

# Faculty Governance Policies and Procedures

Department of Computer Science  
Iowa State University

October 8, 2018

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Mission Statement</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Faculty membership and voting . . . . .	5
2.2	Graduate faculty . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Department executive officer</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Leadership role . . . . .	7
3.2	Appointment . . . . .	8
3.3	Administrative duties . . . . .	8
3.4	Associate chairs . . . . .	9
3.5	Review procedures . . . . .	9
3.5.1	Timeline . . . . .	9
3.5.2	Advisory committee . . . . .	9
3.5.3	Review process . . . . .	9
3.6	Change of leadership . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Department committees</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	Role of committees . . . . .	12
4.2	Standing committees . . . . .	12
4.3	Ad hoc committees . . . . .	15
<b>5</b>	<b>Position responsibilities</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>6</b>	<b>Promotion and tenure</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	Criteria . . . . .	15
6.2	Procedures . . . . .	16
6.2.1	Introduction . . . . .	16
6.2.2	Standards for promotion and tenure . . . . .	17
6.2.3	Relevant Committees . . . . .	18
6.2.4	Action List . . . . .	19
6.2.5	Resume . . . . .	19
6.2.6	Notification and appeal . . . . .	20
6.2.7	Promotion and tenure recommendation . . . . .	20
6.2.8	Promotion and tenure committee . . . . .	21
6.2.9	Evaluation by the DEO and higher administration . . . . .	22
6.2.10	Joint appointments . . . . .	23
6.2.11	Conflict of Interest . . . . .	23
6.2.12	Review and modification . . . . .	23
<b>7</b>	<b>Post-tenure review</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1	General principles . . . . .	23
7.2	Timeline . . . . .	24
7.3	Advisory panel . . . . .	24
7.4	Performance standards . . . . .	25
7.5	Review process . . . . .	25
7.5.1	Review of teaching . . . . .	26
7.5.2	Review of research . . . . .	26
7.6	Summary report . . . . .	27
7.7	Due process . . . . .	27
7.8	After the review . . . . .	27
7.8.1	Consequences . . . . .	27
7.8.2	Dissemination . . . . .	28
7.8.3	Right of appeal . . . . .	28
<b>8</b>	<b>Hiring procedures</b>	<b>28</b>
8.1	Minimum qualifications . . . . .	29
8.2	Procedures . . . . .	29
<b>9</b>	<b>Non-tenure-eligible faculty</b>	<b>30</b>
9.1	Lecturer hiring . . . . .	31
9.2	Lecturer renewal . . . . .	31

9.3	Lecturer reappointment . . . . .	31
9.4	Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer . . . . .	32
9.5	Senior lecturer renewal . . . . .	33
9.6	Senior lecturer reappointment . . . . .	33
9.7	Preparation of documents . . . . .	34
9.7.1	Initial hiring of a lecturer . . . . .	34
9.7.2	Renewal of a lecturer . . . . .	34
9.7.3	Reappointment of a lecturer . . . . .	34
9.7.4	Promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer . . . . .	34
9.7.5	Reappointment of a senior lecturer . . . . .	35
9.8	Helpful hints for LRC and DEO . . . . .	35
<b>10</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Changes to this document</b>	<b>36</b>

## Preamble

No rules or procedures described in this document take precedence over College or University procedures, guidelines, or rules as written in University documents, especially the Faculty Handbook.

## Document history

TBD

## 1 Mission Statement

We, the faculty of the Department of Computer Science at Iowa State University, strive to excel in the following four areas:

**Undergraduate Education:** Our undergraduate programs are designed to train computer scientists, information technologists, and software engineers for productive, life-long careers. Such education equips students with a sound knowledge of the foundations of computer science, problem solving, and system design skills necessary to design and build computing systems that are useful, robust, efficient, reliable, scalable, and flexible.

The department offers strong undergraduate programs leading to a B.S. in Computer Science and a B.S. in Software Engineering (co-administered with the Electrical and Computer Engineering department). We also are one of the three founding departments that jointly administer the Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (BCBio) undergraduate program.

**Graduate Education:** Our graduate program provides research-based training leading to MS and PhD degrees in Computer Science. The department also plays a pivotal role in interdepartmental graduate majors and minors in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (BCB), Information Assurance, and Human-Computer Interaction.

**Discovery, Research and Creative Work:** Our department is committed to strong research programs in computer science and emerging

data-rich and informatics-enabled disciplines, contributing to the fundamental advances needed to address challenges in interdisciplinary areas such as environment, food, health, energy, and security, as well as increasing the competitiveness of Iowa and the nation.

**Outreach, Engagement, and Public Service:** Our faculty, staff, and students enhance the community at large by engaging in technology transfer, contributing to open source software projects, partnering with Iowa K-12 teachers and students, broadening participation of underrepresented groups in STEM disciplines, and providing advice to industry, government, and non-profit groups.

## 2 Faculty

### 2.1 Faculty membership and voting

In this document a “member of the faculty” is an individual who has a regular, adjunct, visiting, temporary, collaborator, or affiliate appointment at Iowa State University and who carries an academic rank of lecturer, senior lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor in the Department of Computer Science. A “voting member of the faculty” is a member of the faculty who is either non-tenure-eligible (NTE) with at least a 60% appointment or tenure-eligible (TE). Voting members of the faculty are automatically entitled to attend faculty meetings and to vote on matters that do not require special status as specified elsewhere in this document.

A voting member of the faculty on leave retains the right to vote (by email or other individual arrangement) on the issue of making changes to the governance document. On any matter requiring a vote, any voting member of the faculty may stipulate that voting be by secret ballot. Minutes of the faculty meetings will be retained permanently and will be accessible to all voting members of the faculty. All committee meetings except meetings on personnel actions such as promotion and tenure and grievances are open to any voting member of the faculty.

### 2.2 Graduate faculty

The types of membership in the graduate faculty of Iowa State University and the rights that come with each type of membership are detailed in the

Graduate College Handbook. The account below summarizes those aspects of graduate faculty membership that directly impact procedures of the Department of Computer Science, but there is much more information in the Graduate College Handbook that must be consulted when contemplating or carrying out these procedures.

All tenure-eligible faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor are full members of the graduate faculty.

Some non-tenure-eligible faculty members may be nominated for either graduate lecturer status (this enables them to teach graduate courses) or associate membership in the graduate faculty (this enables them to teach graduate courses and serve on program of study committees of graduate students).

