PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT HANDBOOK

2017-2018
I. The Faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>E-MAIL (@iastate.edu)</th>
<th>HOME ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Craig</td>
<td>294-3118</td>
<td>Sci 375B</td>
<td>caa</td>
<td>911 Vermont Cr.</td>
<td>292-0263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Patrick</td>
<td>294-8788</td>
<td>Lago W237</td>
<td>pia</td>
<td>921 Poe Ave</td>
<td>231-9773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenship, Kevin</td>
<td>294-9270</td>
<td>O&amp;L 0008</td>
<td>kevinb1</td>
<td>3809 Westlawn Dr.</td>
<td>765/532-6648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Shana</td>
<td>294-6385</td>
<td>O&amp;L 0010</td>
<td>shacarp</td>
<td>1524 Glendale Ave.</td>
<td>858/603-1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Jason</td>
<td>294-6946</td>
<td>O&amp;L 0006</td>
<td>ckchan</td>
<td>NO ADDRESS RELEASE</td>
<td>314/495-7779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Eric</td>
<td>294-2118</td>
<td>Lago W273</td>
<td>ecooper</td>
<td>902 Burnett Ave</td>
<td>232-2896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costabile, Kristi</td>
<td>294-9620</td>
<td>Lago W253</td>
<td>costabil</td>
<td>724 Brookridge</td>
<td>805/705-3012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crede', Marcus</td>
<td>294-7462</td>
<td>Lago W271</td>
<td>mcrede</td>
<td>803 Burnett Ave, Unit 1</td>
<td>217/377-4790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross, Susan</td>
<td>294-3224</td>
<td>Sci 375A</td>
<td>scross</td>
<td>5512 Harvest Rd. 50014</td>
<td>296-2566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutrona, Carolyn</td>
<td>294-0282</td>
<td>Lago W112</td>
<td>ccutrona</td>
<td>2631 Ridgetop Rd.</td>
<td>292-8348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark, Veronica</td>
<td>294-1688</td>
<td>Sci 374</td>
<td>vdark</td>
<td>5556 Arrasmith Tr.</td>
<td>232-7742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyll, Max</td>
<td>294-8006</td>
<td>Sci 490</td>
<td>guyll</td>
<td>64185 260th St., Nevada</td>
<td>382-5770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Jonathan</td>
<td>294-2322</td>
<td>O&amp;L 0018</td>
<td>jonkelly</td>
<td>724 Brookridge</td>
<td>450-2279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krizan, Zlatan</td>
<td>294-1975</td>
<td>Lago W204</td>
<td>zkrizan(dept only)</td>
<td>NO ADDRESS/PHONE RELEASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Lisa</td>
<td>294-1487</td>
<td>Lago W216</td>
<td>ilmarnson</td>
<td>NO ADDRESS/PHONE RELEASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madon, Stephanie</td>
<td>294-2932</td>
<td>Sci 492</td>
<td>madon</td>
<td>64185 260th St., Nevada</td>
<td>382-5770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsee, Monica</td>
<td>294-3950</td>
<td>Lago W259</td>
<td>mmarsee</td>
<td></td>
<td>504/427-0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meissner, Chris</td>
<td>294-2119</td>
<td>Sci 487B</td>
<td>cameissn</td>
<td>2203 Jensen Ave.</td>
<td>915-204-9275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Alison</td>
<td>294-3393</td>
<td>O&amp;L 0020</td>
<td>alisoph</td>
<td>803 Burnett Ave, Unit 1</td>
<td>217/369-1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prieto, Loreto</td>
<td>294-2455</td>
<td>Lago W218</td>
<td>lpieto</td>
<td>2124 Country Club Blvd.</td>
<td>292-3623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet, Dawn</td>
<td>294-6370</td>
<td>Lago W153</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>NO ADDRESS RELEASE</td>
<td>908/295-4651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkatagiri, Horabail</td>
<td>294-6476</td>
<td>3248 Pearson</td>
<td>gir</td>
<td>2511 Green Hills Dr.</td>
<td>292-0858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel, David</td>
<td>294-1582</td>
<td>Lago W149</td>
<td>dvogel</td>
<td>452 Westfield Rd.</td>
<td>231-5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade, Nathaniel</td>
<td>294-1455</td>
<td>Lago W208</td>
<td>nwade</td>
<td>2027 Kildee St.</td>
<td>268-1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei, Meifen</td>
<td>294-7534</td>
<td>Lago W214</td>
<td>wei</td>
<td>5431 Cervantes Dr.</td>
<td>292-5516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Gary</td>
<td>294-6033</td>
<td>Sci 476A</td>
<td>glwells</td>
<td>3109 NE Trilein, Ankeny</td>
<td>NO PHONE RELEASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OTHER FACULTY/POST-DOCS/STAFF 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>E-mail (@iastate.edu)</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acerbo, Martin</td>
<td>4-6867</td>
<td>Lago W161</td>
<td>macerbo</td>
<td>3114 34th Pl DSM</td>
<td>274-9438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Catherine</td>
<td>4-2814</td>
<td>Lago W105</td>
<td>cathi</td>
<td>296-2579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, John</td>
<td>4-5067</td>
<td>Lago W105C</td>
<td>skyman</td>
<td>462-0246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavel, Fred</td>
<td>4-3150</td>
<td>Sci 475</td>
<td>fdclavel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corral, Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duwe, Elise Ann Geist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eaduwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gul, Pelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansisch, Kathy</td>
<td>4-1488</td>
<td>Lago W122</td>
<td>kathann</td>
<td>4729 Hemingway Dr</td>
<td>292-6059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessling, Robert</td>
<td>4-1786</td>
<td>Lago W261</td>
<td>rmh</td>
<td>3110 Turnberry Ct.#224</td>
<td>343-0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Edie</td>
<td>4-0283</td>
<td>Lago W112</td>
<td>ehunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, India</td>
<td>4-3646</td>
<td>Lago W022</td>
<td>psychady</td>
<td>1401 Carroll Ave.</td>
<td>917/885-5865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallsen, Sarah</td>
<td>4-1742</td>
<td>Lago W112</td>
<td>kallsen</td>
<td>1533 Idaho Avenue</td>
<td>290-9219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws, Ann</td>
<td>4-1545</td>
<td>Lago W112</td>
<td>laws</td>
<td>200 Ashton St., Gilbert</td>
<td>231-7784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesbit, Sunde</td>
<td>4-7532</td>
<td>Lago W137</td>
<td>smnesbit</td>
<td>3809 Westlawn Dr.</td>
<td>765/532-7955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleszkiewicz, Simon</td>
<td>4-1961</td>
<td>Lago W251</td>
<td>simono</td>
<td>1539 Meadowlalne Ave.</td>
<td>290-5395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Warren</td>
<td>4-6933</td>
<td>Lago W022</td>
<td>pschady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phipps, Ashley</td>
<td>4-1509</td>
<td>Lago W06</td>
<td>crichie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richie, Carrie</td>
<td>4-4083</td>
<td>Lago W169</td>
<td>krscheel</td>
<td>2313 Donald St.</td>
<td>708-0828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheel, Karen</td>
<td>4-1642</td>
<td>Lago W022</td>
<td>psychady</td>
<td>911 NW 39th St. Ankeny</td>
<td>318-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers, Kristin</td>
<td>4-6205</td>
<td>Lago W205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology FAX</td>
<td>4-5755</td>
<td>Lago W105</td>
<td>psych-tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td>4-8065</td>
<td>Lago W004</td>
<td>psychinf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Admissions</td>
<td>4-1742</td>
<td>Lago W112</td>
<td>gradpsychapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Advising</td>
<td>4-1642</td>
<td>Lago W022</td>
<td>psychady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counsel Serv</td>
<td>4-5056</td>
<td>2223 Student Serv. Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP E-MAIL:** All faculty (psychfac), All lecturers (psychlecturer), All grad students (psychgrad), Psych Staff (psychstaff), Everyone (psychall).  
**Area groups:** counselfac, counselgrad, cognitfac, cognitgrad, socialfac, socialgrad, comstudies, psychemeritus, psichiexec, psychclubexec
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>E-mail (iastate.edu)</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conger, Rand</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rdconger@ucdavis.edu">rdconger@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Davis, CA UC Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunnick, Joan</td>
<td>4-3181</td>
<td>309 Catt Hall</td>
<td>jcunnick</td>
<td>Animal Science ISU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edberg, Tara</td>
<td>4-2552</td>
<td>239 Forker</td>
<td>edberg</td>
<td>Kinesiology ISU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellingson, Laura</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>ellingsl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerrard, Meg</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meg.gerrard@uconn.edu">meg.gerrard@uconn.edu</a></td>
<td>Univ of CT</td>
<td>860/486-4533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons, Frederick</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rick.gibbons@uconn.edu">rick.gibbons@uconn.edu</a></td>
<td>Univ of CT</td>
<td>860/486-5060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, Stephen</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>gilbert</td>
<td>IMSE ISU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning-Ouellete, Amber</td>
<td>309 Catt Hall</td>
<td>309 Catt Hall</td>
<td>amouell</td>
<td>College of LAS ISU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phye, Gary</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>gdphey</td>
<td>2175 Ashmore Dr.</td>
<td>292-3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Daniel</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>drussell</td>
<td>2631 Ridgetop Rd.</td>
<td>292-8342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shechtman, Zipora</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>julesy</td>
<td>U of Haifa, Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder-Yuly, Julie</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>julesy</td>
<td>VPR ISU</td>
<td>515-964-2974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoth, Richard</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td>rlspoth</td>
<td>San Jose State U.</td>
<td>408/924-5630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still, Mary</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.still@sjsu.edu">mary.still@sjsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winfrey, Kelly</td>
<td>4-2070</td>
<td>384 Sci I</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kwinfrey@iastate.edu">kwinfrey@iastate.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/OFFICE/PHONE</td>
<td>ACADEMIC RANK</td>
<td>DEGREES</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenship, Kevin Office &amp; Lab Rm 8 4-9270</td>
<td>Associate Professor Psychology Communication Studies</td>
<td>PhD-Purdue -2006 MA-Ball State-2001 BA-Ball State-1998</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Shana Office &amp; Lab Rm 10 4-6385</td>
<td>Associate Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Columbia State-2004 MA-Columbia State-2003 BA-Univ. Southern Colorado-2000</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Jason (Chun-Kit) Office &amp; Lab Rm 6 4-6946</td>
<td>Associate Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-St.-Washington Univ-2007. Cognitive BA-Univ. of Victoria, B.C.-2000</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Eric E. Lago W273 4-2118</td>
<td>Associate Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Minnesota-1993</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costabile, Kristi Lago W253 4-9620</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-UC-Santa Barbara-2005 MS-UC Santa Barbara-2003 BS-Univ. of Ill, Urbana-1999</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credé, Marcus Lago W271 4-7462</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Univ of Illinois-2005 MA-Univ of Cape Town-1999</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross, Susan E. Science 375A 4-3224</td>
<td>Professor, Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Michigan-1990 MA-Ohio State-1982 BS-Texas A&amp;M-1979</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutrona, Carolyn E. Lago W112--4-0282 Science 475B--4-9400</td>
<td>Professor, Chair Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-UCLA-1981 MA-New Mexico-1974 BA-Stanford-1973</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark, Veronica J. Science 374 4-1688</td>
<td>Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Washington-1977</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyll, Max Science 490 4-8006</td>
<td>Associate Professor Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Rutgers-1998 MS-Rutgers 1994</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS-Lehigh Univ-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/OFFICE/PHONE</td>
<td>ACADEMIC RANK</td>
<td>DEGREES</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Jonathan</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD-UC, Santa Barbara-2006</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA UC, Santa Barbara-2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA, UC, Los Angeles-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;L 0018 4-2322</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Iowa-2007</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krizan, Zlatan</td>
<td></td>
<td>BA Honors, Winona State-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W204 4-1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Lisa M.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Missouri-1986</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W216 4-1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS-Missouri-1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madon, Stephanie</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Rutgers-1998</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science 492 4-2932</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS-Rutgers-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEd-Utah-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Rutgers-1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsee, Monica</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Univ of New Orleans-2005</td>
<td>Social &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W259 4-3950</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social &amp; Univ of New Orleans-2003</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Univ of Alabama-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meissner, Chris</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Florida State Univ-2001</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science 487B 4-2119</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS-Florida State Univ-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Pfeiffer Univ-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Leigh (Alison)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Rutgers-2011</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;L 0020 4-3393</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA-Rutgers-2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Grinnell College-2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prieto, Loreto</td>
<td>Professor, Psychology</td>
<td>PhD-Iowa 1996</td>
<td>Counseling Psych</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W218 4-2455</td>
<td></td>
<td>BA Honors-Iowa 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel, David L.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Florida-2000</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W149 4-1582</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS-Indiana-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Indiana-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Indiana-1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade, Nathaniel G.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-VA Commonwealth-2003</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W208 4-1455</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS-VA Commonwealth-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA-Wheaton College-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei, Meifen</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Missouri-2000</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago W214 4-7534</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA-Missouri-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA-Tunghai U-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS-Soochow U-1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Gary L.</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>PhD-Ohio State-1977</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science 476A 4-6033</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas State-1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISU Department of Psychology Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
Communication Disorders TENURE AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY 2017-18

