

Department of English
Faculty Handbook

Iowa State University
Fall 2016

203 Ross Hall

<http://www.engl.iastate.edu/>

General Mission of the English Department

The Department of English continues to carry out a mission of crucial importance to both the College and the University:

- ✦ To help students understand the ways that language, literature, and rhetoric are central to acquiring knowledge, shaping thought and attitudes, and transmitting information.
- ✦ To heighten students' sensitivity to the moral, social, and humane values that have molded and continue to inform our culture, environment, and world.
- ✦ To teach students to use language effectively and to analyze and interpret it in various contexts and manifestations.
- ✦ To use technology and multimodal communication to achieve our teaching and research goals.
- ✦ To use the talents, creativity, and expertise of its faculty to help broaden the University's international involvement.
- ✦ To contribute to knowledge through continued research and publication.

Department of English Faculty Handbook

The *Department of English Faculty Handbook (DEFH)* describes the organization, governance, and basic policies and operating procedures of the ISU English Department. *DEFH* is a living document that is subject to ongoing revision, as new policies and procedures are developed and approved by the faculty. The Administrative Committee is responsible for overseeing periodic revisions to the entire document. As mandated by University policy, *DEFH* will be posted on the Department of English website so that it is easily accessible to all English Department staff.

1. Departmental Organization & Governance

Administrative Positions

All administrative appointments made by the Department Chair are for specified terms, renewable only once except under exceptional circumstances. All coordinators and chairs of major committees shall in their final year or semester of service work closely with a chair- or coordinator-designate to insure a smooth transition.

Department Chair

The Department Chair is responsible for the governance and administration of the department, including oversight of budget, faculty and staff reviews, hiring, curriculum, faculty development, personnel matters, fundraising, and the day-to-day operation of the department. The duration of service of the Department Chair shall not exceed ten years.

Selection of Department Chair

The Department Chair is appointed for a fixed term. When a search is required, the Review Committee or its representatives will consult with the dean and the department faculty as to whether an open search is advisable, and will administer the following procedure for electing members to the committee, the election(s) taking place in the Spring preceding the current Chair's last year of office.

Faculty members will be elected at large from each of the department's five primary curricular areas: Creative Writing, Interpersonal and Rhetorical Communication, Literature, Rhetoric and Professional Communication, TESL. All tenure-line faculty who are not intending to compete for the position of Department Chair must stand for election unless excused by the current Department Chair. Only regularly budgeted faculty will vote in this election (this includes Adjunct Assistant Professors and Adjunct Instructors). Non-tenure line or non-faculty constituencies (e.g., merit and P&S staff; graduate students; temporary instructors) will also be invited to select or elect one member each for the committee, though the mechanism for doing so is theirs to decide in consultation with the Department Chair and the Review Committee. If the dean appoints an outside member, or even an outside chair, that appointment should be made only after the department committee is established. If no chair is appointed, the committee shall elect one from among its membership.

The chair of the Department Chair Search Committee will be responsible for keeping the department and the dean and all active candidates apprised of the progress of the search and will, in cases where selection of finalists is necessary, invite faculty and staff to review and comment on application files well in advance of that selection.

The Department Chair Search Committee is charged to advertise the position appropriately; to solicit nominations; to select, in cases where selection is necessary, final candidates from among the larger applicant pool; to provide all finalists and the department sufficient opportunity to exchange views about the health, welfare, and future of the department and its programs; to administer a candidate evaluation questionnaire that, while preserving anonymity

of respondents, will also track pertinent demographic data (e.g., rank, tenure-status) so to provide as complete a picture as possible of the department's individual and collective judgments; and, lastly, to convey those results to the LAS dean. The questionnaire should ask for rankings, where appropriate; for judgments as to degrees of acceptability of various candidates; and will provide space for explicit commentary by individuals. (For questionnaire purposes, "the department" includes all parties who are employed by the department, including faculty, P&S staff, merit system employees, and teaching assistants.) Though the committee should provide an overview memo for the purpose of conveying results, the original documents must be provided to the LAS dean. The committee will provide candidates, at their request, access to the numerical components of the results in advance of the dean; a candidate whose application is still pending when results are reported to the dean's office can expect that numerical results will be made available to any member of the department who so requests. Though contingencies may require improvisation on the part of the Department Chair search committee, its primary duties are to assure that all candidates and issues are fairly treated and that the search is conducted and concluded in a timely manner.

Associate Chair for Curriculum

The Associate Chair for Curriculum has general responsibility for supporting the development of undergraduate and graduate English programs and for implementing those programs. To that end, this person works closely with the Chair, the Associate Chair for Faculty Development, the Directors for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses, the Director of Advanced Communication, the area coordinators, and individual instructors to coordinate scheduling and staffing of courses. The Associate Chair for Curriculum assists the Department Chair in hiring, staffing, and budget preparation and serves as an information resource for various curricular committees and the Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, and Review committees. In carrying out these general responsibilities, the Associate Chair for Curriculum typically performs the follow duties:

- ◆ Schedules and staffs all departmental courses
- ◆ Participates with the Chair and the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses in the hiring, general orientation, and evaluation of temporary and adjunct staff
- ◆ Maintains department records of course offerings and staffing
- ◆ Serves as a member of the Administrative Committee
- ◆ Assigns offices and supervises assignment of classrooms
- ◆ Substitutes for the Department Chair at various on-campus and off-campus activities

The Associate Chair for Curriculum is appointed by the Department Chair for a fixed term, usually three years, renewable once.

Associate Chair for Faculty Development

The Associate Chair for Faculty Development has general duties assisting the Department Chair in annual evaluation of budgeted and non-budgeted faculty. The position also includes oversight responsibility for research activities and for preparing and submitting materials in support of departmental faculty nominated for college and university awards. The Associate Chair for Faculty Development also works with the Chair and others to develop and implement more effective processes for mentoring faculty and evaluating teaching. Additional responsibilities include the following:

- ◆ Chairing standing committees on Faculty Development
- ◆ Proposing speakers for the Goldtrap lecture and planning a department colloquium each semester

The Associate Chair for Faculty Development is appointed by the Department Chair for a fixed term, usually three years, renewable once.

Director and Associate Directors of Graduate Education

The Director and Associate Directors of Graduate Education (DOGE) are responsible for guiding and coordinating all aspects of the graduate program in English. The Director is appointed by the Department Chair for fixed terms, usually three years, renewable once. The Associate DOGE works to improve graduate student professionalization opportunities, graduate program training, and other duties as agreed to in discussion with the DOGE and department chair. The DOGE and Associate DOGE must be members of the graduate faculty.

Responsibilities of the DOGE include approving POSC forms and graduate applications and acting as a liaison between the Graduate College and the graduate program, representing the program at periodic meetings called by the Graduate College and LAS to discuss graduate education and research issues, and reporting to the program faculty regarding these meetings. Additional duties include the following:

- Mediating disputes between graduate students and advisors
- Leading discussions of issues important to the major
- Participating in recruitment and retention initiatives
- Collaborating with the Graduate College for data collection regarding graduate education and outcomes.

The Director oversees operation of the English Department graduate programs and identifies opportunities for their growth and development. The Director chairs the Graduate Studies Committee and supervises the support staff of the Graduate English Office. Periodically, the Director reports to the department on the general operation of the graduate program and convenes the graduate faculty to discuss program and curriculum issues. In carrying out the general responsibilities for the graduate program, the Director works in concert with the graduate English faculty, the Associate Director, the Graduate English support staff, and the area coordinators to accomplish the following:

- ◆ Represent the graduate programs to prospective students (e.g., campus visits, inquiries about M.A./M.F.A./Ph.D. programs)
- ◆ Represent the graduate programs to university and professional organizations (e.g., Graduate College and ISU Directors of Graduate Education)
- ◆ Provide direction for subcommittees of the Graduate Studies Committee and work groups (e.g., admissions, Ph.D. exam committees, awards, publicity, etc.)
- ◆ Oversee graduate advising (e.g., student progress, student and staff orientations, information manuals, events related to graduate student success and professionalization)
- ◆ Advise and inform the Department Chair on matters pertaining to the graduate programs (e.g., assistantship appointments, budget)
- ◆ Work with the Associate Chair for Curriculum on the graduate curriculum (e.g., course offerings, staffing, scheduling)
- ◆ Assist areas in getting new curricula and programs approved by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Faculty Senate, and the Graduate College
- ◆ Ensure that graduate program records are maintained (e.g., student records, graduate assistant appointments and eligibility, admission and enrollment patterns, graduation)
- ◆ Initiate and supervise periodic review of program policies and procedures
- ◆ Evaluate Engl 590 requests for independent study and requests for graduate student travel funding (PAGs).

Director of Undergraduate Studies

The Director of Undergraduate Studies oversees the undergraduate major as well as general education at the undergraduate level. In consultation with undergraduate advisers and the Teacher Education Subcommittee, the Director has the following responsibilities:

- ◆ Chair the Undergraduate Studies Committee to review issues of curriculum, undergraduate teaching, and the English major POS.
- ◆ Coordinate discussions of catalog copy; review undergraduate course proposals; evaluate and process 490 requests; and respond to college and university requests and initiatives.
- ◆ Supervise Outcomes Assessment.
- ◆ Serve as the liaison between the department and the college on issues of undergraduate curriculum and general education.
- ◆ Serve as faculty advisor to the English Club (unless another faculty member serves as advisor).
- ◆ Coordinate discussion of undergraduate curriculum with area groups and other departments; coordinate forums and meetings for discussion of curriculum.
- ◆ Work with the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Department Chair to create, appoint, and disseminate information from ad hoc work groups as needed.

The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Department Chair for a fixed term, usually three years, renewable once.

Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses (formerly First-Year Composition)

The Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses administers all matters related to English 150, 250, and 250H (staffing decisions are made jointly among the Director, the Department Chair, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Associate Chair for Curriculum), and, in consultation with the ISUComm Foundation Courses Ad Hoc Committee and the staff, develops and updates course goals, policies, and procedures. Specifically, the Director is responsible for the following:

- ◆ Serve as liaison with staff and faculty across the campus and beyond; respond to inquiries within and outside the university.
- ◆ Advise students requesting waivers; evaluate transfer credit.
- ◆ Chair the ISUComm Foundation Courses Ad Hoc Committee; with the committee, evaluate course goals and policies, select textbooks, implement grade reviews, develop teaching colloquia for the staff; advise staff on curricular and policy matters.
- ◆ Supervise and train staff: oversee training of the ISUComm Foundation Courses staff (including TA Orientation and collaboration with faculty mentors and instructors of English 500; respond to student concerns and TA issues; review grades and syllabi).
- ◆ Prepare standard English 150 and 250 syllabi and assignment sheets for new TAs and novice instructors.
- ◆ Assist in evaluating TA applications.
- ◆ Participate as necessary in hiring, reviewing, and promoting lecturers.
- ◆ Oversee testing and placement: develop placement policies and procedures, supervise the holistic reading process, update and administer the 250 testout.
- ◆ Resolve student grade appeals and advise and assist instructors on suspected academic dishonesty cases.
- ◆ Serve as advisor and/or liaison with the University Honors program and the Learning Communities program.
- ◆ Work with the ISUComm Foundation Courses Committee and the Department Chair to create, appoint, and disseminate information from ad hoc work groups as needed.
- ◆ Assist ISUComm Director as needed in revising ISUComm *Student* and *Instructor Guides* each summer.

Director of Advanced Communication

The Director of Advanced Communication will review and develop the curriculum and policies related to advanced undergraduate writing courses, especially those serving nonmajors (i.e., 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 314, 404, 405, 406). The Director's primary responsibilities are the following:

- ◆ Chair the Advanced Communication Committee to help review the undergraduate writing curriculum, set policies, plan changes in advanced writing courses, and oversee staff/TA training programs for these courses.
- ◆ Respond to inquiries about advanced writing courses from within the university and beyond.
- ◆ Serve as liaison between the department and university for advanced writing-related planning and curriculum development; coordinate these activities with the Director of ISUComm
- ◆ Supervise the planning, scheduling, and implementing of training programs for Ph.D. TAs (and staff as necessary); coordinate colloquia on teaching for the advanced writing staff.
- ◆ Oversee the development of syllabi and assignments for new Ph.D. TAs who teach advanced writing courses (currently 302 and 314).
- ◆ Manage testout examinations for multi-section advanced writing courses; evaluate transfer credits.
- ◆ Evaluate the role of writing in advanced undergraduate courses in the department.
- ◆ Work with the Advanced Communication Committee and the Department Chair to create, appoint, and disseminate information from ad hoc work groups as needed.
- ◆ See that the Advanced Communication website has current and correct information.
- ◆ Check instructor evaluations

Director of English as a Second Language Courses

The Director of English as a Second Language reviews and develops the curriculum and coordinates the teaching of ESL Academic English courses (i.e., 101B, 101C, 101D, and 101E). Currently, the Director is appointed annually. The Director's primary responsibilities are the following:

- ◆ Chair the ESL Committee which reviews the curriculum and materials, sets policies, plans changes in courses, and oversees staff/TA educational programs, and decides on research priorities for the program.
- ◆ Respond to inquiries related to ESL courses from within the Department of English, the university, and elsewhere.
- ◆ Serve as a liaison between the department and the university, e.g., serving on the English Proficiency Evaluation Committee, developing proposals for change, meeting with and advising departments/colleges as needed.
- ◆ Assist in the hiring, scheduling, supervision, and support of 101 instructors and TAs.
- ◆ Develop colloquia and other opportunities for exchanging information relevant to teaching ESL.
- ◆ Assist in the management, development, and implementation of appropriate testing.

