



## Worcester Polytechnic Institute

### Faculty Handbook

**Reformatted:**

May 19, 2005

**Updated:**

October 11, 2007  
April 17, 2008  
February 25, 2010  
March 25, 2010  
May 13, 2010  
October 7, 2010  
March 24, 2011  
April 14, 2011  
May 12, 2011  
October 14, 2011  
March 22, 2012  
May 8, 2012  
March 14, 2013  
January 23, 2014  
February 27, 2014  
April 17, 2014  
October 9, 2014  
November 20, 2014  
December 18, 2015  
April 14, 2016  
May 10, 2016  
August 15, 2016  
September 8, 2016  
October 14, 2016  
January 19, 2017  
February 14, 2017  
April 13, 2017  
May 9, 2017  
December 12, 2017  
January 18, 2018  
March 15, 2018  
April 12, 2018  
May 8, 2018  
October 4, 2018  
February 7, 2019  
May 7, 2020

## Table of Contents

<b>PART ONE: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS OF THE WPI FACULTY*</b> .....	<b>1-4</b>
SECTION ONE: DEFINITION OF THE FACULTY.....	1-5
SECTION TWO: DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AUTHORITY, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM OF THE FACULTY.....	1-5
SECTION THREE: GENERAL RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE.....	1-6
BYLAW ONE: MEMBERSHIP, DUTIES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY.....	1-9
BYLAW TWO: APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PROVOST'S OFFICE TO SERVE ON THE FIVE STANDING COMMITTEES: CAP, CAO, CASL, CGSR, AND UOAC.....	1-15
BYLAW THREE: ELECTION OF COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY.....	1-15
BYLAW FOUR: UNEXPIRED TERMS - APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION OF REPLACEMENTS.....	1-15
BYLAW FIVE: SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY.....	1-15
BYLAW SIX: MEMBERSHIP OF FACULTY ON COMMITTEES OF THE WPI BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND FACULTY PARTICIPATION AT BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETINGS.....	1-16
BYLAW SEVEN: STANDING AND SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER.....	1-17
I. <i>Standing Rule One</i> .....	1-17
II. <i>Special Rule of Order One</i> .....	1-17
III. <i>Special Rule of Order Two</i> .....	1-17
APPENDIX A: REPORT OF THE AD HOC TENURE COMMITTEE.....	1-19
A. <i>General Procedural Matters</i> .....	1-19
B. <i>Procedure for Granting Tenure</i> .....	1-20
C. <i>Policy on Faculty Conduct</i> .....	1-22
D. <i>Procedural Amendments</i> .....	1-33
APPENDIX B: OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE ....	1-34
APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTANT RUN-OFF VOTING METHOD .....	1-36
APPENDIX D: THE ROLES PLAYED BY TENURED, TENURE-TRACK, AND NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY IN CARRYING OUT WPI'S MISSION.....	1-38
<b>PART TWO: POLICIES AND OPERATING PROCEDURES</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
1. POLICIES REGARDING THE STATUS OF FACULTY .....	2-1
A. <i>Academic Freedom and Tenure*</i> .....	2-1
B. <i>Appointments and Reappointments of Tenure Track Faculty*</i> .....	2-4
C. <i>Department Heads*</i> .....	2-5
D. <i>Promotion*</i> .....	2-8
E. <i>Mentoring and Professional Development of Professors at the Associate Level*</i> .....	2-14
F. <i>Policy on Faculty Conduct*</i> .....	2-16
G. <i>Review Of Tenured Faculty</i> .....	2-27
H. <i>Definitions of Joint Appointments of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</i> .....	2-28
I. <i>Guidelines for Searches to Fill Academic Administrative Positions*</i> .....	2-29
2. POLICIES REGARDING ACADEMICS AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS .....	2-31
A. <i>Statement of Values for Undergraduate Education*</i> .....	2-31
B. <i>WPI Undergraduate Learning Outcomes*</i> .....	2-32
C. <i>Policies Regarding The Awarding Of Grades</i> .....	2-33
1. <i>Faculty Guidelines for Project Grading*</i> .....	2-33
2. <i>Policy on Graduate Grade Appeals and Grade Changes*</i> .....	2-34
3. <i>Policy on Undergraduate Grade Appeals and Grade Changes*</i> .....	2-36

D. <i>Policy on Initiating and Terminating Departments or Programs*</i> .....	2-39
3. CERTAIN POLICIES ON FACULTY BENEFITS AND OPPORTUNITIES .....	2-40
A. <i>Consulting Policy</i> .....	2-40
B. <i>Retirement Plan</i> .....	2-40
C. <i>Policy on Sabbatical Leaves*</i> .....	2-41
D. <i>Summer Supplemental Salary</i> .....	2-43
E. <i>Unpaid Leaves</i> .....	2-43
F. <i>The Fringe Benefits Committee*</i> .....	2-44
4. CERTAIN LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH WPI.....	2-45
A. <i>Conflict of Interest Policy*</i> .....	2-45
B. <i>WPI Policy of Indemnification for Faculty, Professional Staff and         All Other "Exempt" Employees</i> .....	2-49
C. <i>Intellectual Property Policy</i> .....	2-50
D. <i>Anti-Hazing Policy</i> .....	2-57
E. <i>Statement on Affirmative Action</i> .....	2-57
F. <i>Sexual Misconduct Policy*</i> .....	2-59
G. <i>Policy on Research Conduct*</i> .....	2-74
5. DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH .....	2-83
A. <i>Educational Development Council</i> .....	2-84
B. <i>Research Development Council*</i> .....	2-84
6. AWARDS AND AWARD COMMITTEES .....	2-85
A. <i>Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Teaching</i> .....	2-85
B. <i>Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Scholarship</i> .....	2-87
C. <i>Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Academic Advising</i> .....	2-88
D. <i>Romeo L. Moruzzi Young Faculty Award for Innovation in Undergraduate Education</i> .....	2-88
E. <i>Denise Nicoletti Trustees' Award for Service to Community</i> .....	2-89
7. CATEGORIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS AT WPI*.....	2-91
A. <i>The Role of the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</i> .....	2-91
B. <i>Categories of Non-Tenure Track Faculty and their Roles</i> .....	2-91
C. <i>Others with Teaching Responsibilities at WPI</i> .....	2-91
D. <i>Titles</i> .....	2-91
E. <i>Appointments, Evaluation, and Promotion Procedures for Continuing Non-Tenure         Track Faculty</i> .....	2-92
F. <i>Criteria for promotion to the indicated non-tenure track ranks</i> .....	2-95
G. <i>Criteria for reappointment as Professor of Practice</i> .....	2-96

[\* Indicates that the section was approved by a vote of the Faculty]

Other policies, which apply to all WPI employees are available from Human Resources on WPI University Policy webpages at <http://www.wpi.edu/offices/hr>

Other relevant University policies are found at <http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/Policies/>

Policies regarding obligations under various Federal copyright laws are found at <https://www.wpi.edu/offices/policies/copyright.html>

**PART ONE:**  
**CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS OF THE WPI FACULTY\***

Voted:  
March, 1970

Revised:  
May 31, 1972

Amended:  
April 26, 1973

Approved by the Board of Trustees :  
June 2, 1973

Amended:  
March 21, 1974  
January 30, 1975  
May 22, 1975  
September 16, 1976  
May 19, 1977  
October 19, 1978  
December 14, 1978  
Spring, 1979  
May 14, 1981  
March 6, 1984  
February 13, 1986  
December 18, 1986  
November 12, 1987  
May 12, 1988  
April 11, 1991

Approved by the Board of Trustees:  
May 17, 1991

Amended:  
February 13, 1992  
January 16, 1997  
January 15, 1998  
December 16, 1999  
February 24, 2000  
January 25, 2001  
March 25, 2010  
May 13, 2010  
October 7, 2010  
April 14, 2011  
May 12, 2011  
March 22, 2012  
March 14, 2013  
April 17, 2014  
December 18, 2015  
April 14, 2016  
May 10, 2016  
January 19, 2017  
April 13, 2017  
May 9, 2017  
May 8, 2018  
May 13, 2020

\* Indicates approval by a vote of the Faculty.

**SECTION ONE**  
**DEFINITION OF THE FACULTY**

(Changes Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 13, 2011. Amended by the Faculty, April 17, 2014)

The Faculty of Worcester Polytechnic Institute consists of the President, the Provost, and those individuals holding full-time appointments with the following exact titles: Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. The Faculty, as a collective body, governs itself under the provisions of this Constitution and under the Bylaws adopted pursuant thereto.<sup>1</sup>

**SECTION TWO**  
**DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AUTHORITY, AND**  
**ACADEMIC FREEDOM OF THE FACULTY**

I. General

The Faculty accepts duties and responsibilities and derives its authority in accordance with the Bylaws of WPI under the direction of the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees, in turn, delegates the areas of responsibility and authority to the Faculty through the President of WPI. In accordance with accepted practices at institutions of higher learning in the United States, areas of duty, responsibility, authority, and academic freedom are understood as follows.

II. Duties

The duties of the Faculty shall include, but not be limited to, the establishment of admission requirements, academic standards, curricula, courses of study, and the regulations pertaining thereto, as well as the certification of candidates for degrees and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for award of degrees.

III. Responsibilities

The Faculty has a responsibility for initiating, considering, and making recommendations on questions of educational policy and problems arising therefrom. A question is one of educational policy to the extent that it bears upon conditions facilitating instruction, study, research, publication, and other scholarly or cultural activities of faculty members and students.

IV. Authority

The Faculty, subject to approval of the Board of Trustees, defines the recognized titles of academic rank at WPI, and the criteria of eligibility thereto, and has such authority over the academic policies and programs as may be delegated to it by the President and the Board of Trustees.

V. Academic Freedom

A. Faculty Members are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be in accordance with established WPI policy.

B. Faculty Members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects and evaluating their students, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subjects.

C. College and university faculty members are citizens, members of learned professions, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As persons of learning and as educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all

---

<sup>1</sup> Former tenured members of the Faculty who are in phased retirement (with fifty percent appointments or greater) retain their privileges to vote on all Faculty governance matters and to serve on all governance committees.

times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokespersons.

D. During their probationary period, untenured Members of the Faculty have the same academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members.

### **SECTION THREE GENERAL RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE**

#### **I. Amending the Constitution and Adopting Bylaws**

An amendment to this Constitution may be proposed by any voting Member of the Faculty by submitting the proposed amendment in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty fourteen days prior to a regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting. Following discussion at this Meeting, the amendment may be voted on at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of those voting is required for adoption.

An amendment will become effective upon endorsement by the Board of Trustees by whatever procedure or agency it chooses to employ.

A Bylaw may be proposed by any voting member of the Faculty by submitting the proposed Bylaw in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty fourteen days prior to a regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting. The Secretary will include the proposed Bylaw on the agenda of the meeting. Following discussion at this meeting, the proposed Bylaw may be voted on at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of those voting is required for adoption. Bylaws may be amended, deleted, or superseded by the adoption of subsequent Bylaws.

#### **II. Faculty Meetings**

The Faculty holds stated monthly meetings and special meetings as the occasion may arise. Special meetings of the Faculty are called by the Secretary of the Faculty or upon petition of ten or more members of the Faculty. Twenty-five percent of the Faculty membership constitutes a quorum. The officers of the Faculty are the Secretary of the Faculty and the Chair of the Committee on Governance. The Secretary of the Faculty normally presides at Faculty Meetings; in the Secretary's absence, the Chair of the Committee on Governance serves in that capacity.

The rules of order for all Faculty Meetings are Robert's Rules of Order (latest edition), except as amended by the Faculty. The agenda for each stated Faculty Meeting will include an opportunity for reports from standing committees as a regular item of business and will be distributed to the Faculty in advance of the meeting. In addition to the oral and written reports of committees to the Faculty, standing committees submit written annual reports of their academic-year activities to the Secretary of the Faculty within one week after the last day of Term D.

Participation in meetings of the Faculty is limited to Members of the Faculty, student members of Faculty committees, and members of the Administration. Attendance is open, except when the Faculty votes to go into executive session. Voting privileges are restricted to members of the Faculty<sup>2</sup> and to such other members of the WPI community as may be designated by a two-thirds majority vote of the entire Faculty. The rules governing Faculty Meetings may be set aside in special circumstances by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty present at any legally constituted Faculty Meeting.

#### **III. Committees of the Faculty**

Committees of the Faculty are created by Bylaws of the Faculty and are responsible to the Faculty. Standing Committees are charged with broad issues of continuing faculty concern, and, once created, maintain their existence until expressly abolished by the Faculty. *Ad hoc* Committees may be created

---

<sup>2</sup> See footnote in "Section One – Definition of the Faculty."

by the Faculty to serve specific purposes and to exist for a designated period of time. Upon completion of its charge or upon the termination of its specified term of existence, an *ad hoc* Committee is required to report to the Faculty, whereupon it ceases to exist unless its term of existence is extended for a designated time and purpose by action of the Faculty. Committees of the Faculty, whether standing or *ad hoc*, may consist of Members of the Faculty, Members of the Administration, and WPI students. Faculty Members of Committees are elected by the Faculty or appointed by the President or Provost or a Committee of the Faculty charged with this responsibility. In any case, the majority of Faculty Members on any Committee must be elected by the Faculty. If the membership of a Committee includes Members of the Administration, such members may be *ex officio* or appointed by the President or Provost, as appropriate. Student members of Faculty committees are selected annually by the students, with the students determining the procedures.

#### IV. Rules Governing Committees

The following rules govern the organization and operation of all standing and *ad hoc* Committees of the Faculty, with the exceptions noted in later sections of this document. The rules of order for all committee formation and procedures may be set aside in special circumstances by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty present at any legally constituted Faculty Meeting.

- A. At their discretion, Committees may invite the participation of non-members whose interest and special knowledge may contribute to their activities.
- B. Committees report regularly to the Faculty, informing, advising, or recommending actions according to their several charges.
- C. Committee terms begin on July 1. Each Committee is responsible for its own organization, and annually elects a chair and a secretary from among the elected Faculty Members for the year beginning July 1. This election will normally take place before the end of Term D. Newly elected members participate in electing the new officers. Outgoing members do not participate in electing the new officers. Committee chairs may succeed themselves except where expressly forbidden in the Bylaws.
- D. Committees are responsible for their own agendas, except that they will be responsive to such duties as may be delegated to them by the Faculty or requested by Members of the Administration.
- E. A Faculty Member may be elected to no more than two standing Committees concurrently. Elected and appointed members of standing Committees cannot succeed themselves unless they have served no more than one year on the Committee. (Service on *ad hoc* or administrative committees is not included in this restriction.)
- F. The Secretary of the Faculty and Faculty Committees should receive sufficient administrative and clerical support to permit them to carry out their functions in a satisfactory manner.
- G. The introduction of new WPI policy or changes in existing policy which are the concern of the Faculty are studied by appropriate Committees for the formulation of recommendations for Faculty consideration and action.
- H. Items deserving of Faculty consideration may be brought to the attention of any Committee by any member of the WPI community.
- I. In those areas where the role of the Faculty is dominant, the Faculty by majority vote may recommend action to administrative officials. Such recommendations may include the solicitation of action by the President or the Board of Trustees.
- J. In those areas where the role of the Faculty is advisory, the appropriate Committee may consult with and advise the appropriate members of the WPI community on matters related to the

Committee's charge without prior notification to the Faculty. The Committee will, however, keep the Faculty advised of the general nature of such communications.

K. *Ex officio*, appointed, and student members have voting privileges on all Faculty Committees, although they do not serve as committee chairs.

L. Committee members are expected to vote on committee business in accordance with their concepts of the best interests of WPI.



**BYLAW ONE**  
**MEMBERSHIP, DUTIES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF**  
**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY**

WPI Faculty Members who accept election or appointment to a committee are expected and obligated to participate in the work of that committee. It is the responsibility of each committee chair to give advance notice of committee meetings and to attempt to resolve scheduling conflicts. It is the responsibility of each committee secretary to note attendance in preparing the minutes of a committee meeting and to forward them to the office of the Faculty Governance Coordinator on a regular basis. If a problem arises, the Committee on Governance will consult with the committee chair on how the matter will be resolved within the committee.

The standing Committees of the Faculty are the following listed committees. The President and the Provost are invited to attend and participate in all meetings of standing and *ad hoc* Committees, excluding deliberations of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom, Joint Tenure Committee, and Committee on Appointments and Promotions, or the Faculty Review Committee on specific individuals regarding tenure, promotion, or matters of academic freedom prior to a Committee recommendation. They will receive published minutes of all committee meetings.

- I. The Committee on Governance (COG) consists of five elected Faculty Members, one Member of the Faculty appointed by the President, and, *ex officio*, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty. Vacancies that occur during the academic year are filled for the unexpired term by special election from a ballot of candidates nominated at a Faculty Meeting. A Member may not be elected Committee chair in successive years.

