

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY HANDBOOK

January 2024

Chapter 1 – About the Faculty Handbook	1
Chapter 2 – The University	3
Chapter 3 – Appointment Policies and Procedures	15
Chapter 4 – Salaries and Benefits	37
Chapter 5 – Evaluation and Review	43
Chapter 6 – Faculty Recognition and Development.....	95
Chapter 7 –Faculty Conduct Policy.....	105
Chapter 8 – University Community Policies.....	140
Chapter 9 – Faculty Grievance Procedures.....	152
Chapter 10 – Instruction.....	161



Faculty Senate

Faculty Handbook Editing Task Force 2021-2022

Denise Vrchota, Chair, Dept. of Psychology; Timothy Day, Dept. of Biomedical Sciences;
Carol Faber, Dept. of Graphic Design; Steven Freeman, Dept. of Agricultural and Biosystems
Engineering; and Robert Wallace, Dept. of Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology.

Edit of the entire Faculty Handbook to address multiple inconsistencies of references, content,
style, completeness, and other editorial aspects that accumulated over time.

Faculty Handbook edits approved by the Faculty Senate (November 15, 2022); by the Senior Vice President
and Provost (November 28, 2022); by the President (November 28, 2022).

Chapter 1. About the Faculty Handbook

The *Iowa State University Faculty Handbook* is the official statement of Iowa State University policies governing the rights, responsibilities, and performance of faculty. This handbook contains information on state and federal policies, Board of Regents, State of Iowa policies, administrative policies, and policies approved by the Faculty Senate on behalf of Iowa State faculty. The handbook is updated twice annually by the Faculty Senate. For information about recent changes, contact the Senior Vice President and Provost or the Faculty Senate.

The *Faculty Handbook* also contains information about procedures that are not readily available elsewhere and links or references to other sources for further information. The Faculty Senate is not responsible for the contents or policies contained in linked websites it does not control.

During the academic year, the Faculty Senate does the following:

- monitors Faculty Senate actions that affect material described in the *Faculty Handbook* and transcribes those actions for inclusion in the handbook
- keeps accurate records to contribute to the revision process
- reviews changes and additions to the *Faculty Handbook*

The Faculty Senate Governance Council is responsible for incorporating all revisions of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate on 1/20/2009 and by president and provost on 1/27/2009.

Chapter 2. The University	3
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 History	3
2.3 Administrative Structure	4
2.4 The Faculty	5
2.4.1 The General Faculty	5
2.4.2 The Faculty Senate	6
2.4.3 The Graduate College	6
2.4.4 The Graduate Faculty	6
2.4.4.1 Directors of Graduate Education	6
2.5 The Department	7
2.6 Governance Documents	7
2.6.1 Constitution of the Faculty Senate	7
2.6.2 College Governance Documents	7
2.6.3 Department Governance Documents	8
2.7 Policy for Academic Reorganizations	8
2.7.1 Policy for Reorganization of Academic Units	9
2.7.2 Discussion	9
2.7.2.1 Decision to Begin Planning	9
2.7.2.2 Formalizing the Decision to Begin Planning	9
2.7.2.3 Faculty Senate Role	9
2.7.3 Planning	9
2.7.3.1 Content of the Plan	9
2.7.3.2 Time Frame for Implementation of the Plan	10
2.7.4 Review	10
2.7.4.1 Review by Faculty	10
2.7.4.2 Review by Senior Vice President and Provost	10
2.7.4.3 Review by Faculty Senate	10
2.7.4.4 Review by President	11
2.7.5 Implementation and Follow-up Review	11
2.8 Policy for Renaming Academic Units	11
2.8.1 Renaming to Modify Description of Scope of Academic Unit ...	11
2.8.1.1 Discussion and Planning	11
2.8.1.2 Faculty Evaluation and Vote	11

2.8.1.3 Review by Senior Vice President and Provost	12
2.8.1.4 Review by Faculty Senate	12
2.8.1.5 Review by President	12
2.8.2 Renaming to Reflect a Philanthropic Gift.....	12
2.9 Definitions	12
2.9.1 Days.....	13

Chapter 2. The University

2.1 Introduction

Iowa State University of Science and Technology (hereafter referred to as Iowa State or the university) is a public land-grant institution serving the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world through its interrelated programs of instruction, research, extension, and professional service. With an institutional emphasis on areas related to science and technology, the university carries out its traditional mission of discovering, developing, disseminating, and preserving knowledge.

Iowa State prohibits discrimination, which can include disparate treatment directed toward an individual or group of individuals based on race, ethnicity, sex, pregnancy, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental disability, age (40 and over), marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, status as a U.S. Veteran (disabled, Vietnam, or other), or other protected class, that adversely affects their employment or education. Any person who has inquiries concerning this may contact the Director of the [Office of Equal Opportunity](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on October 9, 2007, and by the president and provost on October 26, 2007.

2.2 History

Iowa State, then known as the Iowa Agricultural College, formally opened on March 17, 1869. Initially, Iowa State offered courses in agriculture, mechanics (which later developed into engineering), military science, and the liberal arts and sciences. Soon, courses in home economics, veterinary medicine, and pedagogy were added. Iowa State was coeducational from its beginning. In 1897, the name was changed to Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. In 1959, the institution became a university and took its present title of Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

Iowa State traces its origin to an historic act of federal legislation. The Morrill Act of 1862, which provided federal lands to endow land-grant universities, introduced a new era in higher education. Iowa was the first state to accept the terms of the Morrill Act and Iowa State was founded to serve the entire community by developing practical as well as classical knowledge, and to deliver that knowledge more effectively (e.g., through the extension system) to a broader population. Iowa State is also where the Cooperative

Extension Service and the Agriculture Experiment Station system, two key programs in the land-grant outreach mission, trace their roots.

2.3 Administrative Structure

Iowa State is one of five institutions governed by the [Board of Regents, State of Iowa](#). The other institutions are the University of Iowa, the University of Northern Iowa, the Iowa School for the Deaf, and the Iowa Educational Service for the Blind and Visually Impaired. The Board of Regents consists of nine members appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate. The term of office is six years, with the terms of three members expiring on May 1 of each odd-numbered year. The Board of Regents Office is located in Urbandale, Iowa.

Iowa State University of Science and Technology is the official name of the university. Iowa State University (ISU) is the more commonly used name except where the official name may be required on certain documents. The university is not incorporated, and when a statement of the nature of the university is required, it should be described as "an agency of the State of Iowa."

The [university president](#) is the principal administrative officer of the university and is directly responsible to the Board of Regents for the operation of the university. The president is responsible for the administration of university affairs. The president issues diplomas conferring degrees upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate acting on behalf of the General Faculty and by authority of the Board of Regents. The president is directly responsible for recommending the appointment of administrative officers who carry university-wide responsibility. The following vice presidents are part of the president's office:

The vice president for [economic development and industry relations](#) serves as the entry point to university expertise and capabilities related to economic development and industry needs.

The vice president for [information technology services](#) serves as principal advisor to the president on matters involving information and technology.

The vice president for [university human resources](#) works to continue advancing Iowa State as a premier place to work and to learn.

The vice president for [diversity, equity, and inclusion](#) works to promote a welcoming and inclusive campus environment by creating and encouraging opportunities that advance the constructive expression of divergent viewpoints.

[The senior vice president and provost](#) (SVPP) is the chief academic officer, responsible for all aspects of the university's academic mission. These include the recruitment and

retention of faculty, staff, and students, and the implementation of academic program policies. The following vice presidents are part of the SVPP's office:

The vice president for [research](#) promotes research at the university.

The vice president for [extension and outreach](#) serves as the director of ISU Extension and works closely with the SVPP, the vice president for research, and the deans to integrate teaching and research with the university's extension and outreach programs.

The senior vice president for [operations and finance](#) is responsible for business services, environmental health and safety, facilities planning and management, public safety, Reiman Gardens, University Museums, and WOI radio group.

The senior vice president for [student affairs](#) coordinates all non-academic student services, including recruiting, orientation, registration, housing, and financial aid, and promotes student organizations, government, and recreational activities.

Approved by Faculty Senate 11/8/2011; approved by president and provost 11/17/2011

2.4 The Faculty

2.4.1 The General Faculty

The General Faculty is the legislative body of the university. It consists of all tenured, tenure-eligible, and term faculty members as well as all major administrative officers of the university who carry faculty appointments, except as provided in [Section 3.3.3](#). The General Faculty is responsible for educational policies and procedures of the university, including the following:

- admission requirements
- graduation requirements
- curriculum and course revisions
- new degree programs
- grading procedures
- candidate recommendations for diplomas, degrees, and certificates to be conferred by the president

Major changes in educational programs and policies approved by the General Faculty must be presented by the president to the Board of Regents for final approval.

The General Faculty is responsible to, and is chaired by, the university president. While the Faculty Senate was created by the General Faculty to conduct its business, meetings of the General Faculty may be held as needed at the call of the president. If the General Faculty dissolves the Faculty Senate, meetings of the General Faculty would then be held at the end of each semester and as needed at the call of the president. The documents of the General

Faculty, including minutes of its meetings and reports of major committees, are on file in the [University Archives, ISU Library](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on May 4, 2010 and by the president and provost on May 24, 2010

2.4.2 The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate was established by the General Faculty to act as its representative body and to conduct the business of the General Faculty.

The [Constitution of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate](#), as approved by the Board of Regents, and the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#) are maintained on the [Faculty Senate website](#). Also listed are the Faculty Senate councils and committees and their current membership. In addition, the official documents of the Faculty Senate, including minutes of its meetings, agendas, calendars, agenda documents, etc., and all corresponding documents of Faculty Senate councils and committees are on file in the Faculty Senate Office.

2.4.3 The Graduate College

The Graduate College oversees all the programs of post-baccalaureate study offered by the university. Most of the graduate programs are research oriented and lead to a master's degree (with thesis) and to the doctor of philosophy degree. In certain fields that involve advanced study directed more specifically to vocational or professional objectives, a professional master's degree or a master's degree without thesis is available, as noted on the [Graduate College website](#).

2.4.4 The Graduate Faculty

The Graduate Faculty in each of the graduate programs does the following:

- handles admission and classification of graduate students
- establishes requirements for advanced degrees
- directs instruction and research at the graduate level
- teaches graduate courses
- serves on program of study committees
- directs work of master's and doctoral students

All graduate courses offered for major or minor credit are taught by graduate faculty members or graduate lecturers.

For more information, see the [Graduate College Handbook](#).

2.4.4.1 Directors of Graduate Education

Directors of graduate education (DOGE) are members of the graduate faculty who coordinate graduate majors and interdepartmental programs. DOGEs may be department chairs. Periodic meetings of the DOGEs are scheduled during the academic year for announcements and exchange of information about graduate education and research.

Recruitment of graduate students, sources of support, and academic policies are also reviewed at DOGE meetings.

2.5 The Department

The department is the basic administrative unit within the university. It includes all staff members engaged in teaching, research, and extension activities related to that particular academic discipline. Although most departments are administered within a single college, some departments, by nature of the diversity of their programs, are located in more than one college and are responsible to more than one college dean. All members of the faculty are affiliated with at least one academic department. All tenured faculty hold tenure in a department.

2.6 Governance Documents

Governance documents for various bodies of faculty have been developed by representative members of the faculty. Faculty members are affected by and should be familiar with the governance documents of the Faculty Senate, their college, and their department.

College governance documents must comply with the university governance document (e.g., the *Faculty Handbook*), and the departmental governance documents must comply with their college governance document. In cases where conflicts exist among department, college, and university documents, the higher-level governance document prevails. The rules and regulations of higher-level documents are still in effect even if absent from the lower-level document. Language specific to the last two statements should be found in college and departmental documents.

Governance documents may contain a preamble, appendices or other attachments that provide context and additional relevant information. A preamble, if included, is for information purposes only, and is not a binding part of the governance document. Appendices or any other attachments may or may not be binding. It must be clearly stated as to whether sections outside the body of the document are binding; normally this is done in the introductory sections of the governance document.

Approved by Faculty Senate 12/6/2011; approved by president and provost 12/12/2011

2.6.1 Constitution of the Faculty Senate

The [Constitution of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate](#) describes the purpose, functions, organization, membership, and other elements of this representative body of the General Faculty. Changes to the constitution must be approved by the General Faculty. The operation of the Faculty Senate is prescribed in the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#).

2.6.2 College Governance Documents

The governance document of each college describes its mission, governance domains, governance structure, and other policies and procedures. The current documents must be

publicly available through a link to a document website provided to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Faculty Senate. College governance documents are reviewed by the Faculty Senate Committee on College and Departmental Document Review (CDDR). College governance documents should include the following items as required by the Resource Management Model (RMM):

- Each dean shall have a budget advisory council/committee with significant faculty membership, including at least one faculty senator. The governance document should describe the membership of the college's budget advisory committee.
- The dean will communicate to members of the college annually the college goals, priorities, planning, and budget.

Please refer to the CDDR Committee for information about [college governance document requirements](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 1/20/2009; approved by president and provost 1/27/2009
Approved by Faculty Senate 12/6/2011; approved by president and provost 12/12/2011

2.6.3 Department Governance Documents

The governance document of each department includes information specific to the department that parallels the type of information in the college document. The current documents must be publicly available through a link to a document website provided to the Office of the senior vice president and provost (SVPP) and the Faculty Senate.

Please refer to the CDDR Committee for information about [department governance document requirements](#).

The budget of each academic department must be made available for inspection by the faculty of that department. It should include the department's budgetary resources and expenditures by categories, as well as funds received and expended in the preceding year and projected for the current year. The faculty of each department will decide the manner and detail in which the budgets of academic departments are prepared for disclosure and distribution.

Approved by Faculty Senate 2/10/1998
Approved by Faculty Senate 1/20/2009; approved by president and provost 1/27/2009
Approved by Faculty Senate 12/6/2011; approved by president and provost 12/12/2011

2.7 Policy for Academic Reorganizations

Faculty Senate approved this policy on January 13, 2004, and university administration approved this policy on January 23, 2004.

2.7.1 Policy for Reorganization of Academic Units

The reorganization of academic units (departments or colleges) is an academic activity that is part of university governance shared by faculty and administration. Reorganizations are carried out via a three-step process involving discussion, planning, and review.

2.7.2 Discussion

Reorganization begins with discussion of a problem or opportunity where the solution may include restructuring one or more units of the university. This discussion leads to a decision to formally explore the possibility of reorganization by developing a reorganization plan.

2.7.2.1 Decision to Begin Planning

The decision to begin planning is made with no prior assumption that reorganization will be the inevitable outcome. The decision to begin planning is made by the administrator (dean, SVPP, or president) of the unit involved in response to what they feel are compelling reasons. This decision is not to be made lightly, as planning requires time, effort, and resources.

2.7.2.2 Formalizing the Decision to Begin Planning

The decision to begin planning will include a determination of which units are involved, a description of the problem or opportunity at hand, and an estimated time frame for decision-making. The plan may or may not include a previously developed proposal for reorganization. When the decision is made to begin planning, faculty in all involved units and the Faculty Senate are to be notified by the appropriate administrator.

2.7.2.3 Faculty Senate Role

The faculty and/or administrators involved may seek input from the Faculty Senate in structuring the process to be followed. The Faculty Senate must monitor the planning process.

2.7.3 Planning

The goal of planning is the generation of a reorganization plan to resolve a problem or develop an opportunity. This proposed reorganization plan will include a recommendation about whether or not to reorganize. In the spirit of shared governance, substantial effort must be made to include members of all affected units in the planning process.

2.7.3.1 Content of the Plan

The plan will contain an academic plan that describes both the reorganization being proposed and an implementation plan that explains how the proposed reorganization will be implemented and what resources will be needed.

2.7.3.2 Time Frame for Implementation of the Plan

The reorganization plan will also include a description of the time frame for implementing the reorganization.

2.7.4 Review

Reorganization plans must be reviewed and approved before being put into action.

2.7.4.1 Review by Faculty

The proposed reorganization plan will be reviewed by the faculty in the affected units and by the department chairs and/or deans of these units. The faculty review of the plan must conclude with a vote on whether to recommend that the plan be adopted.

2.7.4.2 Review by Senior Vice President and Provost

After the vote by the involved faculty and the review by the administrators, the plan must be reviewed by the SVPP, whether or not the faculty vote is favorable. After reviewing the plan, the SVPP shall take one of the following actions:

- **Return the plan to the unit(s).**
The SVPP may send the plan back to the affected units for further review and/or revision.
- **Reject the plan.**
The SVPP may reject the plan and terminate the process, leaving the existing unit(s) in place.
- **Submit the plan to the Faculty Senate.**
The SVPP may submit the plan to the Faculty Senate for review with a recommendation that it be approved.

2.7.4.3 Review by Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate must review the plan as submitted by the SVPP. The senate's review may include discussions with the faculty and/or administrators in the unit(s) and/or with the SVPP. The senate may request further information and/or clarification from the SVPP about the plan and their recommendation. The senate must complete its review and take action within the normal senate time frame of two meetings after receiving the plan. After completing its review, the senate must take one of the following actions:

- **Return the plan to the Senior Vice President and Provost.**
The senate may return the proposal to the SVPP with a recommendation that they consider revisions or reconsider rejecting the proposal.
- **Submit the plan to the university president.**
The senate may submit the plan to the university president with a recommendation that it be approved.

2.7.4.4 Review by President

After reviewing the recommendations of the SVPP and the Faculty Senate, the university president shall take one of the following actions:

- **Return the plan for further discussion.**
The president may return the plan for further discussion or revision.
- **Dismiss the plan.**
The president may dismiss the plan and terminate the process. This will leave the existing unit(s) in place.
- **Submit the plan to the Board of Regents.**
The president may submit the plan to the Board of Regents with a recommendation that it be approved. Final approval of the proposed reorganization rests with the Board of Regents.

2.7.5 Implementation and Follow-up Review

After receiving the Board of Regents' approval, the plan must be implemented in a timely manner. The SVPP and/or appropriate dean(s) shall conduct follow-up reviews of units that have undergone reorganization.

2.8 Policy for Renaming Academic Units

2.8.1 Renaming to Modify Description of Scope of Academic Unit

The renaming of academic units (departments, interdepartmental and interdisciplinary programs, schools, or colleges) to modify the description of the academic fields encompassed by the unit is an academic activity that is part of university governance shared by faculty and administration. Renaming is carried out via a multi-step process involving discussion, planning, and review.

2.8.1.1 Discussion and Planning

The decision to begin the process of renaming an academic unit can be made by the faculty in the unit or the administrator (dean, SVPP, president) who is responsible for the unit. The goal in planning a renaming is to develop a rationale for the proposed name change and to seek input from appropriate stakeholders. The proposed renaming plan will include a suggested new name and a justification supporting the change. In the spirit of shared governance, substantial effort must be made to include all members of the affected unit in the planning process.

2.8.1.2 Faculty Evaluation and Vote

The proposed renaming plan will be reviewed by the faculty in the affected unit and the faculty review of the plan will conclude with a vote on whether or not to recommend the name change. If the majority faculty vote is no, the plan will not go forward. If the plan involves renaming a department or school, the administrator of the unit will present the plan along with the positive vote of the faculty to the dean for consideration. The dean will

add their recommendation and submit the plan (including the positive faculty vote) to the SVPP. If the plan involves renaming a college, the dean will submit the plan with the positive vote of the college faculty to the SVPP.

2.8.1.3 Review by Senior Vice President and Provost

After reviewing the plan and recommendation of the dean, the SVPP may take one of the following actions:

- **Return the plan to the college.**
The SVPP may send the plan back to the college for further review and/or revision.
- **Reject the plan.**
The SVPP may reject the plan and terminate the process, leaving the existing name in place.
- **Submit the plan to the Faculty Senate.**
The SVPP may submit the plan to the Faculty Senate for a review with a recommendation that it be approved.

2.8.1.4 Review by Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will review the plan as submitted by the SVPP. The senate's review will begin in the Executive Board and may include discussions with the faculty and/or administrators in the unit. The senate may request further information and/or clarification from the SVPP about the plan and about their recommendation. The senate's review will conclude with an advisory vote and recommendation to the president.

Approved as amended by the Faculty Senate on 5/6/14; by the SVPP on 6/1/14; and by the University President on 6/16/14.

2.8.1.5 Review by President

After reviewing the plan and the recommendation of the Faculty Senate, the president may pass the recommendation on to the Board of Regents for final approval or may reject the plan.

2.8.2 Renaming to Reflect a Philanthropic Gift

Appending a name to an academic unit as a result of a philanthropic gift is within the purview of the university president. The faculty of the unit will be informed of and provide advice to the president prior to the naming or renaming of the unit. That advisory process respects the confidential and time sensitive nature of discussions and negotiations associated with the request, acceptance, and stewardship of a major philanthropic gift to the university. In addition, the naming or renaming process must be consistent with other policies of the Board of Regents, the Iowa State University Foundation, and Iowa State.

2.9 Definitions

This section defines terminology used throughout this document.

2.9.1 Days

In all references to "days" in this document, the reference must be to working days, that is, the days university offices are open for business. When "days" are referenced regarding appeals, disputes, and complaints, this excludes the week of spring break; the week of Thanksgiving break; and a week within the university's winter break beginning with the official holidays in December and ending with the New Year holiday, and those days in between.

Approved by Faculty Senate (December 7, 2010); by president and provost (January 18, 2011).

Approved by the Faculty Senate 4/3/18, the Senior Vice President and Provost 4/5/18, and the ISU President 4/8/18.

Section 2.9 Approved by the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (April 10, 2023); by the President (April 18, 2023).

Chapter 3. Appointment Policies and Procedures	15
3.1 Appointment Policies	15
3.1.1 Summer and Winter Session Effort	16
3.1.1.1 Summer Session Effort	16
3.1.1.2 Winter Session Effort.....	16
3.1.2 Sponsored Support	17
3.1.3 Minimum Qualifications	17
3.1.4 Rank and Tenure Upon Appointment for Tenure Eligible Faculty	17
3.1.5 Rank Upon Appointment for Term Faculty	18
3.2 Appointment Procedures	18
3.3 Types of Appointments	18
3.3.1 Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments.....	19
3.3.1.1 Requests for Conversion to Part-time Appointment	19
3.3.1.2 Review of Policy for Part-time Appointments for Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty	20
3.3.2 Term Faculty Appointments.....	20
3.3.2.1 Guidelines for Term Faculty Percentages	21
3.3.2.2 Titles for Term Faculty Appointments	22
3.3.2.3 Ranks and Lengths of Term Faculty Appointments	23
3.3.2.3.1 Term Assistant/Lecturer Rank.....	23
3.3.2.3.2 Term Associate Professor Rank	24
3.3.2.3.3 Term Professor Rank.....	24
3.3.2.4 Role in Governance of Term Faculty	25
3.3.3 Non-salaried Faculty Appointments.....	25
3.3.3.1 Affiliates	25
3.3.3.2 Professional and Scientific Term Faculty Appointments	25
3.3.4 Visiting Appointments.....	26
3.3.5 Joint Academic Appointments	27
3.3.6 Faculty Titles No Longer Allowed for New Appointments	27
3.4 Position Responsibility Statement.....	27
3.4.1 General Description	27
3.4.1.1 Appointments Requiring a PRS	28
3.4.1.2 Intended Use of the PRS.....	28

3.4.2 The Form of the PRS	28
3.4.2.1 Required Elements	28
3.4.2.2 Individualization of Areas of Position Responsibility	29
3.4.3 Establishing and Maintaining Position Responsibility Statements.....	29
3.4.3.1 Procedures at Initial Appointment.....	29
3.4.3.1.1 Joint Appointments.....	30
3.4.3.2 Review and Modification of the Position Responsibility Statement.....	30
3.4.3.2.1 Formal Review of the PRS.....	30
3.4.4 Procedures for Mediating PRS Disputes.....	30
3.5 Nonrenewal and Termination of Appointments	31
3.5.1 Nonrenewal and Termination of Term Faculty and Pre-Tenured Tenure-Eligible Faculty	31
3.5.1.1 Nonrenewal of Term Faculty.....	31
3.5.1.2 Nonrenewal of Appointments of Pre-Tenured Tenure- Eligible Faculty.....	32
3.5.1.3 Termination of Term Faculty Appointments Due to Elimination of Academic Programs and Financial Exigency	32
3.5.2 Termination of Tenured Faculty, Tenure-Eligible, and Continuous Adjunct Faculty	32
3.5.2.1 Termination of Appointments Due to Adequate Cause	33
3.5.2.2 Termination of Appointment Due to Elimination of Academic Programs	33
3.5.2.3 Termination of Appointment Due to Financial Exigency ...	35

Chapter 3. Appointment Policies and Procedures

3.1 Appointment Policies

Appointments to the faculty are ordinarily made for the 9-month academic year. Twelve-month appointments are reserved for administrative positions and for persons whose responsibilities require year-round service. As professionals, faculty members and administrators arrange their own work schedules during their appointment periods so as to carry out their on-going responsibilities to the university. Persons on 12-month appointments are on duty the entire fiscal year, during which they accrue 24 days of paid vacation. Persons on 9-month appointments are on duty during the academic year, and they receive no paid vacation ([see Section 4.5.1](#)). Persons on 12-month, part-time

appointments are expected to maintain their responsibilities to the department, college, and university throughout the entire fiscal year. Persons on 9-month part-time appointments are expected to maintain their responsibilities to the department, college, and university throughout the entire academic year.

All 9-month faculty (with the exception of new hires in their first year) may elect the 12-month pay option to have payroll spread equally over the fiscal year, July 1-June 30.

3.1.1 Summer and Winter Session Effort

Faculty members with 9-month (academic year; August 16-May 15) appointments may be appointed for specific assignments in the summer session and/or winter session if warranted by the needs of the department and the faculty member agrees to the appointment. These appointments, ordinarily made on a year-by-year basis, are not guaranteed except as documented in a faculty member's contract at the time of appointment. Details of these appointments are described in the following sections.

3.1.1.1 Summer Session Effort

Faculty members with 9-month appointments who are engaged in institutional activities (e.g., teaching, grant-writing, extension/outreach, or service) while on summer appointment, in addition to the academic year, may be paid up to a total of eleven months from general (state) funds during the fiscal year. Regardless of funding source, summer salary is based on the individual's 9-month salary for the respective fiscal year. Summer appointments on or after July 1 are at the new academic year rate of pay.

Nine-month faculty members who teach during the summer session may receive pay for the session based on a collegiate policy applying a formula that may include a flat rate with incremental increases dependent on enrollment. Details of collegiate summer session salary policies will be communicated by the college.

3.1.1.2 Winter Session Effort

Faculty members with 9-month appointments engaged in teaching during the winter session may do so with 1) a corresponding reduction in their normal spring semester teaching load, or 2) supplemental pay based on existing college policy. The option selected will be mutually agreed to by the faculty member and their department chair.

Supplemental pay received for teaching during the winter session will be based on a collegiate policy applying a formula that may include a flat rate with incremental increases dependent on enrollment. Details of collegiate winter session salary policies will be communicated by the college.

Unlike the summer session, supplemental salary received for teaching during the winter session does not affect the "up to a total of eleven months from general (state) funds during the fiscal year" pay policy.

Approved by Faculty Senate on 5/4/21; the senior vice president and provost on 5/20/21; and the university president on 5/20/21.

3.1.2 Sponsored Support

Faculty members with 9-month appointments who have secured sponsored support (i.e., externally funded research awards) may have salary charged during the academic year on the sponsored project as long as the effort and salary charges are consistent. To ensure compliance with [Effort Reporting and Certification Policy](#) of Iowa State University of Science and Technology, charges to any federally sourced or state sponsored project must match the effort expended. Summer research appointments on sponsored support may be paid up to a total of three summer months except for specific restrictions that may be imposed by external granting agencies.

3.1.3 Minimum Qualifications

As a major land grant university, Iowa State University of Science and Technology maintains high standards for the qualifications of individuals hired as faculty members (tenured, tenure-eligible, and term). Candidates for faculty positions are expected to have outstanding qualifications in their fields of expertise. Normally these will include the highest/terminal academic degree in the discipline and a record of accomplishments that indicates their suitability to be a faculty member.

Because qualifications vary in different disciplines, each department must have a statement of the minimum qualifications for faculty candidates. This statement must be reviewed and approved by the college. Candidates who do not meet these minimum standards will not be considered for a faculty appointment.

Each college shall have a procedure for departments to seek a waiver for a candidate who does not have the stated minimum qualifications. The dean of the college may recommend to the senior vice president and provost (SVPP) that a waiver be granted.

3.1.4 Rank and Tenure Upon Appointment for Tenure Eligible Faculty

Initial appointments may be made to any of the academic ranks: assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Appointment to the rank of assistant professor may be for a period of four years or less, with the option of renewal for a period up to three years. Initial appointment to the rank of associate professor may be made either for a specified term or it may be continuous, thereby granting the individual academic tenure. Initial appointment to the rank of professor must be continuous, thereby granting the individual academic tenure. Appointments to tenured positions are made only after consultation and approval of the dean of the college and the SVPP.

Departments will advertise for full-time tenure-eligible or tenured positions and must have funding for a full-time hire. Advertisements will include information about university policies for flexible and part-time appointments. At the request of the faculty member, the department chair may appoint the new faculty member on a term or permanent part-time

tenure-eligible or tenured basis. After an initial permanent part-time appointment, increases in the appointment are not guaranteed; however, they may be negotiated via request by the faculty and approval by the department chair. ([See Section 3.3.1.1](#))

3.1.5 Rank Upon Appointment for Term Faculty

Initial appointments may be made to any of the academic ranks: assistant professor (or lecturer), associate professor, or professor. Departmental/program faculty consultation is required for appointment of term faculty. The consultation procedures must be specified in departmental/program governance documents. If circumstances prevent obtaining faculty consultation, the chair may make a one-year term appointment. Reappointment beyond one year requires faculty consultation as described in the pertinent governance document. The faculty of a department/program may delegate their consultation role to the department chair by a formal vote. Such delegation should be reviewed at the time of reappointment or appointment of a department chair.

Approved by Faculty Senate 12/6/2011; approved by president and provost 12/12/2011

Approved by Faculty Senate on 4/3/2012; approved by president and provost on 4/10/2012.

Approved and revised by the Faculty Senate on 3/7/2017; approved by the senior vice president and provost on 3/10/2017; and by the university president on 3/15/2017.

3.2 Appointment Procedures

The chair initiates a proposal for a new appointment after consultation with the members of the department. Upon receipt of approval from the dean(s) and the SVPP, the department follows university search procedures. For more information about appointment procedures, see [Hiring and Employment Policy](#) and [Affirmative Action](#).

When a candidate has been identified for the appointment, the chair specifies the conditions of appointment in an Offer Letter, which must be approved by the dean and, in the case of a tenured or tenure-eligible appointment, by the SVPP. Approval must also be obtained from [University Human Resources](#) confirming that the required search procedures have been followed in filling the position. The stipulated conditions include the academic rank, salary for the first year (in the case of new appointment), the ending date of the probationary period if one is established, the date by which a notification of intent not to renew is to be given if the appointment is renewable, and any special factors that apply to the appointment.

Subsequently, the candidate who was offered the appointment signs the letter electronically, indicating acceptance of the appointment with the specified conditions.

3.3 Types of Appointments

Faculty Appointments are made as tenured/tenure-eligible ([Section 3.3.1](#)) or as term faculty ([Section 3.3.2](#)). Both types of appointments include ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Term faculty also include the rank of lecturer.

3.3.1 Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments

Tenured and tenure-eligible appointments are regularly budgeted positions at any rank and account for most faculty appointments. Tenure-eligible faculty are appointed for a specified period of time. Notice of intent not to renew must be given according to the deadlines specified in [Section 3.5](#). 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 it 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 the university's open search policy.

3.3.1.1 Requests for Conversion to Part-time Appointment

Requests for conversion from full-time to part-time appointments may only be initiated by tenured or tenure-eligible faculty with either 12-month or 9-month 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.

In such cases, a new Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) ([see Section 3.4](#)) will be negotiated by the faculty member and department chair. Part-time appointments can be made for any percentage from fifty percent or greater of a full appointment. Only in unusual circumstances and only for tenured faculty will appointments less than fifty percent FTE be considered.

The length of non-permanent part-time appointments may be made in one-half year segments that may either be consecutive or non-consecutive for no more than two calendar years. During the duration of a part-time non-permanent appointment, terms of the appointment will only be changed via the agreement of the faculty member, department chair, and dean. At the end of any term, the part-time appointment may be continued by agreement of the faculty member, department chair, and dean. Faculty may request permanent conversion to a part-time appointment, subject to approval by the department chair and dean.

The reasons for a change in the percentage of appointment should be clearly stated in the request and may include personal or professional issues, including work/life balance. The department chair should make a careful assessment of the needs of the department and work with the faculty member requesting the part-time appointment to facilitate this whenever possible. The period for which this part-time appointment is granted must be clearly stated in the revised Letter of Intent. For non-permanent appointments, each agreement will specify the date on which the faculty member returns to full-time.

If the faculty member and the department chair do not reach agreement on a change in appointment, the faculty member may request assistance from the chair of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee, the Ombuds Office, the dean, or the SVPP. Disagreements about changes in the PRS should be handled according to [Section 3.4.4](#).

Service responsibilities for faculty on part-time appointments are generally seen as proportional to their appointments. Faculty on such appointments are not excused from regular institutional service and university commitments because of the part-time appointments.

Faculty on part-time tenure-eligible or tenured appointments remain eligible for benefits, including retirements and medical and dental benefits as provided by university benefit plans. Office and laboratory space may be adjusted with part-time appointments.

A faculty member's tenure is assumed to be full-time as long as the part-time appointment has a stated term. When a permanent conversion to part-time appointment takes place, the tenure is for a partial appointment.

Approved by Faculty Senate Executive Board (November 1, 2005); Faculty Senate (December 6, 2005); Faculty Senate Executive Board (April 18, 2006); Faculty Senate (April 25, 2006); provost and president (July 11, 2006). Editing and revision approved by Faculty Senate Executive Board (December 5, 2006) and Faculty Senate (December 12, 2006).

3.3.1.2 Review of Policy for Part-time Appointments for Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty

The policy on part-time appointments for tenure-eligible and tenured faculty must be reviewed six years after it is adopted. It will remain in effect unless explicitly amended by the Faculty Senate and university administration.

Approved by the Faculty Senate December 12, 2006

3.3.2 Term Faculty Appointments

Term faculty are those individuals employed by Iowa State who hold limited term, full, or part-time renewable appointments that are not eligible for tenure and are subject to approval by the department, college, and Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. Term faculty hold positions which have roles involved with the university's missions of instruction, clinical practice, research, extension, and/or outreach, and perform a range of professional duties at the university. These appointments will normally be nine months. The responsibilities of term faculty members are defined in their individual PRS within the guidelines outlined in [Section 3.3.2.2](#). Positions that primarily perform administrative functions instead of faculty responsibilities are not permitted. Persons holding term appointments are eligible to be named to the Graduate Faculty in accordance with Graduate College procedures.

As members of the General Faculty, all term faculty have full rights of academic freedom and participation in shared governance. The PRS must not violate the faculty member's academic freedom. If the parties agree to more specific language beyond a general description of areas of position responsibilities, that specific language must not be understood to be a checklist or constraint on the faculty member's freedom to choose areas and methods of inquiry appropriate to the discipline.

Term faculty are subject to appointment, evaluation, renewal, advancement, termination, and conduct consistent with the *Faculty Handbook* and with other university policies. A formal search that follows the open search policy is required to fill an open term faculty position. Tenured, tenure-eligible, and term faculty must all be allowed to be involved in the search process, review of applications and credentials, final recommendations for hiring, and determination of rank consistent with the department's documented standards for conducting faculty searches. Circumstances under which searches do not require faculty involvement are described in [Section 3.1.4](#).

(For evaluation, renewal, and advancement policies of term faculty appointments, see [Section 5.4](#))

3.3.2.1 Guidelines for Term Faculty Percentages

Iowa State subscribes to American Association of University Professors (AAUP) guidelines and standards for part-time and term faculty, including the AAUP recommendation that part-time and term faculty appointments be limited to no more than 15% of the total instruction within the university, and no more than 25% of the total instruction within any given department. An optimal term faculty teaching goal should be discussed by faculty within each department, identified by each department chair in consultation with their dean, and approved by the SVPP. If the term faculty teaching goal is above 25%, then a careful and clear justification should be stated. If the term faculty percent is higher or becomes higher in subsequent years than the established goal, this then initiates the need for discussion among department faculty, chair, dean, and the SVPP. A Departmental Responsibility Statement must be submitted by each department chair to their respective dean once every three years which reports term faculty percentages.

Additionally, each dean shall identify a healthy and optimal term faculty teaching percentage goal within their college based on the reports from their department chairs and with approval of the SVPP. If the average college goal term faculty percent is above 20%, careful and clear justification should be stated. If the college term faculty percent is higher or becomes higher in subsequent years than their established goal, then this initiates evaluation and discussion among the college faculty caucus, the dean of that college, and the SVPP. A College Responsibility Statement must be submitted by each dean to the SVPP once every three years.

Each department and college should report the maximum percentage of all student credit hours (SCH), section credits (SC), or course sections (CS) instructed by term faculty. Every

three years, the SVPP shall provide the College Responsibility Statements to the Faculty Senate Faculty Development and Administrative Relations (FDAR) Council including any justification or explanation for review. Additionally, the SVPP shall continue to keep the Faculty Senate apprised of department, college, and university term faculty percentages annually. Optimal target for each department and college should be included in this annual report to the Faculty Senate.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/21/15; by the senior vice president and provost on 6/16/15; and by the university president on 7/20/15.

Amended and approved by Faculty Senate (April 10, 2007).

Revised and approved by Faculty Senate (January 15, 2008); by provost and president (January 23, 2008).

Approved by Faculty Senate (March 8, 2011); by provost and president (March 22, 2011).

3.3.2.2 Titles for Term Faculty Appointments

Departments must appoint term faculty using one of the following titles, appropriate to the faculty member's discipline, and that reflects the nature of the work done by the term faculty member. Term faculty rank appointments will be based on the faculty member's documented professional and academic experience and performance. Advancement for all term faculty must follow the policy described in [Section 5.4.1.3](#).

