

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENTS,  
EVALUATIONS, AND PROMOTIONS**

**in**

**THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA**

**FEBRUARY 27, 1985**

**AMENDED TO REFLECT MOTIONS PASSED  
AT FACULTY MEETINGS HELD:**

**MAY 1988  
FEBRUARY 1990  
MAY 1994  
MAY 1996  
MAY 1997  
OCTOBER 1997  
NOVEMBER 1998  
APRIL 1999  
SEPTEMBER 2000  
DECEMBER 2005  
MAY 2006  
MAY 2007  
MAY 2008  
DEC 2009  
MAY 2010  
DEC 2011  
DEC 2012  
MAY 2020**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. <b><u>Introduction</u></b> .....	1
II. <b><u>Criteria for Appointment at or Promotion to Specific Tenure-Track and Tenured Academic Ranks</u></b> .....	2
A. Instructor .....	2
B. Assistant Professor .....	2
C. Associate Professor .....	2
D. Professor .....	3
E. Adjunct and Visiting Faculty .....	3
III. <b><u>Elements of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Evaluations</u></b> .....	4
A. Evaluation of Teaching .....	4
B. Evaluation of Scholarship .....	6
C. Evaluation of Professional Service .....	7
D. Summary .....	7
IV. <b><u>Review and Evaluation Procedures</u></b> .....	9
A. Annual Evaluations by the Department Executive Officer .....	9
B. Faculty Participation in Peer Review and Evaluation for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations .....	9
C. Procedures for New Appointments .....	11
D. Procedures for Reappointments of Tenure-Track Faculty .....	12
E. Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure .....	14
F. Collegiate Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure .....	17
G. Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty .....	18
H. Procedures for Peer Review of Tenured Professors .....	19
I. Promotion Procedures for Adjunct Faculty Members .....	20

**I.****INTRODUCTION**

The College of Engineering adheres to the general criteria for appointment and promotion to all grades of academic rank as stated in the Statement on Tenure and Academic Vitality at The University of Iowa, the University Operations Manual, the Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making at The University of Iowa, and the Manual of Procedure of the College of Engineering.

This document provides further details on the criteria and procedures for tenure-track, tenured, visiting and adjunct faculty appointments, evaluations, and promotions in the College of Engineering to the extent that they apply uniformly in all departments of the College. Individual departments may or may not provide more detailed standards or criteria consistent with this document, and these, together with the College and University documents, will constitute the full set of standards and methods applicable in any individual case.

A companion policy, “Criteria and Procedures for Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions at the Rank of Lecturer, Associate Professor of Instruction, Professor of Instruction, Associate Professor of Practice, or Professor of Practice,” covers appointment, promotion and review procedures for instructional track faculty.

## II. **CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AT OR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIC TENURE-TRACK OR TENURED ACADEMIC RANKS**

The Operations Manual states the qualifications for appointment at and the conditions for promotion to and tenure at the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. while the Provost's Office defines the rank of Instructor.

### A. **Instructor**

1. The rank of tenure-track instructor, in many academic units, is generally reserved for those individuals who are qualified for the rank of tenure-track assistant professor except for completion of the doctorate or the equivalent terminal degree for the area. In such cases, the rank of tenure-track instructor should only be granted to persons who are expected to be advanced to tenure-track assistant professor as soon as they have completed the terminal degree.
2. Completion of the terminal degree will ordinarily result in immediate promotion to the rank of tenure-track assistant professor. Appointment at the rank of tenure-track instructor shall not exceed three years.
3. Failure to complete the doctorate or its equivalent will normally result in termination at the end of the three years. Tenure may not be granted at the rank of instructor.

### B. **Assistant Professor**

1. Promise of ability as a teacher.
2. Holder of the doctorate or its equivalent.
3. Promise of scholarly productivity, supported by publications or the equivalent.

### C. **Associate Professor**

1. Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students.
2. Demonstration of scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).
3. Professional, departmental, collegiate, and/or University service will be expected at an appropriate level.
4. The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

**D. Professor**

1. Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs.
2. Continued scholarly achievement of high quality, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and internationally recognized scholar in the chosen field.
3. The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the profession, department, college, and/or the University.

