

Department of Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems
College of Business
Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures

8/30/2002
Revised 9/18/2003
Revised 9/17/2004
Revised 2/28/2008
Revised 6/24/2009

I. Preface

The purpose of this document is to create specific faculty review and evaluation policies, procedures, and guidelines for the Department of Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems within the College of Business at Iowa State University. As such, this document affirms the Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures of the College of Business at Iowa State University and the corresponding policies and procedures of the university at large at Iowa State University.

As a department within the professional school of the College of Business at Iowa State University, the department of Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems (LOMIS) 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 objectives is necessary for creating and becoming an eminent business school with an international reputation.

To achieve these general goals, the faculty of the LOMIS Department 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 actively participate in 3) extension and professional service and 4) institutional service. The faculty members', through their efforts in these four areas, are deemed indispensable for achieving the mission of the department, college, and the university. In fact, these four broad performance roles describe the faculty of the department, college, and university and are to be explicitly sought, nurtured, developed, and recognized. This suggests mutual responsibilities and expectations for the individual faculty member and the administration of the department and college.

This managerial perspective implies that one of the primary roles of the department's and college's administration is to create an environment where its faculty can become effective contributors to the goals of the department, college, and university. The faculty's behavior and performance should center around the role expectations delineated above. To help enhance faculty performance, and thereby, the goals of the department, college, and university, the department and 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 policies and procedures will generate and sustain a highly recognized Department of Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems.

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) 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. Likewise, in the absence of specific college guidelines or in case of conflict, university guidelines will take precedence.

Deliberations relating to all reviews are confidential, so that openness and candor can be expressed for a fair evaluation of all faculty members. 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 possible. The Chair will inform the faculty member of the department's recommendations 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 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 faculty member performance as they relate to their appointments in the department. This is a shared statement between the individual faculty member and the 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 the 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 so that the department's objectives can be achieved. 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 department and 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 Chair. Consistent with this mutual consent, the following guidelines typically apply:

Assistant Professor

Inquiry & Research - minimum 50%

Learning & Teaching – minimum 30%

Service – minimum 10% (includes both profession and institutional service activities)

Associate Professor

Inquiry & Research - minimum 30%

Learning & Teaching – minimum 30%

Service – minimum 20% (includes both profession and institutional service activities)

Professor

Inquiry & Research - minimum 20%

Learning & Teaching – minimum 30%

Service – minimum 20% (includes both profession and institutional service activities)

This recognizes the view that faculty members in LOMIS 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 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 Chair or the faculty member. Disagreements between the faculty member and the Chair in developing or revising the PRS should be resolved by the Chair and the faculty member. However, in those cases that cannot be resolved the Chair and faculty member may jointly seek mediation from the dean, associate dean, other faculty members, and/or 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 eliminate the department's or 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 sum, quality of performance 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 or related areas. Evidence of effective and quality research is most convincingly shown by publication in top-tier refereed journals.

The department, college, and university missions require that research scholarship forms the basic infrastructure for any academic enterprise and requires high quality scholarship in research from its faculty. To fulfill the mission and goals of the department and the 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 rankings) of one's discipline or related areas.
- 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 or related areas.
- 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. Additionally, faculty members using scholarship in research as their primary basis for promotion and tenure must also successfully demonstrate competency in the area of teaching. Competency in teaching is not demonstrated solely on the basis of student evaluations, but includes a wide range of pedagogical activities.

B. Scholarship in Teaching: Effective teaching, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, is important to the department and the college. 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.

Indicators of quality teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publication in the leading/top-tier teaching journals (based on documented rankings) of one's discipline or related areas.
- 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 at a rigorous and challenging level as evidenced by course expectations and conduct, syllabi and assignments, teaching materials, grading practices, and student learning.
- 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 in 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. Faculty members using scholarship in teaching, as

their primary area for promotion and tenure, should demonstrate excellence by way of publications of the same quality and quantity as faculty members who use scholarship in research as their primary area for promotion and tenure. Additionally, faculty members using scholarship in teaching as their primary basis for promotion and tenure must also successfully demonstrate competency in the area of research.

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 institution and profession.

In accordance with the land-grant mission of the university, LOMIS 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 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; faculty recruitment; 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 department, college, and university
- Officer in the Faculty Senate
- Chair of major department, college, and university committees
- Advisor to student organizations
- Significant departmental or college fund raising
- Projects carried out for the department, college or university
- Member of department, college, and university committees
- Actively participating in recruitment of faculty.

While both extension, 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. 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 is written, if necessary due to intractable differences in opinion. The committee also reviews and evaluates probationary faculty performance under the three-year review process.

The LOMIS departmental committee is composed of tenured associate and full professors in the department. All members of the departmental committee participate in the discussion of all candidates. Each year in the Fall, the LOMIS department nominates and elects a representative to the college promotion and tenure committee. The Department Committee in turn will elect the chair of the Department P&T Committee. All members of the departmental committee including the departmental representative to the college promotion and tenure committee vote on all candidates. Faculty holding administrative appointments cannot serve on either of these committees.

VI. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

All representatives elected to the college P&T committee may 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 departmental P&T committee as mandated by the University Faculty Handbook section 5.2.4.3.

VII. External Reviewers

The basic intent of soliciting external reviews is to get an 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. 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. At least four reviewers are chosen from a list of at least eight names prepared by the department committee and supplemented by the candidate. A maximum 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 on the list from which external reviewers are chosen must be acceptable to both the candidate and the department committee. However, the selection of external reviewers is done solely by the department committee and is not revealed to the candidate. 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.

