

DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES
Indiana University

Contents	Page
Establishment of Policies	i
Faculty Recruitment	A
Reappointment and Review of Non-Tenured Faculty	B
Procedures and Criteria for Determination of Faculty Salaries	C
Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	D
Procedures for Retention, Evaluation and Promotion of Clinical Faculty and Hires	E
Appointment and Reappointment of Non-Tenured staff	F
The Administrative Structure of the Department	G
Department Policy on Voting Rights	H
Process of the Selection of the Chair	I
Graduate Student Policies	J
Curriculum	K
Teaching Responsibilities	L
Office Procedures	M
Grievances	N

ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNING PROCEDURES

The policies and procedures described in this document have been presented to the faculty of the Department of Telecommunications in a series of faculty meetings held during the 1985-1986 and 1986-1987 academic years. Each policy or set of procedures has been thoroughly discussed, and each policy or set of procedures has been approved by at least a majority of the faculty members.

These policies and procedures will be systematically reviewed by the faculty of the Department on a regular basis with the first review to be conducted when deemed necessary.

(Adopted 2-6-87)

INTERIM POLICY

Pending completion of the current review of the department's policies, the December, 1986 policy on membership and duties of the Advisory Committee is amended to specify that the Chairperson of the department serves, ex officio, as a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee.

(Adopted 9-30-94)

ADOPTION OF POLICIES

For purposes of adopting and revising departmental policies, the following people have the right to vote: all full-time employees of Indiana University affiliated with the Department of Telecommunications, the Department Administrative Assistant, one representative of the Telecommunications Department graduate student population, and one representative of the Telecommunications Department undergraduate student population.

Policies will be adopted upon the majority vote of all eligible voters attending a meeting when a quorum of eligible voters is present.

(Adopted 4-28-95)

FACULTY RECRUITMENT DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

I. Tenured, tenure-track, and permanent non-tenured recruitment.

When the need to recruit tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenured permanent faculty arises, the chairperson, with the advice of the Advisory Committee, requests authorization to recruit from the Dean of the College. The Department, based on recommendations from the Chair and the Executive Committee, will identify fields or areas in which the Department will search. The Advisory Committee proposes a draft job description and announcement which is presented to the faculty for approval. Following this decision, the Chair will designate a search committee(s) to coordinate recruitment and screening. Each search committee will consist of at least one member of the Advisory Committee, the Department Chairperson, and as many other faculty members as appropriate.

The job announcement is circulated and published. Compliance with Affirmative Action and University hiring policies and procedures is maintained and reported. Applicant files and correspondence are maintained.

After review of the candidates' application materials by the search and screen committee a recommendation and ranking of finalists is presented to the faculty. The faculty determines who is to be interviewed.

The department chairperson makes the necessary arrangement for candidate visits. After candidate interviews and presentations, the faculty recommends hiring to the departmental chairperson for presentation to the Dean of the College.

The department chairperson, with the advice of the Merit Review Committee, negotiates the questions of salary, support, and contractual conditions of employment with the appropriate Dean(s) in formulating the offer to hire, and conducts subsequent negotiations which may be needed.

II. Visiting and Adjunct faculty recruitment

When hiring visiting and adjunct faculty, the department chairperson will consult with the Advisory Committee.

(Adopted 4-21-86) (Revised 4-28-95) (Revised 4-30-04)

REAPPOINTMENT AND REVIEW OF NON-TENURED FACULTY

DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. At the time of initial appointment, a file will be started and maintained on each faculty member. The Chairman will ask the faculty member to submit for this file each year, along with his/her annual report, evidence of teaching (course syllabi, assignments, grading criteria, letters, and so forth), research /creative activity (reprints of publications, copies of convention papers, reviews of productions, letters, and so forth), and service (work on University and Campus committees, activities on the local, state and national level, positions in national professional associations, and so forth). This material will then be used as supporting documentation for the tenure case.
2. Each non-tenured faculty member will be reviewed each year by the tenured faculty. The purpose of this review is to evaluate the candidate's progress towards tenure. This review will take place in the spring semester following the department's completion of merit reviews. The tenured faculty will prepare a written report for each untenured faculty member which evaluates his/her progress towards tenure in the three areas of responsibility – teaching, research and service. In addition, the tenured faculty may make recommendations about how progress could be improved.
3. **Third Year Review Policy**
The third year review will be conducted by the tenured faculty in the spring semester of the third year. The purpose of the review is to provide comprehensive feedback and advice to the candidate regarding their progress towards tenure. This review will be considered when making the fifth year appointment decision. The third year review will be carried out using the same procedures as the annual review with the following exceptions:
 1. The dossier shall contain material for all 3 years.
 2. The dossier shall contain two reviews of the candidate from faculty outside the department.

Those people should be chosen in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed.

This review will be carried out on the following schedule:

February 1 of the third year:	Selection of the outside reviewers
February 15 of the third year:	The chair will solicit letters from the outside reviewers
March 15 of the third year:	Candidate's dossier will be sent to outside reviewers
April 15 of the third year:	Date for receipt of reviews
May 1 of the third year:	Tenured faculty evaluation due

4. Starting at the end of the third year of the initial appointment, the faculty member may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. Recommendation for promotion at the end of the third year is reflective of extraordinary achievements and is considered exceptional.

Recommendation for promotion at the end of the fourth year is similarly reflective or unusual achievements and is still regarded as exceptional. Candidates with excellent accomplishments may expect to be recommended for promotion at the end of the fifth year.

Candidates who fail to progress steadily in their performance toward a level that would warrant recommendation for promotion will be apprised by the Chairman that the tenured faculty's evaluation suggests that their advancement to higher rank is in jeopardy and that future recommendations may be negative unless substantial improvement is made. The yearly review is intended to provide candidates with accurate feedback from the tenured faculty on their progress towards tenure and an honest appraisal of the candidate's prospects.

If an Assistant Professor has not been recommended for early promotion, and if adequate progress toward a positive decision is not in evidence, the faculty member may be notified by the chairman that the contract might/will be terminated at the end of the following year of appointment. If the departmental review is decidedly negative at the end of the fourth, but especially the fifth year of appointment, it is unlikely that the individual will be given any further consideration for promotion and tenure. The faculty member may be notified at that time that the contract will be terminated at the end of the fifth or sixth year of appointment.

(Adopted 4-21-86) (Revised 10-18-96) (Revised 10-7-05)

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

I. Overview

Merit adjustments are ultimately set by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The process begins, however, with a review of faculty accomplishments by members of the Merit Review Committee. That review is based on analyses of a copy of the Annual Report submitted by each faculty member to the Office of Dean of the Faculties, supplemented by additional documentation that may or may not be submitted to the Dean of the Faculties.

The Merit Review Committee reports the result of its evaluations to the Chair of the Department. The Chair makes a recommendation to the College of Arts and Sciences taking into account the reports of the Merit Review Committee. The Chair reports his or her recommendation to the Dean for each faculty member and may add any information he or she deems appropriate from the evaluation (prepared by the Merit Review Committee.)

The Annual Review covers work conducted during the previous calendar. In any given year, however, the full faculty may vote to instruct the Merit Review Committee to consider a multi-year period. The Faculty might, for example, instruct the Committee to consider a multi-year period covering years when there are (or have been) inadequate monies for merit increases available from the College.

