PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT HANDBOOK

2022-2023

Contents

Faculty Governance

Overview

The Department of Psychology reflects the Iowa State University mission to "Create, share, and apply knowledge to make Iowa and the world a better place." Faculty create knowledge by conducting groundbreaking research in basic domains and in applying psychological theories and the latest research methods to real-world problems. Faculty share this knowledge with graduate students through an apprenticeship model of graduate education that focuses on empirical research, up-to-date quantitative methods, and mastery of relevant scholarship in the areas of cognitive, counseling or social psychology. Our APA-accredited Counseling Psychology program provides professional training that qualifies students to engage in scientifically-informed clinical practice in a wide range of contexts, including university, medical, and community settings. The undergraduate program provides students with a broad overview of the science of human behavior, as well as training in research methods, critical thinking, and communication.

The goals of the Psychology Department are the following:

1.To continue to enhance the stature and visibility of our research and training programs, through maintaining the top-ranked research-focused Counseling Psychology program, honing our nationally competitive Social Psychology program, continuing to grow our strong applied Cognitive program, and developing a new Health Psychology program.

2.To provide a rigorous graduate education to students who have the training and experiences required to enter their desired career setting (academia, industry, private practice, or other).

3.To provide undergraduate students with a broad knowledge of the field of psychology and with the skills and experiences needed to succeed in the work place or in graduate education.

(Adapted from the 2020 Psychology self study document).

Administrative Structure

Overview

1. Associate Chair: Responsibilities that involve both the graduate and undergraduate curriculum/decisions, and responsibilities that involve decisions regarding faculty assignments; responsibilities that involve substituting for the Department Chair
2. The DUS: responsibilities are focused primarily on undergraduate students, program, and advising.

Each position will be compensated with one course buyout and one month summer salary (although there may be a greater course release the first year of service)

<u>ASSOCIATE CHAIR for CURRICULUM</u>

1. **Schedule and staff all department courses**
    - Set teaching schedule (organize, plan, track, record, graybar); keep other departments informed; address last minute crises
    - Work with Advising to manage enrollments;
    - Address (and try to prevent) problems with course offerings/coverage
    - Maintains department records of course offerings and teaching assignments
        - Figure out term faculty proportions
    - Integrate undergrad and grad teaching with GPC
    - Coordinate TA/Course schedule with DOGE (e.g., 102, 440)
    - Proofing, coordinate Grad College Dual listing
    - Proofing, coordinate work with other departments on LAS cross-listing
    - Put in EL0 (online courses, instructors, coordinate with other departments)
    - Work with GIRI and other departments to set ad hoc CMDIS courses (Online and face to face)

2. **New course planning and scheduling (along with UPC)**

3. **Manage classroom scheduling and issues**
    - Oversee course assignments to department-controlled classrooms
    - Evaluate room assignments for problems

4. **Manage and monitor summer teaching schedules**
    - Estimate summer teaching revenue,
    - Set summer teaching (select courses and times of courses),
    - Monitor enrollment; cancel if needed.

5. **Supervise Course Evaluation procedures**

6. **Participate in other departmental planning and management committees and activities**

- Attend meetings of the Undergraduate program committee
- Serve as member of the Executive committee
- Substitutes for the Department Chair at some on-campus and off-campus activities
- Assist in hiring staff and term faculty
- Completes other projects as negotiated with the Chair

DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

1. **Supervise and coordinate undergraduate advising;**
   - Assist in hiring when new advisors are needed.
   - Work with advisors to development new programs
   - Sign advising time cards;
   - Conduct annual advisor evaluations

2. **Supervise new student recruitment:**
   - Work with advisors to enhance recruitment efforts;
   - Meet occasionally with recruits.
   - Assist with orientation if needed.

3. **Oversee and enhance undergraduate curriculum**
   - Stay informed of national trends and APA expectations for undergraduate programs
   - Chair the Undergraduate Program Committee (schedule, meet, agenda, actions, report at faculty meetings)
   - Evaluate and recommend curricular changes; work with Associate Chair, Undergrad Program Committee, Department Chair, faculty and staff to implement changes
   - Supervise the Outcomes Assessment Committee and recommend changes based on assessments (and Senior Survey)
   - Prepare catalog narrative edits and course edits. Keep catalog clean
   - Work with advisors to keep website updated
   - Supervise and be responsible for the Course Improvement Policy in the department.
   - Evaluate transfer credits (or work with advisors to do this)
   - As CIO supervisor: confirm night exam dates; schedule classrooms; assist in scheduling finals, etc.
   - Faculty contact for CIO
   - Attend teaching planning meetings with Associate Chair and Chair

4. **Oversee and maintain quality of student awards, recognition, and advancement**
   - Supervise process of honors and awards for undergraduates, including top 2%; Phi Beta Kappa, awards and scholarships (solicit nominations/applications, collect materials, evaluate with UPC, communicate; work with staff to get money)

Evaluate/Approve student travel reimbursement requests

5. **Point of contact for questions, concerns about undergraduate program**
    - Interact with faculty/instructors to manage undergraduate concerns
    - Field questions from students, faculty, departments, college, outside, etc. about undergrad program (or delegate to others)
    - Point of contact for undergrad grievances/problems
    - Serve as the liaison between the department and the college on issues of undergraduate education
    - Coordinate/solicit faculty participation in LAS and University programs involving undergrad education
6. **Serve as a member of the departmental Executive Committee**

Director of Graduate Education (DOGE)

(Edited by S. Cross, 1/26/18; updated by J. Chan 04/19/22)

The Department Chair will appoint a Director of Graduate Education (DOGE).

Administrative duties of the DOGE include:

1. Assigning graduate student RA and TA assignments for the academic year and summer sessions
2. Chairing the Graduate Program Committee
3. Overseeing the graduate student review process
4. Supervising the qualifying exam process
5. Working with the graduate secretary and area directors to respond to prospective and current student questions, in the admissions process, and in other aspects of the graduate program.
6. Communicating with students and faculty about upcoming events, deadlines, expectations, and best practices.
7. Orienting new students to the program

The DOGE will chair the Graduate Program Committee. The charge to this committee is to:

1. Coordinate graduate admissions
2. Monitor and update policies regarding graduate students
3. Coordinate with major professors to provide annual evaluations of graduate students
4. Coordinate graduate student award nominations at the department, college, and university levels and select award winners for departmental and university excellence awards

The DOGE also represents the department at Graduate College and LAS DOGE meetings. The duties associated with the position are a combination of administrative and teaching related duties. In determining the workload distribution option for the DOGE, there would be a 10% increase in the service load. Compensation includes a one course per year teaching reduction and one month of summer salary.

The DOGE and the DUS will be exempt from duty on the CERTS or the P&T committees. This exemption may be overruled for the P&T election if insufficient numbers of full professors are available for a case that involves promotion to full. (approved 10.15.2018)

Counseling Training Director

Department of Psychology Committees

2022-2023 v1

Department Chair	Susan Cross
Associate Chair for Curriculum	David Vogel
Executive Committee	Cross, Kelly, Vogel, Hessling, Prieto
Director of Undergraduate Studies	Bob Hessling
Director of Graduate Education; Post-doc contact	Jon Kelly
CERTS (3 year terms)-	Gentile, 2020-2023, Social Wei, 2021 – 2024, Counseling Smith, 2022-2025, Cognitive TBD, , Term faculty member
Promotion and Tenure	Carpenter, Cognitive, Spring 2019 – Spring 2023 Cutrona (chair), Social, Spring 2020-Spring 2024 Wade, Counseling, Spring 2021 – Spring 2025 Anderson, At-large, Spring 2022-Spring 2026
Graduate Program	Kelly (chair), A. Phillips, Prieto, Carpenter
Undergraduate Program	Hessling (chair), Vogel, Costabile, Nesbit, Tynan,Phipps
Director – Cognitive	Carpenter
Director – Counseling	Prieto
Director – Social	Alison Phillips
Psych-Law Coordinator	Wells
Colloquium committee	*paused*
TTE Search (Counseling)	Wade (Chair), Prieto, Marsee, A. Phillips
Faculty Enhancement/Awards	Cutrona (chair), Wells, Krizan, Wei,
Research Advancement committee	Meissner (Chair), Blankenship, Cutrona, Krizan
Research Participation Pool	Blankenship (chair), Armstrong, Grundy
Department Diversity	Wei & Marsee co-chairs, Wolf; Gentile, Costabile
Student Outcomes	Hanisch (chair), W. Phillips, Whitney Baker, C. Richie

Assessment	
Human Relations and Grievances	Gentile (chair), Acerbo, Venkatagiri, Chan
PRS Mediator	C. Meissner (Alternate: Wells)
Human Research Ethics Review/IRB Prescreening	Prieto, Anderson, Chan
Social committee	Grundy, Krizan
Psych Club Advisor	Hessling, Wolf
Psi Chi Advisor	Crede
GSP Advisor	Kelly
Library Liaison	Grundy
Learning Community	Scheel, Cutrona, Baker
Faculty Senate	Wade, Armstrong
Representative Assembly	Crede
Quantitative Certificate Program Director	Crede
HCI Advisory Committee	Kelly
Communications Studies Advisory	Vogel (Director), Costabile, Blankenship
Ad hoc faculty evaluation committee	Carpenter (chair), Armstrong, Crede
Ad hoc Wayfinding committee	Cross (Chair), Acerbo, Meissner, Kelly

COMMITTEE CHARGES

Research Participation Pool Committee Charge
(Approved by faculty May 9, 2022)

The Department Chair will appoint a chair and two additional members of the RPPC. A graduate student assistant will also be assigned to the committee. The charge of the committee is to:
1. Enroll students of Sona courses into Sona system.
2. Generate and disseminate Sona pool policies to faculty.
3. Monitor Sona research credit activity.
4. Update faculty on Sona pool status throughout the semester.
5. Be point of contact between faculty and instructors of Sona courses.
6. Be point of contact for faculty requests regarding rules easement.

Additional administrative duties of the RPPC include:
• Maintain Psychology Department Sona pool (e.g., manage IRB continuing reviews IRB for Sona system & mass testing).
• Training RPPC graduate student assistant.
• Coordination of mass testing.

DEI Committee Charge
(Approved by faculty May 9, 2022)

The DEI committee will consist of faculty, advising staff, graduate, and undergraduate representatives. The committee will be responsible for promoting equitable and inclusive practices at the department level. The committee chair will attend monthly meetings with the LAS DEI Chairs Council. The committee will organize a variety of voluntary activities for the department (e.g., speaker series, book/journal clubs, workshops, etc) to create awareness and improvements regarding DEI work within the department. A Canvas page will be maintained by committee members as a communication tool and a repository for DEI resources.

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Standard Position Responsibility Statements

(Approved by faculty 10/27/99, revised 12/11/2006)

Each tenure-track faculty member in the department will be provided with a Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) in accordance with the University Policies and Procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The Department Chair and the faculty member will jointly construct and sign the statement. For the vast majority of faculty, the PRS will be one of the two standard versions listed below.

In rare cases, a faculty member and the Department Chair may construct a modified PRS. For example, upon nearing retirement a senior faculty member with an exceptional teaching record may request a heavier teaching load and a lighter research load than is standard for the department. If the conditions warrant such a change, as determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee, the modified PRS might specify a 6 course teaching load and the phrase “publishing scholarly work in appropriate outlets” might be changed to “publishing or presenting scholarly work in appropriate public outlets (e.g., journals, national or regional conferences).” Note that the PRSs do not supersede the evaluation procedures outlined by Department of Psychology Handbook; rather, they are intended to complement those procedures. Also note that the Department Chair may suggest a modified PRS. In all cases, both the Department Chair and the faculty member must agree to the PRS.

The Department Chair will meet with newly hired assistant professors and their program area chair to discuss expectations for achieving tenure, including discussion of which journal outlets are most appropriate for that person.

Standard PRS for Tenured Faculty

As a tenured faculty member in the Department of Psychology, Professor X’s responsibilities include teaching 3-5 courses per year, publishing scholarly work in appropriate outlets, supervising graduate students, advising undergraduate students, and serving on departmental, college, and university committees. Teaching and service loads may vary from year to year depending on Professor X’s research productivity and career goals, as well as the needs of the department, college, and university. Specific teaching and service assignments, and the associated workload distribution, will be determined annually in consultation with the Department of Psychology Chair (as described in the Department of Psychology Handbook).

Standard PRS for Untenured Faculty

As an untenured assistant professor in the Department of Psychology, Professor X’s responsibilities include teaching 2-3 courses per year, publishing scholarly work in appropriate outlets as described in the department promotion and tenure document, supervising graduate students, advising undergraduate students, and serving on departmental committees. Specific teaching and service responsibilities may vary from year to year depending on Professor X’s research productivity and career goals, as well as the needs of the department, college, and university. These assignments will be determined annually in consultation with the Department of Psychology Chair (as described in the Department of Psychology Handbook).

Changes to the PRS

The faculty work-load distribution in combination with the PRS allows for flexibility in faculty responsibilities as a function of faculty and department needs. Because the role of the PRS in conjunction with the workload distribution is important in faculty evaluation, especially outside the department, tenured faculty members will re-evaluate their PRS with the Department Chair at least every five years. Any changes to a faculty member's PRS must be agreed upon by both the Department Chair and the faculty member.

Disagreements Regarding the PRS

If either the faculty member or the Department Chair disagrees with any proposed change to the faculty member's PRS, either party may ask that the Department PRS Mediator convene a PRS Mediation Panel. The PRS Mediation Panel shall hear the arguments and deliver an opinion in a timely fashion (not more than two months) on how the disagreement should be resolved. The faculty member and the Department Chair should then reconsider the matter to see of an agreement can now be reached based on the panel's recommendation. If an agreement between the faculty member and the Department Chair does not emerge within ten working days, the matter will be forwarded to a college-level PRS Arbitration Panel. During the time of the mediation process, the existing signed and dated PRS will remain in effect.

The office of PRS Mediator for Psychology shall be created. A tenured full professor, who is not the Department Chair, shall be elected to a three-year term as PRS Mediator by a vote of all tenured, tenure-track faculty and term faculty with a ½ time appointment or more. The Department Chair does not participate in this vote. The PRS Mediator shall convene a PRS Mediation Panel should the need for such a panel arise as described in the preceding paragraph. This three-person panel shall consist of the PRS Mediator, who will serve as chair, one faculty member selected by the faculty member involved in the disagreement, and one faculty member selected by the Department Chair. The faculty members selected for the panel must be of rank equal to or higher than the faculty member whose PRS is in dispute.

Position Responsibility Statements and Faculty Evaluation Weights (amended 10/15/2018)

Members of the department contribute to the teaching, research/scholarship, and service missions of the department; these contributions vary across individuals and within individuals over time. This is a flexible position responsibility policy that reflects individual differences in contributions to teaching, research, and service. The primary goal of this policy is to provide variable teaching, research, and service assignments to fit faculty and departmental goals and needs. A secondary goal is to establish a closer relationship between the work load distributions for individual faculty members and the weights the faculty evaluation committee (CERTS) applies to teaching, research, and service when evaluating contributions to the department. The following principles should serve as a guide to implementation of this policy.

1. Every faculty member's position responsibility statement and workload distribution should represent a combination of individual performance and the department's teaching obligations. Individual assignments will result from negotiations between the faculty member and the Department Chair, usually beginning in the fall of the preceding year.

2. Differential workload assignments should be reflected in the weights CERTS and/or Chair applies to each individual faculty member's teaching, research, and service ratings when performing annual evaluations.

3. The typical teaching load for the department should vary between 3 and 8 courses per year. Particular administrative positions (e.g., DOGE and DUS) and exceptional circumstances may justify individual teaching assignments of only 1 or 2 courses per year (see below)

4. Research and scholarly productivity should be the major criterion for teaching assignments for TTE faculty; term faculty may request reductions in teaching if they have exceptional advising or other service assignments. TTE faculty members opting for an increased assignment to research (and therefore a reduced teaching load) should develop a research plan for the year, and have a past record of research productivity which demonstrates their ability to carry out the plan.

5. Service contributions are expected, and except where justified by exceptional circumstances, they will be weighted as only a small percentage of the overall evaluation.

Work-Load Distributions and Weights for TTE Faculty

		Merit Evaluation Weights			
Option	**Courses/Year**	**Teaching**	**Research**	**Service**	
Option	3	30		60	10
Option	4	40		50	10
Option	5	50	30-40	10-20	
Option D	6	60	20-30	10-20	

While we assume that these four options will cover the vast majority of our faculty, two additional options can be employed under extraordinary circumstances:

Option E	2	20	50-70	10-30
Option F	3-4	30-40	30-40	20-30

Special Cases and Other Considerations:

A. Tenure track assistant professors should receive a reduced teaching load during their first year (Note. Implementation of this guideline has resulted in assistant professors teaching two courses their first year and three courses per year until the year following their tenure and promotion decision.). Their teaching load after promotion is negotiated with the Chair, based on research productivity (as evaluated by CERTS and the Chair).

B. In rare cases, the pursuit of new or especially time-consuming research/scholarship (e.g., writing a center grant) or service efforts (e.g., writing the self-study for an accreditation review) may be encouraged with a one-time one-course reduction in teaching load. This reduction must be approved by the Chair and may not be available the specific semester when it is requested because of departmental teaching needs.

C. Occasionally, teaching a large, difficult, or new class may be recognized with increased teaching credit for that class the first time an instructor teaches it.

D. Significantly larger than average formal undergraduate advising responsibilities may justify increased work load assignment to service. Significantly larger than average formal graduate advising responsibilities may justify an increased work load proportion that is assigned to teaching, upon request of the faculty member and with approval by the Chair.

E. (Approved 2017) Faculty members may not drop below one course per year through any combination of circumstances (other than an FPDA, FMDA or approved leave, or appointment as department chair) with a single exception. The only circumstance in which a faculty member may be given a zero teaching load (other than he exceptions noted above) is when the faculty member obtains an externally-funded grant that is awarded on the condition that the faculty member devote 100% of his or her time to the funded project.

F. Teaching a 2-2 class (two hours of lecture and two hours of lab, both taught by the instructor) will be recognized with 1.33 teaching credits per semester (the equivalent of one and a third 3-unit classes). This does not affect the faculty member's work-load distribution weights, but is recognized with a one-course reduction after every third time the individual teaches the course. Psych 302 is the only class that currently fits this description.

G. Some 1-hour classes (Psych 594 and 112) count as .5 of a 3-credit course for the instructor (for example, two 594 courses equal one 3-credit class). This expansion of teaching credit recognizes the labor-intensive nature of the class (lectures, grading homework and exams, consulting with students, engaging in out-of-class activities).

H. Faculty may reduce their teaching load by one course for a major departmental service obligation (DOGE, DUS, or Training Director). They are also entitled to a one 3-unit course teaching reduction for the duration of their appointment.

I. In exceptional circumstances, faculty may reduce their teaching load by one or two courses for a major university appointment (e.g., President of Faculty Senate or an appointment in a university administrative office). University appointments that reduce teaching responsibilities must be accompanied by funds to cover replacement teaching.
It is the responsibility of the faculty member who has been recruited for extra-departmental administrative duties to consult with the Department Chair and to jointly negotiate the appropriate commitment in funding from the ISU unit that is seeking the faculty member's administrative services.

J. Tenured and tenure-track faculty may buy out of one but no more than two courses per academic year using external grant funding, with permission of the chair, who will consider departmental teaching needs. The grant must pay 12.5% of the faculty member’s nine-month salary to reduce the faculty member’s teaching load by each one 3-credit course.

K. Distinguished Professors will be given a two-course teaching load to allow them to produce extraordinary research that may attract AAU-recognized awards. This special reduced load will continue as long as the faculty member is highly research active. Distinguished Professors are sometimes expected to engage in extra service to the university, which seeks their guidance because of their exceptional standing in their field of research. In that case, the distribution of time between research and service may be negotiated with the chair.

L. Editorial Service responsibilities, such as serving as an Editor-in-Chief or as an Associate Editor is to be credited to evaluations of research (per amendment approved 4–23-01). In general, no teaching reductions will be given for service as an associate editor. Faculty who are asked to serve as the lead editor of a major journal should request support from the Dean of the College of LAS for a course buyout (and notify the Chair). If funds are provided from the College, and the Chair approves, a one course reduction may be allowed (recognizing that no faculty member may drop below a 1 course/year minimum).

M. Schedule of course and service reduction requests

All requests for grant or ISU funded course or service reductions must be made in writing to the Chair at least 1 semester in advance. Potential buy-outs (e.g., for grants under review) should also be requested at least one semester in advance when possible. This is necessary so that the funding commitments can be clarified and so that the scheduling and coverage of teaching and service assignments can be made in a timely fashion, consistent with normal departmental planning.

These guidelines do not obligate the department or the Department Chair to automatically grant requests for course buy-outs.

General Procedures for Evaluating Psychology Faculty Productivity

(Approved by faculty 1/23/95)
(Revisions Approved 1/12/98)
(Revised 4/29/02)

1. The key principle underlying evaluation is that every faculty member contributes to the department in a unique way. The emphasis is on encouraging growth and development in areas of individual strength. This does not mean that all faculty are rewarded equally, but that a range of contributions are considered in evaluating each person's performance.

2. One committee, the Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS), has been established to conduct evaluations of teaching research and service. Research and service are evaluated in the odd-numbered years; teaching is evaluated in even-numbered years.

3. Faculty members are not ranked. Faculty are placed in one of five broad categories, or between categories for each of three performance domains (teaching, service, research). The categories are: Excellent, Soundly Competent, Competent, Adequate, and Unsatisfactory. Faculty may be placed midway between two categories. Categorizations are made independent of workload distribution. The committees provide the Department Chair with a written rationale for their evaluative decisions, which is available to the faculty member upon request.

4. General guidelines for ratings have been established in each of the three performance domains. Separate ad hoc committees have been assigned the task of formulating such guidelines for research, teaching, and service (subject to approval by the full faculty). At regular intervals, these guidelines will be reviewed and, if necessary, updated, (e.g., every five years). Where appropriate, input will be sought from each program area regarding standards of excellence (e.g., the most prestigious journals in the area).

5. Performance ratings in the areas of research, teaching, and service are provided by the committee to the Department Chair and it is the Department Chair's responsibility to weigh the information in a manner that is consistent with the workload distribution that was negotiated with each faculty member. The Department Chair is not bound by a rigid formula and may reward individuals for excellence in a flexible manner (e.g., providing special recognition to a faculty member who carries a heavy teaching load and is highly productive in research).

6. Responsibility for communicating developmental feedback rests with the Department Chair. The Department Chair considers the written feedback provided by the evaluation committee and other information (e.g., mutually agreed upon individual goals) in providing verbal and written developmental feedback to each faculty member.

7. Participation in evaluation is viewed as a responsibility shared by all tenured faculty. Broad participation is desirable. The evaluation committees consist of 3 faculty members, one from each of the three areas in the department (social, counseling, and cognitive). Faculty who are not affiliated with one of the three areas would initially be affiliated with the cognitive group until the cognitive area has at least three eligible faculty. At that time, the faculty who are unaffiliated with one of the three areas would select an area to affiliate with for the purpose of the election. They would notify the Chair of their decision prior to the ballots being drawn up. Faculty who are duly appointed to two of the areas (social, counseling, cognitive) must notify the Chair of their primary area affiliation for the purposes of election. This affiliation would remain constant for at least a five-year period.

The length of the term of the office is three years and terms are staggered so that one new member is elected every year, insuring that the level of experience on the committee remains constant. The election occurs in April of each year immediately after the election of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and preceding the appointment of the Executive committee for the following year. Because 2002 is the first year, all three faculty would need to be elected in 2002 but their terms would be as follows.

2 - year term (2002-2004) Social
3 - year term (2002-2005) Cognitive
4 - year term (2002-2006) Counseling

Beginning in 2004, each year one person would be rotated off and a new person would be elected to a 3-year term thereafter.

New tenure-track or tenured faculty serve as observers on the teaching and research evaluation committees.

8. **Eligibility.** All tenured or tenure-track faculty who have successfully completed their first Contract Extension Evaluation, **excluding** the chair and members of the Promotion and Tenure committee, are eligible to serve on the committee unless there is an unusual circumstance that necessitates a faculty member serving on the Evaluation committee and one of the other roles mentioned. Untenured faculty who have successfully completed their first Contract Extension Evaluation would be able to declare themselves ineligible by withdrawing their name from consideration. The exclusion of members from the Promotion and Tenure committee is intended to broaden participation among faculty and distribute the workload of the service/leadership functions within the department. A person cannot serve consecutive terms unless under unusual circumstances.

Faculty on the committee who go on leave would be replaced by a substitute faculty from the respective area for the duration of their leave through a faculty vote. The faculty on leave would not be expected to have to "make up the time" absent. He or she would return to serve his or her tenure on the committee.

9. **Voting.** All tenure-track faculty can vote in each election. In order to ensure anonymity, the ballots and their accompanying unmarked envelopes are placed inside a locked ballot box. Names will be checked off a list at the time of voting. Two of the three current evaluation committee members will count the ballots. (In 2002, two of the three Teaching Evaluation Committee members will count the ballots.) The Hare system will be used to determine the outcome of the elections.

10. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide sufficient information to conduct a thorough and fair evaluation. If special circumstances require consideration, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the committee and/or the Department Chair. (Such circumstances might include difficulties with instrumentation in a series of experiments or special demands on time such as service on a federal grant review committee, election to a university leadership position, or demands placed by another department in which the faculty member has a joint appointment.) The Annual Report of Professional Activity is updated every year by each faculty member.

11. The committee uses a four-year evaluation window. This window covers the four calendar years immediately preceding the spring semester in which the review is conducted. The CERTS members will be given the entire ARPA each year. Because the biennial reviews cover four-year windows, all research and teaching activities for a given year will be evaluated at least once by the committee.

Evaluation of Faculty Service and Professional Practice

(Revised 01/12/98 & 04/23/01)

Faculty service is an important component of academic life. In applying professional expertise and experience, service can sharpen and improve teaching and scholarship domains of academic performance. Reasons for undertaking service roles include both moral/ethical obligations and practical consequences. Viewing service in these ways, faculty must choose appropriate venues and commitments. The prime consideration in service is accomplishing the tasks and meeting the goals implied. Quality service is not mere attendance, but is instead making a difference.