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 on page 13 to form their external review letters.

VIII. 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 Chair based on the faculty member's PRS and professional responsibility report (PRR) – the annual reporting mechanism (see pages 14-15) and formerly known as the personal development report (PDR). The 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 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 PRS and is evaluated in relation to the general criteria in Section IV.

IX. 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 tenured faculty of the department. This should result in two independent assessments (a 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 third 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 IV provide guidelines for these assessments.

X. Promotion and/or Tenure Review

Purpose: Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and the granting of tenure are conferred 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 scholarship 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. The granting of tenure should be based primarily on one's quality of scholarship in teaching and research.

Procedures: This review is initiated by the department and consists of two separate evaluations resulting in two independent reports – one, carried out by the tenured faculty of the department and the other by the Chair. The department faculty report becomes a part of the candidate's dossier which goes to the Chair. The 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 departmental committee and chair.

Each dossier submitted to the college committee shall include the following materials –

- *The 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 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. 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 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, 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 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 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 in either research or teaching. In addition, the university document also suggests that the faculty member show satisfactory institutional service. The criteria listed in Section IV 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 IV, must be achieved for promotion and tenure. In either of these scholarship areas, significant contributions as judged by external peers are necessary.

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.

Appendix One

Time-Frame for the Promotion and Tenure Review Process

July 1	Candidate provides letter of intent to Chair and submits list of names of five external reviewers
September 1	Personal statement, curriculum vitae, and faculty member portfolio submitted to Chair for departmental P&T committee review
September/October	Departmental reviews
September 15	Letter and materials sent to external reviewers
October 15	Receive letters from external reviewers
November 10	Departmental and Chair reports to the Dean
December 15	College P&T committee submits report to the Dean

Time Frame for Probationary Untenured Faculty Review

January 10	The faculty member provides 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.
January/February	Departmental reviews
February 28	Departmental and Chair reports to the Dean with subsequent forwarding to College P&T Committee for evaluation
March 31	College P&T committee submits report to the Dean
April 30	Dean's decision conveyed to the faculty member on or before this date

Appendix Two

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,

enclosures

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY REPORT (PRR)

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 year)*
- 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)*
- J) *Creation of Intellectual Property*

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 and supporting information 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)*
- O. Creation of Intellectual Property*
- P. Other*

III. EXTENSION/PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PORTFOLIO

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

Department of Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems
College of Business
Faculty Review and Evaluation Policies and Procedures

Policies and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

I. Policy Overview

In an effort to assure the continued development and enhance the performance of tenured and continuously appointed faculty within the Logistics, Operations, and Management Information Systems (LOMIS) Department, the LOMIS faculty establishes the following post-tenure review policy and procedures. As such, this policy does not replace or alter existing policies and procedures for discipline and/or dismissal that are outlined in the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook. Additionally, the LOMIS faculty supports academic freedom and views this policy as a complement to that concept.

Periodic review of tenured faculty involves two distinct yet integrated components:

- Annual performance evaluation of tenured faculty by the departmental executive Officer (Chair).
- Peer review of each tenured faculty member at least once every seven years or when
Requested by a faculty member, but not more than once every three years.

A departmental review for promotion, regardless of whether the promotion was granted or denied, will substitute for the mandatory seven-year post-tenure review (i.e., the seven-year clock for mandatory review will begin anew following a review for promotion).

II. Post-tenure Review Procedures

1. Post-tenure reviews of faculty will be conducted by the LOMIS Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T).
2. Inputs to the peer review process will consist of the following documents:
 - Position Responsibility Statement
 - Annual Personal Responsibility Reports for the time since the last post-tenure review
 - Previous post-tenure review reports
 - Current curriculum vita
 - A written, self-assessment statement by the faculty member being reviewed

The self-assessment statement should summarize and evaluate professional activities related to the faculty member's career goals and Position Responsibility Statement.

3. The LOMIS Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will:
 - Create a written summary of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses over the seven year review period.
 - Indicate in the review both areas of satisfactory performance and areas requiring Performance improvements from the faculty member.
 - Provide specific suggestions for development, including suggested revisions to the faculty member's Position Responsibility Statement.
 - Distribute copies of the review to the faculty member and to the Chair. The Dean of the College of Business should be notified of the results.
4. Reviewed faculty members shall have the right to have their personal written comments regarding the Promotion and Tenure Committee's Summary Evaluation of their performance included in the faculty member's personnel file, along with the committee's evaluation.
5. Reviewed faculty members shall have the right to file a grievance in accordance with the procedures listed in the Faculty Handbook, if they believe they have been aggrieved in the post-tenure review process.

III. Initial Review Implementation

The initial implementation of the post-tenure review policy within the LOMIS department is complicated due to the fact that numerous current faculty members are already tenured and have been tenured at Iowa State University for a significant number of years. To effectively implement the policy, while providing a reasonable number of promotion and tenure cases to be reviewed each year, the following implementation plan will be utilized.

The LOMIS department will initiate post-tenure reviews beginning with the faculty members who have been tenured the longest duration at Iowa State University. Commencing with the 2002-2003 academic year, the two faculty members with the longest tenure at Iowa State University will be reviewed. Each subsequent year two faculty members with the longest tenure at Iowa State University, who haven't been reviewed in the past seven years, will be subject to a post-tenure review. This process of conducting initial reviews of currently tenured faculty members in the department will continue until all faculty members currently holding tenure have completed an initial post-tenure review. Subsequent reviews for faculty members currently tenured in the department will proceed on a normal seven-year cycle as outlined previously in this document.