

**DEPARTMENT OF
GENETICS, DEVELOPMENT AND CELL BIOLOGY
GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT**

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES /
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

Iowa State University

Approved September 2004*

*Amendments approved by faculty vote December 9, 2011;
Amendments approved by faculty vote January 15, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PREAMBLE	3
2. VISION & MISSION STATEMENT	3
3. GENERAL PROVISIONS	4
4. FACULTY MEMBERSHIP	4
4.1. THE VOTING FACULTY	5
4.2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY (POSITION RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT).....	5
5. ADMINISTRATION	6
5.1. RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHAIR	6
6. COMMITTEES	7
7. FACULTY MEETINGS AND VOTING PROCEDURES	9
8. SEARCHES AND HIRING	10
8.1 HIRING THE CHAIR.....	10
8.1.1 <i>Appointing an Interim Chair</i>	11
8.2. HIRING TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY	11
8.3. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	12
8.4 HIRING LECTURERS, CLINICIANS, SENIOR LECTURERS AND SENIOR CLINICIANS	13
8.4.1. <i>TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS</i>	13
8.5. ADJUNCT, VISITING, COLLABORATOR, AFFILIATE AND COURTESY APPOINTMENTS	13
8.6 P&S WITH FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY	14
9. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS	14
9.1. FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS	14
9.1.1. <i>Performance Reviews of Tenure-Eligible Faculty</i>	14
9.1.1.1 Departmental Support for Junior Faculty.....	15
9.1.2. <i>Performance Reviews of Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Lecturers, Senior Clinicians and Adjunct Faculty</i>	15
9.1.2.1. Annual Reviews.....	15
9.1.2.2. Renewal Reviews for Lecturers and Clinicians.	15
9.1.3.3. Renewal Reviews for Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians.	16
9.2. CHAIR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS	16
10. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	17
10.1. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW FOR TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY	17
10.1.1. <i>Criteria for promotion and tenure</i>	17
10.1.1.1. Research	17
10.1.1.2. Teaching.....	17
10.1.1.3. Extension and Professional Practice	18
10.1.1.4. Institutional Service	18
10.1.2. <i>Criteria for Specific Promotions</i>	18
10.1.2.2. Promotion to Associate Professor	18
10.1.2.3. Promotion to Full Professor	19
10.1.3. <i>Departmental Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews</i>	19
10.1.3.1. Responsibilities of the Department.....	19
10.1.3.2. Responsibilities of the candidate	20
10.1.3.3. External reviews	21
10.1.4. <i>Promotion of Jointly Appointed Faculty</i>	21

10.2. PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY.....	21
10.2.1. Advancement of Lecturers and Clinicians to Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians.....	21
10.2.2. Advancement of Adjunct Faculty.....	21
10.2.3. Promotion of Collaborator and Affiliate Faculty.....	22
10.2.4. Promotion of Visiting Faculty.....	22
11. POST-TENURE REVIEW	22
12. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.....	22
13. AMENDMENT OF THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT	25
ADDENDUM 1. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR JUNIOR FACULTY HIRED PRIOR TO REORGANIZATION	25
APPENDIX 1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOTANY AND ZOOLOGY & GENETICS DEPARTMENTS AT THE TIME OF REORGANIZATION	26

AMENDMENTS

1. PREAMBLE

Basic biology is central to the fundamental land-grant missions of Iowa State University, to the economy of the State of Iowa and to the well-being of Iowa residents.

Agricultural and health sciences rely on, and build upon, basic biological knowledge. Basic biosciences are encompassed primarily by the Departments of Biochemistry, Biophysics and Molecular Biology (BBMB), Genetics, Development and Cell Biology (GDCB), and Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology (EEOB). These departments guide understanding in the biological sciences from the submolecular to the global scale; from the highly theoretical to the realm of application to societal needs and demands. Applied biosciences are the focus of at least 15 departments at ISU. Basic knowledge in the fields of biochemistry, molecular biology, genetics, cell biology, developmental biology, evolution, organismal biology and ecology provides the underpinning for advancement in these applied sciences. Within this context, GDCB conducts research and teaching primarily in the areas of genetics, cellular and molecular biology and developmental biology.

2. VISION & MISSION STATEMENT

Understanding the genetic blueprint and the functions of cells is critical to virtually all biological endeavors, including health, agricultural and ecological sciences, and bioengineering. The Department of Genetics, Development and Cell Biology (GDCB) contributes to this exciting scientific arena through basic research and teaching in subjects ranging from classical and molecular genetics to the analysis of genome organization and function, and from subcellular processes to the mechanisms of development. The Department is strongly committed to the academic mission of providing discovery-based learning in an engaging research-intensive environment.

GDCB strives to contribute to a broad but integrated array of cutting-edge research

topics, implementing interactive and multidisciplinary approaches that bridge conventional boundaries, and incorporating experimental and computational biology as complementary approaches. Examples include using genetics and molecular biology to investigate the cellular basis of development, or combining biochemical and computational approaches to study basic subcellular functions, signal transduction or metabolism. GDCB seeks to encompass a similarly broad spectrum of experimental systems, including yeast and other unicellular organisms, plant systems such as *Arabidopsis* and maize, simple metazoan model systems including *Drosophila* and *C. elegans*, as well as vertebrate model organisms. Research excellence is characterized by nationally competitive, externally funded research programs that regularly publish in top-tier journals.

Recognizing that student education is of paramount importance, GDCB strives for excellence in teaching. GDCB plays a leading role in undergraduate and graduate training through activities including traditional courses, undergraduate internships in research laboratories, and advanced graduate seminar and literature-based courses. Innovative approaches to learning are emphasized. GDCB assumes responsibility for providing core courses for undergraduate and graduate programs in the life sciences, including Biology, Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, Genetics, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology, Neuroscience, and Plant Physiology. The department applauds and rewards faculty participation and assumption of key leadership roles in these programs. The synergism of integrating cutting-edge research with student learning makes a research university an ideal environment to stimulate young minds, encourage creativity and critical thinking, and train future generations of scientists for success in this increasingly complex society.

3. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Department Governance Document is subsumed under the authorities of the University, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALs). In the event of conflict, the University and College governance documents will prevail.

The Department Governance Document includes both the Departmental Mission Statement and the Policies and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion and Tenure. The Department does not have a separate set of by-laws. There are no other departmental governance documents or departmental procedures that are separate from this document.

The governance of the department is primarily by the faculty as a whole.

4. FACULTY MEMBERSHIP

The "department faculty" or "faculty" includes all persons holding regular, lecturer, clinician, adjunct, affiliate, emeritus or collaborator appointments. This definition applies to those holding an academic rank of professor, associate professor or assistant professor, and includes persons with appointments split between departments.

4.1. The Voting Faculty

The "voting faculty" refers to the subset of the faculty that is entitled to vote on all issues, including personnel matters. The voting faculty consists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty with a budgeted departmental appointment. Voting faculty for promotion and tenure matters is restricted to faculty of at least the rank sought by the candidate.