The election of COG members is conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. Membership on this Committee is limited to no more than two elected Faculty Members from any one academic discipline. The election procedure is as follows. The Secretary prepares a nominating ballot listing eligible Faculty Members by discipline and distributes it to all Members of the Faculty, with instructions to select up to five names from the list. The ten Faculty Members receiving the largest number of nominations, who are also eligible and willing to serve, are then placed on an electing ballot which will contain no more than two names from any one academic discipline. This ballot is distributed with voting instructions to all Members of the Faculty.

COG is responsible for offering nominations and for conducting the election of the Secretary of the Faculty (when that office is vacant) and of Faculty Members to standing and *ad hoc* Committees, except for the election of its own membership and that of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom. Starting in early spring, COG will provide a ballot for the vacancies on each of the other standing Committees, after ascertaining the willingness of each nominee to serve. The ballot will also include names of those nominated by petition signed by five Faculty Members. Ballots will be distributed to each Member of the Faculty and returned to the Committee. The election procedure should normally be completed by the end of Term C. This Committee has the jurisdiction to fill vacancies which may occur during the year in committees which come under its electoral jurisdiction. Such appointments will be only until the next annual election.

COG also receives from members of the WPI community requests for consideration of matters which do not appear to lie within the jurisdiction of existing Faculty Governance and the responsibilities of the Student Government, the Campus Judicial System, or the Administration. The Committee acts by attempting to resolve the issues itself, by referral to an appropriate person or group, or by creation of an *ad hoc* Committee.

COG is also responsible for the formulation of recommendations to the Faculty on changes and additions to the Faculty Rules and Bylaws, and the Faculty Committee structure, as well as for the resolution of questions of jurisdiction of the Faculty Committees relative to each other. The Chair of

COG serves as one of the Faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees.

I.a The Committee on Information Technology Policy (CITP) is a permanent subcommittee of COG that shall have purview over all Information Technology policies, procedures, and practices that affect WPI's academic and research missions. The committee works with representatives from the Information Technology Services (ITS) division and other departments, as needed, on all matters related to computing at WPI.

The five-person CITP includes three faculty members: one selected by COG; one selected by CAP; and one selected by CTAF. In addition, the sub-committee will include a member appointed by the Provost from the Division of Academic Affairs, and, *ex officio*, the Chief Information Officer. The sub-committee elects its Chair from among the three faculty members selected by COG, CAP, and CTAF. The members selected by COG, CAP, and CTAF serve staggered three-year terms, and also serve as the three faculty members appointed to IT's Academic Computing Policy Committee and Working Group. The elected Chair of CITP also serves on the IT Governance Committee. The Provost's appointment to CITP is made each year, with consideration given to the advantages of having members serve longer than one year. Because CITP is not a standing Committee of the Faculty, Section Three, paragraph IV.E of the Bylaws prohibiting committee members from succeeding do not apply.

Although the faculty members appointed to CITP need not be members of the standing committees that select them, each individual should have a sound appreciation for the issues with which those committees and other standing committees deal on a regular basis. In addition, each should have the technical background required to provide constructive input when dealing with the issues that the CITP will likely confront.

It will be the responsibility of the faculty members of the CITP to update the appropriate Faculty committees, including COG, CAP, and CTAF, on any new or modified policies proposed in their work. The Committee may propose new technology-related policies for consideration by COG. With COG's approval, any such proposal will be forwarded to the Faculty for its consideration. (Approved by the Faculty, December 18, 2015.)

II. The Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) consists of six elected Faculty Members, two undergraduate students, and a representative of the Provost's Office.

CAP is responsible for making policy recommendations regarding the direction and goals of undergraduate education at WPI. To do this, the Committee reviews the admission and financial aid policies, reviews the degree requirements, and judges the quality of the academic program as related to WPI goals.

III. The Committee on Academic Operations (CAO) consists of six elected Faculty Members, two undergraduate students, a representative of the Provost's Office, and, *ex officio*, the Registrar.

CAO is responsible for monitoring procedures for administering existing undergraduate academic, admission, and financial aid policies. Recommendations in regard to courses, projects, and programs are made to the Faculty by this Committee. Petitions for exceptions to the established academic rules are received and acted upon. The Committee brings to the Faculty for action the names of students approved as eligible for baccalaureate degrees.

IV. The Committee on Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR) consists of six elected Faculty Members, one graduate student, and two *ex officio* members: Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies. (Amended by the Faculty, May 10, 2016.)

CGSR is concerned with all post-baccalaureate programs of the College, and reviews and recommends changes in WPI policies on goals, student recruitment, admissions, academic standards, teaching and research assistantships, scholarships, and fellowships. It also makes recommendations to the Faculty and Administration on new graduate programs and changes in programs and courses. The Committee acts on admission of graduate students to degree candidacy, dismissal for failure to meet academic standards, and student petitions on academic matters. It brings to the Faculty for

action the names of students who it has determined are eligible for post-baccalaureate degrees. The Committee reviews and recommends changes in policy on the funding, promotion, and conduct of research at WPI.

- V. The Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom (CTAF) is in charge of the process by which tenure recommendations are reached for each probationary Member of the tenure-track Faculty. In the case of Associate Professors and Professors, the recommendation is for or against tenure. In the case of Assistant Professors who have also been nominated for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the recommendation is for or against tenure with promotion. Joint Tenure Committees, comprised of CTAF members and Department Tenure Committees as specified below, recommend to the Administration which members of the Faculty should be granted tenure or tenure with promotion, as appropriate, according to the policy and procedures on the granting of tenure and promotion. CTAF is also concerned with questions relating to academic freedom.

CTAF consists of six Faculty Members having tenure. Department Heads, the Provost, and Deans are not eligible for membership on this Committee, and there will not be more than one Member from any one Department. The term of office for this Committee is four years. No member may serve successive terms.

Nominations and elections for CTAF are conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. Membership on this Committee is limited to no more than one elected Faculty Member from any one academic discipline. The election procedure is as follows. The Secretary prepares a nominating ballot listing eligible Faculty Members by discipline and distributes it to all Members of the Faculty, with instructions to nominate up to one person from each discipline. The member of each academic discipline who receives the largest number of nominations and is willing to serve if elected is then placed on an electing ballot to be distributed with voting instructions to all Members of the Faculty. In the normal pattern, the number to be elected will be alternately two and one in successive years. Vacancies to unexpired terms will be filled by the same nominating and election procedure as for full terms.

For the purpose of considering each tenure case, a Joint Tenure Committee is formed, consisting of five members from CTAF and the three-member Department Tenure Committee. If the candidate and one of the CTAF members are from the same department, then that CTAF member is recused from the Joint Tenure Committee automatically. The Joint Committee shall also consider whether any of its members should be recused due to direct conflict of interest. In the event of no departmental overlap or conflict of interest, the selection of the five CTAF members to sit on the Joint Tenure Committee will be governed by CTAF procedures developed to lead to an overall pattern of recusals distributed over the CTAF membership so as to ensure appropriate participation for each CTAF member. If recusal of two CTAF members is necessary, the most recent qualified past chair of CTAF will serve for that particular case. The Joint Tenure Committee is chaired by the senior elected member of the five CTAF participants. Normally, each Department Tenure Committee consists of two elected department members with tenure plus the Department Head; in the cases of interdepartmental or interdisciplinary candidates the structure of the Department Tenure Committee shall be modified as explained in Appendix A, Section B2. In the event that recusal of one of the Department Tenure Committee members is necessary due to conflict of interest, the most recent qualified past Department Tenure Committee member will serve on the Joint Tenure Committee for that particular case.

CTAF is also charged with the responsibility of reviewing problems involving the academic freedom of both tenured and non-tenured faculty, whether part-time or full-time. At the start of a particular case, CTAF shall consider whether any of its members should be recused due to direct conflict of interest. If a Committee member is recused, the review will proceed with the remaining members. In the event that CTAF is unsuccessful in the resolution of such problems, the subsequent procedures

as well as the procedures to be followed in the granting of tenure will be those in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Tenure approved by the Trustees in June, 1968, and procedural amendments proposed in the Tenure Committee Report, 1968-69, and approved by the Faculty on March 17, 1969. (These reports are appended to this document as Appendix A.)

VI. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP)

(Amended by the Faculty, January 19, 2017)

(Amended by the Faculty, April 16, 2020)

Roles and responsibilities:

COAP is concerned with criteria for academic appointments and promotions. In collaboration with COG, COAP makes recommendations to the Faculty for changes in criteria for promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor and for changes in criteria for appointment and promotion of continuing non-tenure track faculty members.

COAP makes recommendations to the Provost on initial appointments above the rank of Assistant Professor, on academic promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor that occur prior to the scheduled tenure review year, on academic promotions from Associate Professor to Professor, on initial appointments of Associate and (full) teaching and research Professors, on initial appointments of Professors of Practice, on academic promotions of continuing non-tenure track Faculty members to the Associate and (full) teaching and research Professor levels, and on reappointments of Professors of Practice.

COAP represents the Faculty to the President and Provost on appointment, reappointment, and performance evaluation of academic Department Heads.

Membership and Election Procedure:

COAP consists of seven elected Faculty members holding the rank of Professor, with no more than one representative from any one academic department. Department Heads, Deans, and the Provost are not eligible to serve on COAP. The term of office for this committee is three years, and no member may serve successive terms.

Nominations and elections for COAP are conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty.

The election procedure is as follows: The Secretary prepares a nominating ballot listing eligible Faculty members by department and distributes it to all members of the Faculty, with instructions to nominate up to one person from each department. The member of each academic department who receives the largest number of nominations and is willing to serve if elected is then placed on an election ballot to be distributed to all members of the Faculty. The number to be elected annually will rotate from three to two to two in successive years. Vacancies to unexpired terms will be filled by the same nominating and election procedure as for full terms.

Joint Promotion Committees and Recusal:

For the purpose of considering each promotion case, a Joint Promotion Committee is formed, consisting of six voting members of COAP, and a non-voting Nominator and a non-voting Advocate. If the candidate and one of the COAP members are from the same department, then that COAP member is recused from the Joint Promotion Committee automatically. The Joint Promotion Committee also will consider whether any of its members should be recused due to direct conflict of interest. In the event of no departmental overlap or conflict of interest, the selection of the six COAP members to sit on the Joint Promotion Committee will be governed by COAP procedures developed to lead to an overall pattern of recusals distributed over the COAP membership so as to ensure appropriate participation for each COAP member. If recusal of two COAP members is necessary, then the most recent qualified past Chair of COAP will serve for that particular case. The Joint Promotion Committee is chaired by the Chair of COAP. If the

Chair is recused, then the Joint Promotion Committee is chaired by the senior-most elected member of COAP participants.

- VII. The Committee on Advising and Student Life (CASL) consists of six elected Faculty Members, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, a representative of the Provost's Office, and, *ex officio*, the Director of Academic Advising, and the Dean of Student Life.

CASL is responsible for the continuing development of the student advisory and counseling programs. It reviews the effectiveness of the programs, evaluates current practices in the areas of student environment, residential advising systems, and extracurricular activities as they affect the academic performance of the student body, and recommends changes as appropriate.

- VIII. The Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP) consists of six members in total: three elected Faculty members (serving staggered three-year terms), the Chief Financial Officer, one additional administrative representative member designated by the President, and one additional Faculty member appointed by COG (for a one-year term, renewable for up to three consecutive years, in order to diversify the skills or perspectives needed by the committee, given the prospective composition of the committee that year). FAP informs the Faculty on administrative and financial matters that affect the Institute. FAP ascertains the interests and views of the Faculty concerning such matters, deliberates with appropriate access to institutional data, and works with the Administration to make recommendations that serve the best interests of the Institute.  
(Amended by the Faculty, April 14, 2016.)

- IX. The Faculty Review Committee  
(Amended by the Faculty, May 9, 2017)

The Faculty Review Committee (FRC) consists of nine tenured Faculty members: six elected by the Faculty and three appointed by the President. The Chair of the FRC is chosen by the committee from its elected members. Members of CTAF, members of COAP, and Faculty members with administrative appointments of 50 percent time or more are ineligible to serve on the FRC.

Each year, the Faculty elects two members to three-year terms, following the procedures prescribed in the WPI Faculty Constitution and Bylaws for the election of members to Standing Committees. Diversity on the FRC is highly valued. Toward that end, there shall be no more than one person from any one Department in the group of six elected members, and following each annual Faculty election, one member of the FRC shall be appointed by the President to a three-year term. These appointments should be made to ensure proper diversity among the FRC members. The term of office of members of the FRC begins on July 1 and ends on June 30. No elected or appointed member may serve consecutive terms. A vacancy in the membership of the FRC shall be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term by that person receiving the next highest number of votes in the most recent election, if the person leaving the Committee was an elected member, or by appointment by the President if the person was an appointed member.

The FRC reviews three types of cases: 1) faculty grievances; 2) allegations of faculty misconduct; and 3) grade appeals.

- 1) For faculty grievances, a subcommittee of FRC consisting of three elected and two appointed members of FRC has the power to review and to require reconsideration of:
  - A. The Provost's decision not to renew a probationary, tenure-track appointments;
  - B. Negative decisions on tenure; and
  - C. Negative decisions on promotions of tenured, tenure track, and continuing non-tenure track faculty members;

where the action, decision, or recommendation is alleged by an aggrieved faculty member to result from:

- i. a violation of academic freedom; or
- ii. improper procedure; or
- iii. discrimination based on race, sex, age, color, national origin, religion, genetic identity, disability, gender identity or expression, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, transgender status, veteran status, or any other protected status.

When a matter regarding a faculty grievance comes before the FRC, a subcommittee of three elected and two appointed members of the FRC are selected by the Chair of FRC to review the grievance. Committee members who have had a significant prior involvement with the matter in question, or who have a personal relationship with any of the parties directly involved in the matter, shall recuse themselves from participating in the proceedings. Recusals may be requested by FRC members, the grievant, or other parties in the action, such as the Provost or the Chair of CTAF or COAP. Additional recusals necessary to create the subcommittee with three elected and two appointed members will be arranged by the Chair of FRC such that recusals are distributed evenly over the FRC membership. The exercise of the functions of the FRC requires the presence and participation of all five members of the subcommittee as constituted for a particular grievance. Operational guidelines for FRC review are described in Part One, Appendix B).

- 2) For allegations of misconduct by tenured, tenure-track, and continuing non-tenure track faculty members, the fact finding committee is selected as described in the appropriate conduct policy (Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures: Faculty; Policy on Research Conduct; or Policy on Faculty Conduct). Selection of the fact finding committee is conducted so as to ensure members are unbiased and have the appropriate expertise and diversity as necessary for a particular case.
- 3) The Faculty Review Committee also has a role in the grade appeal process by forming three-member ad hoc committees to review grade appeals which are presided over by the Chair of the FRC.

When any matters regarding faculty grievances, allegations of faculty misconduct, or grade appeals are pending before the FRC at the time when the term of office of its members would expire, the subcommittee (or investigating committee) shall continue as then constituted for the sole purpose of disposing of such pending matters in its jurisdiction, notwithstanding the creation of a new FRC in the regular manner at the same time.

The exercise of the functions of the FRC, as well as its internal organization and procedures (including, if appropriate, the selection of a Committee Chair and the appointment of subcommittees) shall be governed, insofar as the matter is not prescribed by this policy or by the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, by rules adopted by the Faculty Review Committee itself.

- X. The Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Committee (UOAC) consists of the following members; four Faculty Members elected for staggered; three-year terms; a member appointed annually by the Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) from among the Faculty; one undergraduate student appointed by the Student Government Association; a representative of the Provost's Office; the Director of the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center (*ex-officio*); and the Director of Institutional Research (*ex-officio*). One of the four elected Faculty Members shall be elected from the Faculty at-large. The other three shall be elected by the entire Faculty but shall be chosen from among the following departmental groupings: One chosen from the Engineering programs; one chosen from the Natural Sciences, Math or Computer Science; and one chosen from the Foisie School of Business, Social Science and Policy Studies, Humanities and Arts, or IGSD.

The UOAC shall function as a permanent subcommittee of CAP. It shall report to CAP and forward recommendations for Faculty action to CAP for its consideration and possible recommendation to the Faculty.

The UOAC is responsible for:

- a. proposing policy with regard to WPI's undergraduate learning outcomes;
- b. identifying and facilitating procedures for assessing those outcomes;
- c. coordinating outcomes assessment activities on campus;
- d. communicating assessment results; and
- e. formulating academic policy recommendations based on its assessment activities.

The Committee is not responsible for the assessment of departmental majors or programs, but for the identification and assessment of learning outcomes that arise from the undergraduate curriculum broadly defined, including assessment of the first year program.

