

PERSONNEL PROCEDURES
Department of Economics

A. SELECTION OF NEW FACULTY

I. Selection of Tenure-Track Faculty

- A. Each spring the personnel committee shall assess the manpower needs of the Department, taking into consideration:
1. Enrollments
 2. Changing patterns of supply and demand.
 3. Turnover of personnel.

After deliberations the committee will advise the Chair concerning the staffing requirements. After giving due consideration to this advice and at the appropriate time the Chair will formulate a staffing request to the Dean of College of Arts and Sciences.

- B. Upon receipt of approval to conduct a search, the Chair shall (with the approval of the Dean and the Affirmative Action Officer) appoint a recruitment committee composed of at least 3 regular faculty members. The committee's duties will be to:
1. Assist and advise the Chair in developing and circulating advertising materials.
 2. Assist in developing selection criteria.
 3. Screen applications.
 4. Participate in the off campus screening process.
 5. Assist candidates in their visits to campus.

In carrying out these duties the committee—and the Chair—will at all times adhere to the spirit and the letter of the University's Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policies.

- C. The regular faculty of the Department are expected to attend a seminar or classroom presentation of each candidate. Furthermore, faculty should endeavor to meet each candidate on an informal basis.
- D. Evaluation of candidates is made in the following manner by a vote of regular faculty:
1. Regular faculty who attended a candidate's presentation may vote on the candidate's acceptability.
 2. For a candidate to be acceptable he or she must receive a 2/3 majority of those voting.
 3. The acceptable candidates will be ranked in a meeting of the regular faculty.

4. The Chair will take these votes and rankings into account in recommending appointments to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and will report them to the Dean.

II. Selection of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Selection of non-tenure-track faculty will be the responsibility of the department Chair, assisted by a recruitment committee as described in IB.

B. EVALUATION, RETENTION, AND TENURE

I. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The personnel committee, composed of at least 3 tenured faculty members who are not applying for promotion in the current year, shall evaluate each non-tenured faculty member. The candidate will be evaluated with regard to expected contributions to the quality and viability of the programs and missions of the Department. In accordance with the ISU Faculty Handbook, each non-tenured faculty member will be evaluated with respect to teaching, research, and service.

Teaching

Teaching effectiveness is a primary consideration in granting tenure. In evaluating teaching the committee and the Chair will consider, but not limited to, the following:

1. Peer observations (conducted annually by the committee.) Two or more members of the committee—separately or jointly—shall observe each individual (by appointment) and complete a standard evaluation form (such as the one in Appendix I.) Both to committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation.
2. Student evaluations (conducted every semester by the committee.) The **chair of the department** is responsible for arranging for the distribution and collection of SIR's (or an acceptable substitute.) Both the committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation, but the individual's copy shall be withheld until the semester has ended.
3. Syllabi and course materials.
4. Loads and preparations.
5. New course development.
6. Meritorious recognition.
7. Direction of student research.
8. Alumni feedback (from questionnaires.)

Research is an important component of the Department's mission. Therefore, non-tenured faculty members are expected to show evidence of a lifetime commitment to scholarly activity. In evaluating scholarly activity, the committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Articles in scholarly journals.
2. Research funded by grants or contracts.

3. Presentation of research at national or regional meetings.
4. Publications of monographs, treatises, or chapters.
5. Publication of software.
6. Publication of textbooks or learning aids.

Professional Service

Professional Service is an important component of the Department's mission. Therefore, a non-tenured faculty member is expected to exhibit a willingness to provide enthusiastic support (growing out of his or her academic appointment) for students, colleagues in the University and in the profession, and the community at large. The tenure decision with respect to service will be based primarily on potential contributions rather than on an extensive record of past accomplishments. In evaluating service activity, the committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Professional organizational offices.
2. on-campus governing body memberships.
3. University, college, and department committee memberships.
4. Refereeing for scholarly journals.
5. Workshops, seminars, or speeches within the University or community.
6. Student advising and other duties assigned by the Chair.

Overall Contribution

The candidate's spirit of cooperation, teamwork, and professional conduct (which includes classroom conduct and a general attitude of respect toward students and their rights) will be a consideration in the tenure decision.

Professional consulting as it contributes to scholarly research, university or community service and teaching effectiveness will also be given full consideration.

The Tenure Decision

Tenure procedures as they are prescribed by University policy will be strictly adhered to. The probationary period leading toward tenure is an important time for professional growth and development. Guidance and mentoring is an important part of the process. Therefore, each year during the probationary period, the Chair, after consulting with the personnel committee, will meet with the candidate and advise the individual of his or her progress toward tenure. A written statement concerning any areas of perceived weakness will be provided at that time. The candidate also has the right to meet with the personnel committee and receive a full explanation of the basis of its evaluation. After the last of the annual evaluations is completed by the committee, a meeting of all tenured members of the Department will be called to review the evaluation documents of the candidate and to vote on the committee's tenure recommendation. The results of this vote (and the committee's vote) will be forwarded with the Chair's own recommendation.