Importance and Benefits

The moral/ethical obligations of apt service range from the personal principles of right conduct (e.g., Its the right thing to do!), through the social equation of carrying one's fair share of the general work (e.g., Its my turn to serve on the student awards committee!), to personal assessment of unique qualifications (e. g., No one else knows the way students are using the computer lab!). These obligations are discharged both by responding to reasonable requests and by initiating/volunteering service for which one is qualified.

Service has practical consequences for each faculty member and for the good and reputation of the department. Faculty members are enriched through seeing alternate viewpoints and different sets of problems faced by others. The personal contacts of hours in meetings and working on projects for the academy deepens understandings and develops useful bonds to apply to future needs. Good service outside the department builds a stronger personal reputation.

Positive reputation generalizes to the department and the discipline. In service to the discipline of psychology outside Iowa State, quality accomplishment enhances department reputation. Intellectual products alone are important, but they may be multiplied by contributing to formal and informal networks with valued personal effort. The combination of valued personal service with abstract scholarship generates a powerful positive halo. Quality service also gives a different kind of visibility to the faculty member and to the department through the simple repetition of positive exposures. Quality service enhances department reputation.

Regarding institutional service, the *ISU Faculty Handbook* (1999) states, "Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation of department, college, and /or university policies; or by carrying out administrative responsibilities" (p. 43). The *Faculty Handbook's* description of Extension/Professional Practice states, "Faculty members may engage in extension/professional practice activities by utilizing their professional expertise to disseminate information outside of the traditional classroom to help improve the knowledge and skills of their clientele (i.e., the publics they serve) or the environment in which they live and work" (p. 42).

Activities to be Considered in Evaluating Professional Practice and Service

<u>Institutional Service</u>

- Memberships on department, college, and/or university committees and organizations
- Other administrative or service responsibilities within the university
- Awards, honors and recognition for institutional service

Professional Practice and Outreach

- Consulting
- Statistical consulting with faculty and students.
- Serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise
- Communicating one's research findings to the public
- Leadership in professional societies or organizations.
- Engaging in technology transfer
- Honors, awards, and recognition for service activities.
- Engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice
- Organizing/leading workshops or training sessions
- Other activities that contribute to professional practice (e.g., tasks associated with licensure)
- Awards, honors and recognition for professional practice or outreach

Expectations for Faculty at Different Ranks

Non-tenured Assistant Professors

Minimal service is expected; it should take place primarily within the department. (The university P & T document states that for promotion, the assistant professor should demonstrate "satisfactory institutional service.)

During their first 1-2 years, assistant professors should be part of the Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) (1 year each) as non-voting members. This is designed to help them understand the considerations used in these committees' evaluations. They should be given only minimal committee assignments apart from this during the early years of their probationary period. During the later years of this period, they may be asked to participate in more departmental committees, but expectations of their involvement in committee work and other types of service should remain low. New assistant professors should not be penalized for minimal service, so we recommend that they be given at a minimum the midpoint rating of "3" (representing "Competent") for their first 1-2 years. After these first two years, service should begin to increase gradually.

Tenured Associate Professors

Substantial institutional service is expected at both the departmental and university levels. (The university P&T document states that for promotion to professor, the person should demonstrate "significant institutional service")

Associate professors should participate fully in the departmental committees and should be involved in some service activities outside the department.

Professors

Significant levels of service at both the departmental and university levels.

Full Professors are expected to have major involvement and leadership roles in department, college, and in university-wide committees. They should be involved in decision-making and governance committees.

Reporting Service and Professional Practice Activities on the ARPA

Faculty should list an activity only in one section of the ARPA (teaching, research, or service/professional practice). The description of activities in the Service/Professional Practice section of the ARPA should follow this outline and the accompanying guidelines.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

A. Committee memberships.
    1. Non-Departmental committees.
    2. Departmental committees.

B. Other activities within the university.

C. Honors, awards, and recognition for institutional service

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE and OUTREACH

A. Offices and service in professional organizations.
Can include work on committees within organizations as well as leadership roles.

B. Consultation with public agencies and groups.
For example: Consulting with human services agencies
Providing services to local public organizations (e.g., the city, the schools).
Providing expert testimony

C. Professional development, i.e., workshops/presentations offered to the public.

D. Other professional practice and outreach
For example: Consulting with private organizations on topics relevant to one's expertise

E. Conferences, workshops, and presentations attended.

F. Honors, awards, and recognition for professional practice and outreach
Examples: APA award for professional practice.

Guidelines for Reporting Service/ Professional Practice Activities

To assist in evaluating individuals' activities, it is helpful to know approximately how much time was involved and what positions the person held in the committee or organization. To make this task simpler, for each activity listed, the person should indicate the following (where appropriate):

<u>Dates of activity</u>
<u>Role</u>: Chair, Organizer, Presenter, or Member
<u>Effort</u>: _______ hours/ semester

In general, activities for which a faculty member has received substantial compensation (more than $1000/day) will not be included in merit evaluations. They may, however, be considered as evidence of the person's expertise when applying for promotion or tenure. Consequently, the faculty member may elect to include such an activity on the report, but it should be indicated that the person has received payment for that activity.

<u>Evaluation Categories</u>

The evaluation categories used in evaluation of faculty service are:

<u>Excellent</u> requires that there be *unusually strong activity and leadership* in service either to the Iowa State academic community or to the psychology profession and *substantial activity and contribution to the other*.

<u>Soundly Competent</u> requires *strong activity and contribution* in either the academic or professional community, or somewhat lesser combinations thereof.

<u>Competent</u> requires *substantial activity and contribution* in either the academic or professional community, or combinations thereof.

<u>Adequate</u> reflects *modest activity* with little evidence of contribution or leadership.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u> designates those having *essentially no record of service*.

Evaluation of Faculty Research

(Revised 1/12/98)

The Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) provides assessments of the research productivity of all faculty members every other year. This information is used by the Department Chair when determining merit raises.

In a review year, the committee begins meeting in February, as soon as the Annual Reports of Professional Activity (ARPAs) are available. The ARPAs are the primary source of information about research productivity; other sources to be used include ARPA supplements provided by individual faculty members and citation counts from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and/or the Science Citation Index (SCI). Initial meetings of the committee focus on the criteria to be used in evaluation. Members then do their ratings independently; when completed, the committee meets again to review and discuss the ratings, particularly any discrepancies. The committee should maintain communication with the Department Chair regarding the date by which the Department Chair will need the final report of the committee (usually around April 1).

Evaluation Criteria

The following productivity categories (based on those outlined in the ARPA) are considered when providing an assessment, as are the specific criteria listed within each category. The order of categories reflects, in a very general sense, their relative importance or significance. There are no set "weightings" of categories or criteria, however, and all entries are considered on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, individual committee members determine independently how to consider each criterion.

1. Publications

   a) Journal Articles. Order of authorship, level or quality of the journal (information about journal quality has been provided by the various areas in the department), quality of the article.

   b) Books. Authored books of a scholarly nature receive most credit (e.g., a sole-authored scholarly book would receive maximum credit), followed by edited books.

   c) Chapters. Order of authorship, level or quality of edited volume, quality of the chapter.

   d) Citation counts from the SCI and/or SSCI.

   e) Other publications. Book reviews and technical reports receive some credit, but less than the categories above.

   f) In press. Counted the same as published articles, chapters, and books.

2. Research activity

   a) Unpublished manuscripts receive little credit.

   b) Grants. Primary factors to be considered are: Role on the grant (i.e., PI, Co-PI, Statistician, Consultant), size of the grant, length of funding time, and funding agency. Some credit is provided for grant proposals that are submitted.

   c) Some credit is provided for contracts, with amount depending on their scientific/scholarly nature.

3. External scholarly professional activity

   a) Editorial responsibilities. Maximum credit is provided for editing a journal, somewhat less for associate editorship; quality of the journal is an important factor. Some credit is provided for guest editing and membership on editorial boards. Minor credit provided for routine manuscript reviewing. Credit is provided for membership on grant review panels, varying depending on the type of panel, level of commitment, etc.

   b) Offices in professional organizations. Some credit is provided for holding office in a scholarly organization (e.g., APA or APS). Credit varies depending on the organization and the office.

4. Presentations

   a) Conference. Credit depends on type of presentation (e.g., invited address, symposium presentation, poster, etc.), as well as type of conference (e.g., local vs. national).

   b) Invited talks. Colloquia and other types of invited presentation receive variable credit depending on circumstances.

5. Other

   a) Other entries to be considered include (but are not limited to) honors or awards, and other forms of recognition by professional and other groups.

Evaluation categories. Evaluations will be based on the following scale: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Soundly competent; 3 = Competent; 2 = Adequate; 1 = Unsatisfactory. Evaluations may also fall midway between categories (i.e., 1.5, 2.5, etc.). The committee's final report includes the evaluations of all faculty members by each committee member (no averaging is done), plus a brief narrative for each faculty member explaining his/her set of evaluations.

Journal Tiers List (Approved 1/10/2010)

The Psychology Department Journal Tiers list, developed by the faculty and maintained by The Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS), is intended to serve as a guide to potential outlets for scholarly work. The Journal Tiers List categorizes journals into four tiers based on perceived quality (e.g., prestige, selectivity, and impact factor) with Tier 1 as the most prestigious. Journals may be proposed for addition or change in ranking at any time as needed via recommendation from an area (Cognitive, Counseling, or Social); journals may also be proposed for addition or change in ranking by unaffiliated faculty in consultation with CERTS. Any disagreements over journal rankings will be discussed by CERTS, in consultation with the appropriate faculty/area. The Journal Tiers List will be reviewed and updated by the areas at least every four years to correspond with CERTS Research review cycles; journals may change rankings or be deleted from the list during those review periods. Recommended revisions will be brought by CERTS to the full faculty for approval.

Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

(Revised 1/12/98)

The Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) provides evaluation of faculty teaching every other year. This document describes policies for the evaluation of teaching in the Department of Psychology. These policies shall be interpreted and implemented in a manner consistent with university and college policies.

Overview

<u>Primary goals</u>. Consistent with the department's long range plan, the two primary goals of the teacher evaluation system in the Department of Psychology are 1) to promote the continuing development of teaching excellence in each faculty member and 2) to develop an evaluation system that recognizes and rewards teaching excellence.

<u>Promoting excellence</u>. An important goal of the departmental evaluation system is to provide developmental feedback to maintain and improve teaching quality. The term, formative evaluation, is used to refer to this process. Formative evaluation enhances the quality of teaching in the department by providing constructive feedback about teaching and encouraging faculty self-reflection. Formative evaluation for untenured assistant professors is currently provided by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) in the years before the faculty member goes up for promotion. This process will continue and will be expanded to include any associate professor that requests such an evaluation in preparation for promotion. In addition, the Teaching Advisory Committee (TAC) conducts formative evaluation reviews designed to help improve teaching at the request of a faculty member. The Department Chair may also request that the TAC review a faculty member's teaching. Both the PTC and TAC reviews are referred to as <u>formative teaching reviews</u>.

<u>Rewarding excellence.</u> Because of the importance of teaching to the mission of the department, information regarding teaching performance should be a major input into the evaluation of overall performance of each faculty member. This input consists of a peer evaluation of teaching performed by the Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS). This review is called the biennial teaching evaluation.

<u>Committees</u>

Two committees in the department are involved in teaching evaluation. The Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts formative teaching reviews. The Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) conducts the biennial teaching evaluation.

Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). The PTC has the responsibility for conducting the formative teaching reviews of assistant professors and of associate professors requesting consideration for promotion to full professor.

The Committee for Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS). The CERTS has responsibility for conducting the biennial teaching evaluation for the Department Chair.

The DOGE and the DUS will be exempt from duty on the CERTS or the P&T committees. This exemption may be overruled for the P&T election if insufficient numbers of full professors are available for a case that involves promotion to full. (approved 10.15.2018)

The Reviews

Biennial teaching evaluation. The purpose of the biennial teaching evaluation is to assess the faculty member's quality and quantity of teaching in order to recognize and reward teaching excellence. The review provides the teaching input into the overall review of the faculty member by the Department Chair.

The faculty member's teaching is evaluated along two dimensions: quality and quantity. The quality of faculty member's teaching will be categorized into one of five categories: Excellent, Strongly Competent, Competent, Adequate, Unsatisfactory. The quantity of the faculty member's teaching will be categorized into one of five categories: Very High Quantity, High Quantity, Medium Quantity, Low Quantity, Very Low Quantity. Under the proposed system, a separate categorization will be made for each dimension.

The biennial teaching evaluation is based upon information in the teaching portfolio, student evaluations, and any relevant agreements between the Department Chair and the faculty member.

The CERTS reviews updated teaching evaluation information (described below) from each faculty member every other year. The biennial evaluation for each faculty member consists of a quality categorization, a quantity categorization, and a written report justifying the classifications and summarizing the strengths, weaknesses, and possible directions for improvement. (Because experience is necessary to more fully operationalize the rating system, the CERTS will bring a proposed operationalization to the department for approval after three spring semesters of using the system.)

The biennial teaching evaluation is given to both the Department Chair and the faculty member. The committee should maintain communication with the Department Chair regarding the date by which the Department Chair will need the final report of the committee (usually around April 1).

Formative teaching review. The formative teaching review, conducted by the PTC or TAC, is based on the same types of information as the biennial teaching evaluation with the addition of classroom observations (section 3.1). The formative teaching review is less structured than the biennial evaluation. No categorizations are mandated and the emphasis is improving teaching quality.

For a formative teaching review requested by a faculty member, the report is distributed only to that faculty member. The faculty member may choose to share the report with the Department Chair or to include it as part of the teaching portfolio. For a formative teaching review requested by the Department Chair or conducted by the PTC for untenured faculty members, the report is distributed to the Department Chair and the faculty member.

Teaching Portfolio

Portfolio overview. Each faculty member prepares and maintains a portfolio to be used as part of the evaluation process. The description below illustrates the types of information that could be provided. The department provides some information for the faculty member.

Statement of philosophy. The portfolio should include a short, general statement of the faculty member's overall philosophy and approach to teaching.

Scheduled teaching. For each year in the review period, the department provides a description of the faculty member's percent of workload assigned to teaching and the specific teaching assignments. For each scheduled course taught in the review period, the department provides the number of students taught by semester, the average course grade by semester, the average course rating by semester, and the percentage of students in the course who provided ratings. In addition, for each course, the department provides averages of these variables across the four-year period. For each course, the faculty member describes or provides: the syllabus, the course goals and philosophy (if different from general philosophy), representative samples of student assignments and exams, grading procedures, innovations and changes since the last review and an assessment of their effectiveness, and any other information deemed relevant. Unless the faculty member has made substantial changes in particular courses during the review period, such information is provided by course, not semester. (Additional optional information, not usually provided, but appropriate in some circumstances may include: written student comments, videotapes of specific teaching procedures or special techniques, psychometric information on multiple-choice exams, special teaching agreements developed with the Department Chair. Such optional information should be included only to communicate aspects of teaching that would not be revealed by the information above).

Non-scheduled teaching and advising. It is expected that faculty will vary in the amount of non-scheduled graduate and undergraduate teaching and advising. The non-scheduled teaching information provided will vary appropriately with the faculty member's assigned workload and career directions. The information provided in the portfolio should describe the faculty member's contribution in this area.

For non-scheduled undergraduate teaching and advising, the department provides a listing of the number of students per semester enrolled in each of the non-scheduled activities for which it keeps records (e.g. Psychology 490, 491, honors supervision, honors components to classes, etc.). The faculty member provides a description of the general approach the faculty member employs in non-scheduled undergraduate teaching, typical activities in which students are involved, examples of student work, and other relevant information. Such additional information might include student conference presentations and publications, laboratory or statistical procedures taught to students, or other information that speaks to the quality of the educational experience provided to the student. The faculty member also describes her/his contributions and role in advising. Advising may include interactions with formally assigned advisees as well as advising provided to other undergraduate students (such as may occur as part of supervising Psych 490, 491, or 492). Examples of contributions also may include career counseling or consultation on professional issues with students in independent study, research practice, in scheduled classes, etc.

For non-scheduled graduate teaching and advising, the department provides a listing of the number of students per semester enrolled in each of the non-scheduled activities and of the faculty member's involvement in other teaching-related activities for which it keeps records (e.g. Psychology 590, practicum supervision, major professorships, committee memberships, prelim writing committees, etc.). The faculty member provides a description of the general approaches employed in non-scheduled graduate teaching, typical activities in which students are involved, examples of student work, and other relevant information. Such additional information might include student conference presentations and publications, laboratory or statistical procedures taught to students, or other information that speaks to the quality of the educational experience provided to the student. The faculty member also describes her/his contributions and role in advising. Advising may include activities provided as part of the POS committee as chair or member and to other graduate students (such as may occur as part of supervising Psych 590, 599, 699, etc.). Example contributions also may include career counseling or consultation on professional issues with students in independent study, research practicum, in scheduled classes, etc.

Student ratings. Student ratings of instruction will be collected every semester in each course. Procedures currently in place for collecting those ratings (see *Faculty Information Book*) will be used. Any procedures shall be consistent with college and university guidelines. If a form is adopted by the college or the university, it is used. Faculty members may include additional items on any forms used. Faculty members are encouraged to obtain written student comments, as these may be especially useful for formative evaluation.

Classroom observations. Classroom observation shall be included in the formative teaching reviews performed by the PTC and TAC.

Internal Psychology Awards

(Approved by psychology faculty September 19, 2004)

The Psychology Department Faculty Enhancement Committee (FEC) brought forward and the faculty approved on September 19, 2004, the development of an annual faculty awards program. The idea of an "internal" awards program for our faculty is grounded in several considerations. First, we believe that there are many faculty members in the Psychology Department whose exemplary performance in selected domains does not necessarily fit existing extra-departmental awards. For instance, outstanding service to the department does not clearly position the person for a college or university award. Second, we note that other departments often have internal awards for such things as teaching or research and that these internal awards generally precede nominations by the department of those persons for college-level or university-level awards. We believe that individuals receiving an internal (departmental) award before being nominated for an external (e.g., university, college, professional association) award provides a boost for their chances at the external award. Furthermore, the internal award begins a process of identification and documentation that can be used productively in nominating the person for external awards. Finally, we believe that it is important to recognize faculty excellence regardless of whether or not the individual ever receives an external award.

The awards are organized under teaching, research, service/outreach and are tied to specific awards given at the college level. Listed below are the awards.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

- Exceptional Departmental Service
- Exceptional Service to the Undergraduate Program
- Exceptional Service to the Graduate Program
- Outstanding Professional Service to the Public or Service to the Profession

TEACHING

- Exceptional Teaching in a Large Enrollment Course (Undergraduate)
- Exceptional Teaching at the Undergraduate Level
- Exceptional Undergraduate Mentoring
- Exception Graduate Mentoring
- Excellence in Undergraduate Curriculum Development
- Excellence in Graduate Curriculum Development
- Exceptional Graduate Teaching

RESEARCH

- Outstanding Conceptual Journal Article
- Outstanding Empirical Journal Article
- Outstanding Junior Faculty Success in Extramural Funding
- Kentner Fritz Junior Faculty Exceptional Productivity
- Outstanding Senior Faculty Success in Extramural Funding
- Martin F. Fritz Senior Faculty Exceptional Productivity

The number of awards per year may vary; however, some years there may be no awards given depending on the nominations the FEC receives. These awards should include a suitable plaque. Normally, an award will not include money. A call for nominations will be done in February. Self nominations are encouraged though anyone may submit a nomination. The Faculty Enhancement Committee will maintain responsibility for administering the awards. Awards will be announced in the spring semester, no later than the last day of finals. An individual cannot receive a given award more than once every five years. The nomination process will be kept to a minimum by asking that the nominator write a brief letter to the chair of the FEC indicating why the nominee should receive this particular award. Spring of 2005 will be the first year for the awards.

Procedures for Collection of Undergraduate and Graduate Course Evaluations

Assumptions: Ratings will be collected for each person meeting students in regularly scheduled classes, labs or seminars. The standard, modified, University of Arizona short or long form, entitled Teacher-Course Evaluation, will be used to collect ratings of instructors and courses. Courses with multiple instructors will evolve evaluation procedures consistent with the spirit of these proposed guidelines and congruent with the needs of these courses. Instructors may request additional, anonymous, student ratings or written comments relevant to the course or to instruction in a manner consistent with these guidelines.

When course evaluation data are to be collected: Course and instructor evaluations will usually be collected at or near the end of a course, not at the final examination.

Announcement of evaluations: The course syllabus will indicate when the standard Teacher-Course Evaluation will be administered.

Procedures for collecting course evaluations: Evaluations will be monitored by a neutral graduate assistant (i.e., one who is not involved with any part of the course) who will be assigned this responsibility by the department administrative assistant. The graduate assistant will deliver the evaluations to the department administrative assistant immediately after they are collected. Evaluations from all courses will be delivered to the Durham Test Scoring Center in one batch at the end of a semester.

The evaluations will be returned to the administrative assistant who will record the numerical data. The summary of ratings and evaluation forms (including anonymous student comments) will be returned to the instructor after final grades have been reported. The written comments for graduate courses will be detached from evaluations and returned to instructors in typed format to preserve anonymity.

Oral instructions to students at the time evaluations are collected: "Your ratings and comments are an essential part of evaluating the quality of the instruction you have received this semester. Your responses are confidential and should be anonymous. No results are released until after grades have been filed. Answer each question sincerely and thoughtfully, and please do not discuss your responses with others until all materials have been collected." [For short form recipients] "If you so choose, you need not answer items 16, 17, and 18, the items requesting class standing, sex, or major."

Policies and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure

(Revised November 2016)

This document describes the policies and procedures for making promotion and tenure recommendations in the Department of Psychology, and for implementing university and college requirements for promotion and tenure decisions. These policies and procedures are intended to enhance the quality of the research, teaching, and service missions of the department, and to recognize individual faculty members for outstanding performance.

The policies and procedures described in this document are consistent with those of Iowa State University, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, and with those of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure, and those faculty members who will vote on promotion and tenure recommendations, should review these documents prior to the review process.

Reviewing Groups

All candidates for promotion or tenure in the department are reviewed by two groups and the Department Chair. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), which is composed of four elected faculty members, reviews each candidate's credentials and develops a report on behalf of the eligible voting faculty (EVF). The EVF, which is composed of all tenured faculty in the department for promotions to associate professor with tenure and all full professors in the department for promotions to full professor, speaks for the faculty when making promotion and tenure recommendations to the dean.

In addition to its role in screening candidates, the PTC is responsible for reviewing the department's policies and procedures regarding granting of promotion and tenure. Proposals for changes in this document must be submitted to the PTC for review. The PTC will then make a recommendation to the department faculty regarding acceptance of the change, and the proposed change will be voted on by the faculty of the department. The issue will be decided by a majority vote of the faculty.

Conflicts of Interest

Promotion and tenure review procedures and judgments must be objective, fair, deliberate, and consistent with departmental, college, and university policies, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the American Psychological Association. Any source of personal influence or association that could alter or that appears to alter a faculty member's objectivity with regard to a particular candidate constitutes a conflict of interest, and is incongruent with further participation in the review of that candidate. Past or present relationships, interactions, or associations that involve marriage, familial relationships, or substantial joint business or financial endeavors are examples, but not an exhaustive list, of dual relationships that present a potential conflict of interest. The integrity of the review process will be maximally enhanced by individual and collective consideration of matters of conflict of interest at the beginning of the review process for a given candidate. Such questions, however, may be raised by any faculty member at any point in the review process.

Any faculty member who has a conflict of interest with regard to a particular candidate has the responsibility of withdrawing from the review process for that candidate.

If a faculty member believes that another faculty member cannot make an objective judgment about a candidate due to a conflict of interest, this concern should be brought to the attention of the faculty member presumed to have the conflict of interest. If the question about the potential conflict of interest is not thereby resolved, and the faculty member suspected of having a conflict of interest does not voluntarily withdraw from the review process, the matter should be brought to the attention of the EVF. A majority vote of the EVF will then determine whether the faculty member in question may participate in the review of the candidate.

Unless otherwise noted, the terms professor, associate professor, assistant professor and faculty member refer only to faculty with tenure or tenure-track positions in the psychology department. This does not include those with adjunct appointments, temporary appointments, courtesy appointments or other non-tenure stream appointments.

Areas of Evaluation

Position Responsibility Statements

It is the policy of Iowa State University that all evaluations are based on the position responsibilities of faculty members. A position responsibility statement is a tool that allows for a flexible and individualized system of faculty review, particularly within the promotion and tenure process.

At the time of appointment, the Department Chair and the new faculty member will agree on a position responsibility statement that should be based on the job advertisement. The description itself should be general and only include the significant responsibilities of the faculty member that are important in evaluating faculty accomplishments in the promotion and tenure process. The descriptions should be brief but may include details important to the department and/or faculty member. The position responsibility statement shall not violate the faculty member’s academic freedom in teaching, in the selection of topics or methods of research, or in extension/professional practice. The position responsibility statement cannot be changed unilaterally by either the Department Chair or the faculty member.

The initial position responsibility statement should stand for the first three years of appointment. In most cases, this initial statement will remain in effect until the tenure review. Any changes in the expectations for the untenured faculty member must be made in consultation between the Department Chair and the faculty member. When tenure is granted, the faculty member and his/her Department Chair should review the details of the position responsibility statement and make any necessary changes.

The statement will be subject to regular review by the faculty member and the Department Chair and allow for flexibility in responsibilities over time and for the changing nature of faculty appointments. At least every seven years as part of the annual review process, tenured faculty members should re-evaluate their position responsibilities with the Department Chair. The statement may be reviewed and/or changed more frequently as part of the annual review process, but this is not mandated. Any changes in the statement must be made in consultation between the Department Chair and the tenured faculty member. The statement will allow both faculty members and their administrative and peer evaluators to understand the basis of the academic appointment and to place that into context with the promotion and tenure criteria.

