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Section I: Composition of the Tenure and Promotion Committee
The History Department establishes membership on its tenure recommendation and review committees according to the following procedures:

A. Membership Selection Procedures
Three departmental members of the committee will be chosen by election by the entire History faculty in the fall as necessary. If circumstances permit, the department will elect two tenured and one non-tenured faculty member. The three departmental members will choose the faculty member who will serve as chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

One non-departmental faculty member will be chosen by the following procedure. The person whose promotion and/or tenure is under consideration will nominate three nondepartmental faculty members, from which the three elected members of the committee will choose one to serve with them.

The committee will also include one student. The student will be chosen by the previously established four members of the committee from a group of three students nominated by the person whose promotion and/or tenure is being evaluated. Each student must have had two courses from the person under consideration, or have been mentored by the faculty member in an internship, or have worked with the faculty member as a graduate student. Students may not serve on the committees of their faculty advisors.

B. Committee Composition
There will be five (5) members on the committee. The composition will be as follows, when possible:
- Two tenured departmental faculty members
- One non-tenured departmental faculty member
- One non-departmental faculty member
- One student

C. Promotion of the Department Chair
If the department chairperson is undergoing review for promotion, the committee will be chosen following the above procedures, but the non-departmental faculty member will be chosen in conjunction with the dean of the college and will be the sitting chair, or a former chairperson, of another department in the college.

D. Policy Approval History
The procedures were determined by a meeting of the entire History faculty on April 22, 1974 and unanimously approved. They were amended and revised by faculty vote on April 28, 2009.
Section II: External Review Letters

The Department of History adopted the Idaho State University College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for external review letters for promotion and tenure in 2003, as outlined in a memorandum by James R. Pratt, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, January 21, 2003. That process is as follows:

1. As early as possible before the tenure and/or promotion semester, the faculty member to be considered will submit a list of three-to-four people he or she would like the department chair to contact as external reviewers.

2. The chair of the department, in consultation with the tenure and/or promotion committee (or other appropriate faculty), will select a total of at least three people (selected from the candidate’s list) from whom external reviews will then be solicited.

3. Three completed external reviews will be the required minimum for each tenure and/or promotion decision.

4. In the event that the chair of the department is undergoing a promotion review process, the dean of the college will be asked to perform the role of choosing the external reviewers, as outlined above.

Section III: Committee Processes and Materials Acquisition

A. Meeting Times and Procedures

The departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee will choose when and where to meet, but it must meet on campus. As soon as possible after the committee is constituted, the chair of the tenure and/or promotion committee will call a meeting during which duties will be divided and a plan for acquiring materials will be set in motion.

B. Materials

The following materials must be gathered by the committee, as outlined in the College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (adopted by faculty vote in January 2008):

» Annual evaluations of the candidate for each of his/her pre-tenure years and/or years prior to promotion

» Letter of hire and subsequent documents affecting conditions of hire

» Teaching evaluations

» External reviews (see above)

» Materials from the candidate (including a vita; statements of research, teaching, service, administration; publications; and course materials, such as syllabi and exams)

» Workload distribution documents and job descriptions for administrative or other appointments

» Other materials deemed appropriate by the Tenure and Promotion Committee

C. Voting

After a period of review determined by the committee but no later than three weeks prior to the deadline for the College, the committee will meet and vote on the categories of teaching, research and service. It is expected that faculty will participate in all three areas, though workload assignments may adjust the amount of time they
spend on each. Workload allocation should be considered by the Tenure and Promotion Committee during its deliberations and voting. The faculty member’s performance in each of the three areas shall be rated superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. According to the College of Arts and Sciences guidelines, to be granted tenure and promotion to associate professor, the faculty member must achieve at least a “satisfactory” level of performance in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity/scholarship, and service for the period under review (see below for the Department of History’s statement on superior and satisfactory rankings in teaching, research, and service), and achieve a “superior” level of performance in at least one of these areas. For promotion to full professor, a faculty member must achieve a performance ranking of “superior” in two of the three areas of professional activity and a rating of at least “satisfactory” in a third area. The committee will also vote on whether or not it recommends tenure and/or promotion. Separate votes will be held for tenure and promotion.

