# Iowa State University College of Engineering Governance Document

College of Engineering Faculty
Updates Approved By Electronic Vote
on 5-May-2017

Table of Contents:

## 1. Preamble

Governance of the College of Engineering is shared between the college faculty and the Dean of the College in accordance with university policies. Governance shall be organized to promote the missions of the College of Engineering and Iowa State University. The dean is primarily responsible for developing a college vision and making administrative decisions regarding budget and space allocation, administrative structure, college operations, and personnel matters. The college faculty serves in an advisory role to the dean to carry out these responsibilities.

The college faculty has responsibility for the research and education programs within the College of Engineering. This includes but is not limited to developing faculty promotion and tenure policies and procedures, admissions requirements, graduation requirements, curriculum and course revisions, degree programs, grading procedures and policies, research programs, and service and outreach programs. The college faculty will recommend candidates from the college for the awarding of diplomas, degrees, and certificates.

The college faculty will make decisions regarding their responsibilities as a body except in cases where they have delegated authority to a committee.

University policies will supersede College of Engineering policies when there is a policy conflict. For matters of concern not addressed in this document, refer to the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook (hereafter referred to as the faculty handbook).

## 2. College Mission

The mission of the College of Engineering is the advancement of engineering knowledge and the education of students that will help address the technological needs of the State of Iowa, the nation, and the world.

## 3. Definition of Shared Governance Domains

Governance documents exist in each of the departments of the college. While the departmental documents establish the policies and procedures within each department, the College of Engineering governance document takes precedence over departmental governance documents for matters at the college level. Should conflicts exist among department, college, and university documents, the higher-level governance document shall prevail. The college document complies with the university document (i.e., faculty handbook), and the departmental documents must comply with the college document. The rules and regulations of higher-level documents are still in effect even if absent from the lower-level document.

**a. <u>Voting Faculty members</u>**

The “Voting Faculty” includes any faculty member holding a position (at any rank) of professor, lecturer, or clinician in at least one department within the College of

Engineering. Non-tenure-eligible Research faculty, affiliates, courtesy appointments, and visiting professors are not members of the Voting Faculty

**b. College Faculty meetings**

The Dean of the College or the College Faculty Caucus (defined in section 3.c.11.) can call for a faculty meeting. A faculty member can request a faculty meeting through the College Faculty Caucus.

3.b.1. Faculty Meeting Requirements: The meeting agenda and all supporting materials will be made available to the faculty at least seven calendar days before the meeting. The dean (or a designate) will preside over the faculty meeting. The dean shall annually appoint a recording secretary and a parliamentarian for the college. Both the secretary and parliamentarian or designated substitutes must be present at the faculty meetings. A quorum at a faculty meeting is 15% of the Voting Faculty members. Faculty meetings will be conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order*.

3.b.2. Voting Procedures: In order to conduct a vote on agenda items at a faculty meeting, a simple majority of all the voting faculty members must be present. Otherwise, voting will take place by electronic ballot within seven calendar days, except for consideration of motions related to the specific language of the electronic ballot; such motions are permitted within the meeting. Approval of motions is based on a simple majority of the votes cast in the meeting or a simple majority of the votes cast by electronic ballot. Within a meeting, voting will be indicated by the show of hands or by a paper ballot at the request of any faculty member. There are two exceptions to this voting procedure:

i. Revisions to the College Governance Document can only be approved by an electronic vote, and approval requires a simple majority of all college voting faculty (see Section 7 of this document).

ii. A college-wide electronic vote for approval of regular catalog revisions will automatically be authorized upon approval of the catalog revisions by the College Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee Chair will notify the Faculty Caucus Chair of this approval and initiate the electronic vote within seven days of Curriculum Committee approval. College approval of a regular catalog revision requires a simple majority of votes cast and shall not constitute or include the approval of new programs.

**c. Faculty Participation on Councils and Committees**

There are two types of committees at the college level: Standing Faculty Committees and Dean's Committees. Standing Faculty Committees are composed of engineering faculty members that are nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean. These committees address matters of faculty governance as well as matters of shared governance with administration and

Dean's Committees, the latter of which are appointed at the discretion of the dean. The term of appointment to all such committees is nominally three years, although terms other than three years may be designated under special circumstances at the discretion of the appointing body/individual. Appointments may be renewed for additional, consecutive terms.

For matters that involve the appointment of a subcommittee to a particular standing committee, membership must include a minimum of four faculty representatives. The chair and members shall be nominated by the standing committee and approved by the Engineering Faculty Caucus. At least one member of the subcommittee must be a faculty member also serving on the parent committee.

Committee meetings will be conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order*. Each committee shall maintain documentation in the form of meeting agenda and minutes and post them in a timely manner on the college intranet so as to be accessible to faculty and staff. Exceptions to this include documentation involving personnel matters.

Each standing committee will report to the college Dean or a designated Associate Dean, who will formally charge the committee at the start of the academic year. Each standing committee shall submit a final report at the end of the academic year. This annual report shall include (i) a statement of the committees charge for the year, (ii) a brief summary of activities and associated outcomes, (iii) a list of proposed objectives for the upcoming year, and (iv) a proposed complete committee roster for the upcoming year. The report shall be posted on the College of Engineering Intranet by June 30.

## Standing Faculty Committees

The membership requirements and scope of responsibilities for each committee are described below. In addition to committee-specific activities, faculty members of COE committees are expected to attend all COE faculty meetings or to designate an appropriate substitute.