Nominations for graduate lecturer status are submitted by the DEO to the Dean of the Graduate College after approval by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Dean of the Graduate College may approve graduate lecturer status for a term of up to five years.

Nominations for associate membership in the graduate faculty may be submitted to the Graduate College by any full member of the graduate faculty. The nomination must include approval by the director of graduate education (DOGE) of the Department of Computer Science and certification that the DOGE has called a vote by secret ballot of all graduate faculty members in the Department of Computer Science and that a simple majority of those who cast a ballot supported the nomination. Associate membership in the graduate faculty, if granted, is initially granted for a term of five years. After completion of a five-year term, associate members may be nominated for permanent associate membership in the graduate faculty.

More details and forms for the above nominations appear on the Graduate College web pages.

### **3 Department executive officer**

The Departmental Executive Officer (DEO) has obligations both to the administration of the University and to members of the faculty of the Department of Computer Science. The obligations to the administration are recorded elsewhere.

### 3.1 Leadership role

It is vital that the DEO provide overall leadership, working to provide a congenial environment that is conducive to the mission of the Department. The foremost specific responsibilities within the department are evaluation of faculty, assignment of responsibilities to faculty, hiring and recommending promotion and tenure, and managing the day-to-day activities of the department. However, hiring of new faculty and promotion and tenure decisions are of such special influence on the department that special procedures are established to formulate faculty recommendations in these areas (see Sections 6 and 8 of this document). The evaluation of faculty must be done fairly, and in a manner that is consistent with the criteria for promotion and tenure. The results of the evaluation as well as policies and procedures used to determine salary increases will be discussed with each individual member of the faculty. In assignment of faculty responsibility, the DEO will be aware of the needs of the department and of the specific interests of the individual faculty members. The DEO should seek, and can expect to receive, careful counsel from the faculty on major administrative matters.

The leadership role of the DEO is extensive and includes

- Representation of the Department and advocacy of its decisions and interests to the administration, to other units in the University, and to organizations outside the University.

If two or more members of the faculty require the DEO to send a written memorandum to the administration, the DEO should send a written letter to the Dean of the College. In such cases, the faculty members should each be given a copy of the letter or memorandum. Likewise, if two or more members of the faculty would like to see a directive from the administration in writing, the DEO should solicit a written letter to that effect which may be circulated to other members of the faculty.

- Seeking opportunities for faculty development and keeping the faculty informed about funding opportunities.
- Chairing faculty meetings and keeping the Department informed of administrative decisions and other items of import to the Department, or to individual faculty.

## **3.2 Appointment**

The DEO will be a Chair with a normal term of three to five years.

## **3.3 Administrative duties**

The DEO's administrative duties include the following:

- Liaison to the following standing committees: P&T, Faculty Search, Graduate Admissions.
- Budget: salaries, wages, benefits, teaching funds, computer fee, equipment, supplies and services, contracts.
- Expenditures: general operating expenses, development funds, computing, TA appointments, telecommunication, student activities.
- Public Relations: Web, newsletter, media, upward communications, donors, student groups, parents, industry/recruiters, peer institutions.
- Fund Raising: External Advisory Council, ISU Foundation, Web-based alumni relations.
- General Personnel Management: faculty, P&S staff, merit employees, staff evaluations, hourly-paid staff evaluations.
- Tenure-track faculty issues: search, evaluation (P&T, annual review, post-tenure review, etc.), development.
- Policies and Procedures Management: development and maintenance of policies and procedures, Web posting, etc.
- Student Contests & Activities: ACM programming contest, UPE, CS Club, GAC, Poster Day, annual reception, etc.
- Periodic Strategic Planning



### **3.4 Associate chairs**

The DEO has two or more associate chairs to assist with the DEO's extensive duties. These associate chairs are chosen from the willing, voting members of the department faculty who are either tenured or non-tenure-eligible. The DEO has wide latitude in recruiting these associate chairs and determining their areas of responsibility.

### **3.5 Review procedures**

#### **3.5.1 Timeline**

The department of computer science carries out a review of the DEO during the next to last year of each term of service of the DEO. Reviews are carried out at other times if either two-thirds of the voting members of the faculty vote for such a review or the Dean requests such a review.

#### **3.5.2 Advisory committee**

The review process begins with the formation of an advisory committee. This committee consists of five voting members of the computer science department, including three professors, one associate professor, and one assistant professor. The professors on the advisory committee are elected by the professors in the department; the associate professor on the advisory committee is elected by the associate professors in the department; and the assistant professor on the advisory committee is elected by the assistant professors in the department. The exceptions to this are that the DEO shall not be on the advisory committee and shall not have voting rights for electing members of the advisory committee.

The advisory committee coordinates and presents a review of the DEO by the entire computer science department. The review is not to contain an assessment of the DEO by the advisory committee.

#### **3.5.3 Review process**

The advisory committee elects a chair from among its members, formulates a process for soliciting evaluations of the DEO's performance from department faculty and staff, discusses this process with the voting members of the faculty, and prepares written summaries of these evaluations for three

audiences: the faculty (to inform discussion and voting), the DEO, and the Dean. After the voting members of the faculty—minus the DEO—have had an opportunity to discuss their summary, they vote on whether the DEO should serve another term and, if so, on how long (3 or 5 years) this term should be. The voting members of the faculty—minus the DEO—also vote on the following question: If the current DEO does not continue for another term, should the next DEO be sought from within the department’s faculty (“internal search”) or should the next DEO be sought via a nationally and internationally advertised “external search” for a new faculty member to serve as the next DEO. All these votes are taken by secret ballot. The advisory committee calls special meetings of the voting members of the faculty as needed in the course of the review process. These meetings are chaired by the chair of the advisory committee and are not attended by the DEO. The advisory committee administers the above voting process. The outcome of the review process is a review (for each of the above three audiences) that consists of the above written summaries together with the tallies of the above votes. This review is communicated to each of the above three audiences. In particular, the review and votes are the department’s recommendations to the Dean.

### **3.6 Change of leadership**

It is ultimately the Deans decision whether the current DEO may continue for another term and, if the current DEO does not continue for another term, whether to conduct an internal search or an external search.

A search for a new DEO, internal or external, often extends past the current DEO’s term. In any such circumstance, the Dean typically appoints an interim DEO to serve during the search. If this search is protracted, the interim DEO may serve two or more interim terms, or there may be successive interim DEOs.

An external search for a DEO is conducted by a search committee appointed by and answerable to the Dean. The external search committee is typically chaired by a non-computer science professor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and it otherwise typically consists of faculty members in computer science. Procedures for this search are determined by the Dean and the chair of the external search committee.