Non-tenure track faculty may be granted voting privileges commensurate with their intended contribution to the department and their intended rights as specified in the Faculty Handbook. Voting privileges are specified in the terms of the initial appointment, and must be approved by the voting faculty. Requests for changes in voting privileges can be made by a message to the Chair, indicating the period of voting privileges requested, and the teaching, research and outreach contributions they plan to make to the Department. Each such request must be approved by the voting faculty, which reserves the right to specify terms and conditions of voting privileges.

All others desiring limited voting privileges on specific matters (e.g., a graduate student representative on a search committee) may request these privileges by addressing a message to the Chair justifying the special request. Each such request must be approved by the voting faculty.

4.2. Responsibilities of the Faculty (Position Responsibility Statement)

The faculty contribute substantially to the mission of the department through the exercise of duties described in their *Position Responsibility Statements* (PRS). Each faculty member with a departmentally budgeted appointment has a PRS that defines the scope, balance and extent of scholarly responsibilities and expectations in the areas of research, teaching, extension and service. The initial PRS is agreed upon in writing by the faculty member and Chair. At first appointment, the PRS will be based on the job advertisement. In the case of joint appointments, the PRS will specify a primary department for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews. The document is subject to regular review by the faculty member and Chair, and allows for flexibility in the changing nature of faculty directions and responsibilities over time. Changes in the PRS are made by agreement between the faculty member and the Chair, and cannot be made unilaterally by either individual. In the case of disagreement over the content of the PRS, it will be presented to the Executive Committee (EC; see section 6) for a recommendation. The EC recommendation may be binding if the faculty member and Chair agree prior to issuance; otherwise the recommendation is advisory and non-binding. If no agreement can be reached after mediation by the EC, the faculty member or Chair may appeal to the Dean of the College.

In addition to the specific responsibilities prescribed in the PRS, all faculty are expected to work to maintain a positive and collegial atmosphere as well as understand and be actively involved in departmental governance.

Each year, in preparation for their annual review (section 9.1), each faculty is responsible for the timely preparation of a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) that summarizes their recent scholarly accomplishments.

5. ADMINISTRATION

The Chair will serve as the principle administrator of the department. The primary roles of the Chair are to coordinate department function and to represent the faculty in interactions with entities outside the department. The Chair is appointed by the Deans in consultation with the department voting faculty for a term of three to five years. Except in exceptional circumstances, appointment may be renewable up to a maximum consecutive term of 10 years.

5.1. Responsibilities of Chair

The following list outlines the major duties of the Department Chair:

Department Representation. The Chair represents the Department to the Colleges and the University, acts to secure resources for the department, promotes involvement in interdisciplinary programs, and ensures efficient function of the Department.

Personnel Recommendations. The Chair makes recommendations to the Deans concerning appointments, promotions, tenure and salary adjustments of faculty and staff, for faculty improvement leaves, and other issues.

Policies and Procedures. The Chair oversees compliance with College and University policies in general departmental activities and directs the daily business of the department.

Faculty Assignments. The Chair makes teaching assignments and assigns office and research space.

Appointment of Associate Chairs. The Chair may appoint consenting faculty as Associate Chairs to perform necessary duties.

Faculty Committee Oversight. The Chair formulates departmental committee assignments to ensure balance and equity, contingent on approval by the voting faculty.

Graduate Assistantship Appointments. The Chair makes departmentally funded graduate assistantship appointments.

Faculty Meeting President. The Chair calls and presides at faculty meetings, and is responsible for maintaining the minutes of the meetings and a listing of significant actions taken, including a list of standing policies. The Chair is responsible for the efficient and fair conduct of faculty meetings. If the Chair is absent for a protracted period, faculty meetings can be presided upon by a faculty member designated by the Chair or the Deans of the appropriate Colleges.

Appointment of Temporary Acting Chair. If the Chair expects to be absent from campus for an extended period, the Chair will send a written recommendation to the LAS Dean and CALS Dean that a specific tenured faculty member serve as Acting Chair during this time.

Maintenance of Records. The Chair and administrative assistant have the responsibility for keeping and maintaining both public and confidential departmental records.

Maintenance of Working Environment. The Chair works to create and maintain a

positive, motivating and collegial atmosphere in the department.

Involvement in Department Mission. It is the expectation that the chair will be substantially involved in the teaching, research and outreach missions of the department.

6. COMMITTEES

Departmental committees are formulated to provide expeditious execution of departmental affairs, balanced representation, and equitable distribution of responsibility and workload. Committee assignments are made by the Department Chair, followed by approval by the voting faculty. Only voting faculty will serve as departmental standing committee members, except as provided. Non-tenure-eligible faculty members that have been granted voting privileges may serve on committees relevant to their contribution to the department. The departmental graduate student group will make recommendations to the Chair for graduate student representatives on designated committees. Tenure in these standing committees is usually for three years but, at inception, terms of 1, 2 and 3 years are assigned so that faculty will rotate off these committees and be replaced regularly (usually in the fall of the academic year). The Chair of each committee is usually a member in their final year of rotation, and is appointed by the Department Chair, unless otherwise specified. Meeting frequency is at the discretion of individual committees and should be concomitant with departmental needs. Standing committees will make regular reports to the faculty. A faculty member or the Department Chair may request the replacement of a given committee member, when circumstances warrant, by making an appropriate motion to the voting faculty.

Standing committees in GDCB are:

Executive Committee (EC) (five faculty members, including the chairs of the Curriculum Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee). The chair of the EC will be elected by the other EC members. The EC shall serve as advisors to the Department Chair on all questions of policy and implementation which the Chair may bring before it. The EC will receive reports from standing committees and ad hoc committees and may take action either by referral to other committees or to the faculty. It may establish policy recommendations but actions must be ratified by the faculty. The EC performs the annual review of the Chair. The EC considers non-tenure track appointments and makes recommendations to the department. The EC also mediates or arbitrates disputes between the Department Chair and faculty members.

Promotion & Tenure Committee (PTC) [at least six tenured faculty members including at least three full professors (ad hoc members, appointed by the department Chair, may be added to the committee as needed)]. The PTC members include the Chair of the Teaching Review Committee; this is intended to facilitate communication regarding peer teaching evaluations. The PTC guides and reviews the professional progress of faculty members for purposes of promotion and tenure in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in this governance document as well as in those of the Colleges and University. Voting membership of the PTC for specific dossiers will include only those members of rank equal or superior to that sought by the candidate. The PTC has the responsibility to 1) perform annual reviews of tenure track, non-tenured faculty, 2)

preliminary reviews of probationary faculty (e.g. third year reviews), 3) promotion and tenure from assistant to associate and for promotion/tenure from associate to full professor, and 4) post-tenure reviews as specified in Section 11. When appropriate, the PTC, in consultation with the Department Chair, may also agree to provide annual reviews for non-tenure eligible faculty as a mentoring activity to help guide career development.