**3.c.1. The College Curriculum Committee** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department of the college nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The charge of the Curriculum Committee shall be to consider matters that pertain to curricula, programs, and courses. Each department representative is expected to act as a liaison between the College Curriculum Committee and his or her department. The committee shall

1. Review curricula, programs, and courses (both undergraduate and graduate) and recommend catalog material to the faculty

2. Review and approve new experimental courses in the college
3. Consider other matters related to curriculum and course offerings, as requested, and make recommendations to the faculty
4. Represent the college on the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (the Chair of the College of Engineering Curriculum Committee serves on the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee)
5. Appoint and oversee liaison committees with departments outside the college as necessary
6. Appoint subcommittees to oversee curriculum matters pertaining to development and management of college-wide programs including minors

**3.c.2. The Academic Standards Committee** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. A representative from the undergraduate programs office of the dean's office will meet with the committee and serve as Secretary without voting privileges. The charge of the committee is to represent the faculty in all matters that pertain to academic standards. The committee shall

1. Recommend policies to the faculty and set minimum requirements pertaining to scholastic attainment of students in the college
2. Establish procedures and enforce policies of minimum scholastic requirements
3. Review admission standards for students entering the college and recommend to the faculty policies regarding such standards
4. Represent the college on the Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions (the Chair of the College of Engineering Academic Standards Committee serves on the Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions Committee)

**3.c.3. The Honors Programs Committee** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean, and two student members nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The charge of the committee is to administer the College of Engineering Honors Programs and to represent the college in all matters relating to honors programs. The committee shall

1. Establish requirements for admission of students into engineering honors programs so as to meet standards imposed by the University Honors Programs Committee and the faculty, and recommend additional standards as the committee finds necessary
2. Establish procedures for admission of students into honors programs
3. Evaluate student honors programs, admission of students into engineering

honors programs, and dismissal for reasonable cause of students from engineering honors programs
4. Provide assistance to departments and coordinate the college's advising of honors students
5. Represent the college on the University Honors Programs Committee (the Chair of the College of Engineering Honors Programs Committee serves on the University Honors Programs Committee)

**3.c.4. <u>The Promotion and Tenure Committee</u>** reports to the Dean and consists of one tenured faculty member at the rank of Professor from each department who will be nominated by the department chair in consultation with the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. Departmental chairs shall not serve on this committee. Terms of office shall be three years with staggered appointments. A person may not serve more than two consecutive terms. A chair is nominated for a one-year term by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The appointment is renewable. The charge to the Promotion and Tenure Committee is to consider nominations prepared by departments for promotion, tenure, and dismissal of faculty, and to report its recommendations as requested by the dean. The committee shall

1. Advise the dean, in the form of a written recommendation, on the merit of nominations received from the departments in the college for promotion and/or tenure as well as cases recommending dismissal of faculty members. The recommendation shall also include a note on whether proper procedures were followed.
2. Advise the Engineering Faculty Caucus on recommended changes in the college criteria for promotion and tenure in the faculty of the college; these changes must be consistent with the university criteria and must be approved by the faculty of the college
3. Approve plans, processes, and procedures developed by departments for post-tenure review of tenured faculty members
4. Review the College Promotion and Tenure document [section 6] and submit recommendations to the Engineering Faculty Caucus

<u>Voting procedure:</u> Committee members must follow the "one person, one vote" policy described in section 6.b.1 of this document, in accordance with the faculty handbook. In addition, to avoid any undue influence, as specified in section 5.2.4.3 of the faculty handbook, only faculty who are members of departments other than that of the promotion and tenure candidate may vote in promotion and tenure decisions on this committee.

**3.c.5. <u>The Professional Development Committee</u>** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean

from the membership of the committee. The charge of the College of Engineering Professional Development Committee shall be to review applications and make recommendations to the dean with regard to professional development assignments (PDA) and foreign travel grants, and to assist the faculty in planning individual professional development. The committee shall

1. Encourage engineering faculty members to plan and prepare proposals for professional development assignments
2. Advise the dean and provide a rank ordering of professional development assignments placed before the committee by faculty members of the college
3. Advise the dean and provide a rank ordering of proposals for foreign travel grants placed before the committee by faculty members of the college
4. Advise the dean and the various department chairs on professional development assignments that may provide outstanding opportunities for faculty
5. When requested by faculty members or by department chairs, advise individual faculty members or groups of faculty on opportunities for professional development
6. When requested, advise individual faculty members in collaboration with their department chairs on plans, procedures, and opportunities that are intended to address professional development issues identified in any formal review process of the department, college, or university
7. Represent the college on the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Development (the Chair of the College of Engineering Professional Development Committee serves on the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Development)

**3.c.6. <u>The Honors and Awards Committee</u>** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. There are two additional members appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The charge of the College Honors and Awards Committee is to advise the dean on nominations originating in the college for faculty and alumni awards. The committee shall

1. Solicit and review nominations from the college for the following awards (list maintained by chair):
    a. Alumni Association awards
    b. Iowa State University awards
    c. College of Engineering awards
    d. Awards intended to recognize outstanding achievements across all branches of engineering
2. Rank candidates for college, university, and alumni awards and refer the nominations to the dean
3. Review nominations for other awards and act as requested
4. As appropriate, work with and assist departmental Honors and Awards

committees to identify candidates and prepare nominations for national and international awards and submit them in accordance with the criteria for those awards.

**3.c.7. The Undergraduate Scholarships and Awards Committee** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department in the college nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus in consultation with each department and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The charge of the committee is to review applications and select recipients for scholarships and awards.

**3.c.8. The Information Technology Advisory Committee** reports to the designated Associate Dean and consists of one faculty member from each department in the college nominated by each department and one member representing the Centers in the college selected in consultation with the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean. A chair is nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the dean from the membership of the committee. The ENTS manager will be an advisory member of the committee. The charge of the committee is to advocate for faculty, staff and students in the development and review of short-term and long-term issues of importance related to computer information technology. Such issues will vary over time and may include formula distribution of student technology fees, purchasing standards, encryption policies, infrastructure needs, process standards, Enterprise Resource Planning, and technology needs for faculty, students and staff. The committee will advise the dean and the college with regard to issues affecting teaching, research and administration.