D. Report
The committee will submit a report of no more than ten pages in length to the chair of the department (or to the dean of the college, if the chair of the department is under review for promotion), along with a recommendation either to grant tenure and/or promotion or to deny tenure and/or promotion. The committee will include the voting totals in its report, but NOT the individual voting record of committee members. The department chair will then write a letter to accompany the report. The candidate MUST be given five working days to respond to the report and chair’s letter prior to any of the reports advancing to the next level.

Section IV: Evaluation Criteria

Research & Scholarship (revised April 2018)
The Department of History recognizes the value of research in historical inquiry, and recognizes that scholarship may be pursued in a variety of ways and emerge in a variety of formats. This part of the Tenure and Promotion policy aims to set a standard for faculty members’ continued engagement in the scholarship and research of history, including traditional scholarship in history as well as work in public history, digital humanities, and/or history pedagogy. The policy also aims to clarify for committees and for the chair how the research activity of History faculty should be read in relation to College of Arts and Letters standards for “Primary” and “Secondary” research and in relation to the ISU categories of “superior” and “satisfactory.”

I. Research-Related Guidelines and Definitions

A. Research Narrative
The Department strongly recommends that all candidates for tenure or promotion include with their application a narrative discussion and evaluation of their research record. This narrative should describe the candidate’s research area and trajectory and how it contributes to a particular field of historical study. It should also address how the research record maps onto the categories below. Candidates should take special care to address aspects of the record that could raise questions, such those that can emerge around multi-authored publications, or in cases where the presence or nature of the peer-review process might not be obvious.
Candidates should also take special care to address projects in the digital humanities or public history. The Department of History values and encourages work in the public and digital humanities, while recognizing that such projects are difficult to quantify and evaluate, since they may take a variety of forms, and often overlap with teaching, professional service, or public engagement.

Candidates will need to demonstrate how their digital or public work corresponds to the categories below. Such demonstrations could involve several of the following: evidence of the excellence of the project (in terms of its validity, integrity, or contribution to the field); the novelty or sophistication of the theoretical methodology, analysis, the extent of engagement with sources; the amount or type of sponsorship; user/participant/audience data; citations or reviews; the candidate’s role in the case of a work with multiple contributors; or advisory board membership.

B. Definitions
“Peer reviewed” means that at least two recognized experts in the field of the publication or project evaluate the work for its quality, accuracy, and contribution prior to publication. In general, review by a single editor or by press’s editorial board does not constitute peer review, unless both the editor and the majority of the members of the editorial board are recognized experts in the field of the publication.

“Publication” means any publication that is in substantially final form and under contract or accepted for publication with an anticipated publication date (as confirmed by the publisher).

C. Research Categories
The College of Arts and Letters divides research activity into two categories, “primary” and “secondary.” The History Department recognizes that publications and research activities are valued differently in the field, depending on their type (book, article, book review), venue of publication, and other factors. This section describes how committees should weigh different types of primary evidence in order to assist in the evaluation of a candidate’s research according to the ISU benchmarks of “superior” and “satisfactory.” It also lists the types of research activity that the History Department classifies, in line with CAL, as secondary evidence.

1. Primary Evidence
a. Category 1
   • Historical monograph (book-length study using primary and secondary sources)
   • Book-length work of scholarly synthesis. (Normally treats a broad topic using primarily secondary sources.)
   • Book-length scholarly edition or translation of a text. (This would normally include a substantial introduction and extensive critical and textual notes, and possibly a running commentary on the text.)

b. Category 2
   • Peer-reviewed article in nationally or internationally academic journal
   • Article in a leading journal in the candidate’s area of specialization
• A substantial article on teaching, grounded in relevant theory or
historiography, in a leading journal on teaching or in the candidate’s
area of specialization
• Chapter or essay in peer-reviewed edited collection from a scholarly press
• Survey-level textbook
• Article-length translation with notes and commentary
• Co-authored article in a scholarly journal for which the candidate is the
lead author
• Monograph for which the candidate is a co-author

c. Category 3
• An article in a scholarly journal for which one is an editor, associate
editor, or assistant editor
• Article in a scholarly journal for which the candidate is a contributing author
• A shorter or descriptive article on teaching, with limited theoretical or
historiographical contextualization
• Major review article (usually more than 3000 words, usually addressing
four or more books)
• Award of an external, competitive, peer-reviewed research-related
grant, fellowship, or scholarship supporting (candidate should be a lead
or co-lead researcher)
• Primary editor of book-length collection of documents
• Translation of a text (at least equal in length to a major article, but with
limited or no annotations or notes)
• Annotated article of 2,500 words or more in a scholarly peer-reviewed
encyclopedia
• Publication in a proceedings from a scholarly meeting

