

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES**  
**Iowa State University**  
**BASIC GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT**  
**(Last revised December 2018)**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Preamble</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>I. Department Membership</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Duties of the Chair</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Selection, Substitution, and Replacement of the Chair</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. The Department Meeting</b> .....	<b>5</b>
A. Rights of Members on Leave .....	5
B. Quorum.....	5
C. Scheduling of Meetings.....	5
D. Majority Rule.....	5
E. Procedure for Challenge by Absent Members.....	5
F. Procedure if Chair Cannot Attend a Meeting.....	6
G. Voting By the Chair .....	6
<b>V. Committees</b> .....	<b>6</b>
A. Formation of Committees.....	6
B. Voting in Committees.....	6
C. Standing Committees.....	6
D. Ad Hoc Committees .....	8
<b>VI. Appointment, Retention, Advancement, Promotion, and Tenure</b> .....	<b>10</b>
A. Minimum Qualifications for Employment .....	10
B. Position Responsibility Statements .....	10
C. Faculty Search Committee and Procedure.....	11
D. Term Faculty.....	12
E. Tenure-Stream Faculty .....	16
F. Faculty Status Review .....	18
G. Dismissals .....	23

<b>VII. Post-Tenure Review</b> .....	<b>23</b>
A. Purpose of Reviews .....	23
B. Schedule of Reviews .....	23
C. Procedures and Timelines .....	23
D. Criteria for PTR Assessment.....	25
<b>VIII. Adoption and Amendment Procedures for This Document</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix A: Criteria Concerning Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching, Research and Service</b> .....	<b>26</b>
Guidelines for Evaluating Excellence in Teaching .....	26
Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Teaching .....	27
Criteria Concerning Excellence in Teaching Scholarship .....	27
Criteria Concerning Excellence in Research Scholarship.....	28
Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Research Scholarship .....	28
Criteria Concerning Excellence in Service.....	28
Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Service.....	28
<b>Appendix B: Peer Evaluations</b> .....	<b>30</b>

## **Preamble**

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies consists of faculty members from two distinct units, each with its own disciplinary traditions. All faculty members in the Department have the same basic rights and duties, including especially the right to be evaluated by standards appropriate to his or her disciplinary tradition.

## **I. Department Membership**

All Iowa State University faculty members, both full- and part-time, whose primary teaching appointment is in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies are members of the Department. Each Department member additionally is considered a member of the disciplinary unit in which they teach. Tenure-stream faculty are those who hold tenured or tenure-eligible appointments. Term faculty are those who hold appointments with contract-limited terms that are not eligible for tenure. Unless specified otherwise below, all members of the Department are eligible to participate in and vote on decisions made by the Department, with the proviso that members of the Department shall in no case participate in a vote concerning their own employment or the discussion leading thereto.

## **II. Duties of the Chair**

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies shall have a Chair. The primary duties of the Chair are to encourage excellence among the members of the Department in the performance of their duties; to inform the members of the Department of University and College policies and of opportunities within the University for research grants, leaves, etc.; to inform the Dean of the College on all pertinent matters; and to execute Departmental policies on a day-to-day basis. The duties of the Chair are further articulated in the Faculty Handbook. The following list sets out several more specific duties of the Chair along with procedures to be observed in their execution.

### **1. Managing Department Funds**

The Chair shall manage funds for current operating expenses. Any member of the department may, however, raise an issue about allocation of operating funds, and such questions are within the purview of departmental voting. The Chair shall provide information necessary for intelligent resolution of any issue that is raised. Records of past expenditures shall be made available to department members once a year.

### **2. Annual Evaluations**

The Chair shall make an annual written evaluation of each faculty member. Each member shall receive a copy of the evaluation. Each faculty member shall have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation with the Chair prior to its being used to set the faculty member's salary for the following year.

### **3. Chair Department Meetings**

The Chair shall chair meetings of the Department, which should be held no less frequently than once a month during the Fall and Spring semesters, although members may vote to

meet more or less frequently (see IV.C) . The Chair may call a meeting other than the next scheduled one anytime there are important matters requiring consideration. The Chair shall have decisions recorded and shall be responsible for maintaining a record of actions that shall be accessible to all the members of the department. If the agenda of a particular meeting will not include items of general interest to one or the other of the disciplinary units in the Department, the Chair will inform faculty members in that unit of that fact.

Any member of the Department may raise issues at meetings. However, the Chair has the responsibility to make sure that all matters requiring the formulation of policy are discussed in Department meetings both in cases affecting the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies alone and in cases where the Department contributes to interdepartmental, college-wide or university-wide policy. The Chair shall do this as soon as possible after a question has been raised. There may be cases that require immediate action. These shall be reported by the Chair at the earliest opportunity so that the Department can discuss and adopt a policy covering future occurrences of such cases. The Chair shall, in every way possible, further the majority view of the members in extra-departmental affairs.

#### **4. Further Duties**

The Chair shall carry out certain further duties relating to committees as specified below.

### **III. Selection, Substitution, and Replacement of the Chair**

- A.** The Chair is selected by the Dean, and shall serve for a term of three to five years. As the end of each term approaches, the Department, minus the Chair, shall vote on the question whether to recommend to the Dean that the Chair be appointed to a further term, and if so, to recommend a further term of three, four, or five years. Members of the Department, aside from the Chair, with titles including 'Professor' are eligible to vote, and the votes of the faculty shall be tallied and communicated to the Dean. The Department shall otherwise determine a method of communicating its view to the Dean that is appropriate at the time. To aid the deliberations of the members, the Chair shall make available to them the most recent evaluation of the Chair (see V.D.2, below).
- B.** A member of the Department who is dissatisfied with a Chair's performance has the right to request the Dean to review that performance. Furthermore, a member may request the formation of a conciliation committee (see V.D.1, below) to examine the cause of the dissatisfaction and make whatever recommendations to either party it may deem appropriate.
- C.** If, for any reason, an incumbent Chair is not going to continue in office, or if the Department is to be without a Chair for a period so long that the Dean determines that an Acting Chair is required, then the Department shall meet and decide upon a recommendation for the filling of that position. The Department shall determine a method for communicating its view to the Dean which shall seem appropriate at the time.

**D.** Each August or September, Department members holding titles including 'Professor' shall elect from among the tenured members an Assistant Chair. The Assistant Chair shall become the Temporary Chair if the Chair is unable to perform departmental duties for a limited period due to illness, vacation, or other cause. The Temporary Chair shall assume all those duties that it is practicable to assume for the limited period of the Chair's absence, and shall make all discretionary decisions expected of a Chair. The Temporary Chair may be expected to perform other duties beyond those listed above. The Chair shall inform the faculty of such duties prior to the election of the Assistant Chair.

## **IV. The Department Meeting**

### **A. Rights of Members on Leave**

Members on leave retain their voting privilege, their right to attend Department meetings, the right to raise challenges as described in IV.E. They may submit a vote by mail or email. While they are not required to exercise any of these rights, they are entitled to receive information that will enable them to exercise them intelligently should they wish to do so. Such information shall be transmitted in any of the following ways: (a) A member may request to be kept informed on a weekly basis of upcoming agenda matters and minutes of Department meetings. The Chair shall send such material to a member who requests it. (b) A vote of one-third of the Department shall require the Chair to contact a member on leave about a specific matter. The Chair shall present to the absent member the circumstances in which the matter has arisen and the arguments which have been advanced on all sides. (c) Members of the department, including the Chair, may, upon their own initiative, contact a member on leave on any matter they deem sufficiently important.