**3.c.9. The Engineering Faculty Caucus** reports to the Dean. The membership of the Engineering Faculty Caucus shall be all faculty from the college currently serving as elected members of the University Faculty Senate. Immediately following the election of new members of the University Faculty Senate, the caucus shall elect or re-elect a chair from among its membership for a one-year term of service. The caucus may also elect other officers as it may deem necessary to the performance of its duties. The Engineering Faculty Caucus shall be representative of faculty interests and act in an advisory capacity to the college administration. The caucus' responsibility and duties are to

1. Monitor the faculty standing committee structure and recommend changes to the faculty as necessary
2. Nominate faculty members for membership on the standing faculty committees
3. Appoint ad-hoc committees of the Engineering Faculty Caucus to study issues as they arise
4. Respond to faculty and administration concerns as directed by the faculty
5. Respond to the dean's requests for advice and counsel
6. Act as a sounding board of faculty viewpoints

7. Represent the faculty in academic concerns as directed by the faculty
8. Schedule faculty meetings in cooperation with the dean
9. Assure that the role of the faculty in the determination of policy concerning instruction, research, extension, and services is asserted, and assure that the faculty is apprised of the latest trends and philosophies in engineering education through the appointment of appropriate study and action committees

# 4. Faculty Appointments Policies and Procedures

## a. Types of Appointments

As described in the faculty handbook, faculty appointments are made as tenured/tenure-eligible (with rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor) or as non-tenure-eligible (e.g. lecturer, clinician, senior lecturer, senior clinician, non-tenure-eligible research (NTER), instructor, adjunct, affiliate, or visiting faculty). The type of appointment influences fringe benefits, tenure status, and renewal procedures.

### 4.a.1. Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments

Tenured and tenure-eligible appointments are regularly budgeted positions at the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Tenure-eligible faculty are appointed for a specified period of time (term appointment), and notice of intent not to renew shall be given according to the deadlines specified in section 3.4 (Nonrenewal or Termination of Appointment) of the faculty handbook.

A person on a tenure-eligible appointment for a specified term is considered to be in a probationary period of service leading to tenure. The length of this period is specified at the time of initial appointment, but may not exceed seven years, except in cases of part-time tenure-eligible appointments and in cases of the approved extension of the tenure-clock. Recruitment for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty must follow university procedures.

#### 4.a.1.1. Requests for Conversion to Part-time Appointment

While the majority of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty appointments are full-time appointments, requests for conversion from full-time to part-time appointments may only be initiated by tenured or tenure-eligible faculty with either A-base or B-base full-time appointments.

Tenured faculty may make such a request for personal or professional issues, including work/life balance. Tenure-eligible faculty may make such a request only for reasons of balancing work and family for the arrival of a child, the care of a child with special needs, elder care, the care of a partner, or for personal circumstances related to the health of the faculty member.

Details on the procedures associated with this request, which include drawing up a new position responsibility statement (PRS), are described in section 3.3.1.1 (Requests for Conversion to Part-time Appointment) of the faculty handbook.

**4.a.1.2. Joint Appointments**

A faculty member may hold an appointment in more than one academic department. Such a joint appointment may be made either coincidental with, or subsequent to, the individual's original appointment. One of the involved departments is designated as the individual's primary department, which is considered to be the faculty member's home department for purposes of evaluation, review, and initiating personnel actions. The individual's letter of intent (for new appointments) and the position responsibility statement will specify the primary department. These appointments will be governed by the policies outlined in section 3.3.8 (Joint Academic Appointments) of the faculty handbook.

**4.a.2. Non-Tenure-Eligible Appointments** Types of Appointments (see faculty handbook sections 3.3.2-8)

**4.a.2.1. Non-Tenure-Eligible (NTE)** faculty appointments can be made as lecturer, senior lecturer, clinicians, senior clinicians, non-tenure-eligible research professor (NTER), adjunct, affiliate, or visiting faculty. Appointments of NTE faculty are made using established university search processes. NTE faculty hiring decisions must follow established departmental procedures which will include faculty input consistent with the principles of shared governance, and the appointments are subject to approval by the dean and the provost. The standard appointment is for nine months (B-base).

**4.a.2.1.1. Lecturer/Clinician** can be appointed for a limited term, full, or part-time renewable appointment of from one semester to three years. A written Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) will be prepared that clearly indicates the duties and expectations of the lecturer/clinician.

**4.a.2.1.2. Senior Lecturer/Senior Clinician** can be appointed for a limited term, full or part-time, renewable appointment not to exceed five years, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew. To be eligible for appointment as senior lecturer/senior clinician, the individual shall have served as a lecturer or clinician or its academic or professional equivalent for a minimum of six years or completed 12 semesters FTEs of employment. A written PRS will be prepared that clearly indicates the duties and expectations of the senior lecturer/clinician.

**4.a.2.1.3. Non-Tenure-Eligible Research (NTER)** faculty can be appointed for a limited term, full or part-time renewable appointment not to exceed five years in any one contract period. Research professor appointments can be made at the rank of research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor. Funding for these positions shall be external to the university and are not a part of the university base budget. A written PRS will be prepared that stipulates not less than a 90 percent time commitment to research. Persons

holding this title may not hold senate positions, nor represent the faculty on collegiate or university committees.