2. Secondary Evidence
• Editorship of an edited collection of scholarly essays or editorship of a
historical encyclopedia or dictionary. (N.B. CAL labels this secondary;
The History Department would be open to the case that serving as the
principal editor of a collection of new scholarly essays or a major historical
encyclopedia or dictionary is Category 2.)
• Editorship of a professionally-relevant journal. (N.B. CAL labels this secondary;
The History Department would be open to the case that editing a national
or international journal in one’s field would be at least Category 3.)
• Published book or other reviews (usually invited, addressing three books or fewer).
• Publication in a national or international venue that is not refereed/reviewed
by peers in the field, such as a major newspaper or major blog.
• Presentation at a scholarly conference or external colloquium.
• Serving in an official capacity at a research or pedagogical conference
or workshop, for instance as a panel chair, respondent, or officer of the
organization sponsoring the conference.
• Participation in professional development activities to improve research
productivity or grant writing.
• Submission or funding of internal research grants.
• Submission of external research grants that were not funded.
• Curation of local, research-related exhibits.
• Invited research or pedagogy presentation to a scholarly or professional audience
D. Research Timeline for Evaluation
When evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate, the committee and chair normally consider all research activity within the past five-to-six years, regardless of the institution where that work was produced. For promotion to full, the Department counts all research in the rank of associate, regardless of where that work was produced or the timeline that has elapsed. In their deliberations for tenure and promotion, the committee and chair should evaluate whether the candidate demonstrates a sustained engagement with their field and the candidate’s potential to sustain a research and publication record following tenure and/or promotion.

II. Evaluation of Research

This section offers guidance about how committees may weigh and evaluate a candidate’s “primary” and “secondary” research activity in order to meet the university’s benchmarks of “satisfactory” and “superior.” The committee has the authority to use its discretion, alongside the candidate’s narrative rationale and the input of external reviewers, to weigh some elements of a candidate’s research-related activity differently than these guidelines. For example, publication of an exceptionally high quality article that is singled out for unusual attention (such as an award) could be weighed more heavily.

For Tenure and/or Promotion to the rank of Associate or Full Professor, the departmental review committee may consider rankings of “superior” or “satisfactory” if the candidate meets or exceeds the following benchmarks. (These benchmarks are based on a five-to-six year timeline for coming up for tenure and/or promotion.)

A. For a ranking of Superior:
• One item from category 1; or
• Three items from category 2; and one item from category 3; or
• Two items from category 2 and three items from category 3; or

B. For a ranking of Satisfactory:
• Two items from category 2; and one item from category 3

C. In addition, candidates for Tenure or Promotion need to have:
• At least two items per year from the listing of “secondary evidence,” including submission of at least two external grant applications during the period under review.
• Evidence of an ongoing research agenda that will continue to lead to scholarly publications following tenure and/or promotion. For candidates for Associate, this evidence should indicate whether the candidate is likely to be promoted to full professor within a five-to-six year timeframe. For candidates for Full, this research record and agenda should indicate whether the candidate is likely to merit at least a “satisfactory” research rating within a five-year PPR timeframe.
Teaching
Teaching is the direct educational involvement with students inside and outside the classroom and the activities that enhance this process, including (but not limited to) the following:
  » classroom instruction
  » supervising graduate students
  » advising
  » supervising independent studies and internships
  » course design, management, and organization
  » professional development that allows faculty to stay current within the field
  » curriculum development
  » developing new modes of instruction
  » working with educators in area high schools to develop and support secondary history curriculum (may also be considered under Professional Service)
  » Serving as member of graduate committees (may also be considered under Professional Service)