- **Teaching faculty title and ranks** are lecturer, assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and teaching professor. Teaching faculty hold positions through which they generally contribute to the teaching mission of the university. All teaching faculty will devote at least 75% of their time to instruction, advising, curriculum coordination, and other responsibilities related to the teaching mission. In addition, such appointments may include scholarly achievement and institutional or professional service, or any other responsibilities as identified in the PRS. The title of lecturer is used for early career teaching faculty with contracts of one year or less, while assistant teaching professor is for teaching faculty on multi-year contracts who have not advanced in rank.
- **Practice faculty title and ranks** are assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, and professor of practice. Professor of practice faculty will have significant relevant professional experience outside of academia that qualify them to contribute to instruction and/or advising. All professor of practice faculty will devote at least 75% of their time to teaching in their area of expertise and related institutional and professional service. In addition, such appointments may include scholarly achievement and institutional or professional service, or any other responsibilities as identified in the PRS.
- **Clinical faculty title and ranks** are clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor. All clinical faculty will devote at least 75% of their time to providing or overseeing the delivery of professional services to individual patients or clients, and to teaching students, residents, or fellows of the university at the undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate level. They are expected

to integrate the delivery of their professional services with their teaching. Clinical titles may be appropriate in a broad range of disciplines where the delivery of professional clinical service is integral to the academic function.

- **Research faculty title and ranks** are research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor. Research faculty will devote at least 80% of their effort to externally funded research, and they shall have the opportunity to move toward research independence. At least 10%, but no more than 20% of research faculty salary must be paid from the general fund. In order for research faculty to be eligible for reappointment, they must demonstrate research and scholarly productivity commensurate with tenure-stream faculty of the same rank and must demonstrate independence as appropriate for their rank in their field. Since research professors are expected to obtain the majority of their funding from external sources, the term appointments for research professors must be contingent upon the availability of external funding. However, if a term faculty research professor needs to be terminated before the end of their contract due to insufficient funding, the term-faculty member will be given a 3-month notice of the termination. During the 3 months, the faculty member's college will be responsible for covering any portion of the faculty member's salary not covered by external research grants or the faculty member's incentive account.
- **Adjunct faculty title and ranks** are adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, and adjunct professor. Adjunct faculty typically are not focused on one area of faculty responsibility such as teaching or clinical activities. Appointments under this category may be appropriate in facilitating the university's quest to hire and retain excellent faculty, including dual-career couples, as well as to carve out new areas of academic expertise and attract experts on extramural grants and contracts.

3.3.2.3 Ranks and Lengths of Term Faculty Appointments

The initial appointment of a term faculty member *at any rank* may be made from one semester to the limits outlined in the subsections that follow. At the conclusion of the initial term, reappointments must follow the guidelines outlined by rank with an exception for practice track faculty as noted in the next paragraph.

Many professors of practice track faculty are working or retired professionals, who are hired to teach a specific course (often just one) to share their professional expertise with students. Accordingly, practice track faculty may be appointed for terms of one semester up to the maximum length allowed by rank (see subsections that follow), regardless of previous employment history at Iowa State.

3.3.2.3.1 Term Assistant/Lecturer Rank

The assistant/lecturer rank is for faculty who have the potential to contribute significantly to the mission of the university as defined in their PRS. Additional specifications related to this rank are listed below.

- **Term lecturers** are appointed for a term of up to one year. Once a lecturer has completed three academic years of continuous employment, they shall transition to a term assistant teaching professor if renewed. Time in rank as a lecturer counts toward advancement to the associate rank and towards multi-year contracts as term assistant professors.
- **Term assistant professors** are appointed for a term of one to three years. Once a term assistant professor has completed three academic years of continuous employment at rank, subsequent terms will be for two or three years.
- **Assistant professors of practice** are appointed for terms of one semester up to three years.

These appointments require a notice of one year of intent not to renew except when the appointment is for one year or less, in which case a notice of three months is required.

3.3.2.3.2 Term Associate Professor Rank

The associate rank denotes a record of successfully contributing to the mission of the university as defined in the PRS or a record of contributions in the professional field and promise of further academic and professional development. Additional specifications related to this rank are listed below.

- **Term associate professors** are appointed for a term of three to five years. Shorter terms may only be issued under exceptional circumstances with the approval of the SVPP.
- **Associate professors of practice** may be appointed for terms of one semester up to five years.

These appointments require a notice of one year of intent not to renew except when the appointment is for one year or less, in which case a notice of three months is required.

3.3.2.3.3 Term Professor Rank

The professor rank is appropriate for term faculty who have proven their excellence in the primary responsibilities identified in their PRS and effectiveness in any other areas of their PRS, or who have demonstrated substantial contributions to their professional field.

Additional specifications related to this rank are listed below.

- **Term professors** are appointed for a term of three to seven years. Shorter terms may only be issued under exceptional circumstances with approval of the SVPP.
- **Professors of practice** are appointed for terms of one semester up to seven years.

These appointments require a notice of one year of intent not to renew except when the appointment is for one year or less, in which case a notice of three months is required.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 11/10/20; by the Senior Vice President and Provost on 11/19/20; and by the ISU President on 11/19/20.

3.3.2.4 Role in Governance of Term Faculty

As part of the general faculty, term faculty participate in faculty governance as defined by the *Faculty Handbook*. All term faculty will have a departmental home and a PRS. Each department hiring term faculty must include provisions defining instructional responsibilities, search and appointment processes, and review, renewal, and advancement procedures in its governance document consistent with the handbook.

3.3.3 Non-salaried Faculty Appointments

3.3.3.1 Affiliates

An affiliate faculty member is not an employee of the university. Affiliate appointments are unpaid, usually part-time appointments granted to persons who are typically employed elsewhere and who provide academic service to the university in furtherance of its research or graduate education mission. In some instances, the affiliate appointment formally recognizes services provided to the university as per a cooperative agreement with another governmental agency (e.g., USDA). Faculty rank will reflect scholarly qualifications equivalent to those of similar rank in the department.

Recommendation for the appointment is initiated within an academic department and must be approved by the faculty, department chair, and dean. Appointments may be made for a term of up to five years, and renewal is possible. The conditions of the appointment, including the extent to which the department will provide support services for the individual, are stated in a written Affiliation Agreement signed by both parties at the time of the appointment (this is in lieu of a PRS). An affiliate is not considered to be tenured, and time spent in affiliate status is not considered to be service in a probationary period leading toward tenure.

As a non-employee, an affiliate faculty member cannot be the instructor of record for a class. Furthermore, as a non-employee they may not be assigned research duties or responsibilities that would ordinarily be carried out by a person in a professional & scientific (P&S) or post-doctoral position. If a department desires to assign such responsibilities to a person on an affiliate appointment, that person's appointment status must be converted to an appropriate status by following the university's procedure for filling a faculty or P&S position.

Persons on affiliate appointments are subject to university and faculty policies.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 19, 2016; the Senior Vice President and Provost on May 2, 2016; and the ISU President on May 3, 2016.

3.3.3.2 Professional and Scientific Term Faculty Appointments

A person employed in a P&S position may also be appointed to term faculty positions by an academic department to carry out faculty responsibilities for that department. Individuals

holding a full or part-time P&S position may have no more than 30% of their total work responsibilities in teaching.

A broad range of P&S employees are granted faculty rank so that they can conduct faculty duties. When the faculty work undertaken is similar to that of a department's term faculty, the correlating appropriate title may be used in accordance with [Section 3.3.2.2](#) and [Section 3.3.2.3](#). 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.

3.3.4 Visiting Appointments

A visiting appointment can be unpaid or paid. Persons holding either unpaid or paid visiting appointments are subject to university and faculty policies.

An unpaid, visiting faculty appointee is not an employee of the university. The visiting appointment is ordinarily made to allow an academic, while in residence at Iowa State, to provide special input into the teaching or research program of any Iowa State academic department. An unpaid, visiting appointee cannot be the instructor of record for a class. The visitor is usually employed as a member of the faculty of another institution and is appointed at the rank held at that institution. A visitor may, however, also come from business, industry, or government, in which case the appointment is at a rank consistent with the individual's professional experience. Recommendation for the appointment is initiated within an academic department and must be approved by the faculty, department chair, and dean. The initial term of an unpaid visiting appointment is one year or less, with renewal possible for a second and final year. No notification of intent not to renew is required.

A paid, visiting faculty appointee is an employee of the university. Generally the visitor is performing services such as teaching at Iowa State. If the visitor is employed as a member of the faculty of another institution, then the rank offered at Iowa State should be similar to the rank held at the home institution. Recommendation for the appointment is initiated within an academic department and must be approved by the faculty, department chair, and dean. An employment background check is required for paid, visiting appointments. The initial term of a paid visiting appointment is one year or less, with renewal possible for a second and final year. No notification of intent not to renew is required. The person is not considered to be tenured at Iowa State, nor is the visiting appointment considered to be service in a probationary period leading to tenure. If, however, the individual is subsequently given a regular appointment following an open recruitment process, continuous time up to one year served in a visiting status may be credited toward completion of the probationary period. Persons holding a paid visiting appointment of one-half time (.5 FTE) or greater and for nine months duration may, at their option, participate in the university's benefits program.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 19, 2016; the Senior Vice President and Provost on May 2, 2016; and the ISU President on May 3, 2016.

3.3.5 Joint Academic Appointments

A faculty member may hold an appointment in more than one academic department. Initiation of such an appointment – which may be made either coincidental with, or subsequent to, the individual's original appointment – requires a Letter of Intent signed by the chairs of both departments, the dean or deans of the college(s) involved, and the SVPP. In approving the appointment, the second department should stipulate in writing the role the faculty member will play in that department, including the person's rights with respect to involvement in the governance of the department.

One of the 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. Recommendations for promotion and tenure are initiated and submitted by the faculty member's primary department, with the advice of the secondary department. Ordinarily, the faculty member's tenure resides in the primary department only. Joint appointments may involve joint budgeting, but the primary department may also fund the faculty member's entire salary. In the latter case, the appointment in the secondary department is sometimes referred to as a courtesy appointment. The PRS should clarify the expectations in each department.

3.3.6 Faculty Titles No Longer Allowed for New Appointments

The title “continuous adjunct” was employed in the past to extend certain adjunct appointments beyond seven years and subject to termination only for adequate cause ([Section 7.2](#)), elimination of academic programs ([Section 3.5.2.2](#)) or financial exigency ([Section 3.5.2.3](#)), lack of need for the role the person has been playing in the department, significant change in the nature of that role, or other circumstances related to the nature of the position within the department. No new appointments may be made using this title. Salaries for continuous adjunct faculty should be equitable with other faculty making similar contributions.

The titles senior lecturer, clinician, and senior clinician were used in the past for some term faculty appointments. No new appointments may be made using these titles.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on May 1, 2018; the Senior Vice President and Provost on July 19, 2018; and the University President on July 25, 2018.

3.4 Position Responsibility Statement

Evaluations of term, tenure-eligible/tenured faculty are based on the position responsibilities of faculty members and other activities that relate to faculty appointments. The results of all reviews must be shared with the individual faculty members.

3.4.1 General Description

The Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) describes the range of responsibilities undertaken by a faculty member. The PRS is written and approved by both the faculty

member and the department chair. Because responsibilities and duties change throughout faculty careers, the PRS must be reviewed and updated as necessary at intervals appropriate to the stages of faculty career development. Thus, the PRS allows for a flexible and individualized system of faculty review.

The PRS must not prevent or constrain justifiable changes to or developments within any area of a faculty member's position responsibilities. The PRS description itself should be general and include only the significant responsibilities of the faculty member that are important in evaluating faculty accomplishments, especially in the promotion and tenure process for tenure-eligible/tenured faculty or for advancement for term faculty.

The PRS must not violate the faculty member's academic freedom. If the parties agree to more specific language beyond a general description of areas of position responsibilities, that specific language must not be understood to be a checklist or constraint on the faculty member's freedom to choose areas and methods of inquiry appropriate to the discipline.

Because it outlines the expectations for faculty members in carrying out their duties in accordance with the public land-grant university mission of Iowa State, the PRS must be understood to be a public document.

3.4.1.1 Appointments Requiring a PRS

All faculty members with appointments governed by the *Faculty Handbook* as defined in [Section 3.3](#) must have a PRS, including university administrators who have faculty rank. If a university administrator has significant non-administrative responsibilities (especially research/creative activity, teaching, or outreach) carried out within an academic department of the university, they must have a PRS appropriate to their duties in that department. Department chairs will have a PRS, written by the department chair and the dean, describing the administrative and other departmental responsibilities of the position.

3.4.1.2 Intended Use of the PRS

As noted in [Chapter 5 Evaluation and Review](#), the PRS is referenced during all forms of faculty review. The PRS is particularly significant within the promotion and tenure process of tenure-eligible/tenured faculty or for advancement of term faculty. The PRS should allow both faculty members and their administrative and peer evaluators to understand the basis of the academic appointment and to place that into context with the promotion and tenure criteria. The descriptions should be brief but may include detail important to the department and/or faculty member.

3.4.2 The Form of the PRS

3.4.2.1 Required Elements

Every PRS should be a brief document and must include the following information:

- name of faculty member and 9-month or 12-month appointment

- title
- primary department (i.e., tenure home)
- secondary department (if applicable)
- description of areas of position responsibility
- signatures of the faculty member and department chair(s)
- signature date
- formal review date

Colleges may require additional statements or information to clarify the nature of faculty position responsibilities.

3.4.2.2 Individualization of Areas of Position Responsibility

Faculty responsibilities in a land-grant university are diverse. Examples of areas of position responsibility common to many faculty members include, but are not limited to: teaching, research/creative activity, extension, outreach, professional practice, clinical practice, professional service, and institutional service. The description of areas of position responsibility in the PRS should include whichever areas are applicable to the faculty member.

Because the PRS is used in evaluation, the goal of the PRS is to provide an individualized description of the expected responsibilities of each faculty member. The PRS will include a brief narrative describing the position responsibilities along with indication of the expected distribution of those responsibilities (e.g., expected proportion of effort or relative importance). Faculty members have different ranges of duties and responsibilities. The PRS description of the distribution of areas of position responsibility should reflect how the faculty member's distribution compares to those of other faculty in the same department or college. (For example, a faculty member who teaches six classes has a greater expected proportion of effort for teaching than a faculty member who teaches one class. With the greater assignment of teaching responsibilities, the evaluator gives greater weight to teaching for the faculty member with the greater number of classes, in accordance with evaluation procedures.) The responsibilities and their distribution should be compatible with satisfying or exceeding the expectations for promotion and tenure or advancement.

3.4.3 Establishing and Maintaining Position Responsibility Statements

3.4.3.1 Procedures at Initial Appointment

Within six weeks of the first day of work, the chair and the new tenure-eligible/tenured faculty member should agree on a PRS that is based on the job advertisement. Tenure-eligible/tenured faculty are expected to have substantive discussions with their chair in establishing their PRS. Term faculty will generally have an initial PRS with a narrower scope of duties. Upon initial appointment, most term faculty will sign a PRS indicating the specific duties for which they are hired. In all cases, the PRS will be signed and dated by

both parties. The signed and dated copy will be on file in the faculty member's Workday profile.

3.4.3.1.1 Joint Appointments

For faculty members with appointments in two departments (or a department and a program), a PRS will be written by the faculty member and the two chairs and will be signed and dated by all three parties. Each department and college involved will receive copies of those statements as indicated in [Section 3.4.2.2](#). For tenure-eligible/tenured faculty, the PRS will specify the primary department in which the faculty member's tenure resides or in which a tenure decision will be made. Because evaluations of faculty initiate in their primary department, changes and updates to the PRS will initiate in that primary department. Faculty members with joint appointments are expected to communicate with the chair in their secondary department or program to maintain a PRS signed by all three parties.

3.4.3.2 Review and Modification of the Position Responsibility Statement

The PRS will be subject to regular review by the faculty member and their chair, and allow for flexibility in responsibilities over time and for the changing nature of faculty appointments and faculty circumstances. Faculty members and their chairs may review the PRS and modify it (if appropriate) at any time. [Section 5.1.1.2](#) states that review of the PRS is to occur during the annual review meeting between the faculty member and the chair. The PRS should not be rewritten unless there is the expectation of a substantive change in the faculty member's position responsibilities. However, the faculty member and chair may rewrite and modify the PRS at any time. The PRS cannot be changed unilaterally by either the chair or the faculty member.

3.4.3.2.1 Formal Review of the PRS

Every PRS must specify a date for formal review. The review date should correspond with major action reviews for tenure-eligible/tenured faculty (preliminary review, promotion and tenure review, or post-tenure review) and with renewal and advancement for term faculty. During or immediately after the formal review, even if no changes are made, the PRS must be updated with a new formal review date and signed and dated by both parties. The faculty member's department(s) and college(s) must receive a copy of the updated PRS with signatures. Department governance documents may specify more frequent intervals for formal review of PRS, but departments are prohibited from conducting formal reviews less frequently than the intervals here specified.

3.4.4 Procedures for Mediating PRS Disputes

When both parties (the faculty member and the department chair) agree to the PRS, it will be signed by both parties and dated. However, if 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. This panel will consist of three faculty at equal rank or higher than the faculty member whose PRS is being disputed. Each party shall select one member of the panel. Unless the department decides otherwise, the

default policy for selecting the third member will be by faculty election in the department at the beginning of each year. [Departments who desire another method of obtaining the third member may choose one of the following: (a) a tenured faculty member who is chair of an elected departmental council; (b) a tenured faculty member who has been elected by the department to the promotion and tenure review committee and who chairs that committee; (c) a tenured faculty member who has been elected by the department to the post-tenure review committee and who chairs that committee.] The faculty members selected by the two parties will be selected at the time of the disagreement between those two parties.

Once the PRS Mediation Panel is formed, all parties will follow the steps below:

1. The party referring the matter to the panel will submit to the panel the faculty member's existing PRS, the text of the proposed PRS, an explanation of why the change is being sought (or is not acceptable), and the faculty member's curriculum vita.
2. The second party should provide a written explanation of why the proposed change is not acceptable (or is being sought).
3. The panel will review the materials that have been submitted, meet with both parties, and deliberate on the issue.
4. The panel will deliver a written opinion in a timely fashion (within two months) on how the disagreement should be resolved.
5. The faculty member and the department chair should then reconsider the matter to see if an agreement can now be reached based on the panel's recommendation.

If an agreement between the faculty member and the department chair does not emerge within ten days (see [Section 2.9.1](#) for a definition of "days"), the matter will be forwarded by the party disagreeing with the proposed change to the faculty member's college. Each college must have a mechanism in place to resolve these cases, which will be fair and equitable to both parties. Final authority rests with the dean.

Throughout the mediation process, the existing signed and dated PRS will remain in effect.

Approved as amended by the Faculty Senate 2/13/07.

Approved as amended by the Faculty Senate 11/10/15; by the Senior Vice President and Provost on 11/19/15; and by the ISU President on 11/30/15.

3.5 Nonrenewal and Termination of Appointments

3.5.1 Nonrenewal and Termination of Term Faculty and Pre-Tenured Tenure-Eligible Faculty

3.5.1.1 Nonrenewal of Term Faculty

The time by which notice of intent not to renew a term faculty appointment varies by rank and is specified in [Section 3.3.2.3](#).

3.5.1.2 Nonrenewal of Appointments of Pre-Tenured Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Written notice that a tenure-eligible faculty member is not to be renewed must be given to the faculty member at least twelve months in advance of the expiration of the appointment. A tenure-eligible faculty member being considered for reappointment must be given the opportunity, well in advance of the final decision, to present to the departmental committee charged with making the recommendation any evidence they believe may be relevant and helpful to their case.

A tenure-eligible faculty member who is not recommended for reappointment must be given an explanation of the action in an informal conference with the department chair and, if they request it, must be given a statement of reasons in writing. A faculty member who is denied reappointment can secure a review of the decision either through administrative channels or the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals if the faculty member believes that it results from improper procedure, or rests on grounds which violate academic freedom or constitutional rights, or is substantively arbitrary or capricious. In such appeal procedures, the burden of proof is on the faculty member.

Financial exigency or academic program elimination *per se* are not valid reasons for nonrenewal of tenure-eligible appointments. In case of academic program elimination or the declaration of financial exigency, the guidelines and procedures for the termination of tenure-eligible faculty appointments are described in [Section 3.5.2](#).

3.5.1.3 Termination of Term Faculty Appointments Due to Elimination of Academic Programs and Financial Exigency

Termination means the ending of a term appointment before the expiration of the appointment term. Whenever [Section 3.5.2.2](#) or [Section 3.5.2.3](#) are invoked, faculty on term appointments can be terminated for elimination of an academic program or financial exigency upon the giving of the following advanced written notice:

- three months for faculty on one-year appointments
- six months for faculty on two-year appointments
- one year for faculty with appointments of more than two years

During the period of appointment, faculty on term appointments will be given a written statement of reasons for termination and an opportunity to appeal involuntary termination. For more information, see [Chapter 9 Faculty Grievance Procedures](#).

3.5.2 Termination of Tenured Faculty, Tenure-Eligible, and Continuous Adjunct Faculty

The appointment of tenured faculty, tenure-eligible, and adjunct faculty with continuous appointments may be terminated for adequate cause, the elimination of an academic

program, or financial exigency. Additional reasons for which adjunct faculty with continuous appointments may be terminated are described in [Section 3.3.6](#).

The appointment of a faculty member with tenure will not be terminated in favor of retaining a faculty member without tenure, except in extraordinary circumstances. The procedures governing any termination must conform in all respects to the requirements of due process.

3.5.2.1 Termination of Appointments Due to Adequate Cause

For information on the process for termination of faculty appointments for adequate cause, see [Chapter 7 Faculty Conduct Policy](#).

3.5.2.2 Termination of Appointment Due to Elimination of Academic Programs

The rationale for the elimination of an academic program must be based primarily on academic or educational reasons (e.g., long-term decline in number of majors or graduates, loss of accreditation, or centrality to the university's mission) as determined by a committee of department or program faculty (see [Section 10.8.2](#)). Alternatives to eliminating academic programs should first be considered. These include (a) merging similar programs, (b) refocusing an existing program, and (c) reducing the size of the program.

The appointment of a tenured or continuous adjunct faculty member may be terminated as a result of elimination of programs for academic reasons, when such discontinuance has been approved by the Faculty Senate, the president of the university, and the Board of Regents, State of Iowa (in accordance with the Board of Regents program discontinuance procedures). An academic program typically means an undergraduate or graduate major approved for a bachelor or graduate degree by the Faculty Senate, university president, and Board of Regents.

After the senate has voted to eliminate an academic program, an *ad hoc* committee will be formed for the discontinued program to determine which faculty are associated with it. This committee will consist of four faculty appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Executive Board, as well as a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. At least two of the four faculty members must be sitting faculty senators, and no member may hold an appointment in the discontinued academic program or a department through which it was offered. A faculty member will be considered to be associated with the discontinued program if their teaching duties within that program are defined as instruction of undergraduate or graduate courses, serving as a major professor, or undergraduate advising as defined in their PRS. Faculty members who have teaching duties in two or more academic programs may be able to transfer to a continuing program if one of the programs with which they are associated is discontinued. For faculty who have continuous appointments that are not associated with an academic

program (e.g., in Extension), the elimination of their unit can result in the potential termination of their appointments, using the same process outlined in this policy.

After the discontinuance of an academic program has been approved by the Board of Regents, faculty members associated with it who hold continuous appointments will be given formal notice that their appointments may be terminated. A good-faith effort (as defined below) will be made to reassign faculty in one of two ways:

- If a department has more than one academic program, faculty associated with an eliminated program will be placed in another academic program in that department if that can be reasonably done. When transferred to another academic program within a department, the faculty member retains their rank, tenure status, and salary. If this transfer is not reasonable, a good-faith effort must be made to place an affected faculty member in an academic program outside the department where their professional services can be used effectively.
- If placed in an academic program outside their department, a faculty member's rank and tenure status will be retained, and compensation provided commensurate with that placement. The duties of a faculty member placed in another academic program do not have to be identical to those in the eliminated program. Whenever such a placement is made, a new PRS will need to be developed.

At a minimum, **the following are required for a good-faith effort.**

- The university and the faculty member must make a concerted effort to find a suitable position for the affected faculty member in an academic program in the same or another department.
- If a move to another academic program would be facilitated by a reasonable period of retraining, university support would be provided.
- If no suitable position can be found, the faculty member will be given formal notice of a terminal one-year appointment, or a mutually agreeable severance package.
- If the same or equivalent position held by a faculty member whose appointment has been terminated is created in the next three years in any academic program or unit, the terminated faculty member will have the right of first refusal of this position.

A faculty member may appeal a proposed transfer or termination resulting from the elimination of an academic program (see [Chapter 9 Faculty Grievance Procedures](#)). In such an appeal, the rationale for the elimination of an academic program cannot be considered or challenged. Appeals must be based on (a) how a determination was made that a faculty member's appointment was associated with the eliminated major, (b) whether the criteria for termination were properly applied in the individual case, and (c) the lack of the university's good faith effort to transfer the faculty member to another program.

3.5.2.3 Termination of Appointment Due to Financial Exigency

The appointment of a tenured, tenure-eligible, or continuous adjunct faculty member may be terminated in case of financial exigency that is demonstrable and bona fide and declared by the Board of Regents.

In any circumstance where the university president recommends, or is asked to recommend, to the Board of Regents whether financial exigency should be declared, the president (prior to making the recommendation) shall confer with the Faculty Senate and relevant administrative units on the following questions:

- Does a financial exigency exist?
- Are there any reasonable alternatives to declaring financial exigency?
- What will be the long-term impact on the institution of such a declaration?

If the Faculty Senate disagrees with the president's recommendation, the Faculty Senate's view must be sent to the Board of Regents for timely consideration.

Upon the declaration of financial exigency, if faculty positions will be affected, the SVPP shall develop a process for involvement of the Faculty Senate and relevant administrative units in the development of a reduction plan. The Faculty Senate must consider matters of educational policy, impact on the faculty, and faculty status. Subsequently the Faculty Senate will make timely recommendations to the SVPP on reductions.

When the reduction plan has been adopted, faculty with tenured, tenure-eligible, and continuous adjunct appointments that will be terminated must receive notice not less than twelve months prior to the effective date of termination.

The university and faculty member are expected to make a reasonable effort to transfer each tenured, tenure-eligible, or continuous adjunct faculty member whose position has been proposed for elimination to another college or department where their professional services may be used effectively. Reasonable efforts to identify alternative academic homes for potentially affected faculty will begin as part of the development of the reduction plan, and will continue for individual faculty members who have been given notice of termination through the notice period. If the same or equivalent position held by a faculty member whose appointment has been terminated is created in the next three years in any academic program or unit, the faculty member affected will have the right of first refusal of this position.

Faculty members may appeal actions affecting their appointments for reasons of financial exigency. See [Chapter 9 Faculty Grievance Procedures](#) for more information.

Approved by Faculty Senate (May 4, 2010); by executive vice president and president (May 24, 2010)

Chapter 4. Salaries and Benefits	36
4.1 Salary Policies and Procedures	36
4.1.1 Merit Increase	37
4.1.2 Promotion Increase	37
4.1.3 Funding for Term Research Appointments.....	37
4.2 Benefits	38
4.3 Retirement Programs	38
4.3.1 Phased Retirement Program.....	38
4.3.2 Other Retirement Programs.....	38
4.3.3 Post Retirement Employment.....	38
4.4 Resignation.....	38
4.5 Leave Policies	39
4.5.1 Vacations and Holidays	39
4.5.2 Sick Leave.....	40
4.5.3 Leave of Absence without Pay.....	40
4.5.4 Pregnancy Leave.....	40
4.5.5 Adoption Leave	40
4.5.6 Family and Medical Leave	40
4.5.7 Military Leave	41

Chapter 4. Salaries and Benefits

4.1 Salary Policies and Procedures

Faculty salaries are determined annually on a merit basis and reflect the annual review of faculty performance based on position responsibilities, market factors, and equity considerations. Within the limits of budgetary resources, every effort is made to maintain faculty salaries at a level competitive with those of similar universities throughout the country. Because Iowa State University of Science and Technology is a public institution, the salaries of all employees are a matter of public record.

The general procedure for initiating salary recommendations begins with the chair of a department or with others in-charge of the individual's work. In some departments, committees assist in the evaluation. The department's salary recommendations are then reviewed by the college dean, the senior vice president and provost (SVPP), and the university president before being submitted to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa for final approval. After the Board of Regents' approval, but not before, the department chair shall inform each faculty member in writing of their salary increase and the reasons for it.

Faculty members must be reviewed annually for performance and development on the basis of their Position Responsibility Statement (PRS). The evaluation will be based on scholarship and contributions in (a) teaching, (b) research/creative activities, (c) extension and/or professional practice, and (d) institutional service. For information about the PRS, see [Section 3.4](#).

Section 4.1 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/07/00.

4.1.1 Merit Increase

The following guidelines apply to faculty merit increases:

- Each faculty member's overall performance must be evaluated as either satisfactory or not satisfactory.
- Faculty receiving a rating of satisfactory must receive a salary increment equal to at least one-third of the percentage of the general salary increase.
- Departments may further subdivide those rated as satisfactory into ranked categories (e.g., good, superior, excellent) for purposes of further differentiation in terms of merit increase.
- Those rated as not satisfactory must receive an increase between zero and one-third of the budgeted general salary increase.
- The university president, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, may adjust the minimum percentage increase for satisfactory performance.

Additional performance, market, and equity increases may be given to individuals rated satisfactory.

4.1.2 Promotion Increase

Promotion to a higher academic rank is accompanied by a salary increase of a fixed amount. The amount of the promotional increase is determined annually by the administration, in consultation with the Faculty Senate. This increase is separate from, and in addition to, the merit increase.

4.1.3 Funding for Term Research Appointments

For a description of direct salary and benefits, see [Section 3.3.2.2](#). Start-up packages must be from sources other than tuition and state appropriations, including state appropriations for the Agriculture & Home Economics Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service. Exceptions will be allowed when short-term funding, up to a maximum of three years, is provided for salary and benefits only for a partner accommodation from centrally managed resources. Any other resources needed for start-up packages must come from external funds, including the following:

- Term research positions may be funded from grants, contracts or other sponsored sources, special project-specific appropriations from the federal, state, or local

government, the Ames Laboratory, and indirect cost revenues distributed to departments or research centers and/or institutes.

- Indirect costs captured from funded research must accrue to the research professor's home unit(s) in accordance with university policy. Reimbursable travel, conferences, and professional development expenses must be covered by grant funding. A share of generated indirect cost revenues may be used to defray such expenses consistent with unit procedures and criteria.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2008, by the university president and provost on February 15, 2008, and by the Board of Regents on May 1, 2008.

4.2 Benefits

New employees shall register with University Human Resources (UHR); this office administers payroll and benefits, including medical, dental, life and long-term disability, and retirement plans. Child care, employee assistance, and training and development programs are also available (contact [University Human Resources](#) for details). To view benefit-related policies, see [Personnel, Conduct and Human Relations](#).

4.3 Retirement Programs

4.3.1 Phased Retirement Program

Faculty members who have attained age 57 and have at least 15 years of consecutive service at Regent's institutions are eligible to negotiate with their departments a schedule of phasing into retirement. During the phasing period, the employee holds at least a 50% but not more than 65% appointment on a schedule that is mutually agreed upon between the department and the employee. Contact UHR for current details of the provisions and benefits of phased retirement.

4.3.2 Other Retirement Programs

Contact UHR for current details of the provisions and benefits of any other retirement programs.

4.3.3 Post Retirement Employment

Faculty members who have retired may be rehired by the university to fulfill defined responsibilities such as offering instruction or participating in specific research projects. For more information, see [Post Retirement Employment](#).

4.4 Resignation

A faculty member who wishes to resign from an appointment or does not plan to accept a renewal of a current appointment should notify their department chair in writing at the earliest opportunity to allow time for a suitable replacement to be found, generally not later than April 15.

A resignation should take effect the last day that the individual will be on duty. If circumstances require that a faculty member with a 12-month appointment resign before they have the opportunity to use all accrued vacation, a payment covering the value of the remaining vacation time may be made at the time of resignation.

A resignation of a faculty member with a 9-month appointment will ordinarily be effective as of May 15 of the current academic year.

4.5 Leave Policies

Faculty Professional Development Assignments (FPDA) and other faculty development programs that may involve absence from campus for a period of time are considered faculty development opportunities. For more information, see [FPDA Program Overview](#) or [Faculty Development](#). For all other leave programs, see or contact [UHR](#).

4.5.1 Vacations and Holidays

Twelve-month faculty accrue vacation on a monthly basis at the rate of two days for each full month of employment. This includes the accrual of two personal holidays per year. Vacation may accrue to twice the annual entitlement.

Faculty with a 9-month appointment do not accrue vacation. They are required to be on duty during the fall and spring semesters on those days when classes are in session and the two working days before the first day of classes of fall and spring semesters. Faculty are expected to manage their professional responsibilities as they deem appropriate, and typically are active throughout the academic year beyond the constraints of formal work hours and work days. Faculty with a 9-month appointment may arrange their responsibilities so that they are absent from campus for personal reasons for limited periods when classes are in session during the fall and spring semesters. Specific absence days are to be established by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department chair.

Faculty members, regardless of appointment base, are not required to be on duty during the following official university holidays: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, the Friday after Thanksgiving, Christmas, and one additional day each year determined by the university president and the Board of Regents. (The latter is in addition to the two personal holidays mentioned in the first paragraph above.)

For more information about holidays and vacation, see [Vacation Time Off](#) and [Holidays](#).

Section 4.5.1 was approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Board on 2/08/91. Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/4/21; the senior vice president and provost on 5/20/21; and the university president on 5/20/21.

4.5.2 Sick Leave

All faculty members, regardless of appointment base, accrue sick leave at the rate of one and one-half days for each full month of employment, with no upper limit on the amount of unused sick leave that may be accrued. Twelve-month faculty who have accumulated a minimum of 30 days of sick leave may elect to have one-half day (four hours) added to their accrued vacation account for any month that no sick leave has been used in lieu of the accumulation of 12 hours of sick leave for the month, up to a limit of 12 additional days (96 hours) of vacation. For details, see [Sick Time Off](#).

4.5.3 Leave of Absence without Pay

Leave of absence without pay may be granted for research or similar professional activity or for compelling personal reasons. A request for a leave is initiated by the faculty member and requires the approval of the chair, college dean, and SVPP.

The request should include the reasons for the leave and, in the case of leave for professional reasons, should describe the benefit to the university upon the individual's return. Approval of leave for professional activity is contingent on the professional benefits to the individual and the university, and the availability of qualified replacements.

Leave may be granted for a maximum of one year. Requests for an extension of a leave beyond one year are considered to be exceptional and are only granted when the extended leave is in the long term interests of academic programs at Iowa State.

Leaves of absence are not ordinarily granted to faculty who have accepted new permanent employment nor to untenured faculty in their terminal year of employment.

4.5.4 Pregnancy Leave

The time during which an employee is unable to work because of a disability caused by or contributed to pregnancy, miscarriage, abortion, childbirth, and recovery will be treated as sick leave. If an employee's accumulated sick leave is insufficient to cover the period of disability, they will, at their request, be granted a leave of absence without pay for the duration of that period. Any request for absence that is beyond the period of disability will be considered as leave of absence without pay or as vacation.

4.5.5 Adoption Leave

A newly adoptive parent is entitled to five days paid leave chargeable to accrued sick leave.

4.5.6 Family and Medical Leave

For information about family and medical leave, see [Family and Medical Leave Act](#), including how to apply for such a leave, contact [UHR](#).

4.5.7 Military Leave

Any member of the staff inducted into extended active duty in the military services will be granted a leave of absence and will suffer no loss of pay from the university for 30 days of such leave. Graduate assistants and 9-month personnel should schedule annual military leave during the summer months, when they are not on university duty.