II. Implementation

A. The Annual Report

I. Responsibility

The Merit Review Committee makes its annual evaluations based on information submitted by each faculty member. Faculty are responsible for presenting their cases to the Committee. The Committee will base its evaluation only on information submitted. Although it is not the responsibility of the Committee to gather data, the Committee can request additional information if it seems required.

2. Contents of the Annual Report to the Merit Review Committee

The committee receives a copy of the Annual Report submitted by each faculty member to the Office of Dean of the Faculties. In addition, faculty are encouraged to submit the following additional information which may (or may not) be found in the Annual Report to the Dean:

a. **Research and Creative Activities**

1. A description of overall research/creative activities program, a summary of progress on that plan made during the calendar year, and a description of additional goals that may have been added to the program.

2. An assessment of progress made, since the last Annual Report, on multi-year projects. Any description of multi-year efforts should clearly explain how the project has advanced since the last Annual Report and provide a projected timetable for its completion. Progress on, as well as completion of, multi-year tasks must be documented.
3. Copies of published research, presented convention papers, and hard copy of creative activities. Submission of these items is necessary for full consideration of research accomplishments.

b. Teaching

1. Copies of syllabi for all courses.
2. Examples of assignments, tests, exercises and other teaching and evaluation tools used in the course.
3. A description of teaching goals and a self-evaluation of the fulfillment of those goals.
4. Student evaluations of teaching, including BEST and letters from students.
5. Comments on the relationship between student evaluations and self-assessment of instruction.
6. Supplementary information about individualized instruction, independent study projects supervised as well as including graduate theses and dissertations.
7. Copies of pedagogical publications, convention papers, or creative activities related to teaching including textbooks. Submission of these items is necessary for full consideration of teaching accomplishments.

c. Service

1. A self-assessment of service goals and your fulfillment of those goals
2. Supplementary descriptions of service activities.

III. Evaluation Procedure

The Department staff will duplicate Annual Reports and collect supporting materials for the Merit Review Committee. Each member of the committee will separately review each faculty member's documents and formulate an individual rating for that faculty member's teaching, research and service accomplishments using a five point interval scale.

- 4) Outstanding. Truly exceptional performance for a faculty member at this career state under this category.
- 3) Very Good. More than adequate performance for a faculty member at this career state under this category.
- 2) Adequate. Typical performance for a faculty member at this career stage under this category. It is anticipated that most faculty competently doing their job in any category will receive this score. Scores of “4” and “3” are reserved for faculty members exceeding basic adequacy.
- 1) Needs some improvement. Performance in this category is below minimal expectations for a faculty member at this career stage. For untenured faculty, an evaluation of “needs improvement” should be interpreted as an indication that progress is not being made toward tenure and appropriate feedback on how to improve this rating should be provided.
- 0) Completely inadequate.

The Committee will meet for a joint discussion of faculty ratings after each member has completed individual evaluations. The committee will discuss each faculty member’s accomplishments. Committee members will then, individually, record their evaluations for each faculty member. For faculty on tenure track lines, three evaluations will be offered: one each for teaching, research, and service. For non-tenure track faculty, two evaluations will be offered: teaching and other contributions. Members do not submit an evaluation of themselves. The Chair will average the scores and, soon as possible, report the results to Merit Review Committee members. These averages will be used, in combination with the weighing systems described below, to establish recommended merit adjustments.

IV. Weighing Faculty Accomplishments

The final teaching, research and service score for each faculty member will be entered into an appropriate weighing formula. For those on tenure track lines, that formula will be:

$$[.45 \times \text{Teaching Score}] + [.45 \times \text{Research Score}] + [.10 \times \text{Service Score}]$$

The formula for those on non-tenure track lines will be:

$$[.75 \times \text{Teaching Score}] + [.25 \times \text{Other Contributions Score}]$$

These formulas can be changed by a vote of the full faculty prior to the beginning of new calendar year (to which a new formula would apply). The formulas can not be changed in the middle of the year or retroactively. Individual variations in the proportions in these formulas are normally negotiated annually with the Chair in the fall. Renewal of a variant formula is dependent on its beneficent effect on the department (for example, additional teaching or research should be performed at the very good level or above).

It is recommended that adjustments be made using a guide of 11.5% per course taught (or not taught).

Courses taught:	%Teaching:	%Research:	%Service:
7	79.5	11.5	10
6	68.0	22.0	10
5	56.5	33.5	10
4	45.0	45.0	10
3	33.5	56.5	10
2	22.0	68.0	10
1	11.5	79.5	10

Variants which increase the weight or service can be negotiated with the chair. Reductions in order to increase service can be taken from teaching or research, as agreed upon with the chair, provided that no category drops below 10.

V. Allocations

Faculty merit adjustment recommendations will be determined using a mix of two procedures.

For the first evaluation, involving 30 percent of the allocated merit dollars, a non-salary-sensitive system is employed. Faculty merit scores employing the five-point scale will be summed, resulting in “total merit score” for the department. Each person’s merit score will then be divided by the total to determine each person’s percentage of merit. This percentage will be multiplied by the total dollars available to the department to determine each person’s recommended merit-based salary increase using this non-salary-sensitive system.

The remaining 70% of the allocated merit dollars uses a procedure that is salary-sensitive and employs the following merit ruler:

Merit Ruler

<u>Average Merit Score of Each Faculty Member</u>	<u>% Salary Increase</u>
4.0	5.0
3.9	4.8
3.8	4.6
3.7	4.4
3.6	4.2
3.5	4.0
3.4	3.8
3.3	3.6
3.2	3.4
3.1	3.2
3.0	3.0
2.9	2.9
2.8	2.8
2.7	2.7
2.6	2.6
2.5	2.5
2.4	2.4
2.3	2.3
2.2	2.2
2.1	2.1
2.0	2.0
1.9	1.8
1.8	1.6
1.7	1.4
1.6	1.2
1.5	1.0
1.4	0.8
1.3	0.6
1.2	0.4
1.1	0.2
1.0	0.0
>1	0.0

For this part of the recommendation, applicable to 70% of the merit dollars, each faculty member's salary-sensitive increment will be determined by multiplying his or her base salary by the appropriate percent of the merit ruler. The resulting increments will be summed across faculty members. This number will then be compared to the actual dollars available for salary based raises. To adjust the salary-based raises to the level determined by the actual dollars available, the percentage difference between the

total dollars in salary-based raises recommended and the actual dollars available will be calculated. Then, each person's recommended increment will be raised or lowered (depending on whether the recommended number is higher or lower than dollars available) by that percentage. This will result in the total recommended raises equaling the total dollars available while maintaining the relative size of raises recommended.

A numerical example is attached. This example assumes 3% of total salaries is allocated to the department for raises, with 30% of that allocated using the non-salary-sensitive system and 70% of that allocated using the salary-sensitive system.