The Tenure and Promotion Committee will gather evidence of quality teaching from, but not limited to, the following:
  » Teaching evaluations
  » Committee classroom visits
  » Syllabus and course materials
  » Statement of teaching
  » Effective and/or innovative use of technology
  » Portfolio

Faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a portfolio that includes syllabi and course materials, a statement of teaching, and a statement of their use of classroom technology, and any other supporting materials. To gain a “superior” in the area of teaching, the faculty member should have consistently strong teaching evaluations, received awards/grants or other recognition of superior teaching, and/or demonstrated continuous improvement and innovation in the classroom.
Professional Service
Service is recognized as an essential function of history faculties, as noted by the American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct. Faculty members are expected to carry out a variety of services to the university, community, state and national community. Service can be understood as:

» Activity within the university outside normal teaching and research activities, such as service on committees or as an external examiner for another department, organizing public presentations, and/or advising a student organization or club
» Service outside the university—at the community, state, regional, or national level—that draws on the faculty member’s academic skills, including work on historic preservation projects, giving talks to community groups, service on committees of scholarly organizations, and consulting work for government agencies and/or nongovernmental organizations

**The Department of History recognizes administrative appointments such as director of womens studies, graduate director, and similar appointments as professional service activities. These activities will be evaluated under the service category and may be used as evidence of “superior” service.

Faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a portfolio with a list of their service activities, together with a collection of material that might document or illustrate the service they have performed. This could include letters thanking them for such activity, or newspaper articles, documents, or photographs relating to activities they have carried out. To gain a “superior” in the area of service the faculty member should show that he or she has taken a leading role in a particular service activity, such as chairing a committee, initiating and/or taking a leading role in a project, or organizing significant scholarly events.
Workload Policy

Created February 2015; revisited 17 April 2017

The Department of History adheres to the following guidelines regarding faculty workload. These include the outline and description of typical duties of full-time faculty members, aligned with the policies and guidelines of Idaho State University, in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Each nine-month contracted faculty member (tenured or tenure-track) is required to complete 15 workload units per semester for a total of 30 units per year. These equate to nine units of teaching, 4-5 units of research, and 1-2 units of service per semester. Non-tenure-track faculty are required to satisfy 15 units of teaching per semester, though this may be reduced to fulfill service obligations. Alternate workload breakdowns may be designated for research faculty.

Note: Some “Teaching/Instruction” units may overlap with those classified as “Research and Creative Activities” or “Service.” In such cases, the classification may be negotiated with the Department Chair.

Workload for Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Instruction/Teaching (9 units per semester)
Instruction falls into four categories:

- Instruction-Related Activity: Courses taught (e.g., lecture, independent study, thesis, graduate committee and chair-related duties)
- Out-of-Classroom Activities Related to Instruction: New course development, new teaching modalities, major course revision, development of digital or web-based modules, tutoring, work with students in office hours, etc.
- Other Instruction Activity: Supervision of undergraduate or graduate students
- Student Advising, Recruitment, Examining: Formally assigned advisees, informal advising, student recruitment activity, on-site recruitment, enrollment fair, Graduate Faculty Representative work, etc.

In the base case, each 3-credit course counts as three workload units. Additional instruction units will be considered for other activities linked to teaching and student advising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of three 3-credit courses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation, preparation, and/or offering of new courses</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study courses</td>
<td>1 unit per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis supervision (HIST 6650: Thesis)</td>
<td>1 unit per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate committee membership and active mentoring</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate advising</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Faculty Representative on exam committee</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Workload units determined by weekly contact hours, manuscript editing.
Questions for discussion on this section:

1. The English & Philosophy department considers online teaching, and “teaching away from one’s primary campus” as constituting additional teaching units. To date, the Department of History has not acknowledged these as additional units, but as part of its existing instructional platform. Should they be considered as additional teaching units?

2. The English & Philosophy department considers the supervision of undergraduate students as constituting additional teaching units. Do contact hours with students per week, in an advisory role or during office hours, constitute a portion of the teaching workload?

3. What weight should be applied to instruction units regarding graduate committee membership and thesis credits? Should these be recorded consummate with contact hours per week, or with credits registered?

4. How should we acknowledge the creation and prepping of new courses? On the surface this appears to fall within the duties of instruction. Creation – particularly on a digital platform – requires serious time commitment.

