

PERSONNEL PROCEDURES

Department of Economics

Revised: May 3, 2021

A. SELECTION OF NEW FACULTY

I. Selection of Regular Faculty

- A. Each spring the personnel committee shall meet with the Chairperson to assess the staffing needs of the Department, taking into consideration:
1. Enrollments
 2. Changing patterns of supply and demand.
 3. Turnover of personnel.
- 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
1. Call a meeting of the Department to discuss selection criteria and desired field expertise
 2. Appoint (with the approval of the Dean and the Affirmative Action Officer) a recruitment committee composed of at least 3 regular faculty members (at least two of whom shall be tenured or tenure-track). If students or lecturers are included on the committee, they will be afforded all rights of a member other than that of a vote.
- C. The committee's duties will be to:
1. Assist and advise the Chair in developing and circulating advertising materials.
 2. Screen applications.
 3. Participate in the screening process.
 4. Assist candidates in their visits to campus.
- Once the Committee has conducted the screening, a meeting of the department shall be called to finalize the list of candidates invited 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.
- D. For the on-campus visits of candidates
1. The regular faculty of the Department are expected to attend a seminar or classroom presentation of each candidate.
 2. All faculty are expected to meet each candidate on an informal basis as well.
- E. After the final interview the evaluation of candidates is made in the following manner by a vote of regular faculty:
1. Only regular faculty may vote on the candidate's acceptability (which is determined by a majority vote).
 2. The acceptable candidates will be ranked in a meeting of the regular faculty. Should there be more than two acceptable candidates, the Chairperson of the Committee, at the direction of the Committee, will offer

a motion ranking the candidates. That motion may be amended by any regular faculty member before a final vote is taken.

3. The Chair will transmit the Department's recommendation and may offer his/her own recommendation as well.

II. Selection of Lecturers

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

B. COMPOSITION OF REVIEW COMMITTEES

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. A Senior Instructor may (at the discretion of the Department Chairperson) be included in the review of Instructors and Lecturers.

C. DOMAINS OF FACULTY WORK AND APPROPRIATE EVIDENCE

In accordance with the ISU Faculty Handbook, each regular faculty member will be evaluated with respect to the assigned domains (teaching, research, and service.)

I. Teaching

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

1. Peer observations*
2. Student evaluations*
3. Syllabi and course materials.
4. Teaching intensiveness (loads, enrollments, faculty-time-intensive assignments, delivery platforms, and preparations)
5. New course development.
6. Meritorious recognition.
7. Direction of student research.
8. Teaching-related grants
9. Community engagement activities (when including students)
10. Experiential learning exercises.
11. Career Readiness exercises.

*The evaluation of teaching will be conducted using a combination of information sources. Student evaluations will be conducted using the University-approved mechanism and reported according to policies established by the University. Peer evaluations will be conducted annually of non-tenured faculty and biennially for tenured faculty. Peer evaluations will be reported using the standardized form found in Appendix I.

II. Research

Research is an important component of the Department's mission. Therefore, tenure-track and 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 limit itself to, the following:

1. Original scholarly books*
2. Articles in scholarly and reputable journals (including extended review articles).*

3. Research funded by grants or contracts.**
4. Meritorious recognition.
5. Presentation of research at reputable national or regional meetings.
6. Publications of monographs, treatises, or chapters.*
7. Publication of software.*
8. Publication of textbooks or learning aids.*
9. Community engagement (when it is evidenced in any of the aforementioned scholarly products.)

*The relative value given to any scholarly activity is subject to the judgement of the committee. The committee will consider the quality of the outlet, the role of the faculty member in producing the product (single, dual, multi-author), and the relevance of the activity to the discipline of economics. In their consideration, the committee may not ignore or underweight outputs that involve multiple authors or are multidisciplinary. In judging a candidate for tenure, however, the committee may consider these factors in deciding whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to contribute significantly to the discipline of economics.

**External sources of funding are considered more significant than internal sources.

III. Professional Service

Professional Service is an important component of the Department's mission. Therefore, a regular 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. In evaluating service activity, the committee and the Chair will consider, but not limit itself to, the following:

1. Professional organizational offices.*
2. On-campus governing body memberships.*
3. University, college, and department committee memberships.*
4. Ad hoc or special committees, special task forces, advisory councils and other such bodies.
5. Meritorious recognition.
6. Refereeing for scholarly journals.
7. Writing reviews of academic and professional books.
8. Providing expertise to the university/media/community through workshops, seminars, interviews, articles or letters, and speaking engagements.
9. Student advising/mentoring.
10. Other duties assigned by the Chair.
11. Community engagement as it relates to the professional duties of an economist (including serving as a consultant to private entities, government agencies or NGO.)

*Positions of more responsibility will be given more weight than membership.