<u>Salary</u>	<u>Merit Score</u>	<u>Merit Ruler</u>	<u>%Merit</u>	<u>Old \$</u>	<u>New \$</u>	<u>Adj.</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>New Salary</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
100,000	4.00	0.05	0.10	960	5000	3810	4770	104770	4.77
100,000	3.00	0.03	0.07	720	3000	2286	3006	103006	3.01
100,000	2.00	0.02	0.05	480	2000	1524	2004	102004	2.00
100,000	1.50	0.01	0.04	360	1000	762	1122	101122	1.12
80,000	4.00	0.05	0.10	960	4000	3048	4008	84008	5.01
80,000	3.00	0.03	0.07	720	2400	1829	2549	82549	3.19
80,000	2.00	0.02	0.05	480	1600	1219	1699	81699	2.12
80,000	1.50	0.01	0.04	360	800	610	970	80970	1.21
60,000	4.00	0.05	0.10	960	3000	2286	3246	63246	5.41
60,000	3.00	0.03	0.07	720	1800	1372	2092	62092	3.49
60,000	2.00	0.02	0.05	480	1200	914	1394	61394	2.32
60,000	1.50	0.01	0.04	360	600	457	817	60817	1.36
40,000	4.00	0.05	0.10	960	2000	1524	2484	42484	6.21
40,000	3.00	0.03	0.07	720	1200	914	1634	41634	4.09
40,000	2.00	0.02	0.05	480	800	610	1090	41090	2.72
40,000	1.50	0.01	0.04	360	400	305	665	40665	1.6

(Adopted 3-7-03) (Revised 4-30-04)

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

In keeping with the objectives and traditions for Indiana University, the Department of Telecommunications is dedicated to achieving outstanding teaching and research/creative activities. It is expected that this Department will be prominent in providing national and international leadership in the academic community, the government, and the telecommunications industry. To achieve promotion and tenure individuals must positively demonstrate that they are making an effective contribution to the field of telecommunications.

To these ends, promotion and tenure are never recommended as a matter of course, but only after careful consideration by appropriate committees in the Department. Recommendations will not only reflect performance as compared with other faculty in the Department and on campus, but also with other individuals nationally who are engaged in scholar/creative pursuits related to telecommunications.

The following procedures and criteria are used in the Department of Telecommunications to implement the guidelines for promotion and tenure presented in the Academic Handbook. Decisions pertaining to promotion and tenure within the Department are made in the form of recommendations to higher administrative units within the University. They are not binding upon these higher units which review the Department's recommendations and make the final judgment.

PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Recommendation for Tenure. In general, departmental recommendations for tenure will be made at the end of the fifth year of appointment -- unless an individual's record is so exceptional that it warrants earlier consideration. The preparation of the tenure documentation should begin the spring of the fifth year and be drawn up by the individual faculty member in conjunction with the Chairman. The recommendation would go forward at the beginning of the candidate's sixth year.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion and tenure will be based on facts and opinions gathered in three areas: teaching, research/creative activities, and service. In order to receive a positive recommendation an individual must be judged to be outstanding in one of the areas and, at least, adequate in the other two. The Department identifies three constituencies of merit to the field of Telecommunications: the academic community; local, state and federal government; and the telecommunications industry. Substantive research/creative activity, teaching, and service may be in one, in two, or shared among all three of these areas when achievements are considered for promotion or tenure. Some faculty activities may reflect a combination of teaching/research/service. Where that is true, credit for the activity may be apportioned across these three areas.

1. Teaching

In all educational programs of the University, detailed and substantial evidence of effective teaching should be included in recommendations for promotion and tenure. Evidence should be drawn from both faculty and students. The evidence should include an evaluation of course objectives, methods, and materials that have been designed and taught by the individual.

Students should be asked to evaluate the in-class performance of the individual as well as the individual's willingness and effectiveness in working with students in advising and consultation. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness can also be drawn from faculty who have taught with the individual or have observed classes taught by the individual. Wherever possible and appropriate, evaluations should also include evidence concerning the performance of students taught by the individual. Wherever possible, letters or interviews should be solicited from former students as to the influence the individual has had on their careers.

Contributions to teaching that extend beyond course should also be taken into consideration. For example, faculty members can influence teaching beyond their classroom by writing and publishing nationally accepted textbooks or by designing courses and programs that have influenced other courses in the Department or been accepted at other institutions.

In order to be judged outstanding in teaching, the individual should be viewed positively by students and colleagues, usually have shown evidence of course development including textbook accomplishments, have shown scholarly interest or activity in teaching, and made nationally recognized efforts in curriculum development. Receipt of teaching awards should be thought of as helpful to achievement of teaching excellence.

2. In-class teaching peer observations for probationary tenure track faculty will be conducted twice a year; generally once per semester.

Senior faculty will conduct the observations. During a probationary faculty member's first year at IU (or first year of peer observation, for those already here) the faculty member may select their peer observer. Use of the same faculty reviewer during the first year is encouraged, but not required, to help solidify an initial mentoring relationship. Over the course of a faculty member's probationary period at IU several different members of the senior faculty will function as peer observers for each junior faculty member.

After the first year, junior faculty will help select the senior faculty who conduct the observations in conjunction with the department's chairperson. The process should be similar to that for selecting tenure letters, with the candidate providing a list from whom the Chair will typically select some reviewers, while reserving the right to choose reviewers not on the list as well. Junior faculty will have veto power over the selection. Over the course of the probationary period, efforts will be made to observe a variety of course settings (i.e., introductory undergraduate to graduate; large lectures to seminars or labs) and courses.

Faculty observations will be written while the experience is fresh; in no case later than one week after the observation occurs. A copy of the written observation will be shared with the junior faculty member. Faculty members conducting observations are expected to meet with the junior faculty member to discuss their observations. That meeting should occur not later than one week after the completion of the written evaluation. A copy of the written observation will be placed in the junior faculty member's file. It will be used as a point of information during annual merit reviews.

Without penalty, junior faculty members may appeal observations for any reason. Appeals may take two routes: Junior faculty members may request—and receive—a second, independent, observation of their teaching in that course from another senior faculty member. They may also (or alternatively) write a rebuttal that will be attached to the written observational comments.

While the written observational reports will be collected in the personnel file, and hence will be available for internal purposes such as the merit review committee, they will not at any time leave the department except for use in building the best case for teaching effectiveness in the probationary faculty member's tenure dossier. Final selection of peer observation reports will be made by tenured faculty as they help prepare the faculty member's case for tenure.

In addition to peer observations, senior faculty members expert in the junior faculty member's area of concentration will also examine course syllabi, assignments and exams. These observations may coincide with the classroom observations and will be conducted, at least during the first two years of the junior faculty member's employment at IU.

3. Research/Creative Activities

After an affirmative showing is made as to teaching effectiveness, an evaluation of research/creative output is warranted. Whether an individual engages in research or creative work, it is expected that the results will be available for peer review. This review will provide an opportunity to evaluate the extent and quality of the work and to ascertain scholarly contributions to the academic community, the government, and the telecommunications industry. Therefore, the focus of the review will be on results not effort. It should be understood that this work must be available for promotion and/or tenure evaluation to campus review committees.

The candidate should supply at least five names of individuals who can evaluate his/her work. The Department will draw up its own list of names.

Since Telecommunications is a multidisciplinary field drawing from several long-established disciplines, the research/creative activity of a single candidate may be concentrated in only one or two aspects of telecommunications and serve only one or two of its constituencies or may be distributed among all three constituencies. In addition to juried scholarly publication, scholarly works may be considered to have substantial merit if they are widely published in the telecommunications industry or in government and are critically reviewed. Creative productions should reach a wide audience or receive special recognition and be critically reviewed. The review process must be documented and, where possible, actual review comments should be included in the documentation.

Refereed and invited papers/creative activities presented at national professional association meetings may be considered as research, teaching or service. Panel presentations will generally be considered service or teaching rather than research. Each faculty member should provide sufficient information to assist the Chairperson in categorizing convention papers/creative activities as research, teaching or service.

4. Service

Among the activities to be considered in this area are performance on Department, University, and professional committees, administrative responsibilities, appointment or election to offices in national professional associations or government work for local, state and national government agencies mid industry related to the field of Telecommunications.