Research and Creative Activities (4-5 units per semester)

All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members will remain actively engaged in research and its dissemination in their areas of specialization. All full-time tenure-track faculty members are required to be actively engaged in research and/or creative activities in their areas of specialization. Tenure-track faculty typically have a workload assignment of 3 or more units in this area. In accordance with the College policy, normally one workload unit will be allocated for approximately 2.67 average weekly hours spent in scholarly or creative activities.

The Department recognizes that research and creative activities are constant processes. Progress should therefore be outlined to the Department Chair when identifying projects that constitute multiple units over several semesters. Progress in research and creative activities will be acknowledged when:

1. A faculty member is actively engaged in the planning of a research project, and/or making progress toward its completion and dissemination. This may be measured through research and data collection; writing, editing or revision of results; collaboration with other scholars; identification of funding opportunities and/or applications for funding; the submission of abstracts and presentation of conference, colloquia, or seminar papers and/or posters.

2. A faculty member brings a research or creative project to completion, that is, having their scholarship published, or having it accepted for publication (contracted with publisher; “forthcoming”). Outlets include academic monographs and other single-authored books; co-authored books; editorship or co-editorship of a book of collected essay chapters; textbooks; peer-reviewed chapters in refereed books; and journal articles. Other research and creative activities include, but are not limited to, the publication of scholarly reviews; and presenting at, or organizing a conference, seminar, colloquia, or presenting a scholarly poster.

Public engagement serves as an important link between the University and the community. As such, certain actions may qualify as “Research and Creative Activities” units. Others fall under “Service,” as outlined below.
Service (1-2 units)
Faculty members are expected to perform service at the Department, College, and University levels, as well as within their professional fields. Faculty may satisfy “Service” requirements in a variety of ways, including serving on Department, College, and/or University committees; serving on graduate exam committees, or as a Graduate Faculty Representative (GFR). External opportunities for service include, but are not limited to, serving on a professionally related executive or guiding committee within one’s field; and serving as a manuscript reviewer for a publisher or journal. Other activities may be considered following discussion with the Department Chair. Normally one workload unit will be allocated for approximately 2.67 average weekly hours spent in service activities.

Early College Program
TBD as we decide how to engage with new compensation system.

Administration
Faculty who take on significant administrative roles in the Department of History may be assigned workload units aligned with the time and responsibility required of their positions. These include, specifically, the positions of Department Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Director, ELC Coordinator, and Department Webmaster.

Adjustments
Although the typical workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 9 units of “Instruction/Teaching,” 4-5 units of “Research and Creative Activity,” and 1-2 units of “Service,” for a total of 15 units per semester, workloads may be adjusted for a variety of reasons. The Chair will determine adjustments.

Assessing Workload
Faculty are required to submit their workload assessment to the Chair prior to the commencement of the semester. For example, a workload assessment for the fall semester should be submitted prior to the completion of the preceding spring semester, after the release of the fall semester course schedule, and identify as accurately as possible the anticipated distribution of workload units.
Instructional Workload Guide (Suggested)

New Course Preparation

1.5 hours/week (.6 Work Load Unit, or WLU)

Undergraduate Instructional Activities

- Independent Study: TBD (by credits registered or hours engaged?)
- Honors project supervision: (by credits registered or hours engaged?)
- Formally assigned undergraduate advising: .27 hours per week (.1 WLU)
- Informal advising activities (office hours, e-mail, chat appointments, web conferencing, and writing student recommendations): 2 hours per week (.8 WLU)

Graduate Instructional Activities

Single Semester Activities
- Serving as an external Graduate Faculty Representative: .27 hours/week (.1 WLU per student)
- HIST 6664: Graduate Internship coordinator: .8 hours per week (.3 WLU)

Multi-Semester Activities
  Hours include summer advising and, retrospectively, proposal writing time. Notice the cap on the maximum number of semesters or graduation (whichever is earlier). A student’s proposal must have been approved for the adviser to begin to earn WLU’s.
  - HIST 6645: Research Project
    - Advisor: 1.33 hours per week (.5 WLU; max 1 semester)
    - Committee member: .33 hour/week (.1 WLU; max 1 semester)
  - HIST 6650: Thesis
    - Advisor: 1.33 hours per week (.5 WLU; max 2 semesters)
    - Committee member: .67 hours per week (.3 WLU; max 1 semester)
Guidelines for Faculty Travel Funding
(Approved in History faculty meeting January 15, 2008)