At the Dean’s discretion, an internal search for a DEO may follow the same structure as that outlined for external searches above, or it may be car-

ried out according to the following computer science department guidelines. The internal search is coordinated by an advisory committee. If the internal search follows right after a review of the DEO, then this same advisory committee coordinates the internal search. Otherwise, the a new advisory committee is formed with the same composition and selection process as that described above for DEO reviews. The function of the advisory committee is then to coordinate a process by which the department faculty recommends a slate of DEO candidates to the Dean. To this end, the advisory committee elects a chair from among its members and compiles an initial slate of nominees after consulting the faculty. Nominees in this initial slate will all be tenured, voting members of the faculty whose appointments are 100% computer science, and, barring unusual circumstances, they will have the rank of professor. The initial slate of nominees includes all such faculty members who have been nominated by either the advisory committee or by any voting member of the computer science department faculty. Once the initial slate has been formed, the advisory committee administers the following two votes, both by secret ballot with all voting members of the computer science faculty eligible to vote.

1. The first ballot contains the initial slate of nominees, each with the question “Would this person be an acceptable DEO?” Each voting member of the faculty may vote yes, no, or abstain, on each nominee.
2. The second ballot consists of those nominees in the initial slate who received at least 1.5 times as many “yes” votes as “no” votes in vote 1 above, together with the instruction “Vote for each nominee who would be an excellent DEO.”

The final slate of DEO candidates recommended to the Dean consists of the two (or, in case of a close vote, three) nominees receiving the highest number of votes on the second ballot. The advisory committee calls special meetings of the voting members of the faculty as needed in the course of the internal search and reports the final slate of DEO candidates, along with the numbers of votes that they received in vote 2 above, to the department faculty and to the Dean. No member of the advisory committee who turns out to be in the final slate of candidates is eligible to participate in the preparation or transmission of this report.

## 4 Department committees

### 4.1 Role of committees

To help in governing the department, various committees along with their duties are listed in this section. These committees are appointed by the DEO and serve as advisory committees to the DEO and members of the faculty. However, if the DEO changes a decision made by a committee, a written document is to be submitted to each member of the committee stating reasons for the change. Such written documents should be made available to all members of the faculty.

### 4.2 Standing committees

- **ABET, Continuous Improvement, and Assessment Committee** Their general responsibilities include managing all aspects of departmental assessment.
- **Colloquium Committee** The colloquium committee shall be chosen from the voting members of the faculty. Their general responsibilities include establishing a colloquium schedule each semester (fall and spring) and inviting speakers to present their ongoing research work. Speakers may be drawn from the computer science department faculty and graduate students, from faculty in other departments, or from other institutions. Consultation with the faculty search committee is required to schedule colloquiums for visiting candidates for faculty positions. Where necessary, this committee should work with the administrative assistant to ensure that out-of-town speakers are reimbursed for their expenses or paid a designated honorarium.
- **Curriculum Committee** The curriculum committee is responsible for approving new experimental courses and approving dual-listing proposals (for combined 400/500-level courses).
- **Diversity Committee** Their general responsibilities include gathering data about student diversity, proposing recruitment and retention actions to foster diversity, and organizing trip to GHC (Grace Hopper Celebration of Women in Computing).

- **Equipment and Space Committee** The equipment and space committee shall be chosen from the members of the faculty with the chair being a voting member of the faculty. Members of the software support group may also be included in this committee. Their general responsibilities include dealing with the acquisition, maintenance, disposal, utilization, and the security of the departmental equipment, advising the DEO on space utilization in the building where the department is housed, and serving as an advisory council to establish policies governing the activities of the software support group. They also monitor computer and related equipment needs and prepare CAC requests.
- **Faculty, Staff, and Alumni Recognition and Awards Committee** Their general responsibilities include nominating faculty and staff for internal awards and nominating faculty for awards and advancements in professional societies.
- **Faculty Governance Committee** Their general responsibilities include organizing, maintaining, and proposing updates to faculty governance documents.
- **Faculty Search Committee** The faculty search committee shall be chosen from the voting members of the faculty. The DEO shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. The general responsibilities of this committee are specified in the section on Hiring Procedures.
- **Graduate Admissions Committee** The graduate admissions committee shall be chosen from the voting members of the faculty. Their general responsibilities include attracting domestic and international applicants to the graduate program, reviewing applications to the graduate program, making recommendations as to type of admission, TA award and PACE award, and organizing a regional recruitment program.
- **Graduate Committee** The graduate committee shall be chosen from the voting members of the faculty. The DEO shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. Their general responsibilities include dealing with issues involving the graduate curriculum and serving as a selection committee for various graduate fellowships and awards. Some of the typical charges of this committee include evaluation of academic progress

of graduate students, overseeing and evaluation of doctoral qualifying exams, and periodically reviewing the graduate curriculum and rules, monitoring graduate student progress and suitability for TAs, and processing proposals for graduate classes.

- **Grievance Committee** Their general responsibilities include supervising the process for student, faculty, and staff grievances.
- **Industry Partnership Committee** Their general responsibilities include fostering faculty-industry collaborations, meeting with company representatives, soliciting donations and funding, and seeking student internships.
- **Library Liaison** The library liaison shall be chosen from the members of the faculty. The liaison's general responsibilities include representing the department's interests regarding university library decisions such as acquisitions, journal subscriptions and discontinuations, etc., and keeping the department faculty informed of changes to university library procedures.
- **Outreach Committee** Their general responsibilities include implementing recruitment and outreach activities and organizing Computational Thinking Workshops.
- **Promotion and Tenure Committee** The structure of promotion and tenure committees and their charges are specified in Appendix A, Computer Science Department Promotion and Tenure Procedures.
- **PRS Mediation Committee** At the beginning of each academic year the voting members of the Computer Science faculty elect a person with professor rank to serve as the "third member" of any PRS mediation committee(s) that need to be formed during that year.
- **Teaching Evaluations and Mentoring Committee** Their general responsibilities include managing class visits and reports for faculty undergoing evaluations, and managing mentoring for Assistant and Associate Professors.
- **Undergraduate Committee** The undergraduate committee shall be chosen from the members of the faculty, with the chair being a voting

member of the faculty. The DEO and academic advisers shall be non-voting ex-officio members. Their general responsibilities include dealing with issues involving the undergraduate curriculum, requirements for the baccalaureate degree, and requirements for accreditation. Some of the typical charges of this committee include planning undergraduate requirements for the catalog, reviewing the numbering of courses, reviewing the status of cross-listed courses, serving as a screening body for new course proposals, serving as a selection committee for undergraduate scholarship awards, managing undergraduate petitions, nominating undergraduate students for awards, and processing proposals for undergraduate classes.