An outstanding service record by itself without an adequate record in teaching or research is rarely sufficient for promotion and tenure. Nevertheless, a positive service record to the

Department, University, community, and general field of telecommunications must be made since a department must act as a cooperative unit if it is to be successful.

If an individual cannot contribute effectively to the growth of the Department, promotion or tenure may be denied because of inadequate service even if his/her teaching and research/creative record are sufficient for promotion.

To be considered on track to excellence (or outstanding accomplishment) in research/creative activities, an individual should publish/produce articles/creative works of national quality and importance. Other factors will be considered in determining excellence, including the regularity and type of creative activity, number and order of authors, and the programmatic nature of the research.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In general, a candidate is recommended for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time that he or she is recommended for tenure. The department may make a separate recommendation on promotion for candidates being considered for tenure. In such a case, the department would follow the guidelines set forth by Dean Lombardi in his memo to Department Chairs dated January 27, 1986.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

There is no set time for an individual to be considered for promotion to Professor. Normally this will not occur until an individual has served three years at the rank of Associate Professor. Consideration for promotion to Professor can be initiated by the Chairman, a committee of the faculty, or the individual concerned.

RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARDING THE TITLE OF "EMERITUS"

The title of "Emeritus" may be recommended for a retiring faculty member by the Chairperson, with the advice and consent of the departmental faculty.

(Adopted 4-21-86) (Revised 3-23-06)

**PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, EVALUATION AND
PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

Expectations

1. Non-tenure track faculty in the Department of Telecommunications are hired to advance the teaching and service activities of the department. The department expects these faculty to be among our best teachers and to exhibit the best such practices in their specialty. In turn, they can expect the department to support their activities, provide a clear expression of teaching expectations, and offer feedback intended to enhance performance of their duties.
2. Non-tenure track faculty typically teaches six courses per academic year demanding unusual expertise of practical experience. They also are expected to assume such teaching-related service activities as student advising (both general and related to specific courses) and mentoring, participating in curriculum development, and serving on departmental committees. Duties beyond classroom teaching normally will be specified when faculty are hired but can be expected to include advising student projects and theses. Such additional responsibilities may subsequently be modified through consultation between the non-tenure track faculty member and the department Chair and with the advice of the department advisory committee.
3. Non-tenure track faculty are not required to conduct research or creative activities, but must remain current with research and creative practices in their specialty areas in order to be up-to-date, effective, and credible teachers. Thus, the department will positively reward creative and research activities when those activities specifically enhance performance of the faculty member's teaching and service activities.

Contract Terms, Reappointment, and Promotion

1. The first two contracts will be for 2 academic years each, giving the faculty member ample time to settle in, fully understand departmental and IU expectations, and develop materials and classroom teaching expertise. Within each contract period, faculty may have two 10-month or 12-month appointments.
2. A significant internal review should be conducted during the faculty member's third year.
3. If renewed after the two initial contracts, the next contract will be for 3 years.
4. Prior to the beginning of the non-tenure track faculty's sixth year, he or she should prepare a dossier addressing the department's stated promotion criteria (listed below). The department will conduct a thorough review of the faculty member during the faculty member's 6th year. At this time, the faculty member will be considered for promotion to the next rank (e.g., from Assistant to Associate Clinical Professor or Lecturer to Senior Lecturer). The Department's recommendation and the faculty's dossier will then be forwarded to the College.
5. The third and sixth year reviews and recommendations for promotion will be conducted by all tenured faculty, Associate and Full Clinical Professors, and Senior Lecturers in the Department.
6. After promotion to associate clinical professor or senior lecturer, contracts will be for a period of 5 years.

7. After the first 5 year contract of an Associate Clinical Professor, the faculty member or the Full Professors in the department may initiate the process of considering the faculty member for promotion to Full Clinical Professor. Promotion recommendations will be made by all Full Professors in the Department, both tenured and clinical.

Rank Associated with Initial Appointment

1. The initial rank should be commensurate with the credentials of the faculty member.

Criteria for Yearly Merit Raise Evaluation

1. Non-tenure track faculty must submit an annual Faculty Summary Report.
2. Accomplishments will be weighed using the following formula: 75/25 teaching/service-other.
3. Non-tenure track faculty may negotiate changes in the weight of both categories on an annual basis with the Chair. Such negotiations must take place before the calendar year begins.

Criteria for Promotion

1. In order to qualify for promotion to associate or full clinical professor or senior lecturer rank, faculty are expected to be outstanding teachers and effective in their other duties and responsibilities. In evaluating the faculty member's teaching contributions, evaluating faculty will consider factors such as:

number of courses taught
number of students taught
student evaluations
undergraduate and graduate advising responsibilities
teaching publications
letters from former students
letters from industry personnel
exit interviews
peer evaluations
quality of instruction, as evidenced by a teaching portfolio
mentoring
curriculum development
committee service
creative or research activities that enhance teaching performance.

2. Six letters of recommendation will be solicited from faculty outside IU for promotion to associate or full clinical faculty rank. Consistent with the College, no external letters are required for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer. Nonetheless, if the circumstance warrants, faculty may request additional information including, but not limited to, external letters.

(Revised 2-05)

3. While national recognition is relevant to teaching excellence, Non-tenure track faculty are not expected to demonstrate having an impact on the national level in order to be deemed outstanding teachers in their specialty. Instead, evaluation of non-tenure track faculty teaching efforts will focus on activity at Indiana University-Bloomington.

(Adopted & Revised 2-05)

Five-Year Review and Reappointment.

1. Re-appointment of senior non-tenure track faculty to successive five-year contracts is contingent on a finding that the faculty member's teaching and performance of assigned service responsibilities in support of teaching are judged to be effective. According to Bloomington Campus policy A-3, "[t]he contributions of Lecturers and Clinical appointees to the missions of their units may vary, but will usually involve student advising, curricular administration, and unit committee work at the levels typical for unit faculty."
2. No later than March 30th of the fourth year of a senior non-tenure track faculty's contract, the faculty member should compile and submit to the Merit Review Committee a brief dossier demonstrating his or her teaching and service contributions during the term of the contract. The dossier may include any of the materials listed in the "Criteria for Promotion" section of this policy. If the faculty being reviewed is a member of the Merit Review Committee, the Committee will appoint a replacement from the NTT faculty.
3. The Merit Review Committee will consider these materials along with the faculty annual reports and Department annual reviews compiled during the term of the contract. If deemed necessary the Merit Review Committee may request additional information.
4. No later than June 30 of that year the Merit Review Committee will make a reappointment recommendation to the Chair.
5. No later than July 31 (the end of the fourth year of the current contract) of that year the Chair will communicate to the faculty member under review whether he or she will be reappointed for another five-year term.
6. Non-reappointment decisions will be referred to the full faculty for review. A majority vote of tenured, tenure-probationary, and senior NTT faculty is needed to reverse the non-reappointment decision. If the decision is reversed, the faculty member will be awarded a five-year contract.
7. Faculty who are not renewed may continue their employment through the fifth year of their existing contract.
8. If a five-year review is not completed as provided in this policy, the Chair shall extend the faculty's contract by one year, during which the review will take place as expeditiously as

possible. A schedule for the review should be agreed upon by the faculty member and the Merit Review Committee, but in all cases the faculty must be informed of the reappointment decision no later than July 31. In cases of non-renewal, the faculty will be granted an additional one-year contract.