It should be noted that a recommendation for promotion does not necessarily constitute a recommendation for tenure. Nor does a failure to recommend for promotion necessarily reflect unsatisfactory progress toward tenure.

II. Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Teaching effectiveness is the primary consideration in the evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty. In evaluating teaching, the committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Peer observations (conducted annually by the committee.)
Two or more members of the committee—separately or jointly—shall observe each individual (by appointment) and complete a standard evaluation form (such as the one in Appendix I.) Both the committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation.
2. Student evaluations (conducted every semester by the committee.)
The **chair of the department** is responsible for arranging for the distribution and collection of SIR's (or an acceptable substitute.) Both the committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation, but the individual's copy shall be withheld until the semester has ended.
3. Syllabi and course materials.
4. Loads and preparations.

To a lesser degree service to the Department and participation in the life of the Department will also be considered.

C. PROMOTION

The personnel committee, composed of at least three tenured faculty members who are not applying for promotion in the current year will, as representatives of the faculty of the Department, evaluate and rank candidates for promotion on the basis of their overall contribution toward the fulfillment of the mission of the Department and of the University. Factors to be considered will be diverse in nature, and may well include intangibles that are difficult to quantify. Promotion is based on both a record of accomplishments and an expectation of continued future contributions. Separately and independently the Chair will evaluate and rank the candidates. The candidates for promotion will receive a copy of the recommendations of the personnel committee and of the Chair, and are entitled to meet with either to receive a full explanation of the basis of the evaluation. Following the meeting—if one is requested—both sets of recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Specific requirements for eligibility for promotion will include:

To Associate Professor:

The Department realizes the importance of teaching to fulfilling the mission of the University. The candidate to associate professor will be required to produce evidence of consistent excellence in teaching.

The committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Peer observations (conducted annually by the committee.)
Two or more members of the committee—separately or jointly—shall observe each individual (by appointment) and complete a standard evaluation form (such as the one in Appendix I.) Both the committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation.
2. Student evaluations (conducted every semester by the committee.)
The **chair of the department** is responsible for arranging for the distribution and collection of SIR's (or an acceptable substitute.) Both the committee and the individual shall receive a copy of this evaluation, but the individual's copy shall be withheld until the semester has ended.
3. Syllabi and course materials.
4. Loads and preparations.
5. New Course Development.
6. Meritorious recognition.
7. Direction of student research.

Research

Research contributions will have greater weight in the promotion than in the tenure decision. The candidate is expected to have produced published results which indicate an ability to conduct independent research beyond the work contained in the doctoral dissertation.

The committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Articles in scholarly journals.
2. Research funded by grants or contracts.
3. Presentation of research at national or regional meetings.
4. Publication of monographs, treatises, or chapters.
5. Publication of software.
6. Publication of textbooks or learning aids.

Professional Service

While the tenure decision is based on a willingness to serve students, colleagues, the community, and the profession, the candidate for promotion is expected to provide a record of accomplishments with respect to service.

The committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Professional organizational offices.
2. on-campus governing body memberships.

3. University, college, and department committee memberships.
4. Refereeing for scholarly journals.
5. Workshops, seminars, or speeches within the University or community.
6. Student advising and other duties assigned by the Chair.

To Professor:

Teaching

The expectations of the Department for teaching include those for promotion to associate professor.

Research

The candidate is expected to have compiled a record that firmly evidences a lifetime commitment to scholarship. Published materials should demonstrate professional growth since the previous promotion.

Professional Service

The candidate is expected to have compiled a record of accomplishments and evidence of providing a leadership role in the Department and the University.

D. STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

I. Voting Procedure.

Any candidate for Regular Graduate Faculty status shall (through the Department Chair) circulate to the current members of the departmental Regular Graduate Faculty his or her record of scholarly activities for the period since the previous certification of status. Candidates for initial appointment shall also circulate a curriculum vitae. After review of the candidate's credentials, each member of the graduate faculty will cast a written ballot in the affirmative or the negative. The Chair will take the vote into consideration when determining whether to nominate a personal to the graduate faculty and , in the event of a difference in judgment, will call a meeting of, and consult with, the Regular Graduate Faculty absent the candidate in question.

‘On April 20, 1989, the Faculty Senate approved the following new policy:

Re-evaluation of Graduate Faculty shall normally occur at least every three years. However, if departments have graduate faculty standards which have been approved by the Graduate Faculty Committee of the Graduate Council, the following policy is applicable:

Re-evaluation of Graduate Faculty shall coincide with the review of the graduate program(s) they serve providing such reviews are conducted within six years. When programs are not revised on a six year or less schedule, re-evaluation of the Graduate Faculty shall occur at least every six years.