Chapter 5. Evaluation and Review.....	46
5.1 Evaluation and Review of Faculty.....	46
5.1.1 Evaluation of Faculty Members.....	46
5.1.1.1 General Policies and Procedures.....	46
5.1.1.2 Annual Reviews	47
5.1.1.2.1 Action Plan.....	48
5.1.1.2.2 Initiation of Action Plan Mediation	48
5.1.1.2.2.1 Purpose of the Action Plan Mediation Committee.....	48
5.1.1.2.2.2 Outcome of Review by an Action Plan Mediation Committee	48
5.1.1.2.2.3 Selection of the Action Plan Mediation Committee	48
5.1.1.2.2.4 Action Plan Mediation Committee Review Process	49
5.1.1.2.2.5 Timeline of the Action Plan Mediation Process.....	49
5.1.1.2.2.6 Prior Action Plans.....	50
5.1.1.2.2.7 Concurrent Reviews.....	50
5.1.1.3 Preliminary Review of Probationary Faculty.....	50
5.1.1.4 Promotion and/or Tenure Review	51
5.1.1.5 Joint Appointment	51
5.1.2 Evaluation of Department Chairs	51
5.1.3 Evaluation of College and Central Administrators	51
5.2 Promotion and Tenure of Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments.....	51
5.2.1 Overview of Tenure.....	52
5.2.1.1 Eligibility for Tenure	53
5.2.1.2 Tenure for Faculty Members in Administrative Positions .	53
5.2.1.3 Terms of Probationary Service	54
5.2.1.4 Extension of the Probationary Period	55
5.2.1.4.1 Extending the Probationary Period for the Birth of a Child, Adoption or the Foster Care Placement of a Child	56
5.2.1.4.2 Extending the Probationary Period for Significant Care Responsibilities	56
5.2.1.4.3 Extension of the Probationary Period for Medical Condition of the Faculty Member	57
5.2.1.4.4 Extension of the Probationary Period for Other Reasons	57

5.2.1.4.5 Extension of the Probationary Period for Faculty on Part-time Appointment.....	57
5.2.1.5 Credit for Prior Service	57
5.2.1.6 Criteria for Awarding Tenure	58
5.2.2 Standards for Promotion and Tenure.....	58
5.2.2.1 Introduction.....	58
5.2.2.2 Scholarship.....	59
5.2.2.2.1 Meaning of Scholarship	59
5.2.2.3 Teaching.....	61
5.2.2.3.1 Scholarly Teaching.....	61
5.2.2.3.2 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.....	63
5.2.2.4 Research / Creative Activities	64
5.2.2.5 Extension / Professional Practice	65
5.2.2.6 Institutional Service.....	66
5.2.3 Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure	66
5.2.3.1 Assistant Professor.....	66
5.2.3.2 Associate Professor and/or Tenure	66
5.2.3.3 Professor.....	67
5.2.4 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review.....	67
5.2.4.1 Voting Procedure	68
5.2.4.2 Department Review	68
5.2.4.2.1 Promotion and Tenure Document.....	69
5.2.4.2.2 Joint Appointment Procedures.....	69
5.2.4.2.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee	70
5.2.4.2.4 Department Chair.....	70
5.2.4.2.5 Notification Procedure	70
5.2.4.2.6 Right to Review Factual Information.....	71
5.2.4.2.7 Treatment of Late-Developed Information	71
5.2.4.3 College Review	71
5.2.4.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Document.....	71
5.2.4.3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee	72
5.2.4.3.3 College Deans.....	72
5.2.4.4 University Review.....	72
5.2.4.4.1 Senior Vice President and Provost.....	72

5.2.4.4.2 President	72
5.2.4.4.3 Final Notification	73
5.2.4.4.4 Effective Dates for Promotions	73
5.2.4.4.5 Appeals.....	73
5.3 Documentation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure	74
5.3.1 Candidate Responsibilities	74
5.3.1.1 Promotion and Tenure Vita.....	74
5.3.1.2 Candidate Information.....	74
5.3.1.3 Scholarship.....	74
5.3.1.4 Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities	75
5.3.1.4.1 Teaching	75
5.3.1.4.2 Research / Creative Activities.....	75
5.3.1.4.3 Extension / Professional Practice.....	75
5.3.1.4.4 Institutional Service	76
5.3.1.4.5 Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Activities	76
5.3.2 Faculty Portfolio	76
5.3.2.1 Scholarship.....	76
5.3.2.2 Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities	76
5.3.2.2.1 Teaching	76
5.3.2.2.2 Research/Creative Activities.....	77
5.3.2.2.3 Extension/Professional Practice.....	77
5.3.2.2.4 Institutional Service	77
5.3.3 Department and Department Chair Responsibilities.....	77
5.3.3.1 Letters of Evaluation (Provided by the Department).....	77
5.3.3.1.1 Letters of External Peer Evaluation from Professionals in the Field, outside the Institution	78
5.3.3.1.2 Letters of Internal Peer Evaluation from Iowa State Department, College, and University Colleagues	78
5.3.3.2 Evaluations (Provided by the Department and Chair).....	78
5.3.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy.....	79
5.3.4.1 Post-Tenure Review Timeline	79
5.3.4.2 Post-Tenure Review Outcomes	80
5.3.4.3 Role of the Department Chair	80
5.3.4.4 Role of the College Dean	81

5.3.4.5 Role of the SVPP.....	81
5.3.4.6 Post-Tenure Review Guiding Principles	81
5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty	
Appointments	82
5.4.1 Evaluation and Renewal of Term Faculty	82
5.4.1.1 Annual Review	82
5.4.1.2 Review for Renewal of Appointment	82
5.4.1.3 Review for Advancement	82
5.4.1.3.1 Introduction	83
5.4.1.3.2 Advancement and Credit for Prior Service.....	83
5.4.1.3.3 Documentation for Advancement Review	84
5.4.1.3.4 Department Review.....	84
5.4.1.3.5 College Review	84
5.4.1.3.6 University Review	85
5.4.1.3.7 Appeals of Advancement Decisions	85
5.4.1.3.8 Effective Dates for Advancement	85
5.4.1.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Professional and	
Scientific Term Faculty Appointments	85
5.4.2 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Continuous Adjunct	
Appointments	85
5.4.3 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Visiting	
Appointments	86
5.4.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Affiliates	86
5.5 Evaluation of a College Dean	86
5.5.1 Policy for Faculty Involvement in Evaluation	86
5.5.2 Schedule	86
5.5.3 Procedures for Faculty Involvement.....	87
5.6 Evaluation of a Teaching Assistant.....	87
5.7 Review of Central Administrators.....	88
5.7.1 Purposes.....	88
5.7.2 Scope of Review Program.....	88
5.7.3 Preparatory Office Self-Study	89
5.7.4 Appointment of Review Committee.....	90
5.7.5 General Review Procedures	90
5.7.5.1 Schedule	90

5.7.5.2 Review Procedures.....	91
5.7.5.3 Review Committee Reports.....	91

Chapter 5. Evaluation and Review

5.1 Evaluation and Review of Faculty

Approved by Faculty Senate (3/24/98)
 Approved by the General Faculty (5/1/98)
 Incorporating editing and revisions as approved by
 Faculty Senate Executive Board (9/18/98)
 Approved by the Faculty Senate (10/13/98)
 Approved by Provost and university president (11/2/98)
 Approved by Board of Regents (12/3/98)

Note: In this document the term "department" is understood to include any academic unit designated as a "school."

5.1.1 Evaluation of Faculty Members

Reflecting the land-grant mission of Iowa State University of Science and Technology, faculty engage in teaching; research, creative, and/or innovation activities; extension, entrepreneurship, and/or professional practice; institutional service; and/or other areas as designated by their Position Responsibility Statement (PRS). All faculty have the responsibility of furthering high-quality programs and initiatives and are fully accountable for their performance of these responsibilities. Iowa State provides intellectual and institutional leadership regarding equity, diversity and inclusion and strives to be a welcoming, inclusive environment of mutual respect for its members of all backgrounds and identities, consistent with a key institutional strategic goal. All faculty are encouraged to engage in equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives that advance the land-grant mission of Iowa State and to document and acknowledge these activities.

5.1.1.1 General Policies and Procedures

For purposes of evaluating performance, Iowa State uses the following forms of faculty review:

- annual review
- preliminary review of probationary faculty
- promotion and/or tenure review
- post-tenure review
- advancement review of term faculty
- renewal review

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/26/21; the senior vice president and provost on 1/29/21; and the university president on 1/29/21.

5.1.1.2 Annual Reviews

All faculty members (tenured, tenure-eligible, and term, whether fulltime or part-time) will be evaluated annually (July 1 to June 30) for performance appraisal and development on the basis of their PRS ([Section 3.4](#)). The evaluation is based on scholarship and contributions in teaching; research, creative, and/or innovation activities; extension, entrepreneurship, and/or professional practice; and institutional service as indicated in each individual's PRS. Each faculty member's overall performance must be evaluated as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory ([Section 4.1.1](#)). The annual evaluation will serve as a basis for determining merit salary increases.

The annual faculty evaluation process is the responsibility of the department chair. In some departments, the associate/assistant chair or a designated review committee has a role in the evaluation process. Department chairs will follow the annual evaluation process as outlined in their departmental governance document.

The departmental governance document must specify the process by which the faculty member will provide evidence about their performance in the areas of their position responsibilities for the year under review. Failure by a faculty member to comply with that process will, except in extenuating circumstances, result in an unsatisfactory annual evaluation. For tenured faculty, two consecutive unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations trigger a Post-Tenure Review ([Section 5.3.4](#)), and for all faculty may also result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy ([Section 7.2.2.6.1](#)). Evaluation of faculty will be in accordance with their PRS and their percentage of appointment.

The annual evaluation meeting between department chair and faculty member provides an opportunity for an exchange of ideas that may be of benefit to the individual and the department. The annual evaluation meeting includes a review of the faculty member's PRS and any action plans from the previous post-tenure review or annual performance evaluation.

The annual evaluation process is finalized in a written document that is prepared by the department chair and signed by both chair and faculty member. The report should include an evaluation of each area of the PRS as well as an overall summary assessment. It is the responsibility of the department chair to ensure that the evaluation is finalized in a timely manner and by the university deadline. The faculty member signs the evaluation as an acknowledgement of receipt, not as an endorsement of the evaluation.

A faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation may submit a written statement of concerns that will be appended to the evaluation. The faculty member may also appeal the evaluation through the established grievance procedures ([Section 9.1](#)).

Section 5.1.1.2 Approved by the Faculty Senate (December 13, 2022); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (January 3, 2023); by the President (January 3, 2023).

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 2/12/13, by the senior vice president and provost on 2/23/13 and the university president on 3/6/13.

5.1.1.2.1 Action Plan

In the case of an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department chair, with the input of the faculty member, will develop an Action Plan to guide improved performance in accordance with the faculty member's PRS. The Action Plan must include the following elements: (1) a list of action items to be accomplished that are detailed, clear, and aligned with a timeline, (2) a specific date for a mid-term evaluation, and (3) a description of consequences if the action items are not completed by the designated timeline.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 2/12/13, by the senior vice president and provost on 2/23/13 and the university President on 3/6/13.

5.1.1.2.2 Initiation of Action Plan Mediation

In the case of disagreement with a specific Action Plan resulting from an unsatisfactory annual performance evaluation or a below expectations post-tenure review, the faculty member or chair will notify the department Action Plan Mediation Committee within 10 working days from the date the faculty member received the written that the mediation process will be initiated.

5.1.1.2.2.1 Purpose of the Action Plan Mediation Committee

The committee's sole purpose is to examine the disputed parts of the Action Plan and offer a recommendation that may resolve the dispute. The committee is not to re-evaluate the faculty member, the process by which annual and post-tenure reviews are conducted, or to formulate a new action plan. The committee, after performing required tasks as set forth below, may recommend changes in specific action plan items in dispute.

5.1.1.2.2.2 Outcome of Review by an Action Plan Mediation Committee

Once the committee has completed its review and provided a recommendation, the role of the committee in the dispute process is complete. Any recommendations provided by the committee are non-binding. The faculty member and chair shall review and discuss the recommendations and attempt to reach a resolution on the Action Plan. The committee plays no role in these discussions, nor will the committee be provided any information on the outcome. If an agreement between the faculty member and the department chair cannot be reached within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendations, the matter will be forwarded by the party disagreeing with the proposed Action Plan to the dean of the college for a final decision. The dean's decision is binding.

5.1.1.2.2.3 Selection of the Action Plan Mediation Committee

Selection procedures for committee membership are defined in the college governance document. To promote a fair process and avoid potential conflicts of interest, faculty members are ineligible to serve on the Action Plan Mediation Committee if they meet any of the following conditions:

- are in the process of mediating their own case
- are currently a respondent in a faculty misconduct case
- have received an unsatisfactory annual review or below expectations post-tenure review in the past cycle
- have a [conflict of interest or commitment](#) as defined by the Iowa State Policy Library or *Faculty Handbook* related to the mediation.

Other potential conflicts of interest will be reviewed by the dean of the college on a case-by-case basis.

5.1.1.2.2.4 Action Plan Mediation Committee Review Process

The faculty member will submit to the Action Plan Mediation Committee a written document describing the disputed elements of the Action Plan and any proposed changes. The department chair shall submit the following items to the committee: (a) the proposed Action Plan, (b) the annual performance review or post-tenure review report on which the Action Plan is based, (c) the faculty member's submitted performance evaluation materials, (d) the faculty member's PRS, (e) the faculty member's vita, and (f) a written explanation of why the faculty member's proposed change(s) in the Action Plan are not acceptable. All materials will be sent to the committee within five working days of the dispute being forwarded for mediation. These would be the same five working days to elect substitute committee members, if needed. If either party fails to deliver materials within the five working days, the committee will still convene and begin their process.

The Action Plan Mediation Committee will review the submitted materials, meet with both parties, meet with any other party deemed pertinent to the disputed items, and deliberate on the issues. The committee will deliver a written recommendation signed by the entire committee, on how the disputed elements of the Action Plan should be resolved to the department chair and faculty member within 10 working days of receipt of the review materials. Travel, busy schedules, or other normal faculty duties are not acceptable reasons to delay the mediation process. Video or in-person meetings and deliberations will carry equal weight, and technology should be used for meetings to ensure timely handling of the dispute. The committee will complete its assessment and written recommendation regardless of the responsiveness of the disputing parties.

5.1.1.2.2.5 Timeline of the Action Plan Mediation Process

To initiate the action plan mediation process, the department Action Plan Mediation Committee will be notified within 10 working days from the date the faculty member received the written Action Plan.

Once initiated, the action plan mediation process is set to occur within 20 working days as follows:

- Five working days for disputing parties to deliver relevant materials to committee. This time will also be used to replace, by faculty election, committee members, if needed.
- Ten working days for the committee to meet with the disputing parties (and others as needed), evaluate materials, and deliver a written recommendation signed by the entire committee.
- Five working days for the disputing parties to consider the recommendations of the committee and either agree or forward the dispute to the college dean.

5.1.1.2.2.6 Prior Action Plans

The Action Plan Mediation Committee must not consult any action plan(s) already in place for the faculty member under review. When the mediation process is concluded, the department chair or college dean (for those cases decided by the dean) shall integrate multiple action plans into a single plan for the faculty member.

5.1.1.2.2.7 Concurrent Reviews

An annual review may occur while an Action Plan is in place. In such cases, the affected area(s) of performance must be evaluated in terms of progress on the Action Plan. All other areas must be evaluated in accordance with the departmental standards.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/22/19; by the senior vice president and provost on 1/25/19; and the university president on 1/26/19.

5.1.1.3 Preliminary Review of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty members are typically reviewed by their departments in the second or third year of their appointments. The purpose of this review is to provide constructive, developmental feedback to probationary faculty regarding progress in meeting departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure. This review also informs the decision to reappoint during the probationary period. For more information, see [Chapter 3 Appointment Policies and Procedures](#).

The review should be based upon departmental criteria and standards used for promotion and/or tenure. The review process must include peer review and an evaluation by the chair. External letters are not normally expected as part of the process. Additional reviews may be conducted at the discretion of the department.

Tenure-eligible faculty members, with either non-permanent or permanent part-time appointments, will have a preliminary departmental review during their third year of employment. This review includes input from departmental faculty and is intended to provide feedback to the faculty member early in their probationary period. This review also informs the decision to reappoint during the probationary period. A second preliminary review will occur in the sixth year of service unless a promotion and/or tenure review will take place in the subsequent year. Thus, a part-time tenure-eligible faculty member will likely have two preliminary reviews. 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 their schedule of preliminary and tenure review updated each year at annual review.

Approved by the Faculty Senate December 12, 2006

5.1.1.4 Promotion and/or Tenure Review

The evaluation for promotion and/or award of tenure initially takes place within the department, with review at each administrative level above the department. Review of departmental recommendations at the college level must involve faculty from outside the department concerned. The evaluation procedures for award of tenure are those used for evaluation for promotion. Full descriptions may be found for: standards ([Section 5.2.2](#)), qualifications ([Section 5.2.3](#)), and procedures ([Section 5.2.4](#)).

5.1.1.5 Joint Appointment

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. The individual's Letter of Intent (for new appointments) and the PRS will specify the primary department. Prior to the review, the two chairs 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. In cases with an equal division of responsibilities, the departments may agree to conduct separate reviews.

5.1.2 Evaluation of Department Chairs

Periodically, each department chair is evaluated on the basis of their administrative responsibilities and accomplishments. This review is normally initiated by the college dean as part of a reappointment decision and includes input from department faculty. Policies and procedures regarding these reviews are contained in college governance documents and may be included in departmental governance documents.

5.1.3 Evaluation of College and Central Administrators

For information regarding the evaluation of a college dean, see ([Section 5.5.1](#)).

For information regarding faculty review of central administrators, see ([Section 5.7](#)).

5.2 Promotion and Tenure of Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Appointments

Approved by Faculty Senate (3/24/98)

Approved by the General Faculty (5/1/98)

Incorporating editing and revisions as approved by Faculty Senate Executive Board (9/18/98)

Approved by the Faculty Senate (10/13/98)

Approved by provost and university president (11/2/98)

Approved by Board of Regents (12/3/98)

Note: In this document the term "department" is understood to include any academic unit designated as a "school."

5.2.1 Overview of Tenure

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write as a public citizen without institutional discipline or restraint. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of academic duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that the individual is not speaking for the institution in matters of public interest.

Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom; it is essential for safeguarding the right of free expression and for encouraging risk-taking inquiry at the frontiers of knowledge. Both tenure and academic freedom are part of an implicit social compact, which recognizes that tenure serves important public purposes and provides benefits to society. The public is best served when faculty are free to teach, conduct research, provide extension and/or professional practice services, and engage in institutional service without fear of reprisal or without compromising the pursuit of knowledge and/or the creative process.

In return, faculty have the responsibility of furthering high-quality programs of research, teaching, and extension and/or professional practice, and are fully accountable for their performance of these responsibilities. Additionally, a well-designed tenure system attracts capable and highly qualified individuals as faculty members, strengthens institutional stability by enhancing faculty members' institutional loyalty, and encourages academic excellence by retaining and rewarding the most meritorious people. Tenure and promotion imply selectivity and choice; they are granted for scholarly and professional merit. The length and intensity of the review leading to the granting of tenure ensures the retention of only productive faculty; periodic performance reviews ensure the continuance of a commitment to excellence.

The system of academic tenure at Iowa State emphasizes the following: (1) recruitment of the most highly qualified candidates available, (2) creation of an opportunity for scholarly performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and extension and/or professional practice, (3) continuing evaluation of performance on the basis of areas of responsibilities in the employment agreement, and (4) the positive evaluation of performance resulting in the award of tenure. The awarding of tenure requires an affirmative decision, based upon an explicit judgment of qualifications resulting from continuous evaluation of the faculty member during the probationary period in light of the applicable criteria.

After the award of tenure, faculty members undergo annual reviews and, as appropriate, reviews for promotion. A tenured faculty member may be dismissed only for adequate cause ([Section 7.2](#)), elimination of academic programs ([Section 3.5.2.2](#)), or financial exigency ([Section 3.5.2.3](#)). Denial of faculty appointment or reappointment, or removal or suspension from office, or censure, or other penalty must not be based upon any belief, expression, or conduct protected by law or by the principles of academic freedom.

Tenure and affirmative action are compatible concepts. Both seek to ensure the hiring and retention of those who are most qualified. In the appointment process, affirmative action operates to ensure that the most qualified available person is identified and is offered the opportunity to join the faculty. After the initial appointment, the affirmative action program ensures that irrelevant considerations, such as race and gender, play no role in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions.

Approved by Faculty Senate (May 4, 2010); by the provost and university president (May 24, 2010).

5.2.1.1 Eligibility for Tenure

Tenure is conferred by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa and is associated with the faculty appointment in an academic department. The tenure process begins with a review by peers in the department(s) of appointment and continues through review by the college, the SVPP, and the university president.

Tenure accompanies appointment to the rank of associate professor or professor unless a probationary period for the new appointee is clearly specified in advance, or unless it is indicated that the appointment does not carry tenure. The latter is used rarely and is limited to instances of term appointments of a special nature or character. For initial appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor without immediate tenure, the departmental recommendation as to tenure specifies the length of the probationary period.

After the awarding of tenure, the appointment is continuous. Except for resignation, retirement, or death of the faculty member, such appointments are terminable only for adequate cause ([Section 7.2](#)), elimination of academic programs ([Section 3.5.2.2](#)), or financial exigency ([Section 3.5.2.3](#)).

Approved by Faculty Senate (May 4, 2010); by the provost and university president (May 24, 2010).

5.2.1.2 Tenure for Faculty Members in Administrative Positions

At Iowa State, the appointment of an individual to an administrative position does not automatically guarantee tenure in a department.

An individual who has been a faculty member at another institution and who is appointed to an administrative position at Iowa State may be proposed for rank in an academic department appropriate for their area of professional expertise. That department must determine whether that individual should be awarded tenure by a review consistent with the individual's proposed academic rank and previous experience. Thus, the department that agrees to award academic rank to the individual must also make a recommendation regarding tenure. For these types of administrative hires, departmental voting policies for the awarding of rank and granting of tenure for new faculty hires must be followed.

Department-level administrators are encouraged to remain actively involved in professional activities within the department in the interests of administrative effectiveness and ease of return to regular faculty duties at the termination of administrative responsibilities. Similarly, tenured faculty members who are appointed to administrative positions that require full-time service outside their departments are encouraged to continue to be involved in their academic disciplines.

When a person relinquishes a full-time administrative position after substantial absence from the department, every effort must be made to assign duties within the university commensurate with their professional qualifications. Even though the person might be tenured in an academic department, the decision as to whether it would be most appropriate for the person to return to that department as an active faculty member will be mutually decided by the department and the individual concerned, in consultation with other appropriate administrative officials. Where necessary and appropriate, a reasonable period of transition, usually one year or less, may be allowed during which the person can prepare themselves to undertake whatever responsibilities have been determined to be most appropriate.

Approved by Faculty Senate (November 19, 2009); by the provost and university president (November 30, 2009).

5.2.1.3 Terms of Probationary Service

The date that a tenure-eligible faculty member actually begins the performance of their duties at or on behalf of Iowa State marks the beginning of the probationary period, except for mid-year appointments. The length of the probationary period must be specified at the time of the initial appointment.

The probationary period must end on a date that coincides with the end of the academic year for 9-month appointments or the end of the fiscal year for 12-month appointments. This ensures the individual's tenure review can take place during a regular review cycle. The probationary period may exceed seven years only for faculty who have had an extension of the tenure clock or for faculty on part-time appointment for a portion of the probationary period. In some instances, such as mid-year appointments, the start date of an appointment does not coincide with the beginning of the academic year. In such cases, the probationary period may extend a few months beyond seven calendar years in order to give the individual the full opportunity to achieve the credentials required for tenure.

Tenure ordinarily is conferred on an individual after seven consecutive years of continuous faculty service in a regular appointment at Iowa State. A faculty member is ordinarily reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of appointment. Upon consultation with the department chair, they may be reviewed for tenure at any time they have satisfied the criteria and requirements for promotion and tenure.

Tenure-eligible faculty members with part-time appointments during the probationary period will be reviewed for tenure in the equivalent of the sixth year of full-time service

during the regular promotion and tenure review cycle. The years of full-time service during a part-time appointment will be calculated as the summed duration of the part-time appointment in years multiplied by the fraction of the appointment. After summation of the part-time appointment, a remaining partial year less than or equal to 0.5 years of service will be rounded down to zero years, whereas a partial year greater than 0.5 years will be rounded up to 1.0 years. Therefore, faculty members will ordinarily be reviewed for tenure in the year following completion of a sum of calculated full-time service no greater than 5.5 years. However, upon consultation with the department chair, a faculty member may be reviewed for tenure at any time they have satisfied the criteria and requirements for promotion and tenure. Under no circumstances, however, will a tenure-eligible faculty member be reviewed for tenure later than during their tenth year of service. If denied tenure, a faculty member on part-time appointment has only one year of appointment beyond the denial.

A faculty member may request an additional review during the final year of the probationary period if there has been a substantial change in the record. The SVPP will determine whether or not to grant the request.

Approved by Faculty Senate (March 8, 2011); university president and provost (March 22, 2011).

5.2.1.4 Extension of the Probationary Period

Ordinarily, the probationary period will provide sufficient time for the faculty member to demonstrate their qualifications for tenure. On occasion, however, special circumstances may occur that interfere significantly with the faculty member's opportunity to develop the qualifications necessary for tenure in the time allowed. It is the intent of this policy to describe legitimate circumstances in which a faculty member might be granted an extension of the probationary period.

A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period based upon special circumstances. The request for an extension should be submitted in writing to the department chair; the department chair will submit the request to the dean of the college; the dean will submit the request to the SVPP as soon as possible but no later than April 1 prior to the academic year in which the third-year review or tenure review is scheduled to be conducted. Requests should clearly explain the reasons for granting an extension of the probationary period and will be acted upon promptly. Requests for extension due to the birth of a child, adoption or the foster care placement of a child will be submitted to and approved by the chair, dean, and SVPP. The chair, dean, and SVPP shall approve requests based on other circumstances.

If the faculty member requests an extension, the faculty member shall acknowledge that tenure cannot be claimed on the basis that the total length of employment has by then extended beyond seven years. A faculty member may be granted only two one-year extensions during the probationary period.

Scholarship accomplished by a tenure-track faculty member during an extension period must be counted as part of a candidate's record. Standards regarding what constitutes a record deserving of tenure must not be raised to adjust for any granted extension.

Section 5.2.1.4 was approved by the Faculty Senate on March 26, 2002, and by the administration on April 29, 2002.

Section 5.2.1.4 was amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/20/15, by the senior vice president and provost on 2/19/15 and the university president on 2/25/15.

5.2.1.4.1 Extending the Probationary Period for the Birth of a Child, Adoption or the Foster Care Placement of a Child

A faculty member who serves as the primary or coequal caregiver will be granted, upon request, a one-year extension of the probationary period if the faculty member becomes a parent any time during the probationary period or within two years prior to appointment at the university. If the faculty member has not previously had more than one extension, a request for extension based upon the arrival of a child will be granted.

Requests for an extension based upon becoming a parent should be made within two years of the arrival of a child. The faculty member will be granted an extension, upon request, even if they do not take leave for the arrival of the child.

5.2.1.4.2 Extending the Probationary Period for Significant Care Responsibilities

Elder or dependent care may be the care of a spouse, domestic partner, mother, father, sister, brother, daughter, son, grandparent, grandchild, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, grandparent-in-law, grandchild-in-law, or corresponding relatives of the employee's partner, other persons for whom the employee is legally responsible, and anyone who stood in loco parentis to the employee as a child. Such circumstances are those in which the dependent person needs special medical or living assistance.

A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period when they have responsibilities for elder, spousal or partner, or dependent care that significantly impede the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure.

Requests for an extension based upon elder, spousal or partner, or dependent care should be made within two years of the onset of any condition requiring care, or within two years of the faculty member becoming responsible for care. The request must be supported by sufficient medical documentation that includes a discussion of the need for that faculty member to provide assistance. This supporting medical documentation must be submitted to and maintained confidentially by University Human Resources (UHR). Upon UHR's confirmation that the medical documentation is consistent with the request, SVPP will evaluate the request for final determination.

5.2.1.4.3 Extension of the Probationary Period for Medical Condition of the Faculty Member

A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period for appropriate medical reasons. Such requests should be based on a medical condition arising or reappearing after accepting a position. The request must be supported by sufficient medical documentation that indicates the effect of the medical condition upon the faculty member's work. This supporting medical documentation must be submitted to and maintained confidentially by UHR. Upon confirmation by UHR that the medical documentation is consistent with the request, the SVPP will evaluate the request for final determination.

5.2.1.4.4 Extension of the Probationary Period for Other Reasons

A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period because of a major shift in the departmental mission or in the faculty member's position responsibility statement. When exceptional circumstances require a major shift in criteria for the awarding of tenure, a department may request an extension of the probationary period for a faculty member who would not otherwise have adequate opportunity to qualify under the new criteria but who has demonstrated the potential to do so.

A faculty member who requests a leave of absence from Iowa State during the probationary period may, in appropriate circumstances, request an extension of the probationary period for the length of the leave of absence.

5.2.1.4.5 Extension of the Probationary Period for Faculty on Part-time Appointment

For faculty members on part-time appointment, extension of the tenure-clock will not be permitted to take faculty past eleven years of service, with mandatory tenure review no later than year ten.

5.2.1.5 Credit for Prior Service

When a faculty member with prior experience in a faculty position at another academic institution is appointed on a probationary faculty appointment at Iowa State, a probationary period is established for the individual as part of the employment agreement. For the faculty member, this could result in a total probationary period in their discipline that may exceed seven years.

A faculty member's usual probationary period of seven years at Iowa State may be reduced through credit for prior faculty service at other academic institutions. The amount of time credited will be determined by the specific relevance of the prior service to the needs and criteria of Iowa State. Evidence of the quality of prior service should be secured from the institution or institutions in which the individual has served.

Up to one year of time served on a visiting appointment at Iowa State may be credited as probationary time for tenure purposes, provided that service in such visiting status is followed, without interruption, by service in a position for which tenure eligibility accrues.

5.2.1.6 Criteria for Awarding Tenure

It is the policy of the university that all current Iowa State faculty must be clearly informed as to the personnel policies of the institution. Personnel policies of the institution are contained in the *Faculty Handbook*, the [University Policy Library](#) and in departmental and college governance documents as well as in supplemental information provided to departmental administrative officers. For each faculty member, the conditions of employment, including the length of appointment, must be clearly stated in writing, along with a statement specifying tenure status and length of probationary period.

Tenure-eligible faculty not initially hired on part-time appointment may request the conversion of their position to a non-permanent part-time appointment. At the time these changes are made, the conditions of employment, including the revised length of appointment and the review schedule, must be clearly stated in writing, along with a statement specifying tenure review status and length of the revised probationary period.

The criteria by which probationary faculty in a department are evaluated for tenure must be stated in writing as clearly and specifically as possible as part of the department's promotion and tenure document. A central component of each review is a written PRS for each candidate. Criteria will be consistent with a commitment to excellence in scholarship and apply to the position responsibilities of probationary faculty. Such criteria and position responsibilities must not impinge upon the academic freedom of the probationary faculty.

The criteria by which faculty with part-time appointments are evaluated for tenure must not differ from the criteria by which full-time faculty are evaluated. At the time of tenure review, faculty with part-time appointments will have accumulated an equivalent amount of service to those with full-time appointments.

5.2.2 Standards for Promotion and Tenure

5.2.2.1 Introduction

Iowa State is a public land-grant institution where liberal and professional education is merged with basic and applied research in pursuit of discoveries and innovations that help solve the world's problems, generate new knowledge, and advance the potential of society. The university serves the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world through its interrelated programs of teaching, research/creative activities, and extension and/or professional practice.

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/innovation activities, and/or extension/entrepreneurship/professional practice. In all areas of

professional activity, a faculty member is expected to follow the principles of faculty conduct as stated in [Section 7.1](#).

A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the Position Responsibility Statement (PRS), which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (a) teaching, (b) research/creative/innovation activities, (c) extension/entrepreneurship/professional practice, and (d) institutional service. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.

The following sections define and provide examples of scholarship and the four central areas of faculty responsibilities and activities.

5.2.2.2 Scholarship

5.2.2.2.1 Meaning of Scholarship

All tenured and probationary faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship in their teaching, research/creative/innovation activities, and extension/entrepreneurship/professional practice. 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 is the umbrella under which research falls, but research is just one form of scholarship. Scholarship also encompasses creative activities, innovation, entrepreneurship, teaching, and extension and/or professional practice. Innovation generally refers to renewing, changing or creating more effective processes or products, while academic entrepreneurship refers to innovating ideas, products, businesses, and/or bringing about change that challenges the status quo of how people live on a daily basis.

Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. This product may take the form of a book, journal article, critical review, annotated bibliography, lecture, review of existing research on a topic, or speech synthesizing the thinking on a topic. Also falling under the umbrella of scholarship are original materials designed for use with the computer; inventions on which patents are obtained; codes and standards; art exhibits by teacher-artists; musical concerts with original scores; novels, essays, short stories, and poems; and scholarly articles published in non-research-based periodicals, newspapers, and other publications. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called "intellectual property" and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to demonstrate significant impact for the public and/or for the discipline itself (including future impact as appropriate).

Scholarship generally implies that one has a solid foundation in the professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. However, it must be noted that

significant advances sometimes accrue when a scholar extends their scope of topics beyond those traditional to a particular discipline.

Table 5.1 describes the broad continuum of scholarship and the parameters to be used when judging the scholarly nature of a faculty member's achievements in all evaluation reviews. It is adapted from Conrad J. Weiser, "The Value of a University - Rethinking Scholarship," draft version; and Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered - Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, New York, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

TABLE 5.1. The Nature of Scholarship

Character of Scholarship	Audiences for Scholarship	Means of Communicating Scholarship	Criteria for Validating Scholarship	Means of Documenting Scholarship
Develops and communicates new understanding and insights. Generates, synthesizes, interprets, critically analyzes, and communicates new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty, etc.	Peers, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral associates, users, patrons, publics, businesses, federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, etc.	Teaching materials and methods, classes, curricula; publications, presentations, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distribution of materials or programs, roles on advisory boards of businesses, governmental organization/non-governmental organizations, etc.	Originality, significance, accuracy, replicability, scope, applicability, breadth, depth and duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, impact or public benefits, etc.	Present evidence that creative intellectual work was validated by peers; communicated to peers and broader audiences in appropriate ways to demonstrate significant impact for the public and/or for the discipline itself (Including future impact as appropriate.); recognized, accepted, cited, adopted, or used by others. In other words, that it made a difference.

The nature of scholarly work at an academically diverse university necessarily varies. In the promotion and tenure review process, however, evidence that a significant portion of a

faculty member's scholarship has been documented (i.e., communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university) is required of all.

Documentation can take many forms. In some fields, refereed journals and monographs are the traditional media for documenting scholarship; in others, exhibitions and performances are appropriate. In still other fields, emerging technologies are creating (and will continue to create) entirely new media. Finally, scholarship may be validated and communicated through conference presentations and invited lectures.

Faculty also may submit evidence of scholarship that has not been documented by peers in the discipline, even though this evidence alone would not be sufficient to justify promotion and tenure. Evidence regarding both documented and undocumented scholarship provides a holistic portrayal of the candidate's scholarly work. For example, course materials in and of themselves do not constitute scholarship. However, if an individual's course materials reveal that they "communicate new understandings and insights" (Table 5.1) effectively to students or "synthesizes, interprets, and communicates new knowledge" (Table 5.1) for students, this material may be submitted as supporting evidence of scholarship, even though it may not have been communicated to peers outside the university.

Scholarship often requires teamwork and other collaborative relationships, particularly because of the growth of interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. When work that is a result of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort must be provided.

In the promotion and tenure review process, the emphasis is on the critical evaluation of the scholarly nature of the candidate's achievements by professional peers, including peers external to the university. Evidence should be presented as to the impact of the scholarship in terms of its depth, duration, and/or persistence of influence or use (e.g., citations, adaptations, or use by others), as well as its public and critical appreciation. Table 5.1 provides the evaluation framework.

5.2.2.3 Teaching

5.2.2.3.1 Scholarly Teaching

Most faculty have significant teaching responsibilities, and the quality of their teaching is a major factor in evaluating their accomplishments and performance. Teaching is a scholarly, innovative and dynamic endeavor and covers a broad range of activities. Some examples of teaching activities include the following:

- presenting resident credit courses, extension and international programs and courses, non-credit seminars and workshops, and continuing education and distance learning programs
- developing new or improving the quality and/or impact of courses and/or internship programs

- directing undergraduate and graduate projects, internships, theses, and dissertations
- serving on masters and doctoral committees
- advising and mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-doctoral associates

Particular expressions of effective teaching vary widely, and teachers may demonstrate their pedagogical skills in a variety of ways. Some may display their pedagogical abilities in organized lectures, others may promote collaborative learning or may improvise in the classroom in response to the dynamics of a specific group, while still others may be adept in facilitating group discussion.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty shall demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and/or innovate and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning.

Examples of activities that provide evidence of a faculty member's particular commitment to effective teaching include the following:

- contributions to curricular development, including collaborative courses and programs and service on curriculum committees
- pedagogical innovation, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment
- documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into teaching practice
- development of teaching materials
- pedagogically-oriented research
- involvement in student research projects
- involvement in student entrepreneurial activities
- contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching
- commitment to advising, including knowledge about curricular and extracurricular matters as well as an ability to aid students in using university resources
- creation and/or incorporation of curricular content that connects the subject matter to societal impact through innovation
- support and instruct students in commercialization, innovation, and entrepreneurship service activities - including developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems

A portfolio format is used to document faculty teaching activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The faculty portfolio includes materials such as teaching philosophy, student ratings of teaching, teaching materials and forms of assessment, peer evaluations

based on both classroom observations and review of teaching materials, and evidence of student learning.

The effectiveness of the candidate's teaching activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in [Section 5.2.2.2](#) and in Table 5.1. The scholarship resulting from teaching is documented through various means such as peer reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, workbooks, lab manuals, invited lectures, and conference papers.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/3/22, by the senior vice president and provost on 5/13/22 and the university president on 5/13/22.

5.2.2.3.2 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The evolving body of research on learning has fostered new forms of inquiry into teaching. By better informing teaching, the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) enhances student learning. Every faculty member with a teaching appointment should engage in scholarly teaching because of its centrality to the university's mission. Table 5.2 shows a comparison of scholarly teaching and SoTL. Scholarship of teaching and learning ultimately improves student learning and occurs when “our work as teachers becomes public, peer-reviewed and critiqued, and exchanged with other members of our professional communities so they, in turn, can build on our work, these are the qualities of scholarship.” (From the Research University Consortium for the Advancement of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and Lee Shulman, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.)

TABLE 5.2. Comparison of scholarly teaching and scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)

	Scholarly Teaching	SoTL
Faculty work as teachers is anchored in the literature of teaching and learning.	X	X
Faculty work as teachers emphasizes documenting student learning.	X	X
Faculty work as teachers is publicly shared with our colleagues and peers.		X
Faculty work as teachers is externally peer-reviewed as scholarship.		X
The evidence of the outcomes of faculty work as teachers is disseminated through professional outlets.		X

Scholarship of teaching and learning extends across all disciplines. However, the way that SoTL manifests itself is defined by each discipline. At Iowa State, SoTL contributes to the

discovery of knowledge about teaching and learning in higher education and must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. While SoTL may be an important part of the promotion and tenure process, it should not displace high quality scholarly teaching in annual performance reviews and in promotion and tenure decisions. Although all faculty should engage in scholarly teaching, not all faculty need to engage in SoTL. Scholarly teaching is part of a faculty member's teaching responsibilities; if a faculty member chooses to pursue SoTL, this work is part of their scholarship, creative activity, and/or research responsibilities.

Approved by the Faculty Senate 4/25/06.

5.2.2.4 Research/Creative Activities

Faculty members who engage in research/creative activities are expected to make original contributions that are appropriate to their chosen area of specialization and that are respected by peers within and outside the university.

Some examples of research/creative activity include the following:

- Conduct experimental research.
- Conduct, create or participate in creative performance or exhibition.
- Conceptualize and theorize in an original way.
- Synthesize, criticize, and clarify extant knowledge and research.
- Collect or analyze empirical data in innovative ways.
- Seek and obtain competitive grants and contracts.
- Relate research to the solution of practical problems.
- Hold leadership positions in professional societies or organizations.

A portfolio format is used to document faculty research/creative activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The faculty portfolio includes materials such as summaries of completed, current, and future research projects; descriptions of applied use of research; summaries of grants, patents, and inventions; exhibition catalogs and other non-juried creative works.

The effectiveness of the candidate's research/creative activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in [Section 5.2.2.2](#) and in Table 5.1.

Scholarship resulting from research/creative activities is documented through means appropriate to the specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, performances, exhibits, invited lectures, and/or conference papers. Evaluation of scholarship considers its impact as judged by its influence, use, or adoption by peers; its originality, richness, breadth, and/or depth of expression.

5.2.2.5 Extension and/or Professional Practice

Extension and/or professional practice distinguishes Iowa State as a land-grant university. Faculty members may engage in extension, entrepreneurship, and/or professional practice activities by utilizing their professional expertise to disseminate information outside of the traditional classroom to help improve the knowledge and skills of their clientele (i.e., the publics they serve) or the environment in which they live and work. This work should be related to the faculty member's position responsibilities.