**E. Adjunct and Visiting Faculty**

1. An adjunct faculty rank is normally given to a person who holds full-time employment in a nonfaculty capacity within or outside the University. While the academic rank granted to adjunct faculty shall be guided by the qualifications noted above for regular faculty appointments, it is recognized that the adjunct faculty member may not meet all of the criteria for a given rank. In such cases, specialized experience of the individual and the level and scope of the contributions to be made to the academic activities of the department in areas relevant to that experience may be considered in determining an appropriate academic rank.
2. The academic rank granted to visiting faculty from an academic institution shall be commensurate with the rank held at the home institution. For visitors from nonacademic institutions, the academic rank in the department shall be determined in accordance with the above qualifications for regular faculty.
3. When recommending the appointment of adjunct and visiting faculty, the DEO shall consult, when feasible, with the tenured and tenure-track faculty holding primary appointments in the department.

### III. ELEMENTS OF TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Evaluations of the performance are of two types:

1. Annual evaluations by the Department Executive Officer (DEO) of all faculty performed for the purpose of recommending salary increments, assigning departmental teaching and service responsibilities, and allocating departmental teaching, research, and service support.
2. Peer evaluations by the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) (defined in Section IV.B) for reviewing the progress of probationary tenure-track faculty and for making recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty members.

All evaluations of faculty performance will be based on documented evidence of faculty contributions in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Contributions in teaching and research will be the major factors in determining the outcome of each evaluation; service, although important, will not carry the same weight. The University of Iowa Academic and Professional Record (APR) contains appropriate sections in which contributions in these three areas are recorded in detail. Faculty may submit the older College of Engineering Faculty Activity Summary (FAS) or acceptable curriculum vitae in place of APR, and references to APR in the remainder of the policy can be read as “APR or equivalent information in the form of the College of Engineering FAS or acceptable curriculum vitae.”

The specific elements of evaluation of these contributions are as follows:

#### A. Evaluation of Teaching

The first step in any consideration of faculty performance is a peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Only after an affirmative judgment as to teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration be given to an evaluation of scholarship and professional service.

Faculty members in the College are generally expected to teach courses at all academic levels. The most important element in the peer evaluation of teaching is the determination of the contributions made by the faculty member in the development and maintenance of contemporary high-quality curricula at the undergraduate and the graduate levels in the light of established collegiate and departmental goals. Evidence for this should be drawn from the various items in APR and evaluated. The following are the essential aspects of such an evaluation.

1. Evaluation of the objectives and contents of, and methods and policies in, courses taught by the faculty member with regard to the currency of content, depth of coverage, treatment of topics assumed for subsequent courses, selection of textbook and teaching material, and preparation of teaching aids.
2. Evaluation of effectiveness in directing undergraduate, M.S., and Ph.D. research to completion.
3. Evaluation of contributions to curriculum development through:

- (a) introduction of new courses;
  - (b) introduction of innovative teaching methods;
  - (c) seminars on modern topics for the benefit of students and faculty;
  - (d) development of teaching laboratories;
  - (e) introduction of computer technology in courses;
  - (f) participation in teaching-related committees;
  - (g) participation in other aspects of curriculum development;
  - (h) cooperation with other instructors of multi-section and related courses;
  - (i) other (development of new course materials, new laboratory experiments, substantial course revision, coordination of courses, etc.).
4. Evaluation of student inputs received through the mandatory Assessing the Classroom Environment (ACE) forms or solicited by the DCG or DEO as part of the regular review process with regard to the classroom performance of the faculty member. Since departmental normative data are often sparse and thus of questionable reliability, analysis of ACE information should include a comparison to normative College-wide ACE data.
5. Evaluation of published class notes, textbooks and other educational material, and of teaching-related awards.
6. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. At minimum, three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation of teaching for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. At least two observers, who will be faculty qualified to be members of the candidate's DCG unless circumstances dictate otherwise, will participate in the visits. The Department Executive Officer, after consulting with the candidate, shall arrange for selection of the observers. Classroom visits need not take place during the semester in which the review is conducted but may take place during the preceding four academic-year semesters. Visits will be scheduled with appropriate advance notice and in consultation with the candidate. Unless prohibited by written department policy, video observation may, with the candidate's consent, be substituted for direct observation of classroom teaching. Unless departmental policy specifies a particular method of recording observations, individual observers may use their own discretion in recording their findings. The conclusions of the observers shall be incorporated into the peer evaluation of teaching report, a copy of which is provided to the candidate. If provided for by department policy, observers may individually or jointly draft a separate report which is shared with the candidate. Although classroom observations are a required part of the peer evaluation of teaching, it is desirable that the observations also serve to help the candidate improve his or her teaching.

## **B. Evaluation of Scholarship**

The criteria employed to evaluate a faculty member's scholarship are quality and productivity. Evidence must be presented to demonstrate high quality, independence, and continuous

productivity in scholarship with growth in research leadership as a faculty member progresses to higher ranks. There should be documented evidence that the research program has achieved or is achieving national recognition.