Curriculum Committee (CC) The CC committee consists of a committee chair and the representatives to undergraduate programs (eg. Biology, Genetics, and BCBio). GDCB representatives to undergraduate program committees report to the CC Chair on matters related to the CC, enabling communication between programs and reallocation of duties as needed, and providing the CC with the information that it needs to make recommendations. The CC reviews, recommends, proposes and helps to develop departmental courses and curricula for which academic credit is received in the undergraduate curricula and, with input from the Graduate Affairs Committee, the graduate curricula. The CC coordinates preparation and editing for the Iowa State University Catalog. The CC also assists in the implementation of the policies and procedures established by the College and University Curriculum Committees, or other administrative authorities. In consultation with the Department Chair, the CC Chair coordinates assignments of CC members to College and University Committees. The CC assists Peer Teaching Evaluation as needed. The CC Chair meets with the Department Chair and the Grad Affairs Committee Chair to discuss issues of joint concern, such as TA duties and evaluations and prioritization of courses to be taught. The CC brings before the faculty, for discussion and action, proposed departmental curricular changes and recommendations. If mutually agreed upon between the Department Chair and the CC Chair, the CC Chair may also serve as a GDCB Associate Chair for Teaching. The roles and responsibilities of an Associate Chair for teaching should be documented and shared with the department.

Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC) The composition and duties of the GAC will depend on the final graduate curricular structure. The chair of the GAC serves as the department's director of graduate education (DOGE). The GAC will establish admission standards, and possibly review applications, and recommend to the Chair the admission of students to the Department graduate program (if there is one). The GAC will also work with the CC to recommend, propose and help develop graduate courses and curricula in the department. They will recommend departmental graduate program policies and procedures, recommend procedures for the evaluation of graduate students that ensure quality performance and good progress toward a degree. The GAC will act as liaison with interdepartmental graduate programs and work with interdepartmental programs that are critical to the health of the Department to assure that the quality of graduate education in the Department meets the highest possible standards. Depending on the final structure of the graduate curriculum, this committee might represent the Department on an interdepartmental committee(s).

Honors and Awards Committee (HAC) (three faculty members, one graduate student representative, one P&S employee, one Merit employee). The HAC will review faculty, alumni and student achievements at least annually and propose and coordinate

nominations of appropriate individuals or groups for honors and awards.

Diversity Committee Encouraging and respecting diversity is a key component of the departmental mission. The Diversity Committee works to increase, maintain, and promote diversity and its awareness among faculty, staff, and students. It serves as a resource for faculty, staff, and departmental committees with regard to University policies and best practices that promote diversity. The Diversity Committee consists of three faculty members and one staff member. The committee members serve as liaisons to college- and university-level diversity committees.

Teaching Review Committee (TRC) (three faculty members) The TRC performs annual peer reviews of classroom teaching by assistant professors annually, and of associate professors at least once before being considered for promotion. On request, they may also review lecturers or senior lecturers.

Seminar Committee or a departmental representative on an interdepartmental seminar committee.

Ad hoc committees are created, staffed, and dissolved by the Department Chair, followed by approval by the voting faculty, as needs arise.

Additional rules concerning the activities of specific committees are found in the relevant sections on performance reviews (section 9), promotion and tenure (section 10), post-tenure review (section 11) and grievance procedures (section 12).

7. FACULTY MEETINGS AND VOTING PROCEDURES

Departmental faculty meetings shall serve as a forum for conducting the business of the Department. Faculty members of all classifications may attend faculty meetings, and are encouraged to do so. The Department Chair normally calls faculty meetings, which may occur either on a regular basis (e.g., monthly) or as deemed necessary. At least one faculty meeting must be held each semester. A faculty member may request that the Chair call a meeting of the faculty, although the Chair is not then obliged to do so. The Chair must call a faculty meeting, as soon as practicable, upon written petition by five or more of the voting faculty. The Chair must also call a meeting when asked to do so by the Chair of a standing committee, in order to advance the business of that committee.

Except in extenuating circumstances, an agenda of each meeting should be published by the Chair at least 48h prior to the meeting. The conduct of faculty meetings is to follow the most recent edition of *Roberts Rules of Order*. Written minutes must be prepared in a timely fashion following each meeting and must be approved by faculty vote before the start of each subsequent faculty meeting.

A quorum, defined as at least half of the voting faculty not currently on leave, must participate in any vote for that vote to be binding. Except as noted elsewhere, voting faculty approval is by majority vote, which is defined as being greater than 50% of the votes cast. The Chair, although counted towards the constitution of a quorum, may only vote in the case of ties, except as specified elsewhere in this document. Abstentions

count toward a quorum but do not count as votes cast in determining the majority. All votes that regard the careers or employment of people must be cast by written ballot. Any member of the quorum may call for a hand or in-meeting written ballot in lieu of a voice vote. Any member of the voting faculty can call for an email or mail ballot in lieu of an in-meeting vote on a specific issue. Absentee ballots and written proxy votes are allowed on request by a faculty member, providing the faculty member is familiar with, or has a special stake in, the issue. Should attendance at a vote fail to meet a quorum, a synopsis of the discussions that took place on the issue will be forwarded to the Department for an email or mail ballot. An email or mail ballot is recorded by the departmental administrative assistant under the supervision of the Chair and at least one member of the executive committee.

8. SEARCHES AND HIRING

8.1 Hiring the Chair

At the time for selection of a Chair, the Dean or Deans will meet with the Department voting faculty to discuss whether the search will include candidates from within and/or outside the Department. If an external search is approved, the voting faculty will make written recommendations for members of the search committee to the Dean(s). The Dean(s), in consultation with the Department, will appoint the search committee and designate the committee chair. The committee will usually consist of five voting Department faculty and a Department graduate student, representing the breadth of diversity within the Department, and two faculty members from outside the Department. Procedures as required by the University will be followed by the committee.

The position description will be developed by the search committee according to the requirements of Human Resources Services, reviewed and approved by the voting faculty, and forwarded to the Dean(s) for approval. The approved position advertisement will be placed in appropriate periodicals.

The search committee will receive and review applications. Applications will be filed in the Department office and will be available to the Department faculty and search committee for evaluation. After reviewing all applications, the committee will develop a short list of candidates considered to be best qualified and will present this list to the voting faculty for discussion. Department faculty may recommend changes to the short list. After review and discussion with the faculty, the committee will select those candidates, usually three to five, judged best qualified for the position. This final list, once approved by the voting faculty, will be recommended to the Deans for invitation to interview.

Approved candidates will be invited to a departmental interview. This will include two presentations to the Department: a research seminar presented by the candidate, and an informal presentation and discussion of future plans and visions for the Department. The candidate will have opportunities to visit with each GDCB faculty member, the Department graduate students, the Department Chair, the Deans and staff of relevant Colleges, and other appropriate University administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

After all interviews have been completed, the search committee will make a final

evaluation of the candidates, rank the acceptable candidates in order of preference, and present their recommendations to the voting faculty. A two-thirds majority vote by written ballot of the faculty will decide which, if any, of the candidates are acceptable for recommendation to the Deans. Each ballot will contain a list of preferences of acceptable candidates and these will be compiled into a departmental prioritized list. The search committee chair will make a recommendation to the Deans to offer the position to the candidates in the order of preference approved by the voting faculty. If no candidate is hired, the voting faculty may direct the search committee chair to request permission from the Deans to re-advertise the position.