### **B. Quorum**

A quorum for a Department meeting will be constituted by two-thirds of the members of the faculty who are not on leave. A quorum for a meeting or vote pertaining to a decision on hiring faculty shall be two-thirds of those not on leave who are eligible to vote on that decision.

### **C. Scheduling of Meetings**

Department meetings shall be regularly scheduled not less frequently than once each month during the Fall and Spring semesters. The Chair may call additional meetings (see II.3, above). Additional meetings must also be called by the Chair if one-third of the voting members who are not on leave request it. Meetings may be held in the Summer sessions to decide matters of a pressing nature. However, no major, permanent policy decisions shall be made during the Summer sessions.

### **D. Majority Rule**

All questions shall be decided by a simple majority of the eligible, non-abstaining voters unless otherwise specified in this document.

### **E. Procedure for Challenge by Absent Members**

Members who are not present at a Department meeting may challenge a decision taken at that meeting, provided they do so within two full weeks following it. They may demand that the issue be reconsidered at the next Department meeting (i.e., either the next regularly scheduled one or one called in accordance with IV.C). The Chair shall not implement a challenged decision unless the decision is reaffirmed in a subsequent Department meeting.

## **F. Procedure if Chair Cannot Attend a Meeting**

If the Chair is unable to attend a Department meeting, the Assistant Chair (see III.D), shall chair the meeting. If both the Chair and Assistant Chair are unable to attend, the Chair shall appoint a member to Chair the meeting.

## **G. Voting By the Chair**

The duty of the Chair to chair Department meetings shall not be construed as a bar to participation in the discussion or voting. The Chair shall count as one in determining whether there is a quorum. The same right of challenge as exists for any member (see IV.E) shall apply in the case where it is the Chair that misses a meeting.

# **V. Committees**

## **A. Formation of Committees**

Part of the Department's work shall be carried out by committees. Unless otherwise specified, committees on the level of the department as a whole shall be formed as follows:

1. The Chair shall solicit nominations from the members of the Department.
2. The Chair shall recommend a slate of nominations to the Department.
3. The Department shall vote to accept or reject each nominee. In case of rejection, the Chair shall make substitute nomination(s), which shall again be submitted to a vote; and so on until a committee is formed.

The same procedure shall be followed in filling vacancies on committees.

The Chair and the Department shall be careful to avoid conflicts of interest in committee appointments wherever these may arise or even appear to arise.

In the Religious Studies unit, one faculty member may be designated to serve as the simultaneous chair of the following committees: Curriculum, Outcomes Assessment, and Scheduling. The person so delegated by the Religious Studies unit will be entitled to one course release per academic year.

## **B. Voting in Committees**

All members of committees are voting members of those committees, except that term faculty shall not vote on decisions involving the evaluation of scholarship or research.

## **C. Standing Committees**

*The following shall be the standing committees of the disciplinary units.*

### **1. Curriculum Committees**

A separate Curriculum Committee shall be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department.

The responsibilities of these committees are:

- (i) To consider what the disciplinary unit's curriculum and course offerings should be for the period of the next catalogue. These considerations shall culminate in a draft of the copy for the next catalogue, which embodies each committee's recommendations regarding courses offered, course descriptions, and the general statements in the relevant disciplinary unit's section of the catalogue. This draft shall then be presented to the disciplinary unit, which shall discuss it and vote upon its provisions.
- (ii) To inform and explain to the members of the disciplinary unit the reasons behind the catalogue proposal.
- (iii) To assist the Chair in presenting and defending the disciplinary unit's final proposals before other departments, college committees, and the Dean.
- (iv) To present the Department's catalogue copy in the proper form to the proper offices by the applicable deadlines.
- (v) To consider and bring to the attention of the members of the Department questions of long- or short-range educational policy.

## **2. Speakers Committees**

A separate Speakers Committee shall be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The responsibilities of these committees are:

- (i) to find, in consultation with other members of the disciplinary unit, speakers both on and off the Iowa State University campus of interest to the disciplinary unit's students, its members and colleagues in other departments;
- (ii) to search out ways and means of paying for off-campus speakers;
- (iii) to handle correspondence with potential visitors and to arrange time, place, and publicity for their presentations; and
- (iv) to coordinate the intra-departmental presentation of papers and research projects.

## **3. Outcomes Assessment Committees**

A separate Outcomes Assessment Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The main responsibilities of these committees are to inform the department of any changes in the Outcomes Assessment test, to collect data relevant to determining whether desired student outcomes are being attained, and to propose curriculum improvements to better meet those outcomes, when appropriate.

## **4. Faculty-Student Relations Committees**

A separate Faculty-Student Relations Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The responsibilities of these committees are (a) to advise the departmental clubs and (b) to act as a liaison between faculty members and the students. The members of this committee will also propose a graduating senior to be recognized at the LAS graduating senior recognition ceremony (subject to department approval).

## **5. Awards Committee**

The responsibilities of this committee are to solicit nominations for College and University awards from faculty, to select the candidate(s) to be nominated in consultation with the Chair, and to assemble and submit the nomination package(s).

## **6. Scheduling Committee**

A separate Scheduling Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The duties of this committee include constructing the teaching schedule for the disciplinary unit, in consultation with the Chair and with the faculty members of that unit.

*The following shall be the standing committees of the department as a whole.*

## **7. Alumni Committee**

The members of this committee will i) send out a short annual newsletter to alumni who were majors, and ii) nominate alumni for alumni recognition awards whenever appropriate.

## **8. Budget Committee**

This committee consists of three members: the Chair, the Assistant Chair (see III.D), and one member elected by the Department. This committee advises the Chair on budgetary issues as they arise, and, at the beginning of each Fall semester, reviews and comments on the proposed budget for the ensuing year before the Chair presents it to the Department for review and adoption.

## **9. Computing Committee**

The duties of the members of this committee are to monitor the department website, make suggestions for its improvement, oversee the process of implementing suggestions approved by the department, and assist colleagues in solving minor computer problems that arise. The committee will also provide advice to the Department regarding software and hardware beyond what is normally provided by the College and University. The committee will also help interface with technical professionals from outside the Department.

## **10. Position Responsibility Statement Mediation Panel**

The duties of the member(s) of this committee is to resolve disputes regarding the Position Responsibility Statements of Department members according to the process described in the section of the Faculty Handbook titled "Position Responsibility Statement" (August 2018 edition, section 3.4).

## **D. Ad Hoc Committees**

### **1. Conciliation Committee**

A. Faculty members who believe they have been treated unfairly by the Chair have a right to the complaint and grievance processes described in the sections of the Faculty Handbook titled "Faculty Conduct Policy" and "Faculty Grievance Procedures" (August 2018 edition, Chapters 7 and 9). The intent of the present section is to provide an alternative and less cumbersome method by which a member of the Department may seek relief from a grievance. The procedure here described may be used as a first step in cases of the most serious kind or in less serious but persistent cases of alleged unfairness.