The Mission-Based Activities (Handbook 305.2.2) are incorporated into these domains. Experiential Learning is located within teaching. Student advising is located in professional service. Community engagement can be located in any domain as long as it is appropriate to the nature of the work.

D. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

For the purposes of this document, the following terms will have the denoted and domain-specific definitions. These terms, when used below are in *bold-italics*.

Term	Research	Teaching	Service
Adequacy/ Adequate	<p>Promotion to Associate & Tenure: The equivalent of four peer-reviewed scholarly products in reputable journals.</p> <p>All other contexts: The equivalent of two or more scholarly products in reputable outlets every three years.</p> <p>For the Faculty Performance Evaluation, documentation of significant progress on a work of great substance shall be considered equivalent to this rate of production.</p>	<p>The ability to competently teach all assigned courses with evaluations showing no recurring concerns. Consistently covers prescribed content, exhibits professionalism, completes administrative duties related to teaching, shows evidence of course evaluations showing appropriate student and peer satisfaction.</p>	<p>Conscientious participation in the tasks of the committee/assignment.</p>
Excellence	<p>The equivalent of one or more peer-reviewed scholarly products in reputable outlets per year.</p>	<p>Meets the standard of adequacy and has student and peer evaluations placing in the top tier of the department across assigned courses and delivery types.</p>	<p>Impactful leadership of consequential committees.</p>
Exceptional(ism)	<p>A(n) (inter)national reputation in their scholarship indicated by either voluminous production or importance (as demonstrated by citation data) and the Theodore Dreiser Award for Distinguished Research/Creativity. For the Merit Pay, the performance must remain consistent with that distinction.</p>	<p>Meets the standard of adequacy and has superlative-laden student and peer evaluations and the Caleb Mills Award. For the Merit Pay, the performance must remain consistent with that distinction.</p>	<p>At least a decade of service contributions since tenure of undeniable significance to the university or profession and the Faculty Distinguished Service Award. For the Merit Pay, the performance must remain consistent with that distinction.</p>
Substantial Sustained	<p>The equivalent of one or more scholarly products in reputable outlets every two years; or the production of a scholarly product of significant breadth, depth, or impact.</p>	<p>Student and peer evaluations placing in the middle tier of the department across assigned courses and delivery types.</p>	<p>Conscientious participation and occasional leadership in the tasks of the committee/assignment.</p>

While there is no precise metric for equivalence between single-authored, original university-press scholarly books, and other, less significant scholarly products, it is generally understood that not every scholarly product is equal to another. Equivalence is judged based in the magnitude, importance, and impact of product.

E. PROGRESSION AND EVALUATION

I. Progression of Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure procedures as they are prescribed by University policy will be strictly followed. 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. Aside from the required elements of evaluation (found in section 305 of the Handbook), 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. The candidate also has the right to meet with the personnel committee and receive a full explanation of the basis of its evaluation.

To receive recommendations for unconditional continuation, faculty are expected to make at least *adequate* progress in all the three domains of faculty work. Faculty in their first two years of the tenure track will have created a clearly identifiable research agenda as evidenced by journal submissions and conference presentations, will have made significant strides in establishing themselves as professionally competent teachers, and will have contributed service to the department. Faculty in their third year should have at least one publication accepted in a reputable outlet and at least two others in preparation; have peer and student teaching evaluations showing a firm grasp of the material, excellence in preparation, and thoughtfulness in pedagogy; and have served inside the department, and at least to a modest degree, beyond the department. Faculty in their fourth and fifth years should be on an unmistakable path to four or more publications in reputable outlets; should have solidified their teaching and addressed all concerns related to their future teaching; performed laudable service inside and outside the department.

II. Progression of Instructors

Guidance and mentoring is an important part of the process by which Instructors are developed. Aside from the required elements of evaluation (found in section 305 of the Handbook), 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. The candidate also has the right to meet with the personnel committee and receive a full explanation of the basis of its evaluation.

To receive recommendations for unconditional continuation, instructors are expected to make *adequate* progress in the assigned domains of faculty work. Instructors in their first two years of the appointment will have made significant strides in establishing themselves as professionally competent teachers, and will have contributed service to the department*. Instructors in their third/renewal year should have peer and student teaching evaluations showing a firm grasp of the material, *excellence* in preparation, and thoughtfulness in pedagogy; and provided service appropriate inside the department*. Instructors in their fourth and fifth years should have solidified their teaching and addressed all concerns related to their future teaching; performed laudable service inside and outside the department*.

*as appropriate to the Instructor's appointment

F. EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

Teaching effectiveness is the only consideration in the evaluation of lecturers. In evaluating teaching, the committee and the Chair will consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Peer observations
2. Student evaluations
3. Syllabi and course materials.
4. Loads and preparations.
5. Meritorious recognition.
6. Experiential learning exercises.
7. Career Readiness exercises.