1. Travel Policy
• Travel to scholarly meetings, archives, and to other scholarly venues is essential to the professional functions of faculty in the Department of History. The Department of History will provide funding for professional travel for full-time, tenure-track and tenured faculty up to the allowable per diem amount, as departmental budgets permit, and within the following guidelines. Travel to scholarly conferences for official activities will receive priority; faculty members are encouraged to find other sources, internal and external, for individual research needs.

• Faculty members are encouraged to seek external funding for travel, and to include travel, when necessary, within the budgets of grant proposals. Faculty members are also encouraged to apply for internal funds to assist with travel costs. Funded travel is expected to support the Department of History’s profile and mission. Faculty members who do not follow the guidelines below will not be considered for departmental travel funding.

• Travel for adjunct, non-tenure-track instructional faculty is not generally funded by the Department, but may be funded on a per-case basis, and under the direction of the Department Chair.

• Graduate student and undergraduate student travel is not funded by the Department’s budget. Graduate students are encouraged to apply for internal and external grant funding. Faculty members writing grants for external funding that include funding for graduate research assistants in their budgets must include travel costs for the research assistants, when applicable. Undergraduate students are encouraged to work through the Associated Students of Idaho State University, and various student organizations, in addition to development activities, to procure travel support.

2. Guidelines for Travel Funding Allocation

Eligibility
• Activities eligible for funding include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Presenting paper at a scholarly conference

2. Serving as commentator for panel at a scholarly conference

3. Organizing and chairing a panel at a scholarly conference

4. Official activities of the Department of History, such as interviewing position candidates at a conference, when such activity is not funded by other units

5. Serving as program chair, president, or officer of a scholarly organization, if the organization does not fully fund travel to the main conference and if the faculty member is expected to attend and/or chair business meetings.

6. Other official functions related to dissemination and creation of research at scholarly conferences (poster sessions, facilitating round table discussions, etc.)
7. Soliciting manuscripts, meeting with potential authors, and attending editorial meetings, IF the traveling faculty member is the editor or guest editor of a journal, book series, or press and the journal and/or press does not cover the full expenses of the trip

8. Invited meetings with academic presses interested in pursuing publication of the faculty member’s research (books will receive priority)

9. Attending official business meetings linked to preparing external proposals, as Principle Investigator or Co-Principle Investigator, at scholarly venues, when other units do not provide funding and the external funding proposal will, if funded, generate indirect cost returns for the Department of History

Application Procedure
• Faculty seeking departmental travel funds should complete the History Department Travel Funding Request Form and submit it to the Chairperson of the Department as early as possible during the academic year. Travel budgets are often very limited, so travel requests submitted prior to October 15 of the academic year may be given priority, at the Chair’s discretion, and depending on the budget levels of that year.

Indirect Cost Returns and Travel Funding
• When departmental travel budgets are inadequate to fund travel under the department guidelines, funding from Indirect Cost Returns may be used to fund travel. Travel funded by Indirect Cost Returns will prioritize activities associated with generating external funding, such as attending a regional meeting sponsored by the National Science Foundation, but Indirect Costs may also be used to fund the professional activities listed above.
Academic Dishonesty Policy
(Approved October 19, 2010)

The Department of History adheres to the Idaho State University Faculty and Staff Handbook guidelines for Academic Dishonesty (see Part 6 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook below) but has made the following additions to the policy.

1.) When an instructor/faculty member files a written incident report as outlined in Part 6, Section IX.A.4.e, the Department of History will retain the report on file, under the student’s name, in a secure location. The student will be asked to sign the report and will be given a copy of same. The report may or may not, depending on the conclusions reached by the instructor as per the Faculty/Staff Handbook, be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters.