If an internal search is to be conducted, the Dean(s), in consultation with the Department, will appoint the search committee and designate the committee chair. Voting faculty will submit nominations for departmental candidates to the committee. The committee will contact candidates to ascertain their willingness to be considered for the position of Chair. Any committee members that are nominated and willing to be considered will be replaced on the committee and any individuals being actively considered will excuse themselves from faculty meetings whenever the position is discussed. Candidates will present research seminars and informal discussions of plans and visions for the Department, and meet with faculty, students and Deans, similar to an outside search. Following the interview process, a two-thirds majority vote by written ballot of the voting faculty will decide which, if any, candidates, to recommend to the Deans and the order of preference. If the internal search fails to approve any candidate for recommendation to the Dean(s) by two-thirds majority, the result of the vote is reported to the Dean(s) as a measure of the relative support of the Department for potential candidates. The Department recognizes the sensitivity of this process and will make every effort to avoid undo discomfort to any candidate by treating deliberations with candor, collegiality and confidentiality. The Department recognizes that any candidate willing to be considered for the position of Chair has expressed an honorable commitment to make personal sacrifice in service to the faculty as a whole. The Department also recognizes that making such a position attractive to candidates will require a strong commitment of resources and support to allow the candidate to continue performing the three fundamental land-grant missions and to build or maintain a strong department.

8.1.1 Appointing an Interim Chair

Should the need arise to appoint an interim chair, the Deans, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will nominate a Department faculty member. If the nominee consents, a majority vote of Department faculty shall constitute approval.

8.2. Hiring Tenure-Eligible Faculty

The voting faculty will define the areas in which to search and hire. The decision will consider adherence to the strategic plan and maintaining balance among the various disciplines within the Department, while allowing the flexibility to take advantage of timely opportunities and pursue emerging areas of research related to the mission of the Department.

When a tenure-track faculty position is approved by the LAS Dean or the CALS Dean (or both), a search committee, usually containing at least three faculty members and

one graduate student from GDCB and at least one faculty member from outside GDCB, is formulated by nominations from the Department Chair followed by approval of the voting faculty. The graduate student member of the search committee votes only in search committee recommendations.

The search committee develops a position description and a position advertisement corresponding to the requirements of Human Resources Services. These documents normally include the nature of the appointment, necessary qualifications of the applicant, research and teaching expectations, and application deadlines. Preferred but not required qualifications may also be included. Upon approval by the voting faculty and the Dean or Deans of the appropriate College or Colleges, the position is advertised in appropriate periodicals.

The search committee receives and reviews each application, with special attention to University guidelines for affirmative action. Applications are kept in the Department office and are available to the faculty and search committee for evaluation. After reviewing all applications, the committee develops a short list of applicants it judges best qualified for the position. Members of the voting faculty review and comment to the committee regarding applicants in the short list and may identify other applicants they believe should be included.

From the short list, the search committee selects the applicants it judges best qualified for the position and, at a departmental faculty meeting, recommends that these applicants be interviewed as candidates for the position. Prior to the faculty meeting, the faculty is notified of the list of proposed candidates. Department faculty not on the search committee may bring forward for consideration, applicants other than those recommended by the search committee. The final list to be interviewed is approved by faculty vote.

Candidates approved by the voting faculty and the College Dean(s) will be invited to a departmental interview. This will include two presentations by the candidate to the Department, one a research seminar and the other an informal presentation and discussion of future research plans. The candidate will have opportunities to visit with Department faculty members, the Department Chair, graduate students, the Deans, and other appropriate University administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

After all interviews are completed, the search committee judges each candidate as to her or his acceptability for the position, ranks the acceptable candidates as to the committee's preference for hiring, and presents its recommendations at a meeting of the voting faculty. Voting faculty provide written ballots containing a preference list of acceptable candidates, as well as those candidates deemed unacceptable. Members of the search committee are not bound to vote according to the search committee recommendations. The compiled list is forwarded to the Dean(s), EOD and Provost for approval, and approved candidates are offered the position in order of preference. If no candidate is hired from among those approved, the voting faculty may approve interviewing additional candidates from the current pool or re-advertising the position.

8.3. Joint Appointments

Jointly budgeted appointments must be approved by the voting faculty. If the jointly

budgeted appointment was approved prior to a search, the Department will be actively involved in the search process. The Department may agree or decline to extend an offer to any candidate following the procedures for regular tenure-eligible hires. If a jointly budgeted appointment is requested subsequent to a search, a complete resume will be made available to the Department for review and the Department may request that the candidate make a seminar presentation and meet with GDCB faculty and staff. The request will be discussed in a faculty meeting and a decision rendered by faculty vote. A joint appointment for which there is no budgetary obligation is called a courtesy appointment and is covered in section 8.5.

All faculty members with joint appointments will have a primary department for promotion and tenure purposes defined in their PRS and letter of intent. Individuals wishing to change their primary appointment, as defined in their PRS, to the GDCB Department must obtain the approval of the Dean(s), both Chairs and the GDCB voting faculty.

8.4 Hiring Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians

Non-tenure eligible Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians are hired following established criteria and University search procedures appropriate to their positions. For appointments of greater than one year, the Department Chair works with the EC to define and advertise the position, and to interview and evaluate candidates for position qualifications and credit for prior service. Faculty other than the EC members may be involved in this process as desired or needed. The EC will then nominate lecturers and clinicians at least one week before a meeting of the voting faculty at which the candidates will be discussed and a vote taken. Credentials of candidates for such positions will be available for faculty inspection during the week preceding a faculty vote. Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician appointments also require approval of the Dean(s) and Provost. The Department Chair will forward a recommendation to the appropriate offices.

Renewal appointments of Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians may be made without readvertising the positions, as dictated in section 9.1.2.

The Department affords non-tenure-eligible faculty equitable compensation, commensurate with the candidate's qualifications and duties, and provides ample opportunity and support for professional development.

8.4.1. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments are short-term appointments of one year or less, made to meet a special staffing need, and are usually made at the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer. Hiring procedures and appointments follow the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook. The Department will usually advertise for a pool of applicants from which temporary appointments may be made as needs arise. The Chair may make these temporary appointments or may delegate the task to an appropriate committee.

8.5. Adjunct, Visiting, Collaborator, Affiliate and Courtesy Appointments

Nominations of faculty to these ranks can be made by the Chair or any other voting faculty member. Characteristics of these appointments are defined in the Faculty

Handbook. A courtesy appointment is a joint appointment without a budgetary obligation. A letter is addressed to the Department Chair stipulating the type of appointment sought, the desired rank and term of the appointment, the reasons for seeking the appointment, and the qualifications of the candidate. The benefits to and responsibilities of both the candidate and the Department should be stipulated in this letter and a resume and appropriate supporting documentation should be submitted. The Chair forwards the request to the EC, which will then make a timely recommendation, including proposed voting privileges, if any, to the faculty. The EC or faculty may request a seminar or additional documentation. A vote will be taken after allowing sufficient time for faculty to consider the supporting material.