Examples of activities that fall within extension and/or professional practice include the following:

- organizing/leading workshops or training sessions
- engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice
- acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources
- engaging in transfer of technology/knowledge to society
- engaging in entrepreneurial activities
- consulting
- serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise
- serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.
- serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards
- holding leadership positions in professional societies or organizations

Since extension and/or professional practice activities vary greatly among departments, it is the responsibility of each department to identify faculty activities that fall under this category and the appropriate evaluation methods.

Faculty who engage in extension and/or professional practice are knowledgeable about current research and new developments in their discipline and demonstrate an ability to interpret and apply this knowledge to meet their clients' requirements.

When appropriate, they develop and maintain professional relationships with their clientele in order to identify and serve their needs. They display leadership and initiative, are creative in the practical application of knowledge, and demonstrate a high level of disciplinary expertise as well as the ability to instruct, inform, and assist clients. In addition, a faculty member's professional practice reputation may be reflected by leadership in professional societies and organizations or by significant editorial-related activities.

A portfolio format is used to document faculty extension and/or professional practice activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The faculty portfolio includes materials such as descriptions of appointment responsibilities in extension and/or professional practice; representative workshop, seminar, and training materials; book reviews; unpublished reports, studies, etc.; newsletters and brochures; peer evaluations or ratings of extension and/or professional practice effectiveness; and client assessments.

The effectiveness of the candidate's extension and/or professional practice activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in [Section 5.2.2.2](#) and in Table 5.1. The scholarship resulting from extension and/or professional practice activities is documented through means appropriate to the professional specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, videos, software, websites, hardware, workbooks, manuals, standards, bibliographies, book reviews, and casebooks. Evaluation of scholarship should consider breadth, depth, and duration of influence or use; public appreciation and benefit; and applicability or adoption by peers.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/3/22, by the senior vice president and provost on 5/13/22, and the university president on 5/13/22.

5.2.2.6 Institutional Service

Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation of department, college, and/or university policies; or by carrying out administrative responsibilities. Therefore, to be promoted and/or tenured, faculty members are expected to have been involved in institutional service. For those seeking promotion to the rank of professor, significant institutional service is required.

Institutional service alone must not serve as the central basis for promotion and/or tenure. As citizens of the university, faculty members may also make other direct and indirect contributions to their departments, colleges, and university communities.

5.2.3 Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure

Recommendations for initial appointment and promotion are based on evidence that the individual has met the qualifications for the faculty rank to which they are to be appointed or promoted.

5.2.3.1 Assistant Professor

An assistant professor should have a strong academic record and ordinarily should have earned the accepted highest degree in their field. The assistant professor rank is recognition that the faculty member has exhibited the potential to grow in an academic career. Appointment at or promotion to this rank should be based on evidence that the faculty member can be expected to become qualified for promotion to associate professor in due course.

5.2.3.2 Associate Professor and/or Tenure

An associate professor should have a solid academic reputation and show promise of further development and productivity in their academic career. The candidate shall demonstrate the following:

- excellence in scholarship that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for national distinction
- effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- satisfactory institutional service

Furthermore, a recommendation for promotion to associate professor and granting of tenure must be based on an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has a high likelihood of sustained contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

5.2.3.3 Professor

A professor should be recognized by their professional peers within the university, as well as nationally/internationally, for the quality of the contribution to their discipline. The candidate shall demonstrate the following:

- national distinction in scholarship, as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the field or profession
- effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- significant institutional service

There is no set timeline for a faculty member to demonstrate the three criteria identified above. The faculty member's entire academic career must be considered in the evaluation of whether or not the candidate has met these criteria. A recommendation for promotion to professor also must be based upon an assessment of the record, since the last promotion, regardless of the institution that granted the promotion. The candidate is expected to have made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

Approved by the Faculty Senate 11/13/12; approved by the provost 11/20/12; approved by the university president 11/27/12

5.2.4 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

This section describes the general expectations for promotion and tenure review processes as well as the notification procedures to be followed by departments, colleges, the SVPP, and the president.

The procedures for mandatory and non-mandatory cases vary slightly. 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. 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, college dean, or SVPP may decide not to forward a positive recommendation; that action is the final administrative action. Reviews that occur in the final year (after denial in the mandatory year) are non-mandatory cases.

5.2.4.1 Voting Procedure

In order to avoid undue or unfair influence in promotion and tenure decisions, promotion and tenure procedures must ensure that the guiding principle of “one-person—one-vote” is complied with where a vote is defined as a formal vote or a recommendation on the specific question of whether or not a candidate should receive tenure and/or promotion.

Specifically (in chronological order):

- (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) If a departmental faculty vote occurs regarding promotion and tenure decisions, eligible faculty members shall vote at the departmental level (unless they have already voted as part of a departmental P&T committee) and may not vote again on the decision at the college or other levels.
- (3) Since the chair of the department independently evaluates promotion and tenure decisions, they may not also vote on the decision at the departmental faculty, college, or other levels.
- (4) Other administrators participating in a promotion and tenure decision (those whose title contains the term ‘president’, ‘provost’, or college ‘dean’) shall only participate at the appropriate administrative level and are not allowed to vote on the decision at any other level.

There can be two types of departmental committees. Departments may have advisory or process committees whose function is not evaluative but limited to helping the candidate prepare the dossier, and/or which present or summarize the candidate’s dossier for the faculty. Participating in this committee is not considered a vote. The committee referred to throughout this document as the P&T committee is the evaluative committee which takes a vote for a recommendation or evaluation of the candidate.

See also ([Section 5.2.4.2.3](#)) and ([Section 5.2.4.3](#)).

Policy approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 2006.

Policy approved by the provost and president.

Policy amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 2/13/07.

Policy amended and approved by the Faculty on 4/2/13, the senior vice president and provost on 4/9/13 and the university president on 4/10/13.

5.2.4.2 Department Review

Review for promotion and/or tenure begins at the department level. The department's promotion and tenure document must, at a minimum, specify the conditions listed in [Section 5.2.4.2.1](#) with respect to the department's review procedures.

5.2.4.2.1 Promotion and Tenure Document

Each department must 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 the procedures are consistent with those described in the *Faculty Handbook*. At a minimum, the document must include the following:

- the process by which faculty members are selected for departmental review for promotion and/or tenure
- the composition and means of selection of the department promotion and tenure committee and of any other department committees that may be involved in the review process
- the definition of conflict-of-interest operative in departmental review
- the procedures to be followed by the department P&T committee and related committees in conducting the reviews
- the role of the chair in the department promotion and tenure review process
- the process and circumstances under which a review may be postponed
- the types and sources of information that the department review committee will consider in conducting its review
- the means by which persons being considered submit information and documentation for the review process
- the procedures for obtaining any external evaluations used by the department in evaluating the performance of candidates
- the definition of the factual information in the dossier subject to review by the faculty member before it is advanced from the department
- the procedures for the notification of the results of the reviews

The document must be approved by the tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of the department, by the college dean, and by the SVPP.

5.2.4.2.2 Joint Appointment Procedures

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. The individual's Offer Letter (for new appointments) and PRS will specify the primary department.

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. In cases with an equal division of responsibilities, the departments may agree to conduct separate reviews and forward

separate recommendations to the college dean(s). A coordinated recommendation will be made at the dean's level with a single recommendation forwarded to the SVPP.

5.2.4.2.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee

Each candidate must be reviewed by a P&T committee, which will examine information relevant to the evaluation of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. An individual P&T review committee may include faculty who are not members of the candidate's department. Any member of the P&T 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 committee chair is responsible for making, and justifying in writing, the final decision regarding conflicts of interest. The chair shall inform the candidates in writing of the identity of the members of the department review committee and any other departmental committees that will be involved in the evaluation.

The promotion and tenure review committee reports in writing to the chair the results of its review, including all formal votes.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/2/13, the senior vice president and provost on 4/9/13 and the university president on 4/10/13.

5.2.4.2.4 Department Chair

The department chair prepares a recommendation for promotion and tenure for each person who is recommended by the review committee for promotion and/or tenure. The chair also may prepare a recommendation for promotion and tenure for a candidate who is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the review committee. The recommendation includes the chair's evaluation of the candidate, the votes and reports of all departmental reviews, and the chair's recommendation.

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

5.2.4.2.5 Notification Procedure

The chair will inform each candidate in writing before the department's recommendations are submitted to the college, whether a recommendation will be forwarded and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. Persons who are not being recommended by either the P&T committee or the chair, or both, will be informed by the chair in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the department's criteria for promotion and tenure.

5.2.4.2.6 Right to Review Factual Information

Each person for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the college will be given the opportunity to review the factual information therein, and to inform the chair of any ways in which they believe this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

5.2.4.2.7 Treatment of Late-Developed Information

'Late-developed information' is information that becomes available after the departmental P&T committee recommendation has been sent to the college, and that either the candidate or the department chair considers to be of potential relevance (whether favorable or unfavorable) to the case. Such information must be forwarded by the department chair to the next level in the administrative chain that has not yet made its decision. In the case of unfavorable information, the candidate must also be notified of its nature and the evidence on which it is based. Transmittal of late-developed information must include an indication of when the information became available and which evaluators have had access to it. It is the responsibility of recipients of late-developed information to consider it, determine the degree of its relevance, and decide upon what weight it ought to have in making their decision.

5.2.4.3 College Review

Review for promotion and/or tenure continues at the college level.

Administrative faculty members ([Section 5.2.4.1](#)) should each cast their one vote in a given promotion and tenure decision at the appropriate administrative level. A non-administrative faculty member's one vote in a promotion and tenure decision about a member from their own department must be cast at the departmental level (as a member of a department P&T committee or as part of the department faculty), not at the college or higher levels. Not all departments are equally represented on college or higher-level P&T committees. Thus, to avoid undue influence, only faculty who are members of departments other than that of the promotion and tenure candidate may vote in promotion and tenure decisions at these levels.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/2/13, by the senior vice president and provost on 4/9/13 and by the university president on 4/10/13.

5.2.4.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Document

Each college must have a document that sets forth the standards and procedures governing promotion and tenure of faculty within that college. The college document may specify standards that exceed those of the university, provided that they do not conflict with the standards of the university, and provided the procedures are consistent with those described in the *Faculty Handbook*. The document must be approved by the tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of the college, by the college dean, and by the SVPP.

5.2.4.3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee

A college Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, composed of faculty members from the college, must review all positive departmental and/or chair recommendations for promotion and/or tenure. In addition, the committee will review negative recommendations for persons for whom a tenure decision is mandatory. Any member of the college P&T Committee who has a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate shall not participate in the consideration of that individual. The committee chair is responsible for making, and justifying in writing, the final decision regarding conflicts of interest. The votes and recommendations of this committee are forwarded to the dean of the college. Selection procedures for committee membership are defined in the college promotion and tenure document. Selection procedures will incorporate input from the faculty or their elected representatives.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/2/13, by the senior vice president and provost on 4/9/13, and the university president on 4/10/13.

5.2.4.3.3 College Dean

Each college dean reviews the promotion and tenure recommendations from the departments and from the college committee and presents their recommendations to the SVPP, along with the recommendations and votes of the college and department committees, the chair reports, and supporting material and documentation.

The dean will inform in writing each candidate and the respective chair and the college committee whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the SVPP 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 their recommendation. The chair will forward the dean's recommendation and summary to the department P&T committee.

5.2.4.4 University Review

Review for promotion and/or tenure concludes at the university level.

5.2.4.4.1 Senior Vice President and Provost

The SVPP makes their recommendations to the university president. The SVPP will inform in writing each candidate and the respective chair and college dean whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the president and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If the SVPP's recommendation is contrary to the dean's recommendation, the SVPP will summarize in writing the reasons as part of their recommendation. The chair will forward the SVPP's recommendation and summary to the departmental P&T committee.

5.2.4.4.2 University President

The university president makes their recommendations for the university to the Board of Regents. Only positive recommendations will be sent to the board for action. The president

will inform in writing each candidate, the respective chair and college dean, and the SVPP of the decision being forwarded to the Board of Regents. If the presidential recommendation is contrary to the SVPP's recommendation, the president will include a summary of the reasons. The chair and dean will forward the president's recommendation and summary to the respective P&T committees.

5.2.4.4.3 Final Notification

Following the Board of Regents' action, the SVPP provides official notification to the candidates and their chairs and college deans.

5.2.4.4.4 Effective Dates for Promotions

Promotions in rank for faculty with a 9-month appointment ordinarily take effect at the beginning of the next academic year. Promotions for faculty with a 12-month appointment ordinarily take effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year; exceptions to these dates may be granted by the SVPP.

5.2.4.4.5 Appeals

In a mandatory case, following the SVPP's decision not to forward a positive recommendation to the university president, a faculty member has the right to appeal through administrative channels or through the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals (FSCA). An appeal through administrative channels should be made to the president. An appeal to the FSCA can focus on the decision made at one or more administrative levels depending on where the faculty member believes the improper decision was made. An appeal must be based on the grounds outlined in [Section 9.1](#). The calendar to file an appeal (30 days) (See [Section 2.9.1](#) for a definition of 'days') starts when the faculty member receives notification from the SVPP, regardless of who is listed as the appellee(s).

In non-mandatory cases, a faculty member shall exhaust all possible review processes before filing an appeal. A faculty member may request a negative recommendation be forwarded unless a college or departmental governance document explicitly prohibits it. The request for further review must be made rather than appealing the decision not to forward a positive recommendation.

Once the review process in a non-mandatory case has been exhausted, a decision not to forward a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure may be appealed through administrative channels or through the FSCA when the chair, college dean, or SVPP decides not to forward the recommendation. An administrative appeal should be filed with the next person in the administrative chain.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 12/13/16, by the senior vice president and provost on 12/13/16, and the university president on 12/19/16.

5.3 Documentation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Note: In this document the term "department" is understood to include any academic unit designated as a "school."

The following types of documentation represent what the candidate, the department, and the chair are responsible for within the promotion and tenure process.

Approved by Faculty Senate (3/24/98)
Approved by the General Faculty (5/1/98)
Incorporating editing and revisions as approved by
Faculty Senate Executive Board (9/18/98)
Approved by the Faculty Senate (10/13/98)
Approved by provost and president (11/2/98)
Approved by Board of Regents (12/3/98)

5.3.1 Candidate Responsibilities

The candidate is responsible for submitting a promotion and tenure vita; a faculty portfolio, which contains supplementary materials provided by the candidate related to the four areas of faculty activity; the current position responsibility statement (PRS) and any prior statements for the period under review; and names of potential references, as specified by department and college promotion and tenure guidelines.

5.3.1.1 Promotion and Tenure Vita

The promotion and tenure vita uses the following format and is based upon the candidate's position responsibilities and faculty activities. This vita is a listing of information about the candidate, the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship, and the candidate's activities and accomplishments in the areas of their responsibilities.

5.3.1.2 Candidate Information

This includes name, current rank, degrees held (when, where), and record of professional experience (including Iowa State).

5.3.1.3 Scholarship

This includes a listing of documented activities from the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension and/or professional practice. These activities must include appropriate accomplishments such as the following:

- publications (including monographs, textbooks, journal articles, book chapters, etc.)
- exhibits and performances
- creative published literary works
- computer programs, videos, software, and hardware
- workbooks, lab manuals, manuals, standards, casebooks, etc.
- annotated bibliographies and book reviews
- invited lectures

- conference papers

In addition, the candidate should list any honors, awards, prizes, etc. received as evidence of their scholarship.

5.3.1.4 Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities

5.3.1.4.1 Teaching

Teaching includes activities such as the following:

- teaching assignment and responsibilities
- advising activities
- direction of masters and doctoral candidates
- service on masters and doctoral committees
- training and mentoring activities for post-doctoral associates
- curricular development activity
- grant activity
- leadership positions
- service in professional societies, organizations, and events

5.3.1.4.2 Research/Creative Activities

Research/creative activities may include the following:

- completed projects and programs
- current projects and programs
- future projects and programs
- patent awards and inventions
- grant activity
- leadership positions
- service in professional societies, organizations, and events

5.3.1.4.3 Extension and/or Professional Practice

Extension and/or professional practice may include the following:

- relevant accomplishments and activities including consulting; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; and engaging in clinical diagnostic practice
- workshops, seminars, training sessions, etc.
- service on agencies or boards because of individual expertise
- work in the area of technology transfer
- editorial responsibilities for journals (e.g., service on an editorial board or editorship for a journal)
- service as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.
- grant activity

- leadership positions
- service in professional societies, organizations, and events

5.3.1.4.4 Institutional Service

This section includes a list of memberships on department, college, and/or university committees and organizations as well as descriptions of responsibilities and leadership roles within these service positions. The candidate's role should be indicated.

5.3.1.4.5 Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Activities

Faculty are encouraged to document equity, diversity, and inclusion activities and the impact of this work related to teaching, research/creative activities, extension and/or professional practice, institutional service, and/or other areas of their job responsibilities.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/26/21; the senior vice president and provost on 1/29/21; and the university president on 1/29/21.

5.3.2 Faculty Portfolio

The faculty portfolio includes important and supplemental materials that provide a clear understanding of the candidate's accomplishments within scholarship and their areas of faculty activities.

5.3.2.1 Scholarship

Required for all candidates. This section provides the opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate excellence in scholarship. It begins with an overall statement of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship as they relate to teaching, research/creative activities, and extension and/or professional practice. It must include representative scholarly materials that have been validated by peers.

The section also includes materials that document peer recognition and impact of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments such as professional reviews, citation counts, use of scholarship by peers, and awards.

5.3.2.2 Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities

This section provides the opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate effectiveness in those areas in which they have appointment responsibilities.

5.3.2.2.1 Teaching

This section may include material such as the following:

- ratings of teaching effectiveness
- peer evaluations (based on classroom observations and a review of teaching materials)
- representative teaching materials and forms of assessment
- evidence of student learning

- candidate's teaching philosophy

5.3.2.2.2 Research/Creative Activities

This section may include material such as the following:

- summaries of completed, current, and future research or creative projects and programs
- summaries of grants and contracts applied for and disposition
- summaries of current grant and contract support
- summaries of potential future grant work
- summaries of patents and descriptions of inventions
- exhibit catalogs
- creative works that are not juried
- laboratory management descriptions
- candidate's research/creative activities agenda

5.3.2.2.3 Extension and/or Professional Practice

This section may include material such as the following:

- descriptions of extension and/or professional practice appointment responsibilities
- representative workshop, seminar, training materials
- unpublished reports, studies, etc.
- representative newsletters, brochures, reviews, journals, etc.
- peer evaluation or ratings of extension and/or professional practice effectiveness
- client assessments
- candidate's extension and/or professional practice philosophy

5.3.2.2.4 Institutional Service

This section includes materials the candidate has written or to which they have been a primary contributor. This could include materials such as institutional reports or studies.

5.3.3 Department and Department Chair Responsibilities

5.3.3.1 Letters of Evaluation (Provided by the Department)

The chair and/or the department review committee solicits 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 to college and university review levels. External letters are confidential, but are available for review by those individuals who evaluate candidates either in a formal vote or advisory capacity as part of the promotion and/or tenure process as defined in [Section 5.2.4.1](#). These letters are not to be shared with others.

5.3.3.1.1 Letters of External Peer Evaluation from Professionals in the Field, outside the Institution

A maximum of six external peer evaluation letters should be solicited from appropriate professionals in the field and chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's activities and accomplishments impartially. They should generally be tenured professors at peer institutions or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. These individuals should be independent of the faculty member being reviewed. Co-authors, co-principal investigators, dissertation/thesis advisors, or others with similarly close association should be excluded. Individual exceptions may be granted for small disciplines or other circumstances when it is not possible to exclude all co-authors or co-principal investors. When necessary, however, these individuals should be solicited to detail the nature of collaborative projects or to respond to specific questions.

At least one of the reviewers, but not all, should be suggested by the candidate. Candidates may consult with Iowa State colleagues about appropriate reviewers and their institutions. Candidates may submit a list of up to three people in their field who will not be contacted as reviewers. This request, if made, must be put forward at the same time candidates submit names of potential reviewers.

External peer evaluation letters should primarily focus on the aspects of the candidate's work that qualify as scholarship. While in some cases this might mean a focus on one area such as teaching or research, in others it might entail a focus on a mixture of scholarship in teaching, research/creative activities and/or extension and/or professional practice.

External peer evaluation letters soliciting outside review of a candidate's work must make clear what is to be covered by the reviewer. These letters sent by the department soliciting external reviews may optionally include or exclude asking reviewers their opinions about whether candidates would or should receive tenure and/or promotion at the reviewer's institution or at Iowa State. The department must make any request regarding this summative question consistent for all candidates and all reviewers.

5.3.3.1.2 Letters of Internal Peer Evaluation from Iowa State Department, College, and University Colleagues

Although not required, letters from department, college, and university colleagues may be important. This may be appropriate for activities related to interdisciplinary research and teaching programs, joint projects, and services provided to other colleagues or in cases where a fuller understanding of specific activities is warranted.

Approved by Faculty Senate 2/14/2006, 3/7/2006, 1/13/2009, 2/10/2009, 3/10/2009, 11/13/12;
approved by president and provost 1/15/2009 and 3/19/2009; provost 11/20/12; president 11/27/12.

5.3.3.2 Evaluations (Provided by the Department and Chair)

Evaluations from each level of review will serve as a summary of the case. An evaluation by the department faculty (as outlined in the department governance document) will be

forwarded with the case, as will an independent evaluation by the department chair. These evaluations should not be statements of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance. When appropriate, they should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators. The evaluations should include the following:

- evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship
- evaluation of the candidate's performance in their areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activities, extension and/or professional practice, and/or institutional service
- evaluation of the candidate's prospects for future contributions to the field and department
- assessment of the candidate's role and contributions to department and college missions

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 12/12/17.

5.3.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy

Faculty in each department are charged with developing and implementing a plan for peer review of each tenured faculty member in the unit. The review should address the quality of the faculty member's performance in accordance with their PRS in effect during the period of the review in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, extension and/or professional practice, and institutional service. If applicable, the review should also discuss the effectiveness of part-time appointments.

The review must include an overall recommendation of the performance (meeting expectations or below expectations) and result in acknowledgement of contributions. The review may also include suggestions for future development of the faculty member. A faculty member may receive a below expectations review if their performance in any aspect of the PRS is below expectations.

5.3.4.1 Post-Tenure Review Timeline

Post-tenure review of each tenured faculty on full-time or part-time appointment will occur under the following guidelines:

- at least every seven years
- at the faculty member's request (but at least five years from last review)
- during the year following two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews

Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled post-tenure review if: (a) they are being reviewed for higher rank during the same year, (b) they are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement, or (c) they are faculty members who serve as department chair or whose title contains the term university president, SVPP, or college dean.

5.3.4.2 Post-Tenure Review Outcomes

Based on the outcomes of the post-tenure review, the following actions will be taken:

- **Meeting expectations** - This post-tenure review recommendation may still include suggestions for future development of the faculty member. If a 'meeting expectations' 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. If agreement on the proposed Action Plan cannot be reached, the Action Plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for Action Plan Mediation ([Section 5.1.1.2.2](#)).
- **Below expectations** - This post-tenure review recommendation will include specific recommendations for achieving an acceptable performance evaluation. 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 areas deemed 'below expectations'. The Action Plan will be signed by all three parties. If agreement on the proposed Action Plan cannot be reached, the Action Plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for Action Plan Mediation ([Section 5.1.1.2.2](#)). Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next academic year's annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy ([Section 7.2.2.6.1](#)).

5.3.4.3 Role of the Department Chair

The department chair will take the following actions regarding post-tenure review:

- Review the Post-Tenure Review Report submitted.
- Provide a cover letter to the college dean indicating agreement with the outcome of the report or a detailed explanation if there is disagreement with the report findings. In cases of disagreement, the explanation is also communicated to the post-tenure review committee and the candidate.
- Discuss the Post-Tenure Review Report and its recommendations with the reviewed faculty member.
- Work with the reviewed faculty member and the chair of the review committee to develop the Action Plan for improving performance for those faculty who received a below expectations recommendation. After the Action Plan is agreed upon, it is the responsibility of the department chair and the faculty member to ensure that the Action Plan is implemented. It is the department chair's responsibility to assess the faculty member's performance in accomplishing the Action Plan.
- Forward post-tenure review materials to the college.

5.3.4.4 Role of the College Dean

The college dean will take the following actions regarding post-tenure review:

- Review post-tenure review reports and recommendations submitted for consistency and thoroughness.
- Provide feedback to the department chairs and the college caucus if there are areas that need improvement regarding thoroughness or consistency of post-tenure review processes or reports.
- Forward post-tenure review materials to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

5.3.4.5 Role of the Senior Vice President and Provost

The SVPP will take the following actions regarding post-tenure review:

- Review post-tenure review reports and recommendations submitted for consistency and thoroughness.
- Provide feedback to the college deans if there are areas that need improvement regarding thoroughness or consistency of post-tenure review processes or reports.

5.3.4.6 Post-Tenure Review Guiding Principles

Post-tenure review does not change Iowa State's commitment to academic freedom, nor the circumstances under which tenured faculty can be dismissed from the university.

Grounds for dismissal for adequate cause remain those listed in [Chapter 7 Faculty Conduct Policy](#).

The departmental policy for post-tenure review should designate the following:

- participants involved in the review
- review procedures and timelines
- materials to be reviewed
- mechanisms for the faculty member to respond

If an action plan is necessary, it must include at least the following three parts: (1) the justification for the plan, (2) a specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress on the plan, and (3) a description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation.

The departmental Post-Tenure Review Policy must be reviewed, approved, and revised by the department in accordance with the departmental, collegiate, and university governance approval process.

Approved by Faculty Senate (March 23, 1999).

Approved by Faculty Vote (April 30, 1999).

Approved by Board of Regents (June 16, 1999).

Approved by Faculty Senate (May 4, 2010); by president and provost (May 24, 2010).
Approved by Faculty Senate (April 5, 2011; by president and provost (April 7, 2011).
Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on December 9, 2014; the Senior Vice President SVPP on January 3, 2015; and the University President on January 8, 2015.

5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty

Appointments

For term faculty appointment policies, see [Section 3.3.2](#)

5.4.1 Evaluation and Renewal of Term Faculty

For the purposes of evaluating performance, Iowa State uses the following forms of review for term faculty:

- annual reviews (chair or designee)
- review for renewal of appointment (peer review)
- review for advancement (peer review)

Peer reviews must take place every three years (not counting annual reviews) or at appointment renewal time, whichever is greater.

5.4.1.1 Annual Review

Annual performance reviews ([Section 5.1.1.2](#)) are required for all term faculty whether full-time or part-time and are conducted by the department chair or their designee. The purpose of the review is to evaluate overall performance and is based on an individual's PRS. The annual evaluation will serve as a basis for determining merit salary increases.

5.4.1.2 Review for Renewal of Appointment

Term faculty appointments are eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the unit. Term faculty members, full-time and part-time, must be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee before the end of the third year after the initial appointment date. Tenured faculty and term faculty at the associate professor or professor ranks must be eligible to serve on the committee. Subsequent peer reviews must occur every three years or at appointment renewal time, whichever is greater. The outcomes of peer reviews must inform appointment renewal decisions.

5.4.1.3 Review for Advancement

All term faculty may be proposed for advancement to the next rank according to the schedule and current time at rank as specified in [Section 3.3.2.3](#). Faculty are encouraged to document equity, diversity, and inclusion activities, and the impact of this work related to teaching, research/creative activities, extension and/or professional practice, institutional service, and/or other areas of their job responsibilities. Colleges and departments must develop procedures in their governance documents for advancing term faculty that include a faculty peer review committee. Tenured faculty and term faculty at or above the rank being considered must be eligible to serve on the committee. The next peer review must

occur during the third year following a successful advancement review or at appointment renewal time.

Term faculty appointments at the assistant/lecturer rank are eligible for promotion to the associate level after five years of employment as a faculty member at Iowa State (full- or part-time) or equivalent experience. They must meet the standards for appointment identified in [Section 3.3.2.3](#). For term research faculty, external letters must be included in the review for advancement.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/26/21; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 1/29/21; and the ISU President on 1/29/21.

5.4.1.3.1 Introduction

All term faculty may seek advancement to the next rank according to the schedule and current time at rank as specified in [Section 3.3.2.3](#). Recommendation for advancement is based upon an assessment of the record since the last advancement. All advancement reviews for term faculty are non-mandatory, and an eligible faculty member may decline to seek advancement. Advancement review and contract renewal review are separate and independent processes.

5.4.1.3.2 Advancement and Credit for Prior Service

Term faculty may seek advancement review, which is non-mandatory. Colleges and/or departments may have more specific criteria for advancement, which must be clearly documented and available for the faculty member seeking advancement ([Section 5.4.1.3.3](#)). A faculty member's entire academic career, including service as a faculty member at other institutions, may be considered for advancement. However, service at other institutions does not count toward the three years of continuous service at Iowa State after which contracts are required to be for two to three years ([Section 3.3.2.3](#)).

Term faculty appointments (full- or part-time) at the lecturer/assistant rank are eligible for advancement to the associate rank after a total of five years of employment as a faculty member at Iowa State. Advancement to the term associate rank denotes a record of successful contributions to the mission of the university or the professional field as defined in the PRS and promise of further accomplishment ([Section 3.3.2.3](#)).

There is no set timeline for advancement from term associate to term professor rank. Advancement to the term professor rank is appropriate for term faculty who have proven their excellence in the primary responsibilities identified in their PRS and effectiveness in any other areas of their PRS ([Section 3.3.2.3](#)). A recommendation for advancement to term professor must be based upon an assessment of the record since the last advancement, regardless of the institution that granted it.

The five years of service at Iowa State may be reduced through credit for prior faculty service at other academic institutions or relevant professional expertise. Credit for prior

service is granted at the discretion of the hiring unit at the time of hire or before the issuance of the first multi-year contract.

5.4.1.3.3 Documentation for Advancement Review

The candidate is responsible for submitting a faculty portfolio documenting their performance with respect to the responsibilities identified in their PRS. Each college must establish guidelines and a template for faculty indicating how faculty seeking advancement shall document their performance. As stated in [Section 5.4.1.3.1](#), all advancement reviews for term faculty are non-mandatory, and an eligible faculty member may decline to seek advancement.

5.4.1.3.4 Department Review

Colleges and departments must develop procedures in their governance documents for advancing term faculty that include a faculty peer review committee. Term, tenured, and tenured-eligible faculty must be eligible to serve on advancement committees with the same rank expectations (as distinct from appointment type) as the department uses for promotion and tenure committees. For term research faculty, external letters must be included in the review for advancement ([Section 5.4.1.3](#)).

The department reviews the candidate's advancement materials per the departmental governance document process. The department chair will inform the term faculty member whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the college dean, and, if so, the nature of the recommendation(s). Term faculty who are not recommended by either the department committee, the department chair, or both, will be informed in writing by the department chair. This information should be presented in a constructive manner and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance relative to the department's criteria for advancement.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/19/22; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/13/22; and the ISU President on 5/13/22.

5.4.1.3.5 College Review

The college dean reviews the advancement recommendations from the department(s) and the college committee responsible for term faculty advancement [if constituted]. The dean provides the final college recommendations to the SVPP, along with the recommendations and votes of the committee(s), the department chair report, and documentation required by the college.

The dean will inform in writing each candidate, the respective department chair, and the college committee responsible for term faculty advancement [if constituted], whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the SVPP and, if so, the nature of the recommendation. If the dean's recommendation is contrary to the department chair or committees responsible for term faculty advancement recommendations, the dean will

summarize the reasons in writing to the department chair. The department chair will forward the dean's recommendation and summary to the department committee.

5.4.1.3.6 University Review

Review for advancement of term faculty concludes at the university level with the SVPP who will inform in writing each candidate and the respective department chair and college dean of the final institutional decision. If the SVPP's decision is contrary to the dean's recommendation, the SVPP will summarize in writing the reasons as part of their recommendation and share this with the dean and department chair.

5.4.1.3.7 Appeals of Advancement Decisions

As advancement cases are non-mandatory, a faculty member shall exhaust all possible review processes before filing an appeal. A faculty member may request a negative recommendation be forwarded to the next review level unless a college or departmental governance document explicitly prohibits it. The request for further review must be made rather than appealing the decision not to forward a positive recommendation. Once the review process in a non-mandatory case has been exhausted, a decision not to forward a positive recommendation for advancement may be appealed through administrative channels or through the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals when the department chair or college dean decides not to forward the recommendation. An administrative appeal should be filed with the next person in the administrative chain.

5.4.1.3.8 Effective Dates for Advancement

Advancement in rank for faculty with a 9-month appointment takes effect at the beginning of the next academic year. Advancement for faculty with a 12-month appointment takes effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The SVPP may grant exceptions to these dates.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/4/21; the Senior Vice President SVPP on 6/1/21; and the ISU President on 6/2/21.

5.4.1.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Professional and Scientific Term Faculty Appointments

A person employed in a Professional and Scientific position and assigned term faculty responsibilities must be evaluated, renewed, and advanced for that portion of their responsibilities according to the schedule as specified in [Section 3.3.3.2](#). Advancement must follow the policy described in [Section 5.4.1.3](#).

5.4.2 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Continuous Adjunct Appointments

Faculty on continuous adjunct appointment are eligible for review for promotion in accordance with tenured and tenure-eligible faculty promotion policies and procedures, as described in Sections [5.2.2](#), [5.2.3](#) and [5.2.4](#).

5.4.3 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Visiting Appointments

Since visiting appointments are for a one-year term and renewable for a maximum of two years in total, peer reviews are not required nor is advancement possible. Visiting appointments may be terminated at any time without cause.

5.4.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Affiliates

Appointments for all ranks of affiliate faculty must not exceed five years, with the possibility of renewal. A peer performance review involving a faculty committee must be done at the time of renewal. Affiliate appointments may be terminated at any time without cause.

An affiliate faculty member may be reviewed for advancement to the next rank according to the schedule as specified in [Section 3.3.3.1](#). Advancement must follow the policy described in [Section 5.4.1.3](#). Review of individuals in these positions will be based on the Affiliation Agreement form.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 19, 2016; by the Senior Vice President SVPP on May 2, 2016; and by the ISU President on May 3, 2016.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on May 1, 2018; by the Senior Vice President Provost on July 19, 2018; and by the ISU President on July 25, 2018.

5.5 Evaluation of a College Dean

Approved by Faculty Senate (11/13/90)

5.5.1 Policy for Faculty Involvement in Evaluation

A systematic and constructive review program must be established whereby college offices and officers are evaluated by their respective faculties. This review program should serve the following two purposes:

- provide a constructive and systematic faculty evaluation of college deans and their administrative organizations
- provide faculty opinion(s) for the evaluation of deans by the SVPP

The results of a review should be an improved capacity by the college offices and deans for maintaining academic programs, attaining goals established for the college, and securing resources that support the teaching, research, and service of the university.

5.5.2 Schedule

Reviews, in accordance with college governance documents, will be initiated at least once every five years by the SVPP in consultation with the appropriate elected collegiate governance organization. In the absence of such an elected organization, the SVPP will consult the appropriate collegiate caucus of the Faculty Senate.

5.5.3 Procedures for Faculty Involvement

Each elected college governance organization must develop written review procedures for their respective college dean. Reviews should result in the following outcomes:

- self-assessment by the dean
- performance evaluation of the dean
- provision for formal consultation involving the dean, the SVPP, and the college faculty

Review procedures adopted by each college must become part of that college's governance document after they have been reviewed by the SVPP.

5.6 Evaluation of a Teaching Assistant

Approved by Faculty Senate (5/7/91)

Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 19, 2009 and by the president and provost on November 30, 2009

The supervision of teaching assistants and the maintenance of teaching proficiency standards are the responsibilities of the hiring department. To that end, departments or programs in which teaching assistants perform their duties will evaluate their teaching proficiency at the end of each academic period. The nature and scope of these evaluations will vary with instructional settings and materials being taught.

Evaluations of teaching assistants will encompass the following aspects of teaching as mandated by the Board of Regents policy:

- knowledge of the subject material at a level appropriate for the course being taught
- proficiency in oral and written communication in formal and informal instructional settings
- ability to evaluate student performance appropriately
- facility with appropriate instructional materials and equipment

The departmental faculty has the responsibility to mentor and arrange instructional assistance for students who teach. Policies for evaluation need to be developed at the department level to ensure both the quality of instruction and the sustained development of the teaching assistants' professional skills. Written standards and procedures for these evaluations should be developed in a collegial way at the department level and be provided to teaching assistants at the outset of their teaching appointments. Special attention should be paid to assure that the standards, review procedures, and the evaluations themselves are fully communicated to the teaching assistants involved. Evaluations should consider the teaching assistants' knowledge of the subject matter, their ability with written and spoken English, and the social dynamics of the classroom including matters of age, gender, and cultural diversity. Student input will be included in evaluation.

The department chair and program directors, college deans, and the SVPP are responsible for the implementation of this policy and for ensuring that adequate standards of teaching proficiency are maintained among departmental teaching assistants.

For more information about evaluating instruction, see [Section 10.7.1](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 19, 2009, and by the president and provost on November 30, 2009,

5.7 Review of Central Administrators

Section 5.6 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/23/90.

Section 5.6 was amended and approved by the Faculty Senate 4/23/13, by the Senior Vice President SVPP on 5/29/13, and the ISU President on 6/6/13.

5.7.1 Purposes

This review program has the following two primary purposes:

- to provide an occasion for central administrative officers to review their programs and subunits and, in return, to explain the roles, procedures, and activities of their offices to the university community
- to provide a means for constructive and systematic faculty review of central administrative offices and officers

The review procedure is intended to improve the capacity of administrative offices and officers to provide system maintenance, goal attainment, and resource development efforts that support the teaching, research, and service functions of the university. The conduct of a review should facilitate communication between central administrators and the faculty and promote the concept of responsible shared governance in the university.

5.7.2 Scope of Review Program

Central administrative officers are defined as the senior vice presidents and above. Under the present administrative structure, the offices of the following officers are to be served by this review program: president of the university, SVPP, senior vice president for operations and finance, and senior vice president for student affairs.

Each review will consist of three separate reports:

- a self-study by the office to be reviewed
- a faculty review of the office and its subunits
- a faculty review of the administrator's performance

These reports will be prepared, and a follow-up conference will be scheduled one year after completion of the review.