**4.a.2.1.4. Adjunct faculty:** The departments in the College of Engineering may have periodic need to appoint non-tenure eligible faculty in adjunct positions. Adjunct faculty can be appointed for a limited term, full, or part-time renewable appointment not to exceed five years, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew except when the appointment is for a year or less. Adjunct faculty appointments can be made at the rank of adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, or adjunct professor. The use of the title of adjunct instructor is reserved for a special circumstance and must receive special approval by the provost and the Faculty Senate.

Adjunct faculty can be used for persons who are employed by the university or who are employed elsewhere. See sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.2.4 of the faculty handbook.

**Continuous Adjunct appointments:** No new appointments may be made using this title. No changes to the status, title, and privileges of persons already holding continuous adjunct title shall be made unless requested by such a person.

**4.a.2.1.5. Professional and Scientific (P&S) non-tenure-eligible appointments.** P&S employees may be appointed to non-tenure-eligible positions to carry out faculty duties in a department in the college. The appointments are renewable, term appointments not to exceed five years. There is no required notice of intent not to renew. Individuals holding a full or part-time P&S position may not have more than 30% of their total work responsibilities in teaching.

The following titles will be employed for P&S employees assuming faculty responsibility in the college. These titles will be in addition to their title within the P&S system.

1. The title of lecturer and clinician (or senior lecturer and senior clinician) is appropriate when the faculty work undertaken is similar to that of a department's lecturers and clinicians. These titles should only be given to employees with an advanced degree in an appropriate field. These titles can be given for terms not to exceed five years, when a department foresees a continuing need for the P&S employee's service in faculty roles.
2. The title of adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, or adjunct professor may be given when the faculty work undertaken is substantially different from the work of department clinicians and lecturers, which often occurs when the work is focused on research or extension/professional practice. The qualifications for these titles should be similar to those required to hire at the assistant, associate or full professorial ranks under the tenure-eligible system. These titles should only be given to employees with the terminal degree in the field. The

awarding of these titles must be approved by the department, the college, and the provost.

3. Persons may not hold simultaneous appointments as P&S and NTER faculty except that persons holding P&S positions at level P-17 and higher may do so, provided they meet the conditions of both appointments, and only when governmental stipulations require an appointment as a P&S staff member. Exceptions to the simultaneous appointments must be reviewed and approved by the provost and the Faculty Senate president and must be reported annually to the Faculty Senate.
4. Adjunct instructor will not be used for P&S employees.
5. P&S employees should not teach courses in the college without a non-tenure-eligible title, with the exception being courses that are only R credit (such as orientation courses).

**4.a.2.1.6. Visiting appointments** are ordinarily intended to provide special input into the teaching or research program of the department. A visiting appointment is usually for one academic year, but may be for a shorter period of time. It is not subject to renewal, so no special notification of intent not to renew is necessary. Since visiting appointments are not renewable, the university's affirmative action procedures do not apply and the position need not be advertised.

**4.a.2.1.7. Affiliates** are persons appointed to the faculty, without financial obligation on the part of the university, to carry out scholarly activities from which the individual as well as the department and the university will benefit. Faculty rank will reflect scholarly qualifications equivalent to those of similar rank in the department. Affiliates are not employed on a regular basis outside the university. Since affiliates are not recruited following university affirmative action procedures, they may not be assigned duties or responsibilities such as teaching courses or providing research support for other faculty or staff that would ordinarily be carried out by a person in a faculty or P&S position. Appointments may be made for one to three years and may be renewed. The conditions of the appointment, including the extent to which the department will provide support services for the individual, are stated in a written agreement signed by both parties at the time of the appointment.

**b. <u>Position Responsibility Statements (see faculty handbook section 3.4 and 3.4.4)</u>**

**4.b.1.** Each faculty member (tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-eligible) will have a PRS, which is a description of areas of responsibility. It should be general and include only areas of significant responsibility, especially addressing the areas of teaching, research/scholarly activities, extension/professional practice and institutional service. The PRS is a key tool that allows for a flexible and individualized system of faculty review, particularly within the promotion and tenure review process and for the advancement of non-tenure-eligible faculty.

**4.b.2.** Reviewing and changing the PRS for tenure, tenure-eligible faculty: The PRS will be subject to regular review by the faculty member and his/her chair,

and allow for flexibility in responsibilities over time and for the changing nature of faculty appointments. The PRS cannot be changed unilaterally by either the chair or the faculty member. The governance document in each department may specify the procedure by which a position responsibility statement can be changed.

At the time of appointment or within the first semester of the appointment, the chair and a new tenure-eligible/tenured faculty member will agree on a position responsibility statement that should be based on the job advertisement. This PRS should stand for the first three years of appointment. In most cases, this initial statement will remain in effect until the tenure review, unless the new faculty member is already tenured. Any changes in the expectations for the tenure-eligible/tenured faculty member must be made in consultation between the chair and the faculty member. When tenure is granted, the faculty member and his/her chair will review the details of the position responsibility statement and make any necessary changes.

At least every five years as part of the annual review process, tenured faculty members will re-evaluate their position responsibilities with their chairs.

The policy for changing the PRS for a non-tenure-eligible faculty member is found in faculty handbook section 5.4.1.2.

**4.b.3. PRS Mediation:** When both parties (the tenure-eligible/tenured faculty member and the department chair) agree to the PRS, it will be signed by both parties and dated. If however one of the parties disagrees with a proposed change to the faculty member's PRS, either party may refer the matter to the PRS Mediation Panel, which will be in place in each department; see faculty handbook section 3.4.4. If the matter is not resolved through the use of the departmental mediation panel it should then be forwarded to the PRS Mediation Panel at the college level. This panel will consist of one tenured faculty member selected by the faculty member involved in the disagreement and one tenured faculty member selected by the Dean. A third tenured faculty member will elected by the Engineering Caucus to serve on the panel at the beginning of each year. Finally, if the issue is not resolved through the use of the college panel, the matter will be taken to the Dean. The Dean will then specify the PRS in consultation with the Engineering Faculty Caucus.