- B. A conciliation committee shall be formed only at the request of a member of the Department other than the Chair. Upon such a request, the Chair shall within fourteen working days call a meeting of the Department and, without going into the particulars of the issue, inform the Department of the need for such a committee. The Chair shall then appoint one member to the committee. The faculty member requesting the formation of the committee shall appoint one member. The Department shall then elect an additional member (but neither the Chair nor the aggrieved member) who shall be the Chairperson of the committee.
- C. The conciliation committee shall hear both sides of the issue and shall do whatever it can to remove the source of contention and restore collegial trust.
- D. A conciliation committee shall serve until it has done all it can to try to bring the Chair and the aggrieved member to a point of mutual understanding, but no longer than thirty working days after its formation. The committee shall report the end of its service to the Department and such further particulars of the case that seem to it appropriate to report.
- E. A member who requests a conciliation committee shall be expected to seek a resolution in good faith and to give the committee a reasonable time to make recommendations. However, the formation of and recommendations by a conciliation committee shall in no way interfere with a member's right to the use of the Faculty Grievance Procedures described in the Faculty Handbook.

## **2. Chair Review Committee**

At certain Department meetings of certain years the Chair shall be excused and the remaining members shall elect three of their number to be the Chair Review Committee. These three shall elect one of their number as Chairperson. The periods in which the committee shall be formed are as follows: (a) The second semester of the second year of a Chair's first term or first non-consecutive term; and (b) thereafter, in the year prior to the last year of a Chair's current term.

The Chair Review Committee shall solicit evaluations of the Chair's performance from students and members of the Department and may sit in on the Chair's courses. It shall prepare a document analogous to the annual evaluation of members of the Department, except that it shall include a section on the administrative functions of the Chair. The committee shall present this document to a meeting of the members of the Department minus the Chair for revision and, finally, approval. The committee shall then present the final document to the Chair and shall meet with the Chair to discuss it. The document shall be filed and made available in accordance with III.A.

## **3. Faculty Search Committee**

The formation and functioning of this committee will be described in section VI.

## **4. Faculty Status Review Committee**

The formation and functioning of this committee will be described in section VI.

## **5. Post-Tenure Review Committee**

The formation and functioning of this committee will be described in section VII.

## **6. Other Committees**

The Department or a disciplinary unit may from time to time vote to form a committee to consider a specific question or carry out a specific task. Its members shall be appointed according to the procedure in V.A. Its duties, its manner of proceeding and the conditions under which it will be dissolved shall be clearly specified by the Department at the time the committee is formed.

# **VI. Appointment, Retention, Advancement, Promotion, and Tenure**

## **A. Minimum Qualifications for Employment**

Tenure-eligible and tenured faculty in the department are expected to hold a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree appropriate to the discipline in which they will teach. Term faculty are required to hold a graduate degree appropriate to the discipline in which they will teach. Additionally, a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree shall be a preferred qualification for term faculty positions. In special circumstances, such as spousal accommodations, and upon a favorable vote of the faculty of the relevant disciplinary unit holding titles including 'Professor', the Department may waive the preferred qualification when advertising for a position, or seek a waiver of the required qualification from the Dean.

## **B. Position Responsibility Statements**

- A. Each faculty member shall have a position responsibility statement (PRS). This shall consist of a general description of those responsibilities that are most important in evaluating that member in the promotion and tenure or advancement process. The position responsibility statement shall not violate the member's academic freedom in teaching, research, service, or extension activities. The position responsibility statement should allow appropriate opportunities for professional development and career advancement.
- B. For new appointments, the Chair and the new faculty member will agree on a position responsibility statement based on the job advertisement.
- C. Faculty members may review their position responsibility statement with the Chair as part of the annual review process or at other times if need arises. The PRS should also be reviewed whenever the faculty member is subject of a Faculty Status Review (see VI.F). Faculty members shall review their position responsibility statement with the Chair at least once every seven years.
- D. The PRS should not be rewritten unless there is the expectation of a substantive change in the faculty member's position responsibilities. The PRS cannot be changed unilaterally by either the Chair or the faculty member.
- E. When both parties (the faculty member and the Chair) agree to the PRS, it will be signed by both parties and dated. However if one of the parties disagrees with a proposed change to the faculty member's PRS, either party may refer the matter to the Department PRS Mediation Panel according to the process described in the section of

the Faculty Handbook titled "Position Responsibility Statement" (August 2018 edition, section 3.4).

### **C. Faculty Search Committee and Procedure**

- A. When the availability of a tenure-stream or continuing term (see VI.D.2, below) faculty position in the Department is anticipated, a search committee shall be formed to conduct the search for candidates to fill the position.
- B. When the anticipated opening is for a tenure-stream position, the search committee shall be composed of tenure-stream faculty. When the anticipated opening is for a term position, members whose titles include 'Professor' are eligible to serve on the search committee, though the committee must include at least one tenure-stream member from the search unit.
- C. This committee shall be composed of three members of the disciplinary unit in which the search is being held (hereafter the "search unit"). In a search for a tenure-stream appointment, one faculty member from outside the Department is additionally required. Members of the committee from within the Department will be elected by the members of the search unit eligible to serve on the committee. If necessary, the members of the committee will then select the external member.
- D. In addition, the disciplinary unit in which the search is not being held (hereafter the "non-search unit") shall select a liaison to the committee from among and by vote of those who would have been eligible to serve on the committee had the search been in that unit. The liaison facilitates communication between the search committee and the non-search unit, and is expected to attend, as a non-voting participant, meetings of the committee and search-related meetings of the primary unit. The liaison is not expected to engage in critical peer review of candidate dossier materials.
- E. The members of the search committee shall elect one of their number to be chairperson.
- F. The search committee shall
  - (i) Develop job descriptions in consultation with the faculty.
  - (ii) Advertise the position.
  - (iii) Review candidates' dossiers.
  - (iv) Facilitate the preliminary interviewing of candidates at professional meetings, by teleconference, or by other means, as deemed necessary.
  - (v) Select a list of approximately twelve candidates from whom to solicit additional materials.
  - (vi) Present all materials from the selected candidates to the search unit for further consideration and development of a short list.
  - (vii) Arrange schedules for candidates who come to Iowa State University for interviews.
  - (viii) Conduct every phase of its operations in a manner concordant with the spirit and the letter of the affirmative action and equal opportunity policy.

- G. When a search committee has presented its list of candidates to the search unit, the major part of its work will ordinarily be done. (The handling of correspondence and the scheduling of interviews may go on for some time after this point.) The search unit will then decide whom to bring to campus for interviews, and inform the Department as a whole of its decision.
- H. Though all members of the Department and the search committee are encouraged to participate in the search process, only members of the search unit eligible to serve on the search committee are eligible to vote on decisions regarding whom to bring to campus for interviews and the ultimate hiring recommendations resulting from the search.
- I. Furthermore, eligible members are expected to qualify themselves to vote on ultimate hiring recommendations by familiarizing themselves with candidates' dossiers and by attending all of the main interview sessions (usually, a paper presentation and an informal discussion) with each candidate invited to campus. If this is impossible, substantial individual talks with candidates may substitute for one of the sessions in the case of each candidate. Although non-qualified members may contribute relevant information to the discussion of candidates, voting that results in a recommendation of a candidate for appointment shall be taken only among eligible and qualified members.
- J. In unusual cases, e.g., if offers are declined by the first two or three candidates, the search committee may be asked by the search unit to renew its efforts.