Function of Standards.

Standards may be used to further at least three separate objectives:

1. To promote and maintain a high level of competence among the faculty.
2. To encourage among the faculty as broad and as active a level of participation as is possible in a life of research and scholarship.
3. To provide a mechanism for encouraging the utilization of only the most qualified personnel for the instruction, advisement, and research supervision of graduate students.

Choice of an appropriate standard depends upon which objective is considered paramount. The first objective calls for a level of accomplishment that provides a challenge to some without being an insuperable barrier to any. However, a rigid, inflexible standard may be more of a barrier than a facilitator for the third objective. What is important is that only those who remain professionally active be able to obtain (or retain) Regular Graduate Faculty status. Note, however, that membership on the Regular Graduate Faculty will not be taken as a license to teach any economics course. The guiding principle for assignment of responsibilities, whether in teaching, advisement, or supervision of research, will be merit.

III. Standards for Regular Graduate Faculty.

A. Teaching

The Department of Economics expects a strong commitment to teaching from its entire faculty, and the quality of teaching is the single most important concern in their decisions. Instructors at the graduate level are expected to be totally command of their fields, and fully conversant with the current literature. Courses are to be presented at an appropriate level of rigor, and students are to be taught how to engage in independent study and research. Compliance with these teaching standards is a requirement for appointment or reappointment to the Regular Graduate Faculty.

B. Research and Scholarship.

It is expected that those serving on the Regular Graduate Faculty will be active researchers who regularly publish refereed articles in fields appropriate to their graduate teaching responsibilities. However, for instruction in certain applied areas of economics, professional practice may provide better preparation than scholarly publication. In these cases, irrespective of comparative publication records, it is better to utilize the services of someone with expertise in an area than to utilize a specialist from a non-related field.

Initial appointment to Regular Graduate Faculty will be contingent upon a level of published writing and other professional practice appropriate to the candidate's years of experience. Reappointment to the Regular Graduate Faculty will be contingent upon a substantial record of published writing and other professional practice during the renewal period, with a total level of half of the minimum requirement must be accomplished by achievement in at least two of the subcategories in #1 and #2 below, and the overall record must show clear evidence of an ongoing commitment to scholarship.

The following submissions will be considered in evaluating the record of professional and scholarly accomplishment.

1. Publications.

- a. Articles published by—or with a letter of acceptance from—refereed journals.
- b. Books or chapters in books published by a commercial press or a university press.
- c. Work of a scholarly nature published in periodicals with a professional audience.
- d. Substantial reports submitted as the end product of an external grant or contract.

2. Scholarly Presentations.

- a. Presenting papers for, or acting as a respondent at, meetings of the American Economic Association, or at national or international meetings of appropriate sub disciplines.
- b. Presentations at regional economics associations, including but not limited to the Midwest Economic Association and the Missouri Valley Economic Association.
- c. Off-campus presentations of working papers to faculty seminars or workshops at universities which grant the PhD in economics.

3. Honors and Awards.
 - a. Postdoctoral fellowships and other scholarly internships, such as Lilly or Fulbright Fellowships.
 - b. Successful competition for a grant that involved substantial peer review.
 - c. Election to office in professional societies, and other prizes and awards related to scholarly accomplishment.
4. Professional Activities.
 - a. Professional consulting activities, including arbitration and mediation, when such work is subject to substantial peer review.
 - b. Advisory positions of substantial professional nature to government agencies, educational foundations, or professional societies, when such work is subject to substantial peer review.
 - c. Evidence of having served as a referee or editor of a scholarly journal.
 - d. Book reviews published by—or with a letter of acceptance from—refereed journals.

IV. Additional Policies

A. Provisional Graduate Faculty

Except in regard to education and experience, Provisional Graduate Faculty will be held to the same standards, and enjoy the same privileges, as Regular Graduate Faculty. Selection for membership in the Provisional Graduate Faculty shall be in accord with the voting procedures established for Regular Graduate Faculty status.

B. Clearance to teach a graduate course

Clearance to teach a graduate course shall be granted in accord with the voting procedures established for Regular Graduate Faculty status. Clearance to teach a graduate course may be granted when the following two questions can be answered in the affirmative.

1. Is the applicant clearly the most qualified individual available for teaching the course in question?
2. Is the quality of the graduate program strengthened by offering course as taught by the applicant for clearance to teach a graduate course?