Although quality of research is difficult to determine in absolute terms, an evaluation and acceptance by knowledgeable peers is an essential component. Thus, publications in rigorously refereed archival journals with a national and international readership are the best indicators of a faculty member's scholarly accomplishments. University policy also requires that evaluations be solicited from external reviewers.

Material to be used in the evaluation of scholarship should be drawn principally from the promotion dossier and record described in the Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making at The University of Iowa. It is important that listed publications contain complete citations and, for those involving multiple authors, some indication of the contribution of the faculty member. Evidence for the evaluation of scholarship should include the following categories.

1. Research monographs and textbooks that represent a major scholarly effort and synthesize knowledge or methodologies in a field. Edited books, in which the faculty member conceptualized the project, contributed in a substantial way to the included papers, and wrote important portions of the book, also indicate a high level of scholarship and recognition by peers.
2. Papers published or accepted for publication in technical journals and proceedings with rigorous review procedures. As noted above, these are the primary indicators of quality and recognition of research.
3. Other publications [e.g., papers in proceedings of conferences and symposia, articles in books, etc., articles in popular magazines, and technical reports] which are effective media for the dissemination of current research results, but which do not have a formal and rigorous peer review. Although such publications shall not be regarded as substitutes for rigorously refereed articles, they should be evaluated to determine their impact on subsequent journal publications and recognition by peers.
4. External funding attracted by the faculty member in support of scholarly activities. Depending upon the review process and the level of competition, these provide a measure of the reputation of the faculty member among his/her peers.
5. Awards which recognize special accomplishments in research.

### **C. Evaluation of Professional Service**

In addition to teaching and research contributions, faculty members routinely are expected to provide service at various levels within and outside the department. It is very difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to place a higher value on one type of service activity than on another. However, factors that are paramount in the evaluation of overall service contributions are (a) successful discharge of departmental and collegiate responsibilities, (b) growth in the scope of



service with advancement in academic ranks, and (c) contribution to the enhancement of the reputation of the department and the University. The types of activities to be considered in such an evaluation of service involve the following:

1. Department, College, and University. Carrying out committee responsibilities in a thorough and timely manner is essential for a favorable evaluation. Other activities include advising students and student organizations, providing peer support through review of proposals and articles written by colleagues, and, for more experienced faculty members, taking a leadership role in curriculum review and development, and in securing external support for the academic programs of the department.
2. Professional and Scholarly Organizations. Important forms of service in this category include: committee membership; organization of conferences or sessions at conferences; presentation of short courses; membership on accreditation boards or agencies; reviewing of journal articles and research grant proposals; editorship of journals; presentation of seminars at universities, research laboratories, and other organizations; etc.
3. Government Agencies and Community Groups. These include membership on state and national boards, and professional advising of government organizations in the solution of engineering problems and in the formulation of public policy.

#### **D. Summary**

In identifying the important elements in the evaluation of faculty performance, no attempt has been made to distinguish between criteria applicable to different academic ranks. The same general types of activities are normally pursued by all faculty. The evaluations are, however, to be based on the differences in qualifications and conditions noted in Section II of this document. In particular, promotion to, or appointment at, the rank of Associate Professor requires that the candidate show promise of ultimately attaining the rank of Professor; for recommendations involving the granting of tenure, the Operations Manual requires that the "institution's overall educational needs must be taken into account along with the institution's fiscal ability to support the position occupied by the faculty member "; and for promotion to, or appointment at, the rank of Professor, it is necessary to demonstrate "unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and internationally recognized scholar." All such evidence must be gathered during the course of the evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and professional contributions.

Evidence of peer recognition at the national level may include national honors for outstanding teaching, adoption by other institutions of teaching material and concepts developed by the candidate, a substantial record of publication in widely-read refereed professional journals, awards of distinction from professional societies for research, presentation of keynote addresses or research reviews at national and international meetings, appointments to prestigious national or international committees, membership on editorial boards of journals, invitations to render unique professional services to industry and government agencies, and letters obtained from external reviewers.

#### **IV. REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

##### **A. Annual Evaluations by the Department Executive Officer**

1. Annual evaluations shall be made of all departmental faculty members.
2. The evaluations shall be based on the latest Academic and Professional Record (APR) and any additional material the faculty member believes is appropriate. Deadlines for updating the APR and submitting additional material shall be established by the Department Executive Officer.
3. The DEO will carefully review the available material according to the expected standard of performance for the faculty members in their unit and then schedule an individual conference with each faculty member to discuss the Department Executive Officer's evaluation of the material. Such conferences shall take place before making any final recommendations for salary increments or reallocation of departmental resources for the coming year. In addition, the DEO may utilize inputs from students and other faculty members (and other Department Executive Officers for persons on joint appointments) who may have special knowledge of the contributions of the faculty member.
4. When, as a result of an annual review, the DEO concludes that there are significant deficiencies related to teaching, research, or service, the DEO shall provide written notifications of these conclusions to the faculty member being reviewed, and the faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond in writing. The final report and the faculty member's response will be sent to the dean and will be kept with the faculty member's personnel records.