## **D. Term Faculty**

### **1. Appointment Tracks and Titles**

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies typically will employ only term faculty whose primary responsibility for the Department is teaching. Consequently, such faculty will hold one of the following titles, under the attendant conditions specified:

#### *A. Lecturer*

Lecturers are short-term teaching faculty appointments, and shall have a contract length of one year or less.

If teaching needs persist, the Chair may reappoint Lecturers for an additional semester or year, contingent on satisfactory teaching performance and after soliciting comments from the Department, for up to three years of continuous service. After three years of continuous service, Lecturers become Assistant Teaching Professors upon renewal, and shall have three-year contracts. This change in title and contract length is not an advancement.

Prior to completing three years of continuous service, Lecturers may be reappointed as Assistant Teaching Professor following a satisfactory Faculty Status Review initiated by the Chair. All Lecturers must undergo Faculty Status Review and be notified of an intent to renew or not renew by February 15 of their third year of continuous employment.

Term faculty at the Lecturer rank require at least three-months' notice of intent not to renew.

B. *Assistant Teaching Professor*

Assistant Teaching Professors shall have a contract length of three years, with a Faculty Status Review conducted in the second year of each contract period.

Assistant Teaching Professors may request consideration for advancement to the Associate rank after five years of employment as a faculty member at Iowa State and/or any equivalent service elsewhere that is credited to the faculty member at the time of initial appointment at Iowa State.

C. *Associate Teaching Professor*

Associate Teaching Professors shall have a contract length of three years, with a Faculty Status Review conducted in the second year of each contract period.

There is no minimum service required before an Associate Teaching Professor can request consideration for advancement to Teaching Professor.

D. *Teaching Professor*

Teaching Professors shall have a contract length of five years, with a Faculty Status Review conducted in the fourth year of each contract period.

- E. The Department normally will not employ term faculty with Practice, Research, Clinical, or Adjunct titles. If an individual were to hold such a title and were to have teaching duties in the Department, insofar as contractual obligations permit, such faculty will be treated by the Department as term Teaching faculty of equivalent rank.

## 2. Initial Appointment of Term Faculty

- A. The Department distinguishes two means of initial appointment for term faculty. 'L1 appointments' fill positions that arise on an *ad hoc* basis to fulfill unforeseen and/or short-term teaching needs. 'L2 appointments' fill foreseeable vacancies intended to fulfill persisting teaching needs.
- B. L1 appointments shall be made by the Chair with, wherever possible, the assistance of an *ad hoc* committee from the relevant disciplinary unit. L2 appointments shall be made using established departmental search procedures (see VI.C).
- C. In circumstances where an L2 appointment fills a position initially filled by an L1 appointment, a member of the department may stand as a candidate for the new appointment. However, a successful outcome of a member's candidacy shall be considered a renewal, not an initial appointment.
- D. Usually, initial term faculty appointments will be as Lecturer. In circumstances where, in the judgment of the Department following a search, a candidate for an L2 appointment has deserving qualifications, the initial appointment may be as Assistant, Associate, or full Teaching Professor.

## 3. Nonrenewal

Term faculty contracts may fail to be renewed due to unsatisfactory performance, lack of funding, a change in department teaching needs, or by conversion of a lecturer line into a tenure-track line.

If either disciplinary unit loses one or more lecturer positions and a decision must be made regarding which term faculty member is not renewed, the tenure-stream faculty of the relevant unit will make a recommendation to the Chair and to the College, based on the following considerations:

- (i) Seniority (as determined first by rank and second by length of employment);
- (ii) Teaching needs;
- (iii) Teaching performance;
- (iv) Hiring arrangements, such as those related to partner/spousal accommodations and contract length.

These considerations may conflict and the decision will necessarily involve judgment and weighting of considerations in the particular circumstances.

#### **4. Criteria for Contract Renewal and Advancement**

- A. The evaluation of term faculty performance for purposes of contract renewal and advancement is based on the faculty member's Position Responsibility Statement. Term faculty performance in research and service shall not be taken into consideration unless such duties are noted in their PRS.
- B. Guidelines for evaluating faculty performance are outlined in Appendix A of the Governance Document. As outlined in Appendix A, assessment of teaching performance demands consideration of many factors, including classroom observation, quantitative teaching scores and qualitative student feedback, selection and use of teaching materials, classroom management, and pedagogical methods, etc. Judgments of teaching performance must assess and weigh these different factors on a case-by-case basis.
- C. For purposes of contract renewal of Lecturer and Teaching Assistant Professor appointments, candidates should achieve a standard of effectiveness in teaching.

In determining whether the standard of effectiveness in teaching has been reached, the Chair and, where applicable, Faculty Status Review committee will focus especially on those aspects of teaching identified in Appendix A to the Governance Document. Renewal will typically require that the candidate is effective in all or most of the identified areas, and shows a willingness to improve in any substantive areas of weakness.

In the strongest cases, observation of the candidate's teaching will support the judgment that the standard of effectiveness in teaching has been reached. The candidate's student ratings of teaching will be generally supportive of the judgment that the standard of effectiveness has been reached. Although the department recognizes the difficulties in relying extensively on student ratings of teaching, the numerical scores and the qualitative comments must provide the Chair and/or committee with evidence on which to base the judgment that the standard of effectiveness has been reached. Candidates whose ratings indicate persistent weaknesses in the central areas of teaching identified in the Appendix must demonstrate through action a willingness to improve in those areas.

- D. For purposes of advancement to Associate Teaching Professor, candidates should achieve a standard of effectiveness with strong potential for excellence in teaching. A record indicating that this standard has been met will include evidence of pedagogical development, such as use of creative teaching techniques, responsiveness to course assessments, innovative use of technology, or work with campus partners. Furthermore, the candidate's record should indicate promise of further academic and professional development as a scholarly teacher. Scholarly teaching is distinct from scholarship and requires command of the subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning. See the Faculty Handbook section titled "Scholarly Teaching" (August 2018 edition, section 5.2.2.3.1).

In determining whether the standard of effectiveness with strong potential for excellence in teaching has been reached, the Faculty Status Review committee will focus especially on those aspects of teaching identified in Appendix A to the Governance Document. Advancement will typically require that the candidate is effective in all or most of the identified areas, without any areas of significant weakness, and shows a willingness to improve. In the strongest cases, observation of the candidate's teaching will support the judgment that the standard of effectiveness with strong potential for excellence in teaching has been reached. Although the department recognizes the difficulties in relying extensively on student ratings of teaching, the numerical scores and the qualitative comments must provide the committee with evidence on which to base the judgment that the standard of effectiveness with strong potential for excellence has been reached. The candidate's student ratings of teaching should indicate that the candidate excels in all or most of the areas of teaching identified in Appendix A, and they must indicate no persistent, unaddressed weaknesses in any of the areas of central importance identified in the Appendix.

Renewal at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor presumes at minimum continued effectiveness in teaching.

