

**Governance Documentd**  
**Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering**

**Table of Contents**

Article I: Purpose and Goals.....2

Article II: Department Mission.....2

Article III: Department Personnel.....3

Article IV: Faculty and Chair Responsibilities .....3

Article V: Voting Faculty .....5

Article VI: Conduct of Faculty Business .....6

Article VII: Department Committees .....7

Article VIII: Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee.....7

Article IX: ABE Faculty Expectations .....9

Article X: Faculty Member Performance Appraisal .....15

Article XI: Probationary Faculty Members Performance Appraisal.....15

Article XII: Promotion to Professor.....17

Article XIII: Post-Tenure Review.....18

Article XIV: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members (Adjunct, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers) Performance Appraisal.....18

Article XV: Non-Tenure-Eligible Research (NTER) Faculty Member Performance Appraisal .....20

Article XVI: Other Types of Faculty Appointments .....20

Article XVII: Faculty Member Work Assignments.....21

Article XVIII: Department Focus Area Leaders.....22

Article XIX: Department Chair Performance Appraisal.....22

Article XX: Department Planning Retreat.....23

Article XXI: Salary Adjustments.....23

Article XXII: Amendments .....23

Article XXIII: Adoption .....25

**Article I: Purpose and Goals**

This Governance Document defines the role of and procedures for faculty participation in governance of the Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Department.

The goals of this document are to promote effective operation of the department and to assist the department in fulfilling its mission.

Other documents that affect department governance are:

1. Iowa State University Faculty Handbook
2. College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Governance Document
3. College of Engineering Governance Document

This Governance Document is subservient to those listed above, and properly adopted changes in those documents that are in conflict with provisions in this Governance document shall supersede said provisions of this document.

Faculty evaluation and review procedures and processes are embedded in this document as well as the documents listed above.

In this document, a faculty member's "College" refers to that college where the faculty member has their primary appointment.

**Article II: Department Mission**

The mission of the Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Department is to serve, through education, research, extension and service, the agricultural and allied industries. The department develops and transfers engineering and related technological knowledge for efficient production of food and fiber to citizens in Iowa and beyond while wisely using our natural resources. Department programs integrate basic biological and physical sciences through application of engineering fundamentals and allied technologies to develop and deliver new knowledge and understanding of agricultural and biological systems. Included in the department's mission are the efficient and effective production, processing, storage, handling, distribution, and use of food and other biological products, and the management of related natural resources.

The department remains committed to the Land Grant philosophy of serving the people of Iowa through education, research, extension, and international programs, particularly as

human needs become more global in nature, and population growth requires increased food supplies.

#### Mission I – Education

To provide educational programs of unsurpassed quality in selected areas of agricultural and biosystems engineering and allied technologies.

#### Mission II – Research

To generate new knowledge through internationally recognized research programs in selected areas of engineering and allied technologies as related to agriculture and biosystems.

#### Mission III – Extension

To transfer technology to the people of Iowa in selected areas of agricultural and biosystems engineering and allied technologies.

#### Mission IV – International

To develop and support instruction, research, and extension opportunities and needs in international agricultural development.

### **Article III: Department Personnel**

Department personnel are classified into several categories:

- Faculty
- Non-Tenure-Eligible Research (NTER) Faculty
- Professional and Scientific Staff
- Merit System Staff
- Graduate Assistants
- Hourly Employees

All individuals in these categories have critical responsibilities in achieving the department mission. However, governance of the department is specifically assigned to the Faculty and Department Chair acting within established College and University procedures.

### **Article IV: Faculty and Chair Responsibilities**

The faculty and Chair share responsibility for department operation. The faculty has an important voice in setting policy and the Chair is responsible for department administration. It is

expected that faculty and Chair will approach department governance in a cooperative and positive spirit.

Responsibilities of the Chair include:

- Directing the work of the department
- Preparing and administering the department's Teaching, Experiment Station and Extension budgets
- Recommending personnel actions
- Assigning work loads
- Appraising performance of faculty members
- Assigning faculty member salaries
- Providing department leadership

The faculty is responsible for academic matters, including:

- Curricula. Note that the two ABE curriculum committees are charged with general oversight of, including assessment and continuous improvement of, the degree programs under their purview (TCC for technology programs, ECC for engineering programs). Voting members on the curriculum committees must be voting members of the faculty; other members such as advisers and students, are in an ex-officio role. Any major changes in programs or policies – e.g.: addition or deletion of an option, certificate, or degree program; change in credit hours required for graduation; changes in admission requirements to any program; changes in the assessment tool for student evaluation of instruction – must be brought to the full faculty for a vote after the relevant curriculum committee(s) has voted on the change.
- Admission of, monitoring progress of, and setting retention standards for undergraduate and graduate students