##### **B. Faculty Participation in Peer Review and Evaluation for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations**

1. The composition of the "Departmental Consulting Group" (hereafter denoted by "DCG") participating in the review and evaluation process will vary depending upon the status of the person being considered and the purpose of the review, and will be limited to faculty members who hold primary appointments in the department and who attend the meeting or meetings where the appropriate matter is discussed and resolved. Membership of the DCG shall be as follows:

<b>Matter under Consideration</b>	<b>Membership of the DCG</b>
(a) New appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty at all ranks	All tenured and tenure-track faculty holding a primary appointment in the department
(b) Grant of tenure to new appointees	Tenured faculty members holding a primary appointment in the department at the same rank or higher
(c) Reappointments As Instructor or Assistant Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
As Associate Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
As Professor	Tenured Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
(d) Promotion/Tenure Recommendations	
Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor	Tenured Full Professors holding a primary appointment in the department
Grant of Tenure in Rank	Tenured faculty members holding a primary appointment in the department at the same rank or higher
(e) Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	Tenured faculty members holding the same or higher rank
(f) Peer Review of Tenured Faculty	Tenured faculty members holding the same or higher rank and holding a primary appointment in the department, <sup>1</sup> excepting the faculty member being reviewed

---

<sup>1</sup> See Section H.2.

2. The following persons shall not be considered members of the DCG: faculty members who have tendered their resignations prior to the meeting; instructional faculty; adjunct and visiting professors; emeriti; the Dean and Provost; persons charged with making an independent recommendation to the Dean or to the Provost. For peer reviews of faculty, the DEO and other academic administrators may not be present for DCG meetings. In all other cases, the DEO can attend the meetings of the DCG only if invited by the DCG chair, to obtain information and perceptions about the candidate by listening to the group discussion. Although the DEO should exchange any factual information with the group, he/she shall not express an opinion about the candidate in the meetings and shall not participate in any vote.
3. If a DEO is being considered for reappointment or promotion and/or tenure, the Dean shall select an Associate Dean or a DEO holding the rank of professor with tenure to assume the responsibilities of the DEO in the review process except that such person will neither vote nor transmit his or her independent recommendation to the Dean. The selection shall be made after consultation with the DCG.
4. In the event that the DCG in a department numbers fewer than four, the group should be enlarged to at least four by including tenured faculty members at the appropriate rank(s) from other departments as selected by the Dean after consultation with the DEO and the faculty member being reviewed or the candidate for reappointment or promotion and/or tenure.
5. When the DEO of a department is unable to provide an independent review of a faculty member, a DCG is assembled in consultation with the Dean in the spring semester of the academic year before the review. At its first meeting, the DCG will elect, by vote, a member of the group to act as the DEO-designate (acting in place of the DEO) for the particular promotion case at hand. The election of the DEO-designate will be subject to approval by the Dean. The DEO-designate shall not participate in the DCG deliberations for the particular case. The DEO-designate will handle all of the duties usually handled by the DEO, including providing communication and feedback to the faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/or granting tenure, soliciting external letters of reference, etc. This process should be initiated in the spring semester of the academic year before the review so the DEO-designate is in place to handle the early stages of the review process.

### **C. Procedures for New Appointments**

1. Any appointment to a probationary or tenured faculty position of a person not then holding such a position in the College of Engineering shall be deemed a new appointment. In case the appointment involves individuals who already hold a tenured or tenure-track appointment in another College of the University, all the procedures in this section will apply except for those in items 3 (b-e).
2. When a faculty position is to be filled, the DEO shall appoint and designate the chair of a Search Committee consisting of at least three faculty members holding primary appointments in the department. If advantageous, a faculty member holding secondary appointment in the department, or external to the department, may be added to the

committee. The entire tenure-track and tenured departmental faculty may be designated as the Search Committee.