5.7.3 Preparatory Office Self-Study

In preparation for a review, an office will conduct a self-study. The resulting Self-Study Report should also describe how the office and its responsibilities have changed over the past five years and what the impact has been on the university. The report should also address the following questions, within the general categories listed below:

- **Goals** - What are the purposes and goals of the office and its subunits? How are the goals established and what is the faculty's role in this process? What priorities are given to the principal goals, and what changes in priorities are envisioned? How do the goals of the office support the university's mission statement?
- **Programs** - What are the program activities of the office? What subordinate administrative units are involved in these programs? Exactly how is the program effectiveness of the office evaluated? How are the programs administered by the office responding to the needs of the faculty, staff, students, and the people of Iowa?
- **Services** - What services are provided by the office and its subunits? How effective are these services? What plans for discontinuing or adding services are being considered? What priorities are attached to present services?
- **Staffing** - What is the table of organization for the office? How are staff persons recruited and evaluated? Is the present staff adequate to provide the programs and services of the office? What are future staffing plans?
- **Resources** - What is the budget for the office? What priorities govern the allocation of budget resources administered by the office? What have been the changes in budgetary support for the office in recent years? How does the office evaluate its budget success? Are administrative costs too high or too low? What facilities does the office have at its disposal, and are changes needed or planned?
- **Internal Evaluation** - What are the procedures and timetable used for on-going self-review of subordinate administrative units? Have there been external reviews of subunits? What areas in the office's performance need improvement? How does the office intend to improve its performance? What development plans are being pursued? Are annual or planning reports available?
- **Relations with Other Offices** - How are the office's goals and purposes coordinated with those of other university offices and agencies, with the other Regents institutions, and with the Board of Regents? Is there overlap of functions and responsibilities with other offices? Where appropriate, what are the relationships between the office being evaluated and the Office of the Governor, the Iowa General Assembly, and other sources of support for the university?

Finally, the report should mention any other activities or functions that are not addressed in this list, but which the faculty should recognize as important aspects of the office's responsibilities.

In preparing the Self-Study Report, the emphasis should be on evaluation and analysis of activities that directly support the university's mission statement in terms of maintaining the basic academic system, attaining the goals established for the university, and developing the resources necessary to advance the multifaceted purposes of a land-grant university. This report will become a public document.

The office is also encouraged to provide the review committee with the names of faculty members who, because of their interactions with the office, may be able to provide insights about the operations and performance of the office.

5.7.4 Appointment of Review Committee

A separate review committee will be appointed for each office to be evaluated. Before establishing any review committee, the president of the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the president of the university, will provide an appropriate budget so that the committee can effectively perform its duties.

Review committee members will be appointed by the Faculty Senate president, with suggestions from the Faculty Senate, and approval of the Senate Executive Board. A review committee usually consists of the following seven individuals:

- a committee chair, appointed with the approval of the senate
- one member from the Faculty Senate Faculty Development and Administrative Relations Council
- one member from another Faculty Senate council
- three additional faculty members, appointed after due consideration to the representation of various faculty concerns and the needs of the review committee for particular expertise relevant to the office being evaluated
- one or more reviewers with relevant expertise, appointed after consultation with the administrator of the office being evaluated (reviewer(s) may be external to the university)

5.7.5 General Review Procedures

Specific procedures for conducting a review will be designed by each committee in collaboration with the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate as appropriate for the office being evaluated. The following policies pertain to all reviews.

5.7.5.1 Schedule

Administrative office reviews are usually limited to one office per year, and each office is usually evaluated about every five years. However, the Faculty Senate can call for the evaluation of multiple offices in a year or for the evaluation of an office more than once

every five years – but never more than once every three years. A majority vote of the senate is required to initiate the review process each year. As turnover occurs, first reviews should be scheduled about three years into the appointment to provide timely constructive advice.

The following order of review is established, subject to considerations of timeliness and annual senate confirmation:

- Office of the University President, including the Offices of the Vice Presidents for Information Technology; Human Resources; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; and Economic Development and Industry Relations
- Office of the Senior Vice President for Operations and Finance
- Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, including the Offices of the Vice Presidents for Research; and Extension and Outreach
- Office of the Senior Vice President for Student Affairs

Approved by Faculty Senate (November 9, 2010); by university president and provost (December 6, 2010)

5.7.5.2 Review Procedures

In conducting a review, a review committee will confer with persons responsible for framing or approving policies that affect the relationship between the office and the faculty. In addition to the Self-Study Report prepared by the office under review, the committee will have access to all necessary documents and administrative information unless the requested information is considered confidential under state or federal laws. Opinions concerning the performance of the office and officer under review must also be solicited by at least the following means:

- publication in *Inside Iowa State* of a call for such opinions
- notification of the request for such opinions through the channels of administrative organization (president, senior vice presidents, college deans, department chairs)
- solicitation of comments from faculty and others who, because of their interactions with the office being reviewed, may have especially useful information

All responses sent to a review committee will be treated as confidential correspondence, subject to applicable laws.

5.7.5.3 Review Committee Reports

The review committee will prepare two written reports: (a) Office Evaluation Report, a public document that should not contain confidential information related to the evaluation of the administrative officer, and (b) Officer Evaluation Report, a confidential evaluation of the performance of the administrative officer. Both reports will summarize the findings of the review committee and will include any recommendations it deems appropriate.

Detailed descriptions of each report are included below:

- **Office Evaluation Report** - This report will address the issues listed identified in the self-study ([Section 5.7.3](#)) and through solicited feedback. A draft of this report will be submitted to the administrator of the office under review, primarily to allow an opportunity for corrections to assertions of fact. The committee will confer with the administrator under review and with the university president (or, if the office of the university president is under review, with the president of the Board of Regents) to discuss the draft report.

Once these processes have been completed, a final report will be written and forwarded to the president of the Faculty Senate who will inform the senate about the major recommendations. Copies of the final report will also be submitted to the administrator of the office under review (who may make copies for subordinates), to the university president (or, if the president's office is under review, to the Board of Regents), and to the Faculty Senate Executive Board. A brief summary will be published in *Inside Iowa State* to alert the faculty to the fact that a review is completed.

Appropriate provision will be made to have reading copies of the office's Self-Study Report and the review committee's Final Office Evaluation Report accessible by all Iowa State faculty.

- **Officer Evaluation Report** - The review committee will solicit from all members of the university community written and/or oral evaluations concerning the performance of administrators under review. The review committee will summarize the results of this survey in writing and prepare recommendations.

This report will be distributed to the administrator being evaluated, to the university president or Board of Regents (depending on to whom the administrator being evaluated directly reports) and to the president of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate president will, in turn, summarize the recommendations before the Faculty Senate Executive Board, meeting in closed session, subject to the requirements of applicable laws.

Approximately one year after the two evaluation reports are submitted, the Faculty Senate president shall instruct the chair to reconvene the review committee to determine to what extent the recommendations contained in these reports are being adopted. With this intent, the review committee will carry out the following activities:

- Solicit, through *Inside Iowa State*, perceptions of the effectiveness with which the recommendations of the Final Office Evaluation Report have been implemented.
- Request that the reviewed administrator provide a statement indicating how the recommendations in the Office and Officer Evaluation Reports are being addressed.

- Prepare a brief perceived progress report and forward it to the officer of the office which was reviewed.

Once the perceived progress report is submitted, the review committee chair will schedule a follow-up conference.

For Faculty Senate administrative reviews, this conference will include the president of the university, the senior vice president that was reviewed, and the president of the Faculty Senate. For reviews concerning the university president's office, this conference will include the president of the Board of Regents, the president of the university, and the president of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate president will report to the senate on the outcomes of these follow-up conferences.

Chapter 6. Faculty Recognition and Development.....	95
6.1 Introduction.....	95
6.2 Honorary Degrees.....	95
6.2.1 Eligibility	95
6.2.2 The Nomination Process.....	95
6.2.3 Procedures for the Selection of a Candidate.....	95
6.2.4 Rescission of Honorary Degrees	96
6.3 Distinguished, University, and Morrill Professorships.....	96
6.3.1 Distinguished Professor.....	97
6.3.1.1 Eligibility.....	97
6.3.1.2 Procedures for the Selection Process	98
6.3.2 University Professor	98
6.3.2.1 Eligibility.....	98
6.3.2.2 Procedures for the Selection Process	98
6.3.3 Morrill Professor	98
6.3.3.1 Eligibility.....	99
6.3.3.2 Procedures for the Selection Process	99
6.4 Emeritus or Emerita Faculty	99
6.4.1 Eligibility	100
6.4.2 Nomination Process	100
6.5 Awards.....	101
6.6 Study Opportunities.....	101
6.7 Faculty Development Programs.....	101
6.7.1 Faculty Professional Development Assignments	101
6.7.2 Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program	101
6.7.3 Internship and Fellowship Programs.....	102
6.7.3.1 Selection Process	102
6.7.4 Miller Faculty Fellowships	102
6.7.5 Foreign Travel Grant Program	102
6.7.5.1 Eligibility.....	103
6.7.5.2 Categories of Foreign Travel.....	103
6.7.5.3 Application and Review	103
6.7.6 Mentoring Program for New Faculty	103
6.7.7 Bailey Research Career Development Award.....	103

Chapter 6. Faculty Recognition and Development

6.1 Introduction

Iowa State University of Science and Technology provides a variety of career development opportunities for faculty members and several forms of recognition that celebrate their accomplishments or the accomplishments of others. This chapter highlights the role played by faculty groups – notably the Faculty Senate and academic department – in the processes of development and recognition. It also explains the criteria and procedures employed in making relevant decisions.

6.2 Honorary Degrees

Iowa State awards honorary degrees to celebrate and honor careers of extraordinary achievement in the community of knowledge, understanding, and creativity of which the university is a part. In conferring an honorary degree, Iowa State associates itself with the highest achievements in scholarship, research, and creative activity consistent with its educational mission. Honorary degrees express the ideals of a great university by designating models of exceptional merit for emulation and respect.

6.2.1 Eligibility

To be eligible for an honorary degree, a candidate must be deeply grounded in a career of scholarship, research, and creative activity consistent with the academic endeavors of the university. An honorary degree is not awarded for philanthropic activity or service to the university or the State of Iowa. Additional considerations include the following:

- Neither active nor retired faculty members of Iowa State are eligible for candidacy.
- Faculty who have left Iowa State and have established a career in another setting are eligible for candidacy five years after leaving the institution.
- Holders of elective or appointive public offices are not eligible for consideration for at least five years after they have vacated office.

6.2.2 The Nomination Process

An honorary degree is awarded only in exceptional circumstances. Nominations come from the following sources:

- The Honorary Degrees Committee accepts nominations only from faculty members. A nomination may originate from an individual faculty member, from an academic unit, or from the collaborative efforts of the faculties of two or more departments.
- A nomination that comes to the committee from a source other than the academic discipline with which the candidate is associated must be reviewed by the faculty of the appropriate academic unit before submission.

6.2.3 Procedures for the Selection of a Candidate

The primary criterion for the selection of a candidate is a career of superlative intellectual and/or creative activity that represents the ideals of the university. Special emphasis

should be placed on securing nominations for candidates that will advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Honorary Degrees Committee is a committee of the Faculty Senate and will be chaired by a faculty member. The committee is responsible for inviting and reviewing all nominations, making written recommendations, and reports – in confidence – its recommendations to the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate. The board then makes its recommendations to the university president.

The committee must announce its procedures and its timetable for receiving nominations from the faculty in a timely manner. In the event that the university president does not accept a recommendation for an honorary degree from the Executive Board, the president will communicate the reasons for not doing so to the Executive Board in a timely manner.

The following guidelines apply to awarding honorary degrees:

- The university president extends the invitations to those selected to receive an honorary degree.
- Honorary degrees are awarded at commencement ceremonies, except in cases of extraordinary circumstances.
- Honorary degrees are not awarded in absentia, except in cases of extraordinary circumstances.
- The recipient of an honorary degree will interact with faculty and students in the field or area of interest while the recipient is visiting the campus, except in cases of extraordinary circumstances.

Approved by the Faculty Senate 4/23/13, the Senior Vice President and Provost 5/20/13, and the ISU President 5/28/13.

6.2.4 Rescission of Honorary Degrees

If an honorary degree recipient has acted in a manner as to bring Iowa State into disrepute, compromise the public trust, dishonor the university's standards, or otherwise be contrary to the best interests of the university, that recipient's honorary degree may be rescinded by the university president, following the recommendation of the Honorary Degrees Committee and the approval of the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate.

Approved by the Faculty Senate 4/23/13, the Senior Vice President and Provost 5/20/13 and the ISU President 5/28/13.

6.3 Distinguished, University, and Morrill Professorships

The Distinguished Professorship, University Professorship, and Morrill Professorship represent the highest academic recognitions at Iowa State and are bestowed on faculty who have demonstrated exemplary performance in their faculty activities. Recipients of these professorships represent the very best of our faculty.

These three recognitions exist to reflect the fact that faculty have multiple responsibilities and that there are different ways for a faculty member to demonstrate excellence. The

differences between the three professorships are based on the nature and focus of the faculty member's accomplishments and are summarized below:

- **Distinguished Professorship** is bestowed on faculty members who have outstanding accomplishments in their research/creative activities that have had a significant impact on their fields of expertise.
- **University Professorship** is bestowed on faculty members who have made outstanding contributions to Iowa State that have significantly changed and improved the university.
- **Morrill Professorship** is bestowed on faculty members who have demonstrated outstanding and sustained success in teaching and learning in undergraduate, graduate, and/or extension/outreach programs.

The recognition precedes the recipient's existing title. Each professorship is described in detail in the sections that follow.

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/06/01

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/27/07

Approved by Faculty Senate 11/8/11; approved by president and provost 11/17/11

Section 6.3 Approved by the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (April 10, 2023); by the President (April 10, 2023).

6.3.1 Distinguished Professor

A Distinguished Professorship is awarded for exemplary performance in research/creative activities as reflected by a national or international reputation in the nominee's discipline. A Distinguished Professor above all else must have accomplishments in research/creative activities that have had a significant impact on, or improved the quality of, their discipline. In addition, a Distinguished Professor must have demonstrated outstanding performance in at least one other area of faculty responsibility: (a) teaching and advising, (b) extension and/or professional practice, or (c) institutional service.

6.3.1.1 Eligibility

Nominees should hold the rank of professor (tenured or term) and should have served for at least five years on the Iowa State faculty. The length of service could be waived for a new hire who holds a similar title at a peer university or who is a member of one of the National Academies, but only if recommended by the Distinguished Professor Nomination Review Committee.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on December 9, 2014; the Senior Vice President and Provost on January 3, 2015; and the University President on January 8, 2015.

Section 6.3.1.1 Approved by the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (April 10, 2023); by the President (April 10, 2023).

6.3.1.2 Procedures for the Selection Process

For information about nomination and selection procedures, see [Distinguished Professor Award](#).

The Distinguished Professor Nomination Review Committee is appointed by the senior vice president and provost (SVPP) following procedures established by the Faculty Senate, receives nominations for Distinguished Professor from colleges, and makes recommendations to the SVPP.

6.3.2 University Professor

The University Professorship recognizes faculty members whose professional work has focused on effecting positive, significant institutional change at Iowa State. A University Professor must above all else have acted as a change agent by having made significant contributions that have improved the university. This professional work must go beyond excellence in teaching or research. In addition to the area of these contributions, a University Professor must have demonstrated outstanding performance in at least one other area of faculty responsibility: (a) research/creative activities, (b) teaching and advising, or (c) extension and/or professional practice.

6.3.2.1 Eligibility

Nominees should hold the rank of professor (tenured or term) and should have served for at least ten years on the Iowa State faculty prior to the beginning of the academic year in which they are nominated. The nominees must be individuals whose contributions extend well beyond a one-time impact. Having held an administrative position in and of itself is insufficient for consideration for this recognition. Faculty who have served as administrators (e.g. department chairs, college deans, vice president, SVPP, or staff members in those offices) may be nominated only after they have been out of their administrative roles and functioning as faculty members for at least three years.

Section 6.3.2.1 Approved by the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (April 10, 2023); by the President (April 10, 2023).

6.3.2.2 Procedures for the Selection Process

For information about nomination and selection procedures, see [University Professor Award](#).

The University Professor Nomination Review Committee is appointed by the SVPP following procedures established by the Faculty Senate, receives nominations from the colleges, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Board. The Executive Board forwards recommendations to the SVPP.

6.3.3 Morrill Professor

The Morrill Professorship recognizes faculty members whose professional work has demonstrated outstanding success in teaching and learning in undergraduate, graduate

and/or extension/outreach programs which is reflected by a national or international reputation in the nominee's discipline. A Morrill Professor must above all else have long-term and sustained excellence in teaching and learning. This professional work must go beyond scholarly work in teaching and learning and show outstanding accomplishments that have enhanced learning outcomes in undergraduate, graduate, and/or extension/outreach programs. In addition to these contributions, a Morrill Professor must have demonstrated outstanding performance in at least one other area of faculty responsibility: (a) research/creative activities, (b) professional practice, or (c) institutional service.

Approved by Faculty Senate 11/8/11; approved by president and provost 11/17/11

6.3.3.1 Eligibility

Nominees must hold the rank of professor (tenured or term) and have served for at least five years on the Iowa State faculty.

Section 6.3.3.1 Approved by the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (April 10, 2023); by the President (April 10, 2023).

6.3.3.2 Procedures for the Selection Process

For information about nomination and selection procedures, see [Morrill Professor Award](#).

The Morrill Professor Nomination Review Committee is appointed by the SVPP following procedures established by the Faculty Senate, receives nominations from the colleges, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Board. The Executive Board forwards recommendations to the SVPP.

6.4 Emeritus or Emerita Faculty

Designation as emeritus or emerita is a recognition of meritorious service to Iowa State.

The privileges enjoyed by emeritus and emerita faculty include the following:

- being listed by title in the online Iowa State University Catalog: [Faculty List](#)
- being included on institutional communications to faculty
- being afforded the same status as regular faculty with respect to all events, activities, and services sponsored or provided by the university
- being provided office space when such space is available

Emeritus and emerita faculty are subject to the same Faculty Conduct Policy ([see Chapter 7 Faculty Conduct](#)) as current faculty and shall abide by all university policies as articulated in the *Faculty Handbook* and in the Iowa State University Policy Library. Violation of policy is grounds for removal of the emeritus or emerita designation.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/07/91; 11/14/12

Approved by the Provost 11/20/12; Approved by the President 11/27/12

6.4.1 Eligibility

The following faculty are eligible for the emeritus or emerita designation:

- A term or tenured faculty member who has attained the rank of professor and who retires immediately following ten or more continuous years of employment by Iowa State will automatically be given emeritus or emerita designation at the rank of professor.
- A retiring term or tenured faculty member at the rank of full professor serving fewer than 10 years at Iowa State through process of nomination.
- A term or tenured faculty member who has retired at the rank of assistant or associate professor, who has a record of distinguished meritorious service to the university and the profession. Emeritus or emerita designation may be given at the last rank held through process of nomination.
- Persons retiring from administrative duties, at the discretion of the university president, may retain their administrative title with emeritus or emerita designation added (e.g., dean emeritus, dean emerita).
- A president, upon retirement, may be given the title president emeritus or president emerita by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

6.4.2 Nomination Process

Term or tenured faculty who retire at the rank of professor with 10 or more years of continuous employment at the university are automatically granted emeritus or emerita designation upon retirement.

A nomination and approval process is required for:

- term or tenured faculty who retire at the rank of professor with less than 10 years of continuous employment at Iowa State
- term or tenured faculty who retire at the rank of assistant or associate professor

The nomination and approval process follows the steps below:

1. Nominations are initiated by the faculty of the individual's department(s) and supported by the faculty. The department chair forwards the department's nomination statement and any supporting documentation to the college dean's office.
2. Within 30 days of receipt of the department's nomination, the dean reviews the nomination and may solicit input from the dean's cabinet. The dean forwards their recommendation, along with the department nomination, to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.
3. The SVPP reviews the documentation received and renders a decision within 30 days of receipt of the dean's recommendation.
4. The SVPP notifies the faculty member nominated, the department chair, and the dean of the final decision.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/18/2017 and 11/12/2019; by the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/1/17 and 11/25/19; and by the ISU President on 5/1/17 and 11/26/19.

6.5 Awards

Iowa State maintains a system of honors and awards to recognize the accomplishments of faculty in teaching, research, institutional service, and professional practice. For a list and description of awards and nomination criteria, see [Faculty Awards](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.6 Study Opportunities

Faculty may enroll in university classes for professional development or personal enrichment. Enrollment in classes that conflict or interfere with the completion of faculty responsibilities should be avoided. Faculty who wish to receive credit will be expected to pay full tuition and fees for all courses. Alternatively, faculty members who wish to attend university classes informally on a no-credit basis should confer with the instructor in charge.

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.7 Faculty Development Programs

6.7.1 Faculty Professional Development Assignments

Iowa State recognizes that significant opportunities for professional growth and development are required periodically by faculty members and that the Faculty Professional Development Assignments (FPDA) Program is one of the best modes to achieve such growth and development.

The university strives to promote an environment in which faculty members are motivated to participate in the FPDA Program. This environment permits both the faculty and administration to plan so as to obtain the desired results from the program. Leaves other than the FPDA will be handled administratively and will not be included as part of this program. For guidelines on preparation, review, and approval of applications, see [FDPA Program Overview](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/16/90.

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.7.2 Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program

The Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program offers faculty the opportunity to travel throughout the academic year to member institutions to exchange ideas and research. For guidelines on preparing and submitting proposals, see [Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.7.3 Internship and Fellowship Programs

The university supports administrative internships and fellowships for faculty because these can be relevant experiences for faculty members' professional development. The following policies apply:

- The university will continue to encourage faculty professional development by making timely university-wide announcements of internal and external internship and fellowship opportunities.
- Such announcements will include information about internships available in the various Iowa State administrative offices and colleges, the American Council on Education (ACE) Fellows Program, the Kellogg National Fellowship Program, and other similar programs.
- No central funding will be available for the Kellogg National Fellowship Program or the ACE Fellows Program, and all such expenses will be covered by the respective college/administrative offices.

6.7.3.1 Selection Process

Nominations for external internship/fellowship programs are initiated at the departmental level by the chair, forwarded to the college dean, and, if approved, forwarded to the SVPP.

The following policies apply to internal internships:

- Nominations and applications for the internal internship programs will be administered consistent with the individual college policies and procedures related to the internship position.
- The preferred title will be "Administrative Intern to the _____", not "Assistant to the _____" or "Assistant _____."
- There will be no administrative increment awarded to those individuals appointed to the internal internship programs. Salaries are to be paid by the respective administrative units, with reimbursement for necessary replacement of faculty duties to be negotiated with the employing office.

6.7.4 Miller Faculty Fellowships

Miller Faculty Fellowships, supported by an endowment, are awarded annually to fund faculty development proposals that advance the university's strategic plan. The program is administered by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching. For guidelines on preparing and submitting proposals, see [Miller Faculty Fellowship Program](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.7.5 Foreign Travel Grant Program

In some instances, financial support for university-related travel to foreign countries may be obtained through the Foreign Travel Grant Program. Because funds in this program are limited, grants are awarded on a competitive basis and for no more than 75 percent of the

least expensive round-trip airfare between Des Moines and the individual's destination or 75 percent of the lowest appropriate airfare between two destinations, whichever is less at the time the quote is obtained.

6.7.5.1 Eligibility

All faculty may apply for foreign travel grants. Junior faculty who have an opportunity to participate in an international activity that is in the purview of the Foreign Travel Grant Program are encouraged to apply.

6.7.5.2 Categories of Foreign Travel

Although foreign travel may be undertaken for a number of reasons, most foreign travel requests involve one or more of the following categories:

- long-term research projects in a foreign location
- research projects of short duration or collaborative efforts, often involving several related activities such as lecturing, graduate student recruiting, fund-raising, etc.
- presentations at foreign conferences
- faculty exchanges

6.7.5.3 Application and Review

For information and application forms, see [Foreign Travel Grants](#). Applications are reviewed and grants are awarded three times a year by the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 2008, and by the president and provost on April 29, 2008.

6.7.6 Mentoring Program for New Faculty

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost sponsors a mentoring program for new tenure-eligible faculty. The program focuses on helping an individual develop professionally through advice and consultation. Senior faculty designated as mentors accept special responsibilities for assisting new faculty members. For information and resources on faculty mentoring, see [Faculty Mentoring](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

6.7.7 Bailey Research Career Development Award

The overall goal of this award is to foster research that is innovative, and not only increases knowledge but also has practical applications. It is expected that the Bailey Award will allow faculty to devote time toward high-risk research addressing emerging scientific, technical and/or societal problems resulting in practical applications and, in appropriate disciplines, extramural funding. For application guidelines, see [Bailey Award](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/6/2012; approved by president and provost 4/10/2012

Chapter 7. Faculty Conduct Policy	106
7.1 Statement of Principles	106
7.1.1 Academic Freedom	106
7.1.2 Professional Responsibilities	107
7.2 Faculty Misconduct.....	108
7.2.1 Interpretation of Misconduct Rules.....	108
7.2.1.1 Protection of Academic Freedom	108
7.2.1.2 Scholarly Discourse and Germaneness	108
7.2.1.3 Severity of Violations.....	109
7.2.2 Types of Misconduct.....	109
7.2.2.1 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment.....	109
7.2.2.1.1 Consenting Relationships.....	110
7.2.2.1.2 Family Relationships - Nepotism	111
7.2.2.1.3 Procurement.....	111
7.2.2.2 Discrimination and Harassment.....	111
7.2.2.3 Bullying (Harassing) Behavior	111
7.2.2.4 Academic and Research Misconduct	112
7.2.2.4.1 Academic Misconduct	112
7.2.2.4.2 Research Misconduct	112
7.2.2.5 Criminal Acts or Acts of Violence.....	113
7.2.2.6 Violation of Other University Principles and Policies	113
7.2.2.6.1 Unacceptable Performance of Duty	113
7.2.2.6.2 Abandonment of Position.....	114
7.2.2.6.3 Assisting Others in Violating University Rules.....	114
7.2.2.6.4 Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources .	114
7.2.2.6.5 Breach of Confidentiality	115
7.2.2.6.6 Breach of a Mediation Agreement	115
7.2.2.6.7 Breach of Professional Ethics.....	115
7.2.2.6.8 Deception	115
7.2.2.6.9 Interference with Disciplinary Procedures.....	115
7.2.2.6.10 Misuse of Funds, Equipment, and Facilities.....	115
7.2.2.6.11 Misuse of Others' Intellectual Property	116
7.2.2.6.12 Other Policies	116
7.2.3 Addressing Claims of Faculty Misconduct	116

7.2.4 Voluntary Mediated Process	117
7.2.4.1 Initiating the Process.....	117
7.2.4.2 Complaint Review and Processing.....	117
7.2.4.3 Resolution of Complaints	117
7.2.5 Formal Complaint Process	117
7.2.5.1 Filing Formal Complaints	118
7.2.5.1.1 Content of Formal Complaints	118
7.2.5.1.2 Offices Where Formal Complaints May be Filed	118
7.2.5.1.3 Initial Steps to be taken by Senior Vice President and Provost.....	119
7.2.5.1.4 Interim Action	120
7.2.5.2 Complaint Review and Resolution	121
7.2.5.2.1 Faculty Review Board	121
7.2.5.2.2 Investigation of the Case	122
7.2.5.2.3 Investigative Report.....	123
7.2.5.2.4 Minor Sanction Hearing	123
7.2.5.2.5 Post-hearing Report	124
7.2.5.2.6 Response of the Senior Vice President and Provost to the Final Post-Hearing Report	125
7.2.5.3 Major Sanction Process.....	126
7.2.5.3.1 Appointment of Major Sanction Committee.....	126
7.2.5.3.2 Major Sanction Committee Review and Hearing.....	127
7.2.5.3.3 Procedures Applicable to the Major Sanction Hearing .	128
7.2.5.3.4 Report of the Major Sanction Committee	130
7.2.5.3.5 Response of the University President to Major Sanction Committee Report.....	131
7.2.5.4 Records.....	132
7.2.6 Processes for Appeal.....	132
7.2.6.1 Appeals to the University President.....	133
7.2.6.2 Appeals to the Board of Regents.....	133
7.2.6.3 Appeals to the Courts.....	133
7.2.6.4 Request to Reopen.....	133
7.2.6.5 Faculty Senate Appeals	134
7.2.6.6 Appeals following an Administrative Procedure Act Hearing	134

7.2.7 Definitions	134
7.2.7.1 Administrative Leave.....	134
7.2.7.2 Faculty Member	134
7.2.7.3 Faculty Pool.....	135
7.2.7.4 Major Sanctions	135
7.2.7.5 Minor Sanctions.....	135
7.2.7.6 Progressive Corrective Action.....	136
7.2.7.7 Reassignment of Duties	138
7.2.7.8 Suspension	138

Chapter 7. Faculty Conduct Policy

Changes to this section were approved by the Faculty Senate, November 14, 2006.

7.1 Statement of Principles

Section 7 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/01/01, by the University President on 1/31/02 and by the Board of Regents on 3/14/02.

7.1.1 Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the foundation of the university because it encourages and guarantees the right to inquiry, discourse, and learning that characterizes a community of scholars. Iowa State University of Science and Technology supports, within the law, full freedom of expression in all faculty responsibilities including teaching, investigation in research, and dissemination of results through presentation, performance, and publication. No faculty member will be judged on any basis not demonstrably related to professional performance. Iowa State is dedicated to ensuring that faculty have the freedom to engage in teaching, research, extension, administration, and other professional activities and it considers a strong tenure system to be indispensable to the success of fulfilling its obligations. Iowa State is committed to an uninhibited, robust, and unfettered pursuit of ideas. All members of the university community, faculty, staff, students, and administrators, are members of an ethical team whose goal is to create an environment in which no one hesitates to speak their mind for fear of reprisal. Iowa State will take all appropriate actions to defend academic freedom, and to defend faculty who are accused or charged during the appropriate exercise of their duties.

In the exercise of academic freedom, faculty members may discuss without limitation any topic related to their professional area of expertise in the classroom, at professional meetings, or through publication. As scholars and educational officers, faculty should remember that the public might judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, and should show respect for the opinions of others. When faculty members speak or write as individuals, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline.

7.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

Iowa State recognizes that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Faculty members, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their discipline is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, faculty members devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Faculty members do not allow subsidiary interests to compromise their freedom of inquiry.

As teachers, faculty members encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. Faculty hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Faculty members demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty members foster honest academic conduct and evaluate student work with respect to its true academic merit. Faculty respect the special nature of the relationship between professor and student. Faculty do not exploit, harass, or improperly discriminate against students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. Faculty protect their academic freedom.

As administrators and colleagues, faculty members have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Faculty members do not exploit, harass, or improperly discriminate against colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, faculty members show due respect for the opinions of others. They acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Faculty members accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

As members of an academic institution, faculty members seek to be effective teachers, scholars, and administrators. Faculty members maintain their rights to criticize and seek revision of university regulations and actions that they believe violate academic freedom. Faculty members give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, faculty members recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

As private individuals, faculty members have the same rights and obligations as others. Faculty members measure the urgency of these obligations in light of their responsibilities to their discipline, students, profession, and institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As individuals engaged in a profession that depends on freedom for its health

and integrity, faculty members promote conditions of free inquiry and further public understanding of academic freedom.

7.2 Faculty Misconduct

Every faculty member at Iowa State recognizes that certain types of behavior constitute misconduct. Such behavior compromises the integrity of the university and the trust placed upon its members. The university will take any actions necessary to prevent misconduct and to discipline those it finds responsible. Generally, adequate cause for sanction of a faculty member includes but is not limited to:

- professional dishonesty in teaching, research, extension, or administrative activity
- demonstrated incompetence
- substantial and manifest neglect of duty
- serious misconduct prohibited by law, Board of Regents, State of Iowa policies, or official university policies

In addition, the Board of Regents reserves the power to sanction a member of the faculty for other causes, but this power is exercised only under exceptional circumstances and then only for conduct which is clearly prejudicial to the best interests of the university.

7.2.1 Interpretation of Misconduct Rules

7.2.1.1 Protection of Academic Freedom

To ensure protection of academic freedom, this faculty conduct policy must not be interpreted to permit discipline of faculty for immaterial violations of policy. Faculty should be disciplined only for practices that affect an important interest of the university.

7.2.1.2 Scholarly Discourse and Germaneness

When faculty are engaged in scholarly discourse they may not be disciplined for discussion or presentation of material, ideas, or topics that are germane to the scholarly subject matter. Scholarly discourse includes the investigation, discussion, and presentation of scholarly subject matter, including the presentation of material in the classroom. In order to be germane, the material presented must be relevant to the scholarly subject matter and presented by appropriate means.

Faculty shall remember that students are constrained in their freedom of choice of classes and in continuation in classes. Teaching methods that target individual students in an unfair way so as to prevent them from full participation in a course is not appropriate. Comments related to sex, gender, race, or ethnicity that are persistent, demeaning, and unnecessary are not germane. Failure to adhere to the policy on the use of explicit materials will be considered in deciding whether the material is germane (see [Section 10.6.1](#)).

7.2.1.3 Severity of Violations

Disciplinary action will be appropriate to the severity of the underlying misconduct. Generally, violations considered more severe include but are not limited to the following:

- violence or threats of violence
- acts intended to result in improper personal gain of the faculty member and loss to others
- intentional or knowing violation of laws or rules known to the faculty member
- acts the faculty member could anticipate will be seriously prejudicial to others
- acts that result in substantial interference with the learning of students, the work of colleagues and staff, or the receipt of benefits intended for the public
- repeated acts of a similar nature

7.2.2 Types of Misconduct

The following sections describe general categories of misbehavior. The fact that a particular behavior is not specifically mentioned does not mean that faculty cannot be sanctioned if the behavior falls within the general definition of adequate cause described in [Section 7.2.1](#).

7.2.2.1 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment

Iowa State encourages faculty to participate in external activities that promote the university's mission, enhance professional skills, expand knowledge, and/or contribute to public service. At the same time, the university expects all employees to conscientiously guard against possible adverse effects of their activities on the performance of their university duties and the reputation of the university.

Activities or financial interests with the potential to lead to such adverse effects are termed "conflicts." The university's [Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policy](#) (COIC Policy) provides a broad framework for understanding, disclosing, and managing conflicts. All Iowa State employees are required to comply with the COIC Policy and the [Procedures, Applications, and Guidance](#) established for disclosure, approval, and management of conflicts of interest and commitment. The COIC Policy complies with federal and state law and Board of Regents policies and rules regarding all forms of conflicts.

Details of procedures for disclosing and managing specific types of conflicts are provided in the [COIC Policy](#) and the [Procedures, Applications, and Guidance](#) document. Topics of interest include

- financial conflicts of interest (financial interests in, management roles in, and consulting for external entities, as well as ownership of patents, patent, and royalty rights)
- professional activity leave
- service to government and professional associations

Iowa State requires the disclosure, review, approval, and management of external activities or financial interests with the potential to interfere with one or more of the following:

- **Performance of Duties:** University employees are expected to devote sufficient time and attention to their university duties to perform them conscientiously. An external activity with the potential to interfere with the employee's university duties is known as a conflict of commitment.
- **Objectivity:** University employees are expected to be objective in the decisions they make while performing their university responsibilities. Financial or other personal considerations with the potential to compromise an employee's objectivity are known as conflicts of interest.
- **Appropriate Use of State Resources:** State law prohibits the use of state resources, including the university name and trademarks, for personal benefit when such use is detrimental to the state or university.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.1.1 Consenting Relationships

Consenting relationships that are of concern to Iowa State are those intimate relationships to which both parties have consented, but where a reporting or evaluative relationship exists between the parties. When a relationship between a faculty member and a student is not confined to that of intellectual guide and academic counselor, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to take appropriate actions to avoid any conflict or apparent conflict of interest between the personal and academic concerns. Likewise, when such a relationship exists between faculty members or when it includes their role as supervisor, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to take appropriate actions to avoid any conflict or apparent conflict of interest.

Because of the reporting and evaluative nature of the relationship and the uneven power inherent in such relationships, they may become exploitative. Further, other individuals in proximity to the consenting relationship may suffer as a result of the reporting or evaluative aspects of the consenting relationship. Although consenting relationships may be viewed as private, real or perceived preferential treatment at the expense of others is in violation of an environment that seeks to foster a community for learning and scholarship. Because of these reporting and evaluation relationships and the uneven power inherent in such relationships, it will be very difficult to avoid subsequent charges of sexual harassment.

A faculty member must not participate in the supervision, instruction, or evaluation of a student, staff member, or colleague with whom a romantic or sexual relationship exists or has existed. The faculty member shall take appropriate actions to end the supervisory, instructional, or reporting relationship, thereby removing the possibility of a conflict of interest. Failure to do so must be viewed as misconduct. See [Consenting Relationships](#).

7.2.2.1.2 Family Relationships - Nepotism

The Board of Regents policy prohibits persons responsible for the employment of staff members from recommending for employment anyone related to them by blood or marriage as follows: parent, child, brother, sister, first cousin, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, spouse, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepparent, and stepchild. This restriction applies to all employees.

Faculty may not vote or formally participate in decisions to appoint, set salary, tenure, promote, or determine working conditions when the candidate is their spouse, domestic partner, child, or others as defined by Board of Regents policy. Nor are they permitted to supervise the academic work of their spouses, domestic partners, or children unless specific permission has been granted by the department chair, and a plan for oversight has been instituted to assure objective evaluation of the work. Generally, someone other than the faculty member should evaluate the work of such family members. See [Board of Regents Policy Manual – 2.1 Human Resources, Section 4.H.](#)

7.2.2.1.3 Procurement

Faculty and immediate family members may not sell goods or services to the university unless in conformity with Board of Regents Policy (see [Section 8.4.6](#)). Iowa law also forbids the acceptance of gifts from persons in certain circumstances, which may indicate improper influence. For more information, see [Gratuities and Gifts, Procurement](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/6/2012; approved by the president and provost on 4/10/2012
Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.2 Discrimination and Harassment

Iowa State values and promotes an environment that enables all members of the community to pursue work and study free from discrimination and harassment. At the same time, the university is committed to preserving academic freedom and an environment of free debate and discussion. As employees, faculty are responsible for abiding by the university's [Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#) as well as the [Title IX Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, and Stalking Policy](#). These policies, and the procedures detailed within, govern the investigation and adjudication of complaints filed pursuant to these policies.

Amended and approved by Faculty Senate 12/8/20; by the Senior Vice President and Provost 12/12/20; and the ISU President 12/12/20.

7.2.2.3 Bullying (Harassing) Behavior

Criticism and actions can result in bullying when:

- Spoken, written or physical conduct attempts to improperly influence another's academic or personal decisions with the direct or indirect threat of negative consequences if compliance does not occur.

- Spoken, written, or physical conduct is directed against another and is reasonably regarded as either abusive, intimidating, or humiliating, and substantially impairs the academic or work environment of the person against whom it is directed.
- Spoken, written, or physical conduct intentionally encourages others, acting singly or in a group, to bully others.