- E. For purposes of advancement to Teaching Professor, a faculty member must have a record of proven and sustained excellence in teaching, and of proven effectiveness in other areas of the PRS. In addition, a faculty member is expected to have made substantial contributions to the mission of the university beyond routine classroom teaching.

In determining whether the standard of proven and sustained excellence in teaching has been reached, the Faculty Status Review committee will focus especially on those aspects of teaching identified in Appendix A to the Governance Document. Advancement will typically require that the candidate excel in all or most of the identified areas. In the strongest cases, observation of the candidate's teaching will support the judgment that the standard of excellence in teaching has been reached. Although the department recognizes the difficulties in relying extensively on student ratings of teaching, the numerical scores and the qualitative comments must provide the committee with evidence on which to base the judgment that the standard of excellence has been reached. The candidate's student ratings of teaching must show that the

candidate excels in all or most of the areas of teaching identified in Appendix A, and they must indicate no persistent, unaddressed weaknesses in any of the areas of central importance identified in the Appendix.

In determining whether the standard of proven effectiveness in other areas of responsibility has been reached, the committee will focus on the criteria outlined in Appendix A to the Governance Document.

Examples of substantial contributions to the mission of the university beyond routine classroom teaching supportive of advancement include, but are not limited to:

- (i) A record of significant curriculum improvement and development, including development of collaborative courses and programs, innovative use of technology, and pedagogical innovation;
- (ii) Substantial student service (e.g., advising individual students and student organizations, mentoring, leading learning communities);
- (iii) A record of substantial and meaningful service to the department, university, or profession;
- (iv) A leadership role in a department, the college, or the university; and
- (v) A record of involvement in department life and responsiveness to department needs.

Contributions to the professional field are not required, but may support advancement to the professor rank when related to the PRS. However, such career contributions will not offset deficiencies in PRS performance.

Renewal at the rank of full Teaching Professor presumes at minimum continued effectiveness in all areas of the Position Responsibility Statement.

## **E. Tenure-Stream Faculty**

### **1. Review of Tenure-Stream Faculty**

- A. Members on probationary or continuous appointments shall be considered for retention or promotion and/or tenure when either:
  1. They are in the year prior to the last year of their first contract; or
  2. A decision is required by the impending end of a contract other than the first. In this case, consideration shall be carried out far enough in advance to comply with College deadlines; or
  3. The member requests to be considered, subject to the limitation that such a request from the same member shall not be acted upon more than once a year.  
Departmental colleagues may encourage those members whom they feel are qualified for promotion to apply for it. However, the final decision whether to apply for promotion rests with the member concerned in all cases other than those coming under 1 or 2 of this section.

Consideration for retention or promotion and/or tenure will be in accordance with the Faculty Status Review procedures described below.



- B. On occasion, special circumstances may occur that would justify postponement of a review for retention or promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure. The assumption of parental responsibilities or major change in assigned responsibilities might be such circumstances. A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period based upon such circumstances. The request for an extension should be submitted in writing to the department Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Provost as soon as possible, but no later than April 1 before the academic year in which the preliminary review or tenure review is scheduled to be conducted. Requests should clearly explain the reasons for granting an extension of the probationary period and will be acted upon promptly. Requests for extension due to the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age five will be submitted to and approved by the Chair, Dean of the College, and Provost. The Chair, Dean of the College, and Provost, must approve requests based on other circumstances.

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

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

- C. The date that a faculty member actually begins the performance of his or her duties at or on behalf of Iowa State University as tenure-stream faculty marks the beginning of the probationary period.

## **2. Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure**

Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's responsibility statement, the criteria for retention or promotion are set forth below. (See Appendix A for elucidation of the criteria.)

- A. The criteria for retention for a second appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor shall be the demonstration of adequate progress toward the fulfillment of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor (see below). Progress shall be deemed "adequate" if in the judgment of eligible voting members the candidate has a reasonable chance of fulfilling the criteria for Associate Professor by the time that a mandatory decision for tenure must be made.
- B. The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor shall include excellence in scholarship, and actual demonstration of effectiveness in the areas of teaching and service.
- C. To be recommended for promotion to full Professorship, a candidate must continue to develop his or her talents and must show a considerable degree of achievement above the criteria for Associate Professor. The candidate's record must exhibit significant institutional service and national distinction in scholarship in teaching or research, as evident in his or her wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the profession. The candidate's contributions must be such as to give review committees confidence that a high degree of performance will be sustained throughout his or her career.

## **F. Faculty Status Review**

All considerations of members for renewal, advancement, retention, promotion, or tenure (except cases of renewal that can be directed by the Chair according to VI.D.2) shall begin with the selection of a Faculty Status Review (FSR) Committee. A FSR committee shall be formed whenever such consideration is required or requested in accordance with the provisions elsewhere in this document. The manner of selection, procedures, and duties of these committees are set out below.

Faculty Status Reviews shall proceed in accordance with the provisions set forth in the sections of the Faculty Handbook devoted to the renewal of term and probationary contracts, advancement, promotion, and tenure, as well as official policies regarding these matters adopted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Faculty Status Review Committee shall consult these policies and abide by them.

### **1. Eligibility for Service on Faculty Status Review Committees**

- A. When considering a term faculty member for renewal in cases that require a Faculty Status Review, tenured faculty and term faculty at the Associate Professor or Professor ranks shall be eligible to serve on the committee.
- B. When considering a term faculty member for advancement, tenured faculty and term faculty at or above the rank being sought shall be eligible to serve on the committee.
- C. When considering an Assistant Professor for retention or for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, only tenured Associate and full Professors shall be eligible to serve on the committee.
- D. When considering an Associate Professor for promotion to full Professor, only tenured full Professors shall be eligible to serve on the committee.

### **2. Eligibility to Vote on Faculty Status Reviews**

Department members eligible to serve on the Faculty Status Review Committee are eligible to vote on the recommendation of that Faculty Status Review. The Chair, who makes a separate recommendation, is not eligible to vote.

In accordance with University expectations as articulated by the Provost concerning combined departments such as Philosophy and Religious Studies, eligible faculty from both units are expected to vote on all promotion and tenure cases coming from the Department. The same expectation is extended to retention, renewal, and advancement cases, as well.

### **3. Formation of Faculty Status Review Committees**

A separate Faculty Status Review Committee shall be formed for each candidate under consideration. When the committee is to consider a term faculty member for a contract renewal that does not result in a change of title, the committee shall be composed of three eligible faculty members, two from the disciplinary unit of the candidate (hereafter the "primary unit"), and one from the other disciplinary unit (the "secondary unit"). In all other cases, the committee shall be composed of four eligible faculty members, three from the primary unit, and one from the secondary unit.

Of the members of the committee from the primary unit, one shall be chosen by the candidate, and the remainder shall be chosen by the primary unit. The candidate shall have the option of selecting the member of the committee from the secondary unit, who will be chosen by the secondary unit if the candidate declines to make a selection. At least one committee member must be a tenured member of the primary unit, and the primary unit must ensure this requirement is met when making its selection(s). When a term faculty member is under consideration, the committee shall include an eligible term faculty member, unless the candidate opts to waive this requirement. The order in which these selections and options are made shall be determined by the candidate. Only members with titles including 'Professor' may vote on the selection of committee members. In cases where a tenure-stream faculty member is under review, only tenured members of the Department shall participate in these selections.