3. It shall be the duty of the Search Committee to:
  - (a) Ensure, in consultation with the Department Executive Officer, that all affirmative action procedures are followed in the search;
  - (b) Describe the position in a form suitable for advertisement;
  - (c) Send notification of the vacancy to appropriate institutions, associations, publications, and individuals;
  - (d) Screen applications;
  - (e) Consult with the DEO and the DCG to identify candidates to be invited for interview;
  - (f) Prepare a schedule for each candidate's visit to include conferences with individual faculty, the Department Executive Officer, the Dean, and other appropriate persons, and a seminar presented by the candidate to the faculty and students.
4. A meeting or meetings of the DCG shall be convened by the DEO or the Search Committee Chair to discuss the qualifications of the candidates, to obtain a closed ballot vote at the meeting to select the candidate for the position, and to make contingency plans in the event that (1) the selected candidate rejects the offer, or (2) the DEO and/or the Dean do not concur in the DCG recommendation.
5. After taking into account the vote of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in the DCG meetings, the DEO shall transmit his/her own independent recommendation to the Dean along with the results of the DCG vote, and make an offer to the candidate upon receiving concurrence from the Dean.
6. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DCG shall be made at the time the Department Executive Officer's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the Dean shall report this fact to the DEO and to the members of the DCG together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DEO and to the members of the DCG shall be made at the time the Dean's recommendation is made.

#### **D. Procedures for Reappointments**

1. Evaluations for reappointment are required for all probationary (nontenured) tenure-track faculty who hold term appointments in the department, and whose performance, if judged to be satisfactory, would normally lead to reappointment at the current rank.

2. Such evaluations shall be undertaken and completed by a date designated by the DEO during the terminal year of an initial three-year appointment or in the year prior to the terminal year of the appointment if warranted by the previous Annual Review of Tenure-Track Probationary Faculty (Section IV.G).
3. It shall be the responsibility of the DEO to:
  - (a) Establish a timetable for the conduct of the review;
  - (b) Arrange for the development of a file for each person being considered for a reappointment with each such person given the opportunity to submit whatever he/she considers relevant to the established criteria;
  - (c) Convene the DCG and appoint a chairperson to conduct the meeting or meetings at which the group considers what action to recommend concerning reappointment;
  - (d) Transmit, after taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the file and the meeting, her or his own independent recommendation to the Dean and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the DCG and the results of the consultations with those named above.
4. The DCG may appoint individual faculty or subcommittees to collect all pertinent information on each candidate and shall meet as often as necessary to review and evaluate the faculty member's teaching, research, and service contributions. The faculty member being reviewed may be interviewed by the group and may wish to request such an interview and/or the opportunity to present a departmental seminar describing past, present, and planned teaching and research activities.
5. A closed ballot vote of the DCG attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting. A written report of the DCG's activities and evaluation shall be drafted by the group chairperson, modified as necessary and approved by the group, and submitted by the group chairperson to the Department Executive Officer. Minority reports, if applicable, shall be appended to and submitted as part of the written report.
6. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DCG shall be made at the time the Department Executive Officer's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the Dean shall report this fact to the DEO and to the members of the DCG with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DEO and to the members of the DCG shall be made in writing and at the time the Dean's recommendation is submitted to the Provost.
8. At each level of the review and recommendation process and at the time that such information is available, the DEO shall inform the candidate of the recommendation being forwarded to the next level. Following the complete review and recommendation process,

the DEO shall meet with each candidate not recommended for reappointment to review the recommendations of the DCG, the Department Executive Officer, and the Dean, along with the decision of the Provost, and to inform the candidate of the grievance procedures available should the candidate wish to contest the final decision.

#### **E. Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure**

1. University of Iowa policy shall apply to all mandatory and nonmandatory departmental peer reviews leading to recommendations concerning promotions and the granting of tenure. Departmental and Collegiate procedures employed in such reviews shall be consistent with the guidelines defined in the document Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making at The University of Iowa.

A faculty member may make a written request to the DEO for a non-mandatory review of his or her promotion and/or tenure in any academic year, or such a review may be initiated by the DEO or DCG. In such cases, the DCG, after conducting a preliminary review of the faculty member's contributions, shall inform the faculty member whether or not a full review is, in its opinion, warranted. Regardless of this opinion, the faculty member has the right, through written notification to the Department Executive Officer, to request that the full non-mandatory review be either continued or discontinued in that academic year. Full non-mandatory reviews shall be governed by the same procedures as those specified herein for a mandatory review.