(Amended by the Faculty, April 13, 2017)

## **BYLAW TWO**

### **APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PROVOST'S OFFICE TO SERVE ON THE FIVE STANDING COMMITTEES: CAP, CAO, CASL, CGSR, AND UOAC**

On an annual basis, the Provost will appoint, with COG review and concurrence on a case-by-case basis, an appropriate member of Academic Administration to serve as the representative of the Provost's Office on CAP, on CAO, on CASL, on CGSR, and on UOAC. Each appointment will be consistent with the allocation of responsibilities within the Provost's Office at the time; there is no limit to the number of re-appointments that one representative may receive to a given committee.

## **BYLAW THREE**

### **ELECTION OF COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY**

The term of office for all committee positions, except as otherwise indicated, is three years, with individual members' terms staggered to provide for continuity. Terms will begin on July 1.

Faculty members of committees will be elected as at-large members.

Academic disciplines are those offering courses for which academic credit is given.

The Instant Run-Off Voting method, as described in Appendix C, will be used in the conduct of all elections to Standing Committees of the Faculty.

## **BYLAW FOUR**

### **UNEXPIRED TERMS - APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION OF REPLACEMENTS**

If a faculty member on a standing or *Ad hoc* Committee will be absent from the campus for more than ten weeks (exclusive of the summer period), a replacement will be appointed to serve until succeeded by a member elected to fill the remainder of the unexpired term. Faculty Members who anticipate being absent from WPI for more than ten weeks should notify the Committee on Governance at the earliest opportunity.

## **BYLAW FIVE**

### **SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY**

(Amended by the Faculty March 22, 2012)

The Secretary of the Faculty is the senior elected member of the Faculty. He or she, working with the Faculty Governance Executive Assistant, maintains the office that:

1. Prepares and distributes the schedule of Faculty Meetings for the academic year;
2. Prepares the agenda for each Faculty Meeting;
3. Notifies the Faculty of Faculty Meeting times and locations;
4. Assembles and distributes supporting documentation for the Faculty Meeting agenda for the purpose of promoting informed discussion of the issues to be voted upon;
5. Publishes and distributes minutes of the Faculty Meetings;
6. Prepares Annual Reports showing membership of Faculty Committees, including terms of office and Committee Officers;
7. Conducts the annual election of the Committee on Governance and the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom;
8. Ascertains that a permanent record of Faculty Meeting minutes and pertinent addenda is maintained for the archives of Worcester Polytechnic Institute and performs other such duties as may be directed by the Faculty;
9. Informs appropriate individuals and groups of Faculty decisions;
10. Monitors progress of the implementation of Faculty decisions; and
11. Solicits periodic reports from administrative officers for Faculty committees.

The Secretary of the Faculty is elected for a term of three years, and may not serve successive terms. The Secretary coordinates Faculty Committee activities, is an *ex officio* member of the Committee on Governance, and may attend all Faculty Committee meetings, excluding CTAF, Joint Tenure Committee, and COAP deliberations on specific individuals. The Secretary of the Faculty is invited to attend meetings of the five "open" Board committees as an observer, but not as a voting member of any committee of the Board unless also appointed as one of the two faculty committee members. In addition, The Secretary of the Faculty will be seated with the members of the Board at meetings of the Corporation and may participate fully in discussions and deliberations, with the exception of not having a formal vote.

The election of the Secretary of the Faculty, when held, will precede all other committee elections. The Committee on Governance will conduct the election by preparing and distributing to all Members of the Faculty a list of eligible candidates with instruction to nominate up to five from the list. The Committee on Governance will then tabulate the returns and prepare an electing ballot listing the names of at least two of the candidates who received the largest number of nominations and are willing to accept the office. This ballot will be distributed with voting instructions to all members of the Faculty. The same procedure will be used for an unexpired term vacancy.

**BYLAW SIX**  
**MEMBERSHIP OF FACULTY ON COMMITTEES OF**  
**THE WPI BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND FACULTY PARTICIPATION AT**  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES' MEETINGS**

(Approved by the Faculty March 22, 2012)

In order to strengthen shared governance and foster good communication among the WPI Faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees, the Trustees will appoint two tenured or tenure-track members of the Faculty to each of five Board committees: Academic Planning, Student Affairs, Budget and Finance, Facilities and Campus Infrastructure, and Marketing. The Board of Trustees' Committee on Nominations and Governance will make the appointments from slates of nominees prepared by the Faculty Committee on Governance (COG). COG will prepare slates containing at least two names for each open position. In



preparing the slates, COG will give preference to members of the Faculty with prior or current experience serving on Faculty Governance Committees.

Terms of service for faculty members of Board committees will be for three years, except that to ensure staggered terms, replacement appointments for unexpired terms, would be for fewer than three years. No member of the Faculty shall serve on more than one Board committee concurrently, but those completing a term on one Board committee can be considered for future service on another. Faculty members of Board committees will have voting privileges, and are considered full, participating members of the committee, not simply observers. It is expected that members of the Faculty serving on Board committees will report regularly to, and seek input from, the corresponding Faculty Governance Committees, including the COG.

Faculty members wishing to be considered for service on a Board committee should submit a brief statement of interest to COG, giving basic information about their appointment at WPI, relevant experience, and reasons for interest in serving on a Board committee.

The Secretary of the Faculty will be seated with the members of the Board at meetings of the Corporation and may participate fully in discussions and deliberations, with the exception of not having a formal vote, as this is a responsibility unique to Trustees and cannot be delegated. In addition, the Secretary of the Faculty is invited to attend meetings of the five "open" Board committees as an observer, but not as a voting member of any committee unless also appointed as one of the two faculty committee members.

## **BYLAW SEVEN STANDING AND SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER**

These special rules governing the conduct of Faculty Meetings have been adopted by the Faculty on the dates indicated; they may be suspended (for the duration of the meeting) by 2/3 vote of those present.

### **I. Standing Rule One**

The time at which any regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting shall adjourn is 85 minutes after its scheduled starting time. (Approved by the Faculty January 25, 2001)

### **II. Special Rule of Order One**

- A. Motions that change either the WPI undergraduate or graduate degree requirements must be distributed to the Faculty in final form a minimum of 14 days prior to their introduction for discussion at a Faculty Meeting.
- B. Motions that represent major changes in academic policy or academic operations that are, or are intended to be, published in the current version of the Undergraduate Catalog, Graduate Catalog, or Faculty Handbook must be distributed to the Faculty in final form a minimum of 14 days prior to their introduction for discussion at a Faculty Meeting. In cases of dispute on whether an item represents a major change, the Secretary of the Faculty will decide.
- C. All motions presented by the Standing Committees of the Faculty must appear in final form in the notice of the meeting distributed by the Secretary of the Faculty. Motions specifically exempted from this requirement are approval of degree candidates and the waiving of degree requirements for individual students. (Adopted March 6, 1984.)

### **III. Special Rule of Order Two\***

(Approved by the Faculty, October 7, 2010)

- A. At each Faculty meeting, a consent agenda will be presented for consideration by voting members in attendance and for their approval by general consent. The consent agenda will consist of the minutes of the previous meeting and any other items that the Secretary of the Faculty, in consultation with the appropriate Committee Chairs, believes will generate no substantive discussion at the Faculty meeting. The items identified for inclusion on the consent

agenda will be designated in the materials that are distributed one week before each faculty meeting.

- B. At each Faculty meeting, the consent agenda will be presented for approval before any other business is transacted. When it is presented, the Presiding Officer will ask if any faculty member wants to extract an item from the consent agenda. Any faculty member who is present can extract an item by simply requesting to do so. The request will not need a second and no vote will be required to grant it. Any faculty member who intends to ask that an item be extracted from the consent agenda should make every attempt to inform the Secretary of the Faculty as far in advance as possible, although such advance notice is not strictly required. The extracted items will be placed on the regular agenda under the proper categories (normally the appropriate Committee Reports) for bringing such items to the Faculty. The items that remain on the consent agenda will then be put to a vote by general consent.
- C. Items that require two-week's notice will not be included on the consent agenda. These are motions that change campus-wide degree requirements or represent major changes in academic policy or academic operations that will be published in the undergraduate catalog, the graduate catalog, or the Faculty handbook. To preserve the tradition of formally voting to approve the graduation lists, these lists will also not be placed on the consent agenda.

## **APPENDIX A: REPORT OF THE AD HOC TENURE COMMITTEE**

(with subsequent Procedural Amendments)

Adopted by the Board of Trustees, June, 1968  
Amended by the Faculty, April 11, 1991  
Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 17, 1991  
Amended by the Faculty, January 25, 2001  
Amended by the Faculty, April 12, 2001  
Changes approved by the Board of Trustees, May 18, 2001  
Amended by the Faculty, April 14, 2011  
Changes Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 13, 2011  
Amended by the Faculty, May 12, 2011  
Changes Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 13, 2011

### **A. GENERAL PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

(Amended by the Faculty, April 14, 2011)

#### **1. Applicability**

(Amended by the Faculty, May 12, 2011)

The term "Faculty" as used in this tenure statement shall be interpreted to mean those individuals holding full-time appointments with the following exact titles: Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. All full-time Faculty appointments at the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor shall be either (a) probationary with respect to tenure, or (b) with tenure.

The precise terms and conditions of every appointment to the Faculty, including the year of the scheduled tenure review for each probationary appointment, must be stated in writing and be in the possession of both WPI and the Faculty Member before the appointment is consummated.

#### **2. Limitations on time in service for probationary appointments**

The maximum duration of a probationary appointment is determined by the time accumulated on the tenure clock, summarized as follows. A tenure-track Faculty Member's tenure clock begins running on the July 1 closest to the starting date of the initial appointment, and normally runs continuously from its starting moment, except as noted in the section of the Faculty Handbook entitled "Academic Freedom and Tenure" under conditions for stopping the tenure clock. The tenure-track Faculty Member's tenure review must be conducted no later than during the sixth year on the tenure clock, and under no circumstances may a probationary appointment be continued after the seventh year on the tenure clock.

Probationary appointments may be for one year or for other stated periods, subject to renewal, and may include credit for previous full-time service with rank of Assistant Professor or higher at other academic institutions. All Faculty Members with probationary appointments are required to serve a minimum period of two years on the tenure clock at WPI prior to tenure review.

#### **3. Notice and policy for dismissal and resignation**

a. Written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed must be given to the Faculty Member in advance of the expiration of the appointment, according to the following minimum periods of notice:

- i. no later than four months before the expiration of the first year of service;
- ii. no later than six months before the expiration of the second year of service;
- iii. at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service. WPI will make every effort to notify Faculty Members of the terms and conditions of their renewals by March 15.

b. Until retirement of the Faculty Member with tenure, such an appointment is terminable by WPI

only for an adequate cause or on account of extraordinary financial emergencies after not less than twelve months' notice to the Faculty Member and subject to the procedures outlined below.

- c. If a tenure appointment is terminated because of financial emergency, the released Faculty Member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released Faculty Member has been offered reappointment and has declined.
- d. If a Faculty Member desires to terminate an existing appointment at the end of the academic year, or to decline a renewal, that Faculty Member shall give notice in writing at the earliest opportunity but not later than one month after receiving notice of renewal; but that Faculty Member may properly request a waiver of this requirement in case of hardship.
- e. Termination by WPI of an appointment with tenure or the non-renewal of a probationary appointment with less advance notice than specified herein shall be subject to the procedural rights as specified in the appropriate policy in the WPI Faculty Handbook and shall only be for the grounds described therein. Administrative personnel who hold academic rank are subject to the foregoing regulations in their capacity as Faculty Members.  
(Amended by the Faculty, January 23, 2014)

## **B. PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING TENURE**

### **1. Policy**

Tenure will be granted only in one of the following manners:

- a. With respect to probationary tenure-track Faculty, and candidates for appointment-with-tenure who undergo review; after a formal review conducted by the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom, with the results communicated to the Provost, and after a positive vote by the Board of Trustees.
- b. With respect to candidates for appointment-with-tenure who do not undergo review; after a positive vote by the Board of Trustees.

The Joint Tenure Committee of the Faculty, as defined below, shall recommend to the Provost which members of the Faculty should be granted tenure. This Committee shall consider for tenure those Faculty Members who, within the following fifteen months, will have served the maximum probationary period; it shall recommend, in these cases, that tenure be granted or that the appointment not be continued.

The Committee shall also consider for tenure those Faculty Members who have been at WPI twenty-one months or more and have been nominated for tenure by any Faculty Member; in these cases the Committee shall recommend that tenure be granted or that the nomination be tabled.

### **2. Joint Tenure**

A Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CTAF) shall be elected by the Faculty to consider with individual Department Standing Committees the granting of tenure. The decision reached by this Joint Committee shall be forwarded to the Provost for consideration.

CTAF shall be composed of six Faculty Members having tenure who shall be elected by the Faculty, by secret ballot, under the direction of the Secretary of Faculty. Department Heads and Deans are not eligible for membership on this Committee, and there shall not be more than one member from any one department. No member may serve successive terms.

Prior to each election the Secretary of the Faculty shall instruct each Member of the Faculty to nominate one tenured Member from each eligible academic department. The election ballot will list the name of that Member with the greatest number of nominations in each Department.

At the initial election the Faculty Member receiving the most votes will serve a four-year term, the

Faculty Member receiving the second greatest number of votes will serve a three-year term, etc. Subsequent elections will be conducted during Term C of each year.

Department Committees shall each be composed of two elected Department Members with tenure plus the Department Head. The Members will be nominated and elected by secret ballot by the Department Faculty for a term of two years with one Member being elected each year, after the first year. No member may serve two consecutive terms, unless the limited number of Department Faculty with tenure makes this impossible. No Member of CTAF may serve on a Department Committee.

In the event that a Department has only one tenured Faculty Member and a Department Head, to staff the Joint Tenure Committee, then CTAF will appoint another WPI tenured Faculty Member to serve on the Joint Tenure Committee, thereby bringing the membership of that Committee to eight. In the event that a Department has no tenured Faculty Members, in addition to the Department Head, to staff the Joint Tenure Committee, then the Joint Tenure Committee shall have only six members, the five members of CTAF and the Department Head. If tenure for a Department Head is under consideration, the Provost will sit in place of that Department Head.

In the cases of tenure candidates who have, or have had, interdepartmental affiliations to such an extent that CTAF determines it appropriate to have special composition of the Joint Tenure Committee, CTAF will name, after investigation of the circumstances, an Interdepartmental Tenure Committee in place of the Department Tenure Committee, and will specify the voting rules of this body. These decisions will be made as early as practicable in the academic year, and the composition and roles in that case will be reported to the candidate and to the Faculties of the candidate's departments. Except in those circumstances which preclude it, the total number of votes by the Interdepartmental Tenure Committee will be three. Two of these will be cast by two tenured Faculty Members who would normally be selected from each of the two Department Tenure Committees. The Heads of both departments will participate in the deliberations of the Joint Committee, and will provide the third vote (such as by one or the other being designated the voting member, or by the two department heads sharing the vote.) In the selection of the Committee membership, the candidate's own preference will be solicited and considered, but determination of the membership will be the responsibility of CTAF.

In the case of candidates from the Interdisciplinary and Global Studies Division (IGSD), CTAF shall form a departmental committee for each candidate with membership rotated and probationary reviews conducted in accordance with the rules of departmental tenure committees. In doing so, CTAF shall consider any tenured faculty in the IGSD and other tenured faculty at WPI who have expertise related to the candidate's area of academic expertise. The Dean of the IGSD will serve in the role of a department head on the candidate's departmental and Joint Tenure Committees.

If an elected member of the Joint Committee must resign, a replacement shall be elected as prescribed above to fill the unexpired term.

## C. POLICY ON FACULTY CONDUCT<sup>3</sup>

(Approved by the Faculty on February 7, 2019)

### 1. Introduction and Applicability

Members of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (“WPI”) faculty have traditionally conducted themselves in accordance with high standards of professional performance, ethical behavior and personal conduct. Nonetheless, from time to time it may be necessary to take action with respect to a faculty member who engages in conduct incompatible with the responsibilities of faculty membership or who fails to meet reasonable standards of performance or behavior. In recognition of this need, WPI has developed the following policy to respond to allegations of misconduct not covered by WPI’s Research Misconduct Policy and WPI’s Sexual Misconduct Policy and to inform members of the community of the appropriate channels for bringing such matters to the attention of WPI. This Policy applies to tenured, tenure-track, and continuing full-time non-tenure track members of the WPI faculty, including the President, the Provost, the Vice Provost for Research, and the Academic Deans.

### 2. Definitions

- a) *Complainant*. The individual, department or entity alleging misconduct.
- b) *Respondent*. The individual against whom an allegation of misconduct is made.
- c) *Dean*. The Dean of the Respondent’s School, department or program.
- d) *Investigator*. The individual responsible for conducting an impartial investigation of the allegations of misconduct when the process moves beyond the initial review.
- e) *Judicial Committee*. The panel of three faculty members and three senior academic administrators responsible for determination of responsibility and sanctions when the process moves beyond the initial review.