2.) The Department of History will maintain secure (placed in a locked office with access by the chairperson of the Department) files of academic dishonesty reports. Students may ask, in writing to the chairperson of the Department, to see the contents of their file. The Department will provide the file to the student within 45 days of the request. [MAY NOT BE NEEDED IF ONLY REPORT IS INCLUDED--SEE NOTE]

From the Idaho State University Faculty/Staff Handbook:

Part 6. Student Affairs

Section IX. Student Conduct
A. Academic Dishonesty (Updated 8-18-09)

1. General
   a. Academic integrity is expected of all individuals in academe. Behavior beyond reproach must be the norm. Academic dishonesty in any form is unacceptable.

   b. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating and plagiarism.

2. Definitions
   a. CHEATING is defined as using or attempting to use materials, information, or study aids that are not permitted by the instructor in examinations or other academic work.

   Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to:
   (1) Obtaining, providing, or using unauthorized materials for an examination or assignment, whether verbally, visually, electronically, or by notes, books, or other means.

   (2) Acquiring, examinations or other course materials, possessing them, or providing them to others without permission of the instructor. This includes providing any information about an examination in advance of the examination.

   (3) Taking an examination for another person or arranging for someone else to take an examination in one’s place.
(4) Submitting the same work or substantial portions of the same work in two different classes without prior approval of the instructor.

(5) Fabricating information for any report or other academic exercise without permission of the instructor.

b. PLAGIARISM is defined as representing another person’s words, ideas, data, or work as one’s own. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the exact duplication of another’s work and the incorporation of a substantial or essential portion thereof without appropriate citation. Other examples of plagiarism are the acts of appropriating creative works or substantial portions thereof in such fields as art, music, and technology and presenting them as one's own. The guiding principle is that all work submitted must properly credit sources of information. In written work, direct quotations, statements that are paraphrased, summaries of the work of another, and other information that is not considered common knowledge must be cited or acknowledged. Quotation marks or a proper form of identification shall be used to indicate direct quotations. As long as a student adequately acknowledges sources of information, plagiarism is not present. However, students should be aware that most instructors require certain forms of acknowledgment or references and may evaluate a project on the basis of form, penalizing the student in the grade assigned if citation of sources is improper.

c. ACADEMIC as used in this policy is synonymous with “scholastic” and refers to school-related endeavors, whether the school is vocational or academic.

d. INSTRUCTOR/FACULTY MEMBER as used in this policy is defined as a person who is responsible for the teaching of a class or laboratory or other instruction. These terms include professors regardless of rank, instructional staff, graduate assistants, visiting lecturers, and adjunct or visiting faculty.

3. Penalties for Academic Dishonesty

a. Any penalty imposed for academic dishonesty shall be in proportion to the severity of the offense.

b. Penalties that may be imposed by the instructor are:
   (1) Warning: The instructor indicates to the student that further academic dishonesty will result in other sanctions being imposed.

   (2) Resubmission of work: The instructor may require that the work in question be redone to conform to proper academic standards or may require that a new project be submitted. The instructor may specify additional requirements.

   (3) Grade reduction: The instructor may lower a student’s grade or assign “F” for a test, project, or other academic work.

   (4) Failing: The instructor may assign “F” for the course.

   (5) Failing with notation: The instructor may assign “F” for the course and instruct
the Registrar to place notation indicating academic dishonesty on the student’s permanent transcript.

c. Penalties that may be imposed at the University level are:
   (1) Suspension from the University: This is the administrative withdrawal of the offending student by the University. The student is suspended for a length of time, determined by the University, that may depend upon the circumstances that led to the sanction.

   (2) Expulsion from the University: This is the most severe penalty for academic dishonesty and may be imposed by the University for extreme or multiple acts of academic dishonesty. Once expelled, the student is not eligible for readmission to the University.

d. Combinations of penalties may be imposed.

e. Withdrawal from a course does not exempt a student from penalties for academic dishonesty.