G. REQUIRED EVALUATION ELEMENTS

Evaluation Type	FAD Report	Current CV	Appointment Letter	Previous Evaluations	Statement of Teaching Philosophy	Summary of Scholarship (Research Agenda)	Summary of Service	Teaching Evaluations (Peer and Student)	Re-Prints/Links of Scholarly Outputs
Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty	CAS Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Renewal of Instructors	CAS Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Renewal of Lecturers	Review of Lecturer Appointment							Yes	
Promotion to Associate Professor /Tenure	CAS Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Report	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promotion to Professor	CAS Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Report	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promotion to Sr. Instructor	CAS Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Report	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes	
Faculty Performance Evaluation	FPE Reports	Yes						Yes	
Merit Pay	Revised Biennial Review Report(s)	Yes						Yes	

H. PROMOTION & TENURE

Promotion is based on both a record of accomplishments and an expectation of continued future contributions. Separately and independently the Chair will evaluate the candidates. Aside from the University required elements of evaluation (found in section 305 of the Handbook) and the required elements of evaluation in this document, candidates are entitled to a meeting with the Chair and committee to discuss the basis for the recommendation (either positive or negative.)

Specific requirements for eligibility for promotion will include:

I. To Senior Instructor:

The Department realizes the importance of teaching to fulfilling the mission of the University. The candidate to Senior Instructor will be required to produce the aforementioned evidence. The standard for promotion to Senior Instructor shall be consistent *excellence* in teaching.

II. To Associate Professor with Tenure:

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; noteworthy and consequential research (of the aforementioned forms) consistent with that of an active scholar; and service that brings credit to the faculty member and the department. No faculty member may be promoted to associate professor without *adequacy* in each domain. *Excellent* or *exceptional* performance in at least one domain is required. *Adequacy* in each area is not sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure.

Additional Expectations:

1. 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.
2. 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.

III. To Professor:

The University Handbook (305.12.4.5) allows for two paths to promotion. The candidate may pursue the route (outlined in 305.12.4.5.1) which requires "...*substantial* and effective teaching or librarianship; of a record of *substantial* accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creativity which has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active, *substantive* service to some combination of the University, the community and the profession." Alternatively, the candidate may pursue the route (outlined in 305.12.4.5.1) which requires a higher level of performance "...in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in the other domains." For the department, that higher level of performance must meet the standard of *exceptional* as defined above.

I. Faculty Performance Evaluation

Conforming to the University Faculty Faculty Performance Evaluation process and College of Arts and Sciences "Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations (9/18)", tenured faculty, senior instructors, and instructors in the position longer than six years are to be reviewed in the fall of odd numbered years for a period from August 1 of two years prior to July 31 of the current year. The faculty are to submit materials for this review using the established university process.

A faculty member performing to the aforementioned department standard of *adequacy* in each of the domains will be rated as *Meets Expectations*. A faculty member not meeting the standard of *adequacy* in any of the domains will be rated as *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

The annual evaluations (Year's 1 and 2) of the Faculty Performance Evaluation that are conducted by the Chairperson and Dean will be based on the STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE table above at rates/levels associated with adequacy.

J. MERIT INCREASES

I. Shares

The committee and chairperson shall independently rate every participating faculty member using the terms defined above (adequate, excellent, exceptional) in each of the three domains of faculty work. Only faculty rated as at least adequate in their assigned domains of work are eligible for any portion of the departmental merit pool.

Teaching

An excellent rating in the teaching domain shall entitle an Instructor (assigned no scholarship) to 3 shares and a tenured/tenure track faculty member (or an Instructor with a scholarship assignment) to 2 shares. An exceptional rating in the teaching domain shall entitle an Instructor (assigned no scholarship) to 6 shares and a tenured/tenure track faculty member (or an Instructor with a scholarship assignment) to 4 shares.

Scholarship

An excellent rating in the scholarship domain shall entitle a tenured/tenure track faculty member (or an Instructor with a scholarship assignment) to 2 shares. An exceptional rating in the scholarship domain shall entitle a tenured/tenure track faculty member (or an Instructor with a scholarship assignment) to 4 shares.

Service

An excellent rating in the service domain shall entitle a regular faculty member to 1 share. An exceptional rating in the service domain shall entitle a regular faculty member to 2 share.

The sum of shares across domains constitutes the claim an individual faculty member has to the merit pool.

The committee and chairperson shall each make a recommendation for participating faculty member based on a prorated portion of the total pool based on the number of shares. If necessary, after they have made their independent judgements, the committee and chairperson will meet to resolve discrepancies. If there is no resolution, and either asserts that a faculty member has performed below the standard of adequacy, that faculty member will receive no portion of the merit pool. If there is no resolution and all faculty are rated as at least adequate in each domain, the committee's assigned shares and chairperson's assigned shares will be averaged.