Venkatagiri, Horibail S.
Associate Professor, Psychology
PhD-Bowling Green St-1977
MS-U of Mysore-1969
BA-U of Mysore-1967

PSYCHOLOGY COURTESY, AFFILIATE, ADJUNCT, AND OTHER FACULTY 2017-18

Conger, Rand D.  
rconger@ucdavis.edu  
Professor  
PhD-Washington-1976  
MA-Washington-1974  
BS-Arizona State-1972  
Social

Cunnick, Joan E.
Science 384  
4-2070  
Professor  
Animal Science & Psychology  
PhD-Kansas State-1987  
BA-McPherson College-1979  
Microbiology

Edberg, Tara
Gilman 2275  
edberg@iastate.edu
Lecturer  
PhD-University of San Diego  
MS-Oklahoma State Univ.  
BS-University of Wisconsin  
Leadership Studies

Ellingson, Laura
239 Forker Bldg  
4-2552  
Assistant Professor  
PhD-Univ of Wisconsin-2011  
MS-Univ of Montana-2003  
Kinesiology

Gerrard, Meg
Univ of Connecticut  
4-2552  
Professor  
PhD-Univ of Texas-1974  
Social

Gibbons, Frederick
Univ of Connecticut  
4-2552  
Professor  
PhD-Univ of Texas-1976  
Social

Gilbert, Stephen
1620 Howe Hall  
4-6782  
Assistant Professor  
PhD-MIT-1997  
BSE-Princeton-1992  
HCI

Manning-Ouellette, Amber  
Gilman 2273  
4-7616

Russell, Daniel W.
Palmer 2352  
4-7081  
Professor, Psychology  
PhD-UCLA-1980  
BS-Tulsa-1975  
Social

Shechtman, Zipora  
U of Haifa, Israel
Professor, Emeritus  
PhD-Washington U.-1984  
Educational Counseling

Snyder-Yuly, Julie
2271 Gilman  
4-7604  
Lecturer  
MS-Iowa State University  
BS-University of Iowa

Spoth, Richard L.
RHC 1260  
4-9752  
Professor, Psychology & Affiliate Scientist, PPSI  
PhD-Iowa-1981  
BA-SUNY,Buffalo-1974  
Counseling
Still, Mary  
Lecturer, Psychology  
San Jose State U.  
PhD-Iowa State U.-2009  Cognitive  
MS-Iowa State U.-2006  
BS & BA-Missouri Southern State U.-2004

Sweet, Dawn  
Adj Asst Professor  
Lago W153  
PhD-Rutgers Univ-2008  Comm St  
MA-The College of New Jersey  
BA-Kean College of New Jersey

**PSYCHOLOGY LECTURERS 2017-2018**

Acerbo, Martin  
Lecturer  
Lago W161  
PhD-University of Konstanz, Germany-2001  Math/Natural Sciences  
MS-Buenos Aires University, Argentina-1996  Biology

Hanisch, Kathy A.  
Senior Lecturer  
Lago W212  
PhD-Illinois-1990  Industrial  
MA-Illinois-1988  Organizational  
BA-Northern Iowa-1985

Hessling, Robert  
Lecturer  
Lago W261  
PhD-Iowa State Univ-2000  Social  
BS-Illinois State Univ-1993  
BA-Illinois Wesleyai Univ-1991

Nesbit, Sunde  
Lecturer  
Lago W137  
PhD-Purdue University-2006  Clinical Psychology  
MS-Purdue University-2003

Phillips, Warren H.  
Senior Lecturer  
Lago W251  
PhD-Illinois-1996  Counseling  
MA-Illinois-1993  
BA-Maryland-1989

Richie, Carrie  
Lecturer  
Lago W206  

Karen R. Scheel  
Senior Lecturer  
Lago W169  
Ph.D. Iowa- 1999  Counseling  
B.A., Univ. California—Santa Cruz, 1987
Committee Charges and Memberships 2017-2018

NOTE: All committee assignments are 12-month appointments (i.e., August 16, 2016-August 15, 2017).

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Charge: Advise the Department Chair on policy issues, raise matters of concern by the faculty.
Members: Cutrona (Chair), Dark (Associate Chair), Carpenter, Cross, Guyll, Marsee, Vogel

GRADUATE PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Charge: Deal with all major matters of the graduate program, principally graduate admissions, assistantships, credit for courses taken at other institutions, and evaluate curriculum and courses and recommend changes. Also, conduct informational meetings on graduate study, conduct orientation for new students, prepare student information book, conduct preliminary exams. Develop recommendations and nominations for graduate student awards.
Members: Cross (Chair), Anderson, Wade, Meissner

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Charge: Prepare student information book, recommend instruction evaluation procedures, coordinate undergraduate advising (assigned by Department Chair to one member), evaluate and recommend curriculum changes, prepare catalog copy. Develop recommendations and nominations for undergraduate student awards.
Members: Guyll (Chair), Dark, Cooper, Phillips, A., Hessling, Nesbit, Towers, + (Psi Chi President), (Psych Club President)

COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE (CERTS)
Charge: Conduct evaluations of faculty teaching, research, and service. Research and service are evaluated in the odd-numbered years; teaching is evaluated in even-numbered years.
Members: Wei (Chair—2015-2018), Kelly (1-year replacement for Chan), Guyll (elected 2017)
Non-voting members: Marsee

FACULTY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE
Charge: Evaluate credentials and prepare recommendations for faculty improvement leaves and temporary teaching reductions. Prepare or aid the preparation of nominations for various institutional (e.g., Distinguished Professor) and professional (e.g., APS, APA awards, Fellow status) awards.
Members: Prieto (Chair), Wade, Carpenter, Gentile, Marsee

PROMOTION/TENURE/RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Defined elsewhere)

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE
Charge: Review all proposals from faculty and students for conductance of research involving human participants.
Members: Anderson (Chair), Kelly, Krizan

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT POOL/MASS TESTING COMMITTEE
Charge: Oversee use of subject pool.
Members: Armstrong (Chair), Cooper, Madon

HUMAN RELATIONS & GRIEVANCES COMMITTEE
Charge: Develop procedures for administering grievances and adjudicate grievances as requested by Department Chair.
Members: Larson (Chair), Madon, Venkatagiri, +4 students

DEPARTMENT COMPUTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Charge: Advise chair on enhancing computer capabilities of department.
Members: Wells (Chair), Chan
FRITZ LECTURERSHIP COLLOQUIUM COMMITTEE
  Charge: Run the Fritz colloquium series (selection of speaker, organization of all related talks, visits, and meetings). Should coordinate with Newsletter/Fund raising committee as needed.
  Members: No funding offered this year

DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
  Charge: Coordinate student assessment activities with the DUS and DOGE; Compile student assessment information for Chair, LAS, and ISU reports.
  Member: Hanisch (Chair), Acerbo, Credé, W. Phillips

DIRECTOR, GRADUATE EDUCATION – Cross
DIRECTOR, UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES – Guyll
DIRECTOR, COGNITIVE PROGRAM – Meissner
DIRECTOR, COUNSELING PROGRAM – Wade
DIRECTOR, SOCIAL PROGRAM – Anderson
PSI CHI ADVISOR – A. Phillips
PSYCH CLUB ADVISOR – Kelly, Costabile
GSP ADVISOR – Cross
LIBRARY LIAISON – Cooper
DEPARTMENT DIVERSITY – Prieto (Chair), Wei
DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE TO FACULTY SENATE – Guyll, Meissner
DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE TO LAS REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY – Gentile, President
LAS FACULTY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE – Krizan, Chair
LAS DEAN’S CABINET – Cutrona
LAS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – Guyll
LAS HONORS COMMITTEE – Blankenship, Chair
LAS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE – Madon
LAS DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE - Wei
ISU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD – Anderson
II. Faculty Governance
Administrative Structure

**Associate Chair Position**  
(Approved by faculty 05/02/94; amended 09/25/95)

The associate chair will be appointed by the chair for a one- or two-year term with faculty approval. The duties of the associate chair will vary according to the needs of the department and the wishes of the chair and associate chair. Managing the graduate program, as the Director of Graduate Education (DOGE), will be one specific duty. This includes handling the graduate admissions process, assigning graduate student stipends and TA assignments, coordinating with Student Affairs on assignments into Psychology 131, coordinating the graduate teaching schedule (not teaching assignments) and overseeing the graduate student review process. Other potential responsibilities could include: (1) chairing the Graduate Program Committee, (2) chairing the Human Relations Committee, (3) being available to faculty and graduate students with problems or concerns, and (4) serving as an additional avenue for mediation of conflicts or conflicts of interest that might arise in the department. This individual also will be expected to represent the department when the chair is away and could be asked to assume additional duties as required. The associate chair will not be involved in resource allocation (except as noted above), in assigning faculty workloads, in performance evaluation, or in assigning pay increases. Finally, the associate chair should be a tenured faculty member in the department.

**Director of Undergraduate Studies**  
(Approved by faculty 1/31/00)

The Department Chair will appoint a Director of Undergraduate Studies.

The DUS will chair the Undergraduate Program Committee. The charge of this committee is to:
1. Prepare student information book
2. Recommend instruction evaluation procedures
3. Coordinate undergraduate advising
4. Evaluate and recommend curriculum changes
5. Prepare catalog copy
6. Develop recommendations and nominations for undergraduate student awards.
7. Develop and implement outcomes assessment practices and policies for the undergraduate major. (new charge)

Additional administrative duties of the DUS include:
1. Point of contact for Department/LAS/University issues involving undergraduates
2. Coordination of teaching schedules/assignments
3. Point of contact for undergraduate grievances/problems
4. Coordinating/soliciting faculty participation in LAS and University programs involving undergraduate education (such as the Center for Teaching Excellence)
5. Undergraduate Advising Coordinator (including summer)
6. Honors Advising Liaison
7. Member of the Research Participation Pool/Mass Testing Committee

The "Honors Advisor" position will become the "Honors Advising Liaison" and the Honors Committee will be dropped.

The duties associated with the position are a combination of administrative and teaching related duties. In determining the workload distribution option for the DUS, 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.
Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

**Standard Position Responsibility Statements**

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 if 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 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 and tenure-track faculty. 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 tenured faculty member selected by the faculty member involved in the disagreement, and one tenured faculty member selected by the Department Chair.

Workload Distribution and Faculty Evaluation Weights
(Approved by faculty 2/20/89; Revised October 30, 2017)

Although all members of the department should contribute to the teaching, research/scholarship, and service missions of the department, our contributions to these areas may vary across individuals, and within individuals over time. This is a flexible workload policy that reflects individual differences in contributions to teaching, research, and service. The primary goal of this policy is an increase in the research/scholarly productivity of the department. A secondary goal is to establish a closer relationship between the work load distributions for individual faculty members and the weights the faculty development committee 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 workload distribution should represent a combination of individual preferences 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. The result of these negotiations (the final workload assignments) will be distributed to all faculty.

