents, and make a recommendation to the Department Chair regarding the candidate’s reappointment. 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.

In the case of a reappointment for a Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician, the Department Chair will review the PRRs that the individual has submitted since the last reappointment along with annual reviews and prepare a written evaluation of the individual’s performance. This review, along with the Department Chair’s recommendation concerning reappointment will be forwarded to the Dean. Requests for approval would include a summary of the review results and a statement regarding the continuing need of the Department. 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.
V. Advancement to Senior Clinician or Senior Lecturer

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 review process will follow the guidelines for reappointment as stated in section III above with the following exceptions:

1. 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 by the Dean, and

2. All PRRs, recommendations and student evaluations accumulated prior to becoming a candidate for advancement will be included in the package.

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 will coincide with that for the three-year tenure-track faculty reviews. The Dean will make his/her decision as to advancement and will notify the Department Chair in writing, at least 30 days prior to the end of the Spring semester. 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.

VI. 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.

VII. 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.
Appendix 1

External Reviewer Letter - A Sample

Dear [Name]:

(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 [field].

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 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,
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 and previous years)
B. Non-refereed Journal Articles (current year and previous year)
C. Book, Chapters in Books, and Monographs
D. Other Publications including proceedings
E. Presentations and Conference Participation (identify and describe type of participation)
F. Research Papers under Review (indicate journal and stage of review process, include dates)
G. Research Papers in Process (indicate title and pages and targeted journal)
H. Awards and Honors in Research and Publication
I. Research Grants and Proposals (list all proposals and describe results of your efforts)

II. TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP PORTFOLIO

All citations should be complete including the proper order of authorship.
A. Refereed Journal Articles (current year and previous year)
B. Non-refereed Journal Articles (current year and previous year)
C. Book, Chapters in Books, or Monographs
D. Other Publications including proceedings
E. Presentation and Conference Participation (identify and describe type of participation)
F. Teaching Papers under Review (indicate journal and stage of review process, include dates)
G. Teaching Papers in Process (indicate title and pages and targeted journal)
H. Significant Curriculum and Course Development Work
I. Release Time Granted (describe purpose and outcomes)
J. 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. Student Publications (indicate role)
   6. Student Organizations (indicate role, e.g., advisor)
   7. Placement of Students at All Levels of Study (indicate role)
K. Awards and Honors in Teaching
L. Summary of Student Evaluations
Ratings on file with department

M. Teaching Evaluations from Continuing Education and Extension Programs
N. Teaching Grants and Proposals (list all proposals and describe results of your efforts)

Other

III. EXTENSION/PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PORTFOLIO

A. Extension Service
   Continuing Education and Workshop Activities
B. Professional Service
   1. Editorial Board Activities
   2. Referee or Reviewer Involvement
   3. Association Activities
   4. Consulting Activities
C. Other
D. Awards and Honors for Professional Service

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)