The faculty advises and makes recommendations to the Chair and College and University administrators regarding:

- Hiring of new faculty members
- Faculty member promotion, tenure, and post-tenure issues
- Research programs

- Extension programs
- Teaching programs
- Physical facility needs
- Other items as requested by administrators or as deemed appropriate by the faculty

The faculty conducts an annual performance review of the Chair through the Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee (PTRC) (see Article IX for other responsibilities of this committee). The purpose of this review is to assist the Chair in providing effective leadership to the department (see Article XVI). The PTRC will conduct a concise, confidential, electronic survey of the tenured and tenure-eligible faculty regarding the performance of the Chair. The survey will be administered each June, with responses compiled and a summary report provided by the end of September. The report will be shared with the Chair, and made available to the Deans.

#### **Article V: Voting Faculty**

The voting faculty consists of the regular voting faculty and the provisional voting faculty. The regular voting faculty shall consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members and non-tenure-eligible faculty members (lecturer, senior lecturer) with a budgeted appointment in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, as well as faculty members holding budgeted joint appointments in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering. In cases where a faculty member is also a graduate student (e.g., lecturers pursuing their Ph.D.), their graduate student status may supercede their faculty status and exclude them from some discussions and decisions. The provisional voting faculty members fill positions and have responsibilities similar to those of the regular faculty, but have courtesy appointments or non-tenure track research positions. They may have adjunct or other types of faculty appointments, or may be appointed in a non-faculty position.

At the first faculty meeting of each semester, the Chair will nominate those persons, if any, who he/she believes should be members of the provisional voting faculty. The regular voting faculty will vote to accept or reject each of the nominees. Tenure on the provisional voting faculty is for one year, but members may be reelected an indefinite number of times.

The provisional voting faculty may vote on all items of faculty business, except for promotion and tenure matters (see Article VI).

#### **Article VI: Conduct of Faculty Business**

The Chair or his/her designee chairs in the faculty meetings. Meetings shall be conducted according to parliamentary procedure. Robert's Rules of Order shall be the governing parliamentary document.

The Chair shall designate a Secretary of the Faculty. The Secretary may be a faculty member or a P&S or Merit System employee. The Secretary shall:

- Maintain current rosters of the regular voting faculty and the provisional voting faculty.
- Maintain minutes of faculty meetings, which shall be available in the department office.
- Maintain a current copy of this Governance Document, as amended, and current copies of the nine related documents listed in Article I.

Faculty meetings shall be scheduled by the Chair at whatever frequency deemed appropriate, but at least once during the Fall and once during the Spring semesters. Meetings shall be announced in writing at least one week in advance of the scheduled time.

The Chair must call a faculty meeting within two weeks if so requested in writing by at least two members of the voting faculty, or when presented with a proposed amendment to this Governance Document (see Article XXII).

Individuals with an interest in matters under discussion, e.g. persons with Adjunct, Visiting, or Courtesy appointments, Professional and Scientific Staff, Merit Staff, or others, may be invited to participate in discussions at faculty meetings, unless ruled out of order by the presiding officer. Only members of the voting faculty may vote on questions brought to a vote. Provisional voting faculty members may not vote on promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review matters. A quorum shall consist of 50% of the voting faculty. Unless otherwise stated, approval by a majority (more than one-half) of voting faculty members present and voting is required to pass questions brought to a vote.

**Article VII: Department Committees**

Except for the PTRC, establishing committees, assigning their responsibilities, naming committee members, and terminating committees is a responsibility of the Chair. The purpose of committees is to provide an organizational framework for department personnel to collectively conduct activities vital to department functioning. Committee membership may include any persons budgeted in the department and may include students or others from within or outside the department or university.

By September 1 of each year, the Chair shall publish a list of departmental standing committees their responsibilities, except for the PTRC that is to be formed by May 1 (described in Article IX) and a listing of the chair and members of each committee. The Chair may, at any time, appoint an ad hoc committee to address specific issues that may arise.

**Article VIII: Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee**

Promotion and tenure procedures are specified in the Department Promotion and Tenure document and by Promotion and Tenure Documents of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the College of Engineering. Post-tenure review procedures are specified in the Department Post-Tenure Review document and by Post-Tenure Review Documents of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the College of Engineering.