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

3. Contributing to the teaching mission of the department is expected of all faculty. The typical teaching load for the department should vary between 3 and 6 courses per year. Exceptional circumstances may justify individual teaching assignments of only 1 or 2 courses per year. Faculty members may not drop below one course per year through any combination of circumstances other than a Faculty Professional Development Assignment (FPDA), approved leave of absence, or appointment as department chair. The only other circumstance in which a faculty member may be given a zero teaching load 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 project.

4. Research and scholarly productivity should be the major criterion for reductions in teaching load. 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Courses/Year</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Courses/Year</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>10-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option F</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special cases and other considerations:

1. 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 course per year until the year following their tenure and promotion decision.).

2. The pursuit of new or especially time-consuming research/scholarship efforts may be encouraged with a one-time reduction in teaching load.

3. Teaching a large, difficult, or new class may be recognized with increased teaching credit for that class.

4. 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 increased work load assignment to teaching.
5. Given the current state of uncertainty regarding the future of the A Base/B Base distinction, it is difficult to determine at this time how this policy should be applied to A Base faculty who have no teaching assignments in the summer. However, administrative responsibilities associated with A Base appointments should not qualify for increased work load assignment (or increased evaluation weights) in the service area.

Work-Load Distributions and Evaluation Weights for Faculty: 2012-2016

Note: These are listed differently (by faculty rather than “options”) because there are a number of faculty whose work load distribution don’t fit into an “option” as listed on the previous page.

(Tchg/Rsrh/Serv)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>10/75/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenship</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>50/40/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costabile</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credé</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>30/55/15</td>
<td>(1 course reduction/DOGE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutrona</td>
<td>10/40/50</td>
<td>(2 course buy-out/Chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>40/40/20</td>
<td>(1 course reduction/DUS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentile</td>
<td>30/50/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyll</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krizan</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>20/50/30</td>
<td>(1 course buy-out)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenz</td>
<td>50/Psych and 50/Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madon</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsee</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meissner</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prieto</td>
<td>50/Psych and 50/Latino/a Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>40/30/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkatagiri</td>
<td>50/30/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td>20/60/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>30/60/10 (1 course reduction/Counseling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei</td>
<td>30/60/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>20/60/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviated Sample Annual Report of Professional Activity

A sample annual report or professional activity is listed below. This form reports information regarding faculty productivity for the previous three years. It is updated and filed by faculty each year, and the information contained in this report is utilized by the faculty evaluations committees, as described in subsequent sections.

Annual Report of Professional Activity

GARY L. WELLS

January 1, 1998-December 31, 2001

(Work-Load Distribution = 30T/60R/10S – 20T/60R/20S beginning F2001)

TEACHING (Abbreviated Sample)

I. TEACHING
   A. Scheduled teaching.
      S98: 280A/B (1/2) = 382 (Mean rating = 4.46/231 students/Mean GPA = 2.56)
            Teaching buyout
      F98: 280A/B (1/2) = 515 (Mean rating = 4.38/426 students/Mean GPA = 2.47)
      S99: 280A/B (1/2) = 477 (Mean rating = 4.34/376 students/Mean GPA = 2.50)
      586 (1/2) = 7 (Mean rating = 4.71/7 students/Mean GPA = 3.57)
      F99: 280A/B (1/2) = 556 (Mean rating = 4.36/463 students/Mean GPA= 2.62)
      692N = 10 (Mean rating = 5.00/10 students/Mean GPA = 4.00)
      S00: 280A/B (1/2) = 508 (Mean rating = 4.45/412 students/Mean GPA = 2.58)
      692N = 12 (Mean rating = 4.80/10 students/Mean GPA = 3.95)
      F00: 280A/B (1/2) = 685 (Mean rating = 4.51/513 students/Mean GPA = 2.51)
      S01: Professional Development Assignment - On leave in Australia
      F01: 280A/B (1/2) - 736 (Mean rating = 4.57/608 students/Mean GPA = 2.59)
            Course Reduction - Shift to 20(Teaching) / 20 (Service & Outreach) / 60 (Research)

   B. Unscheduled teaching.
      S98: 491 = Egan, John/3 cr.
            Long, Sandra/3 cr.
            Myers, Joe/3 cr.
            Proulx, Brandy/3 cr.
      F98: 491 = Fuller, Rana/3 cr.
            699 = Bradfield, Amy/3 cr.
      S99: 491 = Hartwigsen, Dana/2 cr.
            Hickle, Lindsay/3 cr.
            Lyman, Alexis/3 cr.
            Schwering, Amy/3 cr.
      F99: 491 = Buse, Gina/3 cr.
            Carnagey, Nicholas/3 cr.
            Hickle, Lindsay/3 cr.
            Lyman, Alexis/3 cr.
            Roach, Jennifer/3 cr.
            699 = Bradfield, Amy/6 cr.
      S00: 490 = Pech, Solomon/3 cr.
            491 = Buse, Gina/3 cr.
            Carnagey, Nicholas/3 cr.
            Neal, John/3 cr.
            Roach, Jennifer/3 cr.
            699 = Bradfield, Amy/6 cr.
      F00: 491 = Foreman, Sarah/3 cr.
            Lacox, Jessey/3 cr.
            Neal, John/3 cr.
            Roach, Jennifer/3 cr.
C. Graduate advising.

1. Committee chair.
   Dissertation: Bogus feedback distorts recall of an interpersonal judgment task: Three empirical tests of the post-decision feedback effect. (Teaching Excellence Award)

2. Committee member.
   1998: Crabb, Brian - PhD candidate
   Hessling, Robert – PhD candidate
   Meyer, Benjamin – MFA-F/Art- awarded S 1999
   1999: Crabb, Brian - PhD candidate (10/98)
   Hessling, Robert – PhD candidate (10/97)
   Phillips, Colleen – MS candidate (5/99)
   Reis-Bergan, Monica - PhD candidate (8/96)
   Rosielle, Luke – PhD candidate (5/99)
   Meyer, Benjamin – MFA-F/Art awarded S1999
   2000: Crabb, Brian – PhD awarded S2000
   Hessling, Robert – PhD awarded SS2000
   Phillips, Colleen – MS awarded F2000
   Reis-Bergan, Monica - PhD awarded SS2000
   Rosielle, Luke – PhD candidate (5/99)
   2001: Carnagey, Nicholas – MS candidate (09/01)
   Hilbert, Sarah – MS candidate (07/01)
   Rosielle, Luke – PhD candidate (5/99)

D. Other teaching/educational activities.
   [See Outreach/Professional Practice section.]

E. Honors, awards, and recognition for teaching.
II. UNIVERSITY SERVICE
   A. Committee memberships.
      1. Non-departmental committees.
         1998: Faculty Senate, At-Large Representative (1996-99)
            LAS Caucus (1996-99)
            LAS Faculty and Alumni Recognition (1998-01)
         1999: LAS Faculty and Alumni Recognition (1998-01)
            LAS Dean’s Scholarship Advisory Committee (1999-present)
            Provost’s Distinguished Professor Selection Committee (1999)
         2000: LAS Faculty and Alumni Recognition (1998-03)
         2001: LAS Faculty and Alumni Recognition (1998-03) (Ch)
            LAS Distinguished Professor Awards Committee (Ch)

      2. Departmental committees.
         1998: Executive Committee
               Colloquium Committee
               Research Advisory
               Search/Cognitive
               Search/Department Chair
         1999: Executive
               Faculty Enhancement (Ch)
               Research Advisory
               Research Evaluation (Ch)
               Search/Cognitive
               Faculty Enhancement (Ch)
               Search/Cognitive
               Search/Cognitive
               Faculty Enhancement
               Department Chair Evaluation (Ch)
               Human Relations (Ch)
               Service and Professional Practice Evaluation

   B. Other activities within the university

   C. Honors, awards, and recognition for institutional service

III. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND OUTREACH
   A. Offices and service in professional organizations.
      1. 1994-present: Executive Board, International Association for Applied Psychology
      2. 2001-2003: Chair, Fellows Committee, Psychology and Law Division of APA
      3. 1996-99: American Psychology/Law Society, Chair, White Paper Committee
5. Dec. 99-December, 2000: **Co-chair, panel member,** and working group member developing training program for law enforcement, U.S. Department of Justice. [This required six trips to Washington, DC, Baltimore, and Miami in 2000.]

B. Consultation with public agencies and groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agency/Group</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Story County Prosecutor</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Polk County Public Defenders</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>State of Iowa public defense</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Tennessee Public Defenders</td>
<td>Consulting and expert testimony</td>
<td>2.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Federal 5th Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Consulting and expert testimony</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Federal 8th Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Consulting and expert testimony</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>City of Chicago Legal Services</td>
<td>Deposition</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Deposition</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>Consulting and expert testimony</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Centurian Ministries (Princeton, NJ)</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>New Jersey Justice Department</td>
<td>Consulting &amp; workshops</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>New Jersey Justice Department</td>
<td>Consulting &amp; workshops</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY District Attorney</td>
<td>Consulting &amp; workshop</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>New York State Police Commissioner</td>
<td>Consulting &amp; workshop</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Clinton, IA County Attorney</td>
<td>Expert testimony and consulting</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The Innocence Project (New York)</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Iowa Judicial Institute</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Philadelphia Judges Association</td>
<td>Presentation and consultation</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All above consulting and expert testimony concerned issues surrounding police lineups and eyewitness identification. In all cases expenses were paid by the recipients of the services. Only three of these were remunerated services, the remainder involved either minor honoraria or no remuneration.

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

D. Other professional practice and outreach

Traveled to Houston in January 2001 to give 60 minute lecture before live audience that was digitally captured and transferred to video streaming compact disk. This CD was shown in 34 law schools across the country in 2001. There was no remuneration; proceeds go to the Innocence Network.

E. Conferences, workshops, and presentations attended.

1998:
- Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation Meeting, Washington, DC
- American Medical Association meeting on Patient Safety, Rancho Mirage, CA
- American Psychology/Law Society, Los Angeles, CA

1999:
- Society of Experimental Social Psychology, St. Louis, MO
- American Psychological Association, Boston, MA
- American Bar Foundation/American Psychological Association joint conference, Washington, DC
- Federal Bar Council, Kona, HI

2000:
- Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, Boulder, CO
- Miscarriages of Justice Conference, Newport Beach, CA
- American Psychology-Law Society, New Orleans, LA

2001:
- American Psychological Society, Toronto
- Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, Kingston, Ontario, Canada
- American Psychological Association, San Francisco
F. Honors, awards, and recognition for professional practice and outreach


IIIa. Other Service/Outreach

- 1998: Appearance on 48 Hours (CBS)
- 1999: Associated Press Article on my work with Department of Justice
- 1999: Newspaper articles on my research in 11 local papers across the country
- 1999: Five radio interviews on my research
- 2000: Discovery Channel television appearance
- 2000: Featured in an article published in the APA Monitor on Psychology
- 2001: Feature article in the New Yorker describing my research (written by Atul Gawande)
- 2001: Front page article in the New York Times quoting me and describing the impact of my work in causing New Jersey to change their lineup procedures.
- 2001: My sequential lineup procedure is described in New York Times Magazine as one of the 100 best ideas of 2001.
IV. PUBLICATIONS.
A. Refereed journal articles.

B. Textbooks/chapters.

C. Technical reports [and role]

D. Book reviews.

V. RESEARCH ACTIVITY.
A. Grants and contracts awarded or in effect.

B. Grant proposals submitted.
   Wells, G. L. (submitted December 2001) National Science Foundation research grant ($370,000), pending

C. Unpublished manuscripts.

VI. EXTERNAL SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES.
A. Editorial responsibilities.
   Consulting Editor, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 1999-present
   Consulting Editor, *Law and Human Behavior*, 1984-present
B. **Referred conference papers presented.**
   Wells, Gary L. (1999, August). The law’s role in causing mistaken eyewitness identifications. In *What memory research contributes to law.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

C. **Invited conference presentations.**

D. **Invited colloquia and other invited addresses.**
   Wells, G. L. (February 2000). Northwestern University Law School, invited lecture, Chicago
   Wells, G. L. (January, 2001) The Innocence Network - Digitized lecture broadcast over the internet to law classes in numerous law schools, filmed in Houston, TX, with live audience.