- **Webmaster** TBD

### **4.3 Ad hoc committees**

From time to time the DEO may nominate members of the faculty to serve on ad hoc committees.

## **5 Position responsibilities**

Policies and procedures for the Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) are completely specified by LAS and the Faculty Handbook. One operational matter here is that, at the beginning of each academic year, the voting members of the Computer Science faculty elect a person with professor rank to serve as the “third member” of any mediation committee(s) that need to be formed during that year.

## **6 Promotion and tenure**

### **6.1 Criteria**

A recommendation by the department that a faculty member be awarded tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to professor requires a clear demonstration that the faculty members scholarly achievements have elevated the stature of the department and university as research and edu-

cational institutions and that the faculty members future achievements are very likely to continue doing so.

A case that the above criteria have been met uses several types of evidence. These include publications in peer-reviewed, reputable journals and conference proceedings; peer-reviewed external funding; direction of graduate student or postdoctoral scholarship; external peer evaluations of the quantity, quality, and impact of the faculty members scholarship; and classroom teaching evaluations. Additional types of evidence such as awards, patents, citation counts, editorships, book publications, invited lectures, non-peer-reviewed external funding, service in professional organizations, and supervision of undergraduate scholarship, may also contribute to the case.

The Faculty Handbook specifies some general criteria, applicable to all fields, for promotions to associate professor and professor. Additions and emphases for computer science include the following. A faculty members scholarship may well be interdisciplinary. Tenure and promotion to associate professor require a sustained record of scholarship, with external recognition of its importance, along with good classroom instruction and department service. Significant graduate student supervision and some peer-reviewed funding are ordinarily also part of a successful case. Promotion to professor requires a sustained record of scholarship since the last promotion that has elevated the faculty member to national or international prominence as a scholar. This ordinarily includes high-impact publications, substantial peer-reviewed external funding, significant additional evidence of national or international prominence, and successful supervision of multiple PhD students. Good classroom instruction and service to the university at both department and college or university levels are also required.

## **6.2 Procedures**

### **6.2.1 Introduction**

This section covers procedures within the Computer Science Department related to promotion, tenure, and renewal of term appointments. It is subservient to the university level and college level documents and where it fails to address issues or prescribe procedures, the latter documents prevail. The Computer Science Department maintains a broad program of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. An appreciation of this is needed as background for the promotion and tenure policy of the department. Teach-



ing duties may include undergraduate or graduate level courses for either majors or non-majors. Research and scholarship may include among other things research and the guidance of graduate student research. Service may include consulting on and off campus as well as participation on department, college, and university committees.

### 6.2.2 Standards for promotion and tenure

Evaluation of faculty for promotion, tenure, or probationary reappointment shall be based on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching and research. The faculty member will demonstrate evidence of excellence in at least one of the two areas. A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement, which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) institutional service. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member's scholarly achievements. A strong sense of professional ethics must be exhibited in all three areas covered in the position responsibility statement.

**Teaching** Faculty typically teach at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and in both major and supporting courses. Excellence in teaching is based on classroom effectiveness and innovation in pedagogical practices and techniques, publication in educational journals and conference proceedings, and the record of extramural funding to support instruction. Work must be recognized and appreciated by both students and peers at Iowa State University. It must also include external peer recognition of leadership in computer science education and in the development of pedagogical practices and techniques.

**Research** Both experimental and theoretical research are encouraged. Excellence in research and scholarship is based on the publication of results in reputable journals and conference proceedings, the record of extramural research funding, and the direction of graduate student research. Work must be recognized by peers, both internal and external to ISU, as being scholarly and important contributions to the body of knowledge in the discipline of computer science. Promotion to Associate Professor requires a sustained record of contribution, recognized for its importance, along with high promise of continued development and expectations of normal progress toward full professorship. Promotion to Full Professorship requires a sustained record

of contribution that has a recognized important impact on the discipline of computer science and establishes the candidate as a nationally recognized expert.

**Service** Service is encouraged at the department, college, university, state, national, and international levels. While all faculty are expected to participate in departmental service, less is typically expected of junior non-tenured faculty.

### **6.2.3 Relevant Committees**

The departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) consists of those individuals franchised to vote on promotion and tenure issues (see Subsection 6.2.8). Its composition will vary depending on the proposed rank of the individual under consideration. An associated Steering Committee is created to guide the departmental promotion and tenure process. The precise composition and functions of the PTC and the Steering Committee are described below.

The Steering Committee shall normally consist of four full professors and one associate professor who are tenured in computer science and receive at least 25% of their support from the department teaching or research budget. The Departmental Executive Officer (DEO) is not eligible to be a member of the Steering Committee. The four full professor members are elected by the faculty of full professors. In the event that there is a shortfall of full professors in the department to fill the committee, the faculty of full professors shall elect tenured full professors with less than 25% appointment in the department or elect one or more full professors from other departments to serve on the Steering Committee. The associate professor member shall be elected by the faculty of associate professors in the department. In the event that there are no associate professors, the slot will be left vacant.

Unless qualified, the term “faculty” in this section shall be taken to mean tenure-eligible faculty in computer science.

The functions of the Steering Committee are to:

- Screen the faculty for eligibility for promotion, tenure, and reappointment.
- Assist the DEO in preparation of recommendations for promotion and tenure.

- Present these recommendations to the PTC for review, possible modification, and formal vote.

The Steering Committee does not take a vote of its members on promotion or tenure cases. Its members only vote on cases as part of the PTC.

#### **6.2.4 Action List**

Each spring, the department chairperson shall cause the formation of a Steering Committee, which in turn shall elect its own chairperson. Prior to August 23 of each year, this committee shall examine the list of faculty other than tenured full professors to determine who is to be considered for promotion, tenure, or reappointment. The Steering Committee will request each such faculty member to submit a resume, as described in the following section, for this purpose. A faculty member whose consideration for promotion, tenure, or reappointment is not mandatory may decline to be considered and thus not submit a resume. The names so selected shall be placed on the Action List. An individual whose consideration is mandated by university regulations will automatically be placed on the Action List. Mandated cases can only be postponed and removed from the Action List by a written request from the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. A member of the faculty may request to be included in the action list by providing the relevant information in writing to the Steering Committee by September 1. The DEO may also add names to the Action List. An individual who is placed on this list will be hereafter referred to as a “candidate”.

