College of Business
Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures

I. Preface

As a professional school, the College of Business at Iowa State University strives to achieve three fundamental objectives: 1) advancing knowledge, 2) disseminating knowledge, and 3) preparing students to meet the changing needs of a diverse and technologically-oriented learning society. Each of these is highly valued and necessary for creating the eminent business school that it aspires to become.

To achieve this overarching set of goals, the faculty of the College of Business are expected to fulfill multiple roles. Specifically, the faculty member is expected to participate in two primary endeavors: 1) inquiry and research and 2) learning and teaching. In addition, the faculty member is expected to contribute to 3) extension and professional service and 4) institutional service. A faculty member’s behavior and performance in these four areas are deemed necessary for achieving the mission of the college and the university. In fact, these four broad performance roles describe the faculty of the college and are explicitly to be sought, nurtured, developed, and recognized. This suggests mutual responsibilities and expectations for the individual faculty member and the administration of the college.

This performance management perspective implies that one of the primary roles of the college’s administration is to create an environment where its faculty can become effective contributors to the goals of the college. For its part, the faculty’s behavior and performance will center around the role expectations delineated above. To help enhance faculty performance, and thereby, the goals of the college, the college will conduct systematic and fair assessment programs in recruitment and selection, annual reviews, reviews of probationary ( untenured) faculty, promotion and tenure reviews, and periodic reviews of tenured faculty. It is believed that these programs will not only generate but also sustain a competitive faculty base.
II. General Guidelines for All Reviews

This document describes the purpose, procedures, and standards for managing the performance of the faculty. Specifically, this document focuses on policies and procedures for performance review and feedback for both untenured and tenured faculty. These evaluation activities are categorized into four categories, namely, (1) on-going annual reviews of all faculty, (2) preliminary 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 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 recommendation and the department chair’s recommendation before they are submitted to the Dean. The Dean will also inform the faculty member of the college’s recommendation after the Dean has completed his/her review.

Each faculty member’s performance must be reviewed and managed on the basis of achievements in the four roles previously described. To help achieve college and departmental expectations of a faculty member and to assist individual faculty members to contribute to these expectations, position responsibility statements (PRS) must be established for all faculty.

III. Position Responsibility Statement (PRS)

Position responsibility statements describe expectations of a faculty member’s performance as the expectations relate to the faculty member’s appointment in his/her department. This is a shared statement between the individual faculty member 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 the faculty member. The PRS 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 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 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.

While the PRS should accommodate the varying nature of assignments and responsibilities found across the college, it must be consistent with the College 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 department chair. This recognizes the view that faculty members in the College 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 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 by the department chair and the faculty member. In those cases that cannot be resolved the department chair and faculty member may jointly seek mediation from the Dean, an associate Dean or other faculty members, or follow grievance procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

IV. 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 (refer to Part II), the focus is on managing faculty performance, and performance evaluation is the primary apparatus to help achieve that purpose. Each review shall be based on the PRS and supported by detailed description and assessment of the quality of a faculty member’s role and performance.

While quality research and quality teaching are not easily measured, the reviews do 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 the 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 publication in premier refereed journals.

The college 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 college, faculty members are expected to make significant and long-lasting contributions to the disciplinary areas of 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 journals (based on documented ranking) of one’s discipline.
- Publication in journals read by peers who do similar research.
- Publication of academic monographs and books.
- 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 one’s discipline.
- 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 may supplement disciplinary research contributions and are evaluated by the same criteria.

B. Scholarly Teaching: Effective teaching, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, is important to the college. 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 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.
- Having taught courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level as 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.
- Obtaining external peer-reviewed grants 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, College of Business 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
members 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.
- Presenting to major practitioner groups.
- Presenting in executive development programs.
- Serving in officer positions in professional organizations.
- Serving as editor or editorial board member for journals.
- Serving as 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 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 members 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 college and university committees
- Advisor to student organizations
- Significant departmental or college fund raising
- 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.
V. College 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 Dean of the faculty. In the case of a closely divided vote, the reasons for disagreement should be explained. In all cases, committee members voting in the minority must be afforded the opportunity to have their views stated to their satisfaction in the committee report or a separate report. The committee also reviews and evaluates probationary faculty performance under the preliminary review process.