9. Non-reappointment decisions may be appealed through established Departmental, College, and Campus review and grievance procedures.

(Five-Year Review and Reappointment section – Adopted 1-11)

APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURED STAFF

1. The Chairperson of the Department of Telecommunications appoints and reviews the performance of non-tenured staff. When it is appropriate, the Chairperson will seek the advice of the Tenure and Advisory Committee.
2. Faculty members are invited to submit written evaluations of any staff members to the Chairperson.

(Adopted 4-21-86)

**THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

A. The Chairperson (Chair)

The Chair is responsible for the overall administration of the Department which includes but is not limited to:

1. Implementing University policies applicable to the Department of Telecommunications,
2. Representing the department's needs to the College, University and outside funding agencies and managing the departmental budget and expenditures,
3. Making staff appointments,
4. Approving the schedule of classes,
5. Making teaching assignments based on departmental needs and faculty preferences,
6. Making recommendations on hiring, reappointment, tenure and promotion of faculty,
7. Determining and presenting recommendations of faculty salaries,
8. Approving requests for leaves of absence, and sabbatical leaves,
9. Representing the interests of the department to its constituents,
10. Conducting meetings of the faculty.

(Adopted 10-86)

B. The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)

The DGS, appointed by the Chair, is responsible for the overall administration of the department's graduate program. DGS responsibilities include but are not limited to:

1. Implementing University and departmental policies and procedures applicable to the department's graduate program,
2. Directing the selection and appointment of Associate Instructors,
3. Directing the award of graduate fellowships and scholarships,
4. Provide initial guidance to incoming graduate students,
5. Coordinating the training and supervision of associate instructors,
6. Recommending A.I. assignments,

7. Chairing the Graduate Committee of the Department.

(Adopted 10-86)

C. Academic Advisor of Undergraduates

The Undergraduate Advisor, as staff member appointed by the Chair, is responsible for the overall implementation of the Department's advising program. This primarily includes academic program selection and fulfillment of graduation requirements.

(Adopted 10-86)

D. Committees and Their Responsibilities

1. Advisory Committee

The responsibilities of the Advisory Committee are (1) to serve as an independent advisory body to the Chair on budgetary, personnel, strategic planning, and other matters of departmental administration and faculty governance, (2) to facilitate initiatives for improving the Department's ability to fulfill its research and teaching missions, and (3) to serve as a liaison between the Faculty and the Chair for the purpose of communicating and resolving faculty grievances or other matters of faculty concern.

The Advisory Committee consists of four members, one from the ranks of Clinical faculty or full-time lecturers, one from the ranks of untenured tenure track faculty, and two from the ranks of tenured faculty.

Members of the Advisory Committee are elected bi-annually by all faculty holding one of the above ranks, and will include the individuals who receive the highest number of votes within each group. Terms of the members will be staggered, with two members being elected each year. The election will be held in the spring semester for the committee that will serve beginning the next fall. One tenured member and the untenured tenure track member will be elected in even-numbered years. One tenured member and the non-tenure track member will be elected in odd-numbered years. The Advisory Committee will elect one of its tenured members to serve as chair.

The Advisory Committee will meet regularly with the Chair and on other occasions as the need may arise.

(Adopted 12-86) (Revised 9-01) (Revised 4-04) (Revised 5-08)

2. The Merit Review Committee

The primary responsibility of the Merit Review Committee is to evaluate faculty and make recommendations to the Chair on annual merit salary increases according to the procedures in Section C.

The Merit Review Committee consists of five members: one from the ranks of Clinical faculty or full-time lecturers, one from the ranks of untenured tenure track faculty, two tenured faculty; and one member appointed by the Chair. The Merit Review Committee will elect one of its members to serve as chair. The Chair of the department serves as a non-voting *ex officio* member of the Committee.

Elected members of the Merit Review Committee are elected bi-annually by all faculty holding one of the above ranks, and will include the individuals within each of the above groups who receive the highest number of votes. Terms of the elected members will be staggered, with two members being elected each year. The election will be held in the spring semester for the committee that will serve beginning the next fall. One tenured member and the untenured tenure track member will be elected in even-numbered years. One tenured member and the non-tenure track member will be elected in odd-numbered years. The appointed member of the committee serves a one year term.

The annual Chair's review will be completed by the Advisory Committee in consultation with the Merit Review Committee.

(Adopted 4-04) (Revised 5-08)

3. The Graduate Committee

The Graduate Committee proposes and interprets policies, considers proposals for curriculum changes, considers matters referred to the committee by the Graduate Coordinator; promotes graduate applications; makes recommendations on admission of candidates to Graduate School, and recommends students for assistantships and graduate fellowships; and evaluates progress of graduate students.

The Graduate Committee consists of six members, including the DGS, four members elected at large by the faculty, and one member who is appointed by the Chair of the department. The DGS serves as chair of the committee.

(Adopted 12-86) (Revised 4-04) (Revised 5-08)

4. The Undergraduate Committee

The Undergraduate Committee proposes and interprets policies, considers proposals for curriculum changes and makes recommendations to the faculty regarding undergraduate activities.

The Undergraduate Committee consists of seven members, including the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS), three members elected at large by the faculty, one member appointed by the Chair and both of the department's undergraduate advisors. The DUGS serves as chair of the committee.

(Adopted 12-86) (Revised 4-04) (Revised 5-08)

5. Other Committees

Other committees may be appointed by the Chair or by the faculty to deal with special issues or concerns.

(Adopted 12-86)

DEPARTMENT POLICY ON VOTING RIGHTS

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are entitled to vote on the hiring and review of tenure and non-tenure track faculty, the hiring and review of staff, issues associated with teaching and curriculum, and the department's recommendation for the position of departmental chair. (For an overview, see the Voting Grid.)

Non-tenure track full-time teachers (excluding those on visiting appointments) are entitled to vote on the hiring and review of non-tenure track faculty, the hiring and review of staff, issues associated with teaching and curriculum and the department's recommendation for the position of departmental chair.

Full-time professionals are entitled to vote on the hiring and review of staff, issues associated with teaching and curriculum, and the department's recommendation for the position of departmental chair.

A representative from telecommunications undergraduate majors as well as one from telecommunications graduate students are entitled to vote on teaching and curriculum issues.

Faculty may extend voting privileges as needed. Petitions for such privileges will be cast when personnel are hired and/or at the first faculty meeting each fall.

Voting rights only apply to areas within faculty governance which call for faculty votes.

Those not entitled to vote are encouraged to voice their opinions in an advisory capacity.

(Adopted 2-27-98)

VOTING GRID

	Tenure-track faculty hiring and review	Non-Tenure-track faculty hiring and review	Staff hiring and review	Teaching and curriculum	Administration	Recommend chair
--	--	--	-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------	-----------------

Faculty: Professional ranks (assistant to full professor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Associate Faculty: Non-tenure track full-time Teachers (excluding visiting appointments)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Full-time professionals			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Other permanent professional staff						
Permanent clerical staff						
Student representatives undergraduate/graduate				Yes		
Full-time visitors						
Adjuncts						
Emeritus faculty						

PROCESS OF SELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON

1. The departmental Advisory Committee, at least nine months before the expiration of the current chairperson's term, will:
 - a. Ask the current chairperson if he or she wishes to serve another term.
 - b. Notify tenured members of the Department that they may request consideration for the position of Chairperson.
 - c. Ask the faculty for nominations of candidates from within the Department of Telecommunications.
 - d. Survey the faculty to determine if they wish to consider candidates for the position of Chairperson from outside the department.
2. The Advisory Committee presents its recommendations to the full faculty of the Department. If the faculty decides to search internally, that recommendation is made to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. If the faculty decides to search outside the Department, the Advisory Committee will ask the Dean for permission to advertise and recruit.
3. After the search is completed, the Advisory Committee submits a list of ranked candidates to the faculty. Permanent faculty and full-time professional staff vote to decide which candidates to interview.
4. If funds to hire an outside person are not made available, the Department will choose a Chairperson from the list of tenured faculty members who wish to be considered for the position. The Department faculty may, if it chooses, request formal interviews with all these candidates.
5. The Chairperson, whether an internal or an external candidate, will be selected by a two-thirds majority vote of the permanent faculty and full-time professional staff of the Department.
6. Normally, the chairperson's term will be three years, but the faculty may negotiate other terms.