The following areas of scholarship are evaluated for each candidate for promotion and tenure, as specified in their position responsibility statements: (a) research, (b) teaching, and (c) service. For some faculty members, professional practice and outreach might also be included in their position responsibilities. The weight assigned to the performance areas for making a final evaluation of promotion or tenure is determined by the candidate’s position responsibility statement. Normally, research is the area in which excellence in scholarship must be demonstrated for appointments in psychology.

This section describes the areas for evaluation. Examples of ways that faculty members in the Department of Psychology can demonstrate competence and excellence in each area of evaluation, and the levels of performance expected for promotion to each rank are described in Section II. The specific information to be submitted by candidates is listed toward the end of this document. This information should be regarded as the minimum necessary for a thorough, fair, and accurate review of the candidate's qualifications. Candidates are encouraged to submit any additional information that they believe will strengthen their case for promotion and/or tenure.

Research

Faculty members are expected to make original research contributions that are appropriate to their area of specialization within psychology and that are respected by their colleagues and peers, both within and outside the university. Evidence of excellence requires a sustained record of dissemination of the results of their research in refereed journal articles, books, and presentations at scientific and professional associations. The most important criterion is the extent to which their work has contributed to the knowledge base in their field. There are several indices of the extent to which a faculty member’s work has made a contribution to the field such as the quality (selectivity, prestige, readership) of outlets in which the work is published, citations to the faculty member’s work, invitations to present at major scientific conferences, judgments of Iowa State University faculty in the candidate’s specialty area, and testimony of external reviewers who are expert in the field as to the influence of the faculty member’s work.

Teaching

Teaching refers to academic activities that promote learning among individuals or groups. Skilled teachers exhibit command over their subject matter; present material in an organized, objective manner that promotes learning; are able to stimulate students' interest in the subject and awaken students' awareness of the relationship between various fields of knowledge; and display concern and respect for their students. Effective teachers strive to continuously broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding of the discipline; use appropriate and effective methods of instruction; seek to improve their teaching skills; and prepare and use educational materials that are up-to-date and are effective in promoting learning.

Graduate advising and mentoring of graduate students is an important teaching responsibility. Major professors are expected to meet frequently with their graduate students, direct their development of research and professional skills, monitor their progress, provide opportunities for career enhancement, and enforce high standards of scholarship. Faculty are expected to serve on graduate program of study committees, thesis committees, and dissertation committees in ways that promote graduate student training and development.

Institutional Service

All faculty members are expected to play a role in the functioning of the university by participating in the faculty governance process and in the formulation of department, college, and university policies. Some faculty members may take on additional governance, committee, or administrative responsibilities at any of the three levels. These activities are institutional contributions to citizenship. Faculty members also are expected to be active citizens in scholarly and professional organizations relevant to their specialty. Those whose interests and skills are appropriate may also become active participants in the governance, publication programs, or other activities of these organizations. These are disciplinary contributions to citizenship.

Contributions that are not a part of one’s professional duties, such as participating in community organizations or holding public office, are private contributions and are not counted as institutional service.

Professional Practice and Outreach

Scholarship in professional practice and outreach refers to activities in which faculty members utilize their professional expertise to disseminate information or provide services to clients. These include activities aimed at solving societal problems using the faculty member’s expertise, knowledge, and reasoned judgments. Examples of such activities include engaging in the practice of counseling, providing consulting services to businesses, government, or organizations, conducting workshops or training programs, or serving on the board of a community organization that provides services in the faculty member's area of expertise. Although most of these activities will occur outside the university, they can be internal to the university (e.g., a staff member serving as a counselor or supervisor at the Student Counseling Service). Such activities benefit both the individual faculty member and the university by maintaining and enhancing the individual's professional skills, by providing examples that can be used in teaching, and by suggesting research questions and providing research opportunities. This work should be related to the faculty member's position responsibilities. Evaluation of scholarship in this area should consider breadth, depth, duration of influence or use, public appreciation and benefit, and applicability or adoption by peers.

Qualifications for Promotion and Tenure

When making promotion and tenure decisions, the EVF evaluates the performance of a candidate in the areas of research, teaching, institutional service, and professional practice and outreach. To be recommended for promotion or tenure in the Department of Psychology at Iowa State University a candidate must exhibit excellence in scholarship, where scholarship includes activities under research, teaching, and professional practice. Performance in scholarship is evaluated relative to the position responsibility statement. Because the Department of Psychology is a research-oriented department that grants the Ph.D. degree, research is the expected area of scholarly excellence for most candidates.

This section describes the performance expected of candidates for each professorial rank in the Department of Psychology. These descriptions are not definitive; ultimately recommendations for promotion and tenure are based on the deliberate, informed, and conscientious judgments of members of the EVF about the extent and quality of the accomplishments and qualifications of the candidate. A high level of activity is not itself sufficient to justify a recommendation for promotion and tenure; the contributions must be judged to be of high quality.

Although no minimum time in rank is required prior to promotion, individuals recommended for promotion to associate professor typically will be in the fifth or sixth year of their probationary period. Individuals recommended for promotion to professor typically will have spent five or more years at the rank of associate professor.

Extension of probationary period. Ordinarily the probationary period will provide sufficient time for the faculty member to demonstrate his or her qualifications for tenure. On occasion, however, special circumstances may occur that interfere significantly with the faculty member's opportunity to develop the qualifications necessary for tenure in the time allowed. The University policy describes legitimate circumstances in which a faculty member might be granted an extension of the probationary period. The assumption of parental responsibilities or a major change in assigned responsibilities might be examples of 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 third-year review or tenure review is scheduled to be conducted. Requests should clearly explain the reasons for granting an extension of the probationary period and will be acted upon promptly. Requests for extension due to the birth of a child 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.

Other circumstances that may result in an extension of the probationary period and policies on receiving credit for prior experience at another institution are described in the Iowa State University *Faculty Handbook* (Promotion and Tenure, #3, Terms of Probationary Service).

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 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.

Assistant Professor

Appointments to beginning-level tenure-track positions normally are made at the assistant professor level. Faculty members appointed at this rank should have a strong academic record, demonstrated research potential as evidenced by successful publication in major refereed journals, competent professional and teaching skills appropriate to the position, and have been awarded the doctorate. Faculty members appointed to this rank should have the potential to be a leading scholar in their field. (Individuals who begin their appointment before receiving the doctoral degree are appointed at the rank of instructor, then recommended for promotion to assistant professor upon completion of the requirements for the doctorate.)

In the Department of Psychology, tenure cannot be granted at the rank of assistant professor.

Associate Professor

The department policy is to link recommendations for promotion to the rank of associate professor with a recommendation that tenure be granted; recommendations for promotion to associate professor without tenure are seldom made. Thus, the qualifications for promotion to associate professor also are those for granting tenure in the department. Initial appointments at the associate professor level may be made without accompanying tenure. To be recommended for promotion or tenure at Iowa State University, a candidate must exhibit excellence in scholarship, where scholarship includes activities under research, teaching, and professional practice. Performance in these areas is evaluated relative to the candidate's position responsibility statement. Because the Department of Psychology is a research-oriented department, research is the expected area of scholarly excellence for most candidates.

Research. Excellence in research will be evidenced through high quality, programmatic research that is published in major refereed journals appropriate to the candidate's specialty area. The quality of this work will be evaluated by external reviewers and departmental faculty. The critical issue is whether this body of work contributes significantly to advancing the discipline in the candidate's research area. The greatest weight will be given to manuscripts based on work during appointment at Iowa State University. Judgments about whether the work was done at Iowa State University (versus a prior work setting) are made based on the candidate's verbal statements, an examination of the hiring CV of the candidate, and the masthead affiliation listed on the publication. Publications of special significance will be given considerably more weight than other publications. Although collaborative work is encouraged, there must be evidence of the candidate's ability to conduct research independently; usually this will be demonstrated by primary authorship on the majority of the candidate's most important publications. In addition, there must be evidence of an active, programmatic line of research. Although, external research funding is not required for promotion to associate professor, it is expected that candidates will have submitted one or more grant proposals in an effort to obtain funding by the time of review. Success in obtaining research grants from sources outside the University will be viewed as evidence of research excellence. In addition, books, chapters in edited books, and conference proceedings can assist the case for tenure and promotion, if peer reviewed. Candidates are typically expected to have made research presentations at national meetings of professional associations, and to have served as a reviewer for professional journals.

Additional indicators of excellence in research include citations to the candidate's work in the published literature, membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals, invitations to make research presentations to scholarly groups, superior performance as a research supervisor of graduate students, and awards and recognition for research. Normally, no amount of research presentations, manuscript reviewing, editorial work, graduate supervision, awards, or other activities and products are substitutable for publications in strong, refereed journals.

Assistant professors often request guidance concerning a target number of publications required for promotion. However, every case is unique, and quality of scientific contribution is paramount in promotion decisions. The publication record and copies of reprints for recent successful tenure cases may be obtained from the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Teaching. All candidates must demonstrate successful performance, as established by student and peer reviews, in regularly scheduled courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level. There must be no significant deficiencies in their teaching performance. Candidates must also have exhibited satisfactory performance in graduate advising and have been a contributing member to graduate POS committees.

Promotions on the basis of excellence in scholarship of teaching require significant scholarship of teaching that has been validated by peers, such as the publication of high quality scholarship on student learning or the publication of high quality instructional materials. Scholarship resulting from teaching is documented through such means as peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, workbooks, and lab manuals. Evaluation of scholarship in teaching considers its originality, significance, and/or impact as evidenced by its influence, use, or adoption by peers. Promotions to the rank of associate professor based on teaching excellence will be made only in extraordinary circumstances.

Institutional service. A satisfactory level of institutional service is required for promotion to associate professor. Although assistant professors are not encouraged to take on significant institutional service obligations, a satisfactory level of performance would be demonstrated by active participation in the governance process of the department and by membership and participation in professional organizations appropriate to one's specialty. Exceptional contributions in this area would be demonstrated by significant leadership or initiating roles in the governance structure of the department; by contributions as chair of major college or university committees; or by significant involvement in the activities of appropriate professional organizations.

Professional practice and outreach. Professional practice and outreach includes activities in appropriate professional organizations and the use of professional expertise to aid public and community organizations. Scholarship in this area includes activities aimed at solving societal problems using the faculty member’s expertise, knowledge, and reasoned judgments. Examples of such activities include engaging in the practice of counseling, providing consulting services to businesses, government, or organizations, conducting workshops or training programs, or serving on the board of a community organization that provides services in the faculty member's area of expertise.

Assistant professors in applied areas are expected to show evidence of the development and maintenance of their professional skills; hence, professional practice might be a desirable activity for the focused purpose of developing and maintaining professional skills. The appropriate amount of professional practice involvement can vary by the candidate’s specialty area. In some cases, significant professional practice involvement is required of assistant professors, e.g., completion of required hours as part of post-doctoral licensure requirements. In other cases, no professional practice involvement for associate professors is expected or encouraged.

Exceptional contributions to professional practice and outreach are demonstrated by public service appointments related to one's area of expertise, awards for service contributions, advanced levels of certification by professional organizations, and by significant activities aimed at solving societal problems using the faculty member’s expertise. Citizenship, professional practice, and outreach normally would not constitute a basis for promotion to associate professor though significant scholarship in this area that has been validated by peers, such as the publication of high quality scholarship on professional practice and outreach, and the recognition by peers as a leading authority in this area can be part of a promotion case.

Professor

Satisfactory performance as an associate professor, coupled with appropriate time in rank, is not a sufficient basis for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of professor. Promotion to professor requires evidence of a national or international reputation for excellence in scholarship, where scholarship includes activities under research, teaching, or professional practice. Performance in these areas is evaluated relative to the candidate's position responsibility statement. As with tenure and promotion to associate professor, research is the expected area of scholarly excellence in most cases for promotion to professor in the psychology department.

Research. Excellence in research is evidenced through a continuing, active program of research resulting in a sustained record of publications in major refereed journals appropriate to the candidate's specialty area. They must also exhibit an integrative command of their specialty, as demonstrated by publication of review articles, chapters, and books. Excellence in this area is defined as having a national or international reputation as a leading scholar in a particular area of research.

Normally, candidates also will have served on editorial boards and review panels and, when appropriate, have received grant funding from outside the University to support their research. This scholarly record is augmented by citations to the candidate's work in the publications of other researchers, invitations to present research at national and international conferences, serving as an editor of a major research journal, serving as a consultant to major research centers or as a member of scientific review panels, and receiving awards and recognition from professional organizations for research contributions. Letters from external reviewers at major universities should indicate that the candidate has a national or international reputation as a leading scholar in the candidate's area of research and that the candidate has contributed significantly to progress in the field.

Teaching. Candidates are expected to have a continuing record of offering well-planned and well-received courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In addition, they are expected to have developed courses, seminars, and instructional materials; to have taken an active part in the development of curricula in the department and university; to have performed satisfactorily as an advisor of both graduate and undergraduate students; and to have supervised students in independent study, research, or practica.

Promotion to the rank of professor based on excellence in scholarship of teaching requires strong evidence that the faculty member is recognized by peers as a leading authority on effective teaching. This requires that there be significant scholarship in the teaching area that has been validated by peers. Scholarship resulting from teaching is documented through such means as peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, workbooks, and lab manuals. Evaluation of scholarship in teaching considers its originality, significance, and/or impact as evidenced by its influence, use, or adoption by peers. Promotions to the rank of professor based on teaching excellence will be made only in extraordinary circumstances.

Institutional service. All candidates for promotion to professor must have performed significant institutional service. Candidates for promotion to professor must have made significant contributions beyond the departmental level - by service on college or university committees or in the faculty governance structure. Exceptional citizenship is demonstrated by significant performance in such activities as serving as chair of major college and university committees, elected positions in the faculty governance system, major committee assignments, and elected positions in professional organizations. Institutional service cannot be the area of excellence for promotion to full professor.

Professional practice and outreach. Professional practice and outreach includes activities in appropriate professional organizations and the use of professional expertise to aid public and community organizations. Scholarship in this area includes activities aimed at solving societal problems using the faculty member's expertise, knowledge, and reasoned judgments. Examples of such activities include engaging in the practice of counseling, providing consulting services to businesses, government, or organizations, conducting workshops or training programs, or serving on the board of a community organization that provides services in the faculty member's area of expertise.

Associate professors in applied areas are expected to show evidence of the development and maintenance of their professional skills; hence, professional practice might be a desirable activity for the focused purpose of developing and maintaining professional skills. The appropriate amount of professional practice involvement can vary by the candidate's specialty area. In some cases, significant professional practice involvement is required, e.g., completion of required continuing education hours of as part of licensure requirements. In other cases, no professional practice involvement is expected or encouraged.

Exceptional contributions to professional practice and outreach are demonstrated by public service appointments related to one's area of expertise, awards for service contributions, advanced levels of certification by professional organizations, and by significant activities aimed at solving societal problems using the faculty member's expertise. Citizenship, professional practice, and outreach normally would not constitute a basis for promotion to professor though significant scholarship in this area that has been validated by peers, such as the publication of high quality scholarship on professional practice and outreach, and the recognition by peers as a leading authority in this area can be part of a promotion case.

Adjunct Appointments

Candidates for appointment to adjunct professorial ranks and courtesy appointments are expected to demonstrate the same level of qualification as are other candidates for the same rank. Persons holding adjunct appointments are not eligible for tenure in the Department of Psychology.

Procedures

Revised October 17, 2011 (amended March 5, 2017)
Updated April 2019

The promotion and tenure review procedures used in the Department of Psychology are described in this section. The credentials of all candidates for promotion or tenure are reviewed first by the PTC, then by the EVF, and then by the Department Chair.

Review Types and Schedule

The PTC shall carry out three types of reviews:

1) Promotion and Tenure Reviews are carried out whenever an individual is being considered for promotion or tenure. The promotion and tenure review process begins in the late spring of the academic year that precedes the decision year. Assistant professors must be reviewed in their mandatory decision year, but may be reviewed for promotion and tenure before their mandatory decision year at their written request or at the suggestion of the PTC. Associate professors are reviewed upon written request to the chair of the PTC. (See “Procedures used by the PTC”.)

2) Annual Assistant Professor Feedback Reviews are carried out for assistant professors during their second year of appointment and each year thereafter until their year of tenure review or their appointment is terminated. The purpose of the yearly feedback review is to provide formative feedback and guidance to assistant professors with respect to building a career that will lead to promotion and tenure. Early in the Spring semester, the PTC normally will request that the assistant professor prepare and send to the PTC an updated dossier using the format of the LAS Promotion and Tenure Dossier. The assistant professor should not submit names of outside reviewers unless he/she anticipates requesting consideration for promotion that year or unless the PTC requests such information. After receiving the dossier, the PTC will schedule a meeting with the assistant professor during the Spring semester. In some cases the PTC might request additional materials, such as copies of manuscripts or teaching materials. In presenting feedback, the PTC tries to make the assistant professor aware of what the PTC and the EVF regard as strengths, issues, and concerns. After the meeting, the PTC will draft a report, which will be submitted to the assistant professor for correction of errors and comments. The PTC will then draft a final report following receipt of any corrections and comments; the final report will be submitted to the assistant professor and the Department Chair. This report is not a yearly 'score' on the assistant professor; the reports are not averaged to determine if the professor should be promoted. The yearly reports are part of the input the PTC uses to describe the person's record, but the overall record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service forms the basis for the PTC's report to the EVF at the time of the promotion and tenure review. The yearly reports also form a record of the guidance that the PTC has provided that may be of use to both the assistant professor and the department. Because the report is read by the Department Chair, the PTC sometimes includes comments to try to ensure that assistant professors are assigned responsibilities and opportunities consistent with their Position Responsibility Statement and help identify any obstacles that the Department Chair might be able to address in helping the assistant professor make progress toward promotion and tenure. The yearly reports are not normally communicated to the EVF or any higher university level than the Department Chair.

3) Contract Renewal Review. Normally, assistant professor contracts should be written to include two pre-tenure contract periods. The initial period should be for four years, with a notification of renewal for a second period occurring in May of the third year. If there is a decision in the third year not to renew the contract, the initial contract would still be in effect for one year of employment. The assistant professor will complete the preliminary review dossier required by the LAS College. This dossier is the same as the dossier for promotion to associate professor, but without the section for external evaluation letters. This dossier includes detailed information about research, teaching, and service during the probationary period. The assistant professor’s Position Responsibility Statement and curriculum vitae are

included in the dossier. During the contract renewal review, the assistant professor will receive a more thorough evaluation by the PTC than a normal annual feedback review. This includes having in-class peer observations of teaching in which a peer(s) prepares a letter that is included in the dossier. Also, unlike the normal annual feedback review for assistant professors, contract renewal reviews will be shared with the EVF (all tenured faculty members). The EVF will receive the dossier plus the PTC report and then meet and discuss the draft report provided by the PTC (in the same manner as for promotion and tenure cases as described below). After the meeting, the EVF will vote using a secret ballot with respect to whether the assistant professor should be 1) reappointed through the mandatory decision year or 2) not reappointed. Contract renewal reviews will follow the same procedures, as described below, for carrying out a promotion review, except that external evaluation letters will not be solicited by the department. The responsibilities of the PTC and the Department Chair will be the same as in a promotion review, except that the Department Chair, based on all of the information available, including the outcome of the EVF vote, will write a letter to the assistant professor that indicates whether or not the individual is recommended for reappointment (along with appointment terms) including specific reasons for the decision and suggestions for improvements, if necessary, to strengthen the case for future reappointment. This letter will generally fall into one of three categories: 1) Reappointment with no reservation, 2) Reappointment with reservation and specific steps to be taken in the coming years before the next review, and 3) Non-reappointment with specific reasons. The chair's recommendation will be shared with the EVF. The complete dossier and the chair's letter to the candidate will be forwarded to the dean, who will follow LAS College procedures in making a recommendation to the Provost.

Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) reviews the information submitted by each candidate and prepares a draft report on behalf of the eligible voting faculty (EVF) regarding promotion, tenure, and contract renewal decisions. In effect, the PTC is serving as a subcommittee to the EVF. The PTC does not vote as a committee. Instead, members of the PTC vote with the EVF.

Faculty members at the ranks of associate or full professor are eligible to serve on the committee. The DEO is not eligible to serve on the PTC. A tenured associate professor may serve when the PTC is conducting annual reviews or formulating promotion and tenure decisions regarding assistant professors. When an associate professor is elected to the committee, a full professor must be elected from the same area to participate in committee decisions regarding associate professors. All elections are conducted using the Hare System. The following describes specific procedures for electing PTC members.

Election of PTC members. The PTC is composed of four members elected by the faculty of the Department of Psychology. The election procedures are as follows: One person will be elected from each of the three training areas (social, counseling, and cognitive). Faculty who are not affiliated with one of the three areas will be asked to select an area with which to affiliate for the purposes of the PTC election. They will notify the Department Chair of their chosen area before the ballots are printed. The fourth position is an at-large position. The at-large member will be elected immediately after the votes for area representatives. Tenured faculty members at the ranks of associate or full professor are eligible to serve on the committee. When possible, given the composition of the committee, a full professor should serve as chair. When the PTC is preparing a report for consideration of promotion to full professor, the chair of the PTC must be a full professor. In any year when there is no full professor on the committee, an election will be held to select an at-large full professor to serve as chair should a promotion to full professor evaluation be required.

A regular term on the PTC will be four years. To keep the level of experience on the committee constant, one person will rotate off and a new person will be elected every year. All elections are conducted using the Hare System. The following describes specific procedures for electing PTC members.

1. The PTC chair and the Department Chair will prepare a list of faculty eligible to serve on the PTC in the category for which an election is needed. Members of the faculty who have a more than half-

time appointment in another unit of the university and the Department Chair are not eligible to serve on the PTC. All faculty eligible to serve shall be included on the ballot.

2. The PTC chair will prepare ballots that describe the procedure for voting and the required return date. The Hare System will be used as described in this document.

3. All tenured and tenure track members of the faculty are eligible to vote in PTC elections, including the Department Chair.

4. To ensure confidentiality, but to be able to determine who voted, the ballots will be placed in an inner envelope with no identifying information. An outer envelope will have the name of the faculty on it. The ballots are to be returned in both envelopes. The inner envelope will be separated from the outer envelope when it is received by the PTC chair.

5. The ballots will be distributed to the university mailboxes of faculty eligible to vote. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave will be mailed or faxed a ballot, if possible. It is the responsibility of faculty on leave to make mail and fax addresses available to the Department Chair. Faculty shall return the ballots to the PTC chair or a designate indicated on the ballot (such as the Department Administrative Assistant).

6. The ballots shall be counted by any two members of the PTC who are not on the ballot (e.g., because they are continuing their terms into the next year). The Department Chair can substitute for one of the ballot counters if there are not two PTC members who are not on the ballot or are otherwise unavailable.

7. The ballot counters shall distribute the results of the vote to the faculty as soon as is practical. The department newsletter may be used for this distribution.

8. The chair of the PTC is a member of the PTC selected by the sitting members of the PTC.

The Hare System of vote counting is applied to successive choices such that, after the first person has been selected, that person's name is struck from every ballot cast. The next person is selected using every voter's highest remaining choice.

1) Voters rank the persons in order of their preferences, using 1 for the top choice.

2) The person receiving a majority of first choices is declared the winner, or the first person selected.

3) If there is no first choice majority, the candidate with the smallest number of first place votes is eliminated. The second choice candidates of voters whose first choice was eliminated are then counted as first choice candidates and votes are recounted. If one candidate now has a majority of first choices, that person is declared the winner.

4) If there is still no first choice majority, the process in 3) is continued, eliminating at each stage the person with the fewest first choice votes and redistributing the next choice votes to remaining candidates, until a majority for one candidate is achieved.

5) When more than one person must be selected, the person previously selected is struck from every ballot and the next is selected using every voter’s highest remaining choice with the procedure described in points 2 through 4.

Current composition of PTC. See Committee Charges and Memberships in Faculty Section near the front of the book.

Eligibility for re-election. To reduce burden on PTC members and to involve a greater number of faculty in the work of the committee, faculty will not be allowed to serve two consecutive terms.

Timing of the election. The yearly PTC election will be conducted during April. The old committee will complete all of the current year's tasks (e.g., evaluations of assistant professors). The new committee will handle preparations for the following year's tasks (e.g., selection of outside reviewers for the next year's promotion and tenure cases) and will elect the PTC chair for the following year.

Procedures used by the PTC

Each candidate for promotion is responsible for providing the committee with sufficient evidence to support her/his candidacy. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences promotion dossier template is to be used in providing this information. For purposes of providing information to external letter writers, a more traditional CV format (rather than the LAS dossier format) is generally preferred.

The chair of the PTC assembles the material provided by the candidate and relevant material obtained from other sources, informs the department faculty of the names of the person being reviewed, and invites input regarding the candidate's qualifications, arranges for these materials to be made available for review by committee members, contacts external evaluators and solicits their reviews, and convenes meetings of the committee.

Procedures for soliciting external letters. The PTC, in consultation with the candidate's program area, will construct a list of appropriate scholars who could evaluate the candidate's work. Independently of that list, candidates should submit to the chair of the PTC a rank-ordered list of 6 names of appropriate scholars who could evaluate their work. In addition, if there are potential reviewers who the candidate believes could not provide a fair evaluation, the candidate can name up to three such people and state a reason why they might be inappropriate.

Using these lists, the PTC will secure at least five letters (and preferably six) evaluating the candidate. At least one of these letters must have been on the candidate's list and at least one of these letters must have been on the independently generated list from the PTC.