E. **Honors, awards, and recognition for research.**
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
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 by the Service/ Professional Practice Committee

Institutional Service
- 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):

Dates of activity
Role: Chair, Organizer, Presenter, or Member
Effort: _______ 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.

Evaluation Categories

The evaluation categories used in evaluation of faculty services are:

Excellent 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.

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

Competent requires substantial activity and contribution in either the academic or professional community, or combinations thereof.

Adequate reflects modest activity with little evidence of contribution or leadership.

Unsatisfactory 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

Primary goals. 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.

Promoting excellence. 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 formative teaching reviews.

Rewarding excellence. 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.

Committees

Three committees in the department are involved in teaching evaluation. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Teaching Advisory Committee conduct 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.

Teaching Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC has the responsibility for conducting formative teaching reviews at the request of the faculty member or the Department Chair. (Note: the faculty member might also seek such a review from the Center for Teaching Excellence).

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 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)

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. (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.

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.
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 no later than the Monday of the week preceding exam week of fall semester. 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. 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 evaluations provided by EVF members and external letter writers.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Election of new PTC members as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion submit their completed dossier to PTC (cover pages plus tabs 1 and 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 7-15</td>
<td>PTC distributes candidate’s dossier to candidate’s program area and program area meets to discuss candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15-30</td>
<td>Submitted materials and external letters are reviewed by the PTC. Interviews with candidates are completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1-15</td>
<td>Draft reports are written and approved by candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15-30</td>
<td>Reports and dossier distributed to the EVF. The EVF meets to discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1-8</td>
<td>Vote of the EVF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>Assistant professors to be reviewed for feedback or reappointment submit dossiers as per this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1-15</td>
<td>Committee meets with assistant professors for annual reviews or contract-renewal reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 15-31</td>
<td>Draft feedback reports to assistant professors completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1-15</td>
<td>Final feedback reports to assistant professors completed and submitted to assistant professors and Department Chair. Contract-renewal reports submitted to EVF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 15</td>
<td>Meeting and vote of EVF on contract-renewal reviews completed. Recommendation forwarded to Department Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 April 5, 2011.

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 three categories: Superior, Meeting Expectations, and Below Expectations. The five categories used by CERTS map onto the three categories required for PTR in the following manner: Excellent maps onto Superior. Unsatisfactory maps onto Below Expectations. Competent and Adequate map onto Meeting Expectations. The mapping of Soundly Competent is sometimes Superior and sometimes Meeting Expectations. CERTS will determine which mapping is appropriate in a given situation.

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: Superior, Meeting Expectations, Below Expectations.
   a. As noted in Section 5.3.5.2 of the University Faculty Handbook, in order for the PTR overall outcome to be Superior, the faculty member must be judged superior in all areas of his or her PRS. An overall Superior review for a full professor entails a recommendation for a salary increase as described in the same section of the University Faculty Handbook. Associate professors receiving an overall Superior review are encouraged to prepare a promotion packet.

   b. Because of the formative nature of PTR, an overall Meeting Expectations PTR will include recommendations for achieving a Superior performance evaluation in those areas judged to be Meeting Expectations. 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 (Section 5.1.1.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook).

c. 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 (Section 5.1.1.5.1 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 in the faculty member’s personnel file.

**Post-tenure Review Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Last Promotion or Review</th>
<th>Next PTR Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Craig A.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Patrick</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenship, Kevin</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Shana</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Chun Kit (Jason)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Eric E.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costabile, Kristi</td>
<td>Ass’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credè, Marcus</td>
<td>Ass’t</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross, Susan E.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Exempt - Dept Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutrona, Carolyn E.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark, Veronica J.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentile, Douglas A.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyll, Max</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Jonathan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krizan, Zlatan</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, Reappointment, and Promotion of Non-tenure Track Teaching Faculty in the Department of Psychology
(Approved 4/12/2004)

Non-tenure track teaching faculty positions are term appointments made to support the instructional mission of the department. Such appointments may be eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing needs of the Department. There are two levels of appointment: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are eligible for professional development support as appropriate. Eight courses per year (or equivalent) plus significant departmental and university service is considered a full-time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer appointment. Half-time or greater Lecturers on multi-year contracts will be invited to regular faculty meetings as non-voting members. All appointments, reappointments and advancements of non-tenure track faculty are subject to approval at the College and University levels.

A. Lecturer
   1. Term of Appointment. The Lecturer is a limited term full- or part-time appointment of from one semester up to three years and renewable for no more than a total of six years.

   2. Hiring. The initial appointment of a Lecturer may be from one semester to three years. Because the decision to hire a Lecturer is often done on short notice, the Department will run a continuous advertisement for a part-time position. The Chair will decide to fill this position. The Search Committee will consist of the Chair, Associate Chair, and Director of Undergraduate Studies. These three faculty members will review files and make the hiring decision for one-semester or one-year positions. A decision to hire a Lecturer for a term longer than one year must be discussed and voted on at a meeting of the resident tenured and tenure track faculty.

   3. Performance Evaluation. A written position responsibility statement will be prepared that clearly indicates the duties and expectations of each lecturer. Each Lecturer who is scheduled to teach for more than one year or who would like to be considered for future appointments will be reviewed annually by the Department’s Committee for the Evaluation of Research, Teaching and Service (CERTS). The review process may include the following, as requested by CERTS:
   • Updated vitae
   • A summary of accomplishments prepared by the lecturer
   • Review of student evaluations
   • Classroom visits by peers
   • Evaluation of each course syllabus
   • Evaluation of exams and assignments given in the courses
   • Evaluation of course materials in print or on the Web
   • Evaluation of service

For multi-year contracts, renewed 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. This report will be discussed by the Chair/Associate Chair and the candidate before the end of spring semester. 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. The report will be discussed by the Chair/Associate Chair and the candidate prior to renewal negotiations.
4. **Reappointment.** Lecturers will be considered for reappointment based upon a positive outcome of the evaluation process and demonstration of continued need within the Department.

The decision to renew an appointment of a Lecturer for up to one additional year will be made by the Lecturer Search Committee. A decision to renew an appointment of a Lecturer for a term longer than one year must be discussed and voted on at a meeting of the resident tenured and tenure-track faculty. According to University policy, Lecturers are not eligible for reappointment beyond six years of accumulated service unless they have been advanced to the rank of Senior Lecturer.

5. **Advancement review.** After six years of accumulated service, Lecturers are eligible for advancement to Senior Lecturer. (The Chair may negotiate with each lecturer any prior years of service to be counted toward the six years.) Normally this review will take place during the fifth year. Recommendations for advancement to Senior Lecturer are based not only upon performance but also upon staffing needs of the Department.

The CERTS will have the responsibility of conducting the reappointment review for a Senior Lecturer during the penultimate year of the Lecturer's contract. The decision to appoint a Lecturer as a Senior Lecturer must be discussed and voted on at a meeting of the resident tenured and tenure track faculty. The voting results will be forwarded by the Chair to the LAS College long with the recommendation of the Chair. The criteria for advancement to Senior Lecturer are: 1) demonstrated excellence in teaching, 2) success at all other activities listed in the PRS, and 3) departmental need.

For advancement reviews, the candidate submits the following documentation:

- Updated vitae
- Report of student evaluations and GPA by class and semester
- Letters of support, including observations of teaching, and professional development and service (if appropriate)
- Teaching portfolio, including:
  - Statement of teaching philosophy
  - Sample syllabi and sample assignments and exams
  - Course materials in print or on the web
  - Examples of student work (optional)
  - Analysis of course evaluations (optional)
- Description of service and other activities, if appropriate.

B. **Senior Lecturer**

Senior Lecturers have limited term appointments not to exceed five years. To be eligible for appointment as Senior Lecturer, the individual shall have served as a Lecturer or its academic equivalent for six years. Each Senior Lecturer will have a Position Responsibility Statement that clearly outlines duties and expectations. Although a multi-year appointment is preferred, Senior Lecturer appointments may be for a single year. Single-year appointments may or may not be renewed, depending upon the needs of the Department and the available resources.

1. **Performance Evaluation.** Senior Lecturers will be reviewed annually in the same manner as Lecturers (see section A.3 above, *Performance Evaluation* for Lecturers).
2. **Reappointment Review.** During the penultimate year of their contracts, Senior Lecturers will be reviewed for reappointment by the Lecturer Search Committee. Senior Lecturers will be considered for reappointment based upon a positive outcome of the evaluation process and demonstration of continued need within the Department. A decision to renew an appointment of a Senior Lecturer for a multi-year period must be discussed and voted on at a meeting of the resident tenured and tenure-track faculty. The voting results, together with the Chair's recommendation, will be forwarded to the LAS College by the Chair. The decision to renew an appointment of a Senior Lecturer for an additional year may be made by the Lecturer Search Committee. In the event of a single-year reappointment, the Chair will make clear that the appointment may not be renewed the following year.

The criteria for reappointment at the rank of Senior Lecturer are:

1. demonstrated excellence in teaching,
2. success at all other activities listed in the PRS and,
3. departmental need.

For Senior Lecturer reappointment reviews, the candidate submits the material listed under Section A.5 above (*Advancement Review for Lecturers*).

---

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct:</td>
<td>Adjunct Instructor or Adjunct Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate:</td>
<td>Affiliate Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy:</td>
<td>Assistant (Associate, Full) Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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/O 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**

**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.
Policy of Temporary Teaching Load Reductions
(Initiated Fall 1994; Revision approved by faculty 02/14/05)

In 1994, the department initiated a new policy of temporary load reductions in which associate/full professors are granted a one-year reduced teaching load to facilitate scholarly productivity. The concept is similar to a faculty improvement leave, where faculty make proposals and the most meritorious are awarded. Possible projects would include but are not limited to: Completion of a book or significant research project, an ambitious grant proposal, a review or theoretical article for a top journal (e.g., Psychological Bulletin, Psychological Review, or Behavioral and Brain Sciences), or a featured article in the American Psychologist, Psychological Science, or Science. Up to a two-course reduction for one year is proposed, with no faculty member teaching fewer than one course per year. Two awards would be made annually and would not be awarded to the same person more than once every three years. (The success of this program will be evaluated annually.)

To apply, faculty should draft a proposal describing the project and its significance/impact. The project clearly needs to demonstrate that it is above and beyond normal scholarly activities, a unique opportunity, and would facilitate the department’s scholarly goals. Applications should include a statement regarding the course(s) for which relief is sought. Applications should be made by March 15 for the following academic year. If resources permit, a second round of proposals for the spring semester will be considered on September 15 (of the same academic year).

Proposals will be evaluated and rank-ordered by the Faculty Enhancement Committee and recommendations passed on to the Department Chair. The Department Chair makes the final determination, taking into consideration financial resources and student needs.

Psychology Department Chair Guidelines for Editorial Service
(Approved by the faculty April 10, 2000)

This document concerns how the department compensates or aids faculty who have assumed significant editorial responsibilities for major psychology journals. Such service is deemed appropriate and beneficial to the department by virtue of the ways in which it increases the visibility and stature of our programs. "Significant editorial responsibilities" in this context means serving as the editor or associate editor for a major journal, that is, receiving manuscripts, soliciting reviews, and making final decisions on which manuscripts are accepted for publication. It does not include serving as a special issue editor.

1. These are guidelines only. Each case is individually negotiated with the Department Chair.

2. Editorial responsibilities are to be credited to evaluations of Research (amended 04-23-01).

3. The preferred compensation is to reduce service activities.

4. The potential payoff for the department is the first consideration in determining what compensation, if any, is given. The editorial workload is the second consideration. For example, serving as editor of Psychological Review would be very valuable to the department, whereas editing Psychological Reports would detract from the reputation of the department.