(Adopted 10-87)

PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR ADMISSION TO GRADUATE STUDY

Students seeking admission to our graduate programs are expected to submit all required forms by January 15. International applicants should have their files completed by December 1st. All applicants must submit (1) a completed, standard, application form for admission to graduate study at IU, (2) a statement of goals and objectives, (3) three letters of recommendation, (4) two official transcripts of previous post-secondary education, (5) results of the Graduate Record Examination (and, for non-active speakers of English, the Test of English as a Foreign Language), (6) a completed “Background Information” questionnaire, and (7) a creative portfolio (for applicants to the M.I.M.E. program).

Application materials are compiled by the Graduate Secretary. Once the file is complete, it is assigned to two members of the Graduate Committee for evaluation. Evaluation of applicants generally begins very shortly after the January 15 application deadline. Once the members of the Graduate Committee have completed their evaluations, they present the file/application at a meeting of the Graduate Committee. The Committee votes on admission (financial assistance is considered later) and recommends deficiency coursework if appropriate. The Director of Graduate Studies reports the Committee’s decision to the University Graduate School and the applicant.

Certain “benchmark” standards are applied in evaluating applications. They are not, however, applied absolutely. Failure to meet one of them can be offset by one or another factor. In general, however, we minimally expect the following: (1) at least a 3.0 (B) grade average in prior undergraduate work (generally considered with regard to MA and MS applicants) and at least a 3.5 (B+/A-) average in prior graduate work, (2) at least one GRE general test score exceeding 600 and none below 500, (3) where required, a score of at least 600 on the TOEFL exam. We also consider very seriously the applicant’s personal statement and letters of recommendation and the quality and appropriateness of prior post-secondary education. A “Background Information” questionnaire requested of all applicants is primarily used for the evaluation of applicants for financial assistance. It plays little role in the admissions decision.

As noted, these “benchmarks” are applied with some flexibility. Students who fall reasonably close to these standards should apply. They may wish to address the reasons, if any, for shortfalls in their application materials. Achievement of all the quantitative “benchmarks” does not guarantee admission.

(Adopted 10-15-93)

**PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR INITIAL AWARDING OF
ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTORSHIPS
AND OTHER DEPARTMENTAL ASSISTANCE TO GRADUATE STUDENTS**

There are two categories of applicants for initial financial assistance: new students who simultaneously apply for admission to our graduate program and apply for assistance and continuing students who have been previously admitted but were not initially funded. In general, the same standards are applied to both groups of applicants for financial assistance. Procedures for each, however, vary.

Applicants for admission to the program indicate their interest in being considered for assistantships and fellowships by checking the appropriate boxes on their admission applications. Continuing, but unfunded, students apply by letter or by email, addressed to the Director of Graduate Studies, outlining their reasons for wishing to be considered for financial assistance. Students should be aware, however, that the Department relies upon its limited financial aid resources as a means of recruiting new students. Students not funded concurrently with their initial application for admission should not anticipate a high probability of receiving assistance later.

Consideration for financial assistance typically begins in late January or early February. Around that time, the Department notifies all non-funded graduate students in residence of their opportunity to be considered for financial assistance for the following academic year. All currently-funded graduate students in good standing should indicate their desire to be considered for funding for the following year. Students who request funding on a semester-by-semester basis are required to complete an A.I. Interest form. The form is available from the graduate secretary.

The Graduate Committee rank orders the applications for assistance employing the same criteria used for admission, as well as a consideration of the candidate's record as it is relevant to teaching. Top-Ranked applicants are offered assistantships. The number of assistantships varies from year to year depending on the Department's budget and the number of graduate students from the previous year who have completed their studies or expended their eligibility for support. Some students may be notified that they are on a "wait list" and may be offered assistantships later if offers are declined by others or if additional funds become available.

Successful applicants for support at the Master's level are eligible for up to two years of support from any funds administered by the Department. Ph.D. students are eligible for up to three years of support. A student who completes both a Master's degree and a Ph.D. from the Department of Telecommunications could receive up to a total of five years of support. Since the Department offers, and supports, M.A., M.S. and Ph.D. programs, it makes an effort to distribute the money it has available for graduate support among all three types of students. Graduate student progress is reviewed by the Graduate Committee each Spring. Students making reasonable progress toward their degree and in good academic standing can expect to receive the maximum number of support allowed for their degree.

(Adopted 10-15-93) (Revised 8-05)

SUMMER SUPPORT FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

In most instances, the Department will be unable to offer summer financial assistance to graduate students. Associate Instructor appointments are normally only available for the two regular semesters.

On a highly variable basis, the Department is able to offer financial assistance to a small number of graduate students in the summer. These opportunities typically take the form of associate instructorships for a summer class.

Largely for budgetary and scheduling reasons, these opportunities develop very late in the Spring semester – often at the last moment before a summer session begins. This means that the procedures for filling these positions must allow for substantial flexibility.

In the past, the Department has had a preliminary sense of the probabilities of summer support for graduate students in late April. At that time, it notifies all graduate students in residence of the opportunity to apply for consideration for summer support. Those interested should notify the graduate secretary.

Selection of students for summer support is made collaboratively by the Chair of the Department and the Director of Graduate Studies. At times, it may have to be made by the Chair acting individually but, whenever possible, it is expected that the Chair will collaborate with the Director of Graduate Studies, and if necessary, the Graduate Committee. Two factors are typically considered. First, Departmental need. In most instances, these summer teaching opportunities for graduate students will require specific prior background. In some instances, they may require telecommunications production skills. In other cases, prior coursework or even prior A.I. experience in a course may be relevant. In order to protect the integrity of our summer course offerings, the “fit” between a graduate student’s prior experiences and a specific summer assignment is particularly important. Second, academic record. All other things being equal, we prefer to give summer assignments to graduate students with the highest possible academic level of performance.

(Adopted 10-15-93) (Revised 8-05)

**PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR RECOMMENDING GRADUATE STUDENTS
FOR INTERNAL (TO IU) NON-DEPARTMENTAL AWARDS**

On occasion, the Department is asked to recommend graduate students for consideration for internal (to IU) but non-departmental forms of financial assistance made available by IU. Such assistance includes fellowships for dissertation and travel grants to attend profession conferences and conventions.

When these opportunities are made known, the Director of Graduate Studies distributes information about the opportunity to all appropriate graduate students. Interested graduate students may be asked to submit materials to the Graduate Committee who will determine if that student is qualified for nomination for the award.