The committee is composed of tenured associate and full professors, one from each of the departments. Each year in the fall, the department representative is chosen by all tenured faculty members of the department. The chairperson of the College P&T Committee is elected by the members of the committee. Faculty holding administrative appointments cannot serve on this committee. All members of the committee participate in the discussion of all candidates. However, only the members of the committee outside of the candidate’s department may vote on the candidate. The committee member from the candidate’s department may vote on the candidate only as a member of the department P&T committee as mandated by the University Faculty Handbook section 5.2.4.3.

VI. 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 should generally be tenured professors who are widely recognized in the field.

The department P&T committee is responsible for soliciting reviews from appropriate and recognized peers in the field. These individuals should be independent of the faculty member being reviewed, not co-authors, dissertation directors, or others with similarly close association. The department committee and the department chair are responsible for ensuring the selected reviewers are appropriate, professionally unbiased and not unfairly influenced by members of the committee.

The department committee selects five or six external reviewers. Two of the five or two or three of the six are selected from a list of at least four nominations submitted by the candidate. The candidate’s nominations shall include a brief summary of each individual’s qualifications for evaluating the candidate’s scholarship and any relationship with the candidate. Optionally, the candidate may submit with the nominations a list of up to three people who are not to be contacted as reviewers.
Each external reviewer should receive a letter from 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 IV and Section IX) 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 departments use the sample letter in Appendix Two to form their external review letters.

Only those persons involved in the promotion and tenure process will have access to the external reviewer letters. All reviews received by the departmental committee shall be forwarded to the department chair, Dean, and college P&T committee.

**VII. Annual Reviews**

**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 personal responsibility report (PRR) – the annual reporting mechanism (see Appendix Three) and formerly known as the personal development report (PDR). 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 rewrite the PRS. Faculty who feel aggrieved in their annual reviews may appeal the department chair’s evaluation using grievance procedures established in the university Faculty Handbook.

**Standards:** The fundamental basis for assessment of a faculty member’s behavior and accomplishments is the PRS. The faculty member’s performance is reviewed in the context of his/her PSR and is evaluated in relation to the general criteria in Section IV.
VIII. Preliminary Reviews 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 tenured faculty of the department. This should result in two independent assessments (a department chair report and a faculty report) of the faculty member. These reports are forwarded to the Dean who shall then request the College P&T committee to provide an assessment of the faculty member. The college report 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 of 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 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. As noted in Section III, although 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, including papers under review and working papers, shall be shown. The various assessment reports shall 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.
IX. Promotion and Tenure Reviews

**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 College committee reviews all promotion and tenure cases. 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 IV of this document. This report along with the committee’s recommendations and vote is submitted to the Dean.

**Procedures:** This review is initiated by the department and consists of two separate evaluations resulting in two independent reports – one, carried out by the department promotion and tenure committee and the other by the department chair. The department committee report becomes a part of the candidate’s dossier which goes to the department chair. The department chair’s report is added to the dossier which is submitted to the Dean. The Dean forwards to the College Promotion and Tenure committee the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion dossier including the reports written by the department committee and chair. Faculty members with administrative appointments in the Dean’s or Provost’s office are not eligible to serve on either department or college P & T committees.

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 four PRS areas, with particular emphasis given to teaching and research scholarship.
- *The Department 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. The report should provide a recommendation concerning the tenure and/or promotion decision and a tally of the vote. In the case of a closely divided vote, the reasons for disagreement should be explained. In all cases, committee members voting in the minority must be afforded the opportunity to have their views stated to their satisfaction in the committee report or a separate report.
- *Letters of Evaluation* from external reviewers. 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 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 IV.
  - 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 IV.
  - An extension and professional service portfolio describing activities and achievements in this area. This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in section IV.
  - An institutional service portfolio describing activities and achievements in this area.

This provides evidence consistent with the criteria in section IV.

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 and satisfactory service. The criteria listed in Section IV 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, with up to three years of credit given for similar tenure-track experience at other universities.

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.

X. Post-Tenure Reviews

Departments are required to conduct a post-tenure peer review (PTR) of each tenured faculty member according to the procedures and principles specified by the university Faculty Handbook.