### 3. Grounds for Misconduct

Generally, grounds for misconduct are based on violations of professional ethics<sup>4</sup> in carrying out one’s responsibilities to: a) teaching and students; b) scholarship; c) the University; d) colleagues; and e) the community. Nothing in this policy restricts a person's rights to privacy, academic freedom, free speech, and free expression including the right to speak out against a policy or action of the University.

The ethical responsibilities and examples of violations in each category are described as follows:

*Teaching and Students:* As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge

---

<sup>3</sup> This policy replaces and supersedes all previous Faculty Conduct Policies, including policy entitled “Worcester Polytechnic Institute Faculty Conduct Policy” approved by the Board of Trustees on May 11, 2018. The procedures outlined herein apply to conduct predating the implementation date unless a proceeding is pending under the old policy. All faculty members and instructional staff not covered by this Policy should consult the Work Behavior/Discipline section of the Human Resources [Employee Benefits and Policies Manual](#).

<sup>4</sup> See for example AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics.

significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction;
- b) Discrimination, including harassment against a student on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability;
- c) Violation of University instructional policies;
- d) Use of position of power to coerce the judgment or the conscience of a student or to cause harm to a student for arbitrary or personal reasons;
- e) Participating or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.

*Scholarship:* Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry. This Policy covers misconduct related to scholarship only if it is not covered by the Research Misconduct Policy [https://www.wpi.edu/sites/default/files/docs/About-WPI/Policies/Research\\_Misconduct\\_Policy.pdf](https://www.wpi.edu/sites/default/files/docs/About-WPI/Policies/Research_Misconduct_Policy.pdf).

*The University:* As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Incitement of others to disobey University rules when such incitement constitutes a clear and present danger that violence or abuse against persons or property will occur;
- b) Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes;
- c) Forcible detention, threats of physical harm to, or harassment of another member of the University community, that interferes with that person's performance of University activities;
- d) Significant violations of institutional or departmental policies;
- e) Discrimination, including harassment against any employee, contractor, intern on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability.

*Colleagues:* As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance;
- b) Discrimination, including harassment against any employee, contractor, intern on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability;
- c) Violation of University policies related to collegiality;
- d) Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

*The Community:* As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Intentionally misrepresenting that one's personal views are the views, or position of the University;
- b) Illegal actions that clearly demonstrate unfitness to continue as a faculty member;
- c) Conduct not protected by academic freedom, free speech, and freedom of expression that significantly damages the University's reputation or mission.

#### 4. Sanctions

A finding of responsibility for faculty misconduct can result in a wide range of sanctions, depending on the circumstances of a particular case. Sanctions must be commensurate with the seriousness of the misconduct. Seriousness, and thus the sanction, will depend on the egregiousness of a particular action and may be affected by the Respondent's level of cooperation with the process set forth in this Policy, and persistence of behavior in the face of prior warnings, counseling or sanctions. In some instances, a single instance of unacceptable activity by a faculty member may be severe enough to warrant sanctions, including dismissal. In other instances, only a pattern of activity or the continuation of a particular activity or activities may warrant sanctions.

The circumstances that may lead to disciplinary sanctions cannot be anticipated in precise terms and thus grounds for sanctioning faculty members are not made the subject of a precise or comprehensive statement. The determination of appropriate sanctions will account for the following factors, including but not limited to:

- the nature and circumstances of the misconduct;
- the impact of the misconduct on the person who experienced the misconduct and the WPI community;
- the disciplinary history of the Respondent and the Respondent's cooperation with the process set forth in this Policy;
- the intent of the Respondent in committing the misconduct; and
- any other mitigating or aggravating circumstances in order to reach a fair and appropriate resolution in each case.

As with the definition of misconduct, it is not feasible or wise to automatically assign a specific



sanction to particular misconduct. Examples showing the range of possible sanctions include, but are not necessarily limited to:<sup>5</sup>

- A letter of reprimand from the Dean to be placed in the personnel file
- A formal apology from the Respondent
- Remedial training or counseling
- Supervision or oversight of professional activity for specified period of time
- Reassignment of duties, facilities or support
- Limitation of professional responsibilities for a specified period of time
- Restitution of misappropriated funds
- Withholding increases in compensation
- Reduction of salary
- Suspension for a specific time with pay
- Suspension without pay
- Termination of employment

Sanctions of demotions in rank or revocation of tenure are only appropriate in cases where appointment, promotion, or tenure were obtained by fraud or dishonesty.

#### 5. General Matters

- a) All parties are encouraged to resolve disputes and disagreements in a mutually acceptable manner before this Policy is invoked. After this Policy is invoked, allegations of misconduct may be resolved at any time by mutual agreement of the Respondent, the Complainant and the Dean.
- b) At all times, the parties shall cooperate with the process, preserve (and not delete or destroy) evidence, and provide information and materials as requested.
- c) The Respondent should be provided with reasonable updates and opportunities to respond.
- d) The Respondent shall be permitted the assistance of one (1) advisor or legal counsel during any investigative proceeding, including any related meeting, interview, or hearing. Advisors may communicate with their advisee but may not speak or otherwise communicate on behalf of a party. Advisors are subject to the same confidentiality obligations applicable to others in attendance.
- e) The Respondent is entitled to the presumption of innocence, the opportunity to respond to allegations of misconduct, and the opportunity to present a defense and offer evidence. The standard of proof in deciding that misconduct has occurred should be based on a preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires the determination of whether it is more likely than not that a fact exists or a violation of this Policy occurred.
- f) Deadlines under this Policy may be extended upon a showing of reasonable cause.

#### 6. Initial Review of Allegations

- a) Allegations of misconduct (a “Complaint”) should be made in writing to the Dean of the School, department or program of the Respondent named in the Complaint. The fact that a Complaint has been received should be made known only to the Respondent and to other persons who need to know, based on the Dean’s discretion. It should be expected that the

---

<sup>5</sup> The referral of a faculty member to the Employee Assistance Program (see <https://www.wpi.edu/offices/talent/benefits-payroll-perks/benefits-matrix/employee-assistance-program>), training, counseling, or coaching is not considered a disciplinary sanction under this policy.

Dean will notify the Provost and/or the President about allegations of misconduct. Because the Provost and President may be involved later in the process, they must each respect the integrity of the process as it moves forward.

- b) Upon receiving a Complaint, the Dean shall promptly send a copy of the Complaint and a copy of this Policy to the Respondent, and shall take appropriate action to obtain and secure relevant evidence.
- c) The Respondent shall have an opportunity to provide a written response to the allegations within ten (10) days of receiving the Complaint from the Dean.
- d) Once a Complaint has been received, the Dean may explore the possibility of a satisfactory resolution outside the scope of this Policy.
- e) If the Dean believes the alleged misconduct poses any risk to the community, the Dean may, in the Dean's discretion, impose appropriate interim sanctions up to and including suspension with pay and an order that the Respondent not enter WPI's property, or participate in WPI activities or programs. The suspension shall become effective upon notification in writing to the faculty member. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be informed of the suspension. The Dean may revoke a suspension at any time. If not revoked earlier, a suspension shall remain in effect until the final disposition of the process set forth in this Policy.
- f) Upon receipt of a Complaint, the Dean shall review the Complaint and determine whether the allegations in the Complaint would, presuming the allegations to be true, meet the definition of misconduct as set forth in this Policy. If, presuming the allegations to be true, the Complaint does not meet the definition of misconduct, the Dean shall dismiss the Complaint. Otherwise, the process will move forward as set forth herein. In either case, the Dean will promptly provide written notice of the decision and rationale to the Respondent and the Complainant.
- g) If the Dean concludes that the process should move forward, the Dean shall appoint three unbiased faculty members from outside of the Respondent's home department to:
  - i. Review the written Complaint and meet with the Complainant to get their version of the alleged misconduct and relevant events;
  - ii. Review the written response from the Respondent and meet with the Respondent to get their version of the relevant events;
  - iii. Assess whether the behavior alleged constitutes a violation of this Policy and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of such misconduct may be identified.
  - iv. Prepare a written report summarizing the process and information reviewed and, based on the criteria described in Section 7.g) iii. above, recommend to the Dean whether the process under this Policy should continue or whether the Complaint should be dismissed. The report should identify the names of the Complainant and the Respondent, contain a description of the allegations, explain why the faculty members recommend that the Complaint should be dismissed or that the process should continue under this Policy, and reflect the numerical vote (but not the names) of the three faculty members. The report shall be sent to the Dean.
- h) The Dean will consider the faculty's recommendation and then decide whether the process under this Policy should continue or whether the Complaint should be dismissed. When the allegations are within the faculty's area of primary responsibility (i.e. curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research and those aspects of student life which relate to the

educational process), the Dean should normally accept the faculty's decision. In rare instances and for compelling reasons, however, the Dean may reject the faculty's determination. Regardless of the decision, the Dean shall state in writing the basis for the decision and promptly send a copy of both the Dean's report and the report written by the three faculty members to the Complainant and the Respondent. In all cases, the Dean shall also send a copy of the Dean's report to the three faculty members. If the Dean decides that the process should continue, then the Dean's report will include a sufficiently detailed description of the allegations, the portions of this Policy that are alleged to have been violated, and any interim measures in place about which either party should be made aware. This written notice does not constitute a finding or a determination of responsibility. If the Dean decides that the process should continue, the Dean shall also provide a copy of both reports to the Provost, and the matter shall proceed as described below.

- i) The Dean shall make the decision about whether the Complaint will proceed under this Policy within sixty (60) days following the Dean's receipt of the Complaint. The Dean may extend this deadline for a reasonable time if necessary under the circumstances. The Dean shall notify all parties of any extensions.

## 7. The Investigative Phase

- a) Within ten (10) days after receipt of the Dean's decision to continue the process under this Policy, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall collaborate in good faith, concerning the appointment of an unbiased, qualified Investigator. Following such good faith collaboration, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall agree upon and appoint an unbiased, qualified Investigator (e.g. Title IX coordinator or qualified investigator from outside the university) charged with responsibility for conducting a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation of the alleged conduct and presenting evidence to the Judicial Committee (described below). The Provost and/or the Secretary of the Faculty may consult with the Office of General Counsel, the Vice President of Human Resources, and/or such other persons who would be helpful in selecting the appropriate Investigator. If the Secretary of the Faculty and the Provost cannot agree on an Investigator, the President shall select one after reviewing the Secretary of the Faculty's and the Provost's recommendations. The Provost will promptly provide the Respondent with the name of the Investigator. As soon as possible, but no later than three (3) calendar days after delivery of the identity of the Investigator, the Respondent should inform the Provost (in writing) of any potential conflicts of interest about the selected Investigator. The Provost will collaborate in good faith with the Secretary of the Faculty in considering the nature of the potential conflict and in determining if a change is necessary. Following such good faith collaboration, the Provost shall determine if a change is necessary. The Provost's decision regarding any conflicts with the Investigator is final.
- b) The investigation conducted by the Investigator should focus on the violation(s) alleged in the Complaint. The investigation will include the review of documentation or other items relevant to the reported conduct as well as separate interviews with the Complainant, the Respondent, and any witnesses whom the Investigator believes will provide necessary and relevant information. The Respondent will have the opportunity to provide the Investigator with written notice of the names and contact information of potential witnesses with whom they would like the Investigator to speak, together with a brief explanation of how the persons, documents, and/or items are relevant to the reported conduct. The Respondent may also provide the Investigator with any documentation or other items they would like to be considered. The Investigator will exercise discretion in determining what information and questions to consider and which potential witnesses will be interviewed.

- c) The purpose of the investigation is not to look for evidence of misconduct unrelated to the allegations in the Complaint. To the contrary, the investigation should focus on the violation(s) alleged in the Complaint. However, if in the normal course of gathering evidence, the Investigator discovers evidence of other potential violations of this Policy that are separate from or in addition to the allegations in the original Complaint, then the Investigator should inform the Dean (in writing) of the new allegation. The Dean shall notify the Respondent of the additional potential violations and give the Respondent ten (10) days to provide a written response to the additional potential violations. This deadline may be extended by the Dean as necessary under the circumstances. The Dean will treat any new unrelated allegation as a separate Complaint starting at Section 6 of this Policy (Initial Review of Allegations).

8. Procedures Following the Investigative Phase

- a) **The Investigative Report:** After the investigation is completed, the Investigator will deliver an Investigative Report to the Dean. The Investigative Report shall:

- i. include a clear Statement of Charges that specifies the conduct that allegedly violates this Policy, the particular section(s) of this Policy allegedly violated, the time period when the conduct allegedly occurred, and any other information necessary to give the Respondent fair notice of the charges and alleged violations;
- ii. include a summary of the information presented during the investigation including a section where the Investigator points out relevant consistencies or inconsistencies (if any) between different sources of information;
- iii. not include a recommendation or a determination as to whether the Respondent has committed misconduct or what sanctions may be appropriate. These determinations will be made by the Judicial Committee (see below).

- b) **Review by the Respondent:** Within five (5) business days of receiving the Investigative Report, the Dean will provide the Respondent with a copy of the Investigative Report. The Respondent shall respond in writing to the Statement of Charges included in the Investigative Report. The Respondent will also have an opportunity to submit written comments to the Dean about the Investigative Report within five (5) business days of receiving the Report. The time to submit written comments may be extended if the Dean concludes, in his/her sole discretion, that additional time is warranted. After reviewing the submission, if any, from the Respondent, the Dean may determine that additional investigation is required, in which case the Investigator will supplement the Investigative Report and submit a final Investigative Report to the Dean. Any submissions made by the Respondent, as well as any other documentation deemed relevant by the Investigator, will be attached to the Investigative Report. Within three (3) business days of receiving the final Investigative Report, the Dean will provide the Respondent with a copy of the final Investigative Report.

- c) **Convening the Judicial Committee:** After receipt of the final Investigative Report, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall appoint a six member Judicial Committee (“Committee”) comprised of three senior administrators and three faculty members from outside the Respondent’s home department.
  - i. The faculty members shall be selected from the elected members of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) and the elected faculty members of the Campus Hearing Board (CHB).
  - ii. The senior administrators shall be selected from a pool of senior academic administrators.

Once the Committee has been ~~identified~~ **appointed**, the Dean shall notify the Respondent in writing of the names of the members of the Committee. Within five (5) days, the Respondent may challenge the composition of the Committee based on alleged bias or conflict of interest. If a challenge is raised, the remaining members of the Committee shall determine whether bias or a conflict exists. If a bias or conflict is found, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall select a replacement from the pool of elected FRC and CHB members or from other academic administrators, as appropriate.

- d) **Roles and Responsibilities of the Judicial Committee.** Within ten (10) days following the establishment of the Committee (and the resolution of any challenge(s) based on bias or conflict of interest), the Committee should meet and select one faculty member and one senior academic administrator to serve as Co-Chairs.

The Judicial Committee will obtain the Investigative Report from the Dean and convene to review the Investigative Report. The Judicial Committee, in its discretion, may request the Investigator to attend a Judicial Committee meeting and answer questions. The Judicial Committee, in its discretion, may request the Investigator to conduct additional investigation on specific points. In addition, the Judicial Committee must interview the Complainant and the Respondent (where those individuals are available and willing to be interviewed) and, in its discretion, may request to speak with any other individual identified in the Investigative Report as well as any other individual with relevant information including individuals identified by the parties.

The Judicial Committee may request the parties that participated in the investigation to appear at a hearing to answer questions posed by the Judicial Committee. The Respondent should indicate whether the Respondent waives the holding of a hearing. If a hearing is to take place, then:

- i. The Committee Co-Chairs should promptly set a schedule for the hearing and the other disclosures and responses addressed in this section. The hearing schedule may take place over several days, as necessary. Before setting the schedule, the Committee Co-Chairs should discuss the proposed schedule with the Respondent. Once the schedule is set, the Committee Co-Chairs may allow reasonable extensions of time upon request.
- ii. The Committee Co-Chairs shall provide the Respondent with copies of all materials the Committee intends to use at the hearing and the names of witnesses expected to testify. Thereafter, the Committee Co-Chairs may supplement these materials as necessary with adequate notice given to the Respondent.
- iii. The Respondent shall provide the Committee Co-Chairs with copies of all materials the Respondent intends to use at the hearing and the names of any witnesses expected to testify. Thereafter, the Respondent may supplement these materials as necessary with the permission of the Committee Co-Chairs.

At the hearing:

- i. The Respondent shall have an opportunity to present the Respondent's defense to the Committee including any documents, witnesses or other evidence. The Respondent should be allowed, within reasonable limits set by the Committee Co-Chairs, to question witnesses.
- ii. The Committee will not be bound by rules of evidence applicable in a court of law, and may admit any evidence which, in its opinion, is of probative value in deciding the issues involved. If any facts are in dispute, the Committee shall determine the order in which evidence is offered at the hearing and the process for questioning witnesses.