- (a) In the second year of appointment, all tenure-track Instructors shall be reviewed for promotion to Assistant Professor. Note that no faculty member may hold the academic rank of Instructor for more than three years. Note also that when a faculty member is promoted from Instructor to Assistant Professor, the total time at The University of Iowa in nontenured ranks (Instructor and Assistant Professor combined) shall not exceed seven years, including the terminal one-year appointment.
- (b) The University of Iowa guidelines mandate peer reviews of Assistant Professors for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure during the third and sixth years of service, or one year prior to the termination of the appointment period when the appointment or reappointment period is for less than three years.
- (c) Associate Professors with tenure shall be reviewed for promotion to Professor by the DCG, Department Executive Officer, and the Dean at least every seven years. The mandatory seventh year review for promotion to Professor may be delayed upon written request by the faculty member and the concurrence of the DCG, the Department Executive Officer, and the Dean.
- (d) Nontenured Associate Professors and nontenured Professors who have been faculty members at other academic institutions will be reviewed for tenure no later than during the second year of their three-year probationary appointment. Nontenured Associate Professors and nontenured Professors without previous experience at other academic institutions will be reviewed for tenure no later than during the fifth year of their probationary service.

2. It shall be the duty of the Department Executive Officer:
  - (a) To establish a timetable for the conduct of the review (see item 9).
  - (b) To arrange for the development of a promotion/tenure file for each person being considered for promotion and/or tenure, with each person given the opportunity to submit whatever he/she considers relevant to the established criteria. Materials which could not have been available at the time of preparation of this file may be added at a later date by the candidate through the Department Executive Officer. Where the availability of this material prior to the completion of the deliberations of the DCG can be anticipated, the expected additions should be identified at the time the file is submitted, and the new material should be added to the file as it becomes available.
  - (c) To obtain external reviews of the candidate's scholarship. Using the procedure defined in University policy, the DEO shall strive to obtain eight to ten external reviews. In selecting potential reviewers to ask for letters, the DEO shall consult the DCG via the DCG chairperson. The DEO shall take particular care to keep the identity of reviewers confidential. The portion of the candidate's work that each reviewer is to evaluate shall be determined by the DEO in consultation with the DCG with the aim of obtaining a comprehensive assessment of the quality and scope of the candidate's research contributions. Likewise, the wording of the letter soliciting comments from external reviewers, while substantially conforming to the sample letter provided in University policy, shall be determined with the same aim in mind. The process of selecting external reviewers will commence on or before September 1.
  - (d) To convene the DCG to review all eligible faculty and identify the candidates to be considered for promotion and to appoint the chairperson of the DCG.
  - (e) The DEO shall send to the candidate a copy of the internal peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. The candidate will have a total of five working days to submit corrections to statements of fact in these evaluations.
  - (f) After taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the promotion/tenure file and/or the meeting of the DCG when the final recommendation was made, to transmit an independent recommendation to the Dean together with the promotion record (including appendices), and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the DCG and the results of consultations with those named above.
  - (g) The DEO is responsible for those functions assigned to the DEO in the document Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making at The University of Iowa except when they are assigned to others by College policy. The Department Executive Officer's designee may assist the DEO in performing those functions related to communicating with external reviewers or with members of the DCG regarding external reviewers. The DEO shall keep a record of comments about external reviewers submitted by the Department Executive Officer's designee. The DEO will also keep a record of correspondence and other communications between the Department Executive Officer's designee and external reviewers.



3. Although the DCG may appoint individual faculty or subcommittees to collect all pertinent information on each candidate, peer evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service will be conducted and entered into the promotion record by the DCG. The DCG shall meet as often as necessary to review and evaluate the faculty member's teaching, research, and service contributions. When appropriate, the DCG may solicit information and assessments of a candidate's teaching or service from knowledgeable individuals from within or outside of the University. The DCG may also solicit information and assessments of a candidate's research from knowledgeable individuals from within the University. The faculty member being reviewed may be interviewed by the group and may wish to request such an interview and/or the opportunity to present a departmental seminar describing past, present, and planned teaching and research activities. In accordance with University policy, the DCG's internal peer evaluation report on the candidate's scholarship will analyze the relevant materials in the promotion record, excluding the external evaluations of the candidate's scholarship contributed by external reviewers.
4. A closed ballot vote of the DCG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting. It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week's notice of this meeting unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible. Absentee voting by members of the DCG via conference call is appropriate, but voting must be anonymous. To make the vote anonymous, the member missing will participate in the meeting by teleconference and leave two ballots, one yes, one no, each in an envelope inside another envelope. The appropriate vote will be made by having the person designate which envelope contains the official vote. A simple majority voting in favor of promotion and/or tenure will represent a positive recommendation by the DCG. A written report of the DCG's activities and evaluation shall be drafted by the group chairperson, modified as necessary and approved by the group, and submitted by the group chairperson to the DEO and candidate. The report provided to the candidate shall be redacted as necessary to protect the confidentiality of all individuals who directly or indirectly contributed to the report. Minority reports, if applicable, shall be appended to and submitted as part of the written report.
5. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DCG shall be made at the time the Department Executive Officer's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
6. Any new material that becomes available after the submission of the Department Executive Officer's recommendation to the Dean, that could not have been available earlier, and which, in the opinion of the Department Executive Officer, may have a substantive impact on the Dean's evaluation, should be forwarded to the Dean. If, in the Dean's judgment, this material erodes the basis of the DCG or Department Executive Officer's recommendation, the Dean should return the case to the department for further consideration.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the Dean shall report this fact to the DEO and to the members of the DCG with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The