#### **6.2.5 Resume**

The resume submitted to the Steering Committee as in the preceding section must be a normal professional curriculum vitae documenting the activities of the individual in relevant areas. It should not include personal data such as marital status, names of family members, etc. The resume must include the following:

- Name, university appointment data including ranks and dates, ranks on graduate faculty and dates, and academic and professional history.
- Brief description of the candidate’s current research and a history of external research funding.

- Complete citation of publications in journals and conference proceedings and a list of all invited papers and talks. As supplementary information, the candidate shall describe the selection process (e.g. refereed, juried, etc.) and provide other relevant information such as program committee membership and acceptance ratios, if available.
- A list of courses taught over the last five years, including the number of students. A list of students who have been directed in research by the candidate, including both graduate and undergraduate students, and the degrees received, with dates.
- A list of consulting activities and any other evidence of creative scholarly activity.
- A list of POS committees on which the candidate has served.
- A list of service activities including dates performed by the candidate for the department, college, university and relevant outside organizations, including advising and committee work.
- Professional activities including journals reviews, manuscript reviews, research reviews, editorships, offices in professional associations.
- Any other information that the candidate deems to be important.

### **6.2.6 Notification and appeal**

By September 8, the Steering Committee shall notify those individuals whose names were placed on the Action List and also those individuals who requested consideration but whose names were not placed on the Action List. A faculty member may appeal his or her candidacy status in writing to the Steering Committee within seven days. Such an appeal will result in adhering to the wishes of the individual except when university rules mandate consideration.

### **6.2.7 Promotion and tenure recommendation**

Under the guidance of the Steering Committee, a P&T Recommendation will be prepared for each candidate. In keeping with university directives, this

recommendation must document the candidate's history of activity in teaching, scholarship, and service. The P&T Recommendation will be prepared based on the following:

- The candidate's resume.
- External letters of reference that evaluate the candidate's creative scholarship. A minimum of two of these letters will come from individuals selected from a preliminary list of four or more (at the Steering Committee's discretion) individuals provided by the candidate.
- The faculty member's teaching portfolio.
- The faculty member's set of position responsibility statements.
- Any other material gathered and deemed relevant by the Steering Committee such as evaluation reports, observation of performance by peers, and letters of reference from former students that document the candidate's teaching abilities.

The candidate shall be required to explicitly sign a document indicating either "waiver" or "non-waiver" of access to external letters of reference. Upon soliciting external letters, referees will be informed as to whether or not the candidate has waived the right of access. Letters of reference may not be reused in a later year.

Prior to the deliberations of the PTC, the candidate shall review the factual portions of the P&T Recommendation for accuracy, except for those portions for which right of access has been waived, and any inaccuracies will be corrected. This corrected P&T Recommendation will be submitted to the PTC at least five working days before the PTC meets to discuss a candidate.

### **6.2.8 Promotion and tenure committee**

For tenure or promotion to the rank of full professor, the PTC shall consist of all tenured full professors. This same committee will also act on the probationary reappointment of non-tenured professors. For tenure or promotion to the rank of associate or full professor, the PTC shall consist of all tenured associate and full professors in the department. In the event that there are fewer than three eligible individuals, the outside members serving on the Steering Committee will also serve on the PTC.

The DEO will preside over the deliberations of each respective PTC. In the event of multiple candidates, each case will be handled independently, with order determined by an alphabetized list of last names. The committee shall concern itself with faculty members on an individual basis and shall recommend for or against promotion in each case independent of the number of cases being considered or the number of faculty at a given rank.

The Chair of the Steering Committee will present the P&T Recommendation to the PTC. Members of the PTC shall have prior access to the entire file of information gathered on each candidate. After presentation and discussion, the PTC will vote by secret ballot on promotion and tenure. The DEO will not vote. Absentee votes will be accepted only by unanimous consent of those present and eligible to vote. An affirmative vote for promotion and tenure requires a simple majority of those present, provided a quorum of 2/3 of those in residence and eligible to vote is present. Any voting member wishing to file a minority report must notify the PTC immediately following the vote. Any minority reports proposed to be forwarded to the College shall also be completed within three working days and shall be presented to the PTC. The PTC shall have the opportunity to forward its review of the minority report.

If the vote is unfavorable, the candidate may ask within five working days for a hearing before the PTC for purposes of reconsideration.

Based on the deliberations of the PTC, the DEO will revise the P&T recommendations and reconvene the Steering Committee for any discussion and further modifications. After final approval, the DEO will inform the candidate in writing of the vote and discuss with the candidate the entire P&T Recommendation, appropriately edited to preserve anonymity where access rights have been waived, and then forward it to the Dean of the college.

### **6.2.9 Evaluation by the DEO and higher administration**

The DEO will provide a separate evaluation of the candidate to the college and shall inform the PTC of the evaluation except in extraordinary circumstances as agreed to by the Dean of the college.

After the P&T recommendation has been forwarded to the college, the DEO shall in a timely manner inform the candidate of all subsequent recommendations and decisions by higher administration unless such disclosure is expressly precluded by the Dean of the college.

### **6.2.10 Joint appointments**

Candidates holding appointments with another academic department shall be considered for promotion, tenure, and reappointment using the normal procedures in the respective departments. A common set of promotion and tenure recommendations shall be prepared and used by both departments.

### **6.2.11 Conflict of Interest**

An individual who has a conflict of interest in the consideration of a candidate for promotion, tenure, or probationary reappointment is ineligible to participate in any discussion, deliberations or votes with respect to that particular candidate. The associate professor member of the Steering Committee may not participate in the consideration of his or her own candidacy. A member of the PTC who is related to or has an affectional affiliation with a candidate is ineligible to participate in any aspect of the considerations with regard to that candidate.

### **6.2.12 Review and modification**

Annually, the Steering Committee shall review this departmental P&T Document and recommend any modifications to the entire body of tenure-track faculty. Modifications may also be proposed by any faculty member. Proposed modifications shall be distributed in writing at least five working days before the faculty meeting. Modification requires two-thirds majority of those present provided a quorum of two-thirds of those eligible to vote is present.

## **7 Post-tenure review**

### **7.1 General principles**

This section establishes goals, procedures, and safeguards for the post-tenure review (PTR) process of the Department of Computer Science. The objective is a PTR process that is fair, objective, respectful of the rights and privileges of tenure, and not unduly bureaucratic or burdensome. The PTR process is a peer-review process by and for tenured faculty that neither encroaches upon nor augments the prerogatives of the DEO nor duplicates the duties of

the DEO with regard to tenured faculty. Rather the PTR process provides information to the reviewed faculty member and ISU administrators.