If the Faculty Status Review Committee cannot be entirely composed of eligible members of the Department, eligible faculty will be chosen from outside the department in a field related to the candidate's discipline.

The Chair must inform the candidates in writing of the identity of the members of the Faculty Status Review Committee.

The selection of Faculty Status Review Committees must be done in such a way as to avoid conflicts of interest; that is, serious biases due to personal relationships, family relationships, or activities outside of work. The Chair shall ask those appointed to such committees whether they have any conflict of interest. Department members, including candidates, shall inform the Chair of any conflicts of interest they believe to exist. Upon becoming convinced that there is a credible appearance of a conflict of interest, the Chair shall ask the candidate or the Department to nominate a new member of the Committee (depending on whether the apparent conflict involves the candidate's or the Department's nominee, respectively).

The members of the committee shall elect one of their members to be Chairperson. The committee member from the secondary unit serves as a liaison, and is not required to participate in classroom observation or drafting of the committee report. Though the liaison member is strongly encouraged to attend meetings of the committee, a quorum for a meeting of the committee shall be the remaining committee members.

#### **4. Materials to be Collected by the Committee**

- A. In all cases, the Faculty Status Review Committee shall gather sufficient information to enable a fair and considered judgment of the candidate. This shall include at least classroom observation and peer evaluation of each course the candidate teaches in a given term. The committee may also choose to solicit letters from majors in the candidate's discipline.
- B. In the case of consideration of a term faculty member for renewal or advancement, the candidate will provide to the FSR committee, by a date selected by the committee, the background information and documentation of performance in position responsibilities requested by Sections 1 and 2 of the LAS College Term Faculty Advancement Template. This should include at least the following:

- (i) a summary of teaching assignments and responsibilities;
- (ii) information on participation in teaching-related development activities (e.g. CELT workshops);
- (iii) a table summarizing student ratings of teaching and student rating surveys for the five years prior to the review if they have taught at Iowa State for at least that length of time; otherwise, for each semester they have taught at Iowa State.
- (iv) representative samples of teaching-related materials (course syllabi, sample tests and assignments);
- (v) a statement of teaching philosophy, which can include responses to feedback from the previous review (if applicable);
- (vi) statements regarding quality and impact of activities besides teaching if such responsibilities are included in the candidate's PRS.

The candidate will make all these materials available to the Department for consultation.

C. Candidates for retention (i.e., for preliminary review) or for promotion and/or tenure shall provide to the FSR committee, by a date selected by the committee, the background information and documentation of scholarship and performance in position responsibilities requested by Tabs 1 and 2 of the LAS College Preliminary Review Dossier Template, or by Tabs 1 and 2 of the LAS College Promotion and Tenure Template, respectively. The submitted up-to-date vitae that is requested in Tab 1 shall include at least the following:

- (i) Candidate information (name, current rank, degrees held [when, where], and a record of professional experience);
- (ii) Research (a list of refereed publications, invited publications, book reviews, invited lectures, conference papers, grant activity, current projects, etc.);
- (iii) Teaching (e.g., assignments and responsibilities, advising activities, service on masters and doctoral committees, curricular development activity, grant activity, service in professional organizations or events devoted to teaching, textbooks, videos, scholarly publications or presentations concerning teaching);
- (iv) Service (e.g., membership on department, college and/or university committees and organizations, editorial responsibilities, referee responsibilities, service in professional societies, organizations and events).

Candidates are required to provide a complete set of authored reprints/publications and works under consideration. Candidates may choose to submit additional works in progress, as well.

In addition, candidates shall provide representative teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, handouts), and student ratings of teaching for the five years prior to the review if they have taught at Iowa State for at least that length of time; otherwise, candidates shall submit student ratings of teaching for each semester they have taught at Iowa State.

Candidates may also choose to provide solicited and unsolicited materials, such as peer evaluations, a description of creative teaching techniques, a statement of teaching philosophy (if not otherwise required), evidence of effectiveness in academic advising (e.g., student or peer evaluation), participation in professional societies concerned with pedagogy, publications concerned with pedagogy, including textbooks. (Publications of textbook materials shall be evaluated under “teaching” insofar as they consist of anthologized materials and under “research” insofar as they contain introductions, papers, chapters, or whole texts written by the candidate.)

The candidate will make all these materials available to the Department for consultation.

- D. In cases of consideration for tenure and/or promotion of tenure-stream faculty, the FSR committee shall, in addition to the other materials specified above, collect peer evaluations by non-local colleagues. Candidates shall suggest potential external reviewers to the committee. The committee will then solicit evaluations from a certain number of external reviewers (normally 6). The committee shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that at least two (but no more than half) of the external reviewers are among those suggested by the candidate. Candidates will also be provided the opportunity to submit to the committee a short list of no more than three potential reviewers that the candidate wishes to be excluded from consideration. The committee will make every reasonable effort to accommodate this request. Reviewers will be requested to refrain from judging whether the candidate would be tenured or promoted at his or her institution.

The solicited external faculty letters shall remain confidential, except that the Chair shall grant any request by a faculty member eligible to vote on the case to review copies of the external faculty letters. The Chair shall make reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of the letters (e.g., by limiting the number of copies made of the letters).

## **5. Procedures for Faculty Status Review**

- A. The Faculty Status Review Committee will encourage all faculty members eligible to vote on a given case to familiarize themselves with the candidate’s dossier.
- B. Any member of the Department who requests it shall be invited to meet with the committee. The committee itself may initiate such meetings.
- C. The candidate may advise the committee, orally or in writing, of any dissatisfaction with the contents, completeness, or estimates of reliability of the evidence that the committee intends to use in forming its report.
- D. When the Faculty Status Review Committee has collected and read all relevant materials it will meet, discuss them, and draw up a list of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.
- E. In any case in which external faculty letters are solicited, the Faculty Status Review Committee will call a meeting with the faculty of the primary unit eligible to vote on the case, at which the committee will present its list of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. Part of the committee’s report shall include a thorough description of the solicited letters consistent with confidentiality constraints. The attending faculty will then

have an opportunity to question the committee. At no point in the process will the committee provide a recommendation regarding the case.

- F. The Faculty Status Review Committee will then call a meeting of the whole Department, at which it will present its list of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. In any case in which external faculty letters are solicited, part of the committee's report shall include a thorough description of the solicited letters consistent with confidentiality constraints. The faculty will then have an opportunity to question the committee. At no point in the process will the committee provide a recommendation regarding the case.
- G. In the case of a renewal or retention, eligible faculty may vote immediately after the committee's presentation to the Department. In cases where advancement, promotion, and/or tenure are considered, eligible faculty will vote at a subsequent meeting. The Faculty Status Review Committee members, not having made a recommendation, are eligible to vote. The Chair, who makes a separate recommendation, is not eligible.
- H. For decisions concerning renewal or retention prior to tenure, a simple majority of eligible, non-abstaining voters shall be required for the vote to be counted favorable to the candidate. For all other decisions concerning advancement, promotion, and/or tenure, a two-thirds majority of eligible, non-abstaining voters shall be required for the vote to be counted favorable to the candidate. In cases where the issue of promotion/advancement can be separated from the issue of retention/renewal, two votes shall be taken; i.e., it will be possible for faculty members to vote against promotion/advancement but for retention/renewal.
- I. After the vote is taken, the FSR committee and the Department Chair will proceed with the drafting of appropriate documents.
- J. Before the Department's recommendations are submitted to the College, the Chair will inform each candidate in writing whether a recommendation will be forwarded and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If a candidate receives a negative recommendation from the Department or the Chair, the candidate will be informed by the Chair in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the Department's criteria for renewal, advancement, promotion, and/or tenure. The candidate will have an opportunity to meet with the Department Chair and the chair of the FSR committee to discuss the report and the Department vote.
- K. Each person for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the College will be given the opportunity to review the factual information therein, and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.
- L. If a change in the candidate's scholarship occurs after the Department vote, the candidate may notify the Chair, and the Chair may petition the Dean to include updated information in the candidate's dossier.