8.6 P&S With Faculty Responsibility

When P&S personnel perform duties commensurate with faculty responsibilities, they may be appointed to one of the following non-tenure eligible faculty ranks: Lecturer (when the P&S employee will be primarily teaching), Clinician, or Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor. Departmental nominations for such appointments are made as described above. The procedure of awarding faculty rank to a P&S employee also requires review and approval by the College and Provost Office prior to the award of the rank-only appointment. In each case of award of, or renewal of, non-tenure-eligible faculty rank for P&S employees, the department should forward the following items to the College Dean for forwarding to the Provost Office: 1) the form, "Non-tenure-eligible Faculty Appointment of P&S Employees," 2) the Letter-of-Intent form, "ISU Faculty Letter of Intent for Rank Only Appointments" and 3) a copy of the employee's vitae or resume.

9. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Peer performance reviews are necessary and beneficial to the professional growth and development of faculty. Maintaining open communication between the faculty and administration of the Department also benefits the overall health and moral of the Department. All reviews are conducted with a constructive attitude and in an atmosphere of mutual respect. Position responsibilities and the prerogatives of academic freedom guide all deliberations and decisions.

9.1. Faculty Performance Reviews

9.1.1. Performance Reviews of Tenure-Eligible Faculty.

Tenure-eligible faculty within the Department are expected to display a high level of scholarship, as defined in the faculty handbook. Consistent with the Land Grant mission of Iowa State University, faculty evaluations are based on their activities in the areas of research, teaching and extension/professional service. The relative weighting for each area is dictated by the individual faculty's *Position Responsibility Statement* (PRS; see 4.2). All faculty are also expected to make meaningful contributions to the service of the Department and University.

Each faculty member with a budgeted appointment in GDCB undergoes an annual review by the Chair. The Chair requests a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) summarizing

the faculty member's recent accomplishments in research, teaching, service and other relevant areas. The Chair prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's activities with respect to their PRS. These evaluations are used as the basis for deciding annual salary adjustments and for other confidential matters.

9.1.1.1 Departmental Support for Junior Faculty

Tenure-eligible faculty represent the future of the Department; the PTC and Department recognize their responsibilities to provide information, advice, support and assistance to enable the professional development and success of candidates.

Shortly after arrival, the Department Chair will partner, by mutual consent, each newly hired tenure-track assistant professor with a tenured faculty mentor to provide advice throughout the probationary period. As early as convenient, the mentor will meet with the new junior faculty member to give advice and answer questions on faculty activities and what is required for success in the Department. The mentor should explain where to find the Faculty Handbook, and provide the candidate with the Department governance document, and successful examples of a tenure resume and a federal grant proposal (belonging to either the mentor or other volunteers).

Tenure-eligible, but as yet untenured, faculty will also undergo an annual review by the PTC. The purpose of these reviews is to provide constructive guidance to the candidates for making adequate progress toward promotion and tenure. The faculty member provides an updated resume to the PTC prior to a meeting at which time the progress, plans and any problems will be discussed. Mentors may accompany junior faculty in these meetings. The PTC then provides constructive criticism and guidance to the faculty member and provides a written report to the candidate, Department Chair and faculty mentor.

9.1.2. Performance Reviews of Lecturers, Clinicians, Senior Lecturers, Senior Clinicians and Adjunct Faculty

All faculty evaluations are based on their activities in the areas of research, teaching and extension/professional service, consistent with expectations dictated by the individual faculty's *Position Responsibility Statement* (PRS; see 4.2). All faculty are also expected to make meaningful contributions to the service of the Department, including such issues as curriculum development and review.

9.1.2.1. Annual Reviews

Each faculty member with a budgeted appointment in GDCB undergoes an annual review by the Chair. The Chair requests a FAR summarizing the faculty member's recent accomplishments in research, teaching, service and other relevant areas. The Chair prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's activities with respect to their PRS. These evaluations are used as the basis for deciding annual salary adjustments and for other confidential matters. Non-tenure eligible faculty may also request a review by the PTC for guidance in professional development.

9.1.2.2. Renewal Reviews for Lecturers and Clinicians.

Renewal of non-tenure-track positions will depend on the candidate's prior performance, and on whether the Department deems it necessary to continue staffing

the position. Because the appointment is for a specified period, the Department is not required to provide a special notice of intent not to renew. As the end of a non-tenure-eligible faculty member's term of appointment approaches, the member notifies the Department Chair of their desire to seek renewal of their position. If qualified, the lecturer or clinician may request a simultaneous consideration for advancement (see section 10.2). At this time, the Chair notifies the candidate as to whether the Department intends to continue staffing the position. If so, the Lecturer or Clinician should address a letter requesting renewal to the EC, along with as much relevant documentation that the candidate deems necessary to support her or his request for renewal (see suggested documents indicated below under "Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure-eligible Faculty", section 10.1.3.2.). If the member's contributions extend beyond the Department, the candidate, Chair or EC may request letters from relevant individuals outside the Department or University. The candidate may also submit names and justifications of individuals to exclude from the review process because of conflicts of interest. The EC will examine the submitted materials in a timely fashion, evaluate them in light of the faculty member's PRS and role in the Department and make a recommendation to the voting faculty. The materials will be available for review by the voting faculty for one week prior to the faculty vote to approve renewal. The Chair notifies the candidate of the outcome and in the case of a negative decision, provides a written explanation of the reasons renewal was denied.

9.1.3.3. Renewal Reviews for Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians.

The renewal review process for persons appointed as Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians is essentially the same as for Lecturers and Clinicians, except that the Department Chair must notify the individual, one year preceding the end of the term appointment, of the Department's intent to renew or not renew. In addition, appointment renewal requires approval by the Dean(s) and Provost. As such, the review process and administrative approvals must be completed prior to one year before the end of the term appointment. Therefore, the Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician should initiate the review process at least 14 months prior to the end of their term by notifying the Chair of their desire to be considered for reappointment. Review of the member by the PTC and approval by faculty vote occurs as described above (9.1.2.2). If approved, the Chair prepares a report of the review and a recommendation to be sent to the Dean(s) and Provost. If the decision is negative, the Chair provides the candidate with a written explanation of why renewal was denied.

9.2. Chair Performance Reviews

The EC annually requests an evaluation of the Chair by the faculty. The purpose of this review is to provide a positive avenue for faculty feedback to the Chair on the Chair's performance and suggestions for improvement in serving the Department. The faculty have the opportunity to supply confidential evaluations to the EC. The EC then meets with the Chair and presents a summary of the evaluations.

Sixteen months prior to the end of the Chair's term, the Chair will notify the faculty of willingness to be considered for another term. If interested in serving for another term, a departmental evaluation will be conducted by the end of that semester. Written comments from the faculty members will be received by the Executive Committee. The

comments will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and shared with the Chair, the Dean and the departmental faculty. Based on these comments, the Executive Committee will recommend to the voting faculty whether or not to support reappointment of the current Chair. A two-thirds majority vote by written ballot of the voting faculty will serve as the Department's recommendation to the Dean. If less than a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty support the present Chair, the results will be reported to the Dean accompanied by the recommendation that a search for a new Chair be initiated.

10. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

The Chair and members of the faculty should be concerned that decisions relating to promotion and tenure are based on a fair, objective evaluation of faculty members' qualifications. Every effort should be made to avoid undue stress to the candidate and such reviews should be conducted in a positive and collegial atmosphere.

10.1. Promotion and Tenure Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

10.1.1. Criteria for promotion and tenure

Tenure-eligible faculty within the Department are expected to display a high level of scholarship, as defined in the faculty handbook. Consistent with the land grant missions of Iowa State University, faculty evaluations are based on their activities in the areas of research, teaching and extension/ professional service. The relative weighting for each area is dictated by the individual faculty's *Position Responsibility Statement* (section 4.2). All faculty are also expected to make meaningful contributions to the service of the Department and University.

10.1.1.1. Research

Research is the activity that most fundamentally distinguishes a national-level doctorate granting university from other institutions and is a major consideration in determining promotion and tenure. The critical issue in assessing research accomplishments is determining whether the candidate's work contributes significantly to advancing their research discipline. Since publication is the end product of research, the quality and quantity of original peer-reviewed research publications in scientific journals constitutes a primary measure of research productivity. Such aspects as senior authorship and reputation of the journals are considered. The second major indicator of a successful research program is the acquisition of competitive grants and other extramural funding.

Additional documentation of research accomplishments includes the publication of books and book chapters, patents, presentations at professional conferences, invited lectures and the release of computer programs. Serving as a reviewer for research papers, grant proposals and books, as a grant panelist, as a journal editor and participating in professional society affairs (e.g., organizing symposia, serving on committees, holding official positions) also constitute recognition of research accomplishments.

10.1.1.2. Teaching

As a unit in an institution of higher learning, effective teaching is an essential activity of

the Department and its faculty. The Department is committed to excellence in the training of highly qualified personnel at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and the ability to create and maintain an effective instructional environment. Teaching activities include presenting resident credit courses; non-credit seminars and workshops; continuing-education and distance-learning programs; directing undergraduate and graduate projects, internships, theses, and dissertations; serving on masters and doctoral committees; advising and mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral associates and visiting scientists. Commitment to teaching excellence is demonstrated through contributions to curricular development; pedagogical innovation, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning; documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into the classrooms; development of teaching materials; and contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching.

Classroom teaching effectiveness is evaluated on the basis of student responses to departmental course evaluations, and by peer reviews following observation of the candidate's classroom teaching.

10.1.1.3. Extension and Professional Practice.

Extension and professional practice refers to activities where faculty members provide professional expertise through dissemination of information, engaging citizens in development activities, and providing to citizens assistance outside the traditional classroom. These include activities that occur outside of the University as well as those provided to other members of the University community. The general focus of these efforts is to increase the well-being of the people and places served. Such activities would include traditional extension activities as well as presentations to the public, judging at science fairs, answering letters of inquiry, consulting, providing legal testimony as an expert witness, providing information through websites or other publications, etc. In addition, faculty members are recognized for professional service contributions to technical, professional, and scholarly societies appropriate to their academic discipline, to the public or to other agencies. Peer judgment is used to distinguish such contributions that should be considered as professional service from those activities that reflect one's reputation in the areas of research or teaching.

10.1.1.4. Institutional Service

All faculty members are expected to contribute to institutional service by participating effectively in departmental governance and in the formulation of Department, College, and/or University policies, and by carrying out administrative responsibilities when called upon. Participation on official Department, College and University committees, and other official assignments should be documented. However, while necessary, service alone shall not serve as the central basis for promotion and/or tenure.

10.1.2. Criteria for Specific Promotions

10.1.2.2. Promotion to Associate Professor

An associate professor should have a solid academic reputation and show promise of

further development and productivity in his /her academic career. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in scholarship, consistent with activities described in their *Position Responsibility Statement*, that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the discipline with a high likelihood of sustained contributions and potential for national distinction. The candidate must show effectiveness in all areas of their position responsibilities and satisfactory institutional service. Promotion to the rank of associate professor is generally accompanied by the granting of tenure.

10.1.2.3. Promotion to Full Professor

A professor should be recognized by their professional peers within the University, as well as nationally and/or internationally, for excellence in their contributions to his or her scholarly discipline and be recognized as an authority in their field of specialization. The candidate must show significant growth in performance beyond that of the previous rank, consistent with activities described in their *Position Responsibility Statement*, and have demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the discipline. Significant institutional service is also expected for promotion to professor.

10.1.3. Departmental Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

10.1.3.1. Responsibilities of the Department

Six months prior to the deadline established by the college, the Department Chair sends out a notification for faculty that wish to be considered for promotion. Individuals that wish to be considered for promotion will notify the Chair. Promotion and tenure review is mandatory in the penultimate year of a probationary appointment. For other faculty, promotion and tenure review is optional. Should a faculty member in the penultimate year of a probationary period decline to undergo review, the Chair will notify that individual of the consequences.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) works closely with candidates. One tenured member of the PTC with rank greater than the candidate is assigned to advise and guide the candidate in the preparation of their dossier. Mentors may also participate to whatever extent is mutually agreeable to the mentor and candidate. Candidates may submit names of PTC members to be excluded due to conflicts of interest or they may submit rankings of their preferences. The PTC completes the dossier by requesting any available information from the Chair, letters of evaluation from scientists at other institutions (see 10.1.3.3), as well as other sources at their disposal. The completed dossier is discussed among the PTC and a confidential recommendation is prepared for presentation to the Department Chair and the tenured voting faculty of rank greater than the candidate. If the recommendation is not unanimous, it should be duly noted and a minority report may be filed. The PTC member assigned to the candidate presents the candidate's case to the tenured voting faculty and Chair. Following discussion, a departmental vote is taken. A majority vote shall decide the departmental recommendation and the PTC will prepare a final recommendation statement to be forwarded to the College. The Chair will forward a separate recommendation. All items in the departmental report except confidential external letters, their summaries or attributed quotes will be considered as part of the factual information which may be reviewed for accuracy by the candidate. The Chair's report is not considered part of the factual information and is not available for review by

the candidate.

The Chair will promptly notify candidates of the departmental and College decisions. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate will receive a written notification explaining the reasons for denial of promotion.