The Committee shall conclude its review of the case (including the hearing) and make a decision within sixty (60) days after the establishment of the Committee (and the resolution of any challenge(s) based on bias or conflict of interest). All findings and determinations of responsibility and sanctions will be made based on a preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires the determination of whether it is more likely than not that a fact exists or a violation of this Policy occurred.

Upon reaching a determination by majority vote (4 to 2, 5 to 1, or 6 to 0), the Committee shall provide a written report to the Dean, the Provost, the Respondent and the Complainant consisting of: (i) the Committee's factual findings; (ii) a decision as to whether the Respondent committed misconduct; (iii) any sanction; and (iv) the rationale for these decisions addressing the merits of any reasonable explanation or defense provided by the Respondent; and (v) the *numerical* vote of the Committee without identifying individual votes.

In the case of a tie vote (3 to 3), the Committee shall deliver its report (with its factual findings, with appropriate rationale both for and against a finding of responsibility, and without a determination of responsibility and sanctions) to the President. The Committee's report shall indicate that the vote was tied and whether the three faculty members all voted to find the Respondent not responsible. The President will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. In all such cases, the President shall consider the matter and consult with the Judicial Committee and the Secretary of the Faculty before making a decision.

- i. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did not* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible then the President shall make a final written decision with supporting reasons about whether the Respondent committed misconduct and any sanctions to be imposed. The President's final written decision shall be delivered to the Provost, the Complainant, the Respondent, and the Judicial Committee. The Respondent, the Complainant, and the Provost shall also receive the Judicial Committee's written report.
- ii. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible and the President *agrees* with the faculty position, then the President will notify the Judicial Committee, the Dean, the Provost, the Complainant and the Respondent that the Respondent has been found not responsible. The Respondent, the Complainant, and the Provost shall also receive the Judicial Committee's written report.
- iii. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible and the President *disagrees* with the faculty position, then the President will state the reasons for doing so, in writing, to the Judicial Committee and the Respondent and shall provide an opportunity for a response from the Respondent before transmitting the Judicial Committee's report and the supporting materials relevant to the matter, to the Board of Trustees. The Board's review will be based on the supporting materials relevant to the case, and it will provide the opportunity for argument, oral or written or both, at the hearing, by the parties and one of the faculty members on the Judicial Committee, or by their representatives. If the Board is inclined to find the Respondent responsible, then the Board shall state the basis for its inclination in writing and return the proceedings to the Judicial Committee for reconsideration. The Committee will then reconsider, taking into account the Board's comments and receiving new evidence, if necessary. The Board of Trustees will make a final decision only after study of the Committee's reconsideration. The Board's final written decision shall be delivered to the President, the Provost, the Complainant, the Respondent, and the Judicial Committee. The Respondent shall also receive the Committee's written report.

## 9. Appeals

- a) The Respondent may appeal any finding of misconduct and any sanction to the President within two (2) weeks after the Respondent received notification of the decision. If the Respondent is appealing from a decision made by the President (where the Committee vote had been tied) then the appeal should be directed to the Chair of the Board of Trustees. The President (or Board Chair) will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case.
- b) Before the President (or Board Chair) decides the appeal, the President (or Board Chair) shall consult with the Judicial Committee Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty. The President (or Board Chair) should issue a decision within thirty (30) days of receiving the appeal. The President's (or Board Chair's) decision shall be final in all cases except cases involving a sanction of termination of employment or revocation of tenure.
- c) If the President (or Board Chair) imposes a sanction of termination of employment or revocation of tenure, the Respondent may appeal the finding of misconduct and the sanction to the full Board of Trustees within two (2) weeks after the President (or Board Chair) notifies the Respondent of the imposition of the sanction. If the Respondent appeals to the full Board, the Chair of the Board (or Board Vice-Chair in a case where the appeal was decided by the Chair), following good faith collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, shall appoint a committee of five (5) faculty members (who have not had prior involvement in the case) who will make a recommendation regarding the finding of misconduct and the sanction imposed. The faculty committee will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. The faculty committee will summarize the basis for its recommendation in a written report to the Board Chair (or Board Vice-Chair) within thirty (30) days. The Board Chair (or Board Vice-Chair) should issue a written decision within thirty (30) days of receiving the faculty committee's report. The Board Chair's (or Vice-Chair's) decision shall be final.
- d) Other than interim institutional actions which may already be in effect, any finding of misconduct, and the imposition of any sanction, will be stayed while an appeal is pending before the President or the Board of Trustees.
- e) If a faculty member is dismissed or suspended without pay, the faculty member's salary ends at a future time to be determined by the Board of Trustees.

## 10. Provisions Common to the Misconduct Review Process

- a) *No Bias or Conflicts of Interest:* To the maximum extent practicable, steps should be taken to ensure an impartial and unbiased process, including participation of persons who have no conflicts of interest that could affect their ability to be objective and unbiased.

In cases where allegations of misconduct have been brought against the Dean or the Provost, or where there is a claim of bias or conflict of interest involving the Dean or the Provost, then the President shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest and adjust the process as necessary. The President's decision on such questions shall be final. In cases where allegations of misconduct have been brought against the President, or where there is a claim of bias or conflict of interest involving the President, then the Provost shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest and adjust the process as necessary.

In the case when allegations have been brought against the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chair of the Committee on Governance will play the role of the Secretary of the Faculty in this policy.

- b) *Duty of Honesty:* Any person who knowingly makes a false statement – either explicitly or by

omission – in connection with any part of the process will be subject to separate disciplinary action. A false or unfounded report of misconduct determined to have been made in bad faith and dishonesty is a serious offense. Such offenses should themselves be investigated under the appropriate WPI policy and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment or other affiliation with WPI. A report made in good faith is not considered false merely because the evidence does not ultimately support the allegation of violation of the Policy.

- c) *Good Faith Participation by the Parties and Witnesses:* The investigation is a neutral fact-gathering process. Although participation in the process is not required, the Complainant, the Respondent, and all witnesses are expected to participate in good faith in the process set forth in this Policy, and they may be required by WPI to attend meetings related to the process. Any person who knowingly interferes with the reporting, investigation, or resolution of matters under this Policy may be subject to separate and/or additional disciplinary action.
- e) *Confidentiality:* Proceedings concerning misconduct often raise difficult issues for those making the allegations, for those who are the subject of the allegations, and for those responsible for reviewing the allegations. Review of the allegations should therefore be conducted promptly and with care and sensitivity. All participants in the review process under this Policy are expected to maintain confidentiality to protect the privacy of all involved, to the extent possible and as permitted by law. Participants should keep in mind the effect that allegations can have on reputations, even if the allegations are not sustained by the proceedings.
- f) *No Retaliation:* Retaliation is typically a significant adverse action taken against an individual because the individual participated in a review process. Retaliation is a serious offense. No one shall be retaliated against for participating in a review of a misconduct allegation in good faith as a Complainant, a witness, a factfinder, or investigator or in any other capacity. Reasonable efforts should be made to counter potential or actual retaliation against these complainants, witnesses and committee members. A complaint of retaliation may be investigated and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including terminating the individual's relationship with WPI.
- g) *Record Keeping:* The Provost should receive and maintain all records relating to proceedings under this Policy including all notices to and from the parties, all written reports, all decisions, all appeals by the parties, and all decisions involved in the appeals process under this Policy.
- h) *Special Measures.* If there is no finding of misconduct, the University should make reasonable and practical efforts as appropriate to restore the reputation of the Respondent. Any such concerns by the Respondent should be directed to the Provost for follow up with other administrators as appropriate.



## **D. PROCEDURAL AMENDMENTS**

(Approved by the Faculty March 1969)

The Chair of CTAF shall be the member whose term of office expires in June of the current academic year. The Chair shall rule on all matters of procedure and shall be responsible for interpreting all Faculty rules regarding tenure. The Chair's rulings are subject to review by the Faculty only. The Secretary shall be the member whose term of office expires in June of the following academic year.

All four members of CTAF must be present to conduct official business.

The Chairman of each Department Tenure Committee shall be the elected member whose term of office expires in June of the current academic year.

The Provost shall provide annually to CTAF a list of untenured faculty members with the length of remaining probationary period. This list shall be circulated to the Faculty.

When all the members of the Joint Tenure Committee agree that there has been sufficient discussion, a vote is taken for or against tenure (no abstentions) by means of a secret ballot, with the majority ruling.

If the vote is favorable, a statement about some of the salient reasons for recommending tenure is prepared by the Department Head and signed by all eight members of the Joint Tenure Committee. This is then sent to the Provost.

If it is voted to deny tenure for the candidate, then a statement of the reasons for the denial is prepared, signed, and sent to the Provost.

In either case, the candidate for tenure is notified by the Provost of the decision on the case at a time deemed suitable by the Provost.

Nominations for early Tenure must be submitted with a copy to the Secretary of the Faculty. If tenure is recommended, the Provost is notified by the method previously stated. If the nomination is tabled, the nominee is notified personally.

The policy of CTAF toward early tenure is that it should be granted only if there has been some special or significant contribution by the nominee to WPI or to the nominee's Department, or if the academic freedom of the nominee is in serious jeopardy. In the latter case the Committee shall endeavor to verify the facts and shall in any case grant tenure only when there is good evidence that the nominee would eventually be tenured by the normal procedure.

Copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Joint Tenure Committee will be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty after May 1.

## **APPENDIX B: OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

(Amended by the Faculty, May 9, 2017)

### **FACULTY GRIEVANCES:**

For faculty grievances, a subcommittee of FRC consisting of three elected and two appointed members of FRC has the power to review and to require reconsideration of:

- A. The Provost's decision not to renew a probationary, tenure-track appointment;
- B. Negative decisions on tenure; and
- C. Negative decisions on promotions of tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty members.

where the action, decision, or recommendation is alleged by an aggrieved faculty member to result from:

- i. a violation of academic freedom; or
- ii. improper procedure; or
- iii. discrimination based on race, sex, age, color, national origin, religion, genetic identity, disability, gender identity or expression, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, transgender status, veteran status, or any other protected status.

When a grievance on any one or more of these grounds is submitted, the grievant shall present all factual or other data that he or she deems pertinent to the case, as well as all the relevant documentation available to him or her. The FRC shall have access to all the relevant documentation under the control of the University in the same manner and to the same extent as had the administrators and committees or other faculty bodies that participated in the decisions or recommendations to which the grievance refers, and with the same obligation of confidentiality that these administrators, committees or bodies were under with regard to any particular document. The body of documents and files available to the FRC must be identical, without addition, deletion, or embellishment, to that available to those participants.

When a grievance is submitted, the FRC shall first decide whether the allegations and the evidence submitted by the grievant merit detailed consideration of the matter, and shall inform the grievant and the appropriate administrator(s) promptly of this decision.

If the FRC decides that detailed consideration of a grievance is in order, it shall expeditiously investigate the matter in the manner that it deems appropriate. If the Committee finds that there are grounds for formal interviews, it shall conduct such interviews under source confidentiality safeguards identical to those practiced by the Faculty Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom (CTAF) or the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP). Only WPI personnel may participate in such interviews.

The FRC, in carrying out its investigation, may appoint *ad hoc* committees of investigation, reporting to it, and consisting of Faculty Members with tenure who may, but need not, be members of the FRC. The FRC shall be free to discuss the grievance with the Provost and the President.

If the grievance arises from non-renewal of a tenure-track appointment prior to tenure review and alleges infringement of academic freedom either prior to the decision or in the process surrounding the decision, the FRC shall first request a finding on that issue from CTAF. The FRC may not issue its report until receiving that finding.

If the grievance arises from denial of tenure or promotion and alleges infringement of academic freedom either prior to the decision or recommendation or in the process surrounding the decision or recommendation, the FRC will not consult CTAF or COAP, but may employ its powers of investigation and authority to conduct interviews in order to assess the merits of the academic freedom issue and the extent to which that issue bears on its ultimate report and recommendations.

In determining whether a decision or recommendation that is the subject of a grievance was affected by improper procedure, the FRC may examine whether the decision or recommendation by an administrator, committee, or other faculty body was the result of adequate consideration in terms of the relevant standards of the WPI. In no case shall the FRC substitute its judgment for that of the maker(s) of the original decision or recommendation.

If the FRC concludes, after detailed consideration of a grievance, that the allegations in it have been established in full or in part and that the aggrieved matters have affected the decision at issue, then the Committee has the power to require of the maker(s) of the decision or recommendation that is the subject of the grievance that he or she or they reconsider this decision or recommendation to the extent that it is affected by the established allegations. The conclusion of the Committee, its recommendations, the basis for those recommendations, and, if appropriate, requests for reconsideration shall be recorded in a report, and this report shall be provided to the grievant, the maker(s) of the questioned decision or recommendation, and the President. The outcome of a reconsideration required by the FRC shall be promptly reported to the Committee.

In the event that, for a tenure candidate, the Joint Tenure Committee, or, for a promotion candidate, the Joint Promotion Committee, conducts a reconsideration of a case, it shall use only the body of documents available during the first hearing of the case, without addition, deletion, or embellishment, except for the FRC report on the case and any other information the Joint Tenure or Promotion Committee wishes to obtain using its normal procedures, provided such additional information pertains directly to issues raised in the FRC report.

If the reconsideration(s) required by the Committee lead to the same negative decision as that which generated the grievance, the grievant may make a final appeal to the President, who may reverse or uphold the decision.

#### DATES FOR FILING OF A GRIEVANCE

For grievances arising from non-renewal of a probationary appointment, the grievance must be filed within ten business days after the applicable latest non-renewal notification date as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook, in the section entitled “Appointments and Reappointments of Tenure Track Faculty”.

For grievances arising from a negative tenure or promotion decision, the grievance must be filed within ten business days after that meeting of the Board of Trustees (usually February) at which the Provost and President present their tenure and promotion decisions for Board approval, or ten days after the tenure or promotion candidate is notified by the Provost of the negative decision, whichever is later. The FRC is charged with reviewing a grievance in a prompt and timely manner, with the intent that it will issue its report prior to the close of the academic year in which the filing was made. Should a grievance be pending at the close of the academic year, its resolution will continue to be the responsibility of the original receiving committee, notwithstanding the election of a new committee; see Bylaw One, Section IX.

The filing of a grievance or the granting of a reconsideration as an outcome of that filing in no way extends the period of employment beyond that which would apply if no grievance were filed, nor do filing and reconsideration in any way entitle the grievant to automatic tenure through AAUP rules.

## **APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTANT RUN-OFF VOTING METHOD**

(Approved by the Faculty, December 16, 1999)

For each office to be filled, the voter is asked to indicate the order in which he/she prefers all the candidates, placing the numeral 1 beside the first preference, the numeral 2 beside the second preference, and so on for every possible choice. In counting the votes for a given office, the ballots are arranged in piles according to the indicated first preferences – one pile for each candidate. The number of ballots in each pile is then recorded for the teller’s report. These piles remain identified with the names of the same candidates throughout the counting procedure until all but one are eliminated as described below. If more than half of the ballots show one candidate indicated as first choice, that choice has a majority in the ordinary sense and the candidate is elected. But if there is no such majority, candidates are eliminated one by one, beginning with the least popular, until one prevails, as follows: The ballots in the thinnest pile – that is, those containing the name designated as first choice by the fewest number of voters – are redistributed into the other piles according to the names marked as second choice on these ballots. The number of ballots in each remaining pile after this distribution is again recorded. If more than half of the ballots are now in one pile, that candidate is elected. If not, the next least popular candidate is similarly eliminated, by taking the thinnest remaining pile and redistributing its ballots according to their second choices into other remaining piles, except that, if the name eliminated in the last distribution is indicated as a second choice on a ballot, that ballot is placed according to its third choice. Again, the number of ballots in each existing pile is recorded, and, if necessary, the process is repeated – by redistributing each time the ballots in the thinnest remaining pile, according to the marked second choice or most-preferred choice among those not yet eliminated – until one pile contains more than half of the ballots containing instructions in that sort, the result being thereby determined. The tellers’ report consists of a table listing all candidates, with the number of ballots that were in each pile after each successive distribution.

If a ballot having one or more names not marked with any numeral comes up for placement at any stage of the counting and all of the marked names have been eliminated, it should not be placed in any pile, but should be set aside. If at any point two or more candidates are tied for the least popular position, the ballots in their piles are redistributed in a single step, all of the tied names being treated as eliminated. In the event of a tie in the winning position – which would imply that the elimination process is continued until the ballots are reduced to two or more equal piles – the election should be resolved in favor of the candidate or position that was the strongest in terms of first choices (by referring to the record of the first distribution).