The department chair is responsible for initiating the PTR process for each faculty member to be reviewed. The department’s applicable governance document shall provide for the tenured faculty members of the department, excluding the member under review, to elect the committee to conduct the PTR. If no such election is provided for or held, all tenured faculty members of the department, excluding the member under review, shall serve on the committee.

The committee shall review the faculty member’s performance over the period since the later of 1) the faculty member’s previous PTR that resulted in an overall recommendation of either “superior” or “meeting expectations”, or 2) the faculty member’s most recent promotion or tenure review. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed once every seven years except when the Faculty Handbook provides for either an earlier review or an exemption from review. The materials to be considered in the review are:

- All of the faculty member’s position responsibility statements in effect during the period of the review.
- All of the faculty member’s professional responsibility reports related to the period under review.
- The faculty member’s current curriculum vitae.
- A personal statement submitted by the faculty member summarizing his or her professional performance during the period under review.
If the PTR is triggered by two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews, the following additional materials are to be considered:

- All of the department chair’s annual evaluations of the faculty member for the period under review (not only the two unsatisfactory reviews).
- Any materials submitted by the faculty member that focus on the position responsibilities in which the chair evaluated performance as unsatisfactory.
- Any action plan in effect during the period under review for performance improvement in areas deemed below expectations by a previous PTR.

The review committee shall present its findings in a written report to the department chair. The department chair shall provide a copy of the report to the faculty member. If the report deems any area of performance to be “below expectations”, the faculty member may respond in a written statement to the department chair. Any such statement received shall be forwarded with the report to higher levels of review.
## Appendix One

### Due Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion and Tenure Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On or before</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Reviews of Probationary Untenured Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On or before</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>The faculty member provides department chair with a copy of the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, copies of all research and teaching publications, and copies of papers under review including letters from editors. Personal statements on both teaching and research are also required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Department committee and department chair reports sent to the Dean with subsequent forwarding to College P&amp;T Committee for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>College P&amp;T committee submits report to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>Dean’s decision conveyed to the faculty member on or before this date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Post-Tenure Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On or before</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>Department chair notifies the faculty member to be reviewed of the need to conduct the PTR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Faculty member submits current CV, personal statement and the PRR for the year just ended to the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>The committee to conduct the PTR is organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>Department chair forwards all required materials to the chair of the review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Review committee submits report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Department chair meets with the reviewed faculty member to discuss the report and provide the faculty member with a copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Faculty member submits optional response to the PTR report to the department chair in case of a finding of “below expectations” in any performance area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Department chair forwards post-tenure review materials to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Dean forwards post-tenure review materials to the Office of the Senior Vice-President and Provost. If a recommended salary increase is rejected, the dean sends the reasons in writing to the reviewed faculty member and department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Department chair, review committee chair and faculty member complete and sign the performance improvement plan in case of a finding of “below expectations” in any performance area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two
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 ______.

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,

enclosures
Appendix Three

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY REPORT

NAME: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

RANK: __________________________ REPORTING YEAR: 2012

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

I. SCHOLARSHIP PORTFOLIO. All citations should be complete and all necessary bibliographic notation including: co-authors (in proper order of authorship, title of publication, journal or book in which the publication appears, volume number (if appropriate), date, publisher and place of publication (if appropriate), etc. SoTL stands for scholarship of teaching and learning.

A. Refereed Journal Articles (current year and previous year)

    Current Year

    Previous Year

B. Non-refereed Journal Articles (current year and previous year)

    Current Year

    Previous Year

C. Book, Chapters in Books, and Monograph

D. Other Publications including proceedings

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

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

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

H. Awards and Honors in Research, SoTL and Publication.

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

J. Creation of Intellectual Property
II. SCHOLARLY TEACHING PORTFOLIO.

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 and Internship 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 and supporting information on file with department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>Course (i.e., ACCT 284)</th>
<th>Semester Taught</th>
<th># of Students(^1)</th>
<th>Evaluation score (Question #1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The number provided is the number of students in the class.
G. Teaching Evaluations from Continuing Education and Extension Programs

H. Teaching (other than SoTL) Grants 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, Workshop Activities, and Non-Credit Offerings

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 the organization, 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)