The number of names the Department can forward for consideration for these types of awards is usually limited. Thus, the Graduate Committee arrives at a rank order among all students who request consideration. In arriving at this rank ordering, the Graduate Committee considers (1) the specific criteria or standards that are designed as relevant to the specific internal award sought, (2) the academic record of the student, and (3) the significance of the award to the applicant given the progress of the applicant toward his or her degree objective. Under this last criterion, for example, we would probably refer a well-qualified Ph.D. student seeking travel funds in the third year of Ph.D. level work over another well qualified applicant seeking funds in his or her second year.

Selection of graduate students for research assistantships is normally made by the individual faculty member awarded the grant. Whenever possible, these opportunities are made known to all qualified graduate students. The Graduate Committee recommends that faculty consult with them in the selection process for research assistants, however, the decision is ultimately that of the individual faculty member.

(Adopted 10-15-93)

PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR TRANSFER FROM A MASTER'S PROGRAM TO THE PH.D. PROGRAM

The Committee applies the same admissions standards it applies to applicants from “outside” IU. In other words, internal applicants have neither an advantage nor a disadvantage over external applicants. The Department does not require students completing a Master’s degree with us to complete an official IU application for Graduate Study in order to enter the Telecommunications Ph.D. program.

Master’s students who wish to apply to the Ph.D. program should submit a paper application and a statement of purpose. They should also ask at least three IU faculty to send letters of recommendation directly to the Director of Graduate Studies. These letters and other application materials should be received by January 15 for admission to begin the following fall.

The Graduate Committee considers (1) the statement of purpose, (2) letters of recommendation, and (3) the academic record. It may consult with the other faculty with whom the student has worked at IU beyond those who have submitted letters of recommendation.

Students admitted to the Ph.D. program are expected to complete their Master’s degree (whether from this department or any other, at any university) before beginning Ph.D. coursework. Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program who have not finished the Master’s will not be considered to be making satisfactory progress to the Ph.D. degree. All sanctions applied to cases of unsatisfactory progress may be applied here, including termination of funding and removal from the Ph.D. program.

(Adopted 10-15-93) (Revised 8-05)

PROCEDURES FOR DISSEMINATING INFORMATION TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

All graduate students are expected to establish and use electronic email accounts. As soon as they have an active account they should notify the Graduate Secretary of their electronic mail username. The Department uses electronic mail as its primary means of making announcements to graduate students.

All graduate students have mailboxes in the Graduate Resource Room / Lounge (room 320). When printed communication with students is necessary, the Department handles that through those mailboxes.

(Adopted 10-15-93) (Revised 8-05)

COMPREHENSIVE EXAM POLICY

1) *General Procedures*

Comprehensive exams will usually be taken after the completion of all coursework, including completion of all incompletes.

Primary responsibility for formulating the content boundaries and procedures for the examination resides with your committee.

Students and committee members should discuss expectations with them prior to the exam. Specifically, they should discuss:

- The number and scope of the questions that will be asked.
- Procedures that will be followed before, during, and after the examination.
- Preparation strategies.

Exam procedures will be established by the Committee in consultation with the student. Exams will usually be taken closed-book in camera (at a place designated by the Graduate Secretary, using a computer provided by the Department, without texts or notes). Under some circumstances, with the agreement of all members of the Committee, exams may be taken open-book in camera, take-home, or through a combination of procedures. Responses to open-book and take-home exams are expected to be far more detailed, substantial and comprehensive in scope than those taken in camera.

Under normal circumstances, the oral defense of your exam questions will take place within three weeks following the submission of all your responses. In the oral defense, students can expect to be asked to expand on the answers you initially provided and to defend and discuss their responses. Students are advised to actively prepare for the oral defense. This might include:

- Critically re-reading the written answers.
- Identifying weak or incorrect points in those answers.
- Preparing corrections and strengthening answers.

2) *M.S. Examination*

The M.S. exam consists of two sets of questions. One set emphasizes the breadth of knowledge of the field (covered by T501, T504, and either T502/503); the other examines the depth areas of your individualized program. Questions may cut across courses within each area.

The M.S. MIME exam will generally consist of one set of questions covering the core (T570, T571, and T580) and a second set covering the M.S. project. Normally the total length of the exam is eight hours of questions.

3) *Ph.D. Examination*

The Ph.D. exam usually consists of four sets of questions. These emphasize (1) the breadth of knowledge and understanding of the field (covered by T501, T502, T503, T504), (2) research methodology, (3) the areas delineated in your individualized program, and (4) the minor.

In camera closed-book exams usually consist of 16 hours of questions, four hours each on the breadth and methodology sections, four hours on the concentration area, and four hours on the minor. More time may be granted for open-book and take-home exams. Absent unusual circumstances, the administration of the exam should not take more than five days.

(Adopted 9-30-94) (Revised 8-05)

ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTOR GUIDELINES *

- Preamble. There are three primary purposes associated with AI appointments. The first is to help the department fulfill its teaching obligation. Beyond that, AI appointments are designed to reward well qualified students and serve as learning experiences for them. The department is committed to keeping these experiences related to the teaching and scholarly goals of the department and the university.
1. Hourly assignments per week represent an average across weeks for a semester. When the normal allocation of hours is exceeded, faculty are expected to provide compensatory time off in another week. Under no circumstances can this vary on the high side by any more than 25% per week.
 2. Faculty should meet at least once with each AI assigned to them prior to the beginning of each semester. The purpose of this meeting is to provide the AI with ample information about the assignment and the faculty member's expectations of the AI (i.e., in terms of AI attendance of class sessions, office hours, instructional responsibilities...).
 3. AIs must be available for a day during the week prior to classes to work on assignment-related materials.
 4. The AI's work obligation extends through the submission of final grades (that is, no more than 72 hours after the final exam is completed by the students).
 5. It is unreasonable to require AIs to work weekends or vacation periods during the semester. It is also unreasonable to ask AIs to work during semester breaks. AIs may, of course, choose to use weekends and breaks to complete their AI responsibilities.
 6. Beyond expecting attendance during a regularly scheduled class and office hours, faculty cannot be rigid in specifying times the AI must work.
 7. The AI's first order or responsibility is to meet the needs of the assignment. The AI also can be legitimately assigned by the faculty member to other scholarly and/or department duties up to the hours assigned. It is unreasonable to expect an AI to attend more than one class.
 8. Faculty are obligated to adequately prepare and supervise AIs for the tasks being assigned to them (i.e., criteria to be used in developing exam questions, grading papers and exams, delivering lectures...)
 9. Faculty needs to be sensitive to the professional development of AIs. Faculty should regularly provide feedback on the AI's discharge of assigned tasks (i.e., teaching, interactions with students, grading...).
 10. A formal, written evaluation of each AI will be provided to the AI at the end of each semester.
 11. The general expectation is that AIs are professionals and should be treated as such (i.e., given the courtesies due professionals, not embarrassed in front of students).

12. In accordance with our expectations, AIs are expected to behave in a professional and responsible manner (i.e., meet their exam and paper grading obligations in a timely fashion, alert the faculty member in the event of emergencies, treat their students with respect, not date (or give the impression or being emotionally physically interested in) their students, keep their office hours, dress appropriately...).
13. And, of course, meet all the responsibilities in the Handbook for Associate Instructors.

(Adopted 9-1-88) (Revised 4-30-04)

* Includes AI/RA/GA

CURRICULUM

A. Provisions for Change

1. New Courses

New undergraduate courses are submitted by individual faculty members or by appropriate groups of faculty to the Undergraduate Committee. The appropriate committee may make suggestions for modification to the concerned faculty. After the Committee has given due consideration to the course, that committee will forward the course proposal to the entire faculty for its decision.