5. One course reduction may be given for every 50 manuscripts processed. Of course, this is a rough guide only. The Department Chair will take into account the type of manuscripts being processed. For example, Psychological Review papers take considerably more time to process than Aggressive Behavior.

6. # of manuscripts processed may be summed over a two-year period, but not over longer periods of time.
7. Course load will not be reduced below the departmental two-course minimum.

8. If a course reduction is granted, it will normally begin as soon as possible, given departmental teaching constraints.

9. The Department Chair will take into account the teaching, research productivity, service, and outreach needs of the department in deciding what type of compensation (if any) is to be given, and when it will be given.

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 Teaching Evaluation Committee and the Research Evaluation Committee have 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 Teaching Evaluation Committee, Research Evaluation Committee, and PTC.

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 assistants. 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 only university assistants 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

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 five full office days before that faculty meeting. (This shall be interpreted to mean that the communication shall be delivered by reliable messenger to the mailbox of each faculty member's office.)

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.

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.


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 be 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](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](http://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 (Rob West, Chair) 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 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.

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 (2010-2020 membership: P. Armstrong (ch), A. Morris, Z. Krizan). 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.
**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 DEO. 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 one of the two 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)

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 one of two additional compensations 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.

Alternatively, researchers may offer direct payment for the completion of subsequent sessions after the initial session. Participation with direct payment is no longer considered to be part of the RPP and no extra credit can be given. The informed consent form should clearly indicate that the participant is choosing between direct payment or extra credit.

**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.
Instructions for Using the Undergraduate Research Participant Pool

**Experiment Number and Sealed Posting Form**

Each study must first be approved by both the Department of Psychology Human Research Ethics Review Committee and the University Human Subjects Committee. Class projects using the Pool must be approved by the Department Committee, who may decide that University Approval is also needed. When approval has been obtained, the researcher must complete a Posting Form and submit both the to-be-posted form and a copy of the form to the Graduate Secretary. If this is a new project and the researcher has not yet submitted a copy of the signature page with the University signature, that also must be done at this time. If this is a continuation project and the researcher has not yet submitted a copy of the continuation approval for the current academic year, that also must be done at this time. The Graduate Secretary will assign an experiment number to the project and will officially "seal" the Posting Form and write the current academic year under the seal. The experiment number and Posting Form are valid for the rest of the academic year.

Posting forms are valid for the academic year. Researchers who wish to continue using an experiment number from the previous academic year must revalidate the number by submitting a new Posting Form. Revalidation requires continuation approval. Although this procedure might involve a bit of extra paperwork for researchers who originally have their projects approved in the spring, this procedure will ensure that all research involving the Research Participation Pool has current approval. In order to prevent delays in being able to post, researchers should routinely ask for continuation approval prior to or at the beginning of each fall semester.

**Scheduling Sheets**

Recruitment of students as part of the Research Participation Pool can take place ONLY through the use of scheduling sheets posted on the designated bulletin boards at the north end of the center hall in West Lagomarcino. If researchers are using the white and pink carbon scheduling sheet, they may pick these up at any time as needed. Either the white or the pink portion of the sheet MUST remain posted on the bulletin board until after the posted times have past. If researchers use their own made scheduling sheets, leave these up on the board until after the study is complete. This allows participants who have forgotten the relevant information to easily find it.

**Designated Bulletin Boards**

Restrictions concerning participation by students in any class are to be indicated on the posting forms themselves.

The rightmost portion of the rightmost bulletin board is reserved for projects not requiring scheduling sheets (e.g., mass testing, email, phone recruitment, and for studies being done online).

**Recruitment by Phone or Email**

On some occasions, experimenters may need to recruit students over the phone because they need participants with certain characteristics. Before any calls or emails are made, a "stamped" posting form for the experiment must be posted on the bulletin board. This is the only way that students will know that the request is legitimate. An area will be reserved on the bulletin boards for the posting of these forms. By tradition, the area is the rightmost columns of the rightmost bulletin board. Only students granting permission to be contacted by phone or email during the mass testing can be contacted. The caller and/or email must identify himself/herself and provide a phone number, the experiment number, name of experiment, day, time and location of experiment. You MUST inform the students that they are free to decline participation. The complete protocol to be followed by callers is shown in the section, “Experiment Calling Procedures.”
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 an compensation for research participation. The investigator must pay each participant the same amount of compensation for participation.

Experimenter Responsibilities

Experimenterers 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. Experimenterers who wish to post experiments worth more than 3 credits will need to have the wording approved by the RPP Committee. Experimenterers 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 students 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.

**Supplement to Instructions for the Use of the Research Participation Pool**

(Approved by faculty 02/05/95)

Both the office staff and the course information office have made us aware of a number of problems concerning the Research Participation Pool (RPP). We believe that the following procedures should alleviate most of the problems.

**Problem:** In the past, the office staff has had only the Faculty member's name, perhaps a graduate student's name, and the title and number of each experiment. This is insufficient when the staff receive requests from students to locate the room of an experiment.

**Solution:** The Graduate Secretary is to be given a copy of the posting form when it is stamped. In most cases, this form includes the information that the Research Participant (RP) was supposed to copy down when the RP signed-up for the experiment. The only exception is for experiments that are held in other than established labs. For those experiments, when the sign-up sheets are posted, the person doing the posting should give the Graduate Secretary a list of locations that will be used. All researchers who currently have stamped posting forms should provide a copy to the Graduate Secretary ASAP and she will request a copy whenever she stamps a new form.

**Problem:** It is not always clear to the staff whether cancellation slips should be given to the faculty or a graduate student.

**Solution:** For each experiment number, if a graduate student is listed with the experiment, the graduate student will be designated the cancellation contact person.

**Problem:** When undergraduates are listed as the contact persons on the posting form, there is no way for the staff to contact the undergraduate.

**Solution:** It is the responsibility of the supervising faculty member to make arrangements. If the research is required for a class or individual project, Graduate secretary will ask the student the name of the faculty person they are working under. Therefore, the undergraduate student should check the mailbox of the faculty they are working with for any cancellation slips.

**Problem:** Undergraduates not known by the staff are requesting stacks of Extra Credit Cards.
**Solution:** In order to protect the integrity of the Extra Credit Cards, they will be given only to Faculty or Graduate Students.

**Problem:** Students who have been called to participate in research are wandering around with only part of the information that they need.

**Solution:** The staff developed a checklist to be used by telephone callers. If callers use the checklist, the number of cases of RPs with partial information should decrease. Copies of the checklist can be obtained from the Graduate Secretary. Please get sufficient copies to distribute to all persons who contact RPs by phone.

**Problem:** The course information office receives Extra Credit Cards that do no have an experiment number, a value in the number of credits box, or the experimenter initials.

**Solution:** All experimenters should be informed that it is their responsibility to complete these portions of the Extra Credit Cards. In Fall 2001, a pink form illustrating how to properly complete an Extra Credit Form was developed. This form should be prominently displayed in each lab.

**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.

**Proper Posting Etiquette**

After a few weeks into the semester, the posting board begins to get somewhat crowded. Rather than setting rules that apply to posting, the committee decided to become the Emily Post of Posting Boards, so here are our suggestions about proper posting etiquette (PPE).

PPE is to be respectful of others using the board. To prevent crowding, posting should be vertical rather than horizontal. There should be very few circumstances under which one experiment will take up more than two vertical columns on the board.

PPE is that, in most cases, sign-up sheets should not be posted more than two weeks in advance, particularly if a large number of sign-up sheets are required. Once a sign-up sheet is posted, it must be left up until after the session is run. It should be removed shortly thereafter, however, typically by the next class day.

PPE is to use the sign-up sheets efficiently. Do NOT use more of a sheet than necessary. Rather than posting a whole sheet with the bottom half crossed off, post a half sheet or use one sheet for two or more time periods.

It is sometimes necessary to move someone else's sign-up sheet to promote efficient use of space. PPE is to do this with respect for the other researcher. It is never PPE to move someone else's form in order to get "better" space for yourself. If YOU feel that someone else is not following PPE, it is PPE to "complain" to an RPP committee member.

**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 (W112 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/Institutional-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 [\(\Delta\)] 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOCTORATE</th>
<th>(\odot)</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>APPOINTED</th>
<th>DEPARTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adonijah Welch</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Chamberlain</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Beardshear</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Cessna</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Vance</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evans</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Ross</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jenkins</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Wagner</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvha Lauer</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Fritz</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Lucas</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Gaskill</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Henry</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Owens</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Seeck</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Schaeffer</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Husband</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holmes</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bath</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>COU/EDU</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Neidt</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Palubinskas</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hannum</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie Colby</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Hotchkiss</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McHugh</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Hawkes</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>X DEV</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Ellis</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Charles</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>COU/DEV</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Freeman</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Mayer</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morin</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Reed</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gardner</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X DEV</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Schwenk</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur MacKinney</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Lewis</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Wolins</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sheldon Edelman</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Daniel McMillen</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>George Karas</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wilbur Layton</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Frederick Brown</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Roy Warman</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Timothy Brock</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>John Schuck</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>David Edwards</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ronald Peters</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>John Hartzell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ray Moore</td>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Aaron Lowin</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>David Mills</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>James Walsh</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Donald Schuster</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Donald Zytowski</td>
<td>Washington Univ.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Thomas Lyons</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Carole Arnold</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Wayne Bartz</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Donald Penner</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Edwin Hutchins</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Harold Gelfand</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Ronald Baker</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Charles Poe</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Richard Patten</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Charles Rodgers</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Terry Dickinson</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Jeanne Dissinger</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Arnold Kahn</td>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lloyd Avant</td>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Eugene Robinson</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ellen Betz</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Martin Bielefeld</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Eugene Cherry</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Marianne Mcmanus</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>John Menne</td>
<td>Angelicum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Larry Jacoby</td>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Gary Phye</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Jan Wijting</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Thomas Turnage</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Frederick Borgen</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Norman Scott</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Thomas Bartsch</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Wallace Russell</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Harry Lando</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Paul Muchinsky</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Robert Strahan</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Edward Donnerstein</td>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Marcia Donnerstein</td>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Judith Krulewitz</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Mildred Mason</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Richard Hughes</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Daniel Reschly</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Stanley Ahmann</td>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Paula Morrow</td>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Frank Gresham</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Douglas Epperson</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Frederick Gibbons</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sarah Nixon</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Michael O'Boyle</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Susan Epps</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Kenneth De Meuse</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>David Balota</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Camilla Benbow</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Meg Gerrard</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Ann Casey</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Veronica Dark</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Sharon Griffin-Pierson</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Gary Wells</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kathy Hanisch</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>David Lubinski</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>COU/PSM</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Brad Bushman</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Kathryn Benes</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Anita Kelly</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Carolyn Cutrona</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Daniel Russell</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Joan Cunnick</td>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Eric Cooper</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Susan Cross</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Terry Mason</td>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>William Hoyt</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Horabail Venkatagiri</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>CMDIS</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Douglas Bonett</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Lisa Larson</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Craig Anderson</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Susan Day</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Stephanie Madon</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>David Vogel</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Kathleen Bieschke</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Anne Cleary</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Alison Morris</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Meifen Wei</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kenneth Malmberg</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Douglas Gentile</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Nathaniel Wade</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Derrick Parkhurst</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Patrick Armstrong</td>
<td>Illinois, Champaign</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Robert West</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Chun Kit (Jason) Chan</td>
<td>Washington Univ.</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Zlatan Krizan</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Loreto Prieto</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Shana Carpenter</td>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Bethany Weber</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Kevin Blankenship</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Max Guyl</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Sarah Greathouse</td>
<td>City Univ., NY</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Jonathan Kelly</td>
<td>Univ. of California</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Kristi Costabile</td>
<td>Univ. of California</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Christian Meissner</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Marcus Credé</td>
<td>U of Illinois, Urbana</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Phillips, Leigh (Alison)</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Marsee, Monica</td>
<td>U of New Orleans</td>
<td>SOC &amp; COG</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preamble

Psychology is an emerging science, just beginning its second century. Yet, it surely will be a
dominant science in the 21st century due to the social significance of its basic and applied research.
Society is being forced to seriously address (not just debate) its major problems. These problems include
economic productivity, personnel selection, education and learning, child and elderly care, mental illness,
diversity, dropout and drug-abuse prevention, adolescent risk-behaviors, literacy, crime, group conflict,
and health care. Every one of these issues is in large part behavioral—problems of how people develop,
of how to train and motivate people, or of how people relate to one another; they all fall in the province of
psychology. To develop effective plans to improve our society, we must not only draw upon what we
know about behavior but also expand our knowledge-base through programmatic basic and applied
research in psychology. Some of this research may have immediate applications (e.g., decline in risk-
behaviors), whereas the application potential of other projects (e.g., human learning and brain function) is
in the future. Both forms of research are critical, however. As the famous psychologist, Kurt Lewin
observed, “There is nothing so practical as a good theory.” With appropriate knowledge, social issues
can be addressed wisely.