If more than one person is to be elected to the same type of office – for example, if two, three, or more members of a board are to be chosen – the voters can indicate their order of preference among the names in a single list of candidates, just as if only one were to be elected. The counting procedure begins as described above, and is continued to the point where one pile contains more than half of the ballots, thus determining the winner of the first of the positions to be filled. All of the ballots are then re-assembled, including those which were eliminated in the steps leading to the determination of the first winner. The pile-building process begins anew, with one fewer piles than in the first round, and with the first-round winner now treated as a non-candidate, the votes for whom are passed over in favor of the next preference on a given ballot. This distribution process again proceeds to the point where one pile contains more than half of the ballots containing instructions in that sort, thus determining the winner of the second of the positions. If a third position is to be filled, all of the ballots are then re-assembled and re-distributed as before, into two fewer piles than in the first round, and with the first two winners treated as non-candidates. When one pile contains more than half of the ballots containing instructions in that sort, the winner of the third position is determined. The process continues in this manner until the appropriate number of winning candidates has been determined.

Should a given ballot show fewer than the requested number of preferences, it will be put aside temporarily in a given re-distribution step if it in effect gives the tellers no “instruction” as to how to proceed.

For cases in which membership on a committee is limited to no more than one (or two) person(s) from the same department, and in which at a certain point in the tally process that limitation is reached, then any remaining candidates from that department shall be eliminated and their ballots distributed to the next preference, as above.

## **APPENDIX D: THE ROLES PLAYED BY TENURED, TENURE-TRACK, AND NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY IN CARRYING OUT WPI'S MISSION**

(Approved by the Faculty, April 14, 2011; Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 13, 2011)

The tenured and tenure track Faculty at WPI play the primary role in fulfilling the University's academic mission, and are committed to shaping WPI's educational programs and to delivering a significant majority of the academic credit offered to WPI students. Consistent with this principle, the University is committed to maintaining a tenured and tenure-track Faculty of sufficient size to allow each tenured and tenure-track faculty member the time to carry out his or her responsibilities to both teach and engage in scholarship at the highest level. WPI meets this commitment by ensuring that the numbers of tenured and tenure-track Faculty at WPI increase at a rate that is commensurate with the University's growth and strategic needs.

WPI also recognizes the importance of the roles played by non-tenure track faculty both as engaging teachers and active scholars. Through their teaching, non-tenure track faculty members enhance new and existing educational programs. Through their research, the non-tenure track faculty complement and expand the range of scholarly expertise otherwise available on campus. Overall, the non-tenure track faculty provide the flexibility to respond to opportunities that help WPI sustain and build upon its reputation for academic excellence.

Early each fall, the Provost will provide a report to the Committee on Governance detailing the numbers (and full-time equivalents) in each category of faculty, and the percentages of academic credit delivered by each category of faculty across the institution, and within each department, division, and school (including Corporate and Professional Education). In collaboration with the Provost, the Committee on Governance will disseminate a final report to the Faculty and present the results for open discussion at a Faculty meeting during the same year.

## **PART TWO:**

### **POLICIES AND OPERATING PROCEDURES**

(Policies approved or endorsed by the Faculty are indicated with an asterisk\*.)

#### **1. POLICIES REGARDING THE STATUS OF FACULTY**

##### **A. Academic Freedom and Tenure\***

###### *Academic Freedom*

Academic freedom is essential to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Freedom in teaching is fundamental to the protection of the rights of the teacher and of the students.

Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be in accordance with established WPI policy.

Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects and evaluating their students, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subjects.

College or university teachers are citizens, members of learned professions, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As persons of learning and educational officers they should remember that the public may judge their profession and institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokesmen.

During the probationary period teachers have the same academic freedom enjoyed by all other members of the Faculty.

###### *Tenure*

(Approved by the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom, Spring 1988, with modifications indicated below.)

As a consequence of the primary obligation of members of the academic community to pursue truth, the tenure concept has evolved for the protection of individuals from internal and external community pressures.

The WPI Faculty, through its Constitution, has given to the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom the authority and responsibility for tenure recommendations. The Joint Committee consists of the five member At-Large Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and the three member Departmental Tenure Committee. (See Part B of Appendix A of Part One of this Handbook for certain procedures and policies governing the Committee.)

###### *Eligibility and Conditions for Tenure*

(Approved by the Faculty April 12, 2001)

Only full time tenure track Faculty Members are eligible for tenure. Except when hired with tenure, a Faculty Member is required to serve a minimum period of two years on the tenure clock at WPI prior to tenure review. Normally the tenure review will occur during the sixth year on the tenure clock but may be scheduled earlier because of credit for previous full time service with rank of Assistant Professor or higher at other academic institutions. The year of the scheduled tenure review for each probationary appointment must be stated in writing and be in

the possession of both WPI and the Faculty Member before the appointment is consummated. The policy of the Faculty toward early tenure is that it should be granted only if there has been some special or significant contribution by the nominee to WPI or to the nominee's Department, or if the academic freedom of the nominee is in serious jeopardy. In the latter case the Committee shall endeavor to verify the facts and shall in any case recommend tenure only when there is good evidence that the nominee would eventually be tenured by the normal procedure.

The recommendation for or against tenure is a major decision point in an individual's life. Recognizing this, the Joint Committee utilizes operating procedures that protect the welfare of the individual under consideration. To that end the operating procedures are based on these criteria:

1. A Complete Background Study: The Joint Committee collects as much information as possible relative to the candidate's nomination from colleagues, students, alumni, and professional peers.
2. Confidentiality: The welfare of the candidate must be protected by the Joint Committee by observing strict rules of confidentiality during all phases of the tenure deliberation process.
3. Unitary Recommendation: The Joint Tenure Committee forwards to the Provost a unitary recommendation for or against tenure; the recommendation contains no minority opinion, and does not attempt to weigh all the factors that were considered during the deliberations. The purpose of this policy is to prevent the development of a class system of tenure.
4. Shared Authority: The WPI Faculty Constitution is based on a condition of shared authority among the Faculty, Administrative Officers, and the Board of Trustees.

#### ***Criteria for Tenure***

(Approved by the Faculty, October 13, 1988)

(Amended by the Faculty, March 24, 2011)

1. High quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate) is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement for obtaining tenure at WPI. The candidate's activities should demonstrate the capacity for continued high quality performance. High quality teaching can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): course evaluations; faculty peer evaluations; evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, and the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum; freshman advising, academic advising and graduate theses advised by the candidate; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses.
2. High quality scholarship is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement for obtaining tenure at WPI. The candidate's activities should demonstrate the capacity for continued high quality performance. High quality scholarship can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, conference papers, and/or book chapters; books; exhibitions, and performances; professional awards; citations in the professional literature; presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals and grants awarded; offices held in professional societies; journal editorships; reviews of papers and proposals; and patents.
3. Service is valued and considered in the tenure deliberations at WPI. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (faculty governance and ad-hoc committees, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination), service to the local community (board and committee membership in social service and cultural institutions, local government participation); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).



### ***Procedures for Tenure***

(Amended by the Faculty, May 13, 2010)

By April 15th each year the Provost shall provide to the At-Large Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom a list of untenured faculty with the length of, and conditions attached to, the remaining probationary period. This list, without the conditions of the probationary period, shall be circulated to the Faculty. The Committee shall then write to the candidates to be reviewed in the ensuing year asking for information on which to base its review of the candidate's credentials. Among the items asked for are 1) a list of references, 2) a current curriculum vitae, and 3) copies of professional work. This information is due in June, prior to the academic year of tenure review.

After consulting with colleagues on campus, the Joint Committee develops a list of outside references to evaluate the candidate, solicits alumni and student evaluations, and other such evaluations as it deems appropriate to arrive at a fair and equitable evaluation of the nominee.

In Term A and Term B of the tenure review year the Joint Committee meets to consider the candidate. By the end of Term B the Joint Committee forwards its written recommendations to the Provost.

The Provost reviews each case and consults with the appropriate Dean and the President. Subsequently, the Provost may ask to meet with the Joint Committee to discuss its recommendations, and must meet with the Joint Committee in the case of a disagreement. Lastly, the Provost sends to the Board of Trustees the names of those candidates for whom tenure is recommended. Department Heads and Deans that act as Department Heads are restricted to participation on the Joint Committee only.

### ***Stopping the Tenure Clock***

(Amended by the Faculty, September 8, 2016)

#### **1. New Child Provision**

Tenure-track Faculty members who undertake significant childcare responsibilities due to the arrival of a biological or adopted child during their probationary appointment are entitled to stop the tenure clock for one year, thus postponing the academic year in which the tenure decision will be made. The stopping of the tenure clock will be automatically granted by the Provost upon written notification by the Faculty member.

#### ***Procedure***

Notification to stop the tenure clock must be submitted to the Provost in writing. A copy of the notification must also be sent to the appropriate Dean and Department Head. For a biological child, the notification may be made as early as the second trimester of pregnancy but no later than six months after the birth of the child. For an adopted child, the notification may be made as early as the date that the child is legally placed in the home and no later than six months after the child's arrival at the adoptive home. If the birth or adoption of a child occurs during the academic year prior to the Faculty member's scheduled tenure review, then the notification must be submitted by January 15 of the academic year prior to the scheduled tenure review.

The Provost will acknowledge the notification within 2 weeks, and will state the academic year in which the tenure review will occur. The Provost's communication will be copied to the Faculty member's Dean and Department Head and to CTAF.

#### **2. Unpaid Leaves and Part-Time Employment**

Tenure-track Faculty Members are entitled to stop the tenure clock for unpaid full-time leaves or for intervals of part-time employment during which the Faculty Member's activity is at or below the half-time level. The need for such unpaid leaves or part-time intervals may arise from a

variety of situations, including but not limited to parenting, extenuating circumstances related to a personal or family members' health, personal relations within a family which impose special or arduous burdens, or for other reasons as may be provided for in the "Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993." The terms and conditions of the leave are arranged by negotiation between the Faculty Member and the Provost. It is also understood that the leave or part-time interval is not to be imposed by the Administration, but that it is available at the election of the Faculty Member. (Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom.) The following Table gives the time intervals for which the tenure clock is stopped for these two types of leave.

Type of Leave	Duration	Period for which Tenure Clock is Stopped
Unpaid Full-time Leave	Less than 6 months	Not stopped
	6 to 18 months	One year
	More than 18 months	Two years
Half-time Activity Interval	Less than 12 months	Not stopped
	12-24 months	One year
	More than 24 months	Two years

3. Effect on Tenure Review

The tenure review of a Faculty Member who has exercised her/his entitlement to stop the tenure clock will be conducted under the same Criteria for Tenure as a candidate who has not stopped the tenure clock.

**B. Appointments and Reappointments of Tenure Track Faculty\***

(Approved by the COAP, Spring 1988; Approved by the CTAF, Spring 1988; Amended by the Faculty, March 21, 1991 and January 16, 1992)

WPI employs faculty of the highest quality in scholarship and teaching. Every effort is made to search for outstanding candidates and to encourage them, once hired, to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and active scholarship in their own fields of interest. To assist probationary faculty in developing their teaching effectiveness and scholarly competence periodic reviews of their work are conducted.

1. *Initial Appointment*

An initial appointment of a probationary faculty member on the tenure track is reviewed by the department and the Provost. In the case of an appointment at ranks above assistant professor the appointment is also reviewed by the Committee on Appointments and Promotion to see that the candidate's qualifications are commensurate with the criterion used for promotion to the stated ranks (See Promotion, below). Once the Provost has approved the appointment he forwards an official offer letter to the candidate. The terms and conditions of every appointment to the faculty, including the length of the probationary period, are stated in writing in the letter and are in the possession of both the University and the prospective faculty member before the appointment is consummated.

2. *Periodic Review*

(Amended by the Faculty, April 17, 2008. Amended by the Faculty, April 12, 2018.)

Each Department Tenure Committee (DTC) will conduct an annual review of each probationary faculty member consistent with the WPI *Criteria For Tenure*, (Part Two, Section 1A) encompassing scholarship, teaching, and service. The faculty member being reviewed will provide the DTC with documentation of his/her efforts in each category for the preceding year. The DTC may determine the format of this document (e.g. Faculty Annual Report, tenure dossier format or other). Following the DTC's review of the document, the DTC members will meet and discuss the scholarship, teaching and service aspects of the candidate's efforts for the previous year and together formulate recommendations to the candidate. The members of the

DTC will then meet with the candidate to review these recommendations and address any concerns or questions by either party. A summary of the DTC review and recommendations will be prepared, signed by the members of the DTC and the candidate to acknowledge receipt, and kept on file in the department. CTAF will be officially notified that the report has been completed and signed no later than May 1<sup>st</sup>. These documents will remain confidential and will NOT be included in the official tenure dossier unless the candidate so chooses. They must remain on file in the department for a minimum of one year after a tenure decision has been made or the candidate withdraws from the tenure process.

### *3. Reappointment*

(Amended by the Faculty, May 13, 2010)

Reappointment letters are for the period commencing July 1. Within the first year of service a reappointment letter with terms and conditions will be forwarded to the probationary professor by April 15th. If the appointment is not to be renewed written notice must be sent no later April 1st of the first year of service. For individuals whose initial appointment year is two terms or less the next full year (July 1 to June 30) will constitute the first year of service for a) reappointment and non-reappointment dates, and b) time in service for tenure review. In the second year of service a reappointment letter with terms and conditions will be forwarded to the probationary professor by April 15th. If the appointment is not to be renewed written notice must be sent no later than January 1st of the second year of service. In the third, fourth, and fifth year of service a reappointment letter with terms and conditions will be forwarded to the probationary professor by April 15th. If the appointment is not to be renewed, written notice must be sent no later than twelve months prior to the termination date of the final year of service.

Recommendations to the Provost for reappointment or non-reappointment of probationary faculty will originate with the Department Head (or equivalent) after consultation with the other members of the Department Tenure Committee. Subsequently, the Provost consults with the appropriate Dean. For those cases in which non-reappointment is considered, the Provost shall meet with the Department Tenure Committee before taking action on the recommendation.

## **C. Department Heads\***

(Developed and prepared by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, September 1985)

Approved by the Provost, December 17, 1985

Amended by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions and approved by the Provost, March 1991)

Amended by the Faculty May 7, 2020

Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 14, 2020

Heads of Departments report to the Dean of the school their department reports in (referred to in this section as Dean) and are responsible for the operation of the respective academic departments, for the development of the faculty, and for the quality of the programs and facilities of those units. Department Heads are appointed by the Provost upon the recommendation of the Dean and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions and subject to approval by the President.

### *1. Appointment of Department Heads*

The position of Department Head is an administrative position, and the initial appointment is for a five year period. Only one reappointment will be made, for a total of 10 years of service, unless special circumstances exist. The Dean will form a Department Head Search Committee according to the following procedure, after consulting with the faculty in the department concerned.

When a new department head is to be selected from either inside or outside of WPI, a Search Committee is formed consisting of two faculty members elected by the department, one member

of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, a faculty member appointed by the Provost, and the Dean or his/her representative who serves as Chairman of the Search Committee. The Search Committee first establishes its procedures for operation.

The Search Committee will solicit nominations for the position, evaluate the nominees, and select at least two candidates for the position. The Search Committee makes arrangements for each of the candidates to meet with the departmental faculty. The Search Committee will determine the preferences of the members of the department.

The Dean submits to the Provost the names of the candidates, his/her recommendation, the preferences and comments of the departmental faculty, and the preferences and comments of the Search Committee. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions is given copies of all documents submitted to the Provost concerning the selection. The Provost, after consultation with the President, generally will appoint one of the candidates as department head. However, if none of the candidates is acceptable to the Provost, the reasons will be discussed with the Search Committee and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, and the Search Committee will continue the selection process.

## *2. Performance Evaluation of Department Heads*

A performance evaluation is made of a department head in order to determine if the department is accomplishing its goals in an effective, efficient and harmonious way. The Dean has the responsibility for conducting this evaluation and reporting back to the person being evaluated.

A performance evaluation will be scheduled during the spring of the second and fourth year of the first five-year appointment. In the second 5-year appointment, reviews will be done only in the second year. In addition, the Dean, the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, or the department head may request an evaluation at any time. A list of the regular schedule for evaluations is maintained by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

In the first phase of the evaluation, the Dean will distribute a questionnaire to the faculty in the department. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions has the responsibility for preparing and up-dating the questionnaire. The faculty will send the unsigned completed questionnaires to the Faculty Governance, who will confidentially collate responses. The responses will be reviewed only by the Dean and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

If either the Dean, Provost or the Committee on Appointments and Promotions decides that more information is needed, then the COAP will make arrangements for its members to meet with each faculty member in the department concerned. The purpose of these individual meetings is to gain a better understanding of any problem that may have been brought out in the questionnaire. Complete confidentiality will be maintained by the Committee concerning the views of individuals.

The Committee on Appointments and Promotions will discuss all of the information obtained from the interviews and will prepare a summary describing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the department head being evaluated. The COAP will send the summary letter to the Dean who, after reviewing the contents, will meet with the COAP to discuss the case. Only the Dean, Provost and the President of the Institute may read the COAP letter. The Dean will then meet with the Department Head to discuss the evaluation and also send a letter to the department head which summarizes the performance evaluation. A copy of that letter will be sent to the Chairman of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

## *3. Reappointment of Department Heads*

The reappointment of a department head for a second term will involve the following procedure.