Amended and approved by Faculty Senate 9/11/18; by the Senior Vice President and Provost 9/24/18; and the ISU President 10/3/18. Amended and approved by Faculty Senate 1/22/19; by the Senior Vice President and Provost 1/25/19; and the ISU President 1/26/19.

7.2.2.4 Academic and Research Misconduct

The faculty bear the primary responsibility to the academic community, to the institution, and to each other for maintaining high standards of integrity in teaching, research, extension, administration, and scholarly activity. By virtue of their leadership positions in the university, faculty have a special obligation to support and maintain a climate of integrity. It is important to recognize that academic and research misconduct cannot be excused or wrongly protected under a claim of academic freedom.

Academic and research misconduct include any and all practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted in the academic community for teaching, research, extension, administration, professional practice, and service.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.4.1 Academic Misconduct

Examples of academic misconduct include the following:

- plagiarism, the representation of another's work as one's own when it occurs other than in the course of research
- failure to follow required protocols in conducting research, such as adhering to procedures for the protection of human or animal subjects of research
- falsification of one's credentials
- retaliation against persons who file claims of academic misconduct
- falsification or intentional misrepresentations of truth in teaching

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/6/2012; Approved by the president and provost on 4/10/2012.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.4.2 Research Misconduct

Research misconduct, specifically as defined in federal regulations, is detailed below:

- research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or in reporting research results

- plagiarism, the representation of another's work as one's own when it occurs in the course of research
- ordering, advising, or suggesting that subordinates engage in any practice constituting research misconduct

At Iowa State, any other misconduct involving research will be treated as academic misconduct.

Research misconduct must depart significantly from accepted practices of the relevant research community and must be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly. If a faculty member is alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, then the procedures set forth in the university's [Research Misconduct Policy](#) must be followed unless determined otherwise by the university's research integrity officer (RIO).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.5 Criminal Acts or Acts of Violence

Faculty are subject to state and federal laws. Criminal acts involving moral turpitude, acts that violate laws specifically applicable to state employees, or acts of violence or threats of violence against persons or property are considered misconduct and make the perpetrator liable to sanction. This policy is intended to provide a sanction only for those crimes that affect the fitness of the faculty member.

7.2.2.6 Violation of Other University Principles and Policies

Violation of other university principles or policies may result in disciplinary action.

7.2.2.6.1 Unacceptable Performance of Duty

These procedures are intended only in cases for which dismissal for unacceptable performance of duty may be contemplated after reasonable documented efforts have been made (by department, college, and university administrators) to resolve performance concerns according to the university's policies governing faculty performance.

A faculty member's performance of duty may be deemed unacceptable if there has been, for a significant period of time (most recent three to five years), substantial, persistent, and manifest neglect of faculty duties as presented in the faculty member's Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and as reflected in the written record. The written record will include the PRS, annual evaluations, current curriculum vitae, and at least one completed post-tenure review (for tenured faculty) or peer review (for pre-tenure or term faculty) within the time frame in question. The written record may also include any written correspondence over the past three to five years between the department chair and the individual, dealing with performance of duties, and any written correspondence between the individual and the relevant college dean or the senior vice president and provost (SVPP) dealing with performance of duties.

The dean shall make a complaint of unacceptable performance of duty based on the written record.

To initiate the formal complaint procedure of unacceptable performance of duty, the college dean will file a written complaint with the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost by setting forth in writing the specific findings of unacceptable performance of duty. The dean's notification must include the entire written record and a review of the efforts that have been made to resolve the matter, including the use of any established post-tenure review procedures of the college and department(s) in question. Upon receipt of a complaint, the SVPP and the president of the Faculty Senate will immediately evaluate the complaint to determine whether the complaint has been properly filed. If filed properly, the SVPP initiates the formal Complaint Review and Resolution procedures as described in [Section 7.2.5.2](#).

Approved by Faculty Senate (April 19, 2011); by president and provost (April 22, 2011).
Amended and approved by Faculty Senate 12/12/17; by the Senior Vice President and Provost 12/14/17;
and the ISU President 12/15/17.

7.2.2.6.2 Abandonment of Position

Faculty members who substantially fail to perform their position responsibilities and show disregard and lack of care for the accomplishment of their responsibilities have abandoned their positions. Failure to address reasonable requests to perform position responsibilities in a timely manner, especially those related to schedule-driven responsibilities such as teaching and extension/outreach, must be regarded as evidence of abandonment of position. In cases of abandonment, salary may be suspended by the SVPP upon recommendation of a Faculty Review Board (see [Section 7.2.5.1.4](#)).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.2.6.3 Assisting Others in Violating University Rules

As exemplars for others on the campus, faculty may not assist others in material violations of university rules. This applies though the specific rule may not apply to faculty. For example, a faculty member should not assist a student in violation of the university disciplinary regulations applicable to students.

7.2.2.6.4 Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources

Computational equipment is a valuable tool for carrying out the mission of the institution. Faculty are expected to adhere to the university's policy on the [Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources](#). Specifically, faculty shall not access the data of others without authorization nor take action intended to damage or interfere with computer equipment, software, databases, or networks.

7.2.2.6.5 Breach of Confidentiality

Faculty are entrusted with confidential information on students, colleagues, clients, and research subjects. Unauthorized disclosure of personal information subject to restrictions on dissemination is a form of misconduct. With respect to information on students, faculty are expected to adhere to standards set by the [Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act \(FERPA\)](#).

7.2.2.6.6 Breach of a Mediation Agreement

Faculty members are expected to adhere to their commitments made as the outcome of a mediated agreement under the mediation procedure described in [Section 7.2.4](#). Failure to do so may be determined to be misconduct.

7.2.2.6.7 Breach of Professional Ethics

Faculty often are members of a profession based upon the subject of their expertise. Faculty are expected to uphold the standards applied to the practice of their profession. For example, a professional counselor, whether of law, psychology or other therapy is expected to adhere to the applicable ethical rules; a veterinarian is expected to adhere to the ethical rules applicable to veterinarians. Failure to do so may result in disciplinary action.

7.2.2.6.8 Deception

Intentionally providing false information to others – whether orally or in writing – with the understanding that they may rely upon such information, is damaging to the trust placed in faculty. Alteration of documents used for official purposes is both a violation of law and faculty misconduct.

7.2.2.6.9 Interference with Disciplinary Procedures

Faculty members may not intentionally interfere with disciplinary processes, including the following acts:

- destroying or concealing evidence
- providing false or misleading information
- intimidating witnesses
- promising rewards to witnesses for favorable testimony

A faculty member is not required to testify against themselves or under circumstances where they may incriminate themselves by testifying.

7.2.2.6.10 Misuse of Funds, Equipment, and Facilities

The use of funds, equipment, or facilities provided for a specific purpose for other than that purpose is a form of misconduct. Iowa law forbids the use of funds, equipment, or facilities for personal gain or benefit, or for private gain or benefit without following procedures for approval and reimbursement. For more information, see [Personal Use and Misuse of University Property](#).

7.2.2.6.11 Misuse of Others' Intellectual Property

Faculty have the obligation to respect the works of their colleagues and students. Use of others' unpublished work, even with attribution, is not acceptable unless it is clear that the author or owner claims no exclusivity in the work, or appropriate authorization has been granted. Faculty members are expected to comply with fair use rules in using copyrighted works of others.

7.2.2.6.12 Other Policies

Faculty shall comply with all university policies, including but not limited to those found in:

- [Board of Regents Policy Manual](#)
- [Iowa State University Policy Library](#)
- Uniform Rules of Personal Conduct ([Iowa Administrative Code, section 681, Chapter 9](#)).

7.2.3 Addressing Claims of Faculty Misconduct

Conflicts or concerns that arise during the day-to-day functioning of the university are usually addressed through administrative channels and involve bringing the concern(s) to the attention of the appropriate administrator charged with responsibility for that academic unit (e.g., chair, college dean, or SVPP). Any individual with a concern that a faculty member may be guilty of misconduct may bring the concern forward through these same regular administrative channels. The administrator is responsible for assessing the situation and, where appropriate, taking appropriate administrative action to resolve concerns. If the complaint involves activities that are prohibited by the university's [Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#), the administrator shall notify the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) upon the receipt and resolution of the complaint to ensure responsiveness and consistent enforcement. The administrator may recommend the use of the complaint processes described below.

An individual with a concern that misconduct has occurred may also initiate a complaint through either the Voluntary Mediated Process (see [Section 7.2.4](#)) or the Formal Complaint Process (see [Section 7.2.5](#)) delineated in this document, or informally through the [Ombuds Office](#). The Voluntary Mediated Process is used to consider and resolve misconduct issues through mediated discussion with all involved parties. The Formal Complaint Process begins with the presentation of a written complaint and involves peer review.

The procedures described below are designed to assess and resolve the misconduct issues identified in this policy and are not intended to address grievances. For information on faculty grievance procedures, see [Chapter 9 Faculty Grievance Procedures](#).

If an individual has a concern that research misconduct has occurred, the individual is encouraged to report the misconduct to the university's RIO in accordance with the university's [Research Misconduct Policy](#).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.4 Voluntary Mediated Process

7.2.4.1 Initiating the Process

The individual wishing to bring a complaint of misconduct to mediated resolution may do so by contacting the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost in writing. Mediators are individuals designated for their skill and training in mediation and for their knowledge of the policies of the university. The goal of mediation is for an impartial party to work with the individuals to resolve a charge of misconduct outside of a hearing process. Successful mediation results in a written agreement among the parties. The SVPP may also initiate the mediation process in certain cases.

7.2.4.2 Complaint Review and Processing

As part of the process, the mediator will discuss the procedural options with the complainant and the respondent. To enter into the voluntary mediated process, both the respondent and complainant need to agree to follow the process outlined by the mediator. The mediator will arrange for a discussion of the issues and assist in developing a written plan to which the parties will agree. Mediators will consult with the appropriate administrators in the development of the agreement to receive advice on the impact of the resolution on the operations of the department or unit.

7.2.4.3 Resolution of Complaints

The written agreement will be provided to the parties involved, the administrators responsible for overseeing the agreement, and the SVPP. Chairs and college deans will keep such agreements in sealed files in a secure location separate from official personnel files. The documents and notes of the mediation process will be organized following good practice in mediation and will be retained for five years in the confidential files of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. They shall only be opened if the parties agree, or if there is an urgent need for access. Mediators may not be called on as witnesses, and notes and records of these proceedings (except for the agreement) may not be used as evidence in a grievance or a formal hearing except as provided by law.

If mediation is not successful, a complaint may be filed through the formal complaint process.

7.2.5 Formal Complaint Process

The formal complaint process is based upon peer review and respect for due process. It is an academic process, not a judicial process. The goal of a formal complaint is to determine the truth and to recommend and apply remedies and sanctions in keeping with the freedoms and responsibilities of academic freedom and the university environment.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.1 Filing Formal Complaints

To initiate the formal complaint, the complainant will file a written complaint with the appropriate administrative officer as indicated in [Section 7.2.5.1.2](#). Multiple complaints arising out of the same alleged misconduct, or a pattern of alleged misconduct, should be consolidated into a single complaint.

The complainant may be an individual affected by the alleged misconduct, or an administrator or other person to whom an affected individual has referred information regarding the alleged misconduct. For purposes of the Faculty Conduct Policy as described in this chapter, an affected individual allegedly harmed by the conduct (who is not the complainant) will be known as “the referring party.”

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.1.1 Content of Formal Complaints

The formal, written complaint should include:

- name, address, and contact information of the complainant
- name of the referring party, if any
- name and office of the individual(s) alleged to have engaged in misconduct
- short jargon-free statement describing the alleged misconduct
- approximate date(s) on which the misconduct allegedly occurred
- persons known to have information relevant to the complaint
- statement of any provision of law, rule, or policy believed to have been violated by the alleged misconduct
- other information that will assist in the peer investigation and resolution of the complaint
- signature of the complainant

Complaints may also suggest what action might be taken to address the alleged misconduct. Complainants are expected to cooperate by providing relevant information relating to the complaint if requested. Failure to cooperate may result in dismissal of the complaint.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.1.2 Offices Where Formal Complaints May be Filed

The following offices are designated to receive complaints against a member of the faculty:

- Complaints of any alleged misconduct may be filed with the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- Complaints involving alleged research misconduct ([Section 7.2.2.4](#)) may be filed with the RIO. If the complaint is found to involve issues other than research misconduct, the RIO shall inform the SVPP within one day.
- Complaints of discrimination – including those involving sexual, racial, ethnic, or other harassment – may be filed with the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). The OEO must inform the SVPP of discrimination complaints against a faculty member within one day.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.1.3 Initial Steps to be taken by Senior Vice President and Provost

Upon receipt of a complaint, the SVPP and the president of the Faculty Senate will immediately evaluate the complaint to determine whether the complaint is properly filed according to the procedures included in this chapter. If they conclude the case is a grievance (see [Chapter 9 Faculty Grievance Procedures](#)), they will decline to consider the case as alleged misconduct and the complainant will be directed to appropriate channels to seek resolution of the complaint.

Complaints of alleged research misconduct, as defined by [Section 7.2.2.4.2](#), will be referred to the RIO and handled in accordance with the [Research Misconduct Policy](#). If the RIO determines, as a result of an assessment of the complaint, that the matter should not proceed under the [Research Misconduct Policy](#), the RIO shall then refer the matter back to the SVPP indicating the reason that the [Research Misconduct Policy](#) should not be invoked. If appropriate, the complaint will then be handled as a faculty conduct complaint as provided below.

In the case of complaints deemed to require a research misconduct inquiry, but which also involve other types of misconduct, the SVPP and RIO will issue a determination regarding the handling of the complaint. The SVPP may delegate complaints of combined alleged research and academic misconduct to the RIO for handling in accordance with the [Research Misconduct Policy](#).

If a complaint is determined to be properly filed, the SVPP will immediately evaluate, in consultation with the respondent's chair, and in appropriate cases, the director of equal opportunity (for discrimination complaints) or the RIO (for research misconduct cases) whether interim action should be taken in accordance with [Section 7.2.5.1.4](#).

The SVPP will notify the complainant, the respondent, and the respondent's chair of the complaint, of any interim action taken, and will remind the respondent of their obligation not to take retaliatory action against the complainant or others involved with the complaint.

After evaluating a formal complaint and prior to calling for the formation of a Faculty Review Board (see [Section 7.2.5.2.1](#)), the SVPP may direct the parties to participate in mediation, recognizing that not all cases will be appropriate for mediation. If the SVPP recommends mediation of the issue(s), the timelines detailed here in Chapter 7 must be suspended pending the outcome of mediation.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.1.4 Interim Action

There may be instances in which the SVPP needs to take interim action pending investigation of the case or prior to the filing of a formal complaint. The SVPP may take interim action after consulting the president of the Faculty Senate, if any of the following conditions exist:

- an immediate physical danger to persons or property
- a reasonable indication of serious criminal violation
- an immediate health hazard
- an immediate need to protect equipment or funds, including federal funds or federal financial assistance
- an immediate need to protect the safety or interests of the person(s) making the allegations, of witnesses, or of the subject(s) of the allegations or their collaborators and associates
- a need to preserve evidence or to prevent improper influence of witness testimony
- a need to protect the working or educational environment of affected co-workers or students
- a need to protect against liability of the university or its employees

Interim action taken must be appropriate to the interests protected, and reasonably limited so as not to have an undue damaging effect on the respondent. The interim action should not be considered in and of itself a sanction. Interim action may include:

- restrictions on contact with persons involved in the complaint
- limitation on access to certain areas of the campus
- reassignment of duties
- partial or total administrative leave with pay
- directives to preserve or grant access to evidence or records related to the allegations
- direction on conduct of activities
- restrictions on university-related travel

In cases of emergency or the need to preserve evidence or records, the SVPP shall make a good faith effort to implement interim action through discussion with the complainant and, if appropriate, the referring party and the respondent prior to taking any interim action. If

an agreement with the respondent is not reached, the SVPP may still impose interim actions.

The SVPP will inform the chair and college dean of the respondent faculty member of any interim action that is being taken. The SVPP will assist the chair and the dean in ensuring that the interim action will have as little disruption of the teaching, research, or outreach activities of the department as possible. The chair and/or dean will not limit a faculty member's electronic access to university computer systems or email as part of interim action without the express approval of the SVPP.

In cases where the SVPP has taken interim action prior to the filing of a formal complaint, the president of the Faculty Senate will be notified. In these cases, the formal complaint must be filed with the appropriate administrative officer within 10 days of the effective date of the interim action. In the case of a complaint under investigation by the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), the formal faculty conduct complaint must be filed within 10 days after the conclusion of the OEO investigation.

If no formal complaint is filed within the appropriate period, the SVPP shall remove the interim action.

If a Faculty Review Board has not been appointed, the faculty member against whom interim action has been taken may request a review by the SVPP. As indicated in the following section, the Faculty Review Board will review all interim action.

When the faculty member has been charged with abandonment of position ([Section 7.2.2.6.2](#)) and has not presented themselves as ready to perform duties, the Faculty Review Board may recommend to the SVPP the suspension of salary for the duration of the process.

Section 7.2.5.1.4 Approved by the Faculty Senate (December 12, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (December 14, 2023); by the President (December 14, 2023).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/3/2018; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 4/5/2018; and the ISU President on 4/8/2018.

7.2.5.2 Complaint Review and Resolution

7.2.5.2.1 Faculty Review Board

Upon receipt of a complaint, the SVPP will consult with the president of the Faculty Senate to determine if the complaint is properly filed and should be accepted. If accepted, the SVPP will call for the formation of a Faculty Review Board (FRB) within two days after consultation with the president of the Faculty Senate. If mediation was recommended and the SVPP receives notice that mediation was unsuccessful, the SVPP will call for the formation of a FRB within two days after receiving such notification.

The president of the Faculty Senate and SVPP will review the complaint and any additional pertinent information provided by the SVPP. The FRB will consist of three members nominated from the faculty pool ([Section 7.2.7.3](#)) by the president of the Faculty Senate and confirmed by the SVPP. The Faculty Senate president and the SVPP will seek an objective FRB with sufficient depth of expertise and experience to understand and objectively act upon the issues detailed in the complaint. The FRB members should not have any real or apparent conflict of interest in the complaint. At least two of the three FRB members must be of an equal or higher rank than that of the respondent. In the unusual circumstance that appropriate FRB membership is not available from the faculty pool, the Faculty Senate president will nominate additional members from the tenured faculty for confirmation by the SVPP to serve on the FRB.

The complainant and the respondent have the right to challenge the nominees to the FRB. Challenges must be made in writing no more than two days following the naming of the nominees. The Faculty Senate president and the SVPP will determine the standing of the challenges. If nominees are successfully challenged, the Faculty Senate president will submit additional FRB nominees until three members are confirmed. The Faculty Senate president and the SVPP will jointly name the chair of the FRB.

The FRB will assess any interim action taken by the SVPP and will confer on whether this action should continue and/or whether any further or additional interim action is needed. The FRB may make recommendations to the SVPP regarding further and additional interim action.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.2.2 Investigation of the Case

The FRB and the SVPP will decide on the nature and scope of the investigation and on the individual(s) who will carry out the investigation. The FRB may investigate the complaint itself or work in conjunction with one or more university or external investigators, appointed through the SVPP and approved by the FRB.

An investigative report will be prepared by the party or parties conducting the investigation within 30 days of the first meeting of the FRB. If the FRB is working with one or more investigators, the investigators shall submit the investigative report to the chair of the FRB. Extensions of this 30-day period may be granted only for a fixed period of time and only for specific detailed reasons. The party or parties conducting the investigation may submit a written request for an extension of this 30-day period to the chair of the FRB who will transmit the request along with their recommendation to the SVPP and the Faculty Senate president, who will jointly decide whether the extension should be granted.

If the FRB conducts its own investigation, the chair shall submit the written request for extension to the SVPP and the Faculty Senate president. If an extension is granted, the FRB

chair will inform all relevant parties of the extension. All subsequent timelines and deadlines will necessarily be extended by the granting of this or any other extension.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.2.3 Investigative Report

Once the FRB has reviewed and is satisfied with the investigative report, the FRB will submit the report to the complainant and the respondent for comments. All parties will have a period of seven days to provide a response, if any, to the FRB. The FRB must review the responses from the parties and change the investigative report as deemed necessary.

If changes are made to the investigative report, the FRB will not seek additional comments or responses from the complainant and respondent unless it is warranted under the circumstances. Upon receipt of responses from all parties, or after seven days, the FRB will meet and issue a report making one of three recommendations for action by the SVPP, based on a simple majority vote: (a) dismiss the charges and hold no hearing, (b) hold a minor sanction hearing, or (c) recommend that the complaint be referred to a Major Sanction Committee. The FRB report must be issued within 10 days of either the receipt of all responses or expiration of the response timeline.

The FRB may recommend one of the following to the SVPP:

- **Dismissal of charges without a hearing.** The FRB will summarize its reasons for this recommendation in its report. A recommendation to dismiss is only permissible if the FRB finds no violation of the Faculty Conduct Policy by the respondent.
- **Referral for minor sanction hearing.** If the SVPP accepts the recommendation, the FRB will inform all relevant parties and schedule the hearing.
- **Referral to Major Sanction Committee.** The FRB will submit this recommendation to the SVPP along with the reasons for the recommendation. If the FRB recommends that any portion of the complaint warrants review by a Major Sanction Committee, the entire complaint must be heard through that process.

If at any time the FRB concludes there is need for further interim action, they must make a recommendation to the SVPP. If the SVPP disagrees, the FRB may make a recommendation to the president of the university.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.2.4 Minor Sanction Hearing

In conducting a minor sanction hearing, the FRB will respect the due process rights of the respondent, undertake diligent efforts to protect the positions and reputations of those

persons who, in good faith, make allegations of misconduct, and will afford all individuals confidential treatment to the extent possible in the inquiry.

Minor sanction hearings will be closed to the public. During the hearing, the FRB may

- receive additional evidence related to the charges for which the hearing is being held from the respondent and the complainant
- allow alternate forms of witness testimony
- hear rebuttals of evidence presented by either party
- call and question witnesses (including the referring party, if any) on its own behalf

During the hearing, all questions, comments, or statements will be addressed to the FRB.

The FRB may, at its discretion, allow alternate forms of witness testimony. The respondent may choose to waive their right to a formal hearing and allow a written statement to constitute the defense. The respondent and the complainant may have a support person present at the hearing, but the support person may not speak for them during the hearing. The respondent may choose to waive their right to a formal hearing and allow a written statement to constitute the defense.

In all cases, the charge(s) must be established by the preponderance of the evidence. Deliberation on the charge(s) will be based only on evidence relevant to the charge. The FRB must determine the relevance of all evidence.

If evidence of additional instances of misconduct is presented, whether related or unrelated to the original charge, the FRB must consult with the SVPP on the question of whether this additional misconduct must be included in the current case or whether a separate complaint must be made. In such cases, the SVPP must have the authority to approve additional charges and to reasonably extend deadlines if necessary to investigate the additional charges.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.2.5 Post-hearing Report

Following the hearing, the FRB will prepare a post-hearing report containing a full description of the allegations, the evidence reviewed, a summary of testimony, and conclusions that have been reached. The post-hearing report of the FRB will also include a recommendation about the disposition of the case. The FRB can select one of the three following options:

- (a) If the FRB decides that the evidence is not credible or does not sufficiently support the charge, the FRB may recommend that the case be dismissed.
- (b) If the FRB decides that the evidence is credible and that it supports the case, the FRB may recommend the minor sanction (see [Section 7.2.7.5](#)) to be imposed resulting in

the SVPP imposing the minor sanction or sanctions or that non-disciplinary corrective action be taken.

- (c) If the FRB decides that the evidence is credible and that there is a clear and compelling case to warrant a major sanction or sanctions, the FRB may recommend that the SVPP refer the complaint to a Major Sanction Committee.

The FRB will articulate in the post-hearing report the reasons for making its recommendation. The FRB may also make a recommendation about interim actions during the remainder of the process. The FRB post-hearing report will be sent to the respondent and the complainant, who will have 10 days to respond. The FRB must review the responses from the parties, if any, and consider whether changes to the post-hearing report are necessary.

If changes are made to the post-hearing report, the FRB will not seek additional comments or responses from the parties unless it is warranted under the circumstances. After receipt of the responses, or after 10 days, the FRB will submit the final post-hearing report and any responses received from the complainant and respondent to the SVPP. The respondent and the complainant will receive copies of the final post-hearing report from the SVPP. The chair and dean of the respondent will also be notified by the SVPP that the final post-hearing report has been submitted.

The FRB will issue their final post-hearing report within 60 days of the first meeting of the FRB. The FRB may ask for and receive an extension beyond 60 days. A request for an extension must include documented reasons for the extension. An extension will be granted only with the concurrence of the SVPP and the Faculty Senate president.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.2.6 Response of the Senior Vice President and Provost to the Final Post-Hearing Report

The senior vice president and provost (SVPP) will have 15 days to respond to the final post-hearing FRB report. The SVPP will review the results of the investigation and the recommendation of the FRB and will decide whether to accept the recommendation.

If the SVPP disagrees with the FRB recommendation, the SVPP shall meet with the FRB to discuss the reasons for the disagreement before taking any action. If the SVPP is issuing the final decision in a minor sanction case, the decision will describe what sanction(s) (see [Section 7.2.7.5](#)) is/are to be imposed, or the nature of any non-disciplinary corrective action to be taken.

The SVPP will submit to the FRB chair, the respondent, the complainant, and the referring party, if any, a final report containing their decision, and the reasons underlying that decision. The respondent and complainant, or referring party (as appropriate), must be

informed of the option to appeal as provided in [Section 7.2.6.1](#). No public statement about the hearing or about the FRB recommendations will be disseminated. Public announcement of the findings and recommendations will be made at the discretion of the SVPP.

The SVPP will inform the chair and college dean of the disposition of the case. The SVPP will undertake all reasonable measures to prevent retaliation against the complainant, the referring party, if any, or individuals who assisted in or participated in the misconduct complaint process.

All proceedings will be confidential to preserve the integrity of the investigation and those involved. If the complaint is dismissed, the SVPP will undertake all necessary measures to restore the reputation(s) of the person(s) alleged to have engaged in misconduct immediately after the issuing of the final report.

When appropriate, the SVPP will submit a report to the RIO describing the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, information obtained relevant to the investigation, findings, and the basis for the findings.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3 Major Sanction Process

The major sanction process begins when the SVPP files a Statement of Charges with the Office of the President, with a copy sent to the complainant, the referring party, if any, the respondent, and the respondent's chair and dean.

The major sanction process involves a new peer review committee called the Major Sanction Committee (see [Section 7.2.5.3.1](#)). The complaint will be pursued and presented by the SVPP or designee. The individual presenting the case for discipline will be known as "the complainant." The complainant shall inform and consult with the referring party (if any referring party wishes to participate) during the process. The major sanction process is administered by the Office of the President.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/16/18, by the ISU president on 1/19/18, by the senior vice president and provost on 2/18/18. Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3.1 Appointment of Major Sanction Committee

The SVPP will notify the president of the university who will call for the formation of a Major Sanction Committee to review the complaint. The Office of the President must promptly impanel the Major Sanction Committee of seven qualified faculty members. The committee is chosen from the faculty pool provided by the Faculty Senate president and confirmed by the university president.

Members of the Major Sanction Committee should have no real or apparent conflict of interest with the respondent. No member of the Major Sanction Committee will be chosen from the Faculty Review Board that previously reviewed the complaint. More than half of the members of the Major Sanction Committee must be of equal or higher rank to the respondent and, except in unusual circumstances, no member of the respondent's department can serve on this committee.

The complainant or referring party, if any, and the respondent faculty member each have the option of one preemptory challenge from the list so Major Sanction Committee membership may vary from five to seven members. Challenges must be made within five days after receipt of the list. The Faculty Senate president and the president of the university shall jointly appoint the chair of the Major Sanction Committee.

The university president will provide the Major Sanction Committee with a statement of the charges. The Major Sanction Committee will review any interim action that has been taken and will consult as needed with the parties on whether this action should continue and/or whether any further or additional action is needed. If at any time the Major Sanction Committee concludes there is a need for additional interim action, the committee must make a recommendation to the university president.

The university president will inform the chair and dean of the respondent faculty member that a major sanction complaint has been made against that faculty member and of any interim action that is being taken. The SVPP will assist the chair and dean in ensuring that there will be as little disruption of the teaching, research, extension or outreach activities, of the department, as possible.

The respondent faculty member must be given a period of 20 days from the date of issuance of the charges in which to file a written response to the charges. That faculty member may request additional time from the Major Sanction Committee for this response. The respondent faculty member may choose to waive the right to a formal hearing and allow a written statement to constitute their defense.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/16/18, by the ISU president on 1/19/18, by the senior vice president and provost on 2/18/18. Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3.2 Major Sanction Committee Review and Hearing

The Major Sanction Committee will review the case within 20 days of receiving the respondent faculty member's response. This review consists of: (a) the charge against the respondent faculty member, (b) the results of the investigation of this charge, (c) the final post-hearing report of the Faculty Review Board who presided over the minor sanction hearing, and (d) the response of the respondent faculty member.

The Major Sanction Committee may request additional written comments from any party or may request additional investigation. If this requires additional time, the Major Sanction

Committee may extend their review for an additional 40 days and will notify all parties of any extension and of the reasons for this extension. Extensions will be made only for a fixed period and only for specific reasons.

After completion of its review, the entire Major Sanction Committee must hold a hearing. If the respondent waives their right to a formal hearing, the Major Sanction Committee must determine an appropriate recommendation on the basis of available information.

The Major Sanction Committee must apprise the university president and, when appropriate, the RIO, of any developments that disclose facts that may affect current or potential federal funding for individual(s) under investigation or should be disclosed to the relevant federal agency to ensure appropriate use of federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3.3 Procedures Applicable to the Major Sanction Hearing

The Major Sanction Committee must determine the procedures applicable to the hearing. The following procedures are a general guide, but the Major Sanction Committee must have the right to amend them with the consent of both parties, the complainant or referring party, if any, and the respondent faculty member.

Rules of Evidence

- Formal rules of evidence applicable to court proceedings will not apply.
- The Major Sanction Committee may give evidence different weights, based upon its relevance and probative value.
- The Major Sanction Committee may determine that it will not consider evidence that it determines is irrelevant.
- The Major Sanction Committee must respect legally recognized privilege such as that between attorney and client or physician and patient unless the person who has the right to assert the privilege waives the privilege.

Closure of Hearings

- The Hearing must be closed.

Communications to Major Sanction Committee

- To assure the proceedings appear and in fact are fair, the parties are expected to communicate with the Major Sanction Committee and the chair of the Major Sanction Committee in writing, with a copy to the other party, or in a manner in which the other party is able to participate.

Exclusion of Witnesses

- The Major Sanction Committee will not permit witnesses other than the parties to be present during the questioning of other witnesses.

Burden of Proof

- Each allegation must be established by a preponderance of the evidence. The Major Sanction Committee must base its decision upon the evidence presented to it during the proceedings.

Presence of Advisors

- The parties may have an attorney or other person present to advise them.
- The referring party must also have a right to the presence of an attorney or other person to advise them or to provide support.
- Attorneys, advisors, and supporters may not present any part of the case for the parties without the consent of the Major Sanction Committee.

Right of Respondent to Attend

- The respondent faculty member must have a right to attend the hearing, the presentation of witnesses and opening and closing statements.
- With the consent of the Major Sanction Committee, testimony of witnesses may be presented by alternate means.
- In the case of remote testimony, the parties must both have a similar opportunity to view or hear the testimony.

Record

- The hearing will be recorded electronically or by use of a court reporter.

Before the Hearing

- The parties or the Major Sanction Committee may arrange for the exchange of lists of witnesses to be presented and documents to be presented.
- The Major Sanction Committee may set up a pre-hearing conference to assist in presentation of the case.

Order of Presentation at the Hearing

Unless otherwise directed by the Major Sanction Committee, the order of presentation of the case must be:

1. preliminary matters, including comments by the Major Sanction Committee, discussion of order of witnesses, and exchange of documents (if not completed before the hearing)
2. opening statement of the complainant
3. opening statement of the respondent
4. witnesses and evidence of the complainant

5. witnesses and evidence of the respondent
6. rebuttal witnesses and other evidence of the complainant
7. rebuttal witnesses and other evidence of the respondent
8. closing statement of the complainant
9. closing statement of the respondent

After the Hearing

- With the approval of the Major Sanction Committee, the parties may present written summaries.
- The Major Sanction Committee must set the time for submission, no later than 10 days after closing of the hearing.
- When the committee is satisfied that each side has had a complete hearing, it must retire in private to make its findings of fact and its recommendations.

If the parties reach a resolution of the charges after the Major Sanction Committee hearing has begun, the parties must present the proposed resolution in writing to the Major Sanction Committee. The committee will then review the proposed resolution within five days and forward its recommendation to the university president.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3.4 Report of the Major Sanction Committee

The report of the Major Sanction Committee will include a recommendation about the disposition of the case, including the recommended sanction(s) if applicable. The Major Sanction Committee may choose by simple majority vote among the following three options:

- (a) If they decide that the evidence is not credible, or does not sufficiently support the charge, they may recommend that the case be dismissed.
- (b) If they decide that the evidence is credible and that it supports the case, they may recommend that the university president impose one or more minor sanctions (see [Section 7.2.7.5](#)) or that non-disciplinary corrective action be taken.
- (c) If they decide that the evidence is credible and that it supports the case, they may recommend that the university president impose one or more major sanctions (see [Section 7.2.7.4](#)).

The Major Sanction Committee report will contain a description of the findings of fact and recommendations, along with the record, if requested by the complainant and/or the respondent. The report will be sent to the respondent and the complainant, who will have 10 days to respond in writing to the report. The Major Sanction Committee must review the responses from the parties and consider whether changes to the report are necessary.

If changes are made to the report, the Major Sanction Committee will not seek additional comments or responses from the respondent and complainant unless it is warranted under the circumstances. After receipt of the responses, or after 10 days, the Major Sanction Committee will submit their report to the university president with any responses attached. The complainant and the respondent will receive copies of any responses. The Major Sanction Committee will notify the chair and college dean of the respondent that the report has been submitted. The university president shall meet with the Major Sanction Committee to discuss the recommendation.

Should the entire investigation, deliberation, and Major Sanction Committee hearing process not be completed within 120 days of the Major Sanction Committee receiving the complaint, a request for extension must be filed with the university president, who will notify the Office of Research Integrity of any extension, if applicable. The request will include an explanation for the delay, an interim report on the progress to date, an outline of what remains to be done, and an estimated date of completion.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.3.5 Response of the University President to Major Sanction Committee Report

The university president will have 15 days to respond to the Major Sanction Committee report. The president's response will be a formal report that contains their decision, a description of the action to be taken, and the reasons underlying the decision. The president will present the report to the chair of the Major Sanction Committee, the complainant, the respondent, the referring party if any, and where appropriate, the RIO. The president will also inform the dean and the chair of the respondent of the action being taken. The president shall set the effective date of any sanction.

The respondent and referring party must be informed of the option to appeal as provided under the [Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 1.7.3 Appeals Other Than Tenure Appeals](#). The president shall have the power to continue interim action pending the effective date, and will undertake necessary measures to prevent retaliation against individuals who filed the complaint or who assisted in or participated in the misconduct process.

All proceedings will be confidential to preserve the integrity of the investigation and those involved. No public statement about the hearing or about the Major Sanction Committee recommendation will be disseminated. Public announcement of the findings and recommendations will be made at the discretion of the president. If the complaint is dismissed, the president will undertake necessary measures to restore the reputation(s) of the person(s) alleged to have engaged in misconduct immediately after the issuing of the final report.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.5.4 Records

In all cases of formal complaints, the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost must maintain the record of the case for a minimum of three years. The record must include the following:

- the original complaint
- report of the investigation
- Faculty Review Board Minor Sanction Hearing Report
- response of the SVPP
- Major Sanction Committee Report
- response of the respondent and the complainant, and any referring party, if any
- SVPP response to the Major Sanction Committee Report
- correspondence from the respondent, the complainant, and any referring party

In major sanction cases, the case record must include the following:

- statement of charges
- university president's report

If an appeal is filed, the record will also include:

- appeal to the university president and response to the appeal
- recommended decision by a person designated to review the appeal
- decision upon an appeal

At the close of a case, members of the Faculty Review Board and, if applicable, the Major Sanction Committee, must turn all documents over to the SVPP.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.6 Processes for Appeal

To avoid unnecessary and multiple appeals and grievances, any party with concerns about hearing procedures should make those concerns known during the hearing procedure, and those issues must be considered by the person(s) making the recommendation or decision.

If the appeal includes concerns about the hearing procedures that were not raised during the hearing, the person(s) hearing the appeal may consider those concerns at their discretion. Simultaneous appeals cannot be made on the same case.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.6.1 Appeals to the University President

The final decision of the SVPP related to a faculty conduct case may be appealed by the respondent, the complainant, or referring party, if any, in writing to the university president within 20 days following receipt of the SVPP decision. The appeal is initiated by submission of a written statement with reference to the evidence that supports the appeal. The appeal must be based on one of the following four grounds: (a) improper procedures were followed, (b) academic freedoms were violated, (c) policy was interpreted improperly, or (d) arbitrary and capricious criteria were employed in recommending the decision being appealed ([see FH 9.1](#)). The burden of proof for documenting the grounds for the appeal is the responsibility of the appellant. The university president will issue a decision on the appeal within 15 days from the date the appeal was received.

The respondent may request that the university president delay the imposition of any sanctions by the SVPP. The request for delay must be included in the respondent appeal and be accompanied by a statement of the reasons for the request. If the delay is granted, the president may continue interim action(s) in place, or may impose interim action(s) appropriate to the circumstances.

Section 7.2.6.1 Approved by the Faculty Senate (December 12, 2023); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (December 14, 2023); by the President (December 14, 2023).
Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.6.2 Appeals to the Board of Regents

Final decisions of the university president may be appealed to the Board of Regents. For more information, see the [Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 1.7.3 Appeals Other Than Tenure Appeals](#).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.6.3 Appeals to the Courts

Final decisions of the Board of Regents may be challenged by filing a petition for judicial review in Iowa District Court. State law and Iowa court rules determine the procedure for filing and handling such challenges.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

7.2.6.4 Request to Reopen

The respondent may request to have their case reopened under the following circumstances:

- New evidence is discovered that was unavailable at the time of the hearing, and the new evidence clearly undermines confidence in the findings.
- Evidence is discovered that a party provided false or misleading evidence on a key issue, and this evidence clearly undermines confidence in the findings.