Normally, external reviewers should be solicited from departments of psychology that have achieved the type of reputation to which Iowa State University's Psychology Department aspires. They should be leaders in their field and they must hold at least the rank being sought by the candidate. External letters should be not be sought from the candidate's major professor, those with whom the candidate has published, or others who might have a conflict of interest. Outside reviewers are (a) provided with the candidate's vita and a representative sample of the supporting documents, (b) provided with at least five of the candidate's articles (chosen by the candidate), (c) informed of the scholarly standards needed for promotion in psychology at Iowa State University, (d) informed of the confidentiality procedures and any confidentiality limits involved, (e) asked about the nature of any relationship to the candidate, and (f) asked to provide a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. Evaluators should be asked whether the record of the candidate would constitute an acceptable basis for promotion at the evaluator's institution. As well, evaluators should be asked to provide a copy of their own CV. These letters, clearly identified as to whether they were drawn from the candidate's list or were identified from the PTC's list, are available for inspection by members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the EVF, the Department Chair, the dean of the college, and others who are involved officially in the review process. The candidate's file should include a copy of the letter soliciting the review. Upon written request, the chair of the committee provides a summary of the letters to the candidate, using procedures to guarantee the anonymity of the evaluator.

Procedures for soliciting area input for promotion & tenure decisions. The PTC, in consultation with the candidate's program area, will construct a list of appropriate scholars who could evaluate the candidate's work. Independently of that list, members of the candidate's own area of affiliation are likely to be the most informed members of the EVF, when it comes to possessing the knowledge necessary to provide an objective assessment of a candidate's record of scholarly accomplishment. Accordingly, input will be solicited by the PTC from members of the candidate's area of affiliation regarding the candidate's overall record. Specifically,

a) Each candidate will be asked to indicate the program area with which she or he is most closely aligned.

b) The area will convene a meeting of all members of the area, for the purposes of discussing the candidate's record. Area members should be provided with Tabs 1 and 2 of the candidate's dossier. In addition, members of the candidate's area who qualify as EVF for the candidate (hold a rank equal or higher than the rank sought by the candidate) can have access to the external letters. However, those letters and the names of the letter writers should not be discussed in the presence of area members who are not eligible voting faculty for that candidate.

c) During that meeting, the area will choose one (or more) person(s) who will then meet with the PTC for the purpose of conveying to the committee information pertaining to the area's evaluation of the candidate. The area will not vote on tenure, but instead will attempt to provide the PTC with pertinent information. This information may include (but is not limited to) quality of journals in the candidate's area of expertise, perceptions of the candidate's reputation among members of his or her research "community," circumstances faced by the candidate that may have inhibited or facilitated his or her productivity, evidence suggesting that the candidate's record may not be the best indication of his or her previous performance and/or potential, impressions of the strength of the external letters (to be read only by area members who are EVF for that candidate), non-research activities (e.g., program contributions, graduate student supervision) and any other information not contained (or clarification of information that is contained) in the candidate's promotion file. In addition, the area representative can provide the committee with information about the area's evaluation of the overall strength of the candidate's case.

d) Each individual member of the area is welcome to meet alone with the committee to discuss the promotion case.

Meeting with the candidate. After reviewing the information submitted, the PTC meets with the candidate to discuss any questions raised in the review about materials or qualifications, to enable the candidate to respond to any questions, provide any additional information, and to identify any further information needed.

Report by PTC regarding the candidate. A report summarizing the candidate's qualifications, relative to the criteria in the faculty handbook, is prepared by the PTC committee. The report will not include a vote or a specific recommendation on promotion but will serve as the draft report for the EVF. A copy of this draft report is given to the candidate. The candidate has the right to correct factual errors in the report by submitting such corrections to the PTC in writing within one week of receiving the report. Permitting the candidate to read the PTC's draft report and correct any factual errors should be sufficient assurance that the candidate's record is being properly presented. However, if for some reason the candidate feels that the final report is not a fair representation of his or her record, the candidate can prepare a parallel statement that would be submitted to the EVF with the PTC report.

After any factual corrections are made by the candidate, if it is a mandatory tenure decision year, the EVF will automatically receive access to the report along with the dossier and external letters. If it is a report concerning promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate can then decide whether he/she wants to proceed with the promotion request. If the full professor candidate wishes to proceed, the EVF would then be given access to the report, external letters, and dossier. Only the EVF for that candidate are allowed access to the external letters.

The PTC will also create a "Confidential Summary Evaluation" of at least 1 paragraph that is not provided to the candidate. This paragraph provides a summary of the candidate's performance and a summary of the EVF evaluation. This paragraph will be approved during the meeting by the EVF, will not be shared with the candidate, and will be included in Tab 3 of the dossier. (If this paragraph cannot be voted on during the meeting, it will be drafted and sent to faculty for a vote.)

EVF, Meeting of the EVF, and Voting Procedures

The EVF represents the department in considering, evaluating, and voting upon recommendations for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal forwarded from the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The chair of PTC runs the meeting of the EVF and reports the results of the EVF's recommendations to the candidate and to the Department Chair for transmission to the dean of the college.

Composition of the EVF. All full professors with tenure in the department serve as the EVF when considering candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. All full professors and tenured associate professors with tenure in the department comprise the EVF when considering candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor, when making tenure decisions regarding untenured associate professors, and when making decisions regarding contract renewal of assistant professors. The Department Chair is permitted to be at the meeting as a non-voting member of the EVF.

Procedures for the meeting of the EVF. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee serves as the chair of the EVF for purposes of the promotion meeting of the EVF, and is responsible for convening meetings of this group. The EVF meets to consider the draft report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee according to the timeline below. Written notice of the time and place of the meeting(s) must be given to all members of the EVF at least one week in advance. A quorum for these meetings is two-thirds of the EVF.

All members of the EVF must receive a copy of the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least one week in advance of the meeting. Members of the EVF must also be provided access to all materials submitted by the candidate to the PTC, and to the letters of external reviewers.

During the meeting of the EVF, the PTC report on the candidate needs to be approved (or amended and then approved) by a vote of the EVF, along with the Confidential Summary Evaluation paragraph. Usually, any amendments to the report are voted on during this meeting before the final document is approved. However, the EVF can decide to that they would like to convene again to make final approval, in the case where more significant changes have been requested. The PTC report is a part of the dossier that is forwarded with the candidate's materials as the case progresses beyond the department.

Procedures for the post-meeting vote of the EVF. Upon completion of discussion of the qualifications of a candidate, members of the EVF vote on a recommendation for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal by secret written ballot. Ballots are returned to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee within one week of their distribution, and are counted by the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and at least one other member of the PTC. A positive vote of 60% of the members of the EVF who cast ballots is considered a positive recommendation for promotion, tenure, or contract renewal.

1. The PTC chair and the Department Chair will prepare a list of faculty eligible to vote. The Department Chair is not eligible to vote as part of the EVF.

2. The PTC chair will prepare ballots describing the procedure for voting and the required return date.

3. To ensure confidentiality, but to be able to determine who voted, the ballots will be placed in an inner envelope with no identifying information. An outer envelope will have the name of the faculty member on it. The ballot is to be returned in both envelopes. The inner envelope will be separated from the outer envelope when it is received by the PTC chair.

4. The ballots will be distributed to the university mailboxes of faculty eligible to vote. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave will be mailed or faxed a ballot, if possible. It is the responsibility of faculty on leave to make mail and fax addresses available to the department executive assistant. Faculty shall

return the ballots to the PTC chair or a designate indicated on the ballot (such as the Department Administrative Assistant).

5. The ballots shall be counted by the chair and a member of the PTC, as specified in this document.

6. The chair of PTC shall distribute, by confidential memo, the outcome of the vote to the faculty and the vote totals to the EVF.

Appeal procedures. A candidate can appeal the decision of the EVF on procedural grounds. Any appeal must be made in writing to the Department Chair within one week of notification of the recommendation of the EVF. If the Department Chair concludes that proper procedures were not followed, the candidacy will be returned to the EVF for reconsideration.

Multiple candidates. If there is more than one candidate for promotion or tenure or contract renewal in a given year, the procedures described in this section will be applied independently to each candidate. The phrase "applied independently" does not mean that only one candidate can be discussed at a meeting. Instead, it is meant to convey the idea that candidates are evaluated with regard to the promotion and tenure criteria rather than compared to each other.

Report of vote by the EVF back to the faculty. The chair of the PTC reports the overall results of the vote of the EVF to the entire tenure and tenure track faculty, with information on the actual count disclosed only to the EVF.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair

The Department Chair provides each candidate with a written report of the vote on her/his candidacy and a summary of the evaluations of her/his qualifications by the EVF. A candidate can withdraw from further consideration at this point by submitting a written request to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair is responsible for completing the required recommendation for promotion forms, and any required supporting information, for candidates recommended for promotion or tenure and for submitting these materials to the college office. As required by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Department Chair integrates all of the information regarding the candidate's qualifications and writes a narrative in which he or she justifies a recommendation for promotion or tenure. The Department Chair also is responsible for completing all necessary forms and documentation associated with negative recommendations for a faculty member for whom a tenure decision is mandatory, and for appointment of a faculty member for an additional probationary period. This includes a justification for the negative decision.

The Department Chair's positive or negative recommendation should be informed by the report of the PTC and the discussion and vote of the EVF, but the Department Chair's evaluation is not bound by any of these. His or her evaluation and recommendation are made independently. The Department Chair must give the candidate the opportunity to review all aspects of the recommendation, except for the confidential evaluation summary paragraph provided by EVF members, the external letters, and the Chair's evaluation.

When the Department Chair submits a negative recommendation to the dean for a candidate recommended for promotion or tenure by the EVF, or submits a positive recommendation for a candidate who has received a negative vote of the EVF, the Department Chair must inform the EVF of this action in writing.

Information to be Submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee by the Candidate

As described in the university promotion and tenure document, the candidate is responsible for submitting a promotion and tenure vita dossier.

The candidate is welcome to update the dossier throughout the entire review process by submitting these updates to the chair of the PTC. However, updates received after summary judgments have been made (e.g., after the external reviewers have made assessments or after the PTC report has been written) do not normally constitute a basis for reassessing the judgment. Normally, updates can only affect stages of the review not already completed.

The candidate is responsible for completing the cover pages as well as Tabs 1 and 2 of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Dossier. Candidates can download the latest version of the LAS Promotion and Tenure Dossier Template via the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences website. The accuracy and completeness of the cover pages and Tabs 1 & 2 are the responsibility of the candidate. However, the PTC will work with the candidate to help ensure the best presentation of the information.

The LAS Dossier used for promotion and tenure is the same dossier template used for annual reviews and contract renewals for assistant professors. Hence, most faculty members who are being considered for promotion will already be familiar with this dossier template.

Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Activities

This schedule represents a set of guidelines adopted by the PTC to facilitate the orderly execution of its business. It is intended as a set of guidelines; variations in the schedule may occur given variations in the university, college, and department schedules. The schedule is also intended to provide guidance to associate and assistant professors with respect to likely periods of interaction with the PTC. We hope this schedule will facilitate planning.

Date	Activity
April	Election of new PTC members as needed.
May 1	Election of PTC chair. Notification to assistant professors who are subject to mandatory review for promotion and tenure in the following fall. Candidates for promotion should notify the PTC by May 1 if they wish to be considered for promotion.
May 15	Rank ordered list of potential names of external reviewers are submitted to the PTC by candidates for promotion. PTC generates an independent list in consultation with faculty in the candidate's program area.
June 1	Candidates submit materials to the PTC that are needed for external reviewers (CV, research statement, five or more articles in the form of pdfs). External reviewers are contacted and materials sent. Letters from external reviewers are requested to be received by Sept 1.
Sept. 1	Candidates for promotion submit their completed dossier to PTC (cover pages plus tabs 1 and 2).
Sept 7-15	PTC distributes candidate's dossier to candidate's program area and program area meets to discuss candidate.
Sept 15-30	Submitted materials and external letters are reviewed by the PTC. Interviews with candidates are completed.

Oct 1-15 Draft reports are written and approved by candidate.

Oct. 15-30 Reports and dossier distributed to the EVF. The EVF meets to discuss.

Nov 1-8 Vote of the EVF.

Jan 15 Candidates who know they will be considered for renewal, tenure, or promotion in the coming year should arrange for in-class teaching observations this semester. PTC should promote all faculty getting teaching observations once every three semesters.

Feb 10 Assistant professors to be reviewed for feedback or reappointment submit dossiers as per this document.

Feb15-28 Committee meets with assistant professors for annual reviews or contract-renewal reviews.

Mar 1-7 Draft feedback reports for contract-renewals completed.

Mar 8-15 Contract-renewal reports submitted to EVF for vote.

Mar 15-31 Draft feedback reports to assistant professors completed. Contract-renewals voted by EVF and submitted to the Department Chair.

Apr 1-15 Final feedback reports to assistant professors completed and submitted to assistant professors and Department Chair.

Department of Psychology Post Tenure Review

Approved by the Faculty on 11/29/99
Amended on 10/21/02 and 03/19/12

This document describes departmental procedures for conducting post tenure reviews, in accordance with the University Post Tenure Review Policy approved by the Board of Regents (6/16/99) and amended by the Faculty Senate on December 9, 2014, by the Senior Vice President and Provost on January 3, 2015, and the University President on January 8, 2015.

1. All tenured faculty will be reviewed at least once every seven years, beginning in the seventh year after tenure was granted. Faculty may request a review as early as five years after the previous review. Promotion reviews (e.g., to Full Professor) and initial appointments that include tenure (e.g., faculty hired at the Associate or Full Professor level with tenure) are considered post tenure reviews (PTRs), and therefore reset the PTR schedule for that individual. The review will address the quality of the faculty member's performance in accordance with all position responsibility statements (PRSs) in effect during the period of the review in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service.

2. The Department of Psychology has an elected faculty Committee on Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS), which conducts annual evaluations of every faculty member. These departmental annual evaluations include extensive information on teaching, research, and service from the previous four years, and are conducted in conjunction with the position responsibility statements. These annual evaluations are done every spring. Post tenure reviews will be conducted by CERTS during the fall semester.

3. The basis for the PTR will be the annual CERTS evaluations done during the period of the PTR, any additional information that the faculty member under review deems relevant, and a meeting between CERTS and the faculty member.

4. CERTS employs a five-category system in its evaluations: Excellent, Soundly Competent, Competent, Adequate, Unsatisfactory. For PTR, the University Faculty Handbook specifies two categories: Meeting Expectations and Below Expectations. The five categories used by CERTS map onto the two categories required for PTR in the following manner: Unsatisfactory maps onto Below Expectations; all other categories map onto Meeting Expectations.

5. CERTS will prepare a report consisting of sections devoted to each area of the PRS and a final section that is an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Each section will summarize the faculty member’s performance in paragraph form and will include one of the following categorical descriptors: Meeting Expectations or Below Expectations.

a. If any area of the PRS receives a Below Expectations evaluation, then the CERTS chair will meet with the faculty member and the Department Chair to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in that area. The action plan will be signed by all three parties. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation (Sections 5.3.4.2 and 3.4.4 of the Faculty Handbook).

b. If CERTS determines that the overall category for the PRT is Below Expectations, the review will include specific recommendations for achieving an acceptable performance evaluation. The faculty member will work with Department Chair and the CERTS chair to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in areas deemed Below Expectations. The action plan will be signed by all three parties. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation (Sections 5.3.4.2 and 3.4.4 of the Faculty Handbook). Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next academic year's annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy (Section 7.2.2.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook). The action plan will include: 1) the justification for the plan, 2) a specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress on the plan, and 3) a description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation.

6. The PTR report will be given to the Department Chair and the faculty member, who will meet to discuss the report. The faculty member may then take the following courses of action.

a. Accept the report as is and agree to work on developing action plans if required.

b. Ask the evaluating committee to consider additional information and to revise the report.

c. Appeal to the tenured faculty of the department, requesting that an additional review committee be selected to review the faculty member's materials. If this request is approved by a majority of the tenured faculty, the Department Chair will conduct a special election to form the new committee. This Special Review Committee will be elected by a vote of all tenured faculty and will consist of one tenured faculty member from each of the departmental Ph.D. granting program areas (currently, Cognitive, Counseling, and Social). This committee will review the same materials plus any additional materials provided by the faculty member and will prepare their own report.

7. The Department Chair will forward the agreed upon report to the dean. IF the PTR makes an overall categorization of “superior”, the chair will add his or her own recommendation concerning the recommended salary increase.

8. The PTR report(s) and additional statements by the faculty member relevant to the report(s) will be filed.

Faculty on phased retirement or faculty who have declared their intent to retire in the next year are exempt from PTR. The Department Chair also is exempt.

Post-tenure review is not applicable to non-tenured faculty.

Personnel Selection and Hiring Procedures

Faculty Selection and Hiring Procedures
(Approved by faculty 1986-87)

The Search Committee

1) The search committee will be appointed by the Department Chair. A majority of the committee will be comprised of faculty from the area that has a vacancy. The chair of the committee will be from that area. At least one member from the committee will be from another area. One member of the committee will be designated by the Department Chair to monitor affirmative action guidelines throughout the search. Ordinarily, the Department Chair will not be a member of the committee but may supply information to committee members.

2) The job description and the ad for the position will be written by the committee in consultation with area members and with concurrence of the Department Chair.

3) The Executive Committee will make recommendations to the Department Chair as to candidates to be interviewed in all cases where there is more than one search committee for a given position.

The Interview

1) After considering all timely applications, the search committee will present a list of rank-ordered candidates to the Department Chair. The Department Chair, with the committee, will decide which of the top candidates will be invited for an interview. Interviewing more than one candidate is seen as essential. Relevant information about all of the candidates will be available upon request for perusal by the faculty. In addition, the credentials of the interview candidates will be available in the main office for faculty review.

2) The search committee will then set up an interview schedule, which will include a colloquium. The schedule should allow for at least a two-day visit.

3) During the interview, ample time should be provided for faculty to interact with the candidate in groups and individually. In addition, a social occasion should be scheduled.

Evaluation of Candidates

1) After each candidate's interview, the search committee will solicit (as soon as possible) written comments or reactions to the candidate from all tenure-track faculty members and resident graduate students in the area.

2) After all of the candidates have been interviewed, the search committee will discuss the (full) faculty evaluations with members of the area (of hire). Faculty evaluations and the reactions of the area members will be considered by the committee in determining a rank-ordering of the candidates, as well as an indication of the acceptability of each individual. The committee's recommendations will then be given to the Executive Committee to formulate a recommendation for the faculty. This Executive Committee recommendation will be given to all tenure-track faculty.

3) The Department Chair will call a meeting of the entire faculty to discuss and consider the Executive Committee's recommendations. This meeting should take place as soon as possible after the last candidate's colloquium.

4) When discussion is completed, the faculty will approve or disapprove the committee's recommendations via written ballot. Faculty unable to attend should turn their (sealed) ballot in to the committee chair prior to the meeting. The ballots will be counted by the committee chair and one other non-committee member of the department. A simple majority would be needed for approval. Should the faculty not approve the committee's recommendations; the committee will be asked to reconvene for the purpose of determining an alternative course of action.

5) All tenure-track faculty will have access to the numerical results of the final vote by requesting same from the search committee chair.

6) The Executive Committee's recommendation, as approved by the faculty, will then be presented to the Department Chair. This information, along with the Department Chair's recommendation, will be transmitted to the dean.

Policy for Recruitment, Review, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty Teaching in the Department of Psychology

[Approved 2.11.2019]

[See ISU Faculty Handbook (FH) Sections 3.3.2 – 3.3.2.4 and 5.4.1 and [draft] Policy on Term Faculty Appointment, Renewal, and Advancement in the College of Liberal Arts Sciences (PTFARA).]

PREFACE

This policy applies to term faculty whose primary teaching appointment is in the Psychology curriculum. Faculty who teach in the Communication Studies program or the Leadership Studies program should refer to their program policies for guidance.

1.1 Teaching Faculty Titles and Ranks

As described by the Policy on Term Faculty Appointment, Renewal, and Advancement in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (PTFARA, see also FH 3.3.2.3), teaching faculty positions are limited term full- or part-time appointments with the primary responsibility of contributing to the teaching mission of the University. These positions are not eligible for tenure but may be eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing needs of the Department. There are two types of appointment, lecturer and teaching professor at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full. Lecturer positions are short term appointments with a contract length of one year or less, renewable for up to three years. After three years of continuous service, lecturers who are renewed will be renewed as assistant teaching professors. Assistant teaching professors are at the same rank as lecturers. In the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), assistant teaching professors have contract lengths of three years. Associate teaching professors have a record of successfully contributing to the teaching mission of the University, as defined in their PRS, and show promise of further academic and professional development. In LAS, associate teaching professors have contract lengths of three years. Teaching professors have proven and sustained excellence in the primary responsibilities identified in their PRS, effectiveness in any other areas of PRS responsibility, and contribute to the mission of the University beyond routine classroom teaching in a sustained and substantial manner. In LAS, teaching professors have contract lengths of five years. Eight courses per year (or equivalent) is considered a full time position. All appointments, renewals, and advancements of teaching faculty are subject to approval at the College and University levels. Teaching faculty are eligible for professional development support as appropriate.

1.2 Areas of Responsibility and the Position Responsibility Statement

1.2.1 Teaching

Teaching faculty positions must include a significant element of instruction; additional responsibilities may include advising, curriculum coordination, leadership of multi-section classes, and other responsibilities related to the teaching mission of the University or of the Department (PTFARA p. 4). The faculty handbook requires that 75% of the time of teaching faculty be devoted to teaching and related service (FH 3.3.2.2). On some occasions, 25% of the time of term faculty may be committed to scholarship (see section 1.2.3 below)

As also described for tenure-stream faculty in the Department, teaching refers to academic activities that promote learning among individuals or groups. Teaching faculty may contribute to the graduate teaching mission of the Department. Term faculty may request Graduate Faculty status; once approved, they may mentor graduate students and serve on graduate Program of Study committees (but not as chair). Effective service in these roles promotes graduate student training and development. Teaching related service can take many other forms, including but not limited to advising undergraduate students, serving on teaching related department and university committees, contributing to the learning community, and serving in leadership roles related to the teaching mission of the Department.

1.2.2 Service

The faculty handbook (see FH 3.3.2.2) allows institutional and professional service to be included in teaching faculty position responsibilities. As described by the PTFARA, teaching faculty shall have service responsibilities appropriate to their role in the department and rank. Required service must be listed on the PRS and not exceed 10% of appointed time without complementary adjustments to the PRS. Service may be listed as a separate category on the PRS or, if appropriate, included as part of teaching. Teaching faculty may volunteer for service that goes beyond their PRS, but such voluntary service, or its absence, will not be held against faculty during performance reviews (annual, renewal, or advancement).

1.2.3 Scholarship

The faculty handbook also allows scholarship to be included in teaching faculty position responsibilities (FH 3.3.2.2). Funding for salary for scholarship by teaching faculty may not come from general funds in LAS (PTFARA). With the approval of the Department Chair, teaching faculty may apply for grants as PIs or co-PIs to support scholarship. They may also be supported by external grant funds for which they are not a PI or co-PI with the approval of the Department Chair and the College. Scholarship cannot exceed 25% of the PRS.

1.2.4 The Position Responsibility Statement

A written position responsibility statement (PRS) will be prepared that clearly indicates the duties and expectations of each term faculty member. The PRS offers guidance on how much weight to place on the differing responsibilities of each faculty member (FH 3.4.2.2). As teaching faculty have a relatively high effort allocation to teaching, the quality of their teaching will weigh relatively heavily in annual performance reviews and reviews for renewal and advancement.

Although department needs may limit the room for negotiation, the PRS must be written to allow term faculty the opportunity to make a reasonable case for advancement if the faculty member is interested in such advancement (FH 3.4.2.2, PTFARA Advancement and the PRS).

Teaching faculty may participate in a PRS mediation process (FH 3.4.2.). The section on Disagreements Regarding the PRS describes the PRS mediation process in the Department.

1.3 Participation in Shared Governance

As stated in the faculty handbook, term faculty are members of the general faculty with full rights of academic freedom and participation in shared governance (FH 3.3.2). The College allows term faculty to participate in all college level shared governance activities that do not involve the evaluation of research by tenured and tenure eligible faculty. Any term faculty member is eligible to serve as a representative on the Faculty Senate and LAS Representative Assembly.

All term faculty whose primary teaching responsibilities are in the Department have the right to participate in Department meetings and other aspects of departmental governance and service, as described. Lecturers on 1 year contracts may participate in department meetings as non-voting members. Term faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and above have full rights of participation in shared departmental governance, with the exception of activities related to the research and hire of tenure stream faculty. In addition, only faculty with Graduate Faculty membership may vote on issues related to the graduate curriculum or graduate students. Otherwise, term faculty have the right to vote in department meetings on all other matters. Term faculty who are affiliated with program areas also have the right to participate in program area meetings. Term faculty are eligible to participate in departmental committee service that is not related to the research of tenured and tenure eligible faculty and to represent the Department on university committees. Term faculty are eligible to vote in committees on which they serve and to be elected or appointed to committee chair. Lecturers are not eligible for service on committees with multiyear terms (except CERTS), and term faculty are not eligible to serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee. A term faculty member at associate or above with a ½ time or greater appointment shall serve on the Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) for the renewal and advancement of term faculty. The section on General Procedures for Evaluating Faculty Productivity provides details about CERTS membership and election.

1.4 Teaching Faculty in the Graduate College

Teaching faculty are eligible for associate membership of the Graduate Faculty according to the policies and procedures of the Graduate College. Procedures for nomination are included in the Graduate Handbook. Graduate Faculty associate membership requires a terminal degree, with rare exceptions for equivalent experience, and allows ISU employees who have been appointed to a faculty rank to serve as co-major professors or committee members and to teach graduate level (5XX/6XX) courses. Term faculty members who do not have terminal degrees may be approved by the Graduate College to teach graduate courses at levels comparable to their degree. These individuals will be able to teach 5XX courses on a temporary basis if they have a master's degree.

1.5 Terms of Appointment, Qualifications, and Hiring

1.5.1 Lecturers

1.5.1.1 ***Term of Appointment.*** The Lecturer is a limited term full- or part-time appointment of from one semester up to one year and renewable for no more than a total of three years of continuous service. A notice of three months of intent not to renew is required in the first two years. In the third year of continuous service, lecturers must be notified of intent to renew or not renew by Feb. 15. If they are renewed, they are renewed as assistant teaching professors and shall have three year contracts. The change in title is not an advancement and does not normally result in a change in the PRS or FTE.