ESL Testing Coordinator

The ESL Testing Coordinator is responsible for developing and giving the English Placement Test for International Students to all new international students at ISU. The Coordinator's responsibilities are the following:

- ◆ Administer the Placement Test for international students, given to 600-700 new students each year in August, January, and June. This includes making arrangements for the test and materials, coordinating with the Office of International Students and Scholars, hiring and supervising proctors, and coordinating the testing program.
- ◆ Administer the Graduate English Exam for international students who have their undergraduate degrees from ISU. This test is also given three times a year, as well as individually at other times.
- ◆ Train raters and supervise holistic rating sessions for each test; make placement decisions, and consult with students and advisors about students' placement; maintain a data base of placement records.
- ◆ Develop and pilot new test items and revise tests as necessary.
- ◆ Serve on the ESL Committee; serve on the University Proficiency and Evaluation Committee to consult on policy decisions about placement and evaluation of students.
- ◆ Assist the Director of English as a Second Language in coordinating testing and courses, and in gathering data and doing research for the 101 program.

Professor in Charge of Speech Communication

The Professor in Charge of Speech Communication serves with the consent and support of the faculty in Speech Communication, the Chair of the Department of English, and the LAS Dean. The role of the PIC is to represent the SpCm faculty and advise the Chair with regard to budget allocations, searches and hiring, course offerings, curricular matters, and annual faculty and staff reviews. The PIC also assumes the responsibility for the general oversight of the Fundamentals of Public Speaking (SpCm 212) program and works with the Chair and program coordinator to provide training and mentoring of TAs teaching this course. The PIC serves as a member of the LAS Cross Disciplinary Studies Council of Directors.

Coordinator of English Education Program

The teacher education program is responsible for maintaining an accredited curriculum leading to state certification for teachers of secondary English Language Arts. The program functions as a liaison among the Iowa Department of Education, the College of Education, and the area groups and committees of the English Department. The coordinator of English Education oversees the operations of the program, meets regularly with teacher education faculty, consults with English Department faculty and administrators, and serves as an ex-officio member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Department Accountant

The accountant, who serves directly under the Department Chair, performs a variety of duties related to the budget, personnel matters, data collection and analysis, and internal operations of the department. Some of the accountant's key responsibilities include the following:

- ◆ Monitor budget expenditures for the department's supplies and services budget.
- ◆ Initiate paperwork for department expenses.
- ◆ Coordinate equipment, furniture, facility needs, and office assignments.
- ◆ Assist faculty with travel requests and vouchers.
- ◆ Maintain records for foundation, departmental, and grant accounts.
- ◆ Provide statistical information about budgetary allocations and expenditures.
- ◆ Serve on the Administrative Committee and the Computer Resource Committee.

Director of Intensive English and Orientation (IEOP)

The Director of the Intensive English and Orientation Program is responsible for the administrative duties of the program: overseeing the budget, planning the curriculum, scheduling classes, testing and placing students, conducting performance reviews, hiring and evaluating teachers, supervising the Associate Director and the secretary, and writing reports for sponsors and other schools. The Director also supervises textbook selection, the IEOP/ESL library, newly-hired teachers and TA's from the TESL program, and the Practicum experience for MA TESL students. In addition, the Director serves on the MA TESL/AL committee, whose purpose is to strengthen the ties between IEOP, ESL and the MA programs.

Coordinator of the Writing and Media Help Center

The Coordinator of the Writing and Media Help Center administers diagnostic tests and assigns students to appropriate programs; designs and directs spelling and other special programs; schedules students' and tutors' appointments; trains tutors; collects and generates teaching materials; consults with the ISUComm Foundation Courses staff on student clients; keeps records and evaluates the program; oversees work-study office assistants; serves on the ISUComm Foundation Courses Committee; and takes part in national writing center conferences. The coordinator is appointed by the Chair for a flexible term.

Faculty Meetings

Department faculty meetings are basic to the department's operation. Attendance, participation, and, when appropriate, preparation for these meetings are considered to be responsibilities of appointment for tenured and tenure-track staff.

Departmental Faculty Meetings

1. The agenda for departmental staff meetings will be prepared by the Administrative Committee. Any faculty member (including adjunct and temporary staff and graduate assistants) may suggest to members of the Administrative Committee items to be considered

for inclusion on the agenda. All faculty members, including non-tenure-track staff, are encouraged to participate in faculty meetings.

2. When a standing committee presents items for staff approval, such items will be deemed a motion supported by the majority of the committee's members and will not require a second. The committee may also recommend that voting on its motions be done by written ballot.
3. When a matter requiring faculty approval is to be voted on at a meeting, discussion of that matter will be introduced by a motion specifying the action, policy, recommendation, proposition, etc., to be voted on. Meetings may be used to solicit faculty opinion on matters affecting the department in order to guide the committees, department representatives, or the Chair in their work. Expressions of opinion—e.g., straw votes—will not constitute formal approval of a matter. When a matter ultimately requiring faculty approval is introduced for informal discussion at a meeting, a motion calling for formal approval will be deferred until a subsequent meeting.
4. All staff members may participate in the discussion of matters presented at faculty meetings; however, only eligible voters may make motions or may offer amendments to motions.
5. When the recommendations of standing committees are submitted as motions, successful amendments to those motions (i.e., amendments supported by a majority of the eligible voters present at the meeting) must be considered by the committee; and if the amendments are not incorporated into the committee proposal, then the committee must at a subsequent faculty meeting explain its reasons for not accepting the amendments. A second vote will then be taken on each motion to amend, and if any prevail, the faculty will be asked to vote on the committee recommendations as amended
6. Items not on the agenda may be introduced at a meeting as new business by the presiding officer or by committee chairs or by individual faculty members. Items of new business may be discussed at the meeting but may not be formally voted on until a subsequent meeting.

Voting At Faculty Meetings: Eligibility and Procedures

Whenever possible, all matters of policy requiring ratification by the faculty shall be voted on at departmental meetings (those regularly scheduled on a monthly basis or special meetings called by the Chair). Voting at such meetings will be carried out according to the procedures and rules stipulated below.

1. All tenure-track faculty members, adjunct assistant professors, adjunct instructors (including adjunct IEOP instructors), P & S advisers who teach, and senior lecturers will be eligible to vote. (Note: adjunct faculty, P & S advisers, and senior lecturers cannot vote on matters pertaining to promotion and tenure of tenured/tenure-track faculty.) Although lecturers are ineligible to vote, they are encouraged to attend faculty meetings and participate in discussions.
2. At least 50 percent of the tenure-track faculty must be present at a staff meeting in order for votes on matters of policy or curriculum to be taken.
3. Voting at departmental meetings may be by one of two methods:
 - a. Show of hands

- b. Secret ballot (votes tabulated by faculty members present selected by chair)
4. Any eligible voter may request a secret ballot and such a request will be granted by the chair if at least 10% of those eligible voters present support such a request.
5. Any eligible voter may request a mail ballot, and such a request will be granted by the chair if at least 50% + 1 of those eligible voters present support such a request.
6. All issues voted on at faculty meetings or by mail ballots must receive a simple majority of those voting to pass.
7. The results of all votes taken at faculty meetings shall be announced immediately by the chair and shall be reported promptly via email.
8. The results of mail ballots shall be reported via email.
9. Whenever possible, eligible voters shall be informed at least 10 days prior to the date of a staff meeting of the issues that may be voted on at that meeting.

Types of Committees

Much of the department's work—in both the development of policy and the administration of programs—is accomplished by committees. These committees fall roughly into three types: standing policy committees, standing subcommittees, and ad hoc work groups.

Standing Policy Committees

In a few areas essential to its mission, the department charges continuing committees with the responsibility to (1) maintain or improve the quality of existing programs, (2) develop or evaluate policies, (3) formulate position documents and motions for staff consideration, and (4) evaluate proposals and requests from area groups, subcommittees, and work groups.

Standing policy committees are distinguished from other committees because they (1) serve an ongoing function in major areas of the department, (2) can make motions directly to the staff without requiring a second, (3) serve a key liaison role between the faculty-as-a-whole and individual faculty members or faculty groups, (4) have clearly defined chairs and membership, and (4) usually meet at least once a month both fall and spring semesters. Standing committees include the following: Administrative, Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies, Communication and Publicity, Faculty Development, ISUComm Foundation Courses, Advanced Communication, Teacher Education, Computer Resources, and Review.

Standing Subcommittees

Some ongoing administrative work is accomplished within fairly predictable guidelines, such as admitting graduate students or hiring new faculty, yet requires faculty participation and expertise. These standing subcommittees are distinguished from other committees because they (1) implement recurring departmental activities but may not meet every week or even every year, (2) have clearly defined membership, and (3) have a major administrative role in discrete programs or programmatic tasks. Examples of standing subcommittees include Graduate Admissions, Faculty Search, and Ph.D. Exams.

Ad Hoc Work Groups

Ad hoc work groups are distinguished from other committees because they (1) are created for a specific task, (2) have a project-determined deadline, and (3) have a project-determined membership.

General Operating Policies of Departmental Committees

All departmental committees share the following policies and procedures:

- ◆ With respect to routine matters of policy and operation, committees normally make recommendations to the department chair. Where major policy issues are in question, recommendations are first submitted to the department faculty.
- ◆ Generally, committee members are appointed to three-year, staggered terms by the department chair. Exceptions to this policy include the Review Committee, whose members are elected, and the Graduate Studies Committee, on which area coordinators typically serve.
- ◆ Appointments are made on the basis of interest, qualifications, rotation of responsibilities, and the need to balance committee membership by gender, area, or rank, as appropriate.
- ◆ The size of a committee, except for the Administrative and Review Committees, may vary slightly from year to year, given its workload and other commitments of the faculty.
- ◆ The department chair annually announces to the staff in writing known committee openings for the next academic year and solicits faculty preferences for committee service. The chair then consults with appropriate administrative personnel or units during the process of making committee appointments.
- ◆ In the spring semester, the department chair should solicit from the faculty matters they want to have addressed by appropriate committees in the following academic year. In the fall, committees should announce their priorities for that year's work with opportunities for the faculty to respond to and alter these priorities if necessary.
- ◆ Committees regularly publish minutes of their meetings according to guidelines developed by the Communication and Publicity Committee.
- ◆ Standing committees are obligated to meet only about once every month, unless their work flow or pressing business requires that they meet more often.
- ◆ Committee service is evaluated formally as part of annual faculty performance reviews.

Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee, or alternatively referred to as the Advisory Committee, advises the chair on general departmental matters (e.g., budget, hiring) and makes recommendations to the department on major issues that do not fall clearly to an appropriate standing committee. The committee is specifically responsible for leading the faculty in periodic review and planning with respect to the overall departmental program and for providing the department chair with material for certain required review and planning reports. It is also responsible for maintaining an updated summary of all major departmental policies and procedures available to all staff members.

Membership: Department Chair (chair), Associate Chair for Curriculum, Associate Chair for Faculty Development, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses, Director of Advanced Communication, Professor-in-Charge of IRC, the Human Resources Coordinator, and the Accountant. Liaisons from areas not represented on the Committee may be invited to attend Committee meetings as a non-voting members.

Subcommittees

Faculty Search Committees. Faculty Search Committees are convened for each tenure-track hire in the department. More detail about search committees is provided at the beginning of chapter 2.

Membership. Appointed by the chair. Faculty within the area of the hire will be appointed, along with representatives from other areas.

Ad Hoc Work Groups

Budget, Department of English Faculty Handbook, External Review, etc.

Faculty Development Committee

The Faculty Development Committee supports the teaching and research efforts of the faculty by collecting and distributing information on grants, fellowships, speakers, colloquia, and other related activities. It makes recommendations (usually with rankings) to the department chair on applications by faculty for departmental, college, and university research programs. It develops policies and procedures for mentoring faculty and for evaluating teaching. It also helps faculty prepare and submit nomination materials for college and university awards.