The respondent is limited to one request for reopening the entire case. The request must be submitted in writing. The request to reopen the case will be rejected if the evidence was raised during a hearing or appeal of the disciplinary action, and the hearing or appellate authority adequately considered the matter in making its decision. Requests to have a case reopened should be made to the SVPP for minor sanctions or to the university president for major sanctions.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14; and by the president on 2/2/14.

7.2.6.5 Faculty Senate Appeals

The respondent may file an appeal with the Faculty Senate Judiciary and Appeals Council (J&A Council) if they believe there was egregious procedural error that fundamentally undermined the hearing process. The J&A Council will examine only the procedural issues raised in the appeal. Such appeals may be rejected if the respondent knew of the defect in the procedures during the proceeding and failed to bring it to the attention of the hearing or appellate body. Should the J&A Council conclude that egregious procedural errors were made, they may recommend to the SVPP (for minor sanctions) or the university president (for major sanctions) that the case be reopened.

Appeals to the J&A Council must be made within 20 days after the respondent is informed of the sanction decision.

7.2.6.6 Appeals following an Administrative Procedure Act Hearing

If an Administrative Procedure Act Hearing is held, the exclusive process for appealing is provided in [Iowa Code Chapter 17A](#) and in [Iowa Administrative Code Chapter 681-20](#).

7.2.7 Definitions

7.2.7.1 Administrative Leave

Administrative leave is defined as removal from some or all university duties with no reduction in salary. Administrative leave is not considered a sanction, but instead is an interim action used to protect the institution, the investigation of a case, or individuals involved in a case during the conduct of an investigation or hearing.

7.2.7.2 Faculty Member

Reference to "faculty" includes all members of the faculty as defined in Article I of the [Faculty Senate Constitution](#). This includes individuals simultaneously holding faculty rank and administrative positions. All faculty members who hold administrative appointments

with titles containing the term president, SVPP, or dean are ineligible for appointment to the faculty pool or to serve on a Faculty Review Board or a Major Sanction Committee. Department chairs are ineligible for appointment to the faculty pool or to serve on a Faculty Review Board or a Major Sanction Committee.

7.2.7.3 Faculty Pool

A pool of at least 25 tenured faculty members will be identified by the Faculty Senate president and confirmed by the SVPP for service on Faculty Review Boards and Major Sanction Committees. Individuals will serve a three-year term and are eligible for reappointment. The pool should include a broad range of individuals representing the ethnic, racial, gender, and disciplinary diversity of the university.

Individuals should be selected for their ability to bring independence and impartiality to the proceedings and for their stature and respect gained in the course of their professorial work. In cases of alleged academic misconduct, individuals may be selected for their professional expertise. Agreement to serve carries with it the responsibility to provide diligent service when asked. Each May, the Faculty Senate president will confirm the continued availability of those whose terms are not yet complete and will provide names to the SVPP to complete a full slate of pool membership.

Compensation will be made to members of either a Faculty Review Board or a Major Sanction Committee for work on any day that is not in accord with the 9-month contract.

7.2.7.4 Major Sanctions

For the purpose of this document, major sanctions consist of the following:

- dismissal
- suspension without pay for at least one month
- reduction in salary
- removal of graduate supervision privileges
- cancellation of graduate college membership
- removal of distinguished titles
- reparations of \$2,000 or more
- significant reassignment of duties

7.2.7.5 Minor Sanctions

For purposes of this document, minor sanctions consist of the following:

- probation
- suspension of less than one month without pay
- minor reassignment of duties
- mandatory training
- a probationary period
- letters of reprimand

- restrictions on contact with the complainant
- mandatory training
- reparations of less than \$2,000

7.2.7.6 Progressive Corrective Action

Corrective action aims to address and resolve concerns related to faculty conduct. Whenever possible, the corrective action process should be a productive collaboration between the department chair (and/or dean) and the faculty member to achieve the improvement needed for the faculty member's conduct to comply with all university policies and procedures, relevant laws, and professional expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook and policy library. The goal is to identify and correct potentially problematic conduct before disciplinary action is warranted.

Progressive corrective action identifies conduct concerns (related to specific university policies and procedures, relevant laws, and/or professional expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook and policy library). Progressive corrective action provides a faculty member with written notice, indicates how the faculty member should address the concerns, provides appropriate resources (policies, training, or similar professional improvement opportunities), and advises the faculty member of potential consequences if the conduct is not appropriate. In all cases where policies or laws may have been violated (or perceived to have been violated) progressive corrective actions must communicate to faculty those policies or laws.

Progressive corrective action should (when possible) include the following three levels of response:

1. **Clarification meeting.** The chair (and/or dean) shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the conduct concern. The goal of this meeting is to make the faculty member fully aware of the concern and to provide guidance and advice to resolve the concern. The discussion should identify any policies or laws that may have been violated (or perceived to have been violated). The clarification meeting should also avoid drawing conclusions or be a debate regarding the legitimacy of the concern. After the meeting, the chair (or dean) shall document the clarification meeting in a written memo to the faculty member. This memo does not establish misconduct by the faculty member, it only documents that a discussion about the topic occurred. The faculty member shall acknowledge in writing the receipt of the memo within five (5) days.
2. **Letter of expectation.** If the conduct issue discussed in the clarification meeting is not satisfactorily addressed, the chair (or dean) shall document the concerns in a written letter of expectation for the faculty member. The letter of expectation does not establish misconduct by the faculty member, it documents continuing efforts to align faculty conduct with expectations that were not satisfactorily addressed to date. This letter of expectation must describe the ongoing conduct concern, cite any

policies or laws that may have been violated (or perceived to have been violated), the corrective steps that have been taken to date, if any, and specific expectations for improvement necessary to satisfactorily address the ongoing conduct concern. The letter of expectation may require the faculty member to review relevant policies and procedures, to attend specific training(s), to participate in formal coaching, or similar actions. The letter must include a timeline for the faculty member to meet these expectations. The faculty member shall acknowledge in writing the receipt of the letter of expectation within five (5) days.

- 3. Written warning.** If the faculty member's conduct does not meet expectations despite coaching and/or a letter of expectation, the chair (or dean) shall provide the faculty member with a formal written warning. The written warning must be specific as to the reasons for the warning, cite any policies or laws that may have been violated (or perceived to have been violated), provide any evidence obtained by the chair (or dean), and indicate corrective actions that the faculty member must take. The written warning does not itself establish misconduct by the faculty member, but documents continuing efforts to align faculty conduct with expectations, provides the evidence that leads the chair (or dean) to believe that specific policies or laws are being violated, and states what corrective actions are required of the faculty member. The written warning must clearly state that future incidents or failure to improve by a specific timeline may result in a formal faculty conduct complaint. The written warning must be delivered to the faculty member in a face-to-face meeting between the chair (or dean) and faculty member. If a faculty member refuses to or fails to meet with their chair (or dean) within five (5) days of the request for a meeting, the written warning will be delivered via email.

The faculty member may submit a written response to, and which will be kept with, the clarification memo, the letter of expectation, or the written warning. A faculty member cannot avoid or delay progressive corrective action by delaying or ignoring the request to meet with their chair and/or dean. Refusal to participate in progressive corrective action in a timely manner may be considered grounds for a formal faculty conduct charge.

The progressive corrective action does not include sanctions or disciplinary action against the faculty member. Sanctions or disciplinary action can only be taken after a formal faculty conduct complaint (see [section 7.2.5](#)) and the accompanying due process. If the progressive corrective action steps are unsuccessful in improving the faculty member's conduct, the chair (or dean) may choose to proceed with a formal faculty conduct complaint. These progressive corrective action steps may not be appealed under Faculty Handbook [section 9.1](#) unless sanctions as defined by Faculty Handbook [section 7.2.7.4](#) or [section 7.2.7.5](#) have been imposed in violation of this policy.

Depending on the nature and/or severity of the conduct concerns, the chair (or dean) may skip lower levels of response or initiate progressive corrective action at a higher level of response (e.g., including a letter of expectation as part of the initial conversation). These

progressive corrective action steps are not required prior to filing a formal faculty conduct complaint. It may be appropriate to make a formal faculty conduct complaint immediately without going through any corrective action process. It is also possible that escalating conduct issues necessitate a formal faculty conduct complaint prior to completing one or more levels of a progressive corrective action process.

Section 7.2.7.6 Approved by the Faculty Senate (December 13, 2022); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (January 3, 2023); by the President (January 3, 2023).

7.2.7.7 Reassignment of Duties

Reassignment may occur as a result of action other than discipline. For example, elimination of a program may require reassignment. It is not intended that the disciplinary procedures should be used for reassignment for other than disciplinary reasons.

7.2.7.8 Suspension

Suspension is defined as severing of a university responsibility without pay. Total suspension is defined as total severing of all university responsibilities without pay.

Chapter 7 contains changes approved by the Faculty Senate on September 11, 2007, and the president and senior vice president and provost on September 18, 2007.

Chapter 8. University Community Policies	140
8.1 Introduction	140
8.1.1 Compliance	140
8.2 Board of Regents Policies	140
8.3 Policies on Personal Conduct	141
8.3.1 Policy on Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment	141
8.3.2 Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment	141
8.3.2.1 Special Cases: Employee Owned Companies	141
8.3.2.2 Disclosure	141
8.3.2.3 Sanctions	141
8.3.3 Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources	142
8.4 Policies on Professional Activity	142
8.4.1 Sponsored Funding of Projects	142
8.4.1.1 Introduction	142
8.4.1.2 Review of Proposals for Sponsored Funding	143
8.4.1.2.1 Standard Projects	143
8.4.1.2.2 Proprietary Projects	144
8.4.1.2.3 Classified Projects	144
8.4.1.2.4 Weapons Research	144
8.4.1.2.5 Fee for Service Projects	144
8.4.1.2.6 Other Types of Projects	145
8.4.2 Review of Projects/Courses - Live Vertebrate Animals	145
8.4.3 Grants and Contracts	145
8.4.4 Classified Research	145
8.4.5 Consulting	145
8.4.6 Purchases of Goods or Services from Employees	147
8.4.6.1 Conflict of Interest Vendors	147
8.4.7 Trademark Management Policy	147
8.5 Basic Community Operating Policies and Procedures	147
8.5.1 Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment/Affirmative Action Policies	147
8.5.1.1 Sources of Support	147
8.5.2 Inclusive Language Policy	148
8.5.3 Drug Free Workplace	148

8.5.4 Occupational Safety.....	148
8.5.5 Smoke-Free Campus	148
8.5.6 Travel Regulations	149
8.5.7 Gifts to Faculty	149
8.5.8 Open Meetings	149
8.5.9 Employment Related Liability	149
8.5.10 Policy and Information References.....	149

Chapter 8. University Community Policies

Changes to this section were approved by the Faculty Senate, November 14, 2006.

8.1 Introduction

The *Iowa State University Faculty Handbook* is the official statement of the policy governing the rights, responsibilities, and performance of faculty at the Iowa State University of Science and Technology. Faculty (and other university employees) are also subject to policies contained in the Iowa State University Policy Library (hereafter known as the [Policy Library](#)). Policies in the Policy Library are the current official statements of university policy of general applicability from across the university and present non-discretionary expectations that describe accepted standards of conduct, criteria for granting privileges or benefits, or the means of conducting university-related activities. The policies listed in this chapter are found in their entirety in the Policy Library, Board of Regents, State of Iowa [Board Policy Manual](#), the [Iowa Code](#), and/or the [Iowa Administrative Code](#). If there is a conflict between the Faculty Handbook and any policies set forth in the Policy Library or statutes and rules in the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code, the Policy Library, the Iowa Code, and the Iowa Administrative Code will govern.

8.1.1 Compliance

Faculty shall comply with all university and Board of Regents policies, as well as state and federal law. Violation of these policies or laws may be considered faculty misconduct and will be dealt with following the procedures of the faculty conduct policy in [Chapter 7](#) of the Faculty Handbook.

8.2 Board of Regents Policies

The Board of Regents, State of Iowa, is charged by law with the responsibility for the governance of the public universities of Iowa. In line with this responsibility, the Board of Regents adopts rules and policies of personal conduct for faculty, staff, students and visitors. Those rules and policies can be found in the Board of Regents [Board Policy Manual](#) and [the Iowa Administrative Code](#). Violation of these policies, may be considered faculty misconduct and will be dealt with following the procedures in the faculty conduct policy.

8.3 Policies on Personal Conduct

Changes to this section were approved by the Faculty Senate, November 14, 2006.

8.3.1 Policy on Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment

The university's [Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#) prohibits all forms of unlawful discrimination and harassment based on protected status.

8.3.2 Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment

The university requires the disclosure, review, and if warranted, approval and management of external activities or financial interests with the potential to interfere with one or more of the following: (a) performance of duties, (b) objectivity, and (c) appropriate use of state resources. All university employees are required to comply with the [Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policy](#).

Section 8.2.2 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 11/07/95.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.3.2.1 Special Cases: Employee Owned Companies

When the university engages in activities with university-employee-owned companies, a potential conflict of interest is possible in these relationships. Board of Regents policy requires prior approval from the Board of Regents before the university can make purchases from a company owned by an employee or an employee's immediate family. Oversight of research relationships with such companies comes under the [Conflict of Interest and Commitment](#).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.3.2.2 Disclosure

It is the responsibility of every university employee covered by the [Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy](#) to fully disclose the nature and degree of any conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment, as defined in the policy. The disclosures must be made prior to initiating the activity, annually, and whenever the employee's situation changes. The appropriate method of disclosure varies with the type of activity as described in the [Procedures, Applications, and Guidance](#) document.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.3.2.3 Sanctions

Conflicts of interest and commitment, and failure to disclose those conflicts, are serious matters that may, in certain instances, be considered an act of faculty misconduct. ([Section 7.2.3](#)).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.3.3 Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources

Iowa State University endorses the following statement of Software and Intellectual Rights that was developed through EDUCOM, a non-profit consortium of colleges and universities committed to the use and management of information technology in higher education.

"Respect for intellectual labor and creativity is vital to academic discourse and enterprise. This principle applies to works of all authors and publishers in all media. It encompasses respect for the right to acknowledgment, right to privacy, and right to determine the form, manner, and terms of publication and distribution."

Because electronic information is volatile and easily reproduced, respect for the work and personal expression of others is especially critical in computer environments. Violations of authorial integrity, including plagiarism, invasion of privacy, unauthorized access, and trade secret and copyright violations may be grounds for sanctions against members of the academic community.

Extensive guidelines that govern ethical computer use at Iowa State are also part of the [Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources Policy](#).

Section 8.2.3 was endorsed by the Faculty Senate on 5/05/92.

8.4 Policies on Professional Activity

8.4.1 Sponsored Funding of Projects

This section refers to the [Sponsored Programs Authority](#) policy.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 2008, by the provost and president on January 27, 2009, and reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Board on March 31, 2009.

8.4.1.1 Introduction

Iowa State receives financial support from a variety of federal, state, and private sponsors of projects. Grants, contracts, or gifts will be accepted only when the project is believed to benefit the university, the State of Iowa, or the general public. Iowa State is not obligated to accept all sponsorship conditions nor is it obligated to accept projects it deems at odds with its fundamental principles. The availability of funds cannot be the sole justification for undertaking projects. The university has enacted specific policies and procedures for the review of proposed projects and has established conditions under which it will accept sponsored funding of a project to protect the integrity of its programs, to ensure that projects adhere to appropriate legal, quality, and ethical standards of conduct and applicable federal and state laws, including safety. Iowa State will review the terms of all proposed projects to determine whether the project conforms to the usual university

policies and business procedures, permits the university to exercise administrative control and accountability for the proposed project, and adheres to appropriate legal, quality and ethical standards of conduct and safety.

As a public university, Iowa State is dedicated to the principle of free and open dissemination of scholarship and all projects must be reviewed to ensure that they protect the publication rights for faculty, staff, and students. Publication restrictions may place a faculty, staff, or student's academic career in jeopardy. Publication restrictions in a project may place the results and related technical information within the requirements of export control laws. If a project is determined to be subject to export control restrictions, the project must comply with the university's [Export Controls](#) policy.

These policies apply to all university activities except for projects administered by the Ames Laboratory. The Ames Laboratory has its own policies and procedures for reviewing and approving projects and is also subject to additional Department of Energy regulations. Faculty conducting projects administered by the Ames Laboratory will be governed by the Ames Laboratory policies and procedures.

8.4.1.2 Review of Proposals for Sponsored Funding

This policy statement outlines the conditions under which the university will accept sponsored funding of projects and to describe the process whereby proposed sponsored projects are reviewed and approved. All proposed projects are assigned to a review category depending on the nature of the proposed project and/or on the restrictions on publication and/or dissemination proposed by the sponsor either at the time the proposal is submitted (if known at that time) or during the acceptance or negotiation of the award. Projects in each category must go through a specific review and approval process before Iowa State will agree to accept the project.

8.4.1.2.1 Standard Projects

Projects in this category are projects for which the sponsor does not seek or require a restriction on the rights of publication or dissemination beyond a 120-day review period of a publication or of dissemination of results. This review period is for the purpose of determining whether the findings of the project may lead to the filing of a patent application or to ensure that none of the sponsor's proprietary information is inadvertently disclosed. The sponsor does not seek or require the right to permanently block or restrict publication beyond the review period.

Additional information can be found at the following sites:

- [VPR Guidelines for Processing Gifts and Sponsored Projects Funding](#)
- [Research Objectives and Responsibilities](#)
- [Sponsored Programs Authority](#)

8.4.1.2.2 Proprietary Projects

This section talks about projects that involve proprietary information and/or materials provided by the sponsor. A project involving proprietary materials for which the sponsor does not seek or require a restriction on the rights of publication or dissemination beyond a 120-day review period of a publication or of dissemination must be reviewed in the same manner as a standard project. It is the policy of Iowa State not to accept awards for proprietary projects for which the sponsor seeks or requires a delay in publication or dissemination of more than 120 days or seeks an absolute right to block or prohibit publication. A request for an exception to this policy must be approved by the vice president for research (VPR) and by the senior vice president and provost (SVPP). Such requests must have a compelling reason for approval. The existence of funds to support the project is not of itself a compelling reason. See [Restrictions on Reporting Research Results](#).

8.4.1.2.3 Classified Projects

Classified projects involve a subject or materials that have been classified by the federal government as top secret, secret, classified, or which have been placed in a category restricting their import or export. Classified projects entail restrictions on the personnel who can be involved in the project, on the operations of the group, on the procedures used, on the facilities used, and on the dissemination of the results and/or products of the project. It is the policy of Iowa State not to accept proposals for classified projects with such restrictions. A request for an exception to this policy must be approved by the VPR, by the SVPP, and by the president of the university. Such requests must have an overwhelming reason for approval. The simple existence of funds to support the project is not an overwhelming reason. These and other restrictions may place the project results and related technical information within the requirements of federal export control laws (see [Restrictions on Reporting Research Results](#)). If a classified project is determined to be subject to export control restrictions, the project must comply with the university's [Export Controls Policy](#).

8.4.1.2.4 Weapons Research

The University regularly accepts projects funded by agencies such as the Department of Defense that have a wide variety of military purposes as well as applications in the civilian economy. However, the policy of the university is to not accept any project whose stated goal is the construction of nuclear weapons, or of agents for chemical or biological warfare.

8.4.1.2.5 Fee for Service Projects

Fee for service projects are projects in which ISU personnel carry out specific tasks for external sponsors that are of a service nature. These projects are not considered research projects and the generation of new knowledge or new intellectual property is not the primary goal. These projects are considered service activities and are a valuable part of the Land Grant mission. Fee for service activities must meet the guidelines set out by the [Office of Sponsored Programs Administration](#) and must be reviewed and approved following the controller's office standard [fee for service](#) procedures.

8.4.1.2.6 Other Types of Projects

For some proposed projects it may not be apparent which category of review is appropriate. Such proposed projects may be referred to the [Committee on Research Planning and Policy](#), which will review the project and make a recommendation to the VPR as to what category the proposed project should be placed in for review. However, the committee will not make a recommendation as to whether or not the project should be accepted.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.4.2 Review of Projects/Courses - Live Vertebrate Animals

The [Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee](#) (IACUC) evaluates for compliance with federal law and university policy all proposed teaching and research involving the use of live vertebrate animals to be conducted by faculty, staff or students,

8.4.3 Grants and Contracts

The university regularly receives funds (gifts, grants and contracts) from industry, private sources, governmental agencies, and foundations to support various university activities which are reviewed and administered through the [Office of Sponsored Programs](#). Such funds are frequently designated for scholarships, equipment, research, or training. Gift and grant funds are accepted only when they may be used in fields authorized by the laws of Iowa and by the regulations of the Board of Regents.

Funds to support contractual research will be accepted when the work involves an area where there are qualified staff members and adequate facilities, and when the research contemplated will be of benefit to the university, the State of Iowa, or the general public.

8.4.4 Classified Research

The university discourages classified research. Any grant or contract that would restrict disclosure of research results must be approved by the VPR before it is accepted (see [Restrictions on Reporting Research Results](#)). Principal investigators are responsible for calling to the attention of the administration any restrictions that would limit the use and distribution of information resulting from research for which they are responsible.

8.4.5 Consulting

Iowa State endorses and encourages faculty to participate in consulting activities. Such consulting is a way to provide service beyond the university and to enhance the expertise of the faculty.

Faculty are often asked to give advice or counsel to private agencies or individuals, and sometimes they are invited to do so on a continuing basis for pay under arrangements commonly referred to as consulting. Iowa State endorses consulting by faculty in areas related to their academic fields of expertise. The decision of faculty to engage in outside

work for pay depends upon the nature of their responsibility to the university and the conditions of their appointment, whether the outside work contributes to a better understanding of their professional field, whether the university's standing is enhanced by their outside contacts and services, and most important, whether the consulting work can be done without interfering with their regular university duties.

Faculty may undertake consulting work only after the proposed work has been mutually agreed to by both the faculty member and their department chair. Consulting projects undergo a separate review process to ensure the proposed activity does not impede or interfere with the faculty member's assigned duties, and that use of campus resources is consistent with Iowa State policies. Faculty shall follow the university rules for reporting consulting activity.

Faculty who do consulting or otherwise have outside business interests should take care that their actions do not result in use of state funds, facilities, equipment or time subsidizing these outside interests. Faculty are also not permitted to receive compensation for performing those duties which the employee is obligated to perform for the university or the State of Iowa.

Additional information can be found at:

- [Conflict of Interest and Commitment policy](#)
- [COIC Procedures, Applications, and Guidance document](#)
- Faculty Handbook, [Section 7.2.2.1](#)

Faculty are required to report annually, through their department chair, to the college dean, the amount of time they have spent on consulting or other professional work for which compensation has been received from other than university sources. The nature of the service performed and the source of the outside remuneration should be indicated. Faculty are not permitted to receive additional compensation for time spent on a university-administered grant or contract, except with prior approval of the SVPP.

If consulting projects are to involve students, the project must have a plan showing how the academic advancement of the students will not be harmed. If the proposed work is part of the student's academic work, the plan must show how publication and/or dissemination of the results of the project will be permitted. This plan must be approved by the student's department chair and a copy must be given to the student.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.4.6 Purchases of Goods or Services from Employees

8.4.6.1 Conflict of Interest Vendors

Iowa State promotes ethical business practices, professional integrity and objectivity in all procurement transactions conducted by its employees. Any ‘employee’ as defined by the [Conflict of Interest Vendors/Employees, Procurement](#) policy, seeking to sell goods or services to any Board of Regent institution, either directly or indirectly, shall request and receive authorization for such activity. The university is committed to complying with applicable procurement laws and regulations, including requirements that apply to conflicts of interest, as provided by other state and federal agencies.

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on 1/21/2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and by the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

8.4.7 Trademark Management Policy

Iowa State benefits from public recognition of its name, symbols, logos and other identifying marks (hereafter referred to as ‘Marks’). If properly used and managed, these Marks give a unifying look which is critical to establishing a visual presence within the world of university communities. This look becomes identified with the quality of the university’s programs, products and services and distinguishes its programs from other universities. Internal and external use of the Marks is managed by the [Trademark Licensing Office](#). See the [Trademark Management](#) policy.

8.5 Basic Community Operating Policies and Procedures

All university employees are responsible for abiding by the university's official policies presented in the [Policy Library](#). In some cases, suggested procedures that have been approved by the Faculty Senate are provided to assist faculty.

The following sections describe provisions of law affecting employees by using non-legalistic terminology. It is not intended, nor would it be possible, to make university policy less stringent than the applicable law. Legislative action may amend or add provisions prior to the next update of the *Faculty Handbook*.

8.5.1 Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment/Affirmative Action Policies

Faculty are required to comply with university policies on [Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment](#) and [Affirmative Action](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on October 9, 2007, and by the president and provost on October 26, 2007. Reaffirmation 6/1/98 and 11/14/06.

8.5.1.1 Sources of Support

The [Office of Equal Opportunity](#) (OEO) is responsible for handling complaints of discrimination or harassment based on protected class. Questions regarding complaint resolution, advice, education, outreach, interventions, and/or issues involving affirmative action or equal opportunity should be directed to the OEO.

The [Margaret Sloss Center for Women and Gender Equity](#) is responsible for promoting the development of all individuals to their fullest potential and for enhancing the university's learning environment by fostering intellectual growth and providing a supportive environment for students, faculty, and staff.

To assist the administration in its efforts toward continual improvement of equal opportunity, university-wide committees with representation of faculty, staff, and students have been established. For example:

- The University Committee on Disabilities is responsible for sharing knowledge concerning disabilities with the university community, for fostering awareness of the needs of persons with disabilities, and for advocating ways to meet those needs.
- The University Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (VPDEI) Council is responsible for assessing campus climate and making recommendations for improvement.
- The [University Committee for the Advancement of Women and Gender Equity](#) is responsible for increasing gender equity in leadership positions; eliminating barriers and addressing organizational structures and policies that act as impediments to gender equity; and working to improve the climate on campus with regard to gender equity for all students, staff, and faculty.

8.5.2 Inclusive Language Policy

Iowa State encourages the use of [Inclusive Language](#).

Section 8.5.2 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/14/92.

8.5.3 Drug Free Workplace

Iowa State is committed to providing a [Drug Free Workplace](#).

8.5.4 Occupational Safety

Within available resources, it is the policy of Iowa State to provide and ensure a safe and healthy environment for employees, students, and visiting public and to maintain at all times an effective safety program. See the [Accident and Incident Prevention, Reporting, and Investigation](#) policy.

8.5.5 Smoke-Free Campus

Iowa State complies with the Smokefree Air Act. See the [Smoke-Free Campus](#) policy.

Approved as amended by the Faculty Senate April 24, 2007

8.5.6 Travel Regulations

All faculty shall comply with the university's [Travel - Authorization and Funding](#) policy.

8.5.7 Gifts to Faculty

Acceptance of gifts by state employees is regulated by [Iowa Code 68B.22](#).

8.5.8 Open Meetings

Although the university promotes the principle of open meetings, state law does not require that university committee meetings be open to the public, except for the Athletic Council, the Leopold Center Advisory Board and other specific bodies listed in the [open meetings law](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate (February 16, 2010); by the president and provost (February 22, 2010).

8.5.9 Employment Related Liability

As a general rule, university employees need not purchase [liability insurance](#) to cover those situations where they might be sued in their capacity as an employee. As long as a university employee is acting within the scope of their employment and the employee's acts or omissions are not willful or malicious, the state will defend and pay resulting liabilities on behalf of the employee. For additional information see [Iowa Code 669.21](#).

8.5.10 Policy and Information References

The [Iowa State University Catalog](#), revised every year, is the university's official source of information concerning curriculum requirements and course offerings as well as information concerning admissions policies, financial aid, and other facts for prospective students. It also contains a listing of all [university faculty](#).

The Iowa State Catalog contains a section, the [Graduate College](#), relevant to graduate education.

The [Iowa State University Faculty Handbook](#), available online, provides a description of university structure, function, policies, and procedures. It is revised every year by the Faculty Senate under the supervision of the SVPP.

The [Iowa State University Policy Library](#) houses current official statements of university policy of general applicability from across Iowa State University.

The Iowa State University Budget for the current fiscal year is available in the Reserve Room of the Parks Library. It lists all university employees and their salaries by budget unit. Note: This is currently unavailable to any faculty member or the public.

The [Financial Report](#), required by law, is a yearly record of the university's receipts and expenditures, prepared under the supervision of the senior vice president for operations and finance and filed in that office.

The [Iowa Code](#), a current collection of the laws of the State of Iowa and published under the direction of the state legislature, is available in the university library and online.

Chapter 9. Faculty Grievance Procedures.....	151
9.1 Who May File Appeals.....	151
9.2 Appeal through Administrative Channels	152
9.3 Appeal through Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals	153
9.3.1 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals.....	153
9.3.2 Procedures in a Faculty Appeal.....	154
9.3.2.1 Contacting the Committee.....	154
9.3.2.2 Initiating an Appeal.....	154
9.3.2.3 Timing of Initiation of an Appeal.....	154
9.3.3 Appointment of an Ad Hoc Investigative Committee.....	154
9.3.3.1 Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Procedures.....	155
9.3.3.2 The Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Report	155
9.3.3.3 Response to the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Report.	156
9.3.3.4 Terminating an Appeal	156
9.3.4 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Hearing of Case.....	156
9.3.4.1 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Reporting Procedures	156
9.3.5 Limitation	156
9.3.6 Responsibilities of Senior Vice President and Provost and President	157
9.3.6.1 Appeal of an Action of the Senior Vice President and Provost	157
9.3.6.2 Appeal of an Action of the University President	157
9.3.6.3 Appeal to Board of Regents	158
9.3.7 Keeping Records	158
9.3.7.1 Confidentiality	158
9.3.7.2 Archives.....	158
9.3.7.3 Annual Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Report	158
9.4 Amendments.....	158

Chapter 9. Faculty Grievance Procedures

Approved by Faculty Senate 4/7/2009; approved by president and provost 4/21/2009.

9.1 Who May File Appeals

Faculty members who believe they have been treated unfairly with respect to salary, promotion, tenure, academic concerns, reduction in force, or other matters related to

employment may have their cases reviewed formally through the procedures developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the administration.

For purposes of definition, such a call for a review will hereafter be called an appeal. An appeal is brought by an appellant(s) and directed at the appellee(s). Appeals of administrative actions or actions to deny reappointment, promotion, or tenure must be based on one of the following four grounds: (a) improper procedures were followed, (b) academic freedoms were violated, (c) policy was interpreted improperly, or (d) arbitrary and capricious criteria were employed in recommending the action being appealed. The burden of proof for documenting the grounds for the appeal is the responsibility of the appellant. For information about when an appeal of a promotion or tenure decision may be made and the information to be considered in such an appeal, see [Section 5.2.4.4.5](#).

All faculty are eligible to appeal (with the exception of those defined in [Section 3.3.3](#)). Appeals must be initiated no more than 30 days following the occurrence of the last event or events being appealed (see [Section 2.9.1](#) for a definition of ‘days’). The filing of an appeal should not alter any schedule, time limitation, or deadline to which the parties to the appeal would otherwise have been subject in the absence of the filing (e.g., date of termination or date for which tenure is obtained). However, changes in schedules or deadlines may be among the remedies sought by the appellant(s).

There are two independent channels for the consideration of appeals:

- Administrative
- Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals (FSCA)

Faculty may use one or both channels consecutively but not simultaneously.

Section 9.1 Approved by the Faculty Senate (October 18, 2022); by the Senior Vice President and Provost (October 20, 2022); by the President (October 22, 2022).

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/2/17; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/23/17; and the ISU President on 5/29/17.

9.2 Appeal through Administrative Channels

An appeal through administrative channels is initiated when a written appeal stating the case is submitted with supporting evidence documenting the appeal. The appeal must be based on one or more of the four possible grounds stated in [Section 9.1](#). The appeal must also name the appellee(s), and the specific remedies requested. The appeal is presented to the administrator or administrative body whose sphere of responsibility includes the events grieved (e.g., departmental chair, college dean, senior vice president and provost (SVPP), university president, or the Board of Regents, State of Iowa). Administrative offices may require the appeal to follow a specific structure or form to ensure that all relevant information is provided.

Appeals must be initiated within 30 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) of the action or decision being contested. Appeals to the Board of Regents must be initiated within 10 calendar days of the

final institutional decision. If, in the judgment of the SVPP, the grounds for the appeal are unclear, the SVPP shall consult with the president of the Faculty Senate and the chair of the FSCA on whether or not the SVPP will consider the case. Consensus is required for a case not to be considered. Appeals presented initially to the SVPP or to the university president may be referred to the FSCA, where they will be treated as described in [Section 9.3.6.1](#) and [Section 9.3.6.2](#). For information regarding appeals to the Board of Regents, see [Section 9.3.6.3](#).

The administrator or administrative body that receives the appeal shall investigate it and present the appellant(s) and the appellee(s) with a written response within 25 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) from the date the appeal was received. The written response must describe the evidence considered, state the decisions made, and review the reasoning that led to the decisions. If the appeal is denied, the appellant(s) has 15 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) to appeal the decision to the next administrative level or the FSCA, as described in [Section 9.3](#).

The response time for appeals filed near extended periods when classes are not in session or summer session may be modified accordingly to accommodate the availability of the principals and witnesses appropriate to the appeal. Other adjustments may be made in the appeal procedure's time schedule, provided the appellant(s), appellee(s), and the party investigating the appeal agree to them, or, failing that, the approval of the SVPP is obtained. An appeal through administrative channels may be withdrawn by the appellant(s) any time before the response is received.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/2/17; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/23/17; and the ISU President on 5/29/17.

9.3 Appeal through Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals

9.3.1 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals

Established by the Faculty Senate to consider appeals by any faculty member, the FSCA is composed of at least 16 faculty members, plus the chairperson who is elected annually by the Faculty Senate. No member may be a departmental, college, or university administrative officer. Details of the committee structure are described in the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#), Article VI, Section 5, C.1.

The FSCA is a body that investigates and recommends a course of action; it is not an advocate group for faculty members who believe that they have been treated unfairly. When a case is brought to the committee, it is investigated with due consideration given to the appeal and to the counterarguments offered by the appellee(s). Following a confidential committee investigation and discussion of the allegations and pertinent evidence, a committee recommendation is made relative to the remedies sought. These recommendations are sent to the SVPP. If the decision of the SVPP at this point is not acceptable to the appellant(s), it may be appealed to the university president and, ultimately, to the Board of Regents (see [Section 9.3.6.3](#)).

No member of the FSCA must vote on or participate in investigations of an appeal of actions in which they are or have been directly involved. All appeals brought to the committee are handled in the strictest confidence. The committee may develop other rules of procedure subject to approval by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

9.3.2 Procedures in a Faculty Appeal

9.3.2.1 Contacting the Committee

Potential appellants should contact the Faculty Senate Office to obtain the name of the chair of the FSCA. In a confidential preliminary conference, the FSCA chair will advise the potential appellant(s) regarding the appropriate procedures in an appeal process. If the faculty member agrees, the chair of the FSCA may, at this point, act as an ombuds to determine if the appeal can be settled by negotiation before proceeding through the steps described below.

9.3.2.2 Initiating an Appeal

To initiate an appeal, the faculty member shall do the following:

- complete the Request for Study of an Appeal form
- sign a release form that includes suggested parties to be interviewed
- provide a written appeal that carefully states and documents the allegation(s) in the case, names of the appellee(s), and states the relief sought

If, in the judgment of the chair, the grounds for the appeal are questionable, the FSCA must vote on whether or not it will consider the case.

9.3.2.3 Timing of Initiation of an Appeal

Appeals may be initiated at any calendar time within 30 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) of the action/decision being contested. Exceptions to this 30-day limit may be granted at the discretion of the FSCA. If the time available between the submission of the appeal and the beginning of an extended period without classes is insufficient for an investigation and preparation of a final report, the FSCA chair may postpone initiating an investigation of an appeal until the end of the first week following that period.

The decision to postpone obligates the chair to send written notification to appellant(s) and appellee(s). When less than 30 days are left in a spring semester, an appeal may be held over the summer. For appeals that do not involve employment issues, the 30-day limit may be extended a maximum of 30 days if evidence of actively working with the [University Ombuds Office](#) is provided by the faculty member to the chair of FSCA prior to the deadline.

9.3.3 Appointment of an Ad Hoc Investigative Committee

Within five days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) of the acceptance of an appeal by the committee, the FSCA chair shall appoint an Ad Hoc Investigative Committee (AHIC) consisting of three faculty, with consideration of diversity and appropriateness of its members. The

appellant(s) and appellee(s) are informed of the AHIC membership. The appellee(s) will be given a copy of the materials submitted by the appellant(s) and additional procedural information supplied by the FSCA chair.

The appellant(s) and appellee(s) may each request removal of one member from the AHIC within five days of notification of the committee membership. The FSCA chair chooses replacement member(s). The appellee(s) has 10 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) to submit to the FSCA a written response to the appellant(s) request for a Study of an Appeal. A copy of this written response must be given to the appellant(s).

Approved as revised by the Faculty Senate on January 21, 2014; by the president on 2/2/14; and the senior vice president and provost on 1/30/14.

9.3.3.1 Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Procedures

The AHIC must keep a written log when conducting an investigation. It should where possible, interview all witnesses specified by the appellant(s), appellee(s), and other principal parties to the appeal. Other persons may, at the discretion of the AHIC, be interviewed. Interviewees may be accompanied by a counselor(s) at their expense. Only the AHIC, its legal counsel, if any, and persons approved by the party being interviewed will be present during these confidential interviews.

The AHIC has 30 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) to complete its investigation and submit its report. Adjustments may be made in the time schedule, provided the appellant(s), appellee(s), and the AHIC agree, or, in the event of no such agreement, with the approval of the FSCA chair.

9.3.3.2 The Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Report

After completing its investigation, the AHIC must prepare a written report, which must include the following:

- description of the appeal
- relief sought
- evidence appropriate to each allegation in the appeal
- findings relative to each allegation

Copies of confidential letters of recommendation that were solicited during the process that led to the appeal will not be included in the AHIC's report.

A tentative set of recommendations must also be prepared. These will be considered separately from the report by the full FSCA. This report that includes tentative recommendations must be submitted to the appellant(s), to the appellee(s), and to all FSCA members so that all parties concerned will have no less than 10 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) to consider the report prior to a meeting of the FSCA called to act on the appeal.

9.3.3.3 Response to the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Report

Within this 10-day (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) period, the appellant(s) and appellee(s) may submit to the chair of the FSCA written explanatory statements, stating any disagreements on matters of fact and/or interpretation with the AHIC's findings. The chair shall arrange a reciprocal exchange of explanatory statements between the appellant(s) and appellee(s) as well as distribute such statements to the full committee. Failure by any of the parties to submit an explanatory statement will be interpreted as acceptance of the factual and interpretive information of the AHIC's findings.