Findings from psychological laboratories and field studies often augment research in other
disciplines. For example, they have led to cost-effective applications in factories, the ophthalmologist’s
office, airplane cockpits, training of air crews and astronauts, reading x-rays, and abuse liability of drugs.
The spinoffs of psychological research are not so much new products as new ways of helping people
directly or of helping people to effectively use new technology and advances in science. This is a form of
technology transfer. Psychology contributes to the better use of our human resources directly and by
augmenting work conducted in other disciplines.

The future of psychological science is exciting. The ISU Psychology Department is positioning
itself to be an active leader in that future, not just a participant. When the current Departmental Executive
Office (Craig A. Anderson) was recruited, the Department made it clear that its long-term goal is to rank
among the top 25 psychology departments in the country, and the Department Chair’s main charge was
to lead the department a significant way toward that goal. This goal was reinforced by Dean Dobson of
the College of Liberal Arts and Science and by Provost Seagrave. The department’s highest priority
continues to be to continue to conduct high quality research that augments the scientific knowledge base
and advances the frontiers of science.

Our national standing in research, however, will not be increased at the expense of
undergraduate and graduate education. The reciprocal interaction between research and teaching
ensures the maintenance of high quality undergraduate and graduate education in a university setting. In
addition, new models of education will be pursued in response to changing student needs, growth of our
discipline, and increased need for efficiency. We must prepare students for a changing world where they
fully understand and critically think about societal problems and become active contributors to the
development of wise solutions.

Finally, our role also includes public outreach. Knowledge gained through our research can
frequently be directly implemented to benefit our constituents. Good psychological science, basic and
applied, promotes good public policy. The Department of Psychology has successfully influenced public
policy in numerous ways in recent years. We also train scientific practitioners for a variety of professional
practice domains. In sum, our educational, research, and public outreach missions can be seen as
consisting of four overlapping components, as illustrated in Figure 1.
The four components of basic science, applied science, public policy, and professional practice combine in myriad ways and are integral parts of all of our major missions. At the undergraduate level, our teaching is based on the science of psychology. We prepare our majors for careers in a variety of domains, including professional practice and public policy. Furthermore, large numbers of our undergraduates gain invaluable experience in research by working with our faculty and graduate students. Finally, we teach large numbers of non-majors, exposing them to key psychological concepts that will prove useful to them in a variety of domains.

At the graduate level, we prepare students for careers in research, teaching, and professional practice. Some become researchers in university settings, some become professional counselors in various mental health and school settings, some become applied researchers in private industry or governmental organizations. All four components are keys to success.
Recent Accomplishments

This section summarizes information described in greater detail in the companion document "A Comparative Study of Departments of Psychology."

The Department of Psychology has been performing very well on every major mission of our institution. We teach more student credit hours per instructional faculty FTE than any unit at ISU except for Microbiology. We are the 6th most popular major at ISU. Our undergraduate majors consistently outperform the national average on the GRE-Psychology advanced test.

Our graduate students also perform very well. In recent years all of our Counseling Program graduate students have been placed in high quality internship programs, an outcome that has become increasingly difficult with the expansion of HMOs and the resulting contraction of mental health care services. All of our recent Social Psychology Ph.D. who wanted careers in academic settings have successfully obtained such positions immediately upon completing our program.

The research productivity remains high as well. We obtain external funding (per faculty member) at a level that surpasses comparison Peer 11, Big 12, and Big 10 Departments of Psychology (28 grants, $16 million, in the last 5 fiscal years). Our 75th percentile citation count is higher than at the comparison Peer 11, Big 12, and Big 10 Departments of Psychology. Our average citation count increased almost 9% in the last year. A recent analysis of productivity rates of Counseling Psychology Ph.D. programs found our program to be the 3rd most productive (out 40).

Several of our faculty have had a huge impact on important public policy issues. Professor Wells' research on eyewitness evidence led to him to be appointed co-chair of Attorney General Janet Reno's task force charged with developing the first set of federal guidelines on the handling of eyewitness evidence. Professor Epperson's research on recidivism of sexual offenders led to the adoption of his prediction instrument in all states that have sexual predator laws. Professor Bushman's research media violence, on venting, and other related topics has led to interviews on numerous TV and radio news shows (Dateline, 20/20...), in newspapers, magazines, and online news outlets. Professor Anderson's research on violent video games has resulted in the passage of several city and state ordinances designed to increase parental control over access to violent media by their minor children. Other public policy issues that have been influenced by our faculty researchers include risk behaviors of a variety of kinds by adolescents.

These accomplishments have occurred despite the fact that we have fewer resources than relevant comparison universities or other ISU departments. We have fewer faculty, less space, lower operating budget, fewer staff, and fewer graduate assistant lines. Indeed, in the last two years our resources have dwindled despite this incredible productivity and increasing enrollments. We have relied increasingly on temporary instructors. Faculty do many tasks that typically are done by staff at other institutions. We teach more than do top research departments. We have "done more with less" for some time, but are now stretched beyond a reasonable limit. The only way we can increase research productivity (publications, grants...) without increasing resources is to cut other faculty activities (i.e., teaching, service, outreach). We strongly believe that the most appropriate solution for the university is to enhance our department with additional resources, perhaps by reallocating them from less productive units both within and outside of LAS. One immediate consequence of our current low resource state is that other universities have begun attempting to lure our top faculty away, and it appears that those attempts are getting harder to resist.

The Department of Psychology is at a very important crossroad. We are poised to make a major leap towards becoming a top 25 department. But we are also stretched so thin on all resource dimensions that we could easily slide into mediocrity. The action plan and the "Comparative Study" document assume that the current ISU administration want us to succeed in our quest to "become the best," will build on strength, and will commit significant resources to this end.
Long-range Goals and the Process Proposed for their Attainment

Primary Goal:
To become a leading contributor to the development and application of knowledge pertinent to human behavior and human resources, as reflected in the achievement of recognition as one of the top 25 psychology departments in the country.

Other Goals:

I. Enhance undergraduate and graduate education through a continuous examination and modification of the curriculum in anticipation of 21st century psychology and changing needs of students.

II. Enhance professional education and training and direct public outreach to our constituents.

III. Provide leadership regarding the scientific understanding of diversity.

IV. Promote the transfer of scientific information to appropriate users, such as public policy makers and other educational institutions.

Processes:

We will continue to capitalize upon the differing but symbiotic talents of our faculty and, thereby, promote differential assignments. Then, according to both performance and assigned effort, we will reward and facilitate individuals’ contributions to research, teaching, professional practice, and outreach. Most of all, we will reaffirm our commitment to quality rather than quantity of scholarly productivity.

We will build upon strength or already achieved excellence and facilitate cooperative research in specific areas of distinction. The department has recognized that it cannot be excellent in all areas of psychology; such a philosophy inevitably leads to mediocrity. To this end, the department cut several graduate programs in order to concentrate on three areas of strength: cognitive, counseling, and social psychology. Our current plan is to:

I. Continue to focus on getting each of these three areas up to strength.

II. Rebuild a developmental area, with an emphasis on contributions to the three current areas.

III. Maintain top quality faculty and graduate students in each of the three current areas while bringing in top developmental faculty and graduate students.

In essence, these four key areas will provide a stable platform upon which our various research, teaching, public policy, and professional practice activities will be based. We have developed a five-year action plan to help us achieve these goals, which is present after the next section on strategies.

Strategies to Achieve Long-Range Goals

Primary Goal: National recognition for research excellence (i.e., a top 25 department).

Strategy 1: Hiring and developing outstanding faculty. New hires will vary in rank, with at least half being assistant professors. Some senior hires are needed to provide leadership, especially in the cognitive and developmental areas. It is advantageous for beginning scholars to initiate careers in departments offering colleagues with world-class expertise in areas related to their own. These more experienced faculty serve as mentors, offer feedback on research ideas and methodology, assist in gaining access to research participants or university/community resources, and provide guidance in publication and external funding. Stimulating colleagues facilitate faculty and graduate student recruitment, retention of nationally visible faculty, and the attainment of external funding for research and training.


**Strategy 2: Fostering the development of assistant professors.** This strategy recognizes and responds to the principle that it takes more than just world-class talent (what the department recruits for) to ensure the development of world-class achievement (the departmental goal for new hires). Among those with potential, excellence ensues from the “accumulation of advantage.” That is, taking advantage of one opportunity and performing well therein leads to other opportunities, with the effects becoming multiplicative. Enhancing the development of assistant professors eventually leads to enhancement of the department. It also enables the department to more successfully recruit top candidates. To foster the development of assistant professors, we will:

1. Give them lightened teaching loads until they go up for tenure

2. Provide senior faculty mentors

3. Minimize departmental service commitments.

4. If sufficient additional resources come to the department, we will also institute an in-house grant preparation program in which one month of summer salary will be provided to encourage grant preparation instead of summer teaching.

**Strategy 3: Fostering the development and retention of faculty.** An environment that is positive and facilitates faculty productivity enhances commitment, loyalty, and retention. It also helps faculty “accumulate advantage.”

1. Revive (i.e., fund) our former policy of temporary teaching load reductions where associate/full professors are granted a one-year reduced teaching load to facilitate scholarly productivity. The concept is similar to a faculty improvement leave. Possible projects would include: completion of a book or significant research project, an ambitious grant proposal, a review or theoretical article for a top journal (e.g., *Psychological Review*), or a featured article in the *American Psychologist*. Up to a two course reduction for one year is proposed, with no faculty member teaching less than two courses per year. Up to two awards would be made annually and would not be awarded to the same person more than once every three years.

2. The appropriate research/scholarship agenda for a faculty member changes with age and experience. Writing books or review articles, editing journals, and professional leadership, for example, may be especially appropriate undertakings in the advanced stages of an academic career. The department will support faculty in making appropriate transitions.

3. Encourage the formation of research teams, perhaps cross-disciplinary in nature, focused on projects of high interest and visibility.

4. Encourage the formation of new inter-disciplinary programs in faculty areas of expertise, supplementing those in neuroscience, women’s studies, etc.

5. Research in I/O psychology has demonstrated that annual performance evaluation enhances productivity. We will continue this form of faculty development.

**Strategy 4: Provide an environment that optimizes faculty productivity.** In comparison to top-ranked psychology departments, our department is competitive in terms of faculty autonomy and flexibility. We are becoming increasingly competitive in providing laboratory space and equipment necessary for conducting state-of-the-art psychological research. This trend must continue. Yet some faculty were hired before start-up funds became available, leaving them in an intractable situation. Moreover, rapid technological advances are making some equipment obsolete. These problems need to be addressed.
1. Provide faculty with state-of-the-art equipment, critical for the development of their research programs and training of graduate students.

2. Invest in faculty to enable them to conduct their work in an efficient manner and to present findings at national/international forums.

3. Create a fund to allow faculty without sufficient resources to capitalize on the chance factors that present themselves; the development of excellence is due in part to capitalizing on "the smile of good fortune." Examples include: conducting a research study quickly when an unforeseen opportunity presents itself, developing a grant where turn-around time is short, and conducting a pilot study or additional study that increases chances of external funding or paper acceptance.

4. Set aside a fund for each program area to use for enhancing development and national standing of the area and, hence, the department.