# 5. Evaluation and Review

## a. Faculty Evaluation

**5.a.1. Annual Performance Evaluation** (see faculty handbook section 5.1.1.2): Annual faculty reviews are conducted by the department chair. Faculty members are reviewed annually for performance appraisal and development on the basis of their position responsibility statement. This review will serve as a basis for determining merit salary increases. In some departments it may be desirable for the chair to select other persons from the department to aid in this evaluation.

Following the review, the chair discusses the results with the faculty member and follows-up with a written summary, thus providing an opportunity for exchange of ideas that would be of benefit to the individual and the department.

**5.a.2. Review of Probationary Tenure-eligible Faculty** (see faculty handbook section 5.1.1.3):
Departments must conduct a review of all their probationary faculty members in the third year of their appointments. The purpose of this review is to

1. Assess the cumulative performance of the faculty member vis-à-vis their PRS
2. Provide constructive and developmental feedback regarding progress in meeting departmental and college criteria for promotion and/or tenure
3. Determine and state recommendations concerning renewal of appointment

The faculty member shall provide the department chair with up-to-date documentation (vita and portfolio) as per the COE tenure documentation requirements described in section 6.b.2 of this Handbook. The department chair shall appoint a committee to evaluate the progress of the faculty member. This evaluation will be based upon departmental criteria and standards used for promotion and/or tenure and should include assessment of scholarship, teaching, service and funding. External letters are not normally expected as part of the process.

The Department Chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance and progress, based on input from the committee (and other sources at the discretion of the Chair). The Chair will make a recommendation regarding reappointment and will prepare a formal letter to the Dean, detailing the key points of the department's evaluation to substantiate the recommendation. The Chair's recommendation will generally fall into one of the following four categories:

(i) Reappoint with no reservation.
(ii) Reappoint with no strong reservation, but with specific issues that need to be addressed.
(iii) Reappoint with reservation and specific steps to be taken in the coming years before the next review. Reappointment may be for a shorter term than the full probationary period with an additional review scheduled before the tenure review.
(iv) Non-reappointment, with specific reasons.

The Chair will prepare a separate letter to the candidate to inform the candidate of the recommendation being forwarded, including specific reasons for the recommendation and/or suggestions for improvements, if necessary, for reappointment. The Chair will forward both letters, along with all departmental evaluation materials, to the Dean.

The Dean will evaluate the faculty member's performance and progress, based on the evaluation materials and recommendation provided by the Department Chair. The Dean will make a decision regarding the reappointment of the candidate and will prepare a formal letter to the Provost, stating the decision, summarizing the review process, and highlighting the key findings. The Dean will prepare a separate letter to the candidate to inform the candidate of the decision, including specific reasons and/or suggestions for improvements, as appropriate. The Dean will forward both letters, along with requested review materials to the Provost.

The Provost will request selected evaluation materials and documentation from the Dean. The Provost will review the selected materials to (i) ensure that the review includes a detailed evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and (ii) that the candidate receives clear and constructive advice regarding expectations for the promotion and tenure review. The Provost's approval of the evaluation will be relayed to the Dean, Department Chair, and candidate in a letter.

A second review will occur in the sixth year of service, unless a promotion/tenure review will take place in the subsequent year. No contract for a tenure-eligible faculty member will exceed four years. Each tenure-eligible faculty member who has had a non-permanent or permanent part-time appointment will have his/her schedule of preliminary and tenure review updated each year at annual review.

**5.a.3. Review of Joint Appointment cases**

Evaluation of a person holding rank in more than one department should be initiated and conducted by the primary department, with advice from the secondary department, as per the guidelines in the faculty handbook, section 5.2.4.2.2 (Joint Appointment Procedures). Prior to the review, the two chairs, in consultation with department promotion and tenure committees, should decide on the role to be played by the secondary department, including the preparation of the documentation from the secondary department and the process for including that documentation in the review. A coordinated recommendation will be made at the dean's level with a single recommendation forwarded to the provost.

**5.a.4. Evaluation and Review for non-tenure eligible faculty**

Review for appointment renewal for non-tenure eligible faculty (see faculty handbook section 5.4: Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement policies for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Clinician, Senior Clinician and Adjunct Appointments.)

Non-tenure-eligible faculty positions are term appointments eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the unit. Individuals appointed to these positions will be evaluated for compensation and advancement using established criteria appropriate to their positions. Evaluations for renewal of appointment will be conducted by an appropriate faculty committee, and recommended by the department chair at the time of reappointment. Additionally performance evaluations conducted by a faculty committee should be completed at least every six semesters of employment for those who will be

considered for future re-appointment and shall be based on the individual's position responsibility statement.

Lecturer and Clinician: After having served a minimum of six years or its academic or professional equivalent (the completion of 12 semester FTEs of employment), the individual has the right to be reviewed for advancement by the appropriate departmental committee. Criteria for advancement shall be based on the quality of work relative to the individual's PRS. The three outcomes of this review include recommendation for advancement to senior lecturer or senior clinician; continuation of appointment as lecturer or clinician; or non-renewal of contract. Individuals who are not recommended for advancement are eligible to reapply in subsequent years. An outcome of the review process should be to provide constructive, developmental feedback to the individual regarding progress in meeting departmental criteria for advancement.