9.3.3.4 Terminating an Appeal

At any stage prior to submission of the report of the AHIC, the appellant(s) may request in writing to the FSCA chair that consideration of the appeal be terminated. In such a case, the chair of the AHIC shall submit a summary report on the general nature of the appeal and its resolution to the FSCA chair. This report must be written so as to maintain confidentiality in the case. Once the AHIC report has been submitted; the appellant(s) may not terminate an appeal.

9.3.4 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Hearing of Case

After the required 10-day (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) period, a quorum of the FSCA must meet in closed session within five days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) to review the appeal, the AHIC findings, its recommendations, and all written explanatory statements submitted by the appellant(s) and appellee(s). In this discussion, the full FSCA will formulate specific recommendations based on the AHIC's tentative recommendations regarding disposition of the appeal.

Upon returning to open session, a quorum of the FSCA must vote by secret ballot on the recommendations in the case. FSCA members present for voting may individually submit written commentary, corrections, rebuttal, or rationale for accepting or rejecting the recommendations.

9.3.4.1 Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Reporting Procedures

The FSCA recommendations, including a tally of the vote, the investigative findings and attachments, the responses of the appellant(s) and appellee(s), and any concurring or dissenting opinions, must be submitted by the FSCA chair to the SVPP within five days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) from the date of the appeal hearing.

The FSCA chair shall also inform the appellant(s) and appellee(s) of the committee's recommendations within five days of the committee's meeting.

9.3.5 Limitation

Once considered by the committee, an appeal may not be reopened unless there is significant new evidence in the judgment of the FSCA.

9.3.6 Responsibilities of Senior Vice President and Provost and University President

After review of the FSCA report and holding any additional necessary interviews, the SVPP or a designee shall prepare a written report on the final disposition of the appeal and the university's action in the matter. The FSCA recommendations may be accepted as submitted.

If the SVPP rejects or only partially accepts the recommendations, written reasons must be provided to the FSCA. The SVPP signed report must be addressed to the appellant(s), with copies sent to the appellee(s) and the chair of the FSCA, within 15 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) from the date of submission of the FSCA recommendations. The chair shall inform the FSCA of the response by the SVPP.

If the SVPP denies the appeal, the appellant(s) has 15 days to appeal the SVPP decision to the university president.

9.3.6.1 Appeal of an Action of the Senior Vice President and Provost

In cases where the faculty member is appealing an action of the SVPP, the final disposition of the appeal rests with the university president.

The FSCA report and recommendations to the university president will be sent to the SVPP for reconsideration of the initial decision. If the SVPP decision is unchanged, the report and recommendation of the SVPP will be forwarded to the university president with the FSCA recommendation, and all materials related to the appeal within 10 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) from receipt of the FSCA report. The university president's report containing their decision must be sent to the appellant(s), appellee(s), the SVPP, and the chair of the FSCA within 15 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) from the receipt of the SVPP recommendation.

If the university president rejects the appeal, written reasons must be included in the university president's report. The FSCA chair shall inform the FSCA of the response by the university president. If the university president denies the appeal, the appellant(s) has 10 calendar days to appeal the university president's decision to the Board of Regents.

9.3.6.2 Appeal of an Action of the University President

In cases where the faculty member is appealing an action of the university president, the FSCA recommendation will be submitted to the university president who will reconsider the initial action. If the university president's initial decision is unchanged, the university president will prepare a report containing written reasons for their decision. The FSCA report and the university president's report will be forwarded to the Board of Regents within 15 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#)) of the submission of the FSCA recommendations. The university president's report must be sent to the appellant(s) and the chair of the FSCA.

9.3.6.3 Appeal to Board of Regents

A decision may be appealed to the Board of Regents only once. Therefore, if the administrative appeal channel is used and the university president denies the relief sought, appellants shall decide whether (a) to appeal directly to the Board of Regents, or (b) to avail themselves of the opportunity to use the FSCA. Choosing alternative (a) will preclude subsequent use of alternative (b). If the FSCA is used, its recommendation will go to the university president as outlined in [Section 9.3.6.2](#).

This section is not to be construed as implying that the administrative channel must be pursued to the presidential level before using the FSCA. Instead, faculty members may pursue the administrative appeal channel to any level up to and including the university president before turning to the FSCA. However, faculty members may decide to turn to the FSCA, either as a first recourse or in response to denials of relief sought at lower administrative levels.

9.3.7 Keeping Records

9.3.7.1 Confidentiality

The proceedings, findings, and recommendations in an appeal are to be held in strict confidence. Such information may be made public only at the request of or by action of the appellant(s). If the appellant(s) or appellee(s) make public material which the FSCA believes to be unfair to people involved in the case, the committee, after consultation with the parties directly involved, may make public such materials as it deems necessary to achieve a fair presentation of the facts.

9.3.7.2 Archives

The FSCA chair shall deposit in the Faculty Senate Office all materials collected in a review of an appeal. After two years, all materials are to be destroyed unless any of the parties to the appeal request that the materials be retained for two additional years. Neither these documents nor any materials pertinent to the appeal must be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member(s) held by any administrative unit of the university unless the faculty member so requests. The SVPP may retain all materials submitted in a case for up to five years in a separate appeals file.

9.3.7.3 Annual Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals Report

At the end of each academic year, the FSCA chair shall submit to the Faculty Senate a written summary report on the general nature of the appeal(s) taken to the SVPP, indicating whether the recommendations of the committee were accepted, modified, or rejected. This report must be written so as to maintain the confidentiality of all cases.

9.4 Amendments

Amendments to this policy must be governed by the same rules which apply to amendments of the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#) Article IV, B. After amendments are approved by

the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals is responsible for transmitting changes to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost for inclusion in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Chapter 10. Instruction	161
10.1 Introduction	161
10.2 Admissions Requirements.....	162
10.3 Student Academic Performance	162
10.3.1 Special GPA Requirements.....	162
10.4 Attendance Policies.....	162
10.4.1 Class Attendance.....	162
10.4.2 Curricular-Related Activities	163
10.4.3 Excusable Absences for Non-Curricular Reasons.....	163
10.4.3.1 Extra-Curricular Activities as a Representative of the University	163
10.4.3.2 Other Extra-Curricular Activities.....	164
10.4.3.3 Military Service	164
10.4.3.4 Court Appearances.....	164
10.5 Policy for Addressing Disruptive Conduct in the Learning Environment	164
10.5.1 Definitions	165
10.5.1.1 Learning Environment	165
10.5.1.2 Instructor	165
10.5.1.3 Disruptive Conduct	165
10.5.2 Procedures for Addressing Disruptive Conduct in the Learning Environment	166
10.5.3 Rights and Responsibilities	166
10.5.3.1 Instructors	166
10.5.3.2 Students.....	167
10.5.3.3 Department Chairs.....	167
10.5.3.4 Academic Advisors.....	167
10.5.4 Campus Resources	167
10.5.4.1 Dean of Students Office	168
10.5.4.2 Iowa State University Department of Public Safety.....	168
10.5.4.3 Office of Equal Opportunity	168
10.5.4.4 Student Accessibility Services.....	168
10.6 Course Information.....	168
10.6.1 Explicit Materials.....	168

10.6.2 Distant Sites	169
10.6.3 Library Reserve	169
10.6.4 Prep Week Policy	169
10.7 Evaluation of Instruction	170
10.7.1 Oral Communication Competence.....	170
10.7.2 Student Outcomes Assessment.....	171
10.7.2.1 Introduction	171
10.8 Development of Courses and Curricula	172
10.8.1 Academic Program Approvals	172
10.8.2 Discontinuation of Academic Programs.....	174
10.8.3 Consistency of Student Learning Outcomes Across Sections and Modalities of Instruction	175
10.9 Policy on Intellectual Property of Educational Materials.....	176
10.9.1 University-sponsored Educational Materials.....	176
10.9.1.1 Preamble	176
10.9.1.2 Policies.....	178
10.9.1.3 Ownership of Course-related Presentations	178
10.9.1.4 Intellectual Property: Policies and Procedures.....	178
10.9.1.5 Royalties for Instructional Materials	179
10.9.1.6 Required Readings and Textbook Selection	179

Chapter 10. Instruction

10.1 Introduction

As stated in the [Faculty Senate Constitution](#), the faculty "is the legislative body of the university and is responsible for academic policies and procedures. These include but are not limited to faculty promotion and tenure policies and procedures, admissions requirements, graduation requirements, curriculum and course revisions, new degree programs, and grading procedures." Consult the following resources for relevant policies and procedures:

- [Iowa State University Catalog](#)
- [Schedule of Classes](#)
- [Dean of Students Office](#)

For resources on developing and improving teaching skills, visit the [Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching](#).

For policies and procedures concerning students with disabilities, visit [Student Accessibility Services](#).

The policies and procedures described on the pages that follow are those adopted or administered by the Faculty Senate.

10.2 Admissions Requirements

Iowa State University of Science and Technology [admissions requirements](#) are set by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate on 4/21/2009 and by president and provost on 4/29/2009.

10.3 Student Academic Performance

10.3.1 Special GPA Requirements

A program is required to seek approval to establish a minimum GPA requirement for admission, continuation, or graduation that exceeds the university requirement. In its request, the program must provide the following:

- a rationale for the special requirement based on expected student learning outcomes
- an equitable, rational, and purposeful process for establishing, implementing, and evaluating the requirement

The Academic Standards and Admissions Committee (ASAC) of the Faculty Senate is responsible for approving special requirement requests and for reviewing existing requirements regularly.

Section 10.3.1 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 10/14/1997.

10.4 Attendance Policies

Section 10.4 was revised by the Faculty Senate 12/14/1999.

10.4.1 Class Attendance

In order to attend a given class, a student needs to be registered for that class. Exceptions to this policy are at the discretion of the instructor.

Students are expected to attend class meetings as scheduled. Each instructor sets their own policy on class attendance, and excuses for absence from class are handled between the student and the instructor.

For additional information regarding discretionary accommodation for disability and religion, see [Student Accessibility Services](#) and [Modified Religious Accommodations Statement](#).

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/4/2008 and by the president and provost on 3/24/2008.

10.4.2 Curricular-Related Activities

Trips away from campus as part of a course are appropriate educational experiences. They may not, however, take place during the first or last week of the semester or extend for more than two consecutive class days (Monday - Friday). These regulations may be waived only by special permission of the dean of the college in which the course is offered.

Students should consult with instructors whose classes will be missed. If a mutually satisfactory agreement between the instructors and the student cannot be reached, the student cannot be required to attend the curricular-related activity or be penalized by the instructor for missing the curricular-related activity.

10.4.3 Excusable Absences for Non-Curricular Reasons

Students who miss class for non-curricular reasons are responsible for completing all assigned course requirements in a timely manner.

Instructors should provide timely opportunities for students to make up or replace missed scheduled examinations and/or assignments resulting from an excusable absence. While instructors are free to change the format of make-up examinations or assignments, students will be evaluated by the same standards as other members of the class.

In all cases, the person responsible for the event or activity should provide participants with a letter explaining the proposed absence and its duration, including travel times for off-campus events and activities. Students shall provide this documentation to instructors at least 10 days (see [Section 2.9.1](#) for a definition of 'days') in advance of the activity or event, except when such notice is not possible.

Course instructors retain final authority regarding student absences and how they impact course grades and the acceptability of a student's work toward passing their course. If a student needs to miss, for any reason, a portion of a course that, in the considered opinion of the course instructor, is critical to the student's ability to meet the course objectives, the instructor shall recommend alternative actions to the student, which may include dropping the class.

10.4.3.1 Extra-Curricular Activities as a Representative of the University

Students may seek, or be asked, to participate as an Iowa State representative in non-credit events (competitions, conferences, presentations, programs, and performances) scheduled by academic or athletic units of the university at times that conflict with scheduled classes.

Instructors shall excuse students who miss class while representing the university in official department- or university-sponsored activities, including:

- academic or professional conferences and workshops

- intercollegiate athletic, academic, and judging competitions
- musical, theatrical, dance, and other artistic performances
- presentations or programs given to external audiences

10.4.3.2 Other Extra-Curricular Activities

Instructors will determine whether absences similar to those described above ([Section 10.4.3.1](#)), but which are not officially sponsored by a unit of the university (e.g., conference attendance, job interviews), will be treated as excused.

10.4.3.3 Military Service

Instructors shall excuse absences due to veteran or military service obligations (including service-related medical appointments, military orders dictating appointments, and National Guard Service obligations). When a student’s military or veteran obligations are for more than two weeks, the student should meet with their advisor to discuss the situation and academic options and work with their instructors to discuss potential accommodations. University procedures are in place for such situations and should be followed. In all instances, students have a responsibility to communicate with their instructors to ensure they are continuing to meet course expectations and requirements.

Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to consult with the university’s [Military-Affiliated Student Center](#).

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/17/18; the senior vice president and provost on 4/19/2018; and the university president on 4/22/2018.

10.4.3.4 Court Appearances

Instructors shall excuse absences due to officially mandated court appearances including jury duty.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/7/13, the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/20/13, and the ISU President on 5/28/13.

10.5 Policy for Addressing Disruptive Conduct in the Learning Environment

For student learning to be most effective, learning environments must remain civil, safe, collaborative, and free from conduct that unreasonably disrupts, impedes, obstructs, or interferes with the educational process.

The university recognizes the importance of open inquiry, freedom of expression, and viewpoint diversity within its learning environments, and all members of the university – including faculty, staff, students, and administrators – should feel free to express their viewpoints without fear of reprisal (see [Section 7.1](#)). However, students have an obligation to engage in the educational process in a civil manner that does not unreasonably disrupt the educational experiences of their fellow students or the instructor’s course objectives.

Conduct that unreasonably disrupts the ability of instructors to teach or students to learn can be prohibited as being in violation of this policy. Instructors have the right and responsibility to ensure a safe and functional learning environment – including the authority and discretion to address disruptive conduct.

Students who engage in disruptive conduct may be subject to disciplinary action, including possible removal from a course(s) and/or referral for sanctioning under the [Student Code of Conduct](#).

10.5.1 Definitions

This section defines key terms related to addressing disruptive conduct in the learning environment.

10.5.1.1 Learning Environment

A learning environment is a collaborative and safe space in which the exchange of information and knowledge occurs. A learning environment may include, but is not limited to, any gathering of instructor(s) and student(s) for the purposes of teaching and learning, particularly as authorized by Iowa State or any of its units. Learning environments may include, but are not limited to, physical classrooms, online and virtual learning spaces, laboratories, clinical settings, course-related field trips, course-related work, performances, studios, internship sites, testing centers, conferences, university offices, and hosted office hours.

10.5.1.2 Instructor

The classification of “instructor” includes all persons authorized by Iowa State or any of its units to conduct the instruction of students enrolled in the university’s courses, programs, or activities. Instructors in all learning environments hold the right and responsibility to oversee the conduct in their environment and to ensure that a safe and functioning learning environment is maintained.

10.5.1.3 Disruptive Conduct

At the discretion of the instructor, disruptive conduct includes a single serious incident or persistent conduct that unreasonably interrupts, impedes, obstructs, and/or interferes with the educational process. Disruptive conduct may be physical and/or expressive in nature and may occur in person or in a virtual setting. Examples of disruptive conduct may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- arriving to class late or leaving early without instructor permission
- speaking without being recognized
- interrupting or talking over others
- using technology, such as cell phones or computers, without instructor permission – especially when use is unrelated to course content
- creating loud or distracting noises either carelessly or with intent to disrupt

- eating, sleeping, or carrying out other personal activities in class that are unrelated to course content without instructor permission
- performing non-protected malicious, harassing or bullying speech or actions directed at instructors or students (e.g., personal insults, *ad hominem* attacks, name-calling, abusive or ridiculing comments, or threats)
- using curses/expletives or other speech that is not relevant to class discussion
- demonstrating inappropriate physical contact or threats of inappropriate physical contact directed at instructors or students
- refusing to comply with the instructor's request for appropriate conduct

The expression of unpopular or controversial opinions or the expression of disagreement with the instructor or other students – during times when the instructor permits discussion and when delivered in a manner conducive to learning – is not in itself disruptive conduct and is not prohibited. Rules regarding disruption must be consistently and equitably applied.

10.5.2 Procedures for Addressing Disruptive Conduct in the Learning Environment

Iowa State adheres to a graduated approach in responding to and addressing disruptive conduct. Instructors, department chairs, college deans, and relevant administrators identified in [Section 10.5.4](#) work collaboratively to determine the appropriate level of intervention necessary to address the disruptive conduct at issue.

For information on adhering to and administering this policy [Procedures and Guidance for Addressing Disruptive Conduct](#).

10.5.3 Rights and Responsibilities

The rights and responsibilities of relevant campus community members in the context of the instructor's role for addressing disruptive conduct in the learning environment are summarized below as they pertain to the application of this policy.

10.5.3.1 Instructors

Instructors have the right and responsibility to manage disruptive conduct within their learning environments, including establishing and communicating expectations, redirection, follow up, documentation of incidents, and contacting appropriate resources following or during the course of an incident. Instructors can obtain information and assistance from a number of campus resources (see [Section 10.5.4](#)) regarding decisions related to potential violations of this policy and a student's return to or removal from a course(s) following an incident.

The following is an example of a graduated approach for addressing classroom disruptions:

1. Direct a student engaging in disruptive conduct to cease the conduct.

2. Direct a student engaging in disruptive conduct to leave the learning environment during a particular session, or for a defined length of time in appropriate cases.
3. Adjourn the class or activity.
4. Summon the university police (515-294-4428) in serious or emergency situations.

The resources identified in this policy and the [Procedures and Guidelines for Addressing Disruptive Conduct](#) have been developed to assist instructors in understanding the appropriate response(s) to incidents of disruption. Instructors will complete appropriate documentation, summarizing such incidents, and report such incidents to their department chair. Instructors will consult with their department chair regarding any student removals from courses.

In addition to the instructor's own observation of disruptive conduct, the instructor should evaluate reports of disruptive conduct brought to their attention by other instructional staff, teaching assistants, and students.

10.5.3.2 Students

Nothing in this policy will be construed so as to limit or abridge students' constitutional freedoms and legal rights. In the enforcement of this policy, instructors may not infringe upon students' rights as members of the university community nor on their constitutional and statutory rights and privileges protected by state and federal law. This includes students' rights to express themselves through academic work within the guidelines of university rules and regulations or the guidelines set by instructors for the learning environment. Students have the responsibility to familiarize themselves with and follow the expectations set by instructors for the learning environment. Students also have the responsibility not to deny these rights to other members of the university community. For more information, see [Student Code of Conduct](#).

10.5.3.3 Department Chairs

Department chairs receive information from instructors regarding disruptive incidents in the learning environment, as appropriate. They will be informed of and involved in consultations, decision-making, and appeals regarding student removals from the classroom.

10.5.3.4 Academic Advisors

Academic advisors, including major professors for graduate students, may receive information from instructors when incidents of disruption occur. They may be contacted for consultation regarding their knowledge of individual student circumstances, or to assist the student in conversations with instructors or departmental representatives.

10.5.4 Campus Resources

The following offices are available to assist and provide guidance to all members of the university community regarding this policy. For best practices and additional information

about addressing disruptive conduct, see [Procedures and Guidance for Addressing Disruptive Conduct](#).

10.5.4.1 Dean of Students Office

The [Dean of Students Office](#) (DSO) is a principal resource to discuss and consult on all matters of learning environment disruption. Faculty may copy DSO on email communication and summaries sent to the student(s) involved to document the incident with this office (dso@iastate.edu).

10.5.4.2 Iowa State University Department of Public Safety

For emergencies, call 911. For non-emergency issues, call the Iowa State University [Department of Public Safety](#) 24-hour line 515-294-4428.

10.5.4.3 Office of Equal Opportunity

The [Office of Equal Opportunity](#) (OEO) is responsible for outreach, investigations, and follow-up regarding potential violations of the university's Title IX, anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, anti-retaliation, and sexual misconduct prevention related policies. Course instructors are considered 'responsible employees'. For more information, see [How to Report a Title IX Issue](#), under "Who is a responsible employee".

10.5.4.4 Student Accessibility Services

The Office of [Student Accessibility Services](#) determines eligibility for reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/23/19; by the Senior Vice President and Provost on 4/30/19; and the ISU President on 4/30/19.

10.6 Course Information

Section 10.6 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 11/12/1996.

Instructors shall provide information regarding course content, objectives, and procedures to students during the first week of each course. The information must include a course syllabus or schedule of proposed topics, readings, and course materials or other description of the course content. The evaluation procedures to be used, as well as expectations for attendance and assignments, must also be included.

10.6.1 Explicit Materials

For sound pedagogical reasons, a faculty member may decide to use course materials that include explicit visual representations of human sexual acts. The faculty member has an obligation to inform students at the beginning of the course about the nature of that material. If a student chooses not to view the presentation(s) and the faculty member determines that alternative assignment(s) are not feasible, the student must be permitted to drop the course without penalty (as an administrative drop) within seven calendar days of receiving the announcement of the presentation.

10.6.2 Distant Sites

Faculty should notify students at the beginning of the course that the class will be recorded or transmitted to distant sites. Faculty whose classes involve interaction through electronic means should notify their students if comments or submissions are private between instructor and student, available to other students in the class, or available to others outside the class.

10.6.3 Library Reserve

Books and other materials that are required reading may be placed on reserve in the Parks Library for use by students in specified classes.

10.6.4 Prep Week Policy

For each fall and spring semester, the last full week of classes before final examinations is designated as Prep Week. The intent of this policy is to establish a one-week period of substantial and predictable study time for undergraduate students. During Prep Week, regular lectures are expected to continue, including the introduction of new content, as deemed appropriate by the instructor.

The restrictions established by this Prep Week policy are listed below:

- Due dates for mandatory graded submissions of any kind that fall within Prep Week must be listed on the syllabus provided at the start of the course.
- Mandatory final examinations may not be given during Prep Week except for laboratory courses or courses that meet weekly and for which there is no contact during the normal final examination week.
- No in-class quizzes or exams may be given on the Thursday and Friday of Prep Week. Quizzes/exams that are administered outside of class such as take-home exams, online exams, or exams given in the testing centers must open no later than Wednesday at noon of Prep Week and only cover material presented on or before the Tuesday of Prep Week.

Exceptions to this policy include the following:

- classes that meet only on Thursdays or Fridays
- lab components of courses
- half-semester courses
- make-up exams due to excused absences
- regularly used formative assessments intended to enhance student engagement and guide course delivery

All other exceptions require approval by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Additionally, registered Iowa State student organizations may not hold any meetings, functions, or sponsored events during the Prep Week period. Any exception to these restrictions must be authorized in advance by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Student Affairs.

Section 10.6.4 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/9/2002.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/7/13, the Senior Vice President and Provost on 5/20/13 and the ISU President on 5/28/13.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 2/14/17, the Senior Vice President and Provost on 2/16/17 and the ISU President on 2/20/17.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/10/20; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 4/10/20; and the ISU President on 4/10/20.

10.7 Evaluation of Instruction

10.7.1 Oral Communication Competence

The [Board of Regents Policy 3.21 English Language Proficiency \(Oral Communication Competence\)](#) mandates that all faculty and teaching assistants who provide instruction to students during each relevant academic period will be evaluated for oral communication competence. In the context of this policy, oral communication competence is understood to be the ability to communicate appropriately in the language of instruction. The nature and scope of the evaluation of oral communication competence may vary with the discipline, instructional setting, and material being communicated. The following guidelines apply:

- Written standards and procedures for making the determination of oral communication competence are developed at the departmental or program level in a collegial manner and will incorporate a mechanism for evaluation of instructors by students.
- Departments complete such evaluations within the timeframe designated by the Board of Regents Policy 3.21C (i.e., "by the end of each academic period in which [the instructor] has sufficient direct contact with students to render such evaluation meaningful").
- Procedures developed within departments must be written and implemented cooperatively by the teaching faculty and the departmental administration.
- The evaluation of oral competence need not function separately from other evaluation procedures as long as such established procedures meet the Board of Regents requirements for timeliness and student input, and they explicitly address the matter of oral communication.
- The departmental chairs and program directors, college deans, and the senior vice president and provost (SVPP) are responsible for the implementation of this policy and for ensuring that adequate standards of oral communication competence are maintained.

Section 10.7.1 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/07/1991.

10.7.2 Student Outcomes Assessment

10.7.2.1 Introduction

Iowa State is committed to using assessment processes as an essential component of the continuous improvement of our institution's learning and educational outcomes. An effective outcomes assessment and evaluation process is a critical component of a continuous improvement process. Student learning outcomes for a degree program describe the knowledge, skills, and abilities that program faculty determine students should accomplish by the time of graduation. The improvement of students' achievement of these outcomes should be the goal of any program improvement effort.

When performed regularly and consistently, outcomes assessment and evaluation are the processes by which student achievement of learning outcomes is determined. Through a combination of direct and indirect measures, assessment collects data on student performance relative to program learning outcomes. The evaluation of these data provides direction for changes that may be needed to address shortcomings and improve student achievement of the outcomes. After changes are made, student achievement of the outcomes is re-assessed and evaluated, with additional changes implemented as needed, in an ongoing cycle.

Collectively and individually (as appropriate), assessments of general education and program-level outcomes should:

- involve faculty at all points of the process
- align with the university's mission and goals
- use multiple methods of assessment
- evaluate results and take steps to improve student learning outcomes
- align with institutional program review processes
- include external judgment, advice, or benchmarks
- evaluate barriers to student retention and completion

Program Assessment

Every academic program – undergraduate, graduate, professional, and general education – is required to have an active assessment plan. Program assessment plans should:

- articulate specific program goals and measurable student learning outcomes
- identify the courses or student experiences where the disciplinary learning takes place
- assess one or more learning outcomes per year on an established periodic basis
- review assessment data to determine the efficacy and impact of its curriculum in achieving the learning objectives on a continual basis

Program Assessment Reports should:

- identify one or more program learning outcomes that were assessed within the reporting period
- outline the types of assessments that were conducted during the defined assessment period (e.g., one direct assessment is recommended every three years)
- document and analyze the results
- summarize recommendations, identify opportunities for improvements (if needed), and outline recommendations and strategies for implementation

General Education Assessment

The university-wide general education core requirements are designed to ensure that all Iowa State undergraduate students acquire the key skills and perspectives needed to succeed in a global society.

Students graduating with a bachelor's degree will have acquired knowledge and skills:

- to demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking and problem solving as appropriate to their field of study (critical thinking and problem solving);
- to communicate effectively in their field of study (communication);
- to be effective citizens and thrive in a culturally diverse global community (global citizenship);
- to be proficient in the acquisition and use of information (information literacy).

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/20/21; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 4/23/21; and the ISU President on 4/24/21.

Amended and approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/5/15; the Senior Vice President and Provost on 6/16/15; and the ISU President on 7/20/15.

Section 10.7.2 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/07/1991.

10.8 Development of Courses and Curricula

10.8.1 Academic Program Approvals

A new course or curriculum must first be approved by the department(s) or college(s) that initiate it. Changes in existing minors, specializations, certificates, or options within majors require only approval by the faculty of the offering program. If the proposed changes are related to other academic programs, documented consultation with those academic programs must also be provided.

Documentation of support or objection, with rationale and faculty vote must be forwarded with the proposal. Proposed curricular changes must then be approved by the college curriculum committee, and also be approved by the college faculty as designated in the respective college governance document, the college dean, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the SVPP, the university president and the Board of Regents (except as noted in Table 10.1).

Table 10.1 Academic Program Approval Procedures

Action Item	Department or Interdepartmental Program	College	Graduate Council / Graduate Dean	Faculty Senate	SVPP / President	Board of Regents
Majors						
New Major	Yes	Yes	Yes, if graduate program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Name change	Yes	Yes	Yes, if graduate program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Merged majors	Yes	Yes	Yes, if graduate program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Undergraduate Certificates and Minors						
New certificate or minor	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Name change of certificate or minor	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Merged certificates or minors	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Graduate Certificates, Minors, and Specializations						
New certificate, minor, or specialization	Yes	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes	No
Name change of certificate, minor, or specialization	Yes	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes	No
Merged certificates, minors, or specializations	Yes	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes	No
Concurrent bachelor/master's degrees						
New concurrent degree	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Name change concurrent degree	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

**Refers to Graduate College only, through the Graduate Curriculum Committee.*

Prior to proposing a new course for inclusion in the catalog, the department is encouraged to offer the course on an experimental basis. An experimental offering must be announced by a form submitted to the registrar. Experimental courses may be initiated from the link found on the [Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee](#) page.

Curricular changes are published in the [Iowa State Catalog](#). Approved curricular changes that do not meet catalog publishing deadlines will be accessible on the [Office of the Registrar](#) website.

Amended and approved by Faculty Senate 11/11/14; by the Senior Vice President and Provost on 11/15/14; and the University President on 11/19/14.

10.8.2 Discontinuation of Academic Programs

A recommendation for discontinuation of an academic program shall be reviewed through both faculty and administrative channels. In every instance, the proposal for discontinuation of an academic program must be presented to the departmental faculty and administration or appropriate interdepartmental group.

A proposal for discontinuation of an academic program may be made by the academic department or program committee, college curriculum committee or college administration, [Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee](#), SVPP, or Board of Regents. Regardless of the origin of the proposal, there must be opportunity for faculty review at all levels (department or interdepartmental program, college, and university).

Both the rationales for and against a proposed academic program discontinuation must be forwarded with the proposal for discontinuation. Agreement between the SVPP and the Faculty Senate is required before a proposal of discontinuation of an academic program is sent forward to the Board of Regent.

See Table 10.2 for approvals required for discontinuation of academic programs.

Table 10.2 Discontinuation of Academic Program Procedures

Action Item	Department or Interdepartmental Program	College	Graduate Council / Graduate Dean	Faculty Senate	SVPP / President	Board of Regents
Majors						
Discontinue major	Yes*	Yes	Yes, if graduate program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Undergraduate Certificates & Minors						
Discontinue certificate or minor	Advisory	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Graduate Certificates, Minors, and Specializations						
Discontinue certificate, minor, or specialization	Advisory	Yes#	Yes	No	Yes	No
Concurrent bachelor/master's degrees						
Discontinue concurrent degree	Advisory	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

*Refers to Graduate College only, through the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

#A vote of "No" by academic program faculty may be overruled by two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate voting in favor of the discontinuation of an academic major.

Curricular changes are published in the [Iowa State Catalog](#). Approved curricular changes that do not meet catalog publishing deadlines will be accessible on the [Office of the Registrar](#) website.

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate (May 5, 2009); by president and provost (May 15, 2009).

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate (September 21, 2010); by president and provost (October 11, 2010).

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate (April 19, 2011); by president and provost (April 22, 2011).

10.8.3 Consistency of Student Learning Outcomes Across Sections and Modalities of Instruction

To ensure that completion of a given course consistently signifies acquisition of knowledge and abilities, core learning outcomes for all sections of a course should be similar, regardless of the term of offering, instructor, or mode of course delivery. Within individual sections of a course, additional learning outcomes comporting with broader program

and/or general education curricular aims may be articulated, with the understanding that the core learning outcomes will be met. In courses with course directors, fully consistent outcomes across all sections may be required.

All sections of a course must validly assess the core student learning outcomes of the course, though methods of assessment may vary (e.g., appropriate assessment in a section using team-based pedagogy might differ from appropriate assessment in a large lecture-based section).

Approved by the Faculty Senate 2/12/19; by the Senior Vice President and Provost 2/14/19; and the ISU President 2/15/19.

10.9 Policy on Intellectual Property of Educational Materials

10.9.1 University-sponsored Educational Materials

Authors of educational materials – such as books or audiovisual materials produced under university sponsorship or with substantial university assistance – are expected to assign the rights to Iowa State, with the author receiving an appropriate share of the income as defined by prior agreement.

Section 8.3.6.1 was approved by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa on 3/12/76.

10.9.1.1 Preamble

The development of educational materials is a natural and desirable output of intellectual activity. The creation of educational materials, such as textbooks, by the faculty, staff, and students at Iowa State has always been encouraged and has resulted in the availability, through commercial channels, of numerous books, laboratory manuals, and other printed materials of real value to the educational process, teaching, and research on a worldwide basis.

Creation of such works has come about through the extra effort expended by faculty and staff members who concurrently have satisfied their normal employment commitments with the university to teach, do research, or carry out administrative functions. The works created have been due to the efforts of one individual (or a small informal group), with the university providing encouragement and support through the unrestricted use of the employee's office, library facilities, assistance in the preparation of graphs and charts, minor secretarial assistance and other similar services to assist in the production of the work. Professional Development Assignments have been, and continue to be, granted to faculty where the desire of the grantee has been to create a written work.

Such expressions of ideas through the written word result in manuscripts which are, under Iowa law, the sole property of the author to dispose of as they may wish. The only exception to this has been those works created by individuals employed for the specific purpose of writing such works. Through years of development and trial, the freedom to

create such works and the encouragement by the university for faculty and staff members to do so, has resulted in the desirable practice described herein.

This practice has come to be known as the [traditional textbook policy](#) at Iowa State. No change from this policy is anticipated by this document. Because of advancing technology, and the recognition of the value of audio and visual aids in education, new forms of educational materials have come into existence at Iowa State. Motion pictures, slides, and videotapes are examples of such valuable educational materials. While most often developed for internal use at Iowa State, these educational materials are often in a form that directly meets educational needs at other universities or educational facilities elsewhere in the United States and in other countries. On the other hand, these new forms of educational materials, due to their nature, require a more substantial level of direct support by the university to allow their creation.

The new technologies involved require not only the initial creative effort of an author, but often the additional services of a variety of specialists, equipment, and production facilities. The cost of such services and facilities to adapt the author's creative effort into a desired medium may be substantial, and requires the expenditure of significant university funds by a college or department. It is also true that the author will spend extra time and effort, and even learn new skills, to assure that a high-quality final educational product will result.

In the production of these new forms of educational materials, the proportional investment of time and money by the author and the university varies substantially from that involved under the traditional textbook policy. Accordingly, one purpose of this document is to set forth an equitable basis for voluntary agreement between the university and prospective authors (faculty and staff members employed in the variety of departments and colleges at the university) when educational materials are to be developed for internal and external use. It is a further purpose of this document to structure a practical mechanism for the implementation of such agreements, to the benefit of all parties involved.

It is possible that textbooks could be developed under this policy, but in a manner different from the traditional textbook policy. In such a situation, and with the expressed and voluntary written agreement of the faculty or staff member, the university might desire to have a textbook written to meet an educational need, employing the faculty member on a release-time basis to write the needed text. In such a situation, this policy would be used to provide a mechanism for the equitable distribution of income from the sale of the text to others.

This policy is not intended to be retrospective, or to lay any claim to works developed in the past under traditional or nontraditional ways. This policy is prospective. It is somewhat flexible and open to interpretation purposely in some aspects, since not all situations can be anticipated. But above all, it is a basis for voluntary agreement on an equitable basis for meeting new and changing demands for superior education materials - a common goal of every employee of Iowa State.

10.9.1.2 Policies

- Iowa State encourages the development of educational materials to assist in meeting its responsibilities for academic instruction, extension, and research.
- The university encouragement is provided by assistance in the preparation of such materials (through salary support, stenographic services, materials and supplies, art work, filming, and other services) as authorized by the appropriate administrative officer(s).
- The university recognizes the vested rights of an author under the Iowa Code. However, if the educational materials are to be developed with university sponsorship, the author is expected to assign these rights for the benefit of the university. It is not intended that this policy affect the traditional university relationship to faculty members' ownership of books or other instructional materials whose preparation was not supported or assisted in a substantial way by the university.
- Individuals preparing or planning to prepare educational materials are encouraged to clarify whether the materials are covered by this policy through consultation with the appropriate department chair and college dean.
- In cases in which a prospective author wishes to receive support from the university in a proposed development of educational materials covered by this document, the university will enter into an agreement with the prospective author prior to the development of the university-sponsored educational materials setting forth the extent of support, if any, associated with their development and providing for payment to the author and/or the distribution of earnings, if any should accrue from the use, rental royalties, or sale of the educational materials.
- Monies in excess of costs and appropriate reserves that are received from use, rental royalties, or sale of the university-sponsored educational materials must accrue to the benefit of the university, with the author receiving by prior agreement a specified portion of the net income. However, the author may receive a share of first receipts.
- Operational responsibility for university-sponsored educational materials is vested in the appropriate deans or their designated representatives.

10.9.1.3 Ownership of Course-related Presentations

Course-related presentations are owned by the presenter. Individuals may take written notes or make other recordings of the presentations for educational purposes, but specific written permission to sell the notes or recordings must be obtained from the presenter. For the complete policy, see [Academic Conduct](#).

Section 8.3.6.4 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/02/95.

10.9.1.4 Intellectual Property: Policies and Procedures

The [Policy on University-Sponsored Education Materials](#), as approved by the Board of Regents, recognizes certain exemptions to the university's ownership. Ownership and

licensing of other materials is often assigned to the university. Additional information may be obtained from [The Office of Innovation Commercialization](#).

10.9.1.5 Royalties for Instructional Materials

The writing of textbooks and the preparation of other materials for use in university classes are commendable activities frequently engaged in by faculty members. The university encourages such work and supports the principle that the faculty should be free to select texts and materials for use in their classrooms. It is recognized, however, that a faculty member who receives royalties or other direct remuneration for such a scholarly product may be faced with a conflict of interest when they are a participant in the decision to adopt the material for local use.

Therefore, it is university policy that faculty members may use textbooks or other instructional materials for which they receive royalties or remuneration, provided that, for any materials used at Iowa State, the payments that could normally accrue to the faculty member are assigned to the university or to a body mutually agreed upon by the university and the faculty member. However, faculty members may be allowed to retain the royalties under either of the following circumstances:

- the use of such textbooks or instructional materials is in accordance with departmental procedures for selecting such materials and the faculty member/author does not participate in the selection process, or
- because of exceptional circumstances the faculty member's department chair recommends that the faculty member be allowed to retain the normal royalties, and the recommendation is approved by the appropriate dean and the SVPP.

10.9.1.6 Required Readings and Textbook Selection

Prior to the beginning of each term, departments are asked to provide local bookstores with lists of required textbooks for their courses. Although the selection of textbooks is the responsibility of individual faculty members, each department is expected to have a procedure for reviewing the selection of required textbooks and other resources for the following:

- multi-section courses
- courses in which an unusually large number of textbooks is required
- instances in which the instructor of the course is author of a book required for that course
- instances in which questions are raised by students or other faculty members concerning selection of any text. For more information on policies governing instances for which the instructor of the course is the author of the book required for the course, see [Section 10.9.1.5](#)