Membership: Associate Chair for Faculty Development (chair); faculty representing Creative Writing, Literature, RPC, and TESL/Linguistics; and a student. For the purposes of reviewing “Statement of Intent” (see “Department Research Support—Research Assignments” in Part 2), the committee will be augmented with a representative from IRC. For “Speakers and Seminars” purposes, the Associate Chair for Faculty Development will appoint student representatives to the committee. All faculty committee appointments made by the department chair are for staggered three-year terms.

Graduate Studies Committee

The Graduate Studies Committee is a planning and policy-making body for English graduate programs. The committee is responsible for such program matters as establishing admission standards, initiating curricular reform, approving catalog copy and graduate level experimental course proposals, setting advising procedures, reviewing policy and resource allocation for assistantships, determining eligibility for graduate assistantships, reviewing course offerings, initiating special projects, and generally providing direction for graduate education in the department. Before the committee votes on a catalog change, it will send the agenda for the committee meeting to the department so concerned faculty can attend the meeting or otherwise express any concerns.

Membership: Director of Graduate Education, Associate Director of Graduate Education; Coordinators of Creative Writing, Literature, RPC, and Applied Linguistics; one M.A. student, one M.F.A. student, and one Ph.D. student. Students are elected by their fellow graduate students for one-year terms.

Subcommittees

Admissions. Admissions subcommittees composed of faculty volunteers are formed by area group coordinators to make admissions recommendations to the Graduate Studies Committee. The M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. admission subcommittees are separate. Every admissions subcommittee includes a member of the GSC.

ALT Examinations Committee. The committee administers the qualifying exam/portfolio assessment. Faculty in Applied Linguistics serve on the committee for three years, and may rotate into the position of chair after serving for two years. There will be a minimum of three and a maximum of four members on the committee. The decision about the necessity for four members will be made by the committee on the basis of the number of examinees each year.

RPC Examinations Committee. The committee administers the qualifying exam and participates in the administration of the comprehensive examination component of the preliminary exam. The committee consists of four members of the RPC faculty serving staggered two-year terms; members elect a committee chair. The chair of the RPC Examinations Committee works with each student's POS chair to determine the make-up of the evaluation committee for the student's comprehensive exam component.

Ad Hoc Work Groups

Recruitment, Awards, etc.

Undergraduate Studies Committee

The Undergraduate Studies Committee oversees the department's undergraduate academic programs and course offerings, with special emphasis on the English major POS and the department's role in general education. The committee will assist the Director of Undergraduate Studies in preparing catalog copy, reviewing the curriculum, evaluating course proposals, coordinating Outcomes Assessment, and responding to college-level requests and initiatives. Before the committee votes on a catalog change, it will send the agenda for the committee meeting to the department so concerned faculty can attend the meeting or otherwise express any concerns. The committee will also coordinate discussions of pedagogy and undergraduate teaching.

Membership: Director of Undergraduate Studies, Associate Chair for Curriculum (ex officio), Teacher Education Coordinator (ex officio); faculty representatives from Literature, IRC, RPC, Creative Writing, and TESL/Linguistics; and an adviser. All committee appointments are made by the department chair for staggered three-year terms.

Ad Hoc Work Groups

Outcomes Assessment, Program of Study Review, etc.

Technology and New Media Committee

The Technology and New Media Committee oversees the department's computer resources and operations. It establishes priorities for new equipment, develops policies for computer resources and operations (allocation, security, networking, training, system management), and conducts periodic reviews of computer needs. It consists of Computer Support Specialist, the department's Administrative Specialist, the Computer Training Coordinator, the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses, the Director of Advanced Communication, and at least three at-large members. The faculty member who chairs the Committee serves for a flexible term.

TNMC meetings are usually held throughout the first semester, their frequency being determined by the level of work indicated at the first one or two agenda-setting meetings. Unless required by special or unforeseen initiatives, TNMC meetings are not regularly held during second semester, providing the chair additional time to serve on CCMC, CAC, and LASCAC. Sometime during second semester, the chair distributes to englprofess the annual IT Staff Survey, asking department members to indicate additional hardware or software they need should end-of-year funding become available. If that funding does become available—usually from the College, sometimes from the department, and almost always on short notice—the CRC chair, department Administrative Specialist, and department System Support Specialist prioritize the responses from the IT Staff Survey and submit recommendations to the department's Chair.

Review Committee

Refer to Section 3 on Evaluation of Faculty.

Area Groups

Definition of Area Groups

The Area Groups consist of faculty who teach in or who are interested in the following subdivisions: Literature, Creative Writing, Rhetoric and Professional Communication (RPC), TESL/Linguistics, Teacher Education, and Speech Communication.

Group members include tenured, tenure-track, adjunct, and temporary faculty. Faculty may participate in more than one area group. Each group shall meet at least once a semester. The purpose of these groups is to establish forums for the discussion of issues and problems of interest to those teaching in a given area. Specific agendas may include the formation of specific course groups (e.g., British literature, fiction writing), the discussion of curriculum, pedagogy, hiring needs, and/or the generation of ideas for speakers. Recommendations coming from the area groups shall be forwarded to the appropriate policy committee.

Roles and Responsibilities of Area Groups

Area groups, which are composed of faculty who share curricular interests, have chiefly an advisory function in the department. Typically, ideas, concerns, and proposals that emerge from areas will flow directly to standing committees or to the chair for discussion, approval, and implementation.

Although the advisory function of area groups can encompass a wide variety of topics and issues, the major responsibilities of area groups include the following:

- ◆ Advising standing department committees regarding curricular changes.
- ◆ Providing recommendations to the Administrative Committee concerning hiring needs in a specific curricular area.
- ◆ Making staffing and scheduling recommendations to the Associate Chair for Curriculum.

Area Coordinators

Because curricular specialization is most clearly defined at the graduate level, the major responsibility of those who coordinate the department's five identified subdisciplinary groups (creative writing, literature, speech communications, TESL/linguistics, teacher education, and rhetoric and professional communication) is to serve as liaisons between the Graduate Studies Committee and graduate curricular discussions and initiatives within the areas. In this way, Area Coordinators help focus area contributions toward the department's general teaching and research goals. In addition, Area Coordinators will work with other departmental administrators to solicit opinions from areas on various curriculum-related matters (e.g., scheduling, hiring).

In carrying out these various responsibilities, the Area Coordinators will convene area meetings and coordinate curricular initiatives between areas and the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees. Area Coordinators will also serve on the Graduate Studies Committee and in that role coordinate area input into graduate admissions. Some Area Coordinators may assume responsibility for additional area-related tasks as agreed upon within an area group, except where those tasks have already been assigned to a departmental committee or work group.

Changes to *Department English Faculty Handbook (DEFH)*

Department of English Faculty Handbook will be regularly reviewed and updated by Administrative Committee. Proposals for change may be generated by standing committees or individual faculty, and the proposals for change will be deliberated on at faculty meetings. Changes will be approved by standard voting procedures at faculty meetings.

2. Faculty Appointments

Hiring faculty who will support the teaching, research, and service missions of the department, college, and university is critically important to the success of the department.

Tenure-Track Faculty

The responsibility for hiring tenure-track faculty is shared by the entire department. Hiring opportunities arise yearly: 1) when LAS requests proposals, and 2) on other occasions, such as when spousal accommodations are requested or special initiatives are announced.

The annual process for hiring tenure-track faculty begins when curricular and research areas are invited to submit hiring proposals. The hiring proposals are then reviewed and prioritized by the Administrative Committee, based on the overall needs of the department. A preliminary departmental hiring plan is discussed at a staff meeting, and a final plan is then developed by the Administrative Committee. The Chair then submits the plan to the LAS College.

When hiring opportunities arise outside of the annual cycle, search committees will be appointed as usual, and departmental input will be sought throughout the interviewing stage of the search.

For each approved search, the Chair will appoint a search committee and its chair. The committee will consist initially of at least three to four faculty (a graduate student will be added when the committee receives interview approvals).

Listed below are the primary duties of each search committee

- ◆ Develop job description/ NOV.
- ◆ Follow LAS and University procedures (add link to them if possible).
- ◆ Develop a plan for attracting a highly diverse pool of applicants and implement that plan. Strategies for attracting a diverse pool of applicants can be found on the Provost Office website
- ◆ After the position has been approved by Human Resources, disseminate the job ad in print, on listservs, and through the direct solicitation of applications (through letters, email, contacts at conferences, etc.). Note that no job ads can be posted until the position has received College and University approval. Faculty who post the job ad are responsible for reporting the posting to the search committee chair so that it can later be accounted for when the hire is finalized.
- ◆ Create a matrix for evaluating candidates based on required and preferred qualifications; evaluate each candidate on the basis of these criteria.
- ◆ Request and review dossiers (if not with the original application).
- ◆ If needed, create an interview team to attend a national conference with at least one member of the search committee.

- ◆ Provide the Administrative Committee with a prioritized list of candidates to interview.
- ◆ Help arrange campus visits.
- ◆ Identify a graduate student to serve as a non-voting member of the search committee, in consultation with appropriate hiring area coordinator, once candidates are chosen for campus interviews.
- ◆ Meet with the candidate during campus visit.
- ◆ Submit a report to the Administrative Committee that ranks and explains the committee's choices for the position.

After campus visits of finalists are completed, the Chair will solicit input from the faculty. At a joint meeting of the Administrative Committee and the chair of the search committee, the Chair will report faculty input, and the search committee will present its recommendation. Each finalist will be discussed, and a vote will be taken on a hiring recommendation, which is advisory to the Chair. If an offer is to be made to a candidate, the Chair will then seek approval from the LAS College and contact the candidate.

The Associate Chair for Faculty Development will identify a faculty mentor for each new tenure-track faculty member.

Joint Appointments

Occasionally, the department will be asked to consider conducting a tenure-track search with a program (e.g., Latino/a Studies, Women's Studies) that entails a joint appointment in the department and program. Before any such search begins, the Administrative Committee and the Chair, in consultation with the faculty, must consent to the search. If the search is approved, the same general hiring procedures outlined above will be used and will include participation of faculty from the program. See the Policies and Procedures on Governance of Interdisciplinary Programs with Core Faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (http://www.las.iastate.edu/faculty_and_staff/forms/governance.shtml).

Courtesy Appointments

Faculty from other departments in the University may occasionally request, or the English Department may initiate, a courtesy appointment in English for a tenured ISU faculty member. The Administrative Committee and the Chair, in consultation with English Department faculty in the relevant curricular area(s) will evaluate faculty for such appointments.

Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Hiring of nontenure-eligible (NTE) faculty is the collective responsibility of the Chair, the Associate Chair for Curriculum, and faculty in the relevant area of hire. Most new lecturers are hired on a semester basis (i.e., fall semester), though every effort will be made to rehire lecturers in the subsequent semester. Where performance and curricular need warrant it, lecturers will be hired on full-year or multiple-year contracts, consistent with university policies. Senior lecturers will typically be appointed (and reappointed) for five-year terms.

Although the principal function of NTE faculty is teaching, NTE faculty will be given opportunities for a variety of assignments in the department—e.g., advising, TA mentoring, administrative—as well as opportunities to participate voluntarily on work groups and area committees.

Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty from other institutions around the world enrich the intellectual and cultural life of the department. When a prospective visiting faculty member applies for visiting status, the coordinator in the appropriate curricular area will assess the person's credentials and fit for the department and will consult with the Associate Chair for Curriculum about the availability of office space and computer technology. If the area coordinator wishes to invite the applicant to ISU, the coordinator will seek a faculty sponsor who will be responsible for orienting the visiting faculty member and coordinating his/her stay.

3. Faculty Development

Research Support

As noted in the Review section of this *Handbook*, scholarship is one of three areas in which tenured and tenure-eligible faculty are expected to demonstrate competence or excellence. TTE faculty who demonstrate competence or excellence in teaching, research, and service may receive support for their scholarly activities from the Department of English as well as from extra-departmental sources. These scholarly activities may include traditional research, research on the scholarship of teaching, creative expression, and significant external grants.

Faculty Development And Differential Teaching Load

Overview

In accordance with the general requirements of the University, the Department of English expects its faculty to publish scholarly and/or creative work, make presentations at international, national, and regional venues, compete for grant funding, and otherwise impact the fields of study in which its faculty work. This policy explains the nature and function of differential teaching loads in the Department and establishes a basic rubric by which teaching loads will be distinguished and assigned.