## **6. Timing of Faculty Status Reviews**

Each Faculty Status Review Committee shall meet in such a way as to ensure timely execution of their charge, including compliance with College deadlines.

Faculty Status Review Committees considering preliminary reviews for retention and term faculty renewals and advancements will normally be formed in the fall semester of the academic year in which the review occurs. Faculty Status Review Committees considering faculty promotions and/or tenure will normally be formed in the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the review is to occur.

## **G. Dismissals**

A member may be dismissed (severed from a position before expiration of the stated term of office) only in accordance with the procedures stated in the Faculty Handbook.

# **VII. Post-Tenure Review**

## **A. Purpose of Reviews**

The purpose of Post-Tenure Review (hereafter PTR) in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies shall be to encourage the professional development of faculty members through a self-directed review that respects academic freedom. The PTR should provide an opportunity for faculty members to review and assess their past accomplishments and to formulate a viable set of goals that will guide them towards their future achievements.

## **B. Schedule of Reviews**

- A. Each tenured faculty member shall participate in a PTR by an *ad hoc* PTR committee at least once every seven years. Upon written request, however, a faculty member may request an earlier or more frequent PTR (but no sooner than five years since the last PTR or review for promotion). A PTR is mandatory following two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews.
- B. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member is on phased retirement or is within one year of announced retirement.
- C. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member is being reviewed for higher rank during the same year.
- D. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member serves as Department Chair or holds an Iowa State University title that includes 'President', 'Provost', or 'Dean'.

## **C. Procedures and Timelines**

- A. Each spring (by May 1) the Department Chair shall notify those faculty members who are due for PTR in the following fall semester.
- B. The faculty member shall prepare a file consisting of the following items:
  - (i) The faculty member's position responsibility statement (PRS).
  - (ii) A brief (one page) research statement describing the work since the most recent PTR or, if applicable, the most recent review for promotion.
  - (iii) An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
  - (iv) Representative examples of relevant teaching materials such as course syllabi, exams, handouts, and other evidence of teaching ability.

- (v) Student ratings of teaching from all courses taught since the previous PTR or review for promotion.

Materials shall be submitted to the PTR committee by October 1 of the fall in which the PTR is conducted. At this time, the faculty member shall also expressly indicate his or her preference for specific recommendations for improvement in any areas of the PRS judged to be "meeting expectations." Failure to indicate a preference for recommendations shall be interpreted to be a preference not to receive such recommendations.

- C. The PTR committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members, who, according to best practices, should be full Professors. The faculty member under consideration shall select one member of the committee, and the tenured members of the Department shall select two. If there are insufficient members of the Department to compose the committee, eligible faculty from outside the Department shall be sought. The faculty member shall determine the order in which these selections are made.
- D. The PTR committee shall review the file. Within three weeks, the committee shall reach a preliminary recommendation of the faculty member's overall performance and performance in each area of the PRS. The only evaluation categories are "meeting expectations" and "below expectations." The faculty member and Department Chair shall be informed of the preliminary recommendation.
- E. If the preliminary overall recommendation is "meeting expectations" and each area of the PRS is also judged to be "meeting expectations," no further review is required, and the PTR committee shall compose the PTR report.

If a preliminary review of the materials includes a "below expectations" evaluation in any area of the PRS, or if in the judgment of the PTR committee they need additional materials to complete their report, the PTR committee may request clarification or more materials (which may include a class observation) from the reviewed faculty member. The committee shall articulate a clear deadline for the faculty member to reply to the request.

- F. The PTR committee shall submit a PTR report to the Department Chair and the reviewed faculty member no later than the first week of the spring semester following initiation of the PTR. This report shall constitute the PTR committee's final recommendation. Within six weeks of submitting the report, the faculty member and the Department Chair shall meet to discuss the PTR report.

The PTR report may include recommendations for development in areas of position responsibility judged to be "meeting expectations" only if the faculty member expressly requested such recommendations.

- G. If the final recommendation includes "below expectations" in any PRS area, the faculty member shall work with the Department Chair and the chair of the PTR committee to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in those areas. The action plan shall be signed by the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the chair of the PTR committee by the end of the third week of February following initiation of the PTR



review. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan shall be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation. Failure to have the action 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

The areas that received "below expectations" recommendation shall be reevaluated in one year as part of the Department Chair's annual review. If the action plan is being implemented, no further action shall be taken. If the faculty member is not accomplishing the plan, the result may be an unsatisfactory annual review.

- H. After meeting with the reviewed faculty member to discuss the PTR report, the Department Chair shall compose a letter to the faculty member and the Dean, summarizing the results of the discussion and stating an opinion on the PTR report.

The letter shall indicate the Department Chair's agreement or disagreement with the PTR report. If the Department Chair disagrees with the PTR report's recommendations, the Department Chair shall supply a detailed explanation. This explanation shall be communicated to both the PTR committee and the reviewed faculty member.

- I. The reviewed faculty member may choose to compose a written response to the PTR report or the Department Chair's letter of evaluation, or the faculty member may simply accept the PTR report and letter of evaluation. In any case, the PTR is complete. The PTR report and the Department Chair's letter shall be forwarded to the Dean.

#### **D. Criteria for PTR Assessment**

The criteria for the PTR Assessment shall be the same as those defined in Appendix A.

### **VIII. Adoption and Amendment Procedures for This Document**

- A. Amendments to this document shall be first proposed by a member at a regular meeting of the Department. Voting on the proposed amendment(s) shall occur at a subsequent meeting of the Department. Amendments to the document shall be adopted only if two-thirds of all members of the Department vote in favor. If a Department meeting cannot be held within two weeks after the amendment is first proposed, the Chair shall poll the members. The outcome shall be reported to the next regular meeting of the Department. The amended document takes effect on a date determined at the time of amendment.
- B. This document is derived by amendment of its predecessor, the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies Basic Governance Document. Accordingly, it takes effect upon completion of the amendment procedure stated in that document.

# **Appendix A: Criteria Concerning Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching, Research and Service**

Evaluation of a faculty member for retention, promotion or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching and research activities. Scholarship involves creative, systematic rational inquiry into a topic; it builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding; and it results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product.

In any evaluation of a candidate for retention, promotion or tenure, care shall be taken not to infringe on academic freedom. In order to avoid such infringement, evaluators shall become familiar with how a candidate conceives their discipline and the relation of their discipline to activities in the classroom. This shall be done in order that there be no chance of confusing poor teaching or research with excellent presentation of views that may be unfamiliar to or in disagreement with those of the evaluator.