The policy of the Department of Computer Science is that PTR shall be a positive process of creative self-renewal for the tenured faculty member. Creative renewal shall be accomplished through a review that respects the right of each tenured faculty member to exercise personal choice over scholarly activities, within the general bounds of professional conduct. The PTR process shall be conducted in a manner that reaffirms the dignity and honor of the academic profession and the personal and professional respect to which a tenured faculty member is entitled.

Toward these ends, the department hereby reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom and to the institution of tenure. Specifically, this department reaffirms its adherence to the principles established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in its 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, its 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, its 1983 policy on post-tenure review, and its 1999 reaffirmation of that policy. Where conflicts exist or arise between this department's PTR policy or procedures and these AAUP documents, the latter shall prevail. As the 1999 AAUP reaffirmation states, post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from university administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained).

## **7.2 Timeline**

Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed with the frequency and time constraints specified in the Faculty Handbook. In the fall of each academic year the DEO will notify each faculty member who is scheduled for a PTR, providing him or her with a copy of this document and instructions to trigger the formation of the Advisory Panel described in the following section.

## **7.3 Advisory panel**

Each PTR shall be conducted by an Advisory Panel. The panel shall consist of three members, all of whom shall hold tenured faculty appointments in any case, and none of whom shall hold an administrative appointment, unless the faculty member requests otherwise. The chair of the Advisory Panel shall



be selected by the faculty member under review; a second member shall be selected by the DEO from a list of six submitted by the faculty member; and the third member shall be selected by the two previously selected members from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

Upon completion of the appointment process, each panel member shall individually communicate to the DEO in writing that said panel member has no conflict of interest in participating in the review process for the faculty member under review.

The faculty member may include in the above list a faculty member from outside the member's home department, including, in special cases, from another university. In all cases, however, the panel members shall possess relevant knowledge and experience in the general field or in the area of the individual member's specialization and shall be demonstrably capable of fair and impartial judgment toward the individual under review.

#### **7.4 Performance standards**

The performance of the faculty member under review must be assessed with respect to standards that are fair and reasonable and that are appropriate to the individual and the department. The level of expected performance used to judge the performance of the individual in any year must be consistent with the individual's applicable PRS in effect for each of the years under review. Exercise of academic freedom (e.g., choice of research topics or teaching methods) may never be a basis for unfavorable review. Finally, the faculty member is at all times entitled to presumption of competence; the burden of proof for any contrary finding by the Advisory Panel must lie with the Advisory Panel.

#### **7.5 Review process**

After the Advisory Panel has been selected, the faculty member and Advisory Panel will begin the PTR process by reviewing the faculty member's PRS and annual activity reports and evaluations since the member's most recent review or promotion. If the faculty member and Advisory Panel jointly identify one or more areas in which the faculty member wishes deeper review or more extensive advice, then the faculty member and the Advisory Panel will undertake this deeper review in accordance with the following procedures and constraints.

### **7.5.1 Review of teaching**

A deeper review of teaching may consider the complete range of evidence available. While student evaluations should be included, sole or even predominant reliance shall not be placed on this one source. Rather, the entire portfolio of teaching material may be examined, including but not limited to syllabi, examinations, homework exercises, writing assignments, textbooks, and student research papers. Measurements of actual student performance may be included and compared to established standards appropriate to the course(s) in question. When appropriate, opinions may be sought from teaching assistants and other colleagues who have taught the same or similar courses, both for their assessment of the work of the individual under review and for an understanding of the demands of the teaching environment. The faculty member being reviewed may request classroom visits by one or more members of the Advisory Panel.

### **7.5.2 Review of research**

The standards and methods used to review research must respect the right of the tenured faculty member to select his or her own research topics and to pursue these topics thoroughly over the course of a research career. Emphasis in the review must be placed on the overall intellectual merit of the research program and not on quarterly or even annual output flow or on commercial or pecuniary gain. The research standards must be appropriate to the computer science discipline and to the faculty member's field(s) of specialization.

Members of the Advisory Panel are expected to familiarize themselves with and evaluate the faculty member's entire body of intellectual inquiry. At the discretion of the faculty member under review, the assessments of the panel members may be supplemented with the opinions of scholars of the faculty member's choosing from outside the panel.

The faculty member's record of securing research funding shall be evaluated only insofar as such funding is needed to enable the faculty member to carry out his or her responsibilities consistent with his or her applicable PRS. If such research funding has not been secured, a demonstrated good faith effort to obtain such funding shall be an adequate defense to a finding that such funding has not been obtained.

## **7.6 Summary report**

The final report of the Advisory Panel will summarize the faculty member's overall performance as "meeting expectations" or "below expectations", with possible consequences as stated in the Faculty Handbook. The criteria for a "below expectations" finding are the same as those for "unacceptable performance of duty" (a finding that can lead to termination of employment) in the Faculty Handbook.

## **7.7 Due process**

The faculty member shall have the right to receive copies of all written and other materials considered. The faculty member shall have the right to present his or her personal testimony and the testimony of any witnesses the member chooses. The faculty member shall have the right to know the identity of any witness, to review and respond to all testimony taken from the witness, and to put questions to the witness. The Advisory Panel shall prepare an initial report of findings that shall be made available for review of the faculty member under review. The Advisory Panel shall then prepare a revised final draft accounting for, or responding to, the faculty member's feedback.

## **7.8 After the review**

### **7.8.1 Consequences**

The PTR does not change the circumstances under which a tenured faculty member may be dismissed from the university. Grounds for dismissal remain those listed in the Faculty Handbook under Faculty Dismissal Procedures. Moreover, the Advisory Panel shall not recommend any dismissal, demotion, revocation of tenure, reduction in salary, reduction or removal of perquisites, withholding or denial of leave or other privileges, increase in teaching or other workload, withholding or denial of promotion, reduction in financial or staff support for research, teaching or extension duties, or other adverse personnel action.

### **7.8.2 Dissemination**

The faculty member shall receive copies of all findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Advisory Panel and, on request, of any written evidence on which they are based. Neither the findings, conclusions, nor recommendations of the Advisory Panel, nor the evidence on which they are based shall be circulated to anyone other than those specified by the university PTR policy without the advance written permission of the faculty member being reviewed. In the event of release of a portion of the PTR file by the faculty member being reviewed to someone other than those specified by the university PTR policy, the department may release the entire file to said individual or individuals; it being the intention that the PTR file is not to be circulated beyond the specifically identified parties.