In addition to the above statements the following practices and procedures shall apply:

1. Since the appointment of lecturers and clinicians is for a specified period of time, no special notice of intent not to renew is necessary.
2. Persons on appointment as lecturer or clinician may be reviewed for advancement to senior lecturer or senior clinician and may be advanced without a search.
3. Persons on adjunct appointment may be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee for advancement to adjunct associate professor or adjunct professor using established criteria appropriate to the position.
4. Persons appointed as senior lecturer and senior clinician must receive notice by May 15 of the year preceding the end of the term appointment (or at least 12 months in advance of the end of the term appointment when the appointment end date is not May 15) of intent to renew or not renew.
5. Renewal of senior lecturers and senior clinicians or adjunct appointments must be approved by the dean and the provost. Request for approval should include a summary of the review results and a statement regarding the continuing need of the unit.
6. Both full-time and part-time non-tenure-eligible faculty will receive annual reviews as well as review by a faculty committee at least every six semesters of employment.
7. Review of individuals in these positions will be based on the PRS derived from the advertised position. At each renewal time, the PRS may change, depending on the continuing and/or changing needs of the unit. The PRS will be discussed and disagreements negotiated at that time as a part of the renewal agreement. The agreed upon PRS will be signed by both parties and dated.
8. For P&S employees, notice of intent not to renew is governed by the P&S appointment. Termination of the P&S appointment will also mean termination of the non-tenure-eligible appointment.

**5.a.4.1. Evaluation, Renewal and Advancement of Continuous Adjunct Appointments.** Faculty on continuous adjunct appointment are eligible for review for promotion in accordance with university promotion policies and procedures.

**5.a.4.2. Evaluation, Renewal and Advancement of Affiliates**. Affiliates are eligible for review for advancement in accordance with university promotion policies.

**5.a.4.3. Evaluation, Renewal and Advancement of Non-Tenure-Eligible (NTER) faculty.** NTER appointments are renewable at the discretion of the home department contingent on continuation of external funding (except that research professors supported by federal funds shall be governed by applicable federal policy) and departmental performance review. The provost shall approve reappointments. At any time during the contract period positions may be terminated without cause and/or due to lack of grant funding sufficient to cover salary and benefits through the term of contract (subject to federal guidelines when they apply). An NTER faculty member may be proposed for advancement to the next rank. The standards for each rank shall be the same as the definitions for scholarship performance at rank for assistant, associate and professor ranks for tenure-eligible and tenured faculty. Departments shall develop procedures for advancing NTER faculty. The advancement review process shall include tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty and be the same as the review for tenure and promotion of tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

**b. Procedure for Faculty Involvement in Evaluation of the Dean**

**5.b.1**. **Dean Responsibilities**. The dean is responsible for advancing excellence by establishing a vision for the college, leading the development of strategies and action plans to achieve that vision, and generating internal and external support. The dean also is expected to be a leader in attracting and retaining excellent and diverse faculty, staff, and students, and to build collaborative, long-term, strategic relationships with leaders in the business, engineering, and academic units within the university.

**5.b.2. Evaluation Process.** The provost will initiate a faculty evaluation of the dean to be completed by the beginning of the final year of his/her appointment. The following procedures shall be followed in the faculty review and evaluation process:

The focus of the evaluation shall be on the performance of the dean and his/her administrative units, considering:

1. Achieving goals set for the college consistent with the strategic plan
2. Providing leadership in developing, articulating, and implementing improvements in college teaching, research, and outreach programs
3. Fundraising
4. Attracting and retaining high-quality faculty and staff

5. Building collaborative, long-term, strategic relationships with university administration, college faculty, staff and students, administrators in the college and other colleges, and industry leaders
6. Any other topics requested by the provost

**5.b.2.1. Dean Evaluation Committee.** The Dean Evaluation Committee shall be nominated by the Engineering Faculty Caucus and appointed by the provost with the following representation:

1. Three college faculty members selected from nominations solicited from all college faculty members, including at least one member of the Engineering Faculty Caucus
2. One college department chair
3. One evaluator from outside the college, preferably with college administrative experience;
4. One member from the Engineering College Industrial Advisory Council

**5.b.2.2. Review and Evaluation Procedure.** The review and evaluation procedure shall consist of

1. A self-assessment by the dean, which will be distributed to the faculty of the college and discussed with and reviewed by the Evaluation Committee
2. An Evaluation Committee assessment of the college goals and progress toward those goals; input shall be solicited from faculty, administrative unit leaders in the college and related colleges, department executive officers, selected engineering leaders, selected student leaders, and others who are knowledgeable regarding the functioning of the college
3. An Evaluation Committee report on the review and evaluation of the functioning of the college, which will be made available to the faculty
4. A confidential Evaluation Committee report on the review and evaluation of the performance of the dean shall be provided to and discussed with the dean and the provost.

### *c.* Review of the Department Chair

**5.c.1. Chair Responsibilities.** The department chair is the chief administrative officer of the department. As such, the chair is responsible to both the faculty and the college and university administrations for the efficient and forward-looking management of departmental affairs. The duties and responsibilities of the chair shall be specified in the respective departmental governance document.

**5.c.2. Review Process** As documented in the faculty handbook, section 5.1.2, department chairs are typically appointed for three to five years (not to exceed five years), as specified within their respective department's governance document. Appointments are renewable. The dean will meet with him/her to determine if he/she is willing to be considered for reappointment for another term. Appointment renewals are made by the dean on the basis of a formal evaluation initiated by the dean and conducted by department faculty members according to the respective

department's governance document. The dean will take the faculty recommendation into account in making the reappointment decision.

This review will be completed by the beginning of the final year of the of the department chair's appointment. After the response is received, the dean will meet with the respective department's faculty to discuss the reappointment.