1.5.1.2 ***Minimum Qualifications****.* The minimum qualification for a lecturer position in the Department is a graduate degree in psychology or a closely related area. A doctoral degree is preferred but not required and may not be used as a criterion for advancement.

1.5.2 Assistant, Associate, and (full) Teaching Professors

1.5.2.1 Terms of Appointment. Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors are limited term full- or part- time appointments of three years. Teaching professors are limited term full- or part-time appointments of five years. Teaching professors of all ranks require a notice of one year of intent not to renew.

1.5.2.2 Qualifications*.* The minimum qualification for a teaching professor position at the rank of assistant or above is a graduate degree in psychology or a closely related area. A doctoral degree is preferred but not required and may not be used as a criterion for advancement. Candidates for hire at the rank of associate teaching professor must demonstrate a record of contributions in the professional field comparable to meeting the department criteria for advancement to associate teaching professor and must show promise of further academic and professional development (see also FH 3.3.2.3). Candidates for hire at the rank of teaching professor must demonstrate a record of substantial contributions to the professional field comparable to meeting the department criteria for advancement to teaching professor (see also FH 3.3.2.3).

1.5.3 Credit for Prior Experience

College policy requires that any credit towards advancement for years of teaching at other institutions must be determined at the time of initial appointment. Teaching faculty may apply for advancement to associate teaching professor after five years of experience as an ISU faculty member (inclusive of time as a lecturer and assistant teaching professor), or its equivalent.

1.5.4 Hiring Procedures

When hiring a new term faculty member as a lecturer or at the rank of assistant, associate, or full teaching professor, a Teaching Faculty Search Committee will be formed. One member will be designated by the Department Chair to monitor affirmative action guidelines throughout the search. Term faculty are eligible for membership on the committee. The search committee will write the job description and ad, review candidates, and, schedule interviews and in most cases, a teaching colloquium (the colloquium may be waived when a decision must be made very quickly due to an unexpected vacancy or emergency).

The Teaching Faculty Search Committee will make a hiring recommendation to the Executive Committee, which will formulate a recommendation for faculty. The Chair will bring the recommendation to a meeting of the faculty for discussion and consideration. A vote of the eligible department faculty, which includes all tenured and tenure-track faculty and term faculty at the rank of assistant and above, will be required to approve the hire. A simple majority is needed for approval. Should the faculty not approve the search committee's recommendation, the committee will be asked to reconvene for the purpose of determining an alternative course of action. All EVF will have access to the numerical results of the vote by requesting same from the Chair. The outcome of a positive vote, along with the Department Chair's recommendation, will be transmitted to the Dean.

In the case of lecturers who are appointed for only 1 year, the Chair and the Teaching Faculty Search committee may make the hiring decision (and waive a vote of the EVF).

1.6 Peer Review in Evaluation and Policy Change

1.6.1 Peer Reviews in the Department

1.6.1.1 Annual Peer Review. The faculty handbook requires that all teaching faculty receive annual reviews from the department chair or designee (FH 5.1.1.2). The Department includes peer review in its annual review process, as specified below.

1.6.1.2 Peer Review for Renewal and Advancement. Appointment renewal and advancement of teaching faculty include a peer review process (FH 5.4.1.2, 5.4.1.3). Details on renewal and advancement timing, materials, and procedures are described in subsequent sections.

1.6.2 The Peer Review Committee

The Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service (CERTS) is responsible for annual peer reviews and peer reviews for contract renewal and advancement for term faculty. It is not required for CERTS to include a term faculty for the annual peer review. However, if term faculty wish to serve on CERTS for the annual peer review, selection for committee membership will be initiated by self-nomination followed by a faculty election, or by an up or down vote if there is a single nominee. CERTS must include a term faculty when contract renewal and advancement of term faculty are considered. Selection of term faculty for inclusion on CERTS for contract renewal and advancement will be initiated by soliciting nominations of term faculty, followed by a faculty election, or by an up or down vote if there is a single nominee. The term of membership for term faculty will be one year. Term faculty serving on CERTS must have at least 50% appointments. CERTS reviews follow the methods and metrics described under General Procedures for Evaluating Faculty Productivity. Evaluation of faculty teaching is described on p. 19. CERTS annual reviews are based on a four year rolling time period. Peer reviews for annual performance, renewal, and advancement may inform each other.

1.6.3 Peer Review Committee Membership Eligibility

There are no College or University eligibility standards for annual peer reviews of term faculty performance; the membership of these committees, where they occur, follows the policy of the department. The faculty handbook and College policy do define eligibility by faculty rank for term faculty peer reviews for renewal and advancement, and College policy requires that the committees include both tenured and term faculty (FH 5.4.1.2, FH 5.4.1.3, PTFARA Process for Renewal Reviews and Procedures for Advancement). As necessary, a substitute member or members of CERTS will be elected to meet eligibility requirements. Composition of term faculty review committees consistent with these policies is as follows:

- Renewal committees (to renew contracts without advancement)—Tenured and term faculty at the rank of associate and above
- Advancement committees
    - To Associate Teaching Professor— Tenured and term faculty at the rank of associate and above
    - To Teaching Professor—Tenured and term Professors[1]

The CERTS Chair has the responsibility of ensuring appropriate committee membership and maintaining time lines for renewal and advancement reviews conducted by CERTS.

1.6.4 Faculty Voting for Renewal and Advancement

In the Department, a faculty vote is required for advancement of term faculty and for their renewal with multiyear contracts. The CERTS does not vote as a committee. Instead, the CERTS presents their report to the eligible voting faculty (EVF) for discussion and votes with the EVF. College policy defines the EVF for renewal and advancement as those eligible to serve on the committee in question (see above). The guiding principle of "one person—one vote" applies to voting for renewal and advancement of term faculty as it does to voting for advancement for tenure-stream faculty (see FH 5.2.4.1). The CERTS written report and the voting results are available to the EVF.

1.6.5 Teaching Faculty Renewal and Advancement Policy Changes

In addition to its role in peer review, the CERTS is responsible for reviewing the department's policies and procedures regarding the renewal and advancement of teaching faculty. Proposals for changes in this document must be submitted to the CERTS for review. The CERTS will then make a recommendation to the department faculty regarding acceptance of the change, and the proposed change will be voted on by the faculty of the department. The issue will be decided by a majority vote of the faculty.

1.7 Annual Review of Term Faculty

1.7.1 Annual Performance Review Procedure

Each teaching faculty member in the Department will receive an annual review for performance in the duties and expectations indicated by their PRS (FH 3.4.2.2). First and second year lecturers who do not wish to be considered for future appointment may be reviewed by the Chair or designee. All other teaching faculty will be reviewed by CERTS. Formative feedback will be provided as part of the review process and specific recommendations for improvement will be included in the report in the event of an unsatisfactory

---

[1] Committees without term faculty will be allowed in the transitional time before teaching faculty have been advanced to teaching professors.

review. The Chair will discuss the CERTS report with the faculty member, typically in the spring, and each will sign the final report.

1.7.2 Annual Performance Review Materials

The faculty member should submit:

- An updated vitae
- The Teaching and Service sections of the ARPA form (or another form requested by CERTS)
- A Teaching Portfolio, as described in the section on Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

1.7.3 Timing of Annual Performance Reviews

***1.7.3.1 Lecturers in First and Second Contract Years**.* For second year contracts, and first-year contracts with teaching in the fall, the review materials will be submitted in early spring and will cover the previous calendar year. On the basis of this information, a written report will be completed. For first year contracts, especially those with teaching only in the spring or the summer, the review materials will be requested immediately at the end of the semester (May or August) if the Lecturer is to be considered for renewal during the next academic year.

***1.7.3.2 Lecturers in Third Contract Year**.* In their third contract year, lecturers are reviewed by CERTS for both annual performance and contract renewal. Contract renewal review occurs first, with materials due to CERTS by Nov. 1. Renewal procedures are described in section 1.8. Updated materials are due to CERTS for annual review in the early spring.

1.7.3.3. Teaching Professors, All Ranks. Annual review materials are due to CERTS in the early spring. In the penultimate years of their contracts, teaching professors of all ranks are also reviewed for contract renewal, as described below.

1.8 Renewal of Psychology Term Faculty

1.8.1 Criteria for Renewal

The criteria for renewal are positive performance of the responsibilities identified in the PRS and continuing departmental need.

1.8.2 Renewal Procedure

1.8.2.1 Renewal Procedure for One Year Contracts. During a lecturer’s first two contract years, the Chair (or a designee) may make renewal decisions taking the annual review and departmental need into account.

1.8.2.2 Renewal Procedure for Multiyear Contracts The CERTS will review the candidate’s materials and relevant previous performance reviews and prepare a report regarding renewal of the candidate’s contract. A vote of the EVF will be taken, and the results, together with the Chair’s recommendation, will be forwarded to the LAS College by the Chair. Lecturers in their third continuous years must be notified of an intent to renew or not renew by Feb. 15. If renewed, they will be renewed as Assistant Teaching Professors with three year contracts.

1.8.3 Materials

The candidate should submit the materials listed under 1.7.2 (Annual Performance Review Materials). The time period covered by the materials should include the time period of the candidate’s current contract.

1.8.4 Timing of Reviews

1.8.4.1 First and Second Year Lecturers. First and second year lecturers should submit materials for review for in the early spring, or as soon as possible after the completion of a spring or summer teaching assignment.

1.8.4.2 Third Year Lecturers. Lecturers in their third continuous contract year should submit materials for review by Nov. 1 of their third year for renewal as Assistant Teaching Professors. College policy requires that third year lecturers be notified of an intent to renew or not renew by Feb. 15.

1.8.4.3 Teaching Professors. Teaching professors of all ranks should submit materials for review in the early spring of the penultimate years of their contracts

- Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors should be reviewed for renewal in their second year.
- Teaching Professors should be reviewed for renewal in their fourth year.

1.9 Advancement of Term Faculty

1.9.1 Advancement and Contract Renewal

As explained in the College policy procedures for term faculty advancement, advancement and renewal are separate processes. Term faculty members with multiyear contracts may apply for advancement at any year in their contracted term that they meet eligibility requirements. At contract renewal, a decision not to support advancement may not be used as the basis for non-renewal. However, the CERTS evaluation used to inform the advancement recommendation may also inform the renewal decision. Contract renewal in all cases is contingent upon departmental need as well as the quality of the faculty member’s performance.

1.9.2 Evaluation of Teaching for Advancement (PTFARA Procedures for Advancement, Evaluation of Teaching)

College policy requires that the methods and metrics of evaluating teaching performance for advancement reviews be the same for term faculty and tenure-stream faculty. Additionally, student evaluations of teaching are required, but on their own are insufficient evidence of teaching quality. As noted in the section on PRS statements, in advancement decisions, teaching performance will have greater weight for faculty with significant teaching responsibilities than for faculty with lower teaching responsibilities.

1.9.3 Advancement Materials

For advancement reviews, the candidate submits the following documentation to CERTS:

- Sections 1 and 2 of the LAS Term Faculty Advancement Template, which includes, among other information:
    - Updated vitae
    - Statement of teaching philosophy
    - Report of student evaluations with comparable department means
    - Description of service activities
- Letters of support, including observations of teaching, and professional development and service (as appropriate). External letters are not required.
- A Teaching portfolio, as described in the section on Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

1.9.4 Timing of Materials

Advancement review materials are due to CERTS by Nov.1 (advancement recommendations are due to the College by Feb. 1).

1.9.5 Advancement to Associate Teaching Professor

1.9.5.1 Timing of Advancement (FH 5.4.1.3, PTFARA Criteria for Advancement: Advancement to Associate Teaching Professor). Term faculty are eligible for promotion to the associate rank after five years of employment as a faculty member at ISU (full or part time) or equivalent experience elsewhere. Faculty may apply for advancement at the beginning of their 6th year.

1.9.5.2 Criteria*.* To be eligible for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, the faculty member must have (PTFARA Criteria for Advancement to Associate Teaching Professor):

- A record of success in the primary responsibilities of the PRS. The record of success should include
    - a positive peer review evaluation of teaching
    - evidence of pedagogical development, which can include, but is not limited to:
        - use of creative teaching techniques,
        - responsiveness to course assessments
        - innovative use of technology
        - work with campus partners.
- promise of further academic and professional development as a scholarly teacher, as indicated by command of the subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning (FH 5.2.2.3.1)
- effectiveness in all other areas of PRS responsibility.

1.9.6 Advancement to (full) Teaching Professor

1.9.6.1 Timing of Advancement. There is no set time period that establishes eligibility for advancement to teaching professor. Rather, the associate teaching professor must establish a record of experience that demonstrates eligibility according to the criteria below.

1.9.6.2 Criteria. The candidate must have (PTFARA draft pp. 9-10; see also FH 3.3.2.3):

- proven and sustained excellence in the primary responsibilities identified in the PRS

- effectiveness in any other areas of PRS responsibility

- sustained and substantial contributions to the mission of the university beyond routine classroom teaching. Teaching faculty may engage the broader mission through non-routine classroom teaching or other kinds of service. Examples of contributions supportive of advancement may include, but are not limited to:
    - A record of significant curriculum improvement and development, including things such as collaborative courses and programs, innovative use of technology, and pedagogical innovation;
    - Course or program coordination for multi-instructor courses;

- Substantial student service (e.g., advising individual students and student organizations, mentoring, service on graduate student committees, leading learning communities);
- A record of substantial and meaningful service to the Department, University, or profession;
- A leadership role in the Department, the College, or the University; and
- 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. Career contributions will not offset deficiencies in PRS performance.

1.9.7 Advancement Procedure (see also PTFARA, Procedures for Advancement)

The candidate should seek the consultation of the CERTS and the Department Chair in the preparation of Sections 1 and 2 of the LAS Advancement Template. The Department Chair completes the cover sheet. The CERTS and the Department Chair will review the Advancement Template for factual accuracy. As appropriate, the candidate may use feedback from the committee and Department Chair to improve the factual accuracy and quality of the advancement dossier.

The CERTS will prepare Section 3, Part 1 of the Template (The Department Review Committee's Recommendation). The CERTS summarizes accomplishments for Section 3, Part 1 and presents a written summary to the EVF for discussion and a vote. The CERTS reports in writing to the Department Chair the results of its review, including the voting results.

The Department Chair makes an independent evaluation of the advancement case informed by the CERTS review and department discussion and vote and completes Section 3, Part 2 of the Advancement Template (The Department Chair's Recommendation). The Chair will formatively explain to the candidate in writing the results of the faculty vote and the Chair's recommendation before these are submitted to the College.

If the Chair supports the advancement, the Chair will submit the CERT's report, faculty vote, and his or her own letter of recommendation to the Dean. The Dean will inform the candidate of the College's decision in writing before forwarding the recommendation to the Provost.

In the event the Chair does not support an advancement request, the candidate may withdraw his or her application or request that it be forwarded to the Dean for consideration. There is no penalty for withdrawing an application for advancement. The application for advancement may be resubmitted in any advancement cycle in which the advancement portfolio has improved.

Adjunct, Affiliate, and Courtesy Appointments in Psychology

(Approved by faculty 11/04/91)

The Psychology Department does not consider adjunct, affiliate, collaborator or courtesy appointments to be a "right" or in any sense "automatic" upon meeting some set of criteria. Decisions are made on an individual basis where it is considered mutually beneficial to both the department and the candidate. The following sections define these appointments and the procedures to be followed in making such appointments.

Type of Appointment

Adjunct appointments can be made at any academic rank from lecturer through professor. Pay can range from $0 to any level that is appropriate depending on the department's ability to pay and the circumstances surrounding the individual case. Appointments can be made for one to three years. Adjunct appointments are neither tenured nor "tenure track" and appointments at half time or more should not be made for more than six consecutive years so as to avoid de facto tenure. The purpose of adjunct appointments is to address special departmental circumstances related to teaching, research or both. [When teaching alone is the purpose for an appointment and only a one-year appointment is anticipated, a temporary instructor (or assistant or associate or full professor) appointment is more appropriate. Procedures for making temporary appointments are outlined in the Personnel Selection and Hiring Procedures passed by faculty in 1986.] Because appointments within the university cannot add to more than 100%, an adjunct appointment to someone who is full time in another unit would normally involve no pay (i.e., a "zero percent" adjunct appointment or a "title only" adjunct appointment). Recruitment for any adjunct appointments that include salary must follow the university's affirmative action procedures.

Affiliate appointments are appropriate for persons who are not employed on a regular basis either inside or outside the university. Affiliate appointments can be made at any rank. Appointments can be made for one to three year terms and are renewable. Conditions of the appointment are stated in writing and signed by both the affiliate and the Department Chair. An affiliate cannot acquire tenure as an affiliate and any time spent in affiliate status cannot be considered to be service in a probationary period leading to tenure. Affiliate appointments are for the purpose of facilitating research and/or teaching activities that will benefit both the affiliate and the department. Usually, these appointments are made to allow the person to write grants and then s/he can receive salary from the grant through the university's payroll system.

Courtesy appointments are for persons who hold permanent positions in another unit in the university and normally are already tenured in that unit and their tenure continues to reside in that unit. The department acquires no budget obligations to courtesy appointees. The purpose of such appointments is to facilitate teaching and/or research goals for the appointee and the department. Courtesy appointments for those already tenured in another unit have no fixed term. A courtesy appointment for a probationary faculty member in another unit cannot exceed the length of that probationary period.

Appointment Privileges

All of these appointments are subject to review by the department at any time. None of these appointments include the voting rights normally accorded to tenured and tenure-track appointments. Appointees may, however, attend faculty meetings. Adjunct appointments can include specific financial contracts between the appointee and the department. Affiliate and courtesy appointments do not in and of themselves involve any financial, space, supplies, equipment, or other resource obligations on behalf of the department, college, or university. This does not prevent the department from entering into separate agreements with the appointee that might include remuneration or resources, but the appointment itself does not carry such obligations to the appointee.

Adjunct, affiliate, and courtesy appointees cannot be the sole directors of work for graduate students in psychology (i.e., cannot chair a graduate student committee). Adjunct, affiliate, or courtesy appointees can serve as co-chairpersons with a psychology faculty member who is an associate or full member of the graduate faculty as long as the adjunct, affiliate, or courtesy appointee has at least associate member status on the graduate faculty. Adjunct, affiliate, collaborator, and courtesy appointees will need to have status as associate or full members of the graduate faculty in order to teach graduate courses or else be designated "graduate lecturer" status on a temporary basis.

Title. For purposes of presentation within and outside the university, the appointee can use the following titles as appropriate for the period of the appointment:

Appointment	Title
Adjunct:	Adjunct Instructor or Adjunct Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology
Affiliate:	Affiliate Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology
Courtesy:	Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology

Nomination and Approval Procedures

Nominations for affiliate, adjunct, and courtesy appointments can be made by any member of the faculty but usually would be put forward by several individual faculty or a program area in the department. Nominations would be made to the Executive Committee and would include (a) a statement of the rationale for the appointment that includes the expected benefits for the appointee as well as the department, (b) suggested type of appointment, rank, and term and (c) a resume or vita and any relevant supporting documents. The Executive Committee will then formulate a recommendation, notify faculty of any intent to recommend an appointment, and place appropriate materials (e.g., vita, area's statement of rationale) in the main office for faculty review at least one week before an initial faculty meeting discussion.

After the initial faculty meeting discussion, a private ballot can be taken to invite the candidate to give a colloquium or a "conversation hour." Normally, the format will be a colloquium in the case of courtesy and adjunct appointments and a "conversation hour" for affiliates. In some cases, however, a colloquium might be appropriate for an affiliate candidate, especially when the rank being considered is higher than an assistant professor; a conversation hour might be appropriate for an adjunct or courtesy appointment when the appointment is primarily for teaching or service. The intended purpose of the colloquium or discussion hour is to increase familiarity between faculty and the candidate. Such invitations should be extended only when there is a predominant tendency among faculty to favor the appointment. Hence, an invitation to the nominee for a conversation hour or colloquium should be made only if 60% or more of the eligible voting faculty casting ballots vote in favor of such an invitation.

After the colloquium or conversation hour, a ballot will be distributed to all tenure-track and tenured faculty. For lecturer and assistant professor level appointments, a simple majority of those casting ballots is required to approve the appointment. For associate-level proposals, a simple majority of the faculty casting ballots plus a simple majority of associate and full professors casting ballots is required for approval. For full professor proposals, a simple majority of the faculty casting ballots plus a simple majority of full professors casting ballots is required for approval.

Fritz Lectureship Colloquium Series

The Fritz Lectureship colloquium series was established by a generous gift from Dr. Kentner Fritz and Linda Fritz in honor of his father, Martin Fritz. Martin Fritz was an active and very visible member of the Psychology Department for 45 years (1927 to 1972) and, among many other accomplishments, founded the ISU Student Counseling Service. Dr. Kentner Fritz graduated from the Department (BS

1958), and went on to receive his doctorate in psychology from The Ohio State University, working with Dr. Robert Wherry in I/0 and quantitative psychology.

Mission

The goal of the Fritz lectureship is to bring in first-rate, truly exceptional speakers to the department. The focus will be on scientists whose work is both exceedingly important and highly relevant to one or more areas of psychology. The lectureship speaker should rotate between the three main areas of the department (social, cognitive, and counseling).

Goals

The goals of the program are to:

1) Enhance graduate education through interaction with exceptional lectures and people in psychology
2) Bring visibility to Department of Psychology both within Iowa State University and abroad
3) Improve relationships with Alumni and Emeritus faculty
4) Develop connections for future recruitment of faculty and students
5) Develop collaborations with outside researchers and current faculty

Miscellaneous Policies Relevant to Instruction

Absence Leave Policy

(approved November 8, 2021)

Absence from class due to illness

Short-term illness. If you are sick and cannot teach your class:

- Cancel the class period, send an announcement to your class, and contact the main office staff (in case students contact them with questions).
- Work with the Associate Chair to find a replacement for subsequent classes if your TA is not able to provide in-class lecture or activities
- You may assign students to do an alternative assignment:
  - Watch a lecture recorded previously (be thoughtful about issues of confidentiality if students are speaking in the video)
  - Assign an alternate learning activity (e.g., watch a TedTalk, YouTube video); make it a low-stakes assignment
  - Assign an online learning activity (discussion thread, etc.)
  - Add an extra group work day (or swap one on the schedule)

If you test positive for an illness that requires quarantining:

- Let the Associate Chair and Chair know; they will request permission for you to go online for 2 weeks if you are well enough to teach.
- If you are not well enough to teach, consult with the Associate Chair about having your TA or another faculty member fill in for your classes
- Absence for work-related travel (conference, presentation, etc.).
- Complete the Travel Request Form, found on the Dept. of Psychology website; send the completed form to the office administrator
- Cancellation of one 50-75-minute class period is allowed, but you are not allowed to cancel more than one class without approval of the Associate Chair or Chair.
- In your absence:
  - You must find someone to teach your class (e.g., a guest speaker or a grad student) if you must miss more than one 50 – 75 minute class period
  - You are encouraged to assign alternative activities for the cancelled class
  - Avoid describing class as "online" in your absence

Committee work:
Contact the committee chair as early as possible if you are unable to attend a committee meeting due to illness or travel.

LAS Absence from campus policy (excerpt; please read the entire document available on the LAS website)
If you expect to be away from campus for more than 1 week, the Chair must notify the college. Send an email to the Chair with the following information: the faculty member's name, the beginning and end date of the absence, the institution(s) visited and a few sentences detailing the business purpose –for example, giving a presentation at a conference/university, doing archival work for a specific project (please provide title), collaborating with colleagues (please give names).

Absences longer than 2 weeks require approval from the Dean in consultation with the Provost. Such request must be supported by formal documentation. This will typically involve a written request from the faculty member, including a justification (dates, places, business purpose -see above) and supporting evidence (e.g., an invitation from another institution), an explanation how professional responsibilities (e.g., teaching, student advising, lab management and safety, etc.) will be met during the absence, and the written endorsement from the department chair and dean. Submit requests 2 weeks to 1 month in advance of planned travel.

Miscellaneous Duty Pool (MDP)

Policy approved for graduate student handbook December 16, 2013

What is MDP?

Throughout the semester, graduate students will perform several important administrative functions such as proctoring final exams and night exams, proctoring quizzes, helping faculty with instructor evaluations, and other related duties. Those of you who qualify for the MDP are scheduled for a certain number of commitments each semester. Nearly all MDP assignments are made as early as possible in the semester according to your availability. This allows you to add the assignments to your calendar along with your other regularly assigned recurring commitments.

The MDP Schedule

All MDP assignments are documented on a master MDP schedule which you will receive as early as possible in the semester. PLEASE review the schedule immediately and advise the MDP Coordinator if you believe you have received an assignment in error. It is your responsibility to record all of your assignments into your own schedule and show up accordingly. As a courtesy, the MDP coordinator will send you a reminder of your upcoming assignments.

If for any reason you are unable to fulfill an assignment, you are expected find a replacement, perhaps by switching assignments, or by agreeing to take an assignment for someone during finals week, or simply asking a favor to be returned later. Inform the MDP coordinator that you will not be able to make the assignment and explain who the replacement is. If you *switch*, each of you gets the credit for the assignment that you do. If someone completes an assignment simply as a *favor* to you, you get the credit. If, however, you have agreed to pick up a *later to-be-determined assignment* for your replacement, that person gets the MDP credit for the assignment and you get a debit Failure to fulfill an assignment without securing a replacement is noted during annual evaluations of students. Such failures may negatively impact your priority of future department funding.

Who Qualifies for MDP and who is Exempt?

- In general, if you receive all funding through the department, then you will receive a full MDP assignment for the year
- If you are paid partially through the department and partially through grants, then you will receive a proportionate number of MDP assignments for the year.

If 20 hours or more of your funding is through the Student Counseling Services (SCS), Student Disabilities Services, or some other external unit, then you are exempt from MDP.