The PTRC shall have seven members elected from the regular voting faculty. The PTRC shall include five full professors, one associate professor, and one assistant professor. The PTRC shall be elected from a nomination list that includes all members of the regular voting faculty, except for those who are being considered for promotion, tenure, mid-term probationary or post-tenure review, and regular voting faculty members who ask the Chair to remove their names from the nomination list. Additionally, the department chair has the right to limit assistant professor nominees to ensure that all assistant professors have the opportunity to serve on the PTRC prior to their tenure review.

The election must be conducted by May 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. A ballot will be prepared by the Department Chair and distributed to the regular voting faculty. The five professors, one associate professor, and one assistant professor receiving the most votes will be elected to the committee. If a tie vote occurs that would elect more members than specified, a second ballot containing the names of the individuals so tied will be distributed and that person (or persons, if breaking a

multiple tie at the professor position) receiving the most votes will be elected. When no candidate is available at one of the specified ranks, an additional member of the next-higher rank shall be elected.

Since the PTRC is elected by the regular voting faculty of the department, the PTRC vote represents the combined vote for the entire regular voting faculty. Therefore no regular voting faculty member in the department is permitted to cast a vote outside the department in promotion and tenure process. (Note: see faculty handbook on double voting). The elected assistant professor will participate in all processes and deliberations of the committee, but shall not cast any votes on final recommendations. The elected associate professor will participate in all processes and deliberations of the committee, but shall not cast any votes on final recommendations regarding candidates applying for promotion to full professor or post-tenure reviews of full professors.

No faculty member seeking promotion or a tenure decision, being evaluated for mid-term probationary or post-tenure review is eligible for the PTRC. An assistant professor who has previously been elected to the PTRC is not eligible to serve on the PTRC again until all other assistant professors have served. If any elected member is subsequently unable to serve, that member will resign from the committee, and a replacement member of the same rank will be appointed by the Department Chair.

The PTRC shall elect as voting chairperson one of its full professor members. The elected chairperson will also serve as the member the position responsibility statement (PRS) mediation panel selected by the department. If the elected chairperson is the faculty member in dispute, an alternate full professor on the PTRC will be elected to serve. The PTRC shall follow the procedures set forth in the Department, College, and University Promotion and Tenure Documents in evaluating candidates and making recommendations regarding promotion and tenure. However, in the event of conflict between College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and College of Engineering requirements, the committee and the Department Chair shall reach agreement with the Deans of both Colleges regarding the specific rules to follow. This information will be communicated in a timely manner to those seeking promotion and/or tenure.

The PTRC shall follow the procedures set forth in the Department, College, and University Post-Tenure Review Documents in evaluating candidates and making recommendations regarding post-tenure review. Because the department budget is primarily in the College of

Agriculture and Life Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences procedures will normally govern. However, in the event of conflict between College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and College of Engineering requirements, the committee and the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member shall reach agreement with the Deans of both Colleges regarding the specific rules to follow. This information will be communicated in a timely manner to those subject to post-tenure review.

### **Article IX: ABE Faculty Expectations**

The ABE voting faculty have approved the following guidelines<sup>1</sup> detailing the qualities and/or behaviors associated with faculty performing over a range of superior, strong, successful, substandard, or unacceptable, across five key realms of accomplishment. These expectations are applicable to faculty during the entire span of their careers, though the expected productivity, and weighting of factors will change with individual PRS requirements, which themselves should change as faculty progress through their careers.

---

<sup>1</sup> This list is heavily based upon one published in Crookston, R.K. 2012. *Working with Problem Faculty: A 6-Step Guide for Department Chairs*. It has been modified in consultation with ABE faculty members to better reflect the range of activities – e.g., extension and applied research – that characterize our department.

**ABE FACULTY EXPECTATIONS: RESEARCH**

5. Superior scholarship by consistently publishing highly-cited impactful works. Preparing publications used in development of public policy/standards/regulations. Documented broad impact of research including patents, technologies adopted by industry, and/or knowledge from research making an impact on an industry or society because of changes in practices. Consistently preparing and timely completing project reports that lead to continued funding. Consistently obtains funding to conduct his/her research. Consistently mentors students (MS and PhD) and postdocs to maintain a research program.
  
4. Strong scholarship by publishing highly cited impactful works. Preparing publications used in development of public policy/standards/regulations. Documented broad impact of research including patents, technologies adopted by industry, and/or knowledge from research making an impact on an industry or society because of changes in practices. Consistently preparing and timely completing project reports that lead to continued funding. Consistently obtains funding to conduct his/her research. Consistently mentors students (MS and PhD) and postdocs to maintain a research program.
  
3. Successful scholarship by publishing peer-reviewed journal articles. Consistently preparing and timely completing project reports. Obtains funding to conduct his/her research. Mentors students (MS and PhD) and postdocs to maintain a research program.
  