- A. In the spring of the fourth year of tenure, the Committee on Appointments and Promotions will evaluate the Department Head. The evaluation will involve:
  - i. Review of all written materials of the department head obtained in the second and fourth year review plus any additional evaluations deemed necessary by the Committee.
  - ii. Interview with all faculty members in the department, including the department head involved.
  - iii. Collection and review of any other information the COAP feels will influence the evaluation.
- B. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions will write its recommendation to the Dean before the end of Term D of the fourth year of tenure.
- C. The Dean will provide the Provost his/her recommendations and a copy of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions report. The Provost, after consultation with the President, decides on the reappointment. The Provost will discuss his or her decision with the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

Whereas collaboration is essential to WPI, Deans are expected to collaborate with other Deans when evaluating department heads in departments where collaboration across schools is significant (as defined by the Provost).

#### **D. Promotion\***

(Approved by the Faculty, September 1978;

Subsections D.1.1, D.1.2, D.1.3, and D.1.4 Amended by the Faculty, February 14, 2017;

Subsections D.2.1, D.2.2, D.2.3, D.2.4, and D.2.5 Amended by the Faculty, April 13, 2017)

Subsections D.2.5 Amended by the Faculty, April 16, 2020

The principal reason for establishing academic ranks is to recognize and to encourage the continued professional growth of individual faculty members. The faculty make a variety of scholarly contributions as educators, scholars, innovators and leaders that advance WPI's mission to create, discover, and convey knowledge at the frontiers of academic inquiry for the betterment of society.

##### **D.1.1. The Criteria for Promotion**

The candidate for promotion to associate professor should have demonstrated high quality teaching and high quality scholarship/creativity as well as the promise for continued high quality performance in these areas. Evidence of service at an appropriate level is expected.

The candidate for promotion to full professor should demonstrate continuing high quality teaching and high quality scholarship/creativity as well as a record of scholarly contributions that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI as appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise. Service is a critical responsibility of all tenured faculty, and thus evidence of service at a level appropriate to the rank is expected.

The specific standards of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to full professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor, with the added expectation of scholarly contributions that demonstrate a positive external impact beyond WPI. Contributions to WPI may demonstrate an external impact if they are disseminated and recognized externally. In every case, the high quality and positive external impact of scholarly contributions must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people external to WPI. While it is expected that these criteria describe the great majority of cases, there may be exceptional candidates whose unique contributions, while not conforming to these guidelines, are deserving of promotion.

### **D.1.2. Definition of Scholarship**

To recognize the full range of scholarly contributions by faculty, WPI endorses an inclusive definition of scholarship. Scholarship exists in a continuum of diverse forms of knowledge and knowledge-making practices. Scholarship may be pursued through original research, making connections between disciplines, building bridges between theory and practice, communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers, or in reciprocal partnerships with broader communities. The common characteristics for any scholarly form to be considered scholarship are: it must be public, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community.

Candidates for promotion may make contributions to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and practice, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or the scholarship of engagement. Contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship. Scholarly contributions to any area or areas are valued equally by WPI.

The following descriptions of the continuum of scholarship indicate the scope of each domain, but they are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive. The forms that scholarship take along this continuum will vary by discipline, department or academic division.

#### ***Scholarship of Discovery***

The creation or discovery of new knowledge involves creative and critical thought, research skills, the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory and practice, or active experimentation and exploration with the goal of adding to knowledge in a substantive way. The scholarship of discovery is usually demonstrated through publication in peer-reviewed journals and books, presentations at scholarly conferences, inventions and patents, or original creation in writing or multimedia, artistic works, or new technologies.

#### ***Scholarship of Integration***

The scholarship of integration includes the critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or interpretation of research or creative work produced by others. It may be disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary in nature. When disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge is synthesized, interpreted, or connected, this integrative scholarly contribution brings new insight. Integrative or interdisciplinary work might include articles, policy papers, reflective essays and reviews, translations, popular publications, synthesis of the literature on a topic, or textbooks. The scholarship of integration may be shared through any form such as those typical of discovery, application, teaching, or engagement.

#### ***Scholarship of Application and Practice***

Scholarship of application involves the use of a scholar's disciplinary knowledge to address important individual, institutional, and societal problems. The scholarship of application and practice might apply the knowledge, techniques, or technologies of the arts and sciences, business or engineering to the benefit of individuals and groups. This may include translational research, commercialization, start-ups, technology transfer, assistive technologies, learning technologies, or applied research supported by industrial or corporate partners or by government agencies. Contributions to the scholarship of application and practice are shared with stakeholders and open to review and critique by stakeholders and by peers.

#### ***Scholarship of Teaching and Learning***

The scholarship of teaching and learning is the development and improvement of pedagogical practices that are shared with others. Effective teachers engage in scholarly teaching activity when they undertake assessment and evaluation to promote improvement in their own teaching and in student learning. Scholarly teaching activity becomes the scholarship of teaching and

learning when faculty members make their teaching public, so that it can be reviewed, critiqued and built on by others, through publications, presentations or other forms of dissemination.

### ***Scholarship of Engagement***

The scholarship of engagement involves collaborative partnerships with communities (local, regional, state, national, or global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources. Examples of the scholarship of engagement might include, but are not limited to: community-based programs that enhance WPI's curriculum, teaching and learning; educational or public outreach programs; other partnerships with communities beyond the campus to address critical societal issues, prepare educated citizens, or contribute to the public good. Contributions in the scholarship of engagement are of benefit to the external community, visible and shared with stakeholders, and open to review and critique by community stakeholders and by peers.

### **D.1.3. Documentation in the Promotion Dossier**

The candidate for promotion to full Professor will submit a promotion dossier representative of their overall career, with an emphasis on work since tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate's promotion dossier will include the following: a curriculum vitae (CV); a personal statement of teaching, scholarship, service, and impact; a teaching portfolio to document high quality teaching; sample scholarly artifacts and a citation index and other indicators to demonstrate the high quality and external impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

- The **CV** provides comprehensive documentation of the candidate's professional experience and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service.
- The **personal statement** provides a reflective summary and description of the candidate's professional accomplishments and scholarly contributions. Typically, the personal statement will include sections on teaching, scholarship/creativity, service, external impact, and future plans.
- The **teaching portfolio** provides documentation of the candidate's high quality teaching. A teaching portfolio presents representative teaching materials and evidence of their effectiveness. Typical elements in a teaching portfolio include a reflective statement of the candidate's approach to teaching and learning, samples of teaching materials and teaching innovations, and measures of teaching effectiveness or materials that demonstrate student learning.
- The **sample scholarly artifacts** provide documentation of the high quality and external impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions. For most candidates, the sample scholarly artifacts will be three peer-reviewed articles that have been published since tenure and/or promotion. However, scholarly contributions may be documented and disseminated through a variety of artifacts besides peer-reviewed articles. The continuum of artifacts through which knowledge may be documented and disseminated matches, in its inclusiveness and variety, the continuum of scholarship. Sample scholarly artifacts must be publicly available, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community.
- **Citation index and indicators of external impact.** All candidates for promotion must submit a citation index and any other indicators of external impact appropriate to their scholarly contributions. The citation index should include all citations of the candidate's publications, presentations or other scholarly contributions. Additional indicators of external impact might include reviews of the candidate's work, press and media coverage, downloads of scholarly materials, awards and recognition, or any other indicators that the candidate's scholarly contributions have had an impact beyond WPI.

Overall, the candidate should use this documentation to present the case that they have achieved the criteria for promotion. **Scholarly contributions may combine or cut across traditional categories of teaching, scholarship/creativity and service.** The candidate is invited and encouraged to use the promotion dossier to make arguments for the quality and impact of their work using these categories or in other ways if those other ways are appropriate to the form and impact of their scholarly contributions.

In addition to the above materials submitted by the candidate, the Joint Promotion Committee will add four **other sources of information** to the complete promotion review dossier: 1) Summary student ratings for all courses and projects taught at WPI in the last five years. 2) Responses to a teaching evaluation sent to a random selection of former students and alumni whom the candidate has taught in the last five years. 3) Instructional Activity Reports and Sponsored Research Activity Reports for the last five years. 4) Letters of appraisal solicited by the committee from internal and external peers for a confidential evaluation of the materials submitted by the candidate for the promotion dossier.

#### **D.1.4. Standards for Evaluation of the Promotion Dossier: Quality, Impact and Peer Review**

The candidate's promotion dossier and the criteria for promotion (sections D1.1 – D.1.4) will be sent to peers within WPI and to knowledgeable people external to WPI for an independent assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service. These letters of appraisal will be read only by people who are directly involved in the evaluation of the nomination for promotion and they will not be shown to the candidate or to anyone else. This section provides additional guidance to reviewers for this assessment.

An assessment of **high quality teaching, high quality scholarship/creativity, and service** may be based on any and all material in the promotion dossier, including the CV, personal statement, teaching portfolio, peer-reviewed scholarship, peer reviews of sample scholarly artifacts, or indicators of external impact. Traditional measures to assess quality do not necessarily accommodate all areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Nonetheless, the following six standards have been identified to evaluate quality across diverse areas: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed*, 1997). Since the dossier includes the candidate's reflective critique in their personal statement, peer reviewers are invited to apply these six standards to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service in the promotion portfolio.

**External impact** beyond WPI should be assessed based on the relevant standards in the areas of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Thus, the starting point to assess external impact is the candidate's personal statement, which should identify the area or areas of their scholarly contributions across teaching, scholarship and service and indicate examples of external impact beyond WPI. While quantitative measures such as the number of refereed publications and citations or the level of external funding will remain important indicators of quality and impact for many scholars, WPI recognizes that the weight assigned to such measures varies widely between academic fields as well as along the continuum of scholarship. Thus, evidence of external impact beyond WPI might include: funding from multiple sources; peer-reviewed articles or presentations in well-regarded journals or conferences; books; reviews, citations or impact factors; downloadable curriculum; patents; films, broadcasts, software, or computer games; discussion of research in legal cases, policy reports, or the media; keynote addresses; workshops for other institutions, regional, national or international societies; artistic exhibitions, performances or productions; K-12 outreach and educational programs; journal editorships; leadership of academic programs or centers; or impact on external communities through teaching, scholarship or service. These examples of external impact are illustrative and do not limit other ways that a candidate might demonstrate external impact.



**Peer reviewers** should be experts in, and therefore appropriate evaluators of, the area or areas of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Where appropriate, external reviewers may include experts whose institutional affiliation is beyond the academy if they are well-placed to testify to or evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

All reviewers—internal and external peers, members of promotion committees, or academic decision-makers—are reminded that **implicit and explicit bias** has been shown to occur in every aspect of a faculty career that is evaluated. Empirical studies have shown that letters of recommendation for women and men differ in gendered ways: letters for women are often shorter, less detailed, and reinforce gender stereotypes. Women faculty and faculty of color also may face bias in student ratings of teaching or in mentoring and sponsorship. The choice of area for scholarly contributions (e.g. interdisciplinary, qualitative, community-engaged, theoretical, or digital) may result in comparatively less funding or fewer citations but nevertheless demonstrate high quality and impact in forms appropriate to that area of scholarship. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions highlights potential sources of bias in this description of the standards for evaluation of the promotion dossier so that all reviewers at every stage of the review process will be aware of potential implicit and explicit bias and take care to limit opportunities for such bias to influence the consideration of each nomination for promotion.

## **D.2. Procedures for Promotion Nomination and Review**

### **D.2.1. Eligibility and Time in Rank**

A candidate for promotion to **Associate Professor** normally will have completed five years as an Assistant Professor before a promotion review in the sixth year. Probationary faculty with initial appointment as Assistant Professor normally receive a combined review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor from a Joint Tenure Committee, as described in Part Two, Section 1.A. Only in exceptional circumstances should an Assistant Professor be nominated for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than the scheduled tenure review.

To be considered for promotion to professor, an associate professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth. A candidate for promotion to **Professor** normally will have completed at least five years as Associate Professor and at least three years as an Associate Professor at WPI before the year of the promotion review. Only in exceptional circumstances should an Associate Professor be nominated for promotion to Professor at an earlier date.

### **D.2.2. Nomination and the Formation of a Joint Promotion Committee**

A candidate must be nominated for promotion. The **Nominator** is normally the Department Head or a tenured full professor at WPI. Before nomination, the Nominator should discuss with the candidate the strengths and weaknesses of their case based on the promotion criteria and eligibility including time in rank. Departmental promotion procedures should assure equitable treatment of all eligible candidates and should be selective so that only well-qualified candidates are nominated.

The Nominator's initial *statement of nomination* of a candidate for promotion must be received by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions from the Department Head by April 15 or from nominators other than the Department Head by May 1. The nominator must submit a more detailed **letter of nomination**, with a description and analysis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship/creativity, service and impact, during the summer prior to the academic year of the promotion review.

After the initial statement of nomination, the **Candidate** is invited to submit the materials for the promotion dossier (described in section D.1.3), as well as a list of internal and external peers known as Professional Associates (described in section D.2.3) and the name of an Advocate. The

**Advocate** is normally a full-time faculty member who agrees to serve with the Nominator as a non-voting member of a Joint Promotion Committee. The candidate should seek advice from the Nominator, Advocate and other mentors well in advance of the nomination deadline in order to develop a strong promotion dossier and to submit an appropriate list of Professional Associates. The candidate submits the name of the Advocate and the list of Professional Associates by May 1. The candidate's promotion dossier is due in June prior to the academic year of the promotion review.

The **Joint Promotion Committee** consists of six voting members from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) and two non-voting members, the Nominator and Advocate. The selection and recusal of COAP members for a Joint Committee are described in Bylaw One, Section VI.

### **D.2.3. Selection of Internal and External Peer Reviewers**

The Joint Promotion Committee develops a list of peer reviewers to evaluate the candidate's promotion dossier. These peers are 1) six Professional Associates who are selected by candidate; and 2) five to six External Reviewers who are selected by the Joint Committee.

**Professional Associates** are contacted by the candidate at the time of the initial nomination and must agree, at that time, to supply a letter of appraisal when later asked by the Joint Promotion Committee. The six professional associates should include a mixture of internal peers at WPI and external peers in the candidate's areas of expertise. All professional associates must be qualified to evaluate the candidate's promotion dossier, and they must have agreed to write a letter of appraisal when asked by the candidate before they will be contacted by the Joint Committee.

**External Reviewers** are selected by the Joint Promotion Committee after the candidate has identified the professional associates. External reviewers must be competent to judge the candidate's promotion dossier and not have conflicts of interests or close personal ties to the candidate (such as co-author, co-PI, co-advisor, etc.). The candidate may not suggest names for the list of external reviewers, though they should tell the Nominator if there is anyone who should not be asked, with an explanation. The Nominator and Advocate each identify potential external reviewers and the Joint Committee then develops a priority list of reviewers. On behalf of the Joint Committee, the Nominator invites individuals from this priority list to serve as external reviewers until at least five to six external peers agree to write letters of appraisal.

The Joint Committee sends electronic copies of the candidate's promotion dossier as well as the criteria for promotion to the Professional Associates and the External Reviewers early in the summer. All of these peer reviewers are asked to submit a confidential letter of appraisal to the Committee before the beginning of the academic year of the promotion review (typically by August 15).

### **D.2.4. Student and Alumni Evaluations and Other Materials**

During the summer before the academic year of the promotion review, the Joint Promotion Committee solicits **student and alumni evaluations** and collects other materials in the summer or the fall, as necessary, to arrive at a fair and equitable evaluation of the candidate.

### **D.2.5. Review by the Joint Promotion Committee, Dean, and Provost**

The Joint Promotion Committee reviews a nomination for promotion in order to make a recommendation to the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In Term A and Term B of the academic year of the promotion review, the Joint Promotion Committee meets to consider the merits of the nomination for promotion. The Joint Committee

reviews the complete promotion dossier (described in section D.1.3) including the letters of appraisal from Professional Associates and External Reviewers. The welfare of the candidate must be protected by all members of the Joint Committee by observing strict rules of confidentiality during all phases of the promotion review. When all the members of the Joint Promotion Committee agree that there has been sufficient discussion, a vote is taken by the six voting members of the Joint Committee for or against promotion (no abstentions) by means of a secret ballot, with the majority ruling. By the end of Term B, the Joint Committee forwards to the Dean and the Provost a letter conveying the result of its vote as a unitary recommendation for or against promotion and summarizing the salient reasons for its recommendation.

The Provost reviews each case and consults with the Dean and the President. Subsequently, the Provost may ask to meet with the Joint Committee to discuss any of its recommendations, and must meet with the Joint Committee in the case of potential disagreement. Lastly, the Provost sends to the Board of Trustees the names of candidates for whom promotion is recommended. At no time shall the identity of any faculty member who was not recommended for promotion be disclosed to the members of the Board of Trustees. The Provost will inform the candidate of the Board's decision.