Differential teaching loads in the Department of English provide for the recognition of three types of annual teaching load: a 3/3 load (6 courses/year), a 3/2 or 2/3 load (5 courses/year), and a 2/2 load (4 courses/year). In general, and not accounting for factors like administrative releases and grant buyouts for individual courses (see next subsection), determining the teaching load for a faculty member will depend upon her/his research productivity during the prior five calendar years. The *presumptive teaching load* in English is 3/2; the *reciprocal presumption* is that faculty members will produce the quality and quantity of scholarly and/or creative work commensurate with being faculty at a research-intensive university. Moreover, the Department and University presume that publication will be in *peer-reviewed venues* and that faculty will seek out the highest quality publication and presentation venues appropriate to their work.

Beyond these presumptions, two other factors are included in this policy. First, as a way of acknowledging the unpredictability of publication *dates* even for a faculty member who produces work steadily and consistently, each review of productivity for determining teaching load will take into consideration the prior five years of scholarly/creative output. Keeping a five-year window in mind also alleviates concerns for faculty who may, especially after tenure, elect to take on more complex projects with a longer horizon for completion and publication. Second, in order to encourage and assist untenured faculty during their probationary period, assistant professors should generally expect to teach a 2/2 load during their first five years, with their teaching load thereafter determined by the standard five-year window for review.

Evaluating faculty members' scholarly and/or creative productivity is complex: the Department of English contains faculty in several different areas who produce very different kinds of work.

No strictly *quantitative* measure of productivity can account adequately for everything we might do or attempt. Moreover, *quality* must always be considered when evaluating productivity, which means that faculty, the Department Chair, and the Associate Chair(s) should discuss regularly the relative merit, rigor, and prestige of different publishing and presentation venues and different programs for supporting faculty research. In some instances, that discussion could cause the Chair, Associate Chair, and faculty member to conclude that more (or less) than the standard points ought to be given for a particular scholarly/creative work. Likewise innovative, atypical scholarly products (like those that result from work in the digital humanities) will need to be evaluated and assigned a point value individually, according to a comprehensive discussion of their merit. Faculty members contemplating such projects should approach the Chair (and Associate Chair, as needed) *before* undertaking them, so that all sides, and the work itself, can proceed from the outset under a shared understanding of its scholarly “worth” to the field, the department, and the faculty member.

In short, any policy attempting to describe and define standards for faculty productivity—the *kind*, *quantity*, and *quality* of faculty work—must be flexible enough to permit and even require dialogue about what we do. This policy governing differential teaching loads therefore belongs to, and is an integral part of, the broader annual review procedures in the Department.

Faculty Member Course Buyout Rates

When a faculty member is to receive a buyout, the funding source determines the rate for the buyout. If the funding source is external (NSF, USDA, etc.), the buyout rate would be 1/9th of the faculty member’s salary plus benefits. Consult the department accountant for current benefit rates.

If the funding source is internal (CEAH, etc.), the rate is the average salary of the currently employed senior lecturers. Again, consult the department accountant for the current rate. If another department within ISU is buying out the faculty member, the rate would be 1/8th of the faculty member’s annual salary. This rate might be negotiable, depending on the funding availability of the buying department.

If faculty members wish to buy themselves out of a course, the rate would also be 1/8th of the faculty member’s own annual salary.

Procedure and Appeals

Each year as part of the annual review process, the Chair and Associate Chair will use each Curriculum Vitae to arrive at a quantitative measure of the most recent five years of scholarly productivity, according to the rubric below (they may also request copies of publications or other relevant information to help them assess research productivity). The faculty member should also make her/his own quantitative assessment and arrive at an independent conclusion. As part of the face-to-face annual review meeting, the Chair, Associate Chair, and faculty member will discuss

the quantitative results, consider qualitative factors, and, using the rubric, arrive at a conclusion regarding the appropriate teaching load for the subsequent academic year. The updated Curriculum Vitae, with the point value for each item indicated, will be placed each year in a secure annual review CV folder on the departmental server (different from the Public folder with faculty vitas). Only the tenured and tenure-track faculty and confidential staff will have access.

The rubric itself assigns point values to different kinds of scholarly/creative outputs, varying according to the length of time and difficulty involved in producing them and the relative prestige of the form. Because the University asks the humanities to prioritize *peer-reviewed published work*, such work weighs the most heavily. Other forms of work are represented, however, partly because such work reflects our values as a department and partly because such work (i.e., presentations at national conferences, performances of creative work) is often written into our Position Responsibility Statements. Besides assigning point values to different kinds of scholarly/creative outputs, the policy also stipulates *minimum total points* that one must accumulate in order to earn a 3/2 teaching load and in order to earn a 2/2 teaching load. As a final note, the rubric below establishes “Uncapped” and “Capped” categories for points, meaning that only a maximum number of points from the “Capped” category may be counted toward the total points required to earn a particular teaching load. As a general rule, the “Capped” category includes those scholarly outputs that are of relatively low professional value rather than those things—*peer-reviewed publication*, especially—upon which one could build a case for tenure and/or promotion. The research-intensive designation will adhere to an 80/20 percentage ratio between the uncapped and capped items. That means that the capped category is set to a maximum of 7 points, with the rest of the points coming from the uncapped category. Thus, research-intensive designation requires at least 28 uncapped points, and research active designation requires at least 11 uncapped points. Point values for all entries will be locked in at the end of the annual review period for that year.

If a faculty member believes that a particular work product is not represented fairly by the rubric detailed below, she or he may identify that work product, assign it a point value she or he deems appropriate, and write a brief justification for the point value. A three-person committee appointed by the Associate Chair for Faculty Development will consider the appeal. The appeal committee will consist of tenured faculty, including one member from the appellant’s area. The appeal must be filed within two weeks of the annual review meeting; the three-person appeal committee will respond in writing before the next annual review meeting, and the appeals *and* responses will be placed in a secure electronic folder accessible only to the tenure and tenure-track faculty. A faculty member may only appeal point values for individual items if the result of the appeal could change the faculty member’s designation (research-intensive, research-active, teaching-intensive). However, a faculty member need not appeal the points value for an item during the first year it appears on the CV; rather, she or he may file an appeal in *any* year during which the item in question continues to count toward the consideration of teaching load.

Point values for collaborative work should be calculated precisely rather than as rough estimates. In the reporting of the points, specify the standard base point value for the scholarly activity and the percentage of contribution for each coauthor (coauthors may be contacted by the Chair and Associate Chair to verify the percentage contributions). The standard point value should be

adjusted by multiplying by 1.5 and then multiplying by the submitting author's percentage of contribution.

For example, if a faculty member is the first author (55% contribution) on a research article with 1 coauthor (45% contribution), then the point values are calculated as follows:

Standard point value for a research article: 4 points

Adjusted point value for coauthored research article: 6 points (4 x 1.5)

First author's earned points: 3.3 points (6 x 55%)

Note that no single author may earn more than 100% of the standard points. Thus, if the faculty member's contribution is greater than 66%, the maximum number of points earned reverts to the standard point value. For example, if the first author contributed 75% of the above project, the collaborative work would earn 4.5 points (6 points x 75%); since this is more than the standard point value for the scholarly activity, the standard point value (4 points) is used.

Note on coauthorship with students: in recognition that faculty coauthorship with student collaborators is an encouraged scholarly activity that can involve additional effort on the part of the faculty member, faculty members may claim the full standard point value for scholarly works coauthored with students when the faculty member's contribution is at least 50%.

After the third year in which teaching load designations have been based upon the new policy, the department will undertake a mandatory reconsideration of the policy, voting formally on whether to preserve it as is, preserve it with modifications, or discard it. If the department votes to discard it, it will remain in force until the department devises and adopts a different policy for determining research-intensive, research-active, and teaching-intensive status.

Rubric

Points required to earn particular teaching loads

35 Research-intensive, 2/2 load

18 Research-active, 3/2 load

Uncapped scholarly activities

20 Scholarly monograph (peer-reviewed)
Book-length creative work (novel, collection short fiction, nonfiction, or poems)

16 Scholarly edition (book-length, full textual/editorial apparatus)

12 *Successful* external very large (500K or more) scholarly grant

10 Edited scholarly collection (book-length)

- Textbook (new)
Successful external large (250K-499K) scholarly grant
- 8 *Successful* external (100K-249K) scholarly grant
- 6 Submitted prospectus with sample chapters toward a book-length project (the faculty member must provide evidence of submission and progress; no longer counts when full-length work has been published; proposals for the same book submitted to different publishers may be counted only once; an individual may receive credit for a maximum of two submitted prospectuses, each for different book projects, at one time)
 Major (\$25k or more) *successful* application for competitive external grant
- 3–6 Peer-reviewed journal article
 Essay/chapter in peer-reviewed edited collection
 (For both types of articles, points will be assigned depending upon their merit—e.g., quality of journal or press, evidence of rigorous peer-review. Faculty members will supply proof of peer review, and the chosen point value, upon submitting their annual review materials. When faculty wish to assign full point values to articles of either kind, they will need to supply evidence justifying that valuation.)
- 3 Short story or nonfiction essay
 Reprint edition of book-length work
 Scholarly edition (essay-length)
 Textbook (revised, new edition)
 Minor (less than \$25k) *successful* application for competitive external grant
- 2 Peer-reviewed essay publication in conference proceedings
 Reader/educational anthology (new)
 Major (\$25k or more) *successful* application for ISU-funded grant
 Invited keynote, plenary, or other address at major conference
 Encyclopedia entry (minimum 3,000 words)
- 1 Individual poem
 Individual piece of flash fiction
 Scholarly note
 Reader/educational anthology (revised, new edition)
 Invited lecture at non-ISU university or scholarly venue (maximum of 2 points per year)

Capped scholarly activities (maximum 7 points total over 5 years)

- 2 Reading/performance of creative work at non-ISU university or scholarly venue
- 1 Presentation at national/international conference
- Review essay
- Encyclopedia entry (less than 3,000 words)
- Interview published in peer-reviewed venue
- Internal (ISU-funded) competitive grant

If needed, the Faculty Development Committee, in consultation with the faculty, will re-evaluate this points system on an annual basis.

Extra-Departmental Research Support: Faculty Professional Development Assignments

Tenured and tenure-track faculty may apply for a Faculty Professional Development Assignment (FPDA) to pursue research, creative work, or some other program of study. FPDAs may be sought for one semester at full salary or for two semesters at two-thirds salary. However, priority is given to tenured faculty who have not received an FPDA in the past five years. This is a competitive program: All English Department FPDA applications are first ranked by the department Faculty Development Committee; they are then sent forward with the Chair’s comments and endorsement to a college-level committee, whose rankings are then sent to a university-level committee.

Assistance in preparing FPDA applications is provided by the department Faculty Development Committee, both before ranking (informally) and after ranking (through a critique of the application). Though the turn-around time is short, FPDA applications may be revised after being ranked by the Faculty Development Committee but before being sent to the Chair. Usually, the deadline for submitting applications to the department Research Committee is in the first week of September.

Funding For Travel

The department supports faculty, on a limited basis, to attend professional meetings. During the appointment period—August 16 to May 15 for B-Base staff—travel plans must be approved as follows. Requests for such support should be made in writing as far in advance as possible. Requests should indicate dates, place, specific professional purposes or activity, and title of paper, as well as a close estimate of expenses. If support is authorized, applications for reimbursement (Travel Expense Voucher) must be accompanied by receipts for all expenses except meals.

All out-of-state travel and any in-state travel which necessitates missing class or other scheduled appointments requires approval by means of a Travel Authorization form submitted to the Chair at least one week in advance. In case of emergency, the form should be submitted if time permits; if not, the Chair (or the department office staff) should be informed by phone.

Travel arrangements should be made in accordance with university policies. Travel guidelines can be found on the Controller's Department website under the "Travel" section. Airline tickets acquired through ISU-contracted agencies can be arranged and paid for through the departmental accountant prior to travel; conference registration fees can also be paid prior to travel (however, note that lodging cannot be pre-paid). The traveler is not eligible for personal expense reimbursement (e.g., lodging, rental cars, meals) until the trip has been completed. After the traveler has completed the trip, all travel receipts should be submitted to the accountant for entry into the employee reimbursement system.

Teaching Opportunities and Procedures

Teaching Assignments for Budgeted Staff

Making course assignments in a department of this size is a complicated matter. In pragmatic terms, teaching assignments are implicit in the hiring process; hires are made to fill particular curricular needs, and this practice mandates particular research expectations. In addition, faculty are polled yearly as to their teaching preferences. It is department policy to accommodate such needs and preferences in accord with the ranked criteria set forth below:

1. Department need as defined by department and university curriculum documents and student enrollment patterns.
2. Faculty qualifications as determined by teaching experience and/or research accomplishments (each as evaluated by the department review committee) and by conditions of hire.
3. Recommendations of experimental and selected special topics courses forwarded to the Chair by the graduate and undergraduate studies committees and the area committees.
4. Faculty interests as expressed in the course-assignment questionnaire circulated by the Associate Chair for Curriculum.