2. Substandard scholarship consisting of a trend of not publishing and with no tangible evidence of work in progress. Submits annual report, though with little thought or commitment to improvement.
  
1. Unacceptable scholarship, with no verifiable work in progress, no recent submissions, and no publications over a multiyear period. Does not willingly develop plans for improvement and shows no enthusiasm for increasing teaching or service contributions to compensate for lack of scholarly work.

**ABE FACULTY EXPECTATIONS: EXTENSION**

5. Superior extension through continual recognition of needs of clientele and continual development of outreach programs that lead to measurable outcomes. Consistent development of Extension publications and delivery of presentation materials that are widely used by clientele. Obtains evidence of extension program excellence through peer assessment and/or a well-designed client assessment program.
  
4. Strong extension through recognition of needs of clientele and development of outreach programs that lead to measurable outcomes. Development of Extension publications and delivery of presentation materials that are widely used by clientele.
  
3. Successful extension through recognition of needs of clientele and development of outreach programs. Development of Extension publications and delivery of presentations.
  
2. Substandard extension through little development of outreach programs and little development of program improvement plan.
  
1. Unacceptable extension through no development of outreach programs and no development of program improvement plan.

**ABE FACULTY EXPECTATIONS: TEACHING**

5. Superior teaching, as evidenced by delivering courses that demonstrably meet key learning outcomes, with valid and transparent measures consistent with program and department goals. Continually updating course content and exploring improved pedagogy. Develops new modules or courses in response to program-identified needs. Student ratings significantly above department averages. Highly active in mentoring students outside the class (undergraduate theses, special projects, etc.). Recognized by industry as the go-to expert in the area for training and courses. Continually strives for the development of hands-on laboratory experiences as appropriate to promote high quality student learning.

4. Strong teaching, as evidenced by creative and rigorous course design and delivery, attention to course learning outcomes and measures, attention to students outside of class, and above-average student ratings, including narrative comments. Recognized by industry as an expert in the area for training and courses. Strives for the development of hands-on laboratory experiences as appropriate to promote high quality student learning.

3. Successful teaching, as evidenced by efforts to revise and improve with well-considered goals, solid lesson plans, helpful and prompt feedback, and sincere concern for student learning. Student ratings near the department average. Course learning goals consistent with and supportive of program learning outcomes.

2. Substandard teaching, as evidenced by some combination of subpar student ratings, significant student complaints, frequent absences from class or late arrival to class, failure to provide students with prompt feedback, superficial attention to course and program learning outcomes, and/or resistance to department work on assessment.

1. Unacceptable teaching, as evidenced by very low teaching scores, consistent student complaints, failure to provide students with helpful and timely feedback, course content that fails to meet disciplinary standards, and/or refusal to accept proportionate share of teaching load.

**ABE FACULTY EXPECTATIONS: SERVICE**

5. Superior, diligent service to department, college, university, and/or profession by attending meetings and contributing constructively; includes holding leadership posts. Contributes actively and positively to the morale of the department and campus.
  
4. Strong, faithful service on major assignments or significant department, college, and/or university committees. Volunteers for assignments. May include national work such as editorial boards, scholarly reviewer, and assignments in national organizations.
  
3. Successful service with consistent attendance and input at most department, college, and university meetings. Available and accessible. Has well-considered goals for continuing growth as a university citizen. Uses university resources appropriately.
  
2. Substandard service including frequent absence from meetings, consistently coming late, and/or inconsistent or unreliable performance on committees. Little evidence of commitment to improvement. Questionable loyalty to unit mission evidenced by unsupportive behavior or public comments.
  
1. Unacceptable service by failure to participate in meetings and refusal to serve on committees and to fulfill assignments. Frequently away from office and disengaged from formal and informal life of the department. Does not willingly develop plans for improvement and/or shows little or no progress on meeting expectations.

**ABE FACULTY EXPECTATIONS: COLLEGIALITY**

5. Superior collegiality as evidenced by contributing actively and positively to the morale of the department and campus, and promoting commitment to mission, values, behavioral norms or policy. Examples of superior collegiality include: Promotes courtesy and harmony and politely takes a stand against incivility when it occurs. Openly recognizes and promotes contributions of others in achieving department and university goals. Works for the good of the whole rather than for personal gain or credit. Is supportive of others' careers and families.

4. Strong collegiality based contributing positively to the morale of the department and campus, and modeling commitment to mission, values, behavioral norms or policy. Examples of strong collegiality include: Supports candid dialogue and disagrees agreeably. Open to new ideas, teachable. Optimistic, and complimentary in conversations and correspondence. Listens attentively and actively participates in department functions (meetings, initiatives, required paperwork, etc.).