4. Procedures for Determination of Academic Dishonesty and Imposition of Penalties
The instructor of the course is responsible for initiating investigation of each suspected incident of academic dishonesty. When the instructor witnesses such an incident, has evidence of one, or is informed of one by a witness, the instructor shall proceed as follows:

a. The instructor may intervene and shall gather evidence to see whether further action is necessary.

b. If the instructor feels that a sanction of grade reduction, failing, or failing with notation is warranted, he/she shall discuss the incident with his/her department head or dean. If, after this meeting, the instructor decides not to impose sanctions, then no further action is necessary.

c. If, after the meeting, the instructor decides to proceed, he/she shall inform the student or students involved (orally and in writing) of the evidence of academic dishonesty. The instructor shall meet with the student, consider the student’s response (which should be given orally and in writing), and collect any available evidence and testimony from witnesses. In cases of suspected plagiarism, the instructor may ask the student to supply the references used, and the student must comply with such a request.

d. On the basis of this information, the instructor may decide to impose a penalty. If the penalty is only a warning or a demand that work be resubmitted, then no further action is necessary.

e. If, after those steps, the instructor concludes that academic dishonesty has occurred and decides to impose a sanction of grade reduction, failing, or failing with notation, he/she shall prepare a written incident report. The report shall include the student’s name, the date of the incident, a description of the incident and the available evidence, and the instructor’s decision regarding sanctions. The report shall state the specific sanctions imposed—grade reduction, failing, or failing with notation.

The instructor shall keep a copy of the report and send copies to:
(1) the student,

(2) the chairperson (or designee) of the department in which the instructor holds an appointment,

(3) the chairperson (or designee) of the department in which the student is a major,

(4) the dean (or designee) of the college in which the instructor holds an appointment,

(5) the dean (or designee) of the college in which the student is a major, and

(6) the Office of the Registrar. A copy of the incident report shall be placed in the student’s permanent file in that office. The instructor shall also inform the student of the procedures for appeal outlined in Section 5 below.

f. When an ‘F’ with notation is assigned, the Office of the Registrar shall also send a letter to the student informing him/her of the procedures for appeal. Notation indicating academic dishonesty shall be placed on the student’s permanent transcript if

(1) the student does not appeal the penalty within the first full semester following the semester in which the alleged incident occurred, or

(2) the penalty is upheld in the appeals process.

g. Any student who receives two “F”s with notation is subject to suspension or academic expulsion. When a student receives a second “F” with notation, the Office of the Registrar shall notify the Academic Dishonesty Board; that board will then decide whether the student should be suspended, expelled, or neither, following the procedures in Section B below.

5. Procedures for Students’ Appeals of Imposed Penalties

a. The student may appeal penalties for academic dishonesty to the dean (or designee) of the college in which the course was offered. This is the final level of appeal for penalties of resubmission of work, grade reduction, or failing without notation that are imposed for academic dishonesty. For a penalty of failing with notation, the final level of appeal is the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

b. The appeal to the dean (or designee) must be filed, in writing, no later than the next full semester following the semester in which the alleged incident of academic dishonesty occurred.

c. When a student files an appeal, the dean (or designee) shall set a date for a formal hearing to discuss the allegations and sanctions. He/she shall moderate the hearing and keep a written record of it. The hearing shall include the instructor, the student, the chairperson (or designee) of the department in which the instructor holds an appointment, the chairperson (or designee) of the department in which the student is a major, and the dean (or designee) of the college in which the student is a major.
d. If the formal hearing results in the student being exonerated of all charges of academic dishonesty, the dean (or designee) of the college in which the course was offered shall prepare a letter or memorandum stating that the student has been exonerated and requesting that all records about the alleged act of dishonesty be destroyed, other than the dean’s own record of the hearing.

The dean (or designee) shall send copies of the letter or memorandum to:
(1) the instructor,
(2) the student,
(3) the chairperson of the department in which the instructor holds an appointment,
(4) the chairperson of the department in which the student is a major,
(5) the dean of the college in which the student is a major, and
(6) the Office of the Registrar. That office shall remove all records about the alleged dishonest conduct from the student’s permanent file.

e. If the student is not exonerated of all charges, then the dean (or designee) of the college in which the course was offered shall send copies of the written record of the formal hearing to parties (1)-(6) above.

f. If the penalty is reduced or rescinded as a result of the hearing, the dean (or designee) of the college in which the course was offered shall direct the Registrar to make any changes in the student’s grade.

g. Penalties for academic dishonesty may not be challenged through the scholastic appeals process.

6. Procedures for Implementation of Penalties at the University Level

Authority to assign the penalties of suspension or expulsion from the University rests with the Academic Dishonesty Board.