Insofar as possible, these additional guidelines will be followed in staffing:

- ◆ Faculty members teaching primarily composition classes (e.g., 150/250, 250H, 302, 309, 314) may be offered, when requested and where qualified, assignment to appropriate courses in other areas.
- ◆ Since the department increasingly relies on open topic courses which various area groups coordinate, faculty should make every effort to provide students with full descriptions of specific courses on the department website.
- ◆ Whenever possible, tenure-track staff should maintain their abilities and interests in the teaching of composition by periodic assignment to composition classes.
- ◆ The Associate Chair for Curriculum also considers faculty development in making course assignments.

Experimental Courses

Experimental courses introduce new material into the curriculum. Experimental courses may be submitted at any level of the curriculum, graduate or undergraduate; they will be judged on the basis of their appropriateness to the curriculum as well as their intrinsic value as courses. Most experimental course proposals will first be reviewed by the appropriate area group. All experimental courses must then be approved by either the Undergraduate Studies Committee or the Graduate Studies Committee and then must be submitted on the appropriate university form for extra-departmental review.

Because this review can be time-consuming, all experimental course proposals should be submitted as early as possible. To be included in the schedule of classes for the following fall semester, experimental courses must have departmental committee approval by December 1 of the preceding fall semester. To be included in the schedule of classes for the following spring semester, experimental courses must have departmental committee approval by May 1 of the preceding spring semester.

Special Topics Courses—Undergraduate

Special Topics Seminars in Literature

At the 400-level, the department has chosen to offer a series of literature seminars which are flexible enough to allow for topics that reflect the current state of the discipline. To allow faculty to plan schedules and to allow students to plan their programs of study, the courses are selected and scheduled on a two-year cycle. These special topics seminars are evaluated by literature area faculty.

Undergraduate Seminar: 489

The 489 seminars are intended to encourage study of subjects not included in the department's standard offerings. Individual faculty from any area can submit proposals to Undergraduate Studies for feedback and approval.

English 490

English 490, Independent Study in English, allows students to explore specialized interests in English Studies not covered in the regular curriculum. These courses are run as tutorials and should be taken by students in the final stages of their careers (prerequisites include 9 credits in English beyond 250 appropriate to the area of study). The designated areas of study are as follows: A. Literature, B. Linguistics/Semantics, C. Rhetoric, Teaching of Composition, D. Criticism and Theory of Literature, E. Reading: Instructional Methods, F. Creative Writing, G. Business/Technical Communication, and H. Honors. No more than 9 credits in 490 may be used toward a degree in English.

Special Topics Courses—Graduate

Each curricular area in the department has in the catalog one or more 500- and 600-level courses whose content changes from offering to offering. Every two years, the Graduate Studies Committee collects proposals for these courses, reviews them, and prepares a tentative course offering and staffing plan for the subsequent catalog. Typically, the GSC invites each area group to collect the proposals first and submit them, with the area's recommendations, to the Graduate

Studies Committee, which then prepares the plan and transmits it to the Associate Chair for Curriculum. All members of the graduate faculty are eligible to submit course proposals.

4. Evaluation of Faculty

4.1 Formal Review Procedures for Tenure-Track / Tenured Faculty

Formal reviews of department faculty which may lead to recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure are conducted periodically under the guidelines set forth in the following documents. All such recommendations are reviewed at the college and university levels. The Dean also requires the department chair to submit annual performance evaluations of each faculty member (see “Annual Review” below). Both formal and annual evaluations are used in establishing annual salary recommendations.

4.1.1 Review Procedures: General

The Review Committee is elected by the faculty to oversee formal performance, promotion, tenure, and contract renewal reviews as set forth in the policies included in this handbook and in the *ISU Faculty Handbook*.

The University mandates periodic reviews to insure timely promotion and tenure consideration for all faculty. A faculty member, however, may request a review at any time. The Department Chair may initiate a review of any faculty member at any time he/she deems it desirable.

A tenure-track faculty member who wishes to request an extension of a probationary period must follow the guidelines in the *ISU Faculty Handbook*. A tenured faculty member who wishes to postpone a scheduled review must receive the approval of the Department Chair and the LAS Dean.

Materials for each person to be reviewed are gathered (see “Materials for Formal Reviews” below), and Review Committee members are asked to review these materials carefully. For a review that requires a departmental vote of the Eligible Voting Faculty (EVF), all EVF shall have access to review materials for that review.

For any review, the Review Committee can make recommendations when appropriate for various institutional awards for which faculty are eligible.

The Review Committee will annually review its procedures and documents and, if necessary, recommend changes to the tenured and tenure-track staff. Changes that are so proposed will be regarded as matters of departmental policy and will be discussed at one departmental staff meeting, and voted on in a subsequent staff meeting.

4.1.2 Formation of the Review Committee

The committee will be composed of six members: three tenured Professors and three tenured Associate Professors. The Committee will select one of the full professors as its Chair.

Tenured faculty will be elected to the Review Committee by a single voting group composed of all tenured and tenure-track faculty who have completed at least three months in the department.

All persons eligible for election will stand unless excused by the Department Chair for compelling personal reasons.

Conduct of elections: At a special staff meeting of all eligible voters, normally to be held in the spring semester, two ballots will be distributed: one will contain the names of all Professors eligible to serve; the second will contain the names of all Associate Professors eligible to serve. Those persons receiving a majority of votes, by written ballots, will be elected to the Review Committee at this meeting.

Regular terms will be two years. A person must have been off the committee for two years before s/he is eligible for re-election.

Vacancies due to leaves, etc., will be filled by election, the replacement to serve out the original term. Committee members will not be eligible for reelection until they have been off the committee for a period equal to their most recent term.

In cases where Associate Professors are reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, the Review Committee will consist only of Full Professors, the three Full Professors already serving on the Review Committee and three additional Full Professors whose elected terms of committee service have expired, beginning with those Full Professors whose terms expired in the most recent year, followed by those whose terms expired in the next most recent year, and so on.

The Associate Chair for Curriculum and the Associate Chair for Faculty Development will serve ex officio, unless elected as a regular member.

In a case where the membership of the Review Committee does not represent all scholarly areas of the department (i.e., Creative Writing, Speech Communication, Literature, Rhetoric and Professional Communication, Teacher Education, and TESL/Applied Linguistics), and a member of an area not represented is being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion or for a third-year contract renewal, a temporary Review Committee member will be selected by the Review Committee Chair in consultation with the Department Chair, who will make the appointment. The temporary member will serve only for the review of the individual from her/his area.

4.1.3 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Cases

Faculty under review will submit their materials to the department's Human Resources Coordinator by the first Monday in September. If this falls on a university holiday, materials will be due the following Monday. The Review Committee members will examine the candidates' materials and discuss each case. Committee members are invited to submit to the Committee Chair written comments that will be helpful in formulating the Committee's report.

Review Committee reports for promotion and/or tenure, (i.e., Tab 3, Part 1) will be written by subcommittees of the Review Committee appointed by the Committee Chair. Each report-drafting subcommittee will operate as a committee of the whole, with or without designating a chair. The subcommittee reports will reflect the deliberations of the Review Committee. During the report-writing process, the individual written evaluations of the Review Committee members will be consulted by the drafting committee; however, no names of the writers of these statements will be used in the report itself. All Review Committee members will read the draft

of the subcommittee report in order to have an opportunity to offer, on a timely basis, corrections or suggestions for incorporation by the subcommittee.

Draft reports of the Review Committee will be made available to all Eligible Voting Faculty (EVF) but not to the candidate. After the EVF vote, the Review Committee will update its reports and submit them to the Department Chair, who will include them in the candidate's dossier.

4.1.4 Procedures for Contract Renewal (Third Year Review) Cases

For contract renewals (third year reviews), the department will follow the applicable policies laid out by the University and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. In all cases, the candidate will provide the departmental review committee with at least the materials described in the "Materials for Formal Reviews" section below. These materials will be turned in no later than the second Monday in January of the semester in which the review will take place.

The Chair of the Review Committee will inform the EVF faculty when the materials are available, and will solicit written comments about the candidate from the EVF. The Review Committee will incorporate these comments into its report.

For contract renewals (third year reviews), the Review Committee will be expanded to include as voting members: (a) the Associate Chair for Faculty development, or his/her designate if he/she is already on the committee; and (b) a tenured faculty member designated by the candidate (e.g., his/her mentor).

For third-year (contract renewal) reviews, the Review Committee is required to vote anonymously by ballot to determine recommendations in each of the following categories: Reappointment with no reservations; reappointment with no strong reservations, but with specific issues that need to be addressed; reappointment with reservation and specific steps to be taken (may entail a one- or two-year renewal with an additional review scheduled before the mandatory tenure review); or non-reappointment.

4.1.5 Voting Procedures for EVF

In late October or early November, the Review Committee Chair will schedule a meeting of the Eligible Voting Faculty (EVF) to discuss each tenure and/or promotion case. Depending on the number of reviews that year, more than one meeting may need to be scheduled. All EVF must attend, or explain their absence in writing to the Department Chair. The Review Committee Chair will preside over these meetings. Faculty who do not attend may still vote, but they, like all voters, must be familiar with and have thoroughly considered the case in question.

In addition to the Review Committee's report, EVF will have access to the candidate's review materials, including the external review letters, which will be kept in a secure location. The candidate's vita and statement will be available to the EVF in a secured location on the department website.

Only full professors are eligible to vote on full professor cases; only full and associate professors on promotion to associate professor and tenure cases. Review Committee members will vote with all other EVF.

Voting will be done anonymously by ballot and require a Yes/No/Abstain on promotion and/or tenure. The EVF will be encouraged to provide reasons for their judgments and votes; any

Abstain votes must be explained on the ballot. EVF comments on ballots may be used by the Review Committee and the Department Chair in their reports. The Review Committee reports the results of the EVF ballot on the Tab 3 report.

A majority recommendation of the EVF will constitute a department recommendation to the Review Committee and the Department Chair. In all instances where action is recommended by a majority of the EVF faculty, the case will go forward to the LAS College with a positive recommendation. The Department Chair may also forward nominations for candidates who have not received a majority recommendation by the committee.

Contract renewals (third year reviews) will not require an EVF vote.

4.1.6 Procedures for Reporting Results of Reviews

The Review Committee Chair and Department Chair are responsible for reporting the results of the review, including the vote, to each candidate for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal. After the departmental review report is complete, the candidate, a member of the review committee, and the chair will meet to discuss recommendations before they are submitted to the College.

Candidates for contract renewal (third year review) will be provided a copy of the Review Committee's report in advance of any detailed discussion of their performance.

Persons who are not being recommended by either the EVF or the Chair, or both, shall be informed 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.

Each candidate for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the College shall be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the dossier (i.e., Tabs 1 and 2) before the dossier is sent to the College and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

4.1.7 Conflicts of Interest / Appeals

Any member of the EVF who has a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate shall not participate in considering that individual. Using conflict of interest policies set forth in Chapter 7 of the *ISU Faculty Handbook* as their guide, the Department Chair and the Review Committee will determine whether a conflict of interest exists.

If a faculty member undergoing review believes that the review has been unfair or less than thorough, he or she may appeal the review in writing to the Department Chair, who will refer the appeal to the Review Committee in the academic year in which the review was conducted. The Review Committee will give the faculty member under review the opportunity to meet with the Review Committee to discuss the review. If the faculty member under review requests a formal response, the Review Committee will respond in writing. If the matter cannot be resolved, the candidate may file a grievance under applicable College and University policies.

4.2 Materials for Formal Reviews

When providing materials for formal review, faculty members should read carefully the information included in “Documentation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure” in section 5 of the *ISU Faculty Handbook*.

4.2.1 Letters.

In the department. Early in the fall semester, the Chair will send out a memo to invite all tenure-track faculty to comment on department members up for promotion and/or tenure review that fall. Early in the spring semester the Chair will invite comments on department members up for contract renewal (third year review). Such evaluations are most useful when they come from people with close knowledge of some phase of the candidate's professional performance. In accordance with the LAS “Best Practices” requirements, peer observations and evaluations of teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) are required. The absence of this information may be detrimental to the candidate.

The candidate may also submit to the Chair names of department colleagues who would offer useful evaluations of the candidate's work. The Chair will contact these department members individually to request letters. (See section on teaching materials for letters on peer evaluation of teaching.)

In the university. The candidate should also submit to the Chair a list of other faculty in the college and university who are competent to judge the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional practice. The candidate should consider requesting such letters from chairs of college/university committees on which s/he has served, from coordinators of interdisciplinary programs, from those with whom s/he has team-taught, etc. The Chair will contact these faculty members to request letters.

