

June 12, 2003

To: Assistant Professor Jane Doe

From: Bruce Faaland, Chair
Management Science

Subject: Performance Review for September 16, 2001- September 15, 2002

The purpose of this memo is to review your performance over the 2001-2002 year and to offer suggestions we believe will be helpful. The Department, the Chair, and the Dean's Advisory Committee all participated in this process.

The Business School uses an evaluation scale that extends from 1 to 9 for teaching, research, and service, with 1 the lowest and 9 the highest scores we award. We try to attain an average in the School of 5 in each category.

The Department felt that your teaching would have to improve substantially from the average unadjusted rating from students of 3.3 during 2001-2002, but we also noticed that you did improve from the first quarter you taught IS 475 to the second. In addition, as I have told you, I am pleased that you have continued to make progress this year. However, this formal evaluation is for the 2001-2002 year only. The Department awarded you a 4 in teaching, as Chair I thought it was a 3.5, and the Advisory Committee assigned a 3 for that period.

In research, we look primarily at articles which have either appeared or been accepted. Although we are pleased that you had a paper accepted by the *Journal of Production Planning*, we would encourage you to submit your work to journals on our top tier list, particularly those listed under the information systems category to establish your credentials and visibility as an IS faculty member. The Department considers substantial visibility in the IS community essential to achieving tenure. Working with our IS faculty on joint projects, as you now are, might make it easier to do work attractive to IS journals. The Department ranked your research as 4, the Chair as 5, and the Advisory Committee as 5.

The Department tries to shield assistant professors, particularly those in their first years, from major service commitments that might hinder progress in research and teaching, the most important components in achieving tenure. Ultimately some service participation will be needed for tenure, but I purposely kept you away from any assignments the first year. As a consequence, your service evaluations are 5(Department), 1(Chair), and 2(Advisory Committee). The Advisory Committee and I used the same scale over all ranks of faculty, which is why their numbers seem so much lower than the Department's.

Overall, the Advisory Committee recommended an evaluation of 3.8 to the Dean, obtained by calculating a weighted average by assigning weights for teaching and research of .45 and a weight for service of .1.