report to the DEO and to the members of the DCG shall be made in writing and at the time the Dean's recommendation is submitted to the Provost.

8. At the same time the promotion file is submitted to the Dean, the DEO will provide the candidate with a copy of the Officer's recommendation. As provided for by University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response and additional information. Following the complete review and recommendation process, the DEO shall meet with each candidate not recommended for promotion and/or tenure to review the recommendations of the DCG, the Department Executive Officer, and the Dean, along with the decision of the Provost, and to provide suggestions for improving any apparent deficiencies.
9. The normal timetable recommended for promotion/tenure evaluation is as follows.

September 1	Candidate submits promotion dossier.
December 1	DCG's recommendations submitted to the Department Executive Officer.
December 15	Department Executive Officer's recommendations submitted to the Dean.
February 1	Dean's recommendations submitted to the Provost.

#### **F. Collegiate Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure**

1. In formulating his or her recommendation in promotion or tenure cases, the Dean shall seek the formal advice of the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee. The advisory committee provides the Dean a way to obtain help in interpreting the materials in the promotion record and in fully understanding a candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
2. Both the Dean and the advisory committee shall act so as to avoid creating another full layer in the promotion and tenure process that diminishes the importance of faculty judgments at the department level. The Dean shall remain fully accountable for promotion and tenure decisions made at the College level.
3. Following consultation with the Engineering Faculty Council during a regularly scheduled meeting of the Council, the Dean will annually appoint not less than five faculty members to the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee with no more than two members being from the same department. Committee members must be tenured full professors with primary appointments in the College. Except when circumstances warrant, the Dean shall strive to achieve broad departmental representation on the committee and shall appoint the committee as soon in the fall semester as is feasible.
4. A member of the advisory committee, appointed by the Dean, will serve as chairperson and shall ensure that the advisory committee discharges its responsibilities in a timely fashion and in a manner consistent within College and University policy. Following appointment of the advisory committee, the Dean shall notify the faculty of the committee's membership and chairperson.

5. The Dean may attend the meetings of the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee but may not vote or contribute to the committee's report.
6. Members of the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee who are members of the departmental DCG for a particular candidate may not participate in the advisory committee's deliberations or voting in regard to that candidate.
7. The Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee shall meet to discuss the qualifications of each candidate for promotion or tenure and to vote by closed ballot to advise for or against the granting of promotion and/or tenure. A simple majority advising promotion and/or tenure represents a positive recommendation. The results of the balloting will be announced at the same meeting. The Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee shall supervise the drafting of a report recording and explaining the committee's vote. The report need not be lengthy but should explain the rationale for the vote. After securing committee approval of the report, the Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee shall communicate it to the Dean.
8. If either the DCG's or Department Executive Officer's recommendation is positive and the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee advises against promotion or tenure, the Committee's report will be provided to the candidate. Pursuant to University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response.
9. At the same time the promotion file is submitted to the Provost, the Dean will provide the candidate with a copy of the recommendation and the report of the Dean's Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee. As provided for by University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response and additional information. At the time that the Provost's recommendation to the Board of Regents is available to the Dean, the Dean will inform the candidate and DEO in writing of the Provost's recommendation. In the case of a recommendation against promotion or tenure, the Dean will inform the candidate of the availability and enclose a copy via certified mail of the official Faculty Dispute Procedures as explained in Part III, Chapter 29, of The University of Iowa Operations Manual.