Outside the university. In most cases, letters from outside the university will be requested only for candidates up for promotion and/or tenure. In accordance with LAS College policy, at least five (and no more than six) letters from outside the institution will be solicited by the Chair to offer external evaluation of the candidate's work. During the spring semester before an action review, the candidate should submit possible names for at least two of these evaluators; the department, through the coordination of the Chair, will provide additional names of evaluators. These external reviewers will be supplied with a dossier of the candidate's work, prepared jointly by the Chair and the candidate; usually this material will provide evidence of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and/or professional practice and will be focused on the candidate's area(s) of excellence.

In selecting the names of possible outside reviewers, the candidate as well as the department members involved should consider significant or noteworthy scholars in the candidate's field, scholars who would be able to comment on the candidate's scholarly contribution. These external reviewers could, for example, include scholars with whom the candidate has worked at conferences. The college and university pay particular attention to the external reviewers' school affiliation and academic rank. The college specifies that reviewers' institutions should be

comparable to or of better standing than ISU. The college also specifies that except in exceptional circumstances, the reviewer's rank should be at or above the rank being proposed for the candidate.

Optional letter sources. If the candidate has collaborated in his/her research, the Chair should be asked to request a letter from the collaborator(s) indicating the nature of the collaboration. In consultation with the Chair, candidates may also request letters from former students; from teachers or administrators with whom the candidate has worked at secondary schools or community colleges; and from readers of the candidate's manuscripts at presses or journals.

4.2.2 Vita and Self-Evaluation.

The candidate should submit as part of the required Tabs 1 and 2 (a) a vita outlining his or her preparation, experience, and professional development and (b) a written self-evaluation. To be most useful the self-evaluation should be just that—a reflection and assessment of the candidate, an account of the professional direction he or she is taking, not merely a rehearsal of information available in the vita and teaching materials.

4.2.3 Teaching.

The candidate will submit the documentation required by the ISU *Faculty Handbook* and relevant policies of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The department chair will discuss with each faculty member undergoing a formal review the kinds of materials that should be submitted to fulfill the requirements outlined above. In the “Teaching Evaluations” section below, more information is also supplied regarding the documentation of teaching for formal review.

4.2.4. Publications.

Copies of all the candidate's publications should be provided. Candidates should be aware that the *type* of publication can be a significant factor in determining excellence; all else being equal, a single-author book is stronger evidence than an edited collection or an article in a refereed journal. However, excellence cannot simply be assumed. Whenever possible, reviews or discussions of published books should be provided; likewise, frequency of citation can be invoked to confirm the quality of published articles (see section VI. B. of "Policies and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences"; http://www.las.iastate.edu/faculty_and_staff/promotiontenure.shtml).

Staff should be aware that an individual's chances of getting articles accepted are a function of (1) the competition (and thus the acceptance rates) of a given publication and (2) the evaluative procedure (and thus the amount of time) involved. Consequently, an individual should begin this process as soon as possible after his/her appointment begins. It would not be realistic to begin establishing a scholarly record when the departmental review is likely to precede the responses of the journals themselves.

4.2.5 Additional supporting evidence.

Any additional supporting evidence the candidate may wish to offer will be welcome. A candidate may schedule a meeting with the Review Committee if he or she wishes.

4.2.6 Annual Vita Updates and Annual Review Documents

The candidate for contract renewal (third year), promotion, and tenure reviews will in his/her discretion either (a) provide the Review Committee with copies of all Annual Vita Updates and Annual Review Documents, or (b) provide the Review Committee with no such documents.

4.2.7 Teaching Evaluations

In accordance with LAS College policy, all faculty are required to use a departmentally-approved evaluation form (or a comparable form developed by the program or area in which faculty teach) for each course that they teach. However, because evaluation of teaching serves two sometimes divergent purposes—(1) promotion and tenure and (2) professional development—instructors in the department should consider employing a variety of methods to gain feedback on their teaching.

For purposes of tenure and promotion, the department requires that faculty members have their courses evaluated by students as follows:

1. Provide students in each class with a set of end-of-semester evaluations, using the standard department form, part of which is machine scored. Such scores can help provide the statistical data needed in reviews beyond the department. Faculty are asked to follow the procedures for administering student evaluations that are provided with the evaluation materials.

Note that the LAS College requires that departments report in each candidate's dossier student evaluation scores for "Overall Instructor" and "Overall Course" for all of the courses taught by the candidate in the past five years. Department support staff can help candidates organize this data in tabular format.

In addition, the department recommends that faculty undergoing a formal review also consider adopting the following methods of evaluation:

2. Request periodic classroom visits from other faculty members. In the year before a formal review, the faculty member should, in consultation with the Chair, arrange for classroom visits by other faculty members. Ideally such visits would be the basis of an ongoing discussion of pedagogy as well as serving to document the instructor's teaching philosophy.
3. Compile materials for a teaching portfolio, including appropriate items from among the following: a statement of teaching philosophy and goals; representative course syllabi; descriptions of curricular revisions; information on the direction of M.A. and Ph.D. theses; statements from colleagues who have reviewed the faculty member's teaching materials and/or observed his/her teaching; student course evaluations; listing of related awards, honors, invitations; evidence of teaching activities outside the institution and related scholarship. (For additional information about portfolio preparation, see "Documentation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure" in section 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*; <http://www.provost.iastate.edu/handbook/2002>.)

For purposes of professional development of teaching, faculty members should consider a range of methods for assessing their teaching:

4. Provide possibilities for informal evaluations of the course by students at least once and perhaps several times during the semester. The purpose of such responses would be for

teachers to adjust courses to students' needs and concerns as appropriate. Such evaluations could take many forms, depending on the nature of the course and the students.

5. Regularly invite other faculty members to visit classes. Such visits are most useful when on-going. For example, faculty should plan for reciprocal visits when they are teaching the same course or similar course materials.
6. In addition to using the standard departmental form, faculty may consider developing more individualized forms of evaluation.

4.3 Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track / Tenured Faculty

The Department includes herewith by reference the policies established within the framework of College and University policies set forth in the most recent versions of "Policies and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences" and in section 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

4.4 Post-tenure review

Faculty under review will submit their materials to the Faculty Development Committee by the first Monday in September. If this falls on a university holiday, materials will be due the following Monday. For each case, the Faculty Development Committee will form a review subcommittee of at least three faculty. At least one member of the Faculty Development Committee will serve on each subcommittee; additional members will be selected from the tenured faculty by the Associate Chair for Faculty Development in consultation with the Department Chair, who will make the appointments. The subcommittee will include at least one member from the area group of the faculty member under review. The materials will include:

1. A retrospective/prospective statement of a maximum of three pages, including a discussion of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service and (if applicable) outreach since the last review. To be most useful to the committee, the statements should reflect on and assess the professional directions the candidate is taking. The self-evaluations should outline both the impact of the candidate's specific contributions to the field/profession and the university (in terms of influence, use, or adoption by peers; originality, richness, breadth and/or depth of expression) and how the candidate's past work paves the way for future contributions in these areas. Specific and realistic goals for the next five years are appreciated.
2. Documentation of 1-3 significant achievements since the last review, together with brief (<300 word) contextualizing statement(s). Examples: a published article with a description of its significance and impact; a syllabus, course evaluations and "teaching philosophy" statement from a course substantially revised; documents from a significant service project, together with a note about their origins and outcomes.

3. Two complete evaluation packets from the review period from two courses the candidate considers "signature courses;" at least one of which should be at the undergraduate level.

4. A CV with achievements in teaching, scholarship and service since the last review highlighted, in larger font, or otherwise marked off. The CV should be clear about the candidate's contribution to collaborative projects, and about the precise status of any work that has not yet been published. PRS (traditionally, Scholarship, Teaching and Service).

In addition, the Department will provide:

1. The candidate's current PRS.
2. Copies of the candidate's Annual Reviews and Annual Vita Updates since the last major review.
3. Data on course/instructor student evaluations of all the candidate's courses, together with overall grade distributions.

After discussion, the subcommittee will vote anonymously by ballot to determine recommendations. Based on the outcomes of the post-tenure review, the following actions will be taken:

- A "meeting expectations" post-tenure review recommendation may 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 PRS mediation (FH Section 5.1.1.5.1).
- A below expectations post-tenure review recommendation will include specific recommendations for achieving an acceptable performance evaluation. The faculty member will work with 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 PRS mediation (FH Section 5.1.1.5.1). 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 (FH Section 7.2.2.5.1).

The subcommittee will write a brief review report that will be given to the Department Chair, who will provide it to the faculty member reviewed in advance of any detailed discussion, as part of their annual review.

The LAS College and Provost Office set their own deadlines; historically, these deadlines have been sometime in spring semester. The departmental phase of the review will be completed by the end of fall semester.

4.5 Review of Department Chair

The Department Chair will be formally reviewed with respect to administrative performance in the second year of his or her first term and every third year thereafter, or at the request of the Dean, the Chair, or the department Review Committee. If the administrative review is scheduled in same year as that individual's regular faculty performance review, the two reviews will be conducted separately. The Chair's performance review will follow standard departmental procedures.

The Review Committee, convened by the regularly elected full professor with the most years in rank at Iowa State, will be responsible for gathering judgments from department faculty, staff, and other employees and for reporting the results of the review to the Chair, the department faculty, and the Dean.

The review committee that conducts the last mandatory Department Chair review before the expiration of that term (see "Department Chair") will provide faculty and staff the opportunity to address the question of reappointment, and will report results to the Department Chair, the department, and the dean.

4.6 Position Responsibility Statements

All faculty members in the department will have a Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) describing the expectations of their appointments. The PRS will be part of each faculty member's formal reviews.

Faculty will have their PRSs updated periodically (i.e., typically every five years) to reflect any changes in their appointments. If a faculty member and Chair cannot agree on a PRS, the department will follow LAS College procedures for negotiating the PRS via a department-level PRS Mediation Panel (see <http://www.las.iastate.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-governance/>).

4.7 Policies on Hiring, Reappointment, Advancement, and Performance Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members

All non-tenure track faculty are subject to periodic review. With the exception of adjunct instructorships, which are continuous appointments, non-tenure-track faculty positions are term appointments eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the Department. Adjunct faculty at the professorial level will follow the same review and reappointment procedures as senior lecturers (see below). All reappointments and advancements of non-tenure-track faculty are subject to approval at the College and University levels.

4.7.1 Lecturer

Hiring/ reappointment of lecturers is dependent upon the Department's curricular needs, which can vary significantly from year to year and even from semester to semester. Term of appointment: one semester, one year, or in some cases multiple years. Specific areas of teaching expectations appear in each lecturer's Position Responsibility Statement (PRS).

Hiring

Lecturers are hired according to the recommendations of the Associate Chair for Curriculum in consultation with the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses and the Director of ISUComm Advanced Courses. All lecturer hires are approved by the Chair.

Reappointment

Lecturers hired on one-semester or one-year contracts will be considered for reappointment the following semester or year, based on departmental staffing needs and on performance.

Annual Reviews

Lecturers undergo annual reviews by calendar year, as required by the university. Annual reviews for lecturers will be conducted by departmental administrators as assigned by the chair and will be based on a self-evaluation narrative update and selected course evaluations. All lecturers undergoing annual reviews will receive a copy of the report by the end of the semester.

Note: Good practice suggests that all instructors regularly invite classroom observations.

If a lecturer undergoing an annual review believes that the review has been unfair or less than thorough, he or she may appeal the review in writing to the Department Chair and the Associate Chair for Faculty Development, who will give the faculty member under review the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the review. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may file a grievance with the LAS College.

Formal Reappointment Reviews

In every sixth semester of teaching for the department, lecturers will undergo a formal reappointment review unless they file written notice that they do not wish to seek reappointment. When a formal reappointment review occurs, it will supersede that year's annual review.

The criteria for reappointment at the rank of lecturer are

1. Demonstrated teaching success in the area(s) specified by the PRS
2. Evidence of compliance with program guidelines in the area(s) taught
3. Satisfactory evidence of ongoing professional development related to teaching (e.g., attendance at professional meetings, participation in CELT forums, teaching in learning communities)

Review Teams

Formal reappointment reviews for lecturers are conducted by teams of three, selected by the Chair, from among the following:

- ◆ the Associate Chair for Curriculum
- ◆ the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses
- ◆ the Director(s) of ISUComm Advanced Courses
- ◆ the Director of the Basic Speech Course
- ◆ the Area Coordinators (or someone from the area appointed by the coordinator)

The review team submits to the Chair an evaluative report that recommends reappointment or no reappointment. The Chair will notify each reappointment candidate of the results of the review and will provide a copy of the report.