10.1.3.2. Responsibilities of the candidate

Candidates are responsible for notifying the Chair of their intention for undergoing review for promotion. Candidates present seminars of their scholarly achievements to the Department early in the fall and are responsible for preparing their dossiers for review in a timely manner with respect to the deadlines set forth by the PTC , Department and College. The dossier should conform to the guidelines set forth by the relevant college and at a minimum contain the following:

- A list of all publications, including full citations of refereed and non-refereed journal articles, books and monographs, chapters in books, book reviews, and manuscripts submitted that are not yet accepted for publication. Copies of selected articles and manuscripts should be supplied. Citation indices are recommended and work published since being hired or since the latest promotion may be annotated.
- A list of grants, fellowships and other external and internal funds obtained, including source, amount, and dates. Indicate the role of the candidate (e.g., PI, co-PI).
- A list of research papers presented at regional, national and international meetings, giving society, place and date.
- A list of invitations to participate in symposia or give guest lectures off campus.
- A list of the source and number of reviews written for research manuscripts, grant proposals and books.
- A list of graduate students advised as major professor since last promotion and the degree(s) obtained by each student, post docs and visiting scientists advised, and a list of other program-of-study committees served on (i.e., not as major professor).
- A synopsis of research accomplishments since last promotion and current research directions presented as a brief narrative. Indicate proportion of time engaged in research.
- A list of courses taught, including the number of students enrolled, the student ratings of each course, and peer teaching reviews.
- A list of undergraduate research projects and internships supervised.
- A synopsis of other teaching activities including course development and development of teaching materials, contributions to curricular development, pedagogical innovation, and undergraduate advising,
- Service on official departmental, College and University committees.
- Professional service, including serving on grant panels, agencies or boards because of individual expertise, serving as an editor or on the editorial board for a journal, consulting, and participation in professional society affairs (e.g., symposia

organized, service on committees, official positions held).

- Other activities including outreach, obtaining patents or engaging in technology transfer.

10.1.3.3. External reviews

External reviews by recognized authorities in the candidate's discipline will constitute an important component of the dossier. The PTC will generate a list of potential reviewers with input from the Department Chair and faculty. The candidate will supply a list of their own suggestions to the PTC and may submit names to exclude from external review due to conflicts of interest. The Department Chair solicits at least four reviews, including at least one individual from each list. Letters may be submitted in writing or electronically. These external letters are confidential and will only be seen as needed by faculty and administrators directly involved in the promotion and/or tenure decision.

10.1.4. Promotion of Jointly Appointed Faculty.

Promotion of Joint Faculty with their primary appointment in GDCB are evaluated as tenure-eligible faculty (see above). Promotion of Joint Faculty with their primary appointment in another department will follow automatically when the faculty member is promoted by her or his home department. GDCB may review the credentials of jointly budgeted candidates with other primary departments, and submit a letter to the Dean(s) in support or opposition of promotion. In such cases, the candidate's dossier will be available for examination by faculty of greater rank than the candidate. The PTC will present a recommendation to the faculty and following discussion, a vote will be taken whether to support tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. The PTC composes and transmits the appropriate letter to the Dean(s).

10.2. Promotion of Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty

10.2.1. Advancement of Lecturers and Clinicians to Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinicians.

According to University regulations, changes in the rank of lecturers and clinicians can only be made in response to their written request. A lecturer or clinician requesting such advancement should address a letter requesting advancement to the PTC, along with as much relevant documentation that the candidate deems necessary to support her or his request for advancement (see suggested documents indicated above under "Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure-eligible Faculty"). The PTC will examine the submitted materials in a timely fashion, evaluate them in light of the faculty member's responsibilities and role in the Department and make a recommendation to the voting faculty. If approved, required materials will be submitted to the College and Provost's Office. According to University regulations, the candidate must have served six years as a lecturer or clinician before advancement to senior level.

10.2.2. Advancement of Adjunct Faculty.

Adjunct faculty are paid by the University and are normally hired for a specific purpose, usually short-term, as indicated in their *Position Responsibility Statement* at the time of appointment to adjunct status. Therefore, adjunct faculty are normally not eligible for advancement beyond the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor. If the adjunct faculty

member attains the stature normally associated with an Associate or Full Professor, and performs duties equivalent to those performed by faculty of either of those ranks, the adjunct faculty member may apply to the PTC for advancement by documenting their stature and duties in relation to the requirements for advancement to the higher rank (see suggested documents indicated above under “Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure-eligible Faculty”). In this case, the PTC would examine the dossier and make a recommendation to the faculty. The faculty vote by written ballot after sufficient time to examine the dossier of the candidate. If approved, required materials will be submitted to the College and Provost’s Office.

10.2.3. Promotion of Collaborator and Affiliate Faculty.

The rank of these faculty members normally should reflect their stature in the scientific community and the level of contribution they make to their field. Where such faculty are paid by organizations with a promotion system similar to that of the University, promotion at ISU should generally parallel their change in rank at their home institution or organization. Such faculty should be accorded rank equity with ISU-paid faculty of similar stature and productivity. An adjunct, collaborator or affiliate faculty member requesting promotion should address a letter requesting promotion to the PTC, along with as much relevant documentation that the candidate deems necessary to support his or her request for promotion (see suggested documents indicated above under “Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure-eligible Faculty”). The PTC will examine the submitted materials in a timely fashion and make a recommendation to the voting faculty. The faculty vote by written ballot after sufficient time to examine the dossier of the candidate.

10.2.4. Promotion of Visiting Faculty.

Promotion of Visiting faculty will follow automatically if they are promoted by their home institution.

11. POST-TENURE REVIEW

In addition to the annual review by the Department Chair, all tenured faculty will periodically undergo a more comprehensive peer review, initiated by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). The purpose of these post-tenure reviews is to recognize the strengths of the faculty member and to identify areas where development efforts or specific departmental support would be helpful. The post-tenure review should address the faculty member’s performance in all areas of responsibility, as documented in their position responsibility statement. “The review shall include an overall recommendation of the performance (superior, meeting expectations, or below expectations) and result in acknowledgement of contributions and suggestions for future development of the faculty member.” (ISU Faculty Handbook 5.3.5). Post-tenure reviews must occur at least once every seven years (since the last post-tenure review or promotion). Post-tenure reviews must also occur during the year following two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. An earlier review (at least 5 years from last review) may be requested by a faculty member and granted by the PTC. If a faculty member is reviewed for higher rank, the “higher rank” review is substituted for the post-tenure review, and the next post-tenure review is not required for 7 years. If a faculty member has a confirmed

retirement date less than one year hence, then post-tenure review may be waived. Every effort should be made to avoid undue stress to the faculty member under review and such reviews should be conducted in a positive and collegial atmosphere. Responsibility for the review of faculty with split appointments is the same as specified for promotion and tenure review.

On a date specified by the PTC, the individual under review will submit a written summary of his or her activities, including an up-to-date resume and other supplemental materials documenting professional accomplishments and scholarship in the areas of research, teaching, outreach and service related to the individual's Position Responsibility Statement, during the period since the last post-tenure review or promotion. This review will normally not include external evaluations. The PTC will examine the submitted material and may conduct a personal interview. The PTC will present a written evaluation to the faculty member and the Department Chair, including a rating (above expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations) for each area of the PRS, an overall recommendation of the performance (superior, meeting expectations, or below expectations), acknowledgement of contributions, and suggestions for future development of the faculty member. GDCB-specific criteria for superior performance are detailed below. If a post-tenure review recommendation includes a determination of "below expectations" performance in any PRS area, then the faculty member will work with the department chair and the chair of the review committee to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in those areas. The action plan will be signed by all three parties." (ISU Faculty Handbook, 5.3.5.2). Subsequently, external evaluations may be requested by the Chair or the faculty member. The faculty member under review may submit a written response to the Chair and PTC within one month after receiving the written post-tenure review. Afterwards, the post-tenure review document will be forwarded to the Dean and Provost, (as described in the ISU Faculty Handbook 5.3.5.4, 5.3.5.5). These materials are part of the faculty member's personnel record and are kept as such in the department, the college, and the Provost offices. Comments about areas for improvement may be referred to in subsequent annual reviews or post-tenure reviews. Furthermore, all materials will be treated as confidential personnel files.