### **7.8.3 Right of appeal**

A faculty member shall have the right to comment, in writing or otherwise, in response to a PTR, to challenge the process or findings, and to correct the underlying record. The faculty member shall have a reasonable period, not less than twenty working days, in which to respond to the findings of the Advisory Panel, and the Advisory Panel can revise its document in the light of the response. If the faculty member still believes that the Advisory Panel has not followed due process, or if the faculty member disagrees with the record, findings, or recommendations, he or she may appeal by following the appeal processes as described in the Faculty Handbook.

Nothing in the PTR process shall be interpreted or construed so as to deny, limit, modify, compromise, revoke, or supersede any faculty rights, privileges, or protections, whether procedural, substantive, or appellate, as may have been or in the future may be established under Iowa State University policies or procedures or state or federal statutes or regulations.

## **8 Hiring procedures**

Subsection 8.1 below concerns minimum qualifications for both tenure-eligible (TE) faculty positions and non-tenure-eligible (NTE) faculty positions. The remainder of this section details hiring procedures for tenure-eligible faculty members other than the DEO. Hiring procedures for the DEO are discussed

in Section 33, and hiring procedures for NTE faculty are discussed in Section 9.

## **8.1 Minimum qualifications**

The ISU Department of Computer Science maintains high standards for the qualifications of individuals hired as faculty members, both TE and NTE. Candidates for faculty positions are expected to have outstanding qualifications in their fields of expertise. For TE faculty these qualifications normally include a PhD in computer science or a related discipline and a record of achievement that justifies a faculty appointment at a research university. For NTE faculty these qualifications normally include an MS or a PhD in computer science or a related discipline or professional experience indicating equivalent knowledge of computer science. Any candidate who does not meet these minimum standards will not be considered for a faculty appointment, unless the department deems it necessary to seek a waiver for that candidate as detailed in the following paragraph.

The search committee and the DEO will determine whether or not a waiver should be sought and, if so, will submit the question to the department. If a majority of the department faculty who are eligible to vote on this hire vote in favor, the chair will forward a waiver request, with a justification for the waiver, to the Dean. In the case of faculty appointments where no search committee is used, the DEO will meet with the directors of undergraduate and graduate education to consider whether to proceed with the request for a waiver. If a majority of that group decides to proceed, the request will be made, with a justification for the waiver, to the Dean. The Dean may recommend to the provost that a waiver be granted.

## **8.2 Procedures**

At the beginning of each academic year, the DEO will appoint a Faculty Search Committee, consisting of voting members of the faculty. The DEO will inform the search committee of open positions as they arise.

In consultation with the faculty, the search committee will advertise vacant positions in appropriate professional media. A file typically consisting of a resume, letters of recommendation, and other evidence of professional merit will be compiled for each candidate. These files will be available to all voting members of the faculty who wish to review them. In all matters

concerning hiring, the affirmative action policies of the university will be followed.

Normally the search committee will select some number of candidates from among the applicants to invite to campus for an interview. Upon visiting the department, each candidate will typically meet interested faculty, administrators, and often students. The candidate will also give a seminar to faculty and students. Following the visit, all voting members of the faculty will be invited to comment on the candidate and to express their preferences among candidates. If necessary, a secret ballot may be held following the candidates' visit. The voting members of the faculty may choose to vote on recommendations at a regular faculty meeting. Such a meeting will be called by the search committee on the basis of individual recommendations and comments by the faculty.

## 9 Non-tenure-eligible faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty positions at the Department of Computer Science are *lecturer* and *senior lecturer*. These are term appointments eligible for renewal, reappointment, and promotion (from lecturer to senior lecturer) based upon the quality of performance and the continuing needs of the department and subject to approval by the College of Liberal Arts and Science and Iowa State University. No policies described in this document take precedence over those of college or university policies on non-tenure-track faculty members.

The PRS for each lecturer and senior lecturer includes expectations regarding his or her teaching. The PRS does not enumerate specific courses and will be flexible, to allow course reassignments. Lecturers are expected to teach only undergraduate courses, whereas senior lecturers with a PhD degree or equivalent experience may teach graduate courses. To facilitate reviews, a *Lecturer Review Committee* (LRC) consisting of three tenure track faculty members, with one of them designated as its chair, is appointed by the DEO.

Lecturers are initially appointed by the DEO with the recommendation of the LRC followed by college approval. Semester-to-semester or year-to-year renewal for a maximum of two years is done by the DEO with the Colleges approval. Lecturer terms are limited to three years and must be reappointed following the same procedure as their initial term, except for the nature of material to be prepared by the lecturer.

After six years (six and a half years if hired in the spring semester) of accumulated service, lecturers with outstanding qualifications are eligible to be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. The procedure for recommendation for promotion follows the College yearly timetable and guidelines. It is initiated in the fall semester and completed in the following spring semester. At the department level, the procedure requires the participation of the DEO, the LRC, and the tenure track faculty. The final approval takes place at the college and university levels. A senior lecturer is appointed for a term of two to five years, after which a reappointment must be sought to continue to another term. Although yearly renewal within a term is automatic, the appointment can be terminated with a one-year notice given no later than May 31. After such notice, the senior lecturer can serve for the following academic year.

The details of the procedures for the review of lecturers and senior lecturers are covered below. The details of compilation of materials are included in Section 9.7.

## **9.1 Lecturer hiring**

Lecturer hiring is conducted by LRC and DEO. Lecturers are hired with the recommendations of the LRC. The DEO approves all lecturer hires and seeks College approval.

## **9.2 Lecturer renewal**

Lecturer renewal is conducted by the DEO. Lecturers hired for one semester in the fall term will be considered automatically for renewal for the following spring term, based on departmental staffing needs. Lecturers hired for the academic year and those hired for one semester for the spring term will be considered for renewal for the following year upon written request and presentation of a resume and self-evaluation statement by the candidate by April 1. The DEO will make a decision about renewal and inform the candidate by May 1.

## **9.3 Lecturer reappointment**

Lecturer reappointment is conducted by the LRC and DEO. Lecturers in their third year of service will be eligible for reappointment starting the following

year. The criteria for reappointment at the rank of lecturer are:

- demonstrated teaching success in the area or areas specified by the PRS, with potential for excellence; and
- evidence of ongoing professional development (e.g., participation in conferences, CTE forums, teaching in learning communities, acquiring new programming skills).