5. Develop an outstanding colloquium series.

6. Continue our current flexible work load policy, which allows different mixes of teaching, research, and service activity in way which maximizes the collective excellence of the department.

**Strategy 5: Commitment to quality.** Quality of scholarship is primary in moving the department towards national distinction.

1. While both quality and quantity of scholarship are important for development of excellence, quality is of greater importance. The department will not sacrifice quality (of journal articles, books, monographs, etc.) for quantity, but will do the converse.

2. Target our publications for the best relevant journals (e.g., quality at least equivalent to APA/APS journals), perhaps targeting particular journals.

3. Several faculty conduct research important to audiences not reached by psychology's primary journals. While such faculty must communicate with the consumers of their work, they do have the added responsibility of communicating with their discipline through its primary journals.

**Strategy 6: Increase grant support.** When faculty obtain external funds to support their research and scholarly activities, not only does it benefit the individuals themselves it also benefits the whole department and the university. It increases our national visibility; it also reduces pressure on the departmental budget, allowing for greater support of other faculty members so that they too can be more productive.

1. Provide resources to assist faculty in developing and submitting grants.

2. Create a "safety net" fund to assist faculty when between grants.

**Strategy 7: Post-doctoral education.** Post-doctoral education is gaining increasing importance in psychology and facilitates research productivity of faculty. We will develop post-doctoral training opportunities in the department and seek external support in targeted areas.

**Goal: Enhance high-quality undergraduate instruction.**

The Psychology Department is proud of its reputation for providing high-quality undergraduate education to large numbers of students. Students learn about all four key components—basic science, applied science, public policy, and professional practice—often by direct participation. Our program can be enhanced further by adding more breadth and depth to its lean curriculum. Our large class sizes in upper level courses, however, remain problematic. Adding faculty and graduate assistants will help with this problem. Most importantly, we need to prepare students for a changing world, not only in terms of
technology, but also in terms of its complex human problems. Students need to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for solving society’s problems, and they need to effectively communicate their knowledge and skills. We have recently created a Director of Undergraduate Studies position to help manage, evaluate, and develop our undergraduate program.

Strategy 1: Use teaching resources wisely. Teaching loads will vary across faculty as a function of differential talents and other responsibilities (e.g., scholarly products generated). Tenured or tenure-track faculty will continue to teach core courses, and we will place senior faculty in frontier courses whenever feasible.

Strategy 2: Ensure that psychology course-work enables students to learn to think in the analytic and data-based fashion that defines psychology so that students become wise contributors to solutions of society’s problems. As a result of the curriculum, students should:

1. Become able to identify and apply principles of psychological science to a wide variety of vocational and social settings and problems.
2. Become discerning consumers of social science research.
4. Become critical thinkers who recognize the need for empirical data and who are able to interpret and apply data and knowledge when solving problems.
5. Develop an understanding of diversity issues.

Strategy 3: Ensure that students receive adequate communication intensive experiences (including written, oral, visual and electronic communication). Within the constraints of available resources, the department should:

1. Incorporate more lab and writing experiences and training in methods and technology into our classes. This process has already begun by the creation of labs for 440, the creation of the 102 lab class for all majors, and the creation of a required laboratory course (302) for all B.S. students.
2. Consider offering laboratory, discussion, and/or interactive technology sections to complement other lecture classes.
3. Evaluate the curriculum to consider where oral presentations might be incorporated.

Strategy 4: Provide more breadth in the undergraduate curriculum. Students need to have the opportunity and flexibility to take course work in a variety of content areas within psychology and, thereby, gain breadth in their training and knowledge-base. This is critical for preparing students to become more productive members of society. It also responds to current demands for career relevance. Specific steps include:

1. Encourage the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to examine the nature and breadth of current core requirements and the curriculum as a whole on a continuing basis. It should ensure that students receive a meaningful combination of learning experiences in an efficient manner. It also should consider revisions of course offerings to ensure general education service to the university, while appropriately managing enrollment in upper-level courses.
2. Encourage the counseling, social, and cognitive programs to offer a wider variety of advanced undergraduate courses in their areas of specialty.
3. Respond to students’ needs for flexibility and career relevance for course-work while developing a rigorous program of study.
4. Encourage faculty in the new developmental program to offer advanced undergraduate courses in this domain. (To be done only if a new developmental area is created.)

**Strategy 5: Provide more depth in the undergraduate curriculum.** Specific tasks include:

1. Enhance Psychology's contributions to and participation in the honors program.
2. Encourage development of undergraduate seminars that explore one topic in depth.
3. Provide opportunities for student research and internships/practica.
4. Develop mechanisms to assist and prepare our majors for graduate school (about 40% go on to graduate school in psychology and other professional programs). (Example: encouraging presentations at undergraduate research conferences.)
5. Encourage qualified undergraduates to take more graduate-level courses.

**Strategy 6: Enhance instruction through systematic evaluation procedures.** We plan to continue gathering and evaluating assessment data from multiple sources, including GRE Psychology Advanced exams, exit interviews with graduating seniors, employment data, and alumni surveys.

**Goal: Enhance graduate education.**

Our doctoral program also focuses on all four key components—basic science, applied science, public policy, and professional practice. Our program educates students to become sophisticated psychological scientists who, in turn, add to the knowledge on how to better use human resources. Investments of faculty time and other resources in educating new generations of psychological scientists serve to facilitate our goal of becoming one of the top 25 departments in the country. The research contributions of Ph.D. graduates drive to some extent the perceived quality of a department. In addition, well-trained graduate students can reach a level of competence during their last years of training to acquire the functional status of a research colleague.

Formal course-work is necessary but not sufficient for producing high quality Ph.D.s. Most significant is the apprenticeship with the major professor, wherein critical one-on-one interactions take place. It is through this apprenticeship that students develop scientific taste, standards, and self-confidence and truly master the knowledge-base of their domain. Thus, providing high quality apprenticeships enables the department to reach its goal of producing Ph.D.s who not only consume, but also produce scientific products autonomously and do so over the course of their careers. It is the major professor who provides this apprenticeship and, thereby, ensures high quality of Ph.D.s.

**Strategy 1: Place greater emphasis on graduate supervision in faculty evaluation.**
Graduate supervision should be evaluated and counted as part of teaching, using quality indices that go beyond sheer number of students supervised (e.g., interviewing graduate students in their final year, inspecting graduate students’ vitae, noting placement of graduates).

**Strategy 2: Encourage each program area to conduct a research seminar.** Critical in graduate education is the opportunity to present one’s research ideas and results to an audience of peers, colleagues, and mentors who can offer feedback and guidance. Responsibility for conducting a research seminar should rotate among faculty in the area, with the person responsible receiving course credit.
Strategy 3: Provide resources for enhancing graduate student scholarship and productivity.

1. Continue the recent emphasis on graduate work in methods, measurement, and statistics.
2. Continue to add more domain-specific courses or seminars to our lean graduate curriculum.
3. Continue to provide graduate students access to state-of-the-art equipment.
4. Re-establish a competitive fund to assist graduate students in carrying out high quality empirical work.
5. Continue our exemplary teaching of psychology program for Ph.D. students.

Strategy 4: Recruit outstanding graduate students and then maintain their excellence.

The department must have increased assistantship funding to deliver high-quality instruction and to support/recruit graduate students. With increased funding, the department could:

1. Provide summer support to outstanding applicants.
2. Expand the fund to host and interview top graduate applicants.
3. Reward excellent performance in non-class activities through summer support, travel money, research support, and/or tuition credits.

Goal: Enhance professional education and training.

The strength of our counseling program is that it is truly committed to the scientist/practitioner model, with science bringing rigor and credibility to practice and practice giving science relevance. Through the integration of science and practice, our counseling program faculty and students make important scientific and applied contributions to the better use of human resources. They provide both direct service and advance the frontiers of knowledge. Consequently, our program will continue to seek preeminence in professional associations and on conventional indices of scholarship.

Strategy 1: Increase the number of core faculty members within our professional programs. Continued and consistent efforts need to be expended to expeditiously augment existing core faculty in our counseling program with additional scholars at advanced and junior levels (using positions already allocated for this purpose), consistent with the three targeted content areas. These new faculty members must demonstrate excellence in scholarship and embrace the scientist/practitioner training model.

Strategy 2: Utilize qualified practitioners as adjunct instructors for some applied classes. Recruit high quality practitioners in the community, with appropriate experience, to teach some of the applied courses (i.e., practicum & assessment). This will enhance the overall curriculum and enable core faculty to focus more on scholarship and research mentoring. Stable funding needs to be secured for these adjunct faculty to maintain optimal continuity in the curriculum.

Goal: Provide leadership regarding the scientific understanding of diversity.

The discipline of psychology is central to contemporary efforts to enhance opportunities for the full range of humanity. The study of diversity or, in psychology, human individual differences is one of two major themes in American psychology. It is our goal to objectively quantify behavioral phenomena and better understand their causal antecedents. This is how psychology approaches the study of diversity, and it does so with many different methods. The department should be open and receptive to all scientific methods. Nonscientific methods may occupy an important place in the university community but not necessarily within psychology.
Strategy 1: Examine undergraduate and graduate curriculum to assess the consideration of human diversity in course-work and the integration of diversity issues into the content. Specific tasks include:

1. Enhance sections dealing with diversity or individual and group differences in large enrollment introductory service courses such as Psych 101 and Psych 230.

2. Establish an undergraduate course on individual differences at the 200 or 300 level. Its aim would be to provide a scientific understanding of diversity.

3. Examine the graduate program to ensure that content on diversity is included.

Strategy 2: Recruit highly qualified faculty who will enhance diversity

Strategy 3: Recruit highly qualified students who will enhance diversity

Evaluation of Plan

Our primary goal is to increase the national standing of the Psychology Department. The most respected survey of departmental reputation is conducted by the National Research Council. In 1995, the ISU Psychology Department was ranked at 79 (out of 185). By the year 2006 we would like to be in the top 45, while continuing our move to the top 25. Additional indices would be journal article publications, citation counts, major addresses, grant support, and record of receiving national awards.

Our outcomes assessment procedure for the undergraduate program will include examination of the GRE scores of our students, the proportion who enroll in graduate school, and senior surveys. For improving our graduate program, the most obvious evaluation measure would be to track the number of strong scholars and practitioners produced per faculty member over time and to compare our “hit rate” with other top-rated departments. We also would examine the quantity and quality of publications produced by our graduate students and awards received. Finally, our professional training program in counseling is assessed by external accreditation reviews (e.g., by the American Psychological Association), employment data, and performance on the licensure examination.

The public policy aspect of our mission can additionally be assessed by examining the extent to which work done by our faculty and students influences important public policy issues at the state, national, and international levels. For example, Dr. Wells' research on eyewitness testimony led to the creation of the first set of Federal guidelines on the handling of eyewitness evidence. Drs. Gibbons and Gerrard continue to influence the health psychology domain with their ongoing research on understanding and risk behaviors of adolescents (e.g., sun exposure, risky sexual behavior). Drs. Cutrona and Russell's work on stress, vulnerability, and resiliency also continues to have an important impact on public policy. Dr. Epperson's work on predicting recidivism of sexual offenders has influenced public policy on enforcement of sexual predator laws. Dr. Anderson's work on violent video games, which has influenced public policy on giving parents more control over their children's access to such games. Other research projects by current faculty that have had an impact on modern society include: the dangers of "venting" as a means of dealing with anger; how to attract and retain women to the physical sciences and engineering; childhood depression and aggressive behaviors; interest assessments for vocational counseling; retention issues and policies for students and university employees.
The Five-Year Action Plan

In the Fall of 1999, the Department Chair and Psychology staff initiated a self-study in order to pave the way for the development of a long range plan. The resulting document examines where the department currently stands on a number of key dimensions, in comparison to relevant target groups of Psychology Departments around the country and in comparison to other ISU departments (see "A Comparative Study of Departments of Psychology"). The five-year action plan is based on the comparative study and on our long-range goals. To achieve the goals set out in earlier departmental plans, reaffirmed by Dean Dobson and Provost Seagrave at the hiring of Department Chair Anderson, and outlined at the beginning of this planning document, several important actions must be taken.