## **Guidelines for Evaluating Excellence in Teaching**

It is recognized that not all excellent teachers are excellent for the very same reasons. However, the items below are marks characteristically exemplified by excellent teachers. Note that the bullet points below each heading are not intended to be exhaustive.

### **1. Content and Learning Outcomes**

An excellent teacher will select learning materials that facilitate appropriate learning outcomes. These include:

1. stimulation and development of critical thinking, reading and communication skills
2. discipline-specific learning outcomes. For example, in the case of philosophy, these include analyzing philosophical positions and arguments; in the case of religious studies, these include helping students to understand religions empathetically and critically
3. course-specific learning outcomes. These includes using materials (texts, articles and multimedia resources) from suitable sources that accurately represent positions and developments in the field

### **2. Teaching Methods**

Excellence in teaching requires evidence of choosing methodological strategies and instructional material that are well suited to the stated course objectives or goals, the expected student learning outcomes, differences in student learning styles, and the size of the class.

#### **2.1 Methods that are central to the practice of teaching include:**

1. clarity of course objectives, learning outcomes, expectations of students and evaluation criteria;
2. clarity and organization in the presentation of lecture content, and in the answering of student questions;
3. successful communication of the depth, difficulty, and significance of the subject matter;

4. classroom practices and methods of evaluation that encourage students to think reflectively and critically about the subject matter.

## **2.2 Methods that are less central and open to the discretion of individual instructors**

### **include:**

1. effective and appropriate use of supplementary materials, such as audio-visual materials;
2. effective use of traditional and newer classroom technologies, including course management software;
3. use of evaluation methods that offer students a sufficient variety of ways of earning points.

## **2.3 Large Classes**

Teaching and managing larger classes imposes additional constraints that must be taken into consideration when evaluating teaching performance. It is understood that

1. teaching methods that may be desirable in smaller classes (e.g. essay assignments and essay-style answers on tests and quizzes; student presentations; etc.) become less feasible as class sizes increase and more of the grading is shifted to undergraduate graders;
2. the capabilities of teaching assistants to evaluate and give feedback on student work can vary, and teachers may be required to use methods of evaluation that reflect the capabilities of their graders.

## **3. Attitudes**

An excellent teacher will:

1. respect student opinions, thereby modeling the respect expected of students in classroom interactions;
2. be fair in his/her treatment of students, evaluation of students' work and management of classroom discussions;
3. take teaching obligations seriously (e.g. being prepared for lectures, beginning and ending classes on time, timely grading and return of tests and quizzes, being available during scheduled office hours, not canceling classes for casual reasons, etc.);
4. be committed to improving teaching performance in part through serious consideration of feedback from student evaluations and performance reviews.

## **Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Teaching**

Effective teachers strive for the same characteristics that define excellent teachers, but perform at a lesser degree on them, or perform at a high degree on a narrower selection of them.

"Ineffectiveness" can be used as a term of abuse. "Effectiveness" here is not to be understood as meaning "Just good enough not to deserve to be called 'ineffective' in this abusive sense." Instead, "effective" is to be understood to require that students taught by an effective teacher are receiving an education of a quality to which they are entitled.

## **Criteria Concerning Excellence in Teaching Scholarship**

Teaching scholarship includes peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, invited lectures, conference papers, curricular or pedagogical innovations, and teaching materials. It is evaluated in terms of its originality, significance or impact, as evidenced by its influence, use or

adoption by peers. Appropriate assessments of excellence in teaching scholarship include peer and student ratings of in-class performance, evaluations of the performance of the candidate's students, and invitations to conduct classes, seminars, short courses or workshops by other ISU instructors or by off-campus organizations.

Course materials that communicate new understandings and insights effectively to students, or that synthesize, interpret and communicate new knowledge for students, may be submitted as supporting evidence of excellence in teaching scholarship, even though it may not have been communicated to peers outside the university. However, a significant portion of a faculty member's teaching scholarship must have been communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university in order to justify a judgment of excellence in teaching scholarship.

### **Criteria Concerning Excellence in Research Scholarship**

The primary sources of evidence of excellence in research scholarship are (1) publication in refereed journals, books, monographs or anthologies; and (2) receiving of grants, provided that work under them leads eventually to production of items under (1). Publication in non-refereed outlets, papers presented at meetings of professional associations and conferences, invited lectures, and reputable translations of published work into other languages can help support a judgment of excellence in research scholarship, but only when combined with a strong record in (1).

Excellent researchers and scholars publish in outlets of good quality in a sustained fashion. They maintain coherent research programs that show development and responsiveness to ongoing work in their fields.

### **Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Research Scholarship**

As in teaching (see above), effectiveness is to be understood in a positive way, not as the mere absence of ineffectiveness. Competent researchers and scholars strive for excellence and maintain productive activity that results in some degree of public dissemination of their work.

### **Criteria Concerning Excellence in Service**

Excellence in service is partly a matter of quantity but must also include a qualitative component. Evidence for this within the university includes election to bodies by groups wider than or outside of the Department, and reappointment by the Dean's office or the central administration to College-wide and University-wide committees. Review committees may ask for letters from others who have served on committees with candidates they are reviewing. Evidence for excellence in service also includes work with student organizations; e.g., as advisor, and the offering of overload instruction, such as honors program seminars. Evidence for quality of service outside the university includes (but is not limited to) repeated invitations to address local or statewide groups, and service to national professional organizations.

### **Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Service**

Those who are effective in service make positive contributions to the department, college, university or community. In the case of on-campus service, typical contributions would arise through participation in committee work or through helping student organizations. Review committees will know the extent to which the faculty at Iowa State University is self-governing

and shall regard Effectiveness as requiring candidates to do their fair share of the work that this entails.

## **Appendix B: Peer Evaluations**

The primary objective of peer evaluation is to provide Faculty Status Review Committees with your own careful estimate of a colleague's contribution to students and peers in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Up-to-date curriculum vitae as well as manuscripts and/or off-prints are made available to you for this purpose. These documents should be helpful in the areas of research and service. Estimating a colleague's contribution in the area of teaching is another matter. We do have student ratings of teaching available. (It goes without saying that you may have attended courses taught by the colleague(s) being evaluated; you may also have students in your courses who were taught by those colleagues and you may have received what you take to be significant word-of-mouth comments concerning a colleague's teaching. If you choose to make use of such information, please do so—taking care to make clear what the basis of your estimate of teaching quality is.) However, we should also take into account the teaching impact a colleague has on peers. Thus, it is strongly recommended that you give close attention to ways in which you may have realized professional growth and development as a result of interacting with the colleague(s) you are evaluating.

Finally, a carefully developed peer evaluation should attempt to take into account the significance of the colleague(s) being evaluated to the development of the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies. Thus, it is important that you answer the question, Do you consider the candidate undergoing review vital to the future of the unit in Philosophy and/or Religious Studies? Clearly, your evaluation in the areas mentioned above should serve as a basis for your answer to this question. You may, if you wish, inform the Faculty Status Review Committee involved as to what specific action this committee should take in behalf of the candidate(s) being reviewed.