3. Successful collegiality as evidenced by using courtesy and respect when interacting with colleagues and others, and adhering to mission, values, behavioral norms, or policy. Examples of successful collegiality include: Supports unit mission, goals, and behavioral norms. Polite and respectful in conversations and correspondence. Participates in department functions.

2. Substandard collegiality as shown by minimizing mission, values, behavioral norms, or policy. Examples of substandard collegiality include: Arrogant and condescending; treats colleagues, staff, and students as inferiors; ignores or excludes them. Interrupts, tells side jokes, or holds ancillary discussions in meetings. Shares sensitive or private information. Spotty or disruptive participation in department functions.

1. Unacceptable collegiality as demonstrated by damaging morale and/or ignoring or violating behavioral norms or policy. Examples of unacceptable collegiality include: Insubordinate, prejudiced, known for inflammatory statements or e-mails. Humiliates, threatens, attacks, degrades, or insults others. Fails to respect personal space; makes uninvited physical contact; uses vulgarity. Shares sensitive or confidential information. Unresponsive or late responses to departmental requests. Does not participate in department functions, or is combative and disruptive when participating.

**Article X: Faculty Member Performance Appraisal**

The performance of each faculty member shall be reviewed annually by the Chair in accordance with procedures specified in the current appropriate College Performance Appraisal Process. The appraisal process includes a review of the PRS to determine that it accurately reflects the faculty member's duties. The faculty member's accomplishments of the preceding year also are reviewed with reference to the expectations delineated in Article IX. The purpose of the faculty member performance appraisal is to provide the department chair with a detailed knowledge of the faculty member's work and activities, to assist the faculty member in setting goals and priorities, and to enhance productivity.

**Article XI: Probationary Faculty Members Performance Appraisal**

A review will be conducted by the PTRC for all tenure-track faculty members, on a four-year initial appointment, before the end of the third year of employment. The purpose of this review is to provide the faculty member with feedback in accordance with the current promotion and tenure guidelines, and with reference to the expectations delineated in Article IX. A report from the PTRC will be given to the Department Chair and the Chair will communicate the review findings with the faculty member. In cases where the faculty member receives time credit from previously held positions, the PTRC will conduct the review two years before the end of the probationary period (i.e., one year before their mandatory application for tenure).

Materials for reviews conducted prior to the application for tenure and promotion will include the candidate's PRS, complete vita and portfolio (as detailed on the Provost's web site) and proof of institutional and professional citizenship<sup>2</sup>. The departmental faculty may be asked for input concerning institutional and professional citizenship of the candidate.

The timing of probationary faculty member reviews will be distributed annually, but is typically as follows:

- April 15<sup>th</sup> (previous year) – probationary faculty members in need of review are notified by the Department Chair (so that they can be excluded from the PTRC).

---

<sup>2</sup> Evidence of institutional and professional citizenship includes contribution to the decision making and academic/institutional planning at the departmental level, and perhaps even at the college and university levels as well as professional organizations, by effectively carrying out committee assignments. The record of service should demonstrate that the assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service and that their judgments are professionally respected and valued.

- Mid January – materials for probationary faculty member reviews due to the PTRC
- End of April – feedback from the PTRC will be given to the Department Chair to share with the probationary faculty member.

The materials to be submitted for promotion to associate professor with tenure include the PRS, complete vita and portfolio (as detailed in the faculty handbook and the Provost's web page) or other materials as required by the College. Proof of institutional and professional citizenship will be an additional departmental requirement (see definition in the footnote). The PTRC will vote on the awarding of promotion and tenure and submit the result to the Department Chair.

The timing of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be distributed annually, but is typically as follows:

- April 15th – candidate must notify the Department Chair in writing of their intent to seek promotion and tenure if it is not the penultimate year of their contract. In the case of mandatory review, the Department Chair will notify or remind the candidate of the review by this date and the following timelines apply. At this time the candidate should provide a full CV, PRS, and sealed envelope with five names of potential external reviewers and up to three names of individuals not to use as external reviewers.
- May 1 – the new PTRC will be made aware of the candidate's intent and will find appropriate faculty mentors to assist the candidate as they develop their documentation. The PTRC will begin to identify external reviewers and secure external reviewers by early June.
- July 1 – the documentation, including PRS, vita, portfolio and other materials required by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, College of Engineering, University and Departmental guidelines, must be received by the PTRC. The PTRC will review the candidate's dossier and then vote on the solicitation of external reference letters to further the process. The PTRC will give the candidate feedback on their dossier, allowing time for changes before the College deadlines, which are typically around November 1st.
- August 1 – the PTRC will request external reference letters. The external reviewers will receive the PRS and vita along with other P&T guideline materials as defined by the Provost.