Submitting Your MDP Choices

1) General Student Schedule

At the start of each semester we provide students who are required to do MDP with a list of assignments and asking them to characterize the list in terms of their availability and preferences. You will be asked to assign 1, 2, 3 or NA (not applicable) to each MDP task. 1 means that you are available and would prefer this assignment. 2 means that you can be available, but this is not a preferred assignment. 3 means that you are not available. Please note that if you indicate a 3, NOT AVAILABLE, this means that there is some prior commitment that cannot be changed. Examples are classes, practica, scheduled office hours, and scheduled GA times. Personal appointments and family responsibilities that cannot be easily changed may also be coded as 3s. (Note: The DOGE or DUS will talk with any student who has 3s on 50% or more of the MDP assignments to verify that appropriate criteria were being used in assigning the 3s.) . A student with a majority of 3s is likely to be heavily called upon during finals week. An NA means that you already are doing the assignment as part of your regular duties. For example, psych 101 TAs proctor the psych 101 night exams as part of their duties, so they would indicate NA for those assignments.

2) MDP scheduling and guidelines for finals week

There is a high demand for proctors during finals week. The MDP schedule for finals is not determined until later in the semester. The process will be similar for finals week. In addition, the following guidelines apply.

- GAs are paid through finals week and are expected to be available for proctoring throughout that week.
- The assumption for finals week is that you will be available anytime except when you taking an exam or proctoring an exam.
- Supervision meetings with faculty or students should be scheduled around your assigned proctoring hours.
- You should not schedule trips, buy airline tickets, or schedule appointments (including appointments and meetings with faculty or students you supervise) that would conflict with your availability for MDP assignments during finals week.

Timely response to requests for your schedules and other information needed to develop the MDP calendar is critical to the success of the MDP program.

MDP Points

A point system is used to assign a value to the MDP assignment according to the time commitment involved for each type of assignment. Evaluations are worth .5, day exams 1.0, and night exams 1.5. Points are cumulative over the fall and spring semester each academic year and will carry-over to the following academic year if applicable.

Following MDP Guidelines Helps Ensure Fair and Smooth Scheduling

We do everything possible to make MDP assignments as equitable as possible. Your adherence to MDP guidelines, particularly submitting schedules by the deadline assigned by the MDP Coordinator, is critical to ensure a seamless and fair process. We understand you have many significant commitments for your graduate program. MDP is a valued and component of that commitment. Failure to submit an accurate indication of your MDP availability by the prescribed deadline and / or failure to fulfill an assignment will be reflected in your annual evaluation, and may negatively impact your priority of future department funding.

We understand that occasionally extenuating circumstances such as illness or family emergency may prevent you from fulfilling any single assignment (e.g., the proctoring of one quiz or one exam): illness, family emergency, etc. In such emergencies, if at all possible, prior to missing the assignment, call/email the faculty member whose test or evaluation will be affected. Also, inform the MDP coordinator. These cases should be discussed with the DOGE and / or the MDP Coordinator.

Appealing for Exemption from MDP

If you feel you have extenuating circumstances that would prevent you from fulfilling your MDP duties, you should discuss this with the DOGE, or DUS, or Department Chair.

MISCELLANEOUS DUTY POOL

Faculty Guidelines for Submitting Requests for Proctors - *All Psychology faculty and students should read and follow these guidelines.*

Policy approved for Faculty handbook December 16, 2013.

These are the general guidelines faculty use when making requests for proctors. This is how we develop a matrix identifying all the proctoring dates and the number of proctors needed. The MDP Coordinator will send faculty a notice asking for their proctoring requests. Faculty may respond by completing the Excel spreadsheet provided, or simply replying to the e-mail request directly and including all details requested.

Faculty need to submit all information requested in detail by the assigned deadline. Failure to do so can result in inaccurate scheduling, delayed release in scheduling and an excessive amount of time needed to prepare and / or revise the schedule. Before preparing the MDP schedule, the MDP Coordinator will have all MDP requests approved by the Doge and the Associate Department Chair.

1. If a course has a TA assigned to it, the TA should proctor all exams, quizzes, and conduct the evaluations at the end of the semester. These duties are part of being a TA. Additional proctors

obtained from the MDP pool may also be requested depending on the class size (see point 3a-c, below).

2. If a course does not have a TA assigned to it, and the class size is such that one or more proctors are needed for the exams, then the faculty member should request proctors from the MDP pool in a judicious manner (see point 3a-d, below).

3. In terms of number of proctors needed for exams/quizzes, here are some general guidelines to follow whenever possible:

   a. Fewer than 50 students, no MDP proctor is typically needed. If the faculty member is not attending the exam and there is no TA, then an MDP proctor may be requested. If the faculty members believe that 2 proctors are needed, they may be requested.
   b. Between 50 and 80 students, the faculty member plus 1 proctor if needed. If the course has a TA, that TA should be the 1 proctor. If the faculty member is not attending the exam and there is a TA, then 1 MDP proctor may be requested to assist the TA if needed. If the faculty member is not attending the exam and there is no TA, then 2 MDP proctors may be requested.
   c. Between 80 and 200 students, 1-2 proctors plus the faculty member. If the course has a TA, that TA should be a proctor and 1 MDP proctor may also be requested if needed. If the faculty member is not attending the exam and there is no TA, then 2-3 MDP proctors may be requested as needed to efficiently administer the exam. The proctoring needs of very large classes (i.e., more than 200 students) are determined on an individual basis. Faculty, CIO, TAs and Catherine work closely to determine proctoring needs.

4. As noted above, TAs should conduct all evaluations in their courses. If a course does not have a TA, but the instructor is a regular faculty member who has a department-paid graduate assistant, then that graduate assistant should be asked to conduct the evaluations. MDP requests for evaluations should be from lecturers without TAs, graduate student instructors, and multiple-section courses without TAs.

Due to the evolving needs of the department, the guidelines will change from time to time. If you have any questions about the procedures, or if you have suggestions for improvement, please speak to the MDP Coordinator or the Doge.

Summer Session Teaching Guidelines

(Revised 11-21-91)

Summer session class schedules and teaching assignments will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the chairs of the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees. When planning summer session offerings, the Department Chair shall take into account the guidelines below. Once faculty members who want to teach have been assigned a half-time load, the Department Chair can make additional assignments using the guidelines he/she deems most appropriate. Faculty members can negotiate a two-year schedule with the Department Chair, so as to have a full-time teaching load one summer and no teaching the other summer session.

1. Faculty members who want to teach must be assigned a half-time teaching load (one course) before any faculty member is assigned a full teaching load (two courses).

2. Faculty members who have other sources of financial support (equivalent to at least one month's salary) will not be assigned to teach a course until faculty members without other support have been assigned one course.

3. Faculty members who regularly teach a particular course during the academic year will have priority over faculty members who do not regularly teach that course.

4. Faculty members who have supported themselves by external funding for two or more immediately preceding summers will have priority for summer teaching assignments.

5. Graduate students will not be assigned a course if a qualified faculty member, who otherwise would not be assigned summer teaching, is available.

6. Faculty members who were unable to teach the previous summer (i.e., were qualified and want to teach but did not receive a teaching assignment) will receive priority.

7. Faculty members with a record of high quality teaching will receive priority for teaching assignments.

8. Persons holding temporary faculty appointments will not receive summer teaching assignments unless there is a demonstrated need that cannot be filled in other ways.

Suggested Priority for Scheduling Classes

1. Undergraduate courses required of majors and minors (e.g., 101, 301, 440)

2. Undergraduate "core" courses with high enrollments (e.g., 230, 280)

3. Other undergraduate "core" courses (e.g., 310, 314, 360, 460)*

4. Graduate courses that traditionally fill in summer (e.g., 542); Other undergraduate courses that usually fill in the summer Graduate core courses (e.g., 540, 560, 580)*

5. Other undergraduate and graduate courses; graduate seminars.

*We should consider setting up a regular rotation of courses indicated with an asterisk.

Textbook Selection Policy

(Approved by faculty 10/05/92)

The Psychology Department affirms the academic freedom and responsibility of faculty members to select appropriate textbooks. This principle applies to all courses including: (a) multi-section courses, (b) courses in which an unusually large number of textbooks is required, and (c) instances in which the instructor of the course is author of a book required for that course. Student or faculty concerns regarding the appropriateness of required textbooks and other resource materials should be addressed to the department executive officer or the Psychology Advising Office. The Undergraduate Program Committee or the Graduate Program Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, will review the textbook selections for undergraduate and graduate courses, respectively, in any instance in which a student or faculty member questions required course material.

Department Policies and Procedures to Preserve a Quality Educational and Work Environment

Policies and Procedures Regarding Potential Conflicts of Interest

(Approved by faculty 04/18/94 - Amended 09/25/95)

The Department of Psychology recognizes the importance of avoiding actual, potential, or the appearance of conflicts of interest. The following guidelines and procedures were developed to address potential conflicts of interest resulting from a department chair's (Department Chair) close relationship with another faculty member, hereafter referred to as the related faculty member (e.g., spouse, partner, very close collaborator). These guidelines are intended to preserve the rights, privileges, and autonomy of both parties as faculty members while protecting the interests of the department and university. Issues not specifically addressed by the guidelines will be handled in a flexible, objective, and reasonable manner consistent with the expressed purpose and intent of the guidelines. The department's Human Relations Committee has accepted responsibility for drafting a more general policy and set of guidelines.

Annual Review and Raises

The chairs of the Teaching Evaluation Committee and the Research Evaluation Committee will review faculty productivity per current departmental procedures and forward the evaluations of all faculty, except the related faculty member, to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will continue to write annual evaluations and conduct personal review meetings with all faculty except the related faculty member. The Chairs of the Teaching Evaluation Committee and the Research Evaluation Committee will write and discuss the related faculty member's reports with him/her.

When the review is completed each year, the chairs of the Teaching Evaluation Committee, Research Evaluation Committee, and Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) will meet to identify the cluster of faculty members most comparable to that particular faculty member in regard to overall productivity. The Department Chair will provide information to the three committee chairs on salary increases for each faculty member in the cluster, both dollar and percentage contribution, and the general principles used in deciding salary increases. Using this information, the Teaching Evaluation Committee, Research Evaluation Committee, and PTC chairs will establish the related faculty member's salary increase within the range of salary increases for the comparable cluster of faculty members.

Faculty Allocations

The Department Chair will assign faculty allocations according to current procedures and policies for all faculty members except the related faculty member. The Teaching Evaluation Committee, Research Evaluation Committee, and PTC chairs will meet to identify the most comparable cluster of faculty members based on faculty rank, productivity, access to other sources of support, and other variables identified by them and/or the Department Chair as relevant to faculty allocations. The Department Chair will then reveal the allocations of faculty members in the identified cluster, and the three committee chairs will set the related faculty member's allocation within the range of faculty allocations for the comparable cluster of faculty members.

Awards

The Faculty Enhancement Committee has been the typical source of nominations for university and national awards, and they would continue to consider the related faculty member, along with all other faculty members, for such awards. The Department Chair will not nominate the related faculty member for awards during his/her tenure as Department Chair.

Promotion

The Department Chair will remove her/himself from the review process should the related faculty member be considered for promotion during the Department Chair's tenure. The review will be conducted by the department's PTC, and the report normally prepared by the Department Chair and forwarded to the college will be prepared jointly by the chairs of PTC, Teaching Evaluation Committee, and Research Evaluation Committee.

Teaching/Workload, Space, Purchases, and Committee Assignments

The related faculty member's space needs, purchases, and committee assignments will be negotiated with the Chairs of the CERTS Committee and the PTC in consultation with the college.

Priorities for assigning GA hours
(approved by faculty vote on 3/11/19)

TA assignments for courses will have highest priority. Prioritization of non-TA assignments will be determined through discussions involving the department chair, DOGE, and area directors. Prioritization of commitments to other units on campus (e.g., Student Counseling Services) will take into consideration the balance between department and non-department resources associated with those positions. GA assignments within the department will prioritize commitments made as part of faculty startup and those assigned to assistant professors, followed by associate and full professors based on the past two CERTS research ratings. GA hours allocated to assistant professors will only be reduced after all other GA hours allocated to committees (e.g., Sona) and to faculty based on rank have been eliminated.

Department of Psychology Policy on Harassment
(minor revisions made by faculty Spring 1995)

The department reaffirms the university's commitment to providing a professional and educational environment that is fair, responsible, nurturant, and free from discriminatory, inappropriate, and disrespectful conduct or communication. Harassment subverts the mission, goals, and values of the university and department, and it may threaten the personal and professional development of students, staff, and faculty. Harassment is a specific form of discrimination in which a power differential, real or assumed, (or inherent in a relationship) is unfairly exploited. Whereas harassment most often takes place in a situation of obvious power inequity between the persons involved, this policy recognizes that harassment also may occur between persons of the same university status, i.e., student-student, faculty-faculty, or staff-staff. As psychologists, we fully appreciate the negative psychological and environmental effects of harassment and view harassment in any form as reprehensible. It will not be tolerated in this department.

This policy on harassment applies to the entire department and to the conduct of students, merit system, professional and scientific, and academic staff alike. In their professional roles, graduate teaching and research assistants are considered to be faculty under this policy.

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is inconsistent with the commitments of the university and department, as outlined above. It corrupts traditional academic values and compromises the integrity of the university. All persons must be allowed to study and work in an environment free from unsolicited and unwelcome sexual overtures. For these reasons, the university has a written policy that defines sexual harassment, prohibits all forms of sexual harassment, identifies formal and informal means for dealing with allegations of sexual harassment, and establishes mechanisms for disciplinary action against offenders. This policy additionally charges the administration with the responsibility of informing all employees and students that sexual harassment is both illegal and prohibited by this policy and that appropriate procedures for dealing with allegations of sexual harassment and disciplining offenders are available. Consistent with this last charge, the university policy on sexual harassment is attached, and all employees and students in this department are expected to conform their behavior to the goals and standards of the policy and to be familiar with procedures for dealing with allegations of sexual harassment. The following sections draw from and add to that document.

Definitions and examples of sexual harassment. Because of differences in values and backgrounds of employees and students, some individuals may find it difficult to recognize their own behavior as sexual harassment. Sexual harassment refers to behavior which is not welcome, which is personally offensive, which debilitates morale, and which therefore interferes with the effectiveness of its victims and their colleagues. It may include actions such as:

- Sexually oriented verbal joking or abuse.
- Subtle pressure for sexual activity.
- Physical contact such as patting, pinching, or constant brushing against another's body.
- Demands for sexual favors, with or without implied or overt promises of preferential treatment or threats.
- Verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Consenting Romantic or Sexual Relationships

Consenting romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and students or between supervisor and employee, while not expressly forbidden by university policy, present many problems and generally are deemed unwise. The *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*, published by the American Psychological Association, clearly labels such dual relationships as unethical. In the view of this department, the professor-student or supervisor-employee relationship is one instance of a professional-client relationship. The respect and trust accorded a professor by a student, as well as the power exercised by the professor in giving praise, grades, recommendations for future study or employment, etc., greatly diminish the student's actual freedom of choice should offensive behavior or sexual favors be included with the professors other behavior and legitimate demands. Additionally, the professor's ability to appropriately and objectively perform educational and evaluative functions for this student is assumed to be impaired in such situations. The case of supervisor-employee relationships is believed to pose similar problems.

A faculty member, who enters into a relationship with a student, or a supervisor with an employee, must realize that it will be exceedingly difficult to prove immunity from discipline on the grounds of mutual consent if a charge of sexual harassment is subsequently lodged. The administration and relevant grievance committees involved in investigating and hearing a charge of sexual harassment would be likely to be unsympathetic to a defense based on mutual consent when the facts establish that a professional faculty-student or supervisor-employee power differential existed within the relationship.

For these reasons, the department discourages mutually consenting romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and student or supervisor and employee. Should such a relationship develop, the faculty member or supervisor should immediately consult with colleagues and/or staff members or faculty supervisors and transfer all professional and evaluative responsibilities for that student or employee to a capable colleague. Faculty or staff members who have relatives as student, staff, or faculty members should also follow this procedure. The persons involved may consult with the department's Committee on Human Relations.

Other Forms of Harassment

The department recognizes that there are forms of harassment without sexual overtones that are equally undesirable. These forms involve the gratification of one's needs through the debasement, humiliation, or inappropriate domination of another. Thus, a professor might make inappropriate demands of a student and inordinately delay the student's progress toward a degree. Similarly, the individual may occasionally or routinely use the power inherent in her/his position to cause another to engage in meaningless or demeaning behavior. In general, this form of harassment refers to any behavior by one person, which demeans another, belittles them, or unnecessarily diminishes their self-regard. In all its forms, harassment is deemed unacceptable in this department. However, necessary and appropriate communication of evaluative feedback, as required by the professional role of the faculty or staff member, is not precluded by this policy.

Dealing with Harassment

The university policy outlines procedures for dealing with allegations of harassment through formal and informal channels at the university level. Additional information on formal and informal grievance procedures are provided in the *ISU Information Handbook, Psychology Handbook, P & S Handbook,* and the *Merit System Handbook.* In all instances, initial attempts at informal resolution are encouraged, and due process and the welfare of the complainant are protected in all procedures for dealing with allegations of harassment. As a potential first step, faculty, students, and staff may obtain confidential consultation from any of the university assistors. Assistors have received special training to insure that they understand their role, are trustworthy and capable of maintaining confidentiality, and are fully informed about informal and formal procedures for dealing with harassment.

To facilitate communication, clarification, and resolution of incidents of harassment at the departmental level, a departmental Committee on Human Relations has been established. The committee consists of two faculty members, two graduate students, and two undergraduate students with a female and a male representing each of the constituencies. The committee recommends policy and procedural changes to the department chair and faculty; coordinates annual training seminars for faculty, staff, and students; provides information and consultation for individual faculty, staff, and students in the department upon request or as needed; receives complaints of harassment; and investigates complaints and facilitates their informal resolution at the departmental level, if possible. Complaints made directly to the department chair may be referred to the Human Relations Committee for investigation and recommendations. The committee also may serve an advisory function for those considering or carrying out formal action.

Any member of the Human Relations Committee can be contacted about incidents perceived as harassment or requests for consultation, and the committee member contacted shall bring the matter to the committee. However, complainants are not required to contact the department's Human Relations Committee; complaints of harassment also may be directed, orally or in writing, to one's immediate supervisor or advisor, the department chair, the college, or the university Affirmative Action Office. It is hoped that complaints might be handled "in house" but the actual procedures/route taken is left to the discretion of the person with a complaint. It is imperative that complainants understand that <u>only university assistors</u> can guarantee confidentiality and that no action will be taken without the complainant's permission. The department Human Relations Committee, department chair, and any faculty functioning in a supervisory role constitute official representatives of the university and, as such, are legally required to take some kind of action. The action can range from simply noting the allegation to recommending specific types of training for the department to initiating a formal investigation. In all cases, the complainant will be protected from retaliation, which would constitute a violation of university policy in and of itself, to the fullest degree possible

Justice requires that the rights and concerns of both complainant and respondent be fully assured. The Committee on Human Relations and the department shall make every effort to assure and protect these rights and shall undertake no action that threatens or compromises them.

In determining whether the alleged conduct constitutes harassment, those entrusted with carrying out this policy will look at the record as a whole and at the totality of the circumstances, such as the nature, intensity, frequency, and impact of the behavior and the context in which the alleged incidents occurred. The determination of the appropriateness of behavior will be made from the facts, on a case-by-case basis.

This policy was adopted in principle by the faculty on April 23, 1985. The Committee on Human Relations will make recommendations for revision from time to time.

Scope and Role of the Psychology Grievance Committee

(Approved by faculty 02/07/94)

The Psychology Department Grievance Committee will operate as stated in the *ISU Catalog* under "Appeal of Academic Grievances": "Grievances arising out of classroom or other academic situations should be resolved, if at all possible, with the individual instructor involved. If resolution cannot be reached, a student should discuss the grievance with the instructor's department chair and submit it in writing to him or her. The department chair will discuss the grievance with the instructor involved and/or refer it to a departmental grievance committee." This committee is advisory to the chair; if a grievance is referred to the committee, an investigation will be made and a written recommendation made to the chair.

Faculty Meetings Rules of Order

Approved December 6, 2021

The general and specific statement of Roberts Rules of Order will apply in all matters requiring faculty approval, subject to the principles and special rules described herein.

There is a reasonably clear distinction that can be made among the topics presented for faculty consideration and vote: Those (a) that are matters of strictly faculty responsibility, and those (b) that are advisory to the department chair. Category (a) includes primarily matters of curriculum, including course offerings and rules and procedures of attaining degrees in the department. Category (b) includes a variety of matters such as teaching load, faculty review procedures, and use of department resources.

The following statements of procedure are intended primarily for category (a) matters.

1. All significant matters of curriculum will be presented to the appropriate standing committee of the department for consideration. The faculty will not take up such items unless and until they have received a majority vote for such consideration by the committee.

2. Any significant changes that have been voted out of committee must be presented to the department chair in sufficient time that they may be distributed in writing to the faculty at least two full office days before that faculty meeting.

3. In the written introduction to the item, the chair of the presenting committee shall specify as to whether amendments of a significant nature will be permitted. If amendments are to be permitted, the usual rules of order will apply. If amendments are not to be permitted, the faculty will pass, table, or reject the proposal on its merits.

4. Any item, once passed or rejected, can only be brought before the faculty once again by the committee, following the same rule of adequate notice.

5. Vote will be called by the department chair, with the chair voting with the faculty.

Matters in category (b) will follow the same general procedures, except that being advisory to the department chair's administration, the results of discussion and close disagreements need not be decided solely by precise vote, but may instead result in some degree of compromise by the chair, cognizant of the variations in faculty opinion. The chair need not vote on these issues.

To create an inclusive, efficient, engaging, and democratic faculty meeting, we will follow these guidelines:

a. Members will prepare for the meeting by reading the agenda and supporting documents prior to the faculty meeting.
b. Members who wish to speak will raise their hands to be recognized by the chair/moderator.
c. Committee chairs will send motions and supporting documents to the department chair by the Tuesday before the meeting, with an estimate of the amount of time needed in the meeting for a discussion.
d. The Department Chair will send an agenda to the faculty at least 2 working days before the meeting. The agenda will include approximate timelines for discussions. Committees will be allocated 3-5 minutes for announcements unless the chair of the committee requests additional time for a discussion before the agenda is distributed.
e. Members will observe the ISU Principles of Community: respect, purpose, cooperation, richness of diversity, freedom from discrimination, and honest and respectful expression of ideas.

Department of Psychology Ethical Principles and Policies Relevant to Research with Human Participants

General Considerations

Responsibility for knowledge about and evaluation of the ethical principles and issues involved in the planning, implementation, or reporting of research studies rests with each investigator associated with a specific project. **Each** researcher bears ethical responsibilities for all aspects of research conducted with human participants on campus, or in off-campus settings. All psychology department researchers (faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, or staff persons under the supervision of faculty or graduate students) will be expected to assume direct, ethical responsibility for the conduct of research with human participants. The potential and actual consequences to participants from any aspect of a research study (including concept and design, solicitation of participants, treatment interventions or data collection, and participant education or debriefing procedures) are issues that need to be continually considered and evaluated throughout the duration of a research study. At all times research participants are to be accorded respect as autonomous decision makers, valued as individuals, protected from actual or potential physical or psychological harm, and treated with courtesy.

Ethical considerations are guided by the Departmental and University policies and review guidelines. The most pertinent of these are those of the University Human Subjects In Research Office, the University's Human Subjects In Research Review Committee or Institutional Review Board (IRB), as well as the principles, guidelines, and procedures specified below and in the appendices. Central to ethical considerations, and to ethical decision-making, are the American Psychological Association's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2002) and the application and interpretation of these principles contained in the following sources.

American Psychological Association (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060-1073.

Sales, B. D., & Folkman, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Ethics in research with human participants*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

General Ethical Principles

Informed consent: Research participants are autonomous decision makers and volunteers who accord written consent to participate prior to the initiation of a study. They exercise choice about participation only after being fully informed about the nature of the study and other options for acquiring additional educational experiences. They are to be provided information in sufficient detail and in a manner that is comprehensible, so that they may make an informed decision about potential participation. Choices about initial research participation or about continued participation in a study are to be posed in a voluntary manner, free of actual or implied coercion. Participants are to be informed that they may withdraw from a study at any time without any express or implied penalty. The participant may withdraw from a study without giving a specific reason for refusal to participate or for withdrawal of consent to continue participation.

Protection from discomfort, harm, or danger: Research participants are to be accorded respect, valued as individuals, and treated with courtesy. At all times their autonomy as decision makers and their sensitivities as individuals are to be recognized. Participants in research will not be exposed to appreciable physical discomfort or suffering, physical danger, or appreciable stressful conditions. Throughout all phases of a study, the investigator(s) must be aware of the physical safety and comfort of participants and be sensitive to the psychological well being of the participant. Any proposed interventions that pose physical or psychological risk to the participant must be carefully evaluated so that the welfare and dignity of the participant is not harmed, diminished, or compromised.

Confidentiality: Participants' right to privacy and their freedom of choice to disclose confidential information are salient issues that must be considered and respected by research investigators. In general, participants are to granted anonymity and their data are to be treated confidentially. If anonymity and/or confidentiality cannot be observed due to the design of a study, the participants must be so informed at the time informed consent is obtained. Access to research data is to be restricted to the investigator(s) and other research professionals who may be involved in data handling or analyses. All non-anonymous data are to be stored in locked files to which only investigator-supervised, restricted access (consistent with the confidentiality provisions existing at the time data were collected) is permissible.

Concealment and deception of research conducted in this department. One of the goals of the department is the education of participants in the domain of psychological research. This goal is most often achieved by fully informing the participant about the nature and activities associated with a study; that is, by avoiding use of deception and concealment. However, if methodological requirements of a study make use of concealment or deception necessary, the investigator has a responsibility before initiating the research to:

- determine whether use of such techniques is justified by the study's prospective scientific or educational value;

- determine whether alternative procedures are available that do not use deception or concealment; and

- ensure that participants are provided with sufficient explanation of the deception or concealment as soon and as completely as possible.