A candidate should either give a written notice by November 1 to the DEO that he or she does not wish to be reappointed or submit the documentation specified in Section 9.7 to the DEO by November 1 to be considered for reappointment.

For each reappointment candidate, the LRC will provide a recommendation to the DEO for or against reappointment, along with an evaluative report that specifies strengths and weaknesses and suggests how the candidate might prepare for the promotion to senior lecturer. The DEO will forward the committee recommendations together with his or her recommendation to the college for approval. The DEO will notify each candidate of the result of the review by April 1.

Because the criteria for promotion to senior lecturer requires teaching in more than one course, reappointed lecturers may request such opportunities from the DEO.

#### **9.4 Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer**

Promotion of lecturers is conducted by the LRC, tenure track faculty, DEO, and LAS. A vote by the tenure track faculty is required to hire at the senior lecturer level. A senior lecturer should have at least six years of prior accumulated service as a lecturer. The DEO may negotiate with each lecturer any prior years of service (up to a maximum of five) to be counted toward the six years. During the sixth year (or sixth and a half year for those hired in a spring semester) of accumulated service, lecturers with outstanding qualifications are eligible to be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. Consideration or recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer are based not only upon performance but also upon programmatic needs of the department in certain curricular areas of specialization. Thus, in a given year, a well-qualified lecturer might become eligible for promotion to senior lecturer, but because of budgetary constraints or lack of programmatic need,



the department might have no openings at that time. In such a case, the department would be unable to consider or advance a lecturer to the rank of senior lecturer.

The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are:

- demonstrated excellence in teaching in all courses taught;
- evidence of ongoing professional development (e.g., participation in conferences, CTE forums, teaching in learning communities, acquiring new programming skills);
- evidence of teaching-related institutional service (e.g., committees, ad-hoc work groups, extra-departmental university service, coaching programming teams);
- demonstration of activities that impact education beyond the classroom (e.g., publishing in educational forums, achieving national or international reputation, securing peer-reviewed educational funding, publishing textbooks, developing software).

For promotion review, the candidate should submit the documents listed in Section 9.7 to the DEO by November 1.

The LRC will collate the required material, add its assessment of the candidate, and present it to the department tenure track faculty, who will vote on the recommendation. The DEO will forward the faculty recommendation together with his or her own recommendation to the college for review and approval. The DEO will notify each candidate of the results of the promotion review by May 1. The term of appointment of a senior lecturer is from two to five years.

## **9.5 Senior lecturer renewal**

Senior lecturer renewal is conducted by the DEO. Although yearly renewal within a term is automatic, the appointment can be terminated with a one-year notice given no later than May 31. After such notice, the senior lecturer can serve for the following academic year.

## **9.6 Senior lecturer reappointment**

The procedure and document requirements are the same as those for promotion to senior lecturer.

## 9.7 Preparation of documents

<https://las.iastate.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-governance/> is a link to LAS documents regarding policies and procedures that are relevant in non-tenure track faculty matters, including the document titled *Promotion to Senior Lecturer (PSL)*.

Although at the college level, the PSL document is deployed only for promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, subsets of this document are used by the department for various purposes. Therefore, the DEO, the LRC, and the candidates should familiarize themselves with PSL.

### 9.7.1 Initial hiring of a lecturer

The minimum requirement is a resume from the candidate. Additional documents may be specified by the DEO or the LRC.

### 9.7.2 Renewal of a lecturer

For renewal within a term, Sections 1 and 2 of PSL should be compiled by the candidate and handed over to the DEO.

### 9.7.3 Reappointment of a lecturer

The material to be prepared by the candidate consists of:

1. Sections 1 and 2 of PSL.
2. Syllabi, sample assignments and tests, as well as samples of graded student work for each course taught during the past five years.
3. Three letters consisting of observations of teaching solicited by the candidate from department and university colleagues. All these letters should be collated by the candidate and handed over to the LRC.

A recommendation should be completed along Section 3 of the PSL by the LRC for the benefit of the DEO. No faculty review is required.

### 9.7.4 Promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer

The PSL should be followed in its entirety. The material to be prepared by the candidate consists of:

1. Sections 1 and 2 of PSL.
2. Syllabi, sample assignments and tests, as well as samples of graded student work for each course taught during and up to the past five years.

The candidate may include additional material in support of his or her case. All such material should be collated by the candidate and handed over to the LRC. The LRC should add two or more letters from department tenure track faculty solicited on his or her behalf in last 18 months. These letters should include observations of teaching, professional development, and service. The LRC should verify the information in Sections 1 and 2 and describe its recommendation in Section 3 of the PSL. All documents should be placed in a folder and made available for the review of tenure track faculty and subsequently seek their vote. It should be kept in mind that that the faculty on LRC can vote either in an LRC meeting or the faculty meeting, but not both. After entering the result of the faculty vote, the LRC hands over the PSL to the DEO, who enters his or her own recommendation in Part II of PSL. The PSL, including appendices, requires serial numbering of pages and recommends the inclusion of a table of contents. The DEO forwards the completed PSL document electronically to the College. Usually the PSL is due at the college in early February (the College's deadline for submission to the University is in early March).

#### **9.7.5 Reappointment of a senior lecturer**

The documents are same as those for promotion to senior lecturer.

### **9.8 Helpful hints for LRC and DEO**

The DEO and the LRC should review the PSL and the timetable in early fall for all types of appointments, renewals, reappointments, and promotions.

The materials submitted by a candidate, in addition to the PSL or its subset, are sometimes massive. In case of a positive outcome, the additional materials can be returned to the candidate; they can reuse its parts in the future. If the outcome is not positive, a decision should be made by the DEO and the LRC as to what is to be done with the material.

## **10 Appeals**

Any voting member of the faculty may file an appeal on any matter within the mandate of the appropriate committee. All such appeals shall be discussed first with the committee and, if a resolution is not reached, with the DEO and the committee. If both of these fail, the voting members of the faculty shall resolve the matter by majority vote at a regular faculty meeting.

An individual student may file an appeal on any matter within the mandate of the appropriate committee. All such appeals shall be discussed first with the committee and then, if a resolution is not reached, with the DEO and the committee, whose joint decision shall be final.

## **11 Changes to this document**

Any voting member of the faculty may submit a written proposal for a change in the governance document. Such a proposal should be discussed in a faculty meeting and will be adopted if approved by a majority of the entire voting faculty.