**Article XII: Promotion to Professor**

Reviews of faculty members wishing to be promoted to full professor are conducted much the same as those being promoted to associate professor, and will be done with reference to the expectations delineated in Article IX. In addition to criteria set forth by the College and University, institutional and professional citizenship will be a consideration in the evaluation of candidates<sup>3</sup>. The departmental faculty may be asked for input concerning institutional and professional citizenship of the candidate.

The timing of tenure and promotion to Professor will be distributed annually, but typically is as follows:

- April 15th – candidate must notify the Department Chair in writing of their intent to seek promotion. At this time the candidate should provide a full CV, PRS, and sealed envelope with five names of potential external reviewers and up to three names of individuals not to use as external reviewers.
- First week May 1 – the new PTRC will be made aware of the candidate’s intent and will find appropriate faculty mentors to assist the candidate as they develop their documentation. The PTRC will begin to identify external reviewers and secure external reviewers by early June.
- July 1 – the documentation, including PRS, vita, portfolio and other materials required by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, College of Engineering, University and Departmental guidelines, must be received by the PTRC. The PTRC will review the candidate’s dossier and then vote on the solicitation of external reference letters to further the process. The PTRC will give the candidate feedback on their dossier, allowing time for changes before the College deadlines, which are typically around November 1st.

---

<sup>3</sup> Candidates must present reasonable evidence of such service as: effective membership, and in some cases leadership, on standing and/or ad hoc committees at the departmental, college, and/or University levels; sponsorship and advising of student groups or clubs; lectures, consultation, and other contributions to the University and the community consistent with the candidate's professional expertise; honors or awards for professional service to the University, community, and professional groups or organizations; membership, participation, and certain leadership in the activities of regional and national professional organizations as committee members, session chairs, elected officials, and the like; editing of scholarly journals, reviewing of manuscripts and grant applications or other activities that represent high quality professional service at different levels to both the public and private sectors.

- August 1 – the PTRC will request external reference letters. The external reviewers will receive the PRS and vita along with other promotion guideline materials as defined by the Provost.

Beginning of September – the PTRC will request external reference letters. The external reviewers will receive the PRS and vita along with other promotion guideline materials as defined by the Provost.

### **Article XIII: Post-Tenure Review**

Each tenured and continuously appointed faculty member's accomplishments will be reviewed according to the current Department, College, and University Post-Tenure Review Guidelines, and with reference to the expectations delineated in Article IX, at the frequency specified in those documents. The review will be conducted by the PTRC, with an evaluation and recommendation forwarded to the Chair. Faculty members will be evaluated sequentially based on the length of service since their last promotion or post-tenure review.

Review packets submitted by faculty will include all PRS's in effect during the review period, a complete vita, and a two-page document summarizing his or her major accomplishments and impacts associated with each PRS component since his or her last review.

The timing of post-tenure review will be distributed annually, but typically is as follows:

- April 15<sup>th</sup> (previous year) – faculty members scheduled for review are notified by the Department Chair (so they can be excluded from the PTRC).
- Mid December – materials for post-tenure faculty review due to the PTRC
- Mid February – a summary of the PTRC's appraisals and recommendations will be given to the Department Chair in order for the Chair to develop a plan for improvement with the faculty member if such a plan is deemed necessary.

### **Article XIV: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members (Adjunct, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers) Performance Appraisal**

All non-tenure track faculty members with renewable Letters of Intent will be reviewed according to the current Department, College, and University guidelines for non-tenure-track faculty members before a reappointment decision. The review will be conducted by the PTRC, with an evaluation and recommendation forwarded to the Chair.

The following materials are to be submitted by the NTE faculty member under review to the PTRC as part of the review process (this should be submitted as one pdf file with materials in the following order):

1. Updated vita (complete CV that includes all aspects of PRS responsibilities).
2. PRS for the current contract.
3. A two-page summary of the impact of your PRS responsibilities. The focus should be on the impact of your teaching for ABE, including significant changes/upgrades to the courses you have taught and plans for continuous improvement, but also include the impact of your other responsibilities.
4. A summary table of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) scores for each course taught since being appointed in ABE. Include scores for each SEI question and departmental norms where appropriate.
5. All student comments from the SEIs, organized by course and semester (since last review).
6. Documentation of continuous improvement, such as review of curricular materials by departmental or external experts and subsequent changes made, peer evaluations of teaching and subsequent changes made, or similar.