Materials to Submit

Lecturers undergoing reappointment review submit the following:

- ◆ Updated vita
- ◆ Self-evaluation narrative (three pages maximum)
- ◆ Six sets of course evaluations (selected to represent the candidate's teaching assignments during the period of review) and a grade-distribution summary for each set of evaluations
- ◆ Letters of support based upon observations of teaching
- ◆ Teaching portfolio (maximum 20 pages) that includes
 - Statement of teaching philosophy
 - Sample syllabi
 - Sample assignments

Advancement Review

After twelve semesters of teaching for the department (excluding summers), lecturers may be eligible for advancement to senior lecturer.

According to university policy, lecturers denied advancement to senior lecturer remain eligible for employment.

The criteria for advancement to senior lecturer are

1. Demonstrated overall excellence in teaching, with evidence of successful teaching in more than one level of high-demand multi-section courses in ISUComm and Speech Communication. Because the greatest staffing needs are for these high-demand multi-sections courses, lecturer PRS explicitly state that teaching these courses is an expectation. Thus, advancement is based not only upon performance but also upon the staffing needs of the English department. While not required, activity in learning communities and the ability to engage in multiple forms of instructional delivery are desirable.
2. Satisfactory evidence of on-going professional development related to teaching (e.g., attendance at ISUComm workshops, professional meetings, participation in CELT forums, teaching in learning communities).
3. Evidence of teaching-related institutional service (e.g., committees, ad hoc work groups, extra-departmental university service).

Although candidates must meet all three criteria above, teaching excellence, departmental need, and versatility are by far the most important factors.

Review Committee

Advancement reviews for lecturers are conducted by the Lecturer Review Committee. The Associate Chair for curriculum and scheduling convenes and chairs this committee and appoints at least two additional members from the following:

- ◆ Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses
- ◆ Asst. director of ISUComm Foundation Courses
- ◆ Director(s) of ISUComm Advanced Courses
- ◆ Director of the Speech Communication Program
- ◆ IEOP director
- ◆ Asst. director of the Speech Communication Program
- ◆ TTE faculty members with expertise in areas in which advancement candidates have teaching experience.
- ◆ One senior lecturer (elected by the faculty).

Materials to Submit

LAS Senior Lecturer Advancement template (in Word)

- ◆ Eight sets of course evaluations (selected to represent the candidate's teaching assignments during the period of review). For lecturers regularly teaching fewer than six sections per year, the number of sets of teaching evaluations submitted may be adjusted accordingly. Include a brief statement explaining how the selection was made.
- ◆ Letters of support, including observations of teaching, professional development, and service. At least one letter should be from a tenured or tenure-track member of the English department; letters from learning community collaborators are also strongly encouraged.
- ◆ Sample syllabi and sample course materials created by the candidate.
- ◆ A tabular report on the "Overall Instructor" and "Overall Class" for every course taught in the last five years. Request this information from the office staff 2 months prior to the advancement application deadline.
- ◆ You should also request grade-distribution summaries for your courses. This information should be submitted in a tabular format. (2.2B on the LAS Senior Lecturer template)

Following its deliberations, the Lecturer Review Committee votes on advancement. The Chair also makes a decision for or against, and then forwards the advancement case(s) to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Final decisions are made by the Provost's Office.

The Chair will notify each candidate of the results of the advancement review.

A successful advancement dossier will also serve as the candidate's annual review.

4.7.2 Senior Lecturer

Appointment of senior lecturers is dependent upon the Department's curricular needs. Term of appointment: two to five years. Specific areas of teaching expectations appear in each senior lecturer's Position Responsibility Statement (PRS).

Hiring

The rank of senior lecturer is achieved through advancement from the rank of lecturer after an advancement review. The English Department does not hire new faculty at the rank of senior lecturer. A senior lecturer who has resigned the position is eligible to be rehired at the senior lecturer rank.

Annual Reviews

Senior lecturers and adjunct professorial faculty undergo annual reviews by calendar year, as required by the university. These annual reviews will be conducted by departmental administrators as assigned by the chair and will be based on a self-written narrative update and selected course evaluations. All senior lecturers and adjunct professorial faculty undergoing annual reviews will receive a copy of the report by the end of the semester.

If a senior lecturer or adjunct professorial faculty member undergoing an annual review believes that the review has been unfair or less than thorough, he or she may appeal the review in writing to the Department Chair and the Associate Chair for Faculty Development, who will give the faculty member under review the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the review. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may file a grievance with the LAS College.

Reappointment

Reappointment reviews for senior lecturers and adjunct professorial faculty are conducted during the penultimate year of their contract. When a formal reappointment review occurs, it will supersede that year's annual review.

The criteria for reappointment of adjunct professorial faculty will be based on satisfactory fulfillment of terms in the PRS.

The criteria for reappointment at the rank of senior lecturer are

1. Demonstrated overall excellence in teaching; while not required, activity in learning communities and the ability to engage in multiple forms of instructional delivery are desirable
2. Satisfactory evidence of ongoing professional development related to teaching (e.g., attendance at professional meetings, participation in CELT forums, teaching in learning communities)
3. Evidence of teaching-related institutional service (e.g., committees or ad hoc work groups)

Review Teams

Review teams for adjunct professorial faculty will be appointed by the Chair and will consist of no fewer than three department faculty of equal or higher TTE rank chosen from the areas in which the adjunct teaches or performs administrative service.

Reappointment reviews for senior lecturers are conducted by teams of three, selected by the Chair, from among the following:

- ◆ the Associate Chair for Curriculum
- ◆ the Director of ISUComm Foundation Courses
- ◆ the Director of ISUComm Advanced Courses
- ◆ the Director of the Basic Speech Course
- ◆ the Area Coordinators (or someone from the area appointed by the coordinator)

The review team submits to the Chair an evaluative report that recommends reappointment or no reappointment. When reappointment is recommended, the review team may suggest a length for the new contract. The Chair will notify each reappointment candidate of the results of the review and will provide a copy of the report.

Materials to Submit

Senior lecturers and adjunct professorial faculty members undergoing reappointment review

submit the following:

- ◆ Updated vita
- ◆ Self-evaluation statement (four pages maximum)
- ◆ Up to two sets of course evaluations per year over the period being reviewed (selected to represent the candidate's teaching assignments during that time) and a grade-distribution summary for each set of evaluations
- ◆ Letters of support based upon observations of teaching
- ◆ Teaching portfolio (maximum 25 pages) that includes
 - Statement of teaching philosophy
 - Sample syllabi
 - Sample assignments
 - Teaching materials created by the candidate

Promotion Review for Adjunct Professorial Faculty

Adjunct professorial faculty members seeking promotion to a higher rank will follow the same procedures as TTE faculty (see Policies on Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance Evaluation of Tenure-Track/Tenured faculty).

4.8 Annual Reviews

Each year the Chair and the Associate Chair for Faculty Development will evaluate each tenure-track faculty member, and these evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean. The evaluations will be based on an annual vita update, course evaluations, reports from the faculty member's last formal departmental review, and information that comes to the chair in the day-to-day administration of the department. All faculty members undergoing annual review will receive copies of their evaluations.

Non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated either by the Chair or by one of the associate chairs. These evaluations will be based on an annual vita update, course evaluations, and information that comes to the chair or associate chairs in the day-to-day administration of the department.

If a faculty member undergoing an annual review believes that the review has been unfair or less than thorough, he or she may appeal the review in writing to the Department Chair and the Associate Chair for Faculty Development, who will give the faculty member under review the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the review. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may file a grievance with the LAS College

5. Professional Ethics, Rights, and Responsibilities

Relationship to Other Faculty, the Department, and the University

Although the *Department of English Faculty Handbook* outlines specific policies of the English Department, all employees of the department are bound by the policies and codes of conduct in the *ISU Faculty Handbook* as well as the ISU Policy Library (<http://www.policy.iastate.edu>).

Citizenship and Collegiality

The Department of English is committed to sustaining a positive and productive environment for scholarship, learning, and service for each individual and for the collective benefit of all. Faculty are members of an interdependent community of scholars and teachers, and as such are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that contributes constructively to the department's mission and reputation. The department is committed to ensuring a work environment where all individuals can thrive through openness and collaboration (adapted from the LAS Collegiality and Citizenship Statement, <http://www.las.iastate.edu/main/collegiality.shtml>).

Furthermore, as stated in the "Discrimination and Harassment" section of the ISU Policy Library, "Iowa State University reaffirms and emphasizes its commitment to provide a professional working and learning environment that is fair and responsible; that supports, nurtures, and rewards educational and employment growth on the basis of relevant factors such as ability and performance; and that is free of discriminatory, inappropriate, and disrespectful conduct or communication (<http://policy.iastate.edu/policy/discrimination/#Intro>).

As a part of workplace etiquette, faculty members will respond to student, faculty, and administrative email messages, normally within two business days. When faculty members are going to be absent with no computer access, they are to use the automatic out-of-office email response. Syllabi should include a policy that reflects this workplace ethic.

Freedom of Speech

Although we observe the stated regulations of Iowa State University and the Department of English, so long as these do not contravene academic freedom or abridge our Constitutional right of expression of thought or opinion, we maintain the right to criticize, to seek revision, and to express dissent by lawful means, including peaceable assembly and petitions to authorities.

Conflict of Interest

According to the *Faculty Handbook*, "Conflicts of interest include conflicts arising out of personal relationships, family relationships, and those arising out of activities outside of work" (see section 7.2.2.1 for policies involving conflicts of interest in these areas; <http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section7.html#section-7.2.2.1>).

Teaching Responsibilities

Textbook Selection Procedure

The Department of English recognizes each faculty member's responsibility and prerogative to choose appropriate textbooks for assigned courses. In keeping with University policy, the Department of English employs the following procedure to protect both students and faculty from abuse or unfair treatment in the selection of textbooks. To avoid criticism or conflict of interest involving a faculty member who might select his/her own book as a required or recommended text, the Graduate Studies Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, or the appropriate course committee for multi-section courses, will serve as review committees.

1. The textbook selection procedure for multi-section courses will be handled by the ISUComm Foundation Courses Committee and the Advanced Communication Committee. Conflict of interest questions about the selection of a particular text will be viewed by these committees.
2. If a faculty member wishes to use his or her own text for any other undergraduate course, a recommendation to that effect will be reviewed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee with appropriate consultation with other faculty teaching in the same area. The Graduate Studies Committee will serve in a similar capacity for graduate courses.
3. Faculty members using their own books as texts will not be expected to relinquish royalties from books that have been approved by one of these committees.

Course Materials

Handouts, exams, and other classroom materials should be provided to students electronically whenever possible. For those materials that require photocopying, instructors should follow departmental guidelines for number of copies/student. Instructors requiring staff support for preparation of course materials should allow staff ample time to complete request. Instructors are responsible for obtaining any permissions or copyrights for course materials.

Course Syllabi

All instructors are required to create syllabi for all courses they teach. Copies of these syllabi must be submitted to the main office by the tenth day of each semester.

Instructors are strongly encouraged to include on each syllabi a statement about student accommodations for disabilities like the one below:

If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations in this course, please make arrangements to meet with me soon. Please request that a Disability Resources staff send a SAAR.

(For examples of other such statements, see <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~aslagell/SampleSyllabusStatements08.pdf>.)

Meeting Classes

Instructors are responsible for meeting their classes, including final exams, at the scheduled times and places.

Emergency Absences

Emergency absences must be reported to the main office. These reports must be received early enough for the staff to arrange for the assignment to be given and/or dismissal of

the class. Irregularities in class meetings—even those planned in advance—must be reported to the main office, since the office staff will have to answer inquiries that may arise.

Sick Leave

Emergency absences, including illness, must be reported to the main office. The department reports monthly to the Payroll Office the number of days of sick leave accumulated and used by each faculty member. For emergency or sick leave absences of one week or less, instructors should arrange for coverage among colleagues. If emergency of sick leave extends beyond one week, instructor must contact the Human Resources Coordinator and the Associate Chair for Curriculum to arrange for extended class coverage.

Travel for Professional Purposes

Instructors planning to travel to conference or other professional meetings are required to report the activity to the Human Resources Coordinator for approval by the Chair. Normally the instructor should arrange a substitute, or plan a special assignment, to cover the period of absence and maintain the continuity of the class.

Office Hours

Realistic office hours that students and colleagues can rely on should be scheduled at the beginning of the semester. In general, staff members keep at least two office hours per class per week, but teachers should consider the particular needs of their courses and students in setting hours. The main office should be notified of any changes in office hours.