GDCB criteria for superior performance

Each faculty member's record of accomplishment is reviewed in each area of responsibility. Performance is considered to be "superior" in a given area of responsibility if the faculty member is considered a departmental or university leader in that area of responsibility.

Superior in research will be defined as achieving national and/or international recognition for research accomplishments during the period of review. This would be evidenced by accomplishments such as: 1) publishing a consistently high number of original research publications in leading journals; 2) securing and successfully implementing substantial competitive national research grants; 3) receiving the title

Distinguished Professor; 4) receiving university or national research awards; 5) being selected as a standing member of a national grant review panel.

Superior in teaching will be defined as achieving local, regional, national and/or international recognition for the impact of the faculty member's teaching during the period of review. This level of achievement would be expected to include accomplishments such as: receiving the title Morrill Professor; receiving one or more competitive teaching or advising and/or mentoring excellence awards at the university, state, or national levels; developing innovative teaching approaches or techniques with documented effectiveness and wide-reaching impact; implementation of effective pedagogies in new contexts and scholarly assessment of student learning; securing and successfully implementing one or more substantial teaching grants with significant impact; or authoring a widely-adopted textbook.

Superior performance in service is defined as achieving superior recognition and impact during the period of review. This level of achievement would be expected to include accomplishments such as: receiving the title University Professor; serving in university leadership positions at various levels including faculty senate, graduate programs, and research centers; developing international programs; holding a major elected office in a national scientific society, or chairing a national or international scientific conference. The contributions to national scientific or professional societies that may be considered as service should be distinguished from those activities that reflect one's reputation in the areas of teaching, research, and/or extension.

These examples in each area of responsibility are provided to indicate the nature of "superior performance" and are not intended to be all-inclusive.

12. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

All grievances should first be brought before the Chair. In the event that they cannot be resolved by the Chair, grievances among GDCB Department members may be handled within the Department or by the University. The Executive Committee handles disputes between the Department Chair and faculty or staff. Should a member of the EC be involved in the grievance, they will be excused from the EC for the deliberations. The Human Relations and Diversity Committee handles grievances among faculty members, staff members and/or students. Should grieving parties elect to seek departmental resolution to their dispute, they will agree beforehand whether to submit to mediation or arbitration. Decisions of arbitration are binding, while mediation is advisory and does not preclude subsequent pursuit of University grievance procedures. The pertinent committee may request supporting documentation and may conduct interviews of the grieving parties and/or witnesses. A grieving party may request the replacement of a committee member with a conflict of interest. The committee submits to the grieving parties, a written report, including recommended or binding terms of resolution.

University grievance procedures for faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students are described in the *Faculty Handbook*, *Graduate College Handbook*, and *ISU*

General Catalog, respectively.

13. AMENDMENT OF THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

This Governance Document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting faculty. Before a vote to amend is taken, at least one open meeting must be held at which the proposed amendment(s) shall be explained and discussed. A formal vote shall be by written ballot.

ADDENDUM 1. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR JUNIOR FACULTY HIRED PRIOR TO REORGANIZATION

The Department recognizes the uncertainty caused by changing departments and colleagues prior to tenure and will make every effort to avoid undo stress to candidates hired before the departmental reorganization. Candidates will be fairly evaluated based on their PRS and the expectations placed upon them at the time of hiring, and will have the choice of being evaluated by either GDCB or their former department. If a candidate chooses to be evaluated in the GDCB Department, he or she may request letters or written statements from their original department chairs or colleagues to support scholarly accomplishments, career progression and prior departmental contributions. If a candidate feels that a former department member(s) possesses expertise that is absent in GDCB and essential to a fair evaluation, they may request that individual(s) to meet with the PTC and/or the voting faculty of higher rank than the candidate to answer questions concerning the candidate's contribution to their discipline. Otherwise, the process proceeds as described above.

Should a candidate choose to be evaluated by their former department, they should notify their Dean(s). The compositions of the Botany and Zoology & Genetics Departments at the time of reorganization are included in [Appendix 1](#).

APPENDIX 1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOTANY AND ZOOLOGY & GENETICS DEPARTMENTS AT THE TIME OF REORGANIZATION

<u>LAST NAME</u>	<u>FIRST NAME</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT(S)</u>
Bassham	Diane	BOT
Clark	Lynn	BOT
Colbert	Jim	BOT
Crumpton	Bill	BOT
Farrar	Don	BOT
Horner	Jack	BOT
Jurik	Tom	BOT
Mittler	Ron	BOT
Moloney	Kirk	BOT
Nason	John	BOT
Oliver	David	BOT
Raich	Jim	BOT
Rodermel	Steve	BOT
Spalding	Marty	BOT
Tiffany	Lois	BOT
van der Valk	Arnold	BOT
Wallace	Rob	BOT
Wendel	Jonathan	BOT
Wilsey	Brian	BOT
Wurtele	Eve	BOT
Ackerman	Ralph	ZG
Adams	Dean	ZG
Ambrosio	Linda	ZG
Atherly	Alan	ZG
Becraft	Phil	ZG/AGRON
Bowen	Bonnie	ZG
Brendel	Volker	ZG/STAT
Bronokowski	Anne	ZG
Chou	Hui-Hsien	ZG/CS
Coffman	Clark	ZG
Dobbs	Drena	ZG
Dolphin	Warren	ZG/BOT
Dorman	Karin	ZG/STAT
Drewes	Charles	ZG
Emery	Dennis	ZG
Enger	Duane	ZG
Farrar	Eugenia	ZG
Girton	Jack	ZG
Gu	Xun	ZG/AGRON
Henderson	Eric	ZG
Howell	Stephen	ZG
Ingebritsen	Thomas	ZG
Janzen	Fred	ZG
Johansen	Jorgen	ZG
Johansen	Kristen	ZG
Leshem-Ackerman	Adah	ZG
Mayfield	John	ZG
Mccloskey	Michael	ZG
Naylor	Gavin	ZG
Peterson	Thomas	ZG
Pleasants	Barbara	ZG
Pleasants	John	ZG
Powell	Ed	ZG
Powell-Coffman	Jo Anne	ZG
Sakaguchi	Donald	ZG
Shen	Sheldon	ZG
Valenzuela	Nicole	ZG
Viles	Joseph	ZG
Vleck	Carol	ZG

Vleck
Voytas

David
Dan

ZG
ZG

AMENDMENTS

Approved by faculty vote December 2011:

- Amendments to post-tenure review (section 11) to align with ISU policy.
- In section 6, the description of the promotion and tenure committee was amended to more fully reflect the committee's current responsibilities (including 3rd year review and post-tenure review).
- Throughout the document, revisions were made to reflect the change in college name from "College of Agriculture (COA)" to "College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALIS)"