The timing of non-tenure-track faculty member reviews will be distributed annually, but is typically as follows (this reflects ABE's historical tendency to hire lectures on multi-year contracts, rather than on semester-by-semester contracts):

- November 15<sup>th</sup> (~18 months prior to end of contract) – NTE faculty members in need of review are notified by the Department Chair that they need to submit their materials to the PTRC in the spring, as part of their annual review process.
- Mid-February (~15 months prior to end of contract) – Review materials (items 1 – 5 above) due to the PTRC.
- Mid-April (~13 months prior to end of contract) – feedback from the PTRC provided to the Department Chair to inform the reappointment decision. At the chair's discretion, portions or all of this feedback may be shared with the NTE faculty member under review.

## **Article XV: Non-Tenure-Eligible Research (NTER) Faculty Member Performance Appraisal**

The performance of each NTER faculty member shall be reviewed annually by the Chair in accordance with procedures specified in the current appropriate College and University Performance Appraisal Process. The appraisal process includes a review of the PRS to determine that it accurately reflects the NTER faculty member's duties. The NTER faculty member's accomplishments of the preceding year also are reviewed. The purpose of the NTER faculty member performance appraisal is to provide the department Chair with a detailed knowledge of the NTER faculty member's work and activities, to assist the NTER faculty member in setting goals and priorities, and to enhance productivity.

A NTER faculty member may be proposed for advancement to the next rank. The advancement review process shall be conducted by the PTRC and be the same as the review for tenure and promotion of tenure-eligible and tenured faculty members. The standards for each rank shall be the same as the definitions for scholarship performance at rank for assistant, associate and professor ranks for tenure-eligible and tenured faculty members. The review will be conducted by the PTRC, with an evaluation and recommendation forwarded to the Chair.

## **Article XVI: Other Types of Faculty Appointments**

The ABE department offers courtesy, adjunct, visiting, and affiliate appointments. Refer to the Faculty Handbook for details on adjunct, visiting, and affiliate appointments. For courtesy, adjunct, and affiliate appointment, ABE follows the Faculty Handbook with the stipulations below:

Courtesy appointments are offered to faculty members from other academic departments at ISU (see Section 3.3.7 of the ISU Faculty Handbook). Affiliate faculty appointments are offered to non ISU employees (see Section 3.3.6 of the ISU Faculty Handbook). Adjunct faculty appointments are offered to ISU P&S employees to carry out faculty responsibilities (see Section 3.3.2.5 of the ISU Faculty Handbook). It is expected that courtesy, adjunct, visiting, and affiliate faculty members will *engage with ABE in substantive ways that would not be possible without this status*, for example, by recruiting and serving as major professor to students in ABE graduate programs, by providing financial support of ABE graduate student research, or by co-

teaching ABE course(s) with ABE faculty members. ABE makes no financial commitment to these faculty members.

Courtesy, adjunct, and affiliate appointments are term appointments ranging in length from 3 to 5 years, with renewal possible. Unless specifically requested, faculty members with courtesy, adjunct, and affiliate appointments will not have voting rights. If requested, granting of voting rights will be determined by a faculty vote; a two-thirds majority is necessary for passage. If requested and granted, the voting rights of faculty members with these types of appointments shall be the same as for provisional voting faculty, per this governance document.

To request courtesy, adjunct, or affiliate status, the applicant should submit a Letter of Interest indicating the nature of the engagement between the faculty and the ABE department. To request continuation of status, applicants should also include within the Letter of Interest a summary of relevant activities arising from the last appointment. The ABE faculty, with access to (1) the written statement and (2) a current 2-pg vita, shall vote on applications and any subsequent renewals; a two-thirds majority is necessary for passage. In cases of approval, the faculty will provide clear guidance to the chair regarding the content of the Letter of Intent. Applications will be reviewed on a rolling basis, but renewals will be reviewed annually at a faculty retreat (or at the first faculty meeting thereafter). At that time, the Chair will present the prior Letters of Intent and new Letters of Interest from all those who need renewal actions to inform the discussion.

### **Article XVII: Faculty Member Work Assignments**

Teaching, student advising, research, extension, and other duties shall be assigned by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member and in accordance with the current PRS.

**Faculty Buyout from Teaching.** Faculty may buyout part of their workload responsibilities from an externally funded grant or sponsored project. Buyout will typically be taken from teaching responsibilities. Faculty buyout must be approved in a workload discussion, written in a memorandum of agreement, and signed by the faculty member and the chair. The faculty member buying out of teaching must identify an acceptable and willing replacement instructor for the class. The faculty member is responsible if the replacement instructor is not able to complete the class.