Departmental actions

**Space.** The department has recently completed major renovations of office and lab space in Science Hall I and Lagomarcino Hall, using mostly funds saved from vacant faculty lines, substantial additional funds from LAS, and lessor amounts from the Provost's office. The department has also committed substantial funds for the construction of a multimedia computing laboratory, with additional funds from LAS. The department has also funded renovations in Pearson Hall for the OPPTAG program, as part of their move from Psychology space in Lagomarcino Hall. There are no major new space renovations planned for the next few years, unless new space needing renovation is made available.

**Hiring.** The department currently has 24 faculty (3 with split appointments), and 4 vacant lines, yielding 26.5 FTEs. We will continue to search for top research faculty in the cognitive and counseling areas, with a goal of reaching 7 FTE or 8 faculty in each within the next 3 years. We expect three retirements by 2004. We have one tenure case coming up in 2001-2002. All open lines from retirements, resignations, and new lines, will be filled according to the program plan outlined in the next section. All faculty searches will focus on research productivity, though other factors such as teaching needs will play an important role. This plan assumes that the university provides the resources needed to bring our department up to the size and support similar to that provided to appropriate comparison universities. As will be outlined in a later section, the key resources needed are faculty lines, graduate student funds, staff lines, space, and general operating funds.

**Preliminary program plan.** The 1997 external review suggested that the department build on its strengths. Specifically, it recommended that we:

Target the two strongest programs, social psychology and psychometrics and applied individual differences, for growth, maintain or slightly enhance the American Psychological Association accredited program in counseling psychology and the program in experimental psychology, and allow school psychology to merge into the program in counseling psychology.

Because of changes in personnel that took place very shortly after the external review, the department modified this recommendation as follows:

...we have focused faculty resources in our three most established and stable doctoral programs: counseling psychology, experimental (cognitive) psychology, and social psychology. School psychology and psychometrics and applied individual differences were eliminated. The elimination of school psychology was congruent with the external review recommendation. Given the loss of faculty in the psychometrics and applied individual differences area shortly after the external review, we believe that those resources are better invested in other programs.

The external review also recommended that the department continue to emphasize three specific research areas: health, individual differences, and intervention/prevention. The department response to the report concurred with this recommendation, noting that:
The strategy of emphasizing research areas that bridge between graduate programs has worked well for the department and will continue. The specific research areas and the relative emphasis placed on each may change somewhat in the future because of recent personnel changes.

In fact, recent changes in the faculty have resulted in a shift in departmental emphasis and strengths in a way that is more congruent with the overall mission of ISU as a land grant institution. Specifically, the major overarching strength of the department is the link between psychological science and public policy, broadly defined. Under this umbrella, we have major strengths in health psychology, media violence, law enforcement procedures, and training, intervention, prevention, and selection processes. Other strengths that fit under this umbrella are likely to emerge as we continue to fill vacant lines, replace retiring faculty, and add new faculty lines and graduate students.

A careful consideration of our current strengths, the needs of the State of Iowa, and data from the comparative study leads to the conclusion that we must add a fourth speciality area to our Ph.D. program, and that this specialty should be in developmental psychology broadly defined. Many of the key issues facing modern society revolve around the successful (or unsuccessful) development of healthy, productive individuals who contribute to society in positive ways. Developmental issues interface with all of our existing strengths in the social, counseling, and cognitive specialties, and with our target research areas of health psychology, media violence, law enforcement procedures, and training, intervention, prevention, and selection processes. Thus, there would be considerable potential for innovative collaborative projects within the department, as well with other units on the ISU campus (e.g., ISBR, HDFS, Institute for Science & Society).

Many of the developmental hires would have a foot firmly planted in both the developmental area and in one of our other three areas. For example, there have been a number of important breakthroughs in the area of cognition and ageing, and there currently exists considerable funding opportunities in this interface. Similarly, there are many important social development issues, many of which are quite fundable. Several current faculty already do much developmental research, and several of those have had substantial external funding for their research.

At a minimum, we will need 32 FTE faculty lines, spread relatively evenly across the four areas. The target distribution of these 32 FTEs among the 4 areas is:

I. minimum of 7 FTEs in each of the three current areas (cognitive, counseling, and social)
II. minimum of 8 faculty in each of the three current areas (some split between areas or departments/centers/institutes)
III. minimum of 5 FTEs in the developmental area
IV. minimum of 6 faculty in the developmental area (some split between areas or departments)
V. an addition 4-6 faculty FTEs "unaffiliated" with the four content areas to provide teaching and training needs not explicitly covered by faculty in those four areas. For example, we must hire someone with strong biological and/or neural expertise to handle such teaching needs in both our undergraduate and graduate programs. Such a hire could come from any of the four specified program areas, or could be a joint hire with another department or unit.

Once all teaching needs and the above minimums are met, subsequent hires will be based on open searches, with the following criteria guiding the interview and hiring processes:

- Strength of research record
- Ability to fill critical instructional needs at the graduate and undergraduate levels
- Ability to contribute to the health psychology, media violence, law enforcement procedures, and training, intervention, prevention, and selection processes foci
- Joint (split) appointments to related departments/centers/institutes
With 32 (or more) FTE faculty lines, this area distribution plan allows for considerable flexibility in the structure of the department. We believe that this is important because it will encourage cross-area and inter-departmental collaborations and allows the department to respond relatively quickly and effectively to rapid changes in societal needs and funding opportunities.

**Grants.** Although we remain firmly committed to hiring the best people for our various program areas, we plan to take into account (to some extent) grant histories (for senior positions) and grant possibilities (for junior positions) in future hires. Indeed, we already do this, and both of our cognitive hires for this year look very good on this dimension. The department has historically supported a large number of graduate students with grants, and expects to continue to do so in the future. Our goal, once our faculty size is up to 32 or so, is to have about 100 graduate students on campus (i.e., not counting those on internships). We expect slightly more than half to be funded by the departmental Graduate Assistant budget line, and the remaining from grants and other sources (e.g., Student Counseling Services).

**Teaching.** As new faculty are added we will be adding new courses to our undergraduate and graduate programs, adding more sections to currently over-subscribed courses, and replacing temporary faculty with our own tenure track faculty. We plan to add more of the WOVE communication elements (written, oral, visual, & electronic; from ISUcomm I & II) to our classes as new faculty lines are added to help us deal with enrollment pressures. We expect the number of majors and the number of student credit hours to continue to increase. In recent years we have been unable to meet student demand for our courses because of a lack of faculty, and cannot sufficiently improve the communication skills of our students until additional faculty and graduate assistant lines are added to the department.

**University commitments**

The following university commitments are essential to the continuing success of the Department of Psychology. Given the large number of students that we currently teach, the growth in student numbers that has occurred in recent years, the success of the department in research productivity, grant activity, and public policy impact, the commitment of these resources would seem to be a wise investment for the State of Iowa. These recommendations are based on the companion document "A Comparative Study of Departments of Psychology."

**Faculty lines.** The average faculty size of the comparison universities is just under 36. We believe that with the proper level of resources and judicious decision-making in hiring, retention, tenure, and promotions, we can achieve our main goals with 32 FTE. That is an increase of 5.5 FTES. If one or more of our currently split appointment faculty leaves, we might have to add yet another FTE line. Please note that this is not an "initial bargaining level" request. It's hard to imagine how we can be substantially more successful than other major Psychology Departments if we continue to be substantially smaller than they are. We are proposing to remain 4 FTE lines smaller than the competition, in part because of a healthy dose of reality concerning current ISU budgets and in part because we believe that we can successfully compete at that size. We would not need all the lines in the first enhancement year, but would need a commitment for all lines in that year to facilitate hiring top faculty. One of the major obstacles we've faced in recruiting faculty in recent years and in retaining current faculty is skepticism about "expected" lines for future hires.

**Graduate students.** As several recent job candidates have pointed out to us, and as the comparative study shows, we badly need increased university funds to support graduate students. We currently have sufficient funds in our Graduate Assistants line ($275,655) to support about 25 graduate students at $11,000 for 9 months, which is slightly below the average paid by comparison universities in the 1998-1999 academic year. The average comparison university supports more than 52 graduate students. Because graduate student stipends at our competitor universities have increased in the years since the comparative study target year, we need to increase our 9-month departmental stipends to at least $12,000, which means a GA line of $624,000 to support 52 graduate students. Thus, we will need an increase of $348,345 over the next five years.
Also, the university must begin providing full tuition for all full time graduate students (those with at least a quarter time GA appointment). Otherwise, our stipends will need to be higher to offset this cost and to keep us competitive with other major research universities.

**Support staff.** Although the average comparison university has more than 17 more support staff than we do (Peer 11 departments have 13 more), we believe that an increase of 6 (beyond our current 4) would be sufficient. We need (when fully staffed) at least 2 full time computer people, one of whom would be a programmer, the other would be a more general systems person. We need to create a grants administration and preparation office, which would require two people. We also need another person to assist with student advising, enrollment, and management tasks, and another office administrator. Our faculty currently do many of these tasks on their own, which takes them away from the classroom, their research, and their public practice/outreach/public policy activities.

**General operating budget (Supplies & Services).** Our Supplies and Services budget in 1998-1999 was $105,000 short of the average budget for the comparison universities. This past year we converted two faculty lines to deal with this problem and the budget cuts imposed across the departments in LAS (and other colleges). Our current S&S budget is still over $28,000 short of the comparison university average in 1998-1999. Although an additional $30,000 increase would still leave us behind current levels of funding in the comparison universities, we believe it would be sufficient for the near future, as long as we continue to use "block" budgeting and continue to receive most of the salary funds from vacant lines.

**Space.** The comparison university data suggest that a psychology department needs about 1300 square feet of space per faculty member. Interestingly, a recent email from the Chair of Psychology at Syracuse University indicated that when they were remodelling, the architecture firm they hired independently came up with this same estimate of 1300 NASF (net assignable square feet) per faculty member for Research I Departments of Psychology. Based on that number we currently have space sufficient for 16-17 faculty. We currently have 24 faculty, have hired two additional faculty, and intend to hire 2-3 more within the next year.

How have we managed with such little space? Several factors are involved. First, some of our faculty do not need much laboratory research space, either because they currently do little research (and a lot of teaching), or their research is done in other lab space on campus, or because most of their research is done in field settings. Some of these faculty will be retiring within the next few years, and will likely be replaced by researchers who need modern lab space. Second, we have virtually no research support staff, who therefore take up no space. This factor must change if we hope to compete successfully in the near future. Third, a lot of faculty have been extremely cooperative and creative in finding ways to share research space. We expect this to continue.

Overall, we believe that we can accomplish our goals with 10-15% less space than the comparison universities. In other words, we think that 1100 - 1150 square feet per faculty member would be sufficient. At 32 FTEs, that comes to a minimum of 35,200 square feet, an increase of just over 13,000 square feet from what we currently have. Ideally, this space needs to adjoin our current space in Science Hall I or Lagomarcino Hall.
Summary

Based on the comparison data presented in the "Comparative Study" document and on considerations detailed in this Long Range Plan, the Department of Psychology needs to grow in the following ways:

- 32 faculty FTEs (+ 5.5 from FY 2001 level)
- $624,000 in the Graduate Assistant line (+$348,345 from FY 2001 level)
- 10 P&S and Merit staff FTEs (+6 from FY 2001 level)
- $196,000 Supplies & Services line (+$30,000 FY 2001 level)
- 35,200 NASF (+13,000 FY 2001 level).

The proposed action plan takes the department forward along the path suggested by an external review that took place in 1997. We have streamlined our programs at the graduate level, have improved the quality of existing space, and have improved the undergraduate programs as well. We have made a very promising start in the building of the cognitive program, and have laid the groundwork for adding a developmental program that will be closely integrated with our other programs. At this point, we need a firm commitment of resources from the University to further our goal of becoming one of the best programs in psychology in the country. Without such a commitment, we will likely see a slide into mediocrity as top faculty will likely depart, and recruiting of top faculty will likely become impossible.