# 6. Promotion and Tenure Document

This chapter, in conjunction with the university policies, criteria and procedures set forth in the university promotion and tenure document[1], establishes the College of Engineering's promotion and tenure protocol. It includes the general expectations for promotion and tenure review processes as well as the notification procedures to be followed by departments and college before the case is sent to the provost and the president.

## 6.a. Standards and Qualifications for Promotion and Tenure

Evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Promotion through the academic ranks is part of the university's recognition system whereas the purpose of tenure is to ensure academic freedom in the faculty member's scholarly pursuits. A key tool in the promotion and/or tenure process is the PRS, which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and expected activities in these areas. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance and scope of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.

Scholarship is creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. It builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding. Scholarship must be interpreted in accordance with section 5.2.2.2. (Scholarship) of the faculty handbook. In all areas of professional activity, a faculty member is expected to uphold the values and follow the guidelines in the Statement of Professional Ethics found in "Professional Policies and Procedures."

Recommendations for initial appointment and promotion are based on evidence that the individual has met the standards and qualifications for the faculty rank to which he/she is to be appointed or promoted. These standards and qualifications are set by the departments and must not conflict with the expectations of rank described in section 5.2.3. (Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure) of the faculty handbook and should conform to the following minimum standards of the College of Engineering.

[1] (http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/advancement/promotion.html)

Promotion: Promotion from assistant to associate professor generally will be judged on actual accomplishment and potential for growth; whereas, promotion from associate professor to full professor will be judged on accomplishment alone. Professor is the highest academic rank, and a faculty member must have proven his/her right to be awarded that title. All accomplishments and credentials of a faculty member will be considered in making the decision on promotion, but primary weight shall be given to accomplishments and attainments while in current rank.

Tenure: Granting of tenure to a faculty member of the College of Engineering implies that the individual was judged to have potential to develop into an outstanding member of the academic community. This individual is expected to have conducted academic activities in a scholarly manner and to submit their ideas and research results in rigorous peer review. The individual is also expected to have been involved in departmental, college and/or university activities and governance; to have been a willing worker in local, national and/or international societies and organizations of his/her profession; and to have upheld the high standards of the College of Engineering and the university.

**6.b. Review for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Mandatory cases are those which involve review for tenure in the penultimate year of the appointment. In these cases, the final administrative recommendation is made by the president of the university. Mandatory cases are always sent through the administrative chain to the president to determine whether a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion will be made to the Board of Regents. In non-mandatory cases, the department, the dean or the provost may make a decision not to forward a positive recommendation, and that action is the final administrative action. Reviews that occur in the final year (after denial in the mandatory year) are non-mandatory cases.

**6.b.1. Voting procedures:** In order to avoid undue or unfair influence in promotion and tenure decisions, all individuals involved in the review process must follow the "one person-one vote" policy as described below, in accordance with section 5.2.4.1 and 5.2.4.3 of the faculty handbook. For promotion and tenure, a vote is defined as a formal vote or the equivalent of a vote, such as advice or a recommendation on the specific question of whether or not a candidate should receive tenure and/or promotion. Specifically:

1. If a faculty member votes on a promotion and tenure decision as a member of a departmental promotion and tenure committee, that faculty member may not vote again on the same decision at the departmental, college, or other levels.
2. A non-administrative faculty member's one vote in a promotion and tenure decision about a member from their own department should be cast at the departmental level (as a member of a promotion and tenure committee or as part of the department faculty), not at the college or higher levels.

3. Since the chair of the department independently evaluates promotion and tenure decisions, he or she may not also vote on the decision at the departmental faculty, college, or other levels.
4. Administrative faculty members participating in a promotion and tenure decision (as outlined in section 6.b.4.2 of this document) can only participate at the appropriate administrative level and are allowed to vote only once on the decision.

Votes or advice concerning the process or readiness of a portfolio are not in violation of this policy. For example, advice to a candidate on how to improve their portfolio or advice to the department about the completeness of the portfolio or advice to an associate professor about the timing of a promotion application, etc. are process issues not promotion and tenure decision issues.

### 6.b.2. Promotion and Tenure Documentation

Each candidate is required to prepare documentation of his or her accomplishments and scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, extension/professional practice and institutional service for review. In particular, each candidate must submit the following documentation:

- Promotion and Tenure Vita: The vita is based upon the candidate's position responsibilities and faculty activities. It includes information about the candidate, the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship, and the candidate's activities and accomplishments in the areas of his/her responsibilities (see faculty handbook section 5.3.1.1). A template is available on the college intranet at https://intranet.eng.iastate.edu
- Faculty Portfolio: The faculty portfolio includes important and supplemental materials that provide a clear understanding of the candidate's accomplishments within scholarship and his or her areas of faculty activities. A template is available on the college intranet at https://intranet.eng.iastate.edu

### 6.b.3. Department Review

#### 6.b.3.1. Department Promotion and Tenure Document

Review for promotion and/or tenure begins at the department level. The faculty handbook, in section 5.2.4.1.1, requires each department to have a document that sets forth the standards and procedures governing promotion and tenure of faculty within that department. The department document may specify standards that exceed those of the university or college, provided that they do not conflict with the standards of either, and provided the procedures are consistent with those described in the faculty handbook, section 5.2.4 (Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review). The document should also include the information pertaining to items listed in the faculty handbook, section 5.2.4.2.1. (Promotion and Tenure Document).

This document must be approved by the tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of the department, by the dean, and by the provost.

**6.b.3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Each candidate must be reviewed by a promotion and tenure review committee, which will examine information relevant to the evaluation of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Each department should specify the process of determining this committee, in accordance with the following requirements (as specified in the faculty handbook, section 5.2.4.2.3). An individual promotion and tenure review committee may include faculty who are not members of the candidate's department. Any member of the promotion and tenure review committee who has a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate shall not participate in the consideration of that individual or have access to review materials. The chair must inform the candidates in writing of the identity of the members of the department review committee. The promotion and tenure review committee reports in writing to the chair the results of its review, including all formal votes. Appointees to this committee must practice voting as per the voting policy in section 6.b.1 of this document.