C. Selection of faculty to teach graduate courses.

Regular, and Provisional, Graduate Faculty status provides recognition that an individual has maintained at least a certain minimum level of scholarly and/or professional activity within the broad compass of economics. Such status does not certify a level of preparation within a narrow field. It shall be the policy of the Economics Department that the best qualified individual available will be chosen to teach each graduate level course. It will be a priority of faculty recruitment to provide fully qualified graduate faculty for all graduate level courses.

D. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS
See Memorandum from Personnel Committee below.

E. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Personnel Committee referred to in this document is a standing committee of the Department of Economics. Like all standing committees, its members and its chair are nominated by the department chair and confirmed by majority vote of the department faculty. The committee consists of at least three tenured faculty members, none of whom is under consideration for promotion.

**Memorandum from Personnel Committee
Economics Department**

**Personnel Committee Tasks, Criteria and Standards,
and Review Procedures in Connection with
Performance-Based Salary Adjustments**

I. TASKS

The Committee has two tasks:

1. To determine which department faculty are performing satisfactorily and will therefore receive no less than the minimum base salary increment, and which faculty (if any) are performing less than satisfactory and will therefore receive less than the minimum base salary increment. In the latter case(s), additional rationale and documentation must be provided by the Committee.
2. To determine a ranking of department faculty in terms of overall performance, as part of the Committee's advisory role in assisting the Department Chair's division of the department's base salary adjustment pool among faculty members (see the 9/16/99 Memorandum from Provost Richard H. Wells entitled "Faculty Performance Reviews and Base Salary Adjustments").

The Committee's completion of these two tasks is to be based on faculty member's professional accomplishments during the review period.

II. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

1. General

- a. only documented indicators of performance will be considered.
- b. The Committee will evaluate individual performance in the three broad areas of faculty professional activity: teaching, research, and (on-and off-campus) service. In each of these three areas, the Committee will consider indicators not only of individual achievement but also of collegial efforts by individual faculty to enhance the achievements and contributions of other faculty members.

2. Satisfactory Performance

- a. A positive decision on satisfactory performance requires documentation of substantial (not necessarily outstanding) achievement in at least two of the three broad areas listed in (II)(1)(b).
- b. A positive decision on satisfactory performance also requires that the faculty member's teaching performance not be clearly and seriously incompetent. Such incompetent performance would be established by documented evidence of consistently inadequate preparation, repeated unprofessional behavior in the classroom or during office hours, and/or a consistent inability to effectively communicate basic economic concepts.

3. Overall Performance Rankings

- a. A ranking above the department median requires above-median performance in at least two of the three broad areas listed in (II)(1)(b).
- b. In addition, a ranking above the departmental median requires documented evidence that the faculty member is a competent and professional teacher. This requirement is based on the department's consensus that teaching is an integral and important element of each faculty member's professional activity regardless of her or his accomplishments in the areas of research and service.

III. REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Materials to be Considered.

- a. Faculty Activity Reports.
- b. Statistical tabulations of student course evaluations for all courses. For courses taught prior to the **review period**, these tabulations are defined as the mean values of student responses to all 39 questions on the Student Instructional Report. For courses taught during the **review period**, these tabulations are defined as the mean values of student responses to all 17 questions on the Economics Department course evaluation form.
- c. Copies of peer teaching evaluation forms compiled by members of the Committee.
- d. Up-to-date vitae.
- e. Any additional documentation of professional activity that may assist the Committee's efforts to accurately gauge the faculty member's performance in each of the three broad areas listed in (II)(1)(b). Such materials could encompass descriptions or copies of certain relevant items/activities merely listed in the

Faculty Activity Reports and/or the vitae. Examples could include copies of course syllabi (e.g., for new courses taught or revised course preparations), copies of committee documents or memoranda authored by faculty members (for the on-campus service area), copies of referee reports or publishers, reviews (for off-campus service), or copies of published articles, notes, and reviews (for the research area).

2. Formal Review Process

- a. No Committee member will participate in, or be present during, Committee discussions of her or his own performance. No Committee member will vote on whether her or his own performance is satisfactory (see (III)(2)(b)) and each Committee member will exclude her- or himself from her or his own ranking of department faculty performances (see (III)(2)(c)).
- b. The decisions as to whether a faculty member's overall performance was satisfactory will be made by majority vote of the Committee. In case of a tie vote, the Department Chair's vote will break the tie.
- c. The overall performance rankings reported by the Committee to the Department Chair will be the average of the rankings compiled by the individual members of the Committee. The rankings compiled by individual Committee members will be numerical, beginning with 1 for the top-ranked faculty member. In the case of a tie ranking, the Committee will recommend equal salary adjustments for the faculty members in question.
- d. The Department Chair will consult with the Committee before sending her or his final recommendations and supporting narratives on to the Dean. In cases where the Chair's recommendations deviate from those of the Committee, regarding either the overall ranking of faculty or decisions about satisfactory performance, the Chair must explain why a different conclusion has been reached.