Student Evaluations

All members of the teaching staff must perform student evaluations for each course taught. Evaluation packets are placed in each instructor's mailbox two to three weeks before the semester end. The evaluations must be implemented by a student monitor no sooner than the second to last week of regular class. The student monitor in the instructor's class needs to seal the envelope with the completed evaluations, sign over the envelope seal, and deliver the envelope to 203 Ross. Speech Communications and Communications Studies evaluations must be returned to 308 Carver. Instructors will get their evaluation packet(s) back a few weeks after the end of the semester with a one-page statistical summary sheet. Each set of student evaluations should be stored by the instructor for review purposes.

Dead Week Policy

All instructors are expected to follow the following university policies regarding Dead Week:

Dead Week. The last week of fall and spring undergraduate classes has been designated Dead Week by the Government of the Student Body and Iowa State University for undergraduates. The intent is to provide students with time for review and preparation for final examinations. Therefore, no student organization registered with the Student Organization Office may hold meetings or sponsor events without the expressed

permission of Program Coordinator or the Dean of Students Office. For academic programs, the last week of classes is considered to be a normal week in the semester except that in developing their syllabi faculty shall consider the following guidelines:

- Mandatory final examinations in any course may not be given during Dead Week except for laboratory courses and for those classes meeting once a week only and for which there is no contact during the normal final exam week. Take home final exams and small quizzes are generally acceptable. (For example, quizzes worth no more than 10 percent of the final grade and/or that cover no more than one-fourth of assigned reading material in the course could be given.)
- Major course assignments should be assigned prior to Dead Week (major assignments include major research papers, projects, etc.). Any modifications to assignments should be made in a timely fashion to give students adequate time to complete the assignments.
- Major course assignments should be due no later than the Friday prior to Dead Week. Exceptions include class presentations by students, semester-long projects such as a design project in lieu of a final, and extensions of the deadline requested by students.

Instructors are reminded that most students are enrolled in several courses each semester, and widespread violation of these guidelines can cause student workloads to be excessive as students begin their preparation for final examinations (*ISU Faculty Handbook*, <http://www.provost.istate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section10.html>).

Final Exams

All instructors are expected to follow the following university policies regarding final exams:

Final exams may not be given at a time other than that for which the exam is scheduled by the registrar. An instructor may not give a final exam prior to final exam week nor change the time of offering of the final examination as it appears in the final exam schedule. Permission to change the time for which an exam is scheduled may be given only by the dean of the college. If the instructor elects not to give a final exam in a course of two or more credits, the class is required to meet at the scheduled final exam period for other educational activity such as a review of the course or feedback on previous exams (ISU Office of the Registrar, <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~registrar/exams/regulations.shtml>).

Rescheduling an exam for an individual student may occur, for example, if a student has three final exams on the same day. See also Section 10.6.4 of the *Faculty Handbook* for policies regarding “dead week”

(<http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section10.html#section-10.6.4>).

Grades

The online *ISU Policy Library* (<http://policy.iastate.edu/policy/academics>) contains information on academic regulations such as grades, classification, academic grievances, and student records. Final grades for all courses are due in the Registrar’s Office 48 hours after the last exam is given. All grades must now be entered using AccessPlus (Faculty/Staff tab) or WebCT.

Academic Dishonesty

University regulations concerning academic dishonesty appear in the Students section of the online *ISU Policy Library* (<http://policy.iastate.edu/policy/academics>).

Incomplete Grades

Incomplete (I) grades should be given only for good cause. They must be reported on both the class grade sheet and an accompanying Incomplete Grade Report form. When Incompletes are made up, the final grade is reported on a Grade Report to the Registrar form (available in Ross 203).

Posting Grades

“Instructors who wish to inform students of their performance may post grades and test scores on a secure course web site as long as individual students may only access their own grades. The test scores or course grades of students may not be posted in any public location (World Wide Web or hard copy posting) unless the instructor posts the information using a code for each student that is known only by the instructor and the student” (2009-11 *ISU Catalog*, <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~catalog/2009-2011/geninfo/studentrecords.html#Anchor-Postin-39593>). Do not leave student papers in the hall or in envelopes attached to office doors.

Student Papers and Records when Staff Leave the Department

When a staff member leaves the department, keys should be returned to Key Services. Current files should be organized and a statement describing the contents should be left in the main office. Department staff who teach 150, 250, or 250H should give the ISUComm Foundation Courses secretary the following materials from courses taught that semester: grade records (grade book or photocopy of the grades), a course policy sheet and syllabus, and any student papers or final exams the instructor may have.

Credit by Examination

In keeping with University policy, the Department of English offers students the opportunity to test out of all courses except 400-level seminars, courses in which the small-group seminar experience is a crucial part of the academic work. Requests to test out of courses with variable content will be considered on an individual basis. For test-outs in the English Department, students must demonstrate the attainment of skills and knowledge equivalent to that of a student who passes the course with a C or better during the regular semester.

Test-out policies and procedures will be determined by the relevant committees: 250 by the ISUComm Foundation Courses Committee, 302/309/314 by the Advanced Communication Committee, and all other undergraduate courses (except 400-level seminars, for which test-outs are not given) by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

ISU Procedures to Prevent Students from Endangering Themselves or Others

In light of the Virginia Tech tragedy, English instructors—particularly those who teach writing—should be particularly sensitive to student writing that reveals disturbing or threatening content or tone. When such writings or other methods of expression are detected, the instructor

should immediately express concern to the student and enlist (and/or have the student enlist) University support services to intervene.

Below are some steps that the instructor should take if students appear to be a danger to themselves or other students:

1. If a student's behavior poses a clear and present danger to self or others, contact ISU Department of Public Safety (294-4428) for assistance. Ask the student for consent to transport him/her to the Student Health Center, the Student Counseling Service, or Mary Greeley Hospital. Important: If the student refuses to give consent, only a law officer may determine when Iowa Code 229 will permit the involuntary transportation and/or hospitalization of the student.
2. If the incident involves a personal injury and/or ingestion of a harmful substance or a threat of personal injury, contact the Student Health Center (294-5801). The nurse on duty will contact a staff physician and/or a psychiatrist to meet with the student at the Student Health Center or will make arrangements to admit the student to the Mary Greeley Medical Center (with the student's consent or as determined by a Security officer). When it is judged appropriate, the nurse may also contact a Student Counseling Service counselor and/or the Dean of Students Office.
3. In other cases, consult the Student Counseling Service (294-5056). Attempt to contact the counselor who may be (1) the staff member who has already counseled with the student, (2) the Student Counseling Service liaison with the student's living unit, (3) the on-call counselor, or (4) any Student Counseling Service staff member available—in that order. Staff in the Department of Residence should observe internal reporting procedures before contacting the Student Counseling Service.

For additional information about how to handle situations in which students are (or may be) a danger to themselves or others, see the "Violence-Free Campus" section of the ISU Department of Public Safety website (<http://www.dps.iastate.edu/?page id=625>).

Disruptive Classroom Behavior / Dismissal of Students from Class

Faculty should provide an open and supportive environment that fosters student learning and intellectual growth. However, sometimes student behavior can hamper the instructor's efforts. Below are policies from the ISU *Faculty Handbook* about how to proceed under such circumstances (<http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section10.html>):

10.5.1. Policy Statement

The university encourages all instructors to strive for free and open communication within their classrooms. However, for student learning to be most effective, classrooms must maintain a civil environment, free from intimidation, disruption, violence, and harassment.

A fundamental principle underlying university governance and academic freedom is that the faculty has the responsibility to determine the curriculum, methods of delivery, and means for assessing student performance. The general faculty discharges this curriculum responsibility through curriculum committees at the department, college, and university

levels. Curricula and course descriptions are approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Individual course descriptions in the University Catalog are the manifestation of the general faculty's expectations for the course. Individual faculty members then determine the exact nature of the course content, method of delivery, course assignments, etc., and have full responsibility to assess and evaluate student performance.

Student comments on the course may be expressed to the instructor or the Department Chair and are solicited on course evaluations. Students, who feel they have been treated unfairly, may file an Appeal of Academic Grievances (see Iowa State University Catalog, or see <http://www.iastate.edu/~catalog>).

Response to Classroom Disruption

Should any student officially enrolled for credit or audit in a class disrupt the instructor's ability to ensure a safe environment, control the class agenda, and/or deliver the approved curriculum, the instructor has the right to ask that the disruptive action cease immediately. The instructor may find it useful to include general guidelines about disruptive behavior on the course syllabus; and in the event of a classroom disruption, the instructor may, if she or he finds it necessary, explain to the student and the class why the particular action is deemed disruptive. The instructor should also take into consideration complaints of disruptive behavior brought to their attention by students. The responsible student should cease the disruption and utilize non-disruptive means for expressing disagreement or concern. If the disruption continues, the instructor can pursue various forms of intervention, including suspension from class, use of student disciplinary regulations, or police intervention, as discussed below.

Although most situations are best resolved without resorting to requests for police intervention, the Department of Public Safety should be called when the disruptive behavior prohibits the continuation of the class. The Department of Public Safety may also be called if any person enters or remains in the classroom after being asked by the instructor to leave.

Procedure to Suspend a Student from Class Attendance

If, in the instructor's opinion, the student should be suspended from attending the class, the instructor must request the Chair of the Department offering the course to suspend the student from the class until a decision is reached by the Chair as to whether the student will be allowed to return to the class. When the course is offered by a Program, the Director of the Program should assume the role of the Chair. Moreover, when the instructor is an administrator, the petition should be reviewed at the next higher level of administration.

If the instructor's request to suspend the student is accepted by the Chair, the suspension will take effect immediately and the student and the instructor will be notified in writing. Immediately after suspension, the Chair must investigate and determine whether to permit the student to return to the class. The Chair must provide the student and the instructor with a written statement of the outcomes of the investigation in a timely manner.

If the instructor's request to suspend the student is not accepted by the Chair, the Chair must explain the reasons to the instructor in writing for not accepting the instructor's request. The Chair must also ensure that the resources in classroom management are made available to the instructor so that the instructor can manage the student upon the student's return to the class. The instructor may, however, appeal the Chair's decision to the Dean of the College.

Procedure for Students Returning to Class

If the student is allowed to return to the class, the Chair must notify both the student and the instructor in writing. The instructor must inform the student of any conditions of the return and of make-up opportunities for missed work. In some cases, it may be productive to have a conference of the Chair, the instructor, and the student before the student is allowed to return to the class. Upon return to the class, further incidents of disruption by the student could be the basis for terminating the student's enrollment in the course and/or for disciplinary action.

Procedure to Terminate a Student's Enrollment in a Class

If the Chair decides that the student should not be allowed to return to the class, the Chair will notify the student in writing of 1) removal from the class, 2) the reasons for removal, and 3) the right to appeal the decision using the Appeal of Academic Grievances process (see Iowa State University Catalog <http://www.iastate.edu/~catalog>). The Chair will also send written notification of the action to the Dean of the student's college, the Dean of the instructor's college, the Dean of Students and the Registrar. The Dean of the student's college must request that the Registrar terminate the student's enrolment in the course administratively.

Filing of Disciplinary Charges

During the investigation phase, the instructor and/or the Chair could also consider whether the conduct that led to the suspension and/or termination should be reported to the Dean of Students for disciplinary charges. If disciplinary charges are filed, the student's pension may continue pending the outcome of the disciplinary hearing (see Student Disciplinary Regulations <http://www.dso.iastate.edu/handbook/sdr.pdf>).

Attendance by Persons not Enrolled in a Course

The University has the right to determine who is enrolled in a class and to control the presence of the person who is not enrolled in the class. A non-enrolled person is allowed in the classroom only at the discretion of the instructor. The instructor should ask the non-enrolled person who attends a class against the express wishes of the instructor to leave. The instructor should ask such a person to identify themselves. If the person refuses to leave, the Department of Public Safety may be called. If the person is a student enrolled in the university but not enrolled in the class, disciplinary charges may be filed.

Relationship to P & S and Merit Support Staff

Support Staff

The successful operation of the department depends upon a relationship between the faculty and the office support staff that is friendly and efficient and that is built upon mutual respect. To that end, the department has adopted the following procedures and policies:

1. The faculty will treat support staff courteously and considerately in the requests made of them, especially in regard to tasks that interrupt their ongoing work or involve their office space.
2. Departmental administrators will include support staff in discussions of matters related to office staff work.
3. The Chair will solicit from support staff agenda items for departmental meetings and will encourage their participation in these meetings.
4. Departmental administrators and interested faculty will meet regularly with support staff.
5. Periodically, the Chair will undertake a full review of current support staff positions with the following objectives:
 - ◆ To update job descriptions and define more precisely the duties of individual support staff
 - ◆ To reclassify support staff positions as warranted by updated job descriptions
 - ◆ To inform the department of office procedures and responsibilities of individual secretaries as a way to improve efficiency and communication between the office staff and the faculty.
6. The Chair will consult with the support staff or representatives selected by them in any plans to redesign office staff workspace.