The departmental review process shall include solicitations of letters of evaluation from external reviewers as described in section 5.3.3.1 of the faculty handbook. The chair and/or the department promotion and tenure committee solicit letters from qualified reviewers with the understanding that, insofar as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion and tenure decision. All solicited letters are treated as part of the evaluation process and must be forwarded on to college and university review levels.

**6.b.3.3. Responsibilities of Department Chair**

The department chair prepares a Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure Form, which constitutes the cover page for the package to be submitted to the college for each person who is recommended by the review committee for promotion and/or tenure. The chair also may prepare this form for a candidate who is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the review committee. The form includes the chair's evaluation of the candidate; the votes and reports of all departmental reviews; and the chair's recommendation. Evaluations from each level of review within the department will serve as a summary of the case. They should not be statements of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance. The chair’s participation in the candidate’s review must be in accordance with the voting policy in section 6.b.1. of this handbook.

The chair forwards recommendation forms to the college dean and informs the promotion and tenure review committee of his or her recommendations. In addition, the chair must prepare and forward to the college dean negative departmental recommendations for persons for whom tenure decisions are mandatory.

### 6.b.4. College Review

The participation of all individuals at the college level must be in accordance with the voting policy in section 6.b.1. of this handbook.

#### 6.b.4.1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The review at the college level is conducted by a Promotion and Tenure Committee that considers nominations prepared by the departments for promotion, tenure and dismissal of the faculty, and to report its recommendations to the dean. The makeup, charge and voting procedures of this college-level standing committee are detailed in section 3.c of this document.

#### 6.b.4.2. Responsibilities of the Dean

Each dean reviews the promotion and tenure recommendations from the departments and from the college promotion and tenure committee. The dean may appoint an advisory committee consisting of up to four tenured faculty at the rank of Full Professor in the College of Engineering and who are currently serving in college administration. Participation in this committee should be in a manner consistent with the voting policy in section 6.b.1. The committee membership must be established and announced to the college faculty at the beginning of an academic year. The dean then presents his/her recommendations to the provost (including detail on input from the advisory committee), along with the recommendations and votes of the college and department promotion and tenure committees, the chair report, and supporting material and documentation.

The dean will inform each candidate and the respective chair and the college committee in writing whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the provost and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If the recommendation is contrary to the departmental, chair, and/or college committee recommendations, the dean will summarize in writing the reasons as part of his/her recommendation. The chair will forward the dean's recommendation and summary to the department promotion and tenure committee.

#### 6.b.4.3. College Approval or Denial

Subsequent to being notified of the college decision on promotion and/or tenure or denial, the chair shall inform the candidate of the College decision by written memo. If promotion and/or tenure has been denied, the chair shall discuss the reasons given for denial by higher administration and, where appropriate, the means for improving performance.

### 6.c. Procedures for Joint Appointment cases

Review for promotion and/or tenure of a person holding rank in more than one department should be initiated and conducted by the primary department, with advice from the secondary department, as per the guidelines in the faculty handbook, section 5.2.4.2.2 (Joint Appointment Procedures). Prior to the review, the two chairs, in consultation with department promotion and tenure committees,

should decide on the role to be played by the secondary department, including the preparation of the documentation from the secondary department and the process for including that documentation in the review. A coordinated recommendation will be made at the dean's level with a single recommendation forwarded to the provost.

### 6.d. Post-tenure Review

Each department is required to maintain a post-tenure review (PTR) program for all tenured faculty, in accordance with in section 5.3.5 (Post Tenure Review Policy) of the Faculty Handbook. The requirements and guiding principles of the departmental PTR program, including applicable timelines, reportable outcomes, subsequent actions, and the respective roles of the department Chair, Dean, and Provost are specified in Section 5.3.5 of the faculty handbook. Ideally, the review shall result in recommendations for enhancing performance and provide a plan for future development.

This review does not change the university's commitment to academic freedom, nor the circumstances under which tenured faculty can be dismissed from the university. Grounds for dismissal remain those listed in the faculty handbook under section 7 (Faculty Conduct Policy).

The departmental post-tenure review plan shall be reviewed, approved, and revised in accordance with the collegiate governance approval process that applies to departmental promotion and tenure documents.

### 6.e. Appeal Process

In accordance with the faculty handbook (section 5.2.4.4.5, Appeals), in a mandatory case, following the provost’s decision not to forward a recommendation to the president, a faculty member has the right to appeal through administrative channels or through the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals. An appeal through administrative channels should be made to the president in the form of a request for reconsideration of his/her decision.

In non-mandatory cases, a decision not to forward a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure may be appealed through administrative channels or through the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee when the chair, dean, provost or president decides not to forward the recommendation. An administrative appeal should be filed with the next person in the administrative chain, except in the case of an appeal of the president's decision, in which case the appeal should be made to the president in the form of a request for reconsideration of his/her decision.

## 7. Policies and Procedure for Amending the Governance Document

Any faculty member may suggest revisions to the College Governance Document through the Faculty Caucus. Formal proposals for revisions to the College Governance Document may be made by the Dean of the College or the College Faculty Caucus. After approval of the Dean of the College and Faculty Caucus, the revision proposal will be presented by the Faculty Caucus to the college faculty in a College Faculty Meeting. Final approval of the proposed revision will be based on an electronic vote and will require a simple majority of the Voting Faculty (see Section 3.b.2).