The standard ABE workload is four 3-credit classes per year for a 50 % teaching load. Since departmental teaching obligations must be covered, it may not be possible to approve all buy-out requests; therefore early notification of the intent to buyout is crucial. Providing notice at least three months in advance of the semester start is recommended. No faculty member will be allowed to buy out of instruction if it will negatively impact the instructional quality in our programs or compromise the ability of the department to deliver its instructional programs. The impact on the instructional program will determine the number of buyouts, if any, that can be accommodated each year by the department. The percentage of courses delivered by non-tenure track faculty in the ABE programs will also be a consideration in the decision process. Faculty members are expected to teach at least one course each academic year and may not use external funding to buy out of all teaching in a given year. To buy out of a course, faculty will provide reimbursements to the department using the following, where the annual faculty salary is based on a nine-month equivalent salary:

1 course buyout =  $0.15 * \text{annual faculty salary}$

2 course buyout =  $0.30 * \text{annual faculty salary}$

3 course buyout =  $0.50 * \text{annual faculty salary}$

### **Article XVIII: Department Focus Area Leaders**

To facilitate department operation, personnel have been grouped into subject matter focus areas. To improve communication and provide liaison, the Chair may name a leader or co-leaders for each of these units. Unit leaders have no specific administrative duties by virtue of that appointment. Some may, however, have administrative duties assigned by the Chair, or specified in their PRS.

### **Article XIX: Department Chair Performance Appraisal**

The PTRC shall develop a procedure for appraising the performance of the Department Chair and shall conduct a performance appraisal at the request of the Dean or the Chair. The performance appraisal shall include a meeting of the PTRC with the Chair. The purpose of the appraisal is to ensure faculty-Chair interaction and to provide a means for collective, thoughtful recommendations from the faculty to the Chair for enhancing leadership of the department.

The PTRC shall provide for faculty input in developing the performance appraisal. The PTRC shall provide both written and oral reports to the Chair regarding the results of the appraisal. The PTRC may, at its discretion, call a meeting of voting faculty to report orally regarding recommendations made to the Chair.

The faculty may, at its discretion, by majority vote, instruct the PTRC to communicate with the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences or the College of Engineering regarding strengths of the Chair's performance and/or areas of concern that the faculty may have.

### **Article XX: Department Planning Retreat**

The department faculty must be aware of the factors external and internal to the department that affect the ability of the department to fulfill its mission. Thoughtful consideration of these factors is critical to maintaining a strong, vibrant, and effective department.

The Chair shall at least every two years schedule a Department Planning Retreat of appropriate duration for the purpose of reviewing and revising the department's mission and vision. Action plans shall be developed for meeting challenges to department effectiveness, to enhance department relevance, and to evaluate program quality and department stature.

Faculty members have a responsibility to participate in these retreats.

### **Article XXI: Salary Adjustments**

Assigning faculty member salaries is a responsibility of the Department Chair. The Chair may consult with the PTRC or ask any selected individuals to provide guidance in allocating available salary adjustment funds for equity and to reflect contributions to department productivity.

When informing individual faculty members of their salaries for the coming year, the Chair should state the average department percent adjustment, and if the individual's adjustment is appreciably different from the department average, the reasons for that difference.

### **Article XXII: Amendments**

The procedure for amending the Governance Document and/or the Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review Documents shall be as follows: Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair in writing by a voting faculty member for distribution to the faculty and for inclusion

as an agenda item for a faculty meeting to be held within two weeks. Proposed amendments shall be discussed and may be amended at the faculty meeting. Within one week following the faculty meeting at which the proposed amendment is discussed, a ballot shall be prepared and distributed to the voting faculty. Ballots must be returned within 10 days of distribution to be counted.

To be adopted, an amendment must be approved by a majority of the voting faculty (not simply a majority of those voting).

To ensure that this Governance Document remains current, the PTRC shall annually review this document to determine if it is in conflict with University, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, or College of Engineering governance document or procedures. If conflicts are found that committee shall propose amendments to this document to reconcile those differences.

**Article XXIII: Adoption**

This Governance document is proposed as an amendment to and replacement for the “Rules of Governance, Department of Agricultural Engineering”, dated September 1, 1975, revised March 1981, amended by replacing that document in its entirety with the Rules of Governance, Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering May 8, 1992, and amended November 17, 1999, April 11, 2003, November 18, 2003; December 20, 2005, March 31, 2009, May 3, 2010, February 28, 2011, September 12, 2011, March 1, 2012, April 30, 2012, September 24, 2013, September 18, 2014, April 1, 2015, May 19, 2015, February 7, 2017, April 24, 2017.