(Adopted 12-86)

2. Changes in Present Courses

Changes in present courses requiring the approval of the College or Graduate School are treated procedurally as new courses.

(Adopted 12-86)

3. Changes in Degree Requirements

Changes in degree requirements will be considered by the appropriate committee, which will make recommendations to the entire faculty. Changes approved by the faculty will be forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences or to the Graduate School, and will go into effect for those entering a degree program in the fall semester after the changes have been approved.

(Adopted 2-6-97)

TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

These are the major university and departmental policies concerning office responsibilities, class scheduling, examination periods and provisions for substitute teachers. Others are listed in the Academic Guide.

- 1) Academic appointments begin on the day one week prior to the first day of classes for first semester and terminate on the day of Commencement. Full-time faculty should be available for counseling during the orientation week before classes begin.
- 2) All classes should be held according to the schedule from the first day of the semester through the last. Classes should not be dismissed or cancelled. Extra class meetings must be optional.
- 3) Instructors should miss or shorten classes only in case of illness, emergency, or for special university business. Except in cases of illness or emergency, all absences should be cleared through the chairman's office in advance. This should be done by memo. Provisions for substitutes should also be cleared through the chairman's office. Missed classes should be covered by a substitute teacher or by special assignments. Student presentations are not an acceptable substitute.
- 4) A syllabus for the entire course should be issued before the third week of class, before drop/add, if at all possible. Syllabi should include information on instructor's office hours, intent of the course, grading, and indication of the amount and level of work expected of the students, and any penalties specific to the course.

Courses at the 400-level with graduate students should indicate what additional work is required of graduates.

- 5) Final examinations are to be held as scheduled by the university calendar for final exams for your class period.
- 6) At the beginning of each semester, each instructor should determine his or her office hours and post them on his/her office door.
- 7) One faculty member from this department will be available between 1:00P- 4:00P Monday through Friday for student's career and course counseling, parental and perspective student visits and so on. These hours, once determined, should be kept free from regular appointments or conflicting meetings so that student/parental access is assured.

Adherence to these policies contributes a great deal toward smooth-running classes and toward maintaining the reputation of the Department of Telecommunications as first rate.

OFFICE PROCEDURES

Currently the Department of Telecommunications employs three full-time staff members. Reed Nelson serves as accounting associate for the department. He is responsible for purchasing, payroll, travel, faculty personnel files, and other administrative duties associated with the office of the Chair. Tamera Theodore, graduate secretary, is responsible for correspondence and records related to the graduate program, and serves as the department's scheduling officer. Kerchanin Allen, department secretary, is responsible for walk-in traffic in the main office, answers departmental incoming phone calls, assists faculty and AIs with course-related materials, distributes mail, and assists with departmental alumni-related functions.

By working with faculty, students and other University offices, these individuals provide an essential service to the department. They do not work "for" individual faculty members. In addition, the department employs work study students to work part-time in the editing lab and the academic advisors' office.

Neither faculty nor graduate assistants should use the phones, typewriters or computers of the office staff without explicit permission, as dictated by professional protocol. Because exams, confidential letters of reference, and other internal materials are handled in the front office, faculty and graduate students may not use staff members' desks.

How The Office Works. When submitting requests for assistance such as word processing, duplicating, mailing, faxing, etc., instructions should be complete, clear, and in writing. This will help the office personnel to be more efficient and perform these tasks more quickly. Customarily, priorities for completion of requests are:

- Deadline classroom materials (e.g., syllabi, exams, project guidelines).
- Other class-related materials (e.g., handouts, bibliographies, assignment rotations).
- Dated office business (e.g., payroll, promotion cases, reports).
- Research papers for publication or presentation to peers.
- Other research work (e.g., survey forms, book chapters, budgets, reports).

Within each category, first work submitted is first accomplished. Last minute submissions do not advance in priority because of impending deadlines.

Other Professional Work. The department does not provide support for professional work (e.g. consulting) that is funded but not through the university. If individual faculty desire staff help with consulting projects, remunerative publishing projects or personal work not directly related to the department, they may attempt to hire departmental staff members as they would any other individual. The department will typically approve after-hours use of office equipment for such work. Such arrangements must not displace nor interfere with work during business hours.

Office Supplies. For routine office supplies, request what you need from Kerchanin Allen. The Chair must explicitly approve all departmental expenses of more than \$50.

Office Telephones. Faculty office lines are equipped with Voice Message Exchange (VMX), a system that combines store-and-forward capabilities with the convenience, speed, and efficiency of voice communications. The system can be accessed from an ordinary tone telephone from any location and

voice prompts guide you through a sequence of possible functions. Within the system, you have an individual Voice Mailbox. A Voice Mailbox is like a postal mailbox: it's where your messages are left and where you pick them up. The Indiana University Telephone Directory provides user information that applies to employees of Indiana University. (You will find this information at the beginning of the red Indiana University Bloomington listings.) Reed Nelson is responsible for the telecommunication needs of the department and acts as the liaison to the Bloomington Campus Telecommunications services.

Faculty are expected to reimburse the department for any personal or commercially-related long distance calls unavoidably made on the office system. Reed Nelson receives a monthly statement which gives the number dialed, time, duration, and cost of each call by individual access number.

Duplication. Faculty are assigned individual user numbers for access to the departmental copy machines.

Maxi-service is much less expensive than using our copy machine for more than 10 copies and is preferred. Please indicate when placing your request for service: number of copies; color of paper; one side, both sides; if the order is to be collated /stapled. Allow 24 hours turnaround time for delivery, except beginning and end of semesters, at which time 36 hours turnaround can be expected. Unless otherwise requested, the copied order will be placed in mailboxes.

Computer Support. In accord with university policy, the department cannot provide peripheral parts, repair or maintenance for private computers. The department currently supplies paper and cartridges for the printing done on the departmental printers.

Mail. The department pays for postage directly related to departmental work. The U.S. mail is delivered/picked-up mornings, generally between 10 and noon. The department does not pay for UPS, Federal Express or other overnight mail services. Charges for Federal Express must be paid by individual user.

Parking. Reed Nelson has a supply of visitor (one day only) parking permits for guest lecturers and visitors. These permits cost the department \$6 each, and if requested for personal use, must be paid for by user when received.

General Traffic. The Chair's set of offices (261) will be open and phones answered from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on staff working days.

Teaching/Instructing. Class handouts and assignments should be handled in class or by AIs from Room 240F. Office staff cannot be expected to hand out or receive class materials and assignments.

Payroll. The Direct Deposit system is used at Indiana University.

Scheduling Rooms. Faculty members may use the Conference Room (271), the upstairs Conference Room (320), or classroom TV169 for committee meetings. Kerchanin Allen is responsible for scheduling these rooms.

Questions about any other classroom should be addressed to Tamera Theodore, who handles classroom scheduling through the Office of the Registrar.

(Revised 10-02) (Revised 8-05) (Revised 9-07) (Revised 1-11)

GRIEVANCES

Resolving grievances internal to the department is the responsibility of the Chair and/or the Department Advisory Committee. Any faculty member may approach the Chair or any member(s) of the Advisor Committee with a grievance. Appropriate attempts to resolve the grievance will then be made. If those attempts at resolution are unsatisfactory to the aggrieved party, that individual may pursue procedures within the College, the Campus, or the University.

(Adopted 05-08)