Instructions for Preparing Department of Psychology Proposals to Conduct Research Involving Human Participants

All research involving human participants conducted by faculty, students, or hired personnel of the Department of Psychology at Iowa State University **must** receive approval first from the Department Human Participants In Research Review Committee and **then** from the University Committee on Human Subjects in Research, the University IRB. The University's IRB web site is the central source for all IRB proposal application forms, as well as those required for project continuation, modification, or project closure. The site also provides a detailed template of the elements necessary to be included in an informed consent document. This essential on-line resource should be directly accessed at the following site: http://grants-svr.admin.iastate.edu/vpr/humansubjects.html.

The department's Human Participants In Research Review Committee does not have additional research proposal forms other than the department experiment posting form, which is available on the web from the Psychology Home Page, www.psychology.iastate.edu, or it can be obtained from the Graduate Secretary.

Please also note that the IRB web site provides information relevant to all aspects of conducting research with humans at Iowa State University including the necessary research ethics training which must be completed and certified before an investigator's IRB proposal can be reviewed. It is important to keep in perspective that the responses required on IRB proposals should provide sufficient clarity and detail for the Department and University Committees to make informed judgments about the project.

The department's Human Participants In Research Review Committee conducts reviews twice per month. Three copies of a completed proposal with attached questionnaires need to be submitted to the committee chair by 12 noon on the second and fourth Fridays of the month, or as indicated by the review schedule disturbed by e-mail at the beginning of each semester. Approval, or feedback concerning modifications needed to obtain approval, usually will be available within seven days from submission. However, approval or feedback for proposals requiring detailed committee discussion (e.g., proposals that may pose moderate or high risk to participants, such as the use of deception, aversive stimuli, or investigations which involve child or adolescent participants, or persons outside of the research participation pool) may require additional time for review.

During the summer, the department research review committee will meet approximately once a month on a schedule distributed by e-mail prior to the end of spring semester.

Once approved by the department review committee, the committee chair will sign the university IRB form as the department chair's designated representative. One copy of the signed proposal will be retained for departmental files and the two additional signed copies will be returned to the principal investigator for submission to the University IRB.

Specifically, the two additional copies should be submitted to the University Human Subjects Research Office for purpose of IRB review. Signed and complete proposals should be conveyed to Ginny Austin Eason, the IRB Administrative Coordinator, 1138 Pearson Hall, before 9 AM on Tuesday. Ginny Austin Eason can be contacted at 294-4566 or austingr@iastate.edu.

After approval by the University IRB, the principal investigator will receive written notification from the Human Subjects In Research Office of the outcome of the review. The investigator **must** submit a copy of the approval letter to the Graduate Secretary to be placed in the Department file.

University approval for continuing projects must be renewed **every year**. Renewal is accomplished via completion of the University IRB form entitled "Continuing Review and/or Modification of Research involving Human Subjects". Psychology uses the standard IRB form, which is available on the IRB website http://grants-svr.admin.iastate.edu/VPR/humansubjects.html. Although the university IRB committee approves research for a *calendar year*, approval of Research Participation Pool Posting Forms in the department is for an *academic year, including summer*. Each new academic year requires a current departmental posting form prior to running subjects.

A copy of the approved renewal request should be given to the Graduate Secretary to be placed in the Department file.

Human Assurance Training

Effective Fall 2001, the University IRB policy states that all persons (including psychology 491 students) who have contact with research participants **must** have completed a Human Assurance (Research Ethics) Training Course. It is the department's policy that all faculty, all graduate students, and all undergraduate students who are involved in research, complete the on-line training available on the IRB web site. Students and faculty should keep the certificates issued by the IRB office that indicate training completion. In addition, every individual who has completed IRB training should convey a copy of the training certificate to the department's administrative associate for placement in a departmental training certificate file. Moreover, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to ensure that every member of his/her lab team has completed this training and has appropriately documented it. Thus, it is advisable for each faculty member to keep a copy of the training certificate for each person in his/her lab and for each of her/his graduate advisees.

The Department of Psychology Research Participant Pool

The Research Participant Pool was established as a tool to facilitate both the educational and research missions of the department. Undergraduate education is facilitated because participation in psychological research allows undergraduate students to directly experience the methods and procedures used by psychologists to build the knowledge base of the discipline. Graduate education is facilitated as graduate students learn about how research is done by doing it. The contribution to the research mission of the Department is obvious.

The rules for the use of the Research Participant Pool are described in the following sections. The rules, including those for Mass Testing and Mass Data Collection, are designed to provide fair access to this important departmental resource. Persons who do not follow the established rules may be restricted from further use of the Research Participation Pool. Clarifications concerning rule interpretation should be sought from members of the Research Participation Pool Committee. Concerns about fairness of the rules or about possible violations of the rules should be brought to a member of the same committee. Concerns will be treated seriously and confidentially.

Guide to Using the Department of Psychology Research Participation Pool

[removed previous text for updated text August 2022]
These revisions will be discussed and voted on by faculty during fall, 2022

Department of Psychology Policy on the Use of the Participant Pool by Researchers Outside this Department

The Department Research Participation Pool is an important resource for the research education of students and for the conduct of research by members of the Department. Thus, safeguarding its access, use, and the availability of participants for departmental investigators are ongoing concerns and priorities.

In order for any person who is not a faculty member or graduate student in this Department to gain access to the participant pool, the following conditions must be met:

The proposed research will be reviewed by the Department Human Research Ethics Review Committee using the standard departmental procedure. In addition, that committee will, as one of its considerations of proposed research involving investigators outside this department, evaluate the estimated number of participants requested in order to determine whether such a request would adversely affect the number of potential participants available to departmental investigators. Thus, depending on participant availability, proposed investigations by individuals outside of the Psychology Department may be denied or accorded secondary priority. Given that participation in research is intended to contribute to the student's education in psychology, the committee will also consider the extent to which the proposed research focuses primarily on psychological content and contributes to that goal.

A member of the Psychology Department faculty must agree to be Co-Principal Investigator for the proposed research. That faculty member will then assume responsibility for processing the research proposal through the Department Human Research Ethics Review Committee and the University Human Subjects Committee, assuring proper recruitment of participants, ethical treatment of participants during data collection, confidentiality of data, registration of research credit for participants, and proper debriefing of participants.

Policy on Class Inclusion in the Research Participant Pool

(Approved by faculty 05/02/94)

1. The most important consideration in all decisions about student participation in research must be the educational value of the research experience for the students.

2. Introductory Psychology holds a unique position among departmental offerings.

   a) It is the only course in psychology taken by many undergraduates, and thus represents our discipline to a large number of students.

   b) It is required of all psychology majors.

   c) It serves as the foundation for most other psychology courses offered by the department. In light of these characteristics of Introductory Psychology, certain key decisions about this course should be made in consultation with the full faculty (e.g., breadth of coverage, general policies about research participation).

3. Participation in psychological research can be a good vehicle for exposing students to the methods and procedures used by psychologists to build our knowledge base.

4. It is expected that research participation will be made available to students enrolled in Introductory Psychology. Any 101 instructor who wishes to exempt his or her students from the opportunity to earn extra credit through research participation should discuss this issue with the Chair. At issue is whether the instructor plans to provide the educational experience that is gained through research participation in some other way, such as class demonstrations or a laboratory experience.

5. Introductory Psychology introduces students to a wide range of topics within the discipline. Thus, it is consistent with the goals of the course for students to participate in a wide range of research experiences. It is expected that all experiments that have been approved for the research participation pool will be acceptable extra credit options for students enrolled in Psych 101.

6. In courses other than Introductory Psychology, it is the responsibility of instructors who allow extra credit for research participation to decide which student activities will be assigned or accepted for extra credit, based on their educational value to the students. Thus, an instructor may decide that only certain kinds of research experiences further the instructional goals of the course. The instructor has a set of responsibilities that accompany the right to decide whether to allow credit for research participation.

   a) Instructors must take appropriate precautions to avoid implied “coercion” of students to participate in the instructor’s own research (e.g., assuring students that the instructor will not know in which of the allowable experiments the students have participated).

   b) To offer students the broadest range of experiences that fall within the educational goals of their course, it is the responsibility of instructors to be educated about the potential educational value of experiments offered by all departmental researchers, i.e., by reviewing all active research proposals.

7. The department should appoint a Research Participation Pool Committee that will refine procedures, provide oversight of the ongoing operation of the research participation pool, and propose policy changes to the full faculty.

   a) Department chair will appoint members of committee. These members could include frequent users of the pool, instructors of courses that participate in the pool, a representative of the Ethics Committee, and one undergraduate student (e.g., a representative of the Psychology Club or Psi Chi).

   b) Examples of issues that the new committee may wish to address include: Posting form policies, mass testing procedures, research participant supply and demand, record keeping, no-show policies (for both experimenters and participants), and the implementation of recommendations 6a, 6b, and 6c above.

Paragraph added November 2005:

One of the goals of the 100 and 200 level courses in psychology is to familiarize students with the research process in psychology. To meet this goal, we require that each student earn research credits. Each research credit may be earned in one of two ways: (1) research participation and (2) passing a quiz on a research article that students have read. (Adopted from F05 Psych 101 syllabus regarding earning research credits which was approved on 04/12/04).

Policy on Department Data Collection (Mass Testing & Mass Data Collection)

(Approved by faculty 02/06/95; revision approved 10/20/97; revision approved 11/05)

Scheduled class periods in Psychology 101 are not to be used for data collection. The large sections of Psychology 101 have evening tests, however, so both the students and the rooms in which the class is taught are "free" during the regular class period on the day of the three regularly scheduled exams. In order to facilitate research in the department that requires either screening of participants on the basis of individual differences or that requires very large numbers of participants, questionnaires that are designed to collect specific kinds of data will be administered during those three exam periods. The first two exam periods will be designated as Mass Testing and the third exam period will be designated as Mass Data Collection/Scale Validation. The actual dates, times, and locations of the sessions will vary by semester. They may occur on the dates of the 101 exams during the 101 class periods, or they may be scheduled during an evening in a larger lecture hall, depending on room availability.

During Mass Testing, participants will be asked to complete questionnaires that are designed to take at least an hour (that is, 60-90 minutes or about 360 items). Three types of questions will be allowed, but the inclusion of questions will follow a strict priority system. The three types of questions are:

1. questions that define a screening procedure for studies that use individual differences as a selection criterion.
2. questions that comprise a brief “wave 1” baseline in a multiwave study.
3. questions for studies requiring a very large number of participants.

During Mass Testing sessions, the priority for inclusion of items will be in the order listed above. All screening questions will be accommodated during Mass Testing, even if not all items can be included on one questionnaire (the items may be split among two different questionnaire packets, and each version will be given to half of the students who participate). If there is room for the inclusion of all brief “wave 1” questions, they will be included. Finally, if there is room for the inclusion of all questions from large sample studies, they will be included.

Mass Testing will be presented to students in class as an opportunity to become qualified for research opportunities that require research participants with certain characteristics. Students will be advised that they can participate in only <u>one</u> of the <u>two</u> Mass Testing periods. Traditionally, the same questionnaire packets have been used for both Mass Testing periods to reduce costs. All participants in Mass Testing will be given research credit points and will receive a debriefing that describes in general the rationale for Mass Testing and how it relates to the need in some psychological research to select participants on the basis of some individual characteristics. Typically, Mass Testing takes at least an hour (60-90 minutes) and is worth two research credit points. During a semester in which all questions can be accommodated in a questionnaire designed to take 50 minutes or less, however, only one research credit point should be awarded.

The third exam period will be called Mass Data Collection/Scale Validation. It is designed to allow efficient data collection in studies requiring a large number of participants, or to collect data for and validate a new scale. Priority for inclusion in the Mass Data Collection session is the reverse of that described for Mass Testing. In addition, priority will be given to those needing a large number of participants who did not participate in Mass Testing. Depending upon the number of questions submitted, the Mass Data Collection questionnaire for a given semester will be designed to take either 50 minutes or less and will be worth one research credit point or 60-90 minutes and will be worth two research credit points. Participants in Mass Data Collection will receive a debriefing that describes the research included in the Mass Data Collection questionnaire.

Mass Testing and Mass Data Collection are open to all faculty and graduate students, but student theses and dissertations are given the highest priority within the priority levels described above. Everyone who submits items for inclusion in either Mass Testing or Mass Data Collection is expected to participate in the entire process of constructing, administering, and sorting the questionnaires.

The chair will appoint to the Research Participation Pool (RPP) a graduate student who will serve as coordinator of Mass Testing and Mass Data Collection. It is expected that this will be a student who typically participates in these activities or works for a faculty member who often participates so that they are somewhat familiar with the process of Mass Testing. The student Coordinator will be paid by the department as part of their assistantship. At least one week prior to the beginning of each semester, the coordinator will inform the faculty and everyone affiliated with the Psychology Department of Mass Testing and Mass Data Collection dates along with the deadlines for indicating participation on each date. The deadline for participation will typically be two or four weeks before the session. By the deadline, faculty and students who would like to participate in a session should submit their items to the coordinator and indicate whether the items are to be used for screening or are wave 1 questions or are part of a large sample study. Those who submit the items also will be asked to help in creation of the instrument and the running of sessions. The coordinator will be responsible for the final decision on items to be used with the restriction that all items in a priority category should be used. In the event that there are too many questions at a given priority level to be included in the questionnaire, the coordinator will consult with the rest of the RPP Committee to resolve the issue.

Paragraph added August 1998:

Only items that have been approved by the Department Human Research Ethics Review Committee can be included in Mass Testing or Mass Data Collection. When items are submitted, they must be accompanied by the IRB approval number and departmental approval number, or that number must be conveyed to the coordinator as soon as it is received by the researcher.

Multisession Studies

(Approved by faculty 04/19/99, amended 4/23/2018)

In studies requiring two or more sessions in which data from later sessions are critical to the ability to use data from earlier sessions, researchers using the RPP are permitted to offer an additional inducement to get participants to complete all of the sessions. Participants in each session of a multi-session study earn the standard amount of extra credit, which is based on the time required for that session. In addition, upon completion of the last session, the participant may either earn credit equal to an additional session. The informed consent form should clearly indicate that the additional credit is only if all sessions are completed.

Policy on No Shows

(Approved by faculty 02/06/95; Adopted from Psych 101 F05 syllabus regarding earning research credits which approved on 04/12/04)

Participant No Shows

There is no penalty for students who do not show up for scheduled experiments.

Experimenter No Shows

The department views scheduling of research as a contract between the research participant and the experimenter. If for some reason a scheduled session must be canceled, participants who show up for the session MUST be given credit. A participant may be asked to reschedule, but the participant still must be given credit for showing up at the originally scheduled time. It is the supervising faculty member's responsibility to make sure that procedures are in place to handle potential no shows of experimenters, particularly undergraduate experimenters. If an experimenter no show occurs during the day, instruct the student to go to the Psychology main office in W112 Lagomarcino to complete a “No Show Report” form.

A yellow "No Show Report" slip was developed in Spring 2001 to handle situations in which the participant shows up but there is an experimenter no show. Students are instructed in their class syllabi that they should go the psychology office to complete this form when the experimenter fails to show up. The form states that the student will get credit unless he/she is contacted further. The completed “No Show Report” form will be given to the faculty member or graduate student experimenter to sign. Graduate secretary (Ann Schmidt) will send an email to the experimenter indicating a “No Show Report” form is in his/her mailbox, with instructions to either sign the form, giving the student one extra credit and put this form in the extra credit box; or, if the experimenter feels no credit should be given, return the form to Graduate secretary, who will notify the student of the reason(s) for noncredit. The student is also told if he/she feels the decision has been made in error, they may contact Graduate secretary, or the Chair of Research at his/her email address.

Restrictions on Participation

Ethical considerations require that ALL students have the same chances to earn extra credit. Any restrictions, therefore, must be justified and specifically approved by the departmental committee.

Compensations on the Posting Form

Students typically receive extra credit for participation in research. Other types of compensation may be approved for use when participants are recruited in other ways. In some cases, the Posting Form may request that students in the RPP bring along a friend (e.g., the research examines already established relationships). In such cases, the Posting Form may mention other types of compensation for the friends.

Drawing and raffle can not be used as a compensation for research participation. The investigator must pay each participant the same amount of compensation for participation.

Experimenter Responsibilities

Experimenters using undergraduate students as research participants have several responsibilities. Faculty supervising undergraduate and graduate student researchers are responsible for making sure that these responsibilities are carried out. The responsibilities include:

- The experimenter must show up on time for scheduled appointments. If an emergency arises and the experimenter cannot make the appointment, he or she should contact a colleague or the supervising faculty member or the Psychology Office (294-1743) to meet the student. Students must be given one credit in such instances.

- Students must be informed at the beginning of the experiment that they can withdraw at any time and receive credit for the time spent participating. This means exactly what it says. If the student shows up, signs the consent form, and says he or she does not want to participate, the student still gets extra credit. Participation is COMPLETELY voluntary. The student does not need to have a reason to refuse to participate.

- Students must receive credit as established by the rules currently in force in the department. Experiments are categorized into 1, 2, or 3 credit experiments on the basis of the time commitment required by a majority of the students. A 1-credit experiment can be run within a clock hour and requires 50 minutes or less of a student’s time. A 2-credit experiment requires more than a clock hour of a student’s time but not more than 90 minutes. A 3-credit experiment requires close to two clock hours of a student's time. The posting forms for 1-credit experiments will state "This experiment is worth 1 credit and should take 50 minutes or less". The posting forms for 2-credit experiments will state "This experiment is worth 2 credits and should take between 60 and 90 minutes." The posting forms for 3-credit experiments will state "This experiment is worth 3 credits and should take between 90 and 120 minutes". No other mention of time may be included on the posting form. Experimenters who wish to post experiments worth more than 3 credits will need to have the wording approved by the RPP Committee. Experimenters always have the option of providing an extra unit of credit to those students who take significantly more time than the majority of students.

- Credit is recorded by having the student and the experimenter each complete the appropriate portions of the Extra Credit Card. It is then the student's responsibility to deposit this completed Extra Credit Card in the experiment participation deposit box located next to the sign-up board. These Extra Credit Cards are collected frequently and are recorded by the Psychology Information Office (Lago W004). This information on student research participation is merged with the student's total examination scores at the end of the semester for final grade determination. If students find a discrepancy between the total research participation credit posted at the end of the semester and the total indicated by their records, they should contact the Course Information Office (Lago W004). Remember, it is the experimenter's responsibility to ensure that the Extra Credit Card is properly filled in, including the experimenter's initials by the number of credits. Instructions to experimenters on how to correctly complete their portions of the cards should be posted in the lab. The experimenter's initials validate the card. It is the student's responsibility to place it in the deposit box. It is strongly recommended that students deposit the Extra Credit Card immediately after the experiment.

- Beginning in Fall 2004, we no longer deduct points for a participant "no show" penalty.

- The Extra Credit Card is typically handed out at the beginning of the experiment when informed consent is obtained. In multiple-session experiments, credit must be given at each session.

- Students should be debriefed immediately after the session. Debriefing must be done even if the student does not request it and even if the experiment does not involve deception. The rationale for students getting extra credit in class is one of educational benefit. Debriefing ensures this benefit. Exceptions to immediate debriefing must be approved by the departmental committee.

The Student's Responsibilities

A copy of the handout to students is included in this section. The handout includes a description of student responsibility. Note that the student is encouraged to contact the experimenter if they miss an appointment. Research participation IS voluntary, we no longer deduct points for a "no show" penalty.

Problem Prevention Reminders

No experiments are conducted prior to 7:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. and no experiments are conducted during finals week. Except for mass testing, the RP (rather than the experimenter) is to turn in the Extra Credit Card. RPs should be instructed to do this ASAP after participation.

Experiment Contacting Procedures

1. Make sure that YOU have the correct information regarding time, room numbers, and experiment numbers.

2. Instruct the prospective participant that you will be giving him/her 7 important pieces of information that the email should be kept, or information given over the phone should be written down and kept until after the experiment is complete. Give the participant the following information:

   a) your name

b) a FACULTY member's or graduate student's name--this will give the staff a lead to follow should a problem come up
c) the experiment number
d) the experiment name
e) the building and room number of the experiment
f) the date and time of the experiment
g) a phone number and contact person to call to cancel the experiment

3. Ask the person to whom you are speaking to REPEAT the information back to you after you have given it. This will help ensure that they have, in fact, written it down. If they haven't, then give it all to them again.

4. Ask if the caller has any questions. YOU are probably in a better situation to answer correctly than is the office staff.

Procedures for Earning Extra Credit by Participating in Experiments

(Generic Form of Handout Received by Students)

Scientific studies are conducted by the Department of Psychology that involve data collection from human participants. The Department has developed an extra-credit system to encourage research participation. Participation is also an educational experience that increases your understanding of psychology and expands the data base of our science.

1. **How much credit can I earn?** You earn 1 credit for the first 50 minutes or less of an experiment, 2 credits for experiments that require between 60-90 minutes, and 3 credits for experiments that require 90-120 minutes. Unless otherwise indicated, you can participate only ONCE in an experiment. The final grade distribution is based solely on total examination points. Research participation credits are added to your examination scores to determine your course grade after the final grade distribution has been established. **At the end of the course, research participation extra-credits that you have earned will be multiplied by 2 to determine your total number of research participation extra-credits.**

2. **How do I sign-up for an experiment?** Sign-up sheets are on the wall at the north end of the center hall in West Lagomarcino. Each sheet provides the experiment name and number, a brief description of the experiment including time, place, and length of time required for participation, credit earned, and the name(s) and phone number(s) of the experimenter(s). When you sign up, immediately complete your Research Participation Record Sheet (next page). **This is your reminder of when and where to go and allows you to keep track of the number of credits you have earned.** Each approved sign-up sheet is **EMBOSSED** with the **DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY SEAL** in the upper right corner. All approved experiments are conducted on the University campus in classroom buildings (not in the dorms) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and sometimes weekends. Please contact the main Psychology office at 294-1742 if you question the validity of the experiment.

3. **How does an experiment get approved?** It is evaluated by the University Research Committee and the Department of Psychology Human Research Ethics Review Committee to determine that no physical or psychological harm will result from the research and that the research is meaningful. Most experiments are open to all Psych 101, 230, & 280 students, but some experiments restrict participation to subsets of students (e.g., females only or left-handed persons only etc.).

4. **What if I get called by someone in the Psychology Department who wants me to be in an experiment?** Students who complete questionnaires and indicate their willingness to be contacted from mass testing may be called or emailed to see if they will participate in a study. The contact person will provide his or her full name and phone number, the experiment number, the experimenter's name, and the date, time, and location of the experiment. **Before the agreed upon time, check that an approved posting form with the same experimenter and location is on the**

bulletin board. If there is no form, do not keep the appointment and immediately notify the staff in the Psychology Office (1347 Lago or 294-1742).

5. **What are my responsibilities once I sign up for an experiment?** Both you and the experimenter are contracting to show up at the appointed time and place. **BE ON TIME.** If you are unable to make your appointment, call the experimenter or the Psychology Office (294-1742) at least two hours beforehand. If the experimenter does not show, wait for 5 minutes past the scheduled time and then immediately check on the sign-up board to see whether you have the correct date, time, and location. If all the information is correct, go **IMMEDIATELY** to the psychology main office in Lago W112 and ask to complete an Experimenter No Show Form. If the experiment is in the evening or on the weekend, then go to the main office the **NEXT DAY** to complete the form. The form will be used to verify that there was an experimenter no show and, once this is verified, you will receive credit for showing up. The verification process requires that the form be completed as soon as possible after the no show occurs. **Experimenter No Show Forms CANNOT be submitted more than 7 days after the no show episode occurred.**

6. **How is credit recorded?** At each experiment you will receive an Extra-Credit Card. **You must print your name, student ID number, course and section number and fill in the appropriate section of the Extra-Credit Card. It is then your responsibility to deposit this completed Extra-Credit Card in the experiment participation deposit box located next to the sign-up board.** These cards are collected frequently and are recorded by the Psychology Course Information Office (Lago W004). If you find a discrepancy between the total research participation credit posted at the end of the semester and the total indicated by your research participation record sheet, contact the Course Information Office (W004). Remember, it is your responsibility to ensure that the Extra-Credit Card is properly filled in and placed in the deposit box. We strongly recommend that you deposit the Extra-Credit Card immediately after the experiment. **Extra-credit will be assigned only if the Extra-Credit Card is deposited by the Friday before Final Week.**

7. **Do I have to participate in experiments?** No. A participant is also free to withdraw from an experiment at any time for any reason. If a participant shows up for a study and withdraws any time during the study, he/she gets the extra credit.

Harold V. Gaskill Psychology Fellowship

Faculty discussion 1.25.16

The Harold V. Gaskill Psychology Fellowship was established with an estate gift from Dr. Gene Wallar. Dr. Wallar graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics from Iowa State University in 1934. He received his Master's and Ph.D. in Psychology from Ohio State University. The fellowship was established to provide financial assistance to deserving graduate students majoring in Psychology. The amount available for fellowship awards varies depending on the average market value of the investments. The Psychology faculty developed the following policy for the allocation of these awards.

- Gaskill Fellowships are used to recruit new graduate students to the Psychology Department. Gaskill Fellowships cannot be offered to current graduate students nor to students who will not major in Psychology.
- Gaskill Fellowships are offered to specific applicants in the Psychology graduate applicant pool.

Appendix A

A BRIEF HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY AT IOWA STATE

Brief History of Psychology at Iowa State University

The history of Psychology at Iowa State divides naturally into three eras. Before 1920 psychology was primarily one of the few liberal studies either required or offered to the students in the agricultural or mechanical arts. From 1920 to 1960 psychology continued to conform to the college mission but began research and degree programs restricted to certain aspects of applied psychology. After 1960 the department was encouraged to develop a broad psychology program and was authorized to offer doctoral studies.

Liberal Studies Before the Great War

In the first forty-seven years of Iowa State College instruction, psychology was a regular course offering. Varieties of mental and moral philosophy were updated with the most recent psychological ideas and texts. Bits of evidence support the conclusion that the content of psychology at Iowa State was equal to that at any college in the country.