#### **G. Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty**

1. If a faculty member on a probationary appointment is being reviewed for either or promotion and/or tenure, the procedures outlined in Sections IV.D and IV.E, respectively, of this document shall be followed.
2. University policy and procedures for the conduct of such reviews are available from the Office of the Provost.
3. It shall be the duty of the DEO to:
  - (a) Establish the timetable for the review;

- (b) Convene and designate the chair of the DCG;
  - (c) After taking into account the evaluation report of the DCG and after consulting with others who did not participate in the evaluation, submit a written evaluation of the faculty member together with the completed "Annual Review of Probationary Faculty" form to the Dean;
  - (d) Upon completion of the annual evaluation process, meet with the faculty member to provide him/her with feedback and guidance from the review. Copies of the review material should be provided to the faculty member as provided for by University policy.
4. The faculty member shall provide the DEO with the updated Faculty Activities Summary and any additional material he/she deems appropriate for such a review.
  5. The DCG, or a subcommittee designated by the DCG, shall review and evaluate the teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments of the faculty member, and provide a written report to the Department Executive Officer. This report shall highlight the strengths and weaknesses observed and provide guidance for improvements that could lead to satisfactory progress toward reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

#### **H. Procedures for Peer Review of Tenured Professors**

1. As explained in Part III, Chapter 10, Section 7, of The University of Iowa Operations Manual, tenured associate and full professors shall be reviewed by the DCG, consisting of tenured professors at the same or higher rank, once every five years. The review should address the quality of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and should result in recommendations that may help to enhance that performance. Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled five-year peer review if:
  - (a) They are being reviewed for promotion to a higher rank during the year of the scheduled review;
  - (b) They are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement; or
  - (c) They serve as DEO, assistant dean, associate dean, or dean.
2. Before the peer review process starts, the faculty member who is to be reviewed will be notified that they will undergo the five-year review process during the academic year and will be informed of the makeup of the DCG. The faculty member may submit a letter to their Department Executive Officer, requesting the exclusion of certain faculty members from the DCG.
3. The DCG may appoint a subcommittee to gather the information necessary to conduct the reviews. If the faculty member being reviewed is jointly appointed, the DCG must obtain input from the other department(s).

4. Each faculty member reviewed shall provide the DCG with an updated Faculty Activities Summary, supplementary material (such as teaching evaluations) requested by the DCG, and any additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.
5. The DCG will review all submitted materials. The outcome of this peer review is confidential and confined to the faculty member being reviewed, the review committee, the DEO, the dean, others as directed by the faculty member, and in special circumstances the Provost. The faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond in writing.
6. If, after receiving the results of the peer review, the dean, on advice of the DCG and in consultation with the DEO, concludes, on the basis of the DCG's findings, that the faculty member's performance has fallen for a significant period of time below the expected standard of performance for the faculty member's unit, then the dean may initiate discussions with the faculty member concerning the development of a plan to address problems uncovered in the review.
7. The normal timeline recommended for peer review of tenured faculty is as follows:
 

September 15:	Faculty member who is to be reviewed is notified that they will undergo a five-year review.
January 30:	Meeting of DCG to initiate the review procedure.
February 15:	Review materials submitted to review committee.
April 1:	Draft report submitted by the DCG to the DEO to be shared with the faculty member under review.
April 15:	Final report sent to faculty member, DEO, and Dean.

## **I. Promotion Procedures for Adjunct Faculty Members**

1. Promotion review of adjunct faculty members will be considered in the same cycle as regular faculty, with the same deadlines as in section IV.E.9, except that the deadline for the candidates to submit their dossier will be October 15.
2. This policy assumes that the letter of appointment would describe the nature of the contribution to be made by adjunct faculty members in a given semester or academic or calendar year. Adjunct faculty members will be evaluated for promotion based on the quality and significance of the contribution that they make in the area(s) described in their individual appointment letters.
3. The dossier should include:
  - a) A current CV.
  - b) Copies of any evaluations of classroom teaching or individual instruction (if applicable) and information about teaching regularity and quantity since appointment or the last promotion.

- c) A brief (1-2 pages) personal statement regarding classroom teaching or individual instruction/supervision, scholarship, and/or service responsibilities (as applicable).
  - d) Two to three letters of review from individuals outside of the unit who have direct knowledge of the performance of the adjunct faculty member for cases in which it is difficult for DCG members or DEO to directly evaluate the performance of the adjunct faculty member. Departments will have discretion with respect to the need for outside letters generally or in specific cases.
4. The DCG shall consist of all tenure-track faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion. It will be convened in the same manner as described in Section IV. E. 2, by the DEO.
  5. The DCG shall review the dossier, conduct a closed ballot vote, and report its conclusions to the DEO in the manner specified in Section IV. E. 4.
  6. The DEO shall provide a written recommendation and rationale to the Dean in a manner consistent with Sections IV. E. 2 (f), IV. E. 5 and IV. E. 8.
  7. The Dean shall provide a written recommendation and rationale to the Provost in a manner consistent with Sections IV. E. 7 and IV. E. 8.