Taught by The Presidents

Psychology was first taught to the senior class by President Welch in 1872 with an advertised purpose not of "idle speculation" but to gain "...insight into human nature, and the springs of human conduct." It remained a course taught by the president to seniors until a movement toward specialization was instituted at the turn of the century. Though the rhetoric claimed the psychology course was of the sort that fit with the practical arts and sciences of the college, the samples of readings and topic suggest that a typical psychology content was delivered, using the most recent textbooks. The difference perhaps reflected the power struggles that were rampant among the faculty and the regents in those first decades, battles that led to Welch being dismissed as president though retaining his teaching role. On Welch's death in 1889, psychology was taught for two years by President William Chamberlain and for twelve years by President William Beardshear.

Growth in Applied Specialties

In 1901 Professor O. H. Cessna, a member of the first graduating class in 1872, was made Professor of Philosophy and History and placed in charge of the Department of Philosophy in which courses in Psychology and in Ethics were taught. Cessna was also College Chaplain, having earned a Doctor of Divinity degree at the University of Chicago. The Department of Philosophy then had three courses: Psychology, Ethics, and Educational Psychology.

In 1904 the catalog shows a name change to the Department of Psychology and an additional course in Educational History and Method. The next year's catalog showed the two courses in educational psychology gone, with one reappearing in 1908. In 1909 there were courses in child psychology as well. Psychology of Business is listed in the 1911 catalog, claimed by some to be the first course in industrial psychology in the U.S. The 1913 catalog amplified the course description and noted that the three texts by Scott were used as well as those of Munsterberg, Taylor, and Gilbreth—all state-of-the-art.

Other noteworthy additions include Social Psychology in 1912 and Physical and Mental Tests in 1915. This last, too, is one of the earliest of its kind, and was offered well before the test development movement had begun. Records show that the department was authorized to offer M. S. work in history or psychology in 1913, but apparently no students did so. The name was Department of Psychology and Ethics starting in 1914. In 1915 Cessna was joined by Thomas Vance who earned a doctorate in psychology at Iowa.

Conforming to the College Mission

The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts was accurately named. Its mission was to educate Iowa's young people in useful applications. Liberal studies were the province of the University of Iowa, and such courses were taught at Iowa State only as absolutely necessary for an adequate education. There was no possibility for psychology to be offered except in service of the college's applied mission.

Applied Service Between the Wars

After World War I there was a major restructuring at Iowa State, including a shift to the quarter system. Psychology appeared as a separate department in the Division of Industrial Sciences. Professor Cessna and Associate Professor Vance handled about ten courses. The 1919 catalog listed General, Outlines, Mental Tests, Educational, Childhood and Adolescence, Business, Military, Social, and two religion courses.

During the 1920s new faculty appeared and disappeared and the courses expanded, all in applied directions. Among the faculty survivors were John Evans from 1922, Alvhh Lauer from 1925, and Martin Fritz from 1928. John Evans, a Columbia doctorate with strong interests in applied psychology, was appointed to lead the department.

In 1924 there was a new course in Adjustment but also one called Abnormal Psychology in Relation to Certain Industry Problems. Business psychology was joined by two called Industrial Psychology (a seminar) and Psychology of Employment and Vocational Selection. Courses in learning and in motivation were added but their content was that of use to teachers. The preamble to the courses' listings in the 1927 catalog stated that they were "... formulated from the point of view of the practical needs of students in the industrial and vocational fields." This was followed by a statement of these aims (after two more about understanding oneself): to present principles underlying teaching and to apply psychology to the human element in business and industry.

One noteworthy piece of service work in evidence was the activity of psychology faculty in obtaining and applying the group tests of World War I toward a battery of entrance tests. In this work they applied the instruments of L. L. Thurstone, then at Carnegie. Soon they were engaged in administering the testing program. They also began to consult with the health service.

In 1930 there were three faculty holding the professor rank and five instructors. The early 1930s were years of the depression with lowered enrollments and faculty reduced to part-time. Howard Gaskill appeared in 1932, later to become dean of the Industrial Sciences Division. In a twenty-year plan authored by Martin Fritz in 1935 he noted that, "Very soon the department should be permitted to offer advanced degrees in certain applied fields. Such work could be done in cooperation with the University of Iowa. There is no school in the U.S. that offers a more favorable background for advanced work in Industrial Psychology." Master of Science work was authorized in 1937, according to the catalog, but the first degree was not granted until 1946.

Nonetheless, the department was still in a service role, as shown by a statement of Dr. Evans to the faculty at the beginning of the 1939 academic year: "As you know, the applications of psychology are emphasized rather than theoretical aspects. As a supporting department, I feel that we must give applications as we are not training embryo psychologists, but those who are seeking a few psychological tools to use in their chosen field."

At the end of the decade, on the eve of World War II, the 1940 catalog showed 27 courses of which 11 were apparently at the graduate level. These were taught by about seven faculty.

Post-War Education for Applied Psychology

No notable changes came during the war. In 1946 enrollments began to greatly increase. In 1948 Evans was succeeded as chair by William Owens who held a Minnesota doctorate in industrial psychology. An undergraduate major in psychology appeared in 1949. By the end of the decade 23 BS degrees and five MS degrees were granted. In 1950 there were 44 courses, 20 apparently at the graduate level. There were now seven professors and three assistant professors. John Bath, Don Charles, and Thomas Hannum were the survivors among those who joined the department in the late 1940s.

In the early 1950s the department had no particular growth. Its mission was distinctly applied with strongest leanings toward industrial and educational psychology. The 1956 college advertisement sent to prospective students listed only Industrial Psychology among the BS curricula in the Division of Science. Near the end of this decade Owens twice proposed that the department offer a doctorate in a rather narrow specialty of industrial psychology. His requests were refused, and he left in 1959. In his last years he added faculty in both applied and academic areas, including Arthur Mackinney, Edwin Lewis, and Leroy Wolins. Don Charles was acting Head until Wilbur Layton was appointed at the beginning of the 1960 calendar year. Charles recruited and appointed George Karas.

Growth Toward Breadth

Moves toward broadening the mission of Iowa State developed in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Its name was changed to its present form, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, in 1959, and that was more than surface gloss. There was intent to make Iowa State a modern university with traditional programs of study including social sciences, arts, and humanities. The Division of Science became the College of Sciences and Humanities.

In 1960 Layton was Department Head with about 18 faculty. He had been promised by President Hilton, the provost, and the dean of the college that a doctorate in psychology would be approved. A proposal to offer the doctorate was prepared and submitted in October of 1961. The department was given resources to expand and broaden the faculty expertise. The concept was that the science of psychology be a base for applications. In the early 1960s Layton added a social psychologist, Timothy Brock, and built up experimental psychology by appointing David Edwards, Ronald Peters, John Schuck, and later, Wayne Bartz.

Program Development

In April of 1964 the department was authorized to offer study toward a Ph.D. degree in Psychology, and the first doctorate was granted in 1966. In the 30 plus years of offering the doctorate, some patterns are apparent. In the first two half-decades of the program more than half of the doctoral students were in academic areas of psychology, particularly experimental, but the industrial and counseling specialties had substantial strength. Beginning in the last half of the 1970s, the relative numbers of students in counseling and experimental reversed. The 1970s were the period of the greatest numbers of degrees granted, averaging five per year. In the 1980s that rate had been cut nearly in half and most of the reduction appears in the tallies as an absence of experimental specialty students. Industrial doctorates were granted at a relatively steady rate of less than two per year.

The department doctoral programs followed the national trends toward increased numbers of applied students, especially in counseling, and fewer academic area students. The counseling program, under the leadership of Frederick Borgen, was accredited by the American Psychological Association in June of 1975 and that added a valued power to the department to attract potential students. The school psychology program, offering M. S. education since 1963, was refurbished by Daniel Reschly and authorized to grant the Specialist in School Psychology degree in 1978. The Specialist degree was new to Iowa State and School Psychology remains its only variety.

According to the 1970 Graduate Program brochure, a faculty of thirty-seven (including adjuncts) offered eleven areas of concentration for graduate study including General-Experimental, Human Factors, Industrial-Organizational, Social, Personality, Counseling, Developmental, Educational, School, Quantitative, and Psychological-Measurement/Insitutional-Research/Program-Evaluation. Since that time, the variety of specialties of concentration in the doctoral graduate program has been modified several times. Trimmed from the list were Human Factors, Industrial-Organizational, Personality, Developmental, and Educational. Parts of these were integrated into a new area of concentration: Psychometrics and Applied Individual Differences. School Psychology was elevated to the doctoral level to join Counseling, Experimental, and Social Psychology. These latter were the five areas current in 1995.

A subsequent external review, coupled with the departures of several faculty, led to further changes in departmental structure. Both the School Psychology and the Psychometrics & Applied Individual Differences programs were dropped. Some of the School Psychology faculty moved to the Iowa State University College of Education. Many aspects of the Psychometrics & Applied Individual Differences program still exist in the current three Ph.D. programs in Social, Counseling, and Cognitive psychology.

In 1999, Craig A. Anderson joined the department as chair, and began a self-study designed to help in formulating a new long-range plan for the department. That plan was completed and approved by the faculty in the Spring Semester of 2001. It calls for the addition of a program in Developmental Psychology, broadly defined, one that is highly integrated with the other three programs. The plan also calls for the department to expand to 32 FTE faculty over the next decade.

Unfortunately, shortly after Anderson's arrival the State began cutting the budgets of the three Regents Universities. In fact, there were seven budget cuts within a four-year span. Although Psychology's high levels of productivity in all of its primary missions helped shield it somewhat from the cuts, such cuts were made, resulting in a decrease in the number of faculty rather than an increase. One developmental psychologist was hired in 2003.

Faculty Growth, Shrinkage, and Growth

Over the seven years of Layton's first tenure leading the department, 22 faculty were appointed, though 8 of these were employed primarily in the Student Counseling Service. The number of department faculty remained largely unchanged in the 1970s and early 1980s. In 1970 there were 33 faculty holding rank, and in 1980 the number was 32. In 1995 there were 29 rank-holding faculty. Fluctuations in numbers largely reflected appointments and departures of faculty holding rank but budgeted elsewhere in the university. Little change in budgeted faculty occurred despite increasing enrollment in psychology classes. Shortly after Anderson came in as Chair (1999-2000 academic year), the Department had only 23 faculty, but still had 7 vacant faculty lines. Two or three of those lines were needed to balance annual budget shortfalls in the Graduate Assistant and the Supplies & Services budget lines, leaving some lines for additional faculty hires. However, budget shortfalls at the state level in 2000-2004 led to budget cuts at the department level, cuts which effectively meant loss of vacant lines. Because of the high productivity in all of its major missions (teaching at the graduate and undergraduate level, research, external grants, service to state- and nation-wide constituencies), the Department of Psychology repeatedly had one of the smallest budget cuts of any department. Nonetheless, severe damage was done, with the result that in the fall of 2004 the Department had 23 faculty (21.5 FTE) and no remaining vacant lines. Ongoing negotiations with the College and the Provost led to the promise of 4 new lines, to be made available by 2007. One of those lines was filled in 2005.

Facilities Evolution

Until 1967 the department was housed in various spaces on the second, third, and fourth floors of Beardshear Hall. With expanding laboratory needs and other pressures, including unfortunate appearances of escaped laboratory animals in lower floor administration offices, the department moved to lightly-remodeled temporary quarters in the condemned Old Botany Hall. That occupation was to last more than twelve years. After the department's departure, the building was largely sealed as unsafe until it was reconstructed to appear in its 1892 glory beginning in 1994 and to be renamed Carrie Chapman Catt Hall.

Animal laboratory and physiological psychology research facilities were provided on the fourth floor of Sciences Building in 1976. That followed occupation for many years of one of three wood-framed residences, Coburn House, north of Pammel Drive on Morrill Road. Coburn House was demolished following the department's animal laboratory move to Sciences Building. The original plan was to relocate the animal laboratories on a seventh floor of Sciences II, but that floor was eliminated when funding was short.

In the early 1980s part of the former Veterinary Medicine Quadrangle buildings were remodeled for the department and the College of Education. Space was allocated based on the existing size of the department and projections of reduced enrollments. The centerwest building had been originally built as an animal hospital, where many of the current faculty offices had begun as horse stalls. The classrooms on the east side of this building were created anew in a form unlike the original building design. The classroom hallways were originally anatomy laboratories with tracks for suspending partially dissected carcasses of large animals. The basement held vats for preparing and preserving animal bodies for study and research. Adjoining the west of the building was a kennel filled with beagles in a longevity study, and the basement passage to the eastern Quadrangle building held the city dog pound. The southwest building was new in the early 1960s, designed as a Biomedical Engineering research facility. The Quadrangle was named Lagomarcino Hall after the Dean of the College of Education at the time. Virgil Lagomarcino was instrumental in garnering state-wide support for the remodeling project.

Additional laboratory spaces were later remodeled from former storage areas in the basement of the centerwest building of Lagomarcino Hall, and in 1994 more space was granted to the department in the basement of Sciences Building.

Major purchases of specialized equipment were made in the late 1960s with N.S.F. grants to the department. In those before-computer years large sums of money were required to purchase simple calculation devices; a four-work-station calculator doing less than a $5 calculator cost about $1300. Up-to-date solid-state switching and controlling modules were acquired for the research laboratories. With the move of the department to its present remodeled spaces the department was again given funds for equipment improvement. All new furniture was purchased along with some specialized psychology apparatus. At this time the department acquired modern video devices and the first generation of desktop computers. Apple II computers, WordStar word-processing programs, and NEC Spinwriter printers gradually, if noisily, replaced the office IBM typewriters.

Currently, all of the Psychology faculty and graduate students are housed in recently renovated space in the west wing of Lagomarcino Hall and in the adjoining Science Hall I building. Major laboratory and office renovations were completed in both buildings in 2000 and in 2001. Computer equipment and lab space is state-of-the-art. With money from student computing fees and from department and grant funds, a well-equipped and continuously up-dated computer laboratory is now open to all students and faculty. In the fall of 2001, a multimedia computing laboratory was opened for use by Psychology graduate students and faculty. Additional space in Science Hall I was obtained in 2003 and 2004. Ongoing and planned renovations will turn that space in faculty and graduate student offices and laboratories.

Recent Leadership

Coincident with the move to Old Botany Hall in 1967 (some would say because of it), Layton accepted a new position as Vice President of Student Affairs and remained behind in Beardshear Hall. Arthur Mackinney, a department industrial psychologist educated at Minnesota, was appointed Department Head. He accepted a central administration appointment elsewhere after three years, Charles again served a year as Acting Head, and Thomas Turnage, experimental psychology doctorate from California, Berkeley, was appointed Head in 1971, moving from the University of Maryland. After three years he moved to an Associate Dean position in the College of Sciences and Humanities.

In 1975 David Edwards, an experimental psychologist educated at the University of Iowa, was appointed from the department and began a period of nine years as Department Chairman. In 1984 Layton again was appointed to lead the department. After an open search he was succeeded in the spring semester of 1989 by Gary Wells, a social psychologist educated at Ohio State University and coming from the University of Alberta. In 1992 Camilla Benbow, educated in individual differences (gifted) at Johns Hopkins, was appointed from the department to be Chair. In 1996 Benbow was appointed interim Dean of the College of Education and in 1998 assumed an education dean position at Peabody. Douglas Epperson was interim chair of the department from 1996 through 1999. In 1999, after an open search, Craig Anderson, a social psychologist educated at Stanford University and most recently at the University of Missouri, was appointed chair. He served as chair for six years, until August of 2005. At that time Douglas Bonett, who received his PhD in psychometrics from UCLA, took over as Interim Chair. In August 2006, Douglas Bonett accepted a regular appointment as Chair of the department of Psychology.

Last update: January 2007

ISU Psychology Faculty

In preparing this history of psychology at Iowa State a list of all of the faculty over the years was compiled. Annual reports to the regents, catalogs, and budgets from before 1870 to the present were searched. Excluded were part-time, temporary, and Instructor rank, but included are those with rank but budgeted all or partially elsewhere (e.g., the counseling service). Fourth column [✇] means appointed primarily outside of the department, at least at first. This information was not available on the first people, up to Hawkes. Also, faculty who moved from appointment in the department to service elsewhere in the university are not noted, e.g. Lewis.

	NAME	DOCTORATE	✇	AREA	APPOINTED	DEPARTED
1	Adonijah Welch				1870	1889
2	William Chamberlain				1889	1891
3	William Beardshear				1891	1901
4	Orange Cessna				1900	1933
5	Thomas Vance	Iowa			1915	1955
6	John Evans	Columbia			1921	1952
7	Clay Ross				1924	1927
8	John Jenkins	Cornell			1925	1931
9	Louisa Wagner	Iowa			1926	1929
10	Alvha Lauer	Ohio State		IND	1925	1959
11	Martin Fritz	Chicago		COU	1928	1972
12	Darrell Lucas	New York			1930	1931
13	Harold Gaskill	Ohio State			1931	1938
14	Lyle Henry	Iowa			1936	1946
15	William Owens	Minnesota		IND	1940	1959
16	George Seeck	Michigan			1946	1949
17	Vernon Schaeffer	Northwestern			1946	1949
18	Richard Husband	Stanford			1946	1953
19	John Holmes	Ohio State			1947	1957
20	John Bath	Nebraska		COU/EDU	1946	1981
21	Charles Neidt	Iowa State			1948	1950
22	Alice Palubinskas	Iowa State		PSM	1948	1952
23	Thomas Hannum	Nebraska		COU	1950	1989
24	Archie Colby	Purdue			1951	1952
25	S. Hotchkiss				1951	1952
26	Richard McHugh				1951	1957
27	Glen Hawkes	Cornell	X	DEV	1951	1966
28	Douglas Ellis	Northwestern		EXP	1952	1953
29	Don Charles	Nebraska		COU/DEV	1952	1988
30	James Freeman	Northwestern		EXP	1953	1959
31	Howard Mayer	Ohio State			1954	1957
32	Robert Morin	Wisconsin			1956	1957
33	Woodrow Reed	Nebraska			1956	1958
34	David Gardner	Cornell	X	DEV	1956	1969
35	Lillian Schwenk	Iowa State		EDU	1957	1966
36	Arthur MacKinney	Minnesota		IND	1957	1970
37	Edwin Lewis	Ohio State		COU	1957	1998

38	Leroy Wolins	Ohio State		PSM	1957	1989
39	Sheldon Edelman	Purdue	X	COU	1960	1964
40	Daniel McMillen	Purdue	X	COU	1960	1967
41	George Karas	Purdue		EXP	1960	1995
42	Wilbur Layton	Ohio State		COU	1960	1990
43	Frederick Brown	Minnesota		PSM	1961	1997
44	Roy Warman	Ohio State	X	COU	1961	1989
45	Timothy Brock	Yale		SOC	1962	1964
46	John Schuck	Ohio State		EXP	1963	1968
47	David Edwards	Iowa		EXP	1963	1999
48	Ronald Peters	Iowa		EXP	1963	2004
49	John Hartzell		X	COU	1965	1966
50	Ray Moore	Adelphi	X	COU	1965	1968
51	Aaron Lowin	Columbia		SOC	1965	1968
52	David Mills	Michigan State	X	COU	1965	1970
53	James Walsh	Washington		PSM	1965	1972
54	Donald Schuster	Southern California		IND	1965	1990
55	Donald Zytowski	Washington Univ.	X	COU	1965	1990
56	Thomas Lyons	Michigan		IND	1966	1970
57	Carole Arnold	Stanford		DEV	1966	1973
58	Wayne Bartz	Purdue		EXP	1966	1976
59	Donald Penner	Purdue		IND	1967	1968
60	Edwin Hutchins	Illinois	X	PSM	1967	1971
61	Harold Gelfand	Michigan		EXP	1967	1971
62	Ronald Baker	Stanford	X	COU	1967	1972
63	Charles Poe	Missouri	X	COU	1967	1972
64	Richard Patten	Iowa		EXP	1967	1973
65	Charles Rodgers	Claremont		EXP	1968	1970
66	William Davis	Kansas State		SOC	1968	1973
67	Terry Dickinson	Ohio State		IND	1968	1974
68	Jeanne Dissinger	Purdue		EDU	1968	1974
69	Arnold Kahn	Southern Illinois		SOC	1968	1984
70	Lloyd Avant	Kansas State		EXP	1968	1994
71	Eugene Robinson	Purdue	X	COU	1969	1970
72	Ellen Betz	Minnesota	X	COU	1969	1976
73	Martin Bielefeld	Missouri	X	COU	1969	1976
74	Eugene Cherry	Vanderbilt	X	COU	1969	1976
75	Marianne Mcmanus	Wisconsin	X	COU	1969	1976
76	John Menne	Angelicum	X	COU	1969	1978
77	Larry Jacoby	Southern Illinois		EXP	1970	1975
78	Gary Phye	Missouri		EDU	1970	1998
79	Jan Wijting	Bowling Green		IND	1971	1974
80	Thomas Turnage	California		EXP	1971	1993
81	Frederick Borgen	Minnesota		COU	1971	2003
82	Norman Scott	Maryland		COU	1972	2017
83	Thomas Bartsch	West Virginia		DEV	1973	1978
84	Wallace Russell	Iowa	X	EXP	1973	1983
85	Harry Lando	Stanford		PER	1973	1988
86	Paul Muchinsky	Purdue		IND	1973	1993
87	Robert Strahan	Minnesota		PSM	1973	1996

88	Edward Donnerstein	Florida State		SOC	1974	1980
89	Marcia Donnerstein	Florida State	X	SOC	1974	1981
90	Thomas Andre	Illinois		EDU	1974	1998
91	Judith Krulewitz	Cincinnati		COU	1974	1986
92	Mildred Mason	Connecticut		EXP	1975	1982
93	Richard Hughes	Rutgers		EXP	1975	2002
94	Daniel Reschly	Oregon		SCH	1975	1998
95	Stanley Ahmann	Iowa State	X	EDU	1975	1987
96	Paula Morrow	Iowa State		IND	1978	1980
97	Frank Gresham	South Carolina		SCH	1979	1981
98	Douglas Epperson	Ohio State		COU	1979	2009
99	Frederick Gibbons	Texas		SOC	1980	2008
100	Sarah Nixon	Oklahoma		EXP	1982	1983
101	Michael O'Boyle	Southern California		EXP	1982	2000
102	Susan Epps	Minnesota		SCH	1982	1985
103	Kenneth De Meuse	Tennessee		IND	1982	1986
104	David Balota	South Carolina		EXP	1984	1985
105	Camilla Benbow	Johns Hopkins		DEV	1985	1998
106	Meg Gerrard	Texas		SOC	1985	2008
107	Ann Casey	Minnesota		SCH	1986	1988
108	Veronica Dark	Washington		COG	1986	2018
109	Roy Johnson	Bowling Green		IND	1986	1994
110	Sharon Griffin-Pierson	Iowa		COU	1988	1990
111	Gary Wells	Ohio State		SOC	1989	
112	Kathy Hanisch	Illinois		IND	1990	2006
113	David Lubinski	Minnesota		COU/PSM	1990	1998
114	Brad Bushman	Missouri		SOC	1990	2003
115	Kathryn Benes	Nebraska		SCH	1990	1992
116	Anita Kelly	Florida		COU	1991	1994
117	Carolyn Cutrona	UCLA		COU	1993	
118	Daniel Russell	UCLA		SOC	1993	2002
119	William Panak	Vanderbilt		SCH	1993	1997
120	Joan Cunnick	Kansas State	X	EXP	1993	
121	Eric Cooper	Minnesota		COG	1994	2022
122	Susan Cross	Michigan		SOC	1994	
123	Rand Conger	Washington	X	SOC	1994	2001
124	Terry Mason	Texas Tech	X	COU	1994	2015
125	William Hoyt	Virginia Commonwealth		COU	1995	1999
126	Horabail Venkatagiri	Bowling Green		CMDIS	1996	
127	Douglas Bonett	UCLA		PSM	1998	2012
128	Lisa Larson	Missouri		COU	1998	2021
129	Craig Anderson	Stanford		SOC	1999	
130	Susan Day	Illinois	X	COU	1999	2002
131	Stephanie Madon	Rutgers		SOC	1999	2022
132	David Vogel	Florida		COU	2000	
133	Kathleen Bieschke	Michigan State		COU	2001	2002
134	Anne Cleary	Case Western Reserve		COG	2001	2006
135	Alison Morris	Boston University		COG	2002	2014

136	Meifen Wei	Missouri		COU	2002	
137	Kenneth Malmberg	Maryland		COG	2003	2005
139	Douglas Gentile	Minnesota		DEV	2003	
140	Nathaniel Wade	Virginia Commonwealth		COU	2003	
141	Derrick Parkhurst	Johns Hopkins		COG	2004	2006
142	Patrick Armstrong	Illinois, Champaign		COU	2005	
143	Robert West	South Carolina		COG	2006	2015
144	Chun Kit (Jason) Chan	Washington Univ.		COG	2007	
145	Zlatan Krizan	Iowa		SOC	2007	
146	Loreto Prieto	Iowa		COU	2007	
147	Shana Carpenter	Colorado State		COG	2008	
148	Bethany Weber	Rutgers		COG	2008	2014
149	Kevin Blankenship	Purdue		SOC	2008	
150	Max Guyll	Rutgers		COU	2009	2022
151	Sarah Greathouse	City Univ., NY		SOC	2010	2011
152	Jonathan Kelly	Univ. of California		COG	2010	
153	Kristi Costabile	Univ. of California		SOC	2012	
154	Christian Meissner	Florida State University		COG	2013	
155	Marcus Credé	U of Illinois, Urbana		SOC	2014	
156	Phillips, Leigh (Alison)	Rutgers		SOC	2014	
157	Marsee, Monica	U of New Orleans		SOC & COu	2015	
158	John G. Grundy	McMaster Univ.		Cog	2018	
159	Brooke Arterberry	Univ. of Missouri		Cou	2018	2021
160	Andrew M. Smith	Queen’s Univerity (CA)		Cog	2019	

Note: Names and dates of term faculty still to be added.