In the event of a negative decision on promotion, a letter to the candidate discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case for promotion will be written by the Dean, and the Provost. The purpose of this letter is to provide constructive advice to the candidate so that they may address any deficiencies and resubmit the case for promotion consideration in the future. The candidate may meet with the Provost, Dean, or the Nominator to discuss reasons for the promotion decision.

If a candidate for promotion wishes to appeal a negative decision, faculty grievance procedures are available to the extent provided by a Faculty Review Committee (Bylaw One, IX).

## **E.-Mentoring and Professional Development of Professors at the Associate Level**

(Approved by the Faculty October 4, 2018)

### i. Overview.

Strategic professional development opportunities will empower faculty members to engage in career planning, seek productive collaborations and build communities to accelerate and promote their work. Mentoring is a key component of faculty professional development. It is defined here as a process by which an experienced faculty member serves as a guide to an individual (usually with less experience) for the purposes of *socializing them to disciplinary norms, fostering their acquisition of institutional and scholarly knowledge, and providing professional opportunities and personal and/or professional support*. Hence, to foster continuing professional development and promotion in academic rank, all tenured associate professors and continuing (i.e., full-time) non-tenure track associate professors are encouraged to establish a Mentoring Team.

### ii. Mentoring Team Makeup and Training.

The tenured associate professors or continuing (i.e., full time) non-tenure track associate professors seeking mentorship are encouraged to choose a Mentoring Team consisting of two faculty members. Individuals are encouraged to also include their respective department head as a third member of their Mentoring Team, when appropriate and to strengthen their relationship with their department head.

Mentoring Team members will be selected by individual faculty members based on their mentoring needs. It is anticipated that most Mentoring Team members will be at a higher rank (e.g., full professor); however, individual faculty members are encouraged to choose those members who they feel will best serve as mentors. Associate professors are encouraged to discuss their Mentoring Team member choice with trusted colleagues.

Each Mentoring Team member (including department heads) is encouraged to undergo training (as described in Section v. below). Faculty members are free to change their selected mentors as their professional interests, goals, and needs evolve.

### iii. Mentoring Team Model and Frequency of Interaction.

Mentoring Teams will assist tenured associate professors and continuing (i.e., full-time) non-tenure track associate teaching and associate research professors in their professional development, help them reflect on their longer-term accomplishments and future goals, and provide feedback in a confidential and collegial setting.

Individual associate professors with a Mentoring Team are encouraged to meet with their Mentoring Team every two years. In addition, Mentoring Team members are expected to meet regularly (ranging from once per month to twice per year) with the faculty member on an individual basis where meetings may involve informal conversations about professional development, a discussion of the faculty member's Professional Development Plan (PDP)<sup>6</sup>, or a more formal assessment of the faculty member's readiness for promotion in rank.

It is expected that Mentoring Team members will advise on the criteria for promotion in academic rank and potentially serve as members of the Joint Promotion Committee. Meetings with the Mentoring Team are not to be considered performance reviews; they are not a substitute for annual meetings with department heads or for regular consultation with other mentors. Rather, Mentoring Team meetings held at regular intervals are intended to facilitate continued professional development and promotion. The results of Mentoring Team meetings are advisory and will be shared exclusively with the faculty member.

### iv. Administration.

---

<sup>6</sup> The template for Professional Development Plans is available through the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center.

The Associate Professor Mentoring Program will be administered through the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center. Periodic program assessment will be administered through the Center.

v. Mentorship Training.

Mentor training consists of three components: 1) understanding and proper interpretation of WPI's promotion criteria (for both TTT and NTT faculty members); 2) being an effective mentor including the use of Professional Development Plans; and 3) handling implicit bias<sup>7</sup>. Training is designed, customized, delivered and refined to meet program needs. Training is administered through the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center and offered biannually to a cohort of identified Mentoring Team members. This training is also required of the provost, deans, department heads and program directors.

vi. Mentoring Team Meeting and Reporting.

Mentoring Team meetings will focus on discussions of the professional development of the faculty member (using the Professional Development Plan, where appropriate) and serve as a group mentoring experience. If desired, the faculty member may draft a summary of the meeting and ask the Mentoring Team to verify that they agree with the contents of the drafted summary. This summary of the meeting is only for their personal communication and will not be shared with anyone else unless agreed to by all parties. The Mentoring Team meeting should take place before the end of the academic year.

All faculty members choosing to establish a Mentoring Team should address career goals, align those goals with the criteria for promotion, and set objectives or milestones that they intend to achieve (using the Professional Development Plan, where appropriate). Faculty should also maintain annual updates to two forms of vitae: 1) following the more detailed requirements of COAP (organization and categories available from Faculty Governance); and 2) one that is more appropriate for sharing with the faculty member's outside professional community.

The Morgan Teaching and Learning Center will maintain a record mentoring program participants. The content of the meetings will be confidential. Periodically, COAP and COG will request from department heads and the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center reports on actions taken to support mentoring and professional development.

---

<sup>7</sup> Implicit biases are unconscious thoughts that are automatically activated without conscious awareness that can inadvertently influence thoughts, decisions, and behaviors. Implicit biases are pervasive, but they do not necessarily align with explicit beliefs, biases, or motivations.

## **F. POLICY ON FACULTY CONDUCT**<sup>8</sup>

(Approved by the Faculty on February 7, 2019)

### 1. Introduction and Applicability

Members of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (“WPI”) faculty have traditionally conducted themselves in accordance with high standards of professional performance, ethical behavior and personal conduct. Nonetheless, from time to time it may be necessary to take action with respect to a faculty member who engages in conduct incompatible with the responsibilities of faculty membership or who fails to meet reasonable standards of performance or behavior. In recognition of this need, WPI has developed the following policy to respond to allegations of misconduct not covered by WPI’s Research Misconduct Policy and WPI’s Sexual Misconduct Policy and to inform members of the community of the appropriate channels for bringing such matters to the attention of WPI. This Policy applies to tenured, tenure-track, and continuing full-time non-tenure track members of the WPI faculty, including the President, the Provost, the Vice Provost for Research, and the Academic Deans.

### 2. Definitions

- a) *Complainant*. The individual, department or entity alleging misconduct.
- b) *Respondent*. The individual against whom an allegation of misconduct is made.
- c) *Dean*. The Dean of the Respondent’s School, department or program.
- d) *Investigator*. The individual responsible for conducting an impartial investigation of the allegations of misconduct when the process moves beyond the initial review.
- e) *Judicial Committee*. The panel of three faculty members and three senior academic administrators responsible for determination of responsibility and sanctions when the process moves beyond the initial review.

### 3. Grounds for Misconduct

Generally, grounds for misconduct are based on violations of professional ethics<sup>9</sup> in carrying out one’s responsibilities to: a) teaching and students; b) scholarship; c) the University; d) colleagues; and e) the community. Nothing in this policy restricts a person's rights to privacy, academic freedom, free speech, and free expression including the right to speak out against a policy or action of the University.

The ethical responsibilities and examples of violations in each category are described as follows:

*Teaching and Students:* As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge

---

<sup>8</sup> This policy replaces and supersedes all previous Faculty Conduct Policies, including policy entitled “Worcester Polytechnic Institute Faculty Conduct Policy” approved by the Board of Trustees on May 11, 2018. The procedures outlined herein apply to conduct predating the implementation date unless a proceeding is pending under the old policy. All faculty members and instructional staff not covered by this Policy should consult the Work Behavior/Discipline section of the Human Resources [Employee Benefits and Policies Manual](#).

<sup>9</sup> See for example AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics.

significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction;
- b) Discrimination, including harassment against a student on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability;
- c) Violation of University instructional policies;
- d) Use of position of power to coerce the judgment or the conscience of a student or to cause harm to a student for arbitrary or personal reasons;
- e) Participating or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.

*Scholarship:* Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry. This Policy covers misconduct related to scholarship only if it is not covered by the Research Misconduct Policy [https://www.wpi.edu/sites/default/files/docs/About-WPI/Policies/Research\\_Misconduct\\_Policy.pdf](https://www.wpi.edu/sites/default/files/docs/About-WPI/Policies/Research_Misconduct_Policy.pdf).

*The University:* As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Incitement of others to disobey University rules when such incitement constitutes a clear and present danger that violence or abuse against persons or property will occur;
- b) Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes;
- c) Forcible detention, threats of physical harm to, or harassment of another member of the University community, that interferes with that person's performance of University activities;
- d) Significant violations of institutional or departmental policies;
- e) Discrimination, including harassment against any employee, contractor, intern on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability.

*Colleagues:* As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- e) Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance;

- a) Discrimination, including harassment against any employee, contractor, intern on grounds described in <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies/equal-opportunity-anti-discrimination-harassment> or any other arbitrary or personal reason, including disability;
- b) Violation of University policies related to collegiality;
- c) Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

*The Community:* As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom. Examples of unacceptable behavior are:

- a) Intentionally misrepresenting that one's personal views are the views, or position of the University;
- b) Illegal actions that clearly demonstrate unfitness to continue as a faculty member;
- c) Conduct not protected by academic freedom, free speech, and freedom of expression that significantly damages the University's reputation or mission.

#### 4. Sanctions

A finding of responsibility for faculty misconduct can result in a wide range of sanctions, depending on the circumstances of a particular case. Sanctions must be commensurate with the seriousness of the misconduct. Seriousness, and thus the sanction, will depend on the egregiousness of a particular action and may be affected by the Respondent's level of cooperation with the process set forth in this Policy, and persistence of behavior in the face of prior warnings, counseling or sanctions. In some instances, a single instance of unacceptable activity by a faculty member may be severe enough to warrant sanctions, including dismissal. In other instances, only a pattern of activity or the continuation of a particular activity or activities may warrant sanctions.

The circumstances that may lead to disciplinary sanctions cannot be anticipated in precise terms and thus grounds for sanctioning faculty members are not made the subject of a precise or comprehensive statement. The determination of appropriate sanctions will account for the following factors, including but not limited to:

- The nature and circumstances of the misconduct;
- The impact of the misconduct on the person who experienced the misconduct and the WPI community;
- The disciplinary history of the Respondent and the Respondent's cooperation with the process set forth in this Policy;
- The intent of the Respondent in committing the misconduct; and
- Any other mitigating or aggravating circumstances in order to reach a fair and appropriate resolution in each case.

As with the definition of misconduct, it is not feasible or wise to automatically assign a specific sanction to particular misconduct. Examples showing the range of possible sanctions include, but are not necessarily limited to:<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> The referral of a faculty member to the Employee Assistance Program (see <https://www.wpi.edu/offices/talent/benefits-payroll-perks/benefits-matrix/employee-assistance-program>), training, counseling, or coaching is not considered a disciplinary sanction under this policy.



- A letter of reprimand from the Dean to be placed in the personnel file
- A formal apology from the Respondent
- Remedial training or counseling
- Supervision or oversight of professional activity for specified period of time
- Reassignment of duties, facilities or support
- Limitation of professional responsibilities for a specified period of time
- Restitution of misappropriated funds
- Withholding increases in compensation
- Reduction of salary
- Suspension for a specific time with pay
- Suspension without pay
- Termination of employment

Sanctions of demotions in rank or revocation of tenure are only appropriate in cases where appointment, promotion, or tenure were obtained by fraud or dishonesty.

#### 5. General Matters

- a) All parties are encouraged to resolve disputes and disagreements in a mutually acceptable manner before this Policy is invoked. After this Policy is invoked, allegations of misconduct may be resolved at any time by mutual agreement of the Respondent, the Complainant and the Dean.
- b) At all times, the parties shall cooperate with the process, preserve (and not delete or destroy) evidence, and provide information and materials as requested.
- c) The Respondent should be provided with reasonable updates and opportunities to respond.
- d) The Respondent shall be permitted the assistance of one (1) advisor or legal counsel during any investigative proceeding, including any related meeting, interview, or hearing. Advisors may communicate with their advisee but may not speak or otherwise communicate on behalf of a party. Advisors are subject to the same confidentiality obligations applicable to others in attendance.
- e) The Respondent is entitled to the presumption of innocence, the opportunity to respond to allegations of misconduct, and the opportunity to present a defense and offer evidence. The standard of proof in deciding that misconduct has occurred should be based on a preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires the determination of whether it is more likely than not that a fact exists or a violation of this Policy occurred.
- f) Deadlines under this Policy may be extended upon a showing of reasonable cause.

#### 6. Initial Review of Allegations

- a) Allegations of misconduct (a "Complaint") should be made in writing to the Dean of the School, department or program of the Respondent named in the Complaint. The fact that a Complaint has been received should be made known only to the Respondent and to other persons who need to know, based on the Dean's discretion. It should be expected that the Dean will notify the Provost and/or the President about allegations of misconduct. Because the Provost and President may be involved later in the process, they must each respect the integrity of the process as it moves forward.
- b) Upon receiving a Complaint, the Dean shall promptly send a copy of the Complaint and a copy of this Policy to the Respondent, and shall take appropriate action to obtain and secure relevant evidence.

- c) The Respondent shall have an opportunity to provide a written response to the allegations within ten (10) days of receiving the Complaint from the Dean.
- d) Once a Complaint has been received, the Dean may explore the possibility of a satisfactory resolution outside the scope of this Policy.
- e) If the Dean believes the alleged misconduct poses any risk to the community, the Dean may, in the Dean's discretion, impose appropriate interim sanctions up to and including suspension with pay and an order that the Respondent not enter WPI's property, or participate in WPI activities or programs. The suspension shall become effective upon notification in writing to the faculty member. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be informed of the suspension. The Dean may revoke a suspension at any time. If not revoked earlier, a suspension shall remain in effect until the final disposition of the process set forth in this Policy.
- f) Upon receipt of a Complaint, the Dean shall review the Complaint and determine whether the allegations in the Complaint would, presuming the allegations to be true, meet the definition of misconduct as set forth in this Policy. If, presuming the allegations to be true, the Complaint does not meet the definition of misconduct, the Dean shall dismiss the Complaint. Otherwise, the process will move forward as set forth herein. In either case, the Dean will promptly provide written notice of the decision and rationale to the Respondent and the Complainant.
- g) If the Dean concludes that the process should move forward, the Dean shall appoint three unbiased faculty members from outside of the Respondent's home department to:
  - i. Review the written Complaint and meet with the Complainant to get their version of the alleged misconduct and relevant events;
  - ii. Review the written response from the Respondent and meet with the Respondent to get their version of the relevant events;
  - iii. Assess whether the behavior alleged constitutes a violation of this Policy and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of such misconduct may be identified.
  - iv. Prepare a written report summarizing the process and information reviewed and, based on the criteria described in Section 7.g) iii. above, recommend to the Dean whether the process under this Policy should continue or whether the Complaint should be dismissed. The report should identify the names of the Complainant and the Respondent, contain a description of the allegations, explain why the faculty members recommend that the Complaint should be dismissed or that the process should continue under this Policy, and reflect the numerical vote (but not the names) of the three faculty members. The report shall be sent to the Dean.
- h) The Dean will consider the faculty's recommendation and then decide whether the process under this Policy should continue or whether the Complaint should be dismissed. When the allegations are within the faculty's area of primary responsibility (i.e. curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process), the Dean should normally accept the faculty's decision. In rare instances and for compelling reasons, however, the Dean may reject the faculty's determination. Regardless of the decision, the Dean shall state in writing the basis for the decision and promptly send a copy of both the Dean's report and the report written by the three faculty members to the Complainant and the Respondent. In all cases, the Dean shall also send a copy of the Dean's report to the three faculty members. If the Dean decides that the process should continue, then the Dean's report will include a sufficiently detailed description of the allegations, the portions of this Policy that are alleged to have been violated, and any interim

measures in place about which either party should be made aware. This written notice does not constitute a finding or a determination of responsibility. If the Dean decides that the process should continue, the Dean shall also provide a copy of both reports to the Provost, and the matter shall proceed as described below.

- i) The Dean shall make the decision about whether the Complaint will proceed under this Policy within sixty (60) days following the Dean's receipt of the Complaint. The Dean may extend this deadline for a reasonable time if necessary under the circumstances. The Dean shall notify all parties of any extensions.

## 7. The Investigative Phase

- a) Within ten (10) days after receipt of the Dean's decision to continue the process under this Policy, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall collaborate in good faith, concerning the appointment of an unbiased, qualified Investigator. Following such good faith collaboration, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall agree upon and appoint an unbiased, qualified Investigator (e.g. Title IX coordinator or qualified investigator from outside the university) charged with responsibility for conducting a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation of the alleged conduct and presenting evidence to the Judicial Committee (described below). The Provost and/or the Secretary of the Faculty may consult with the Office of General Counsel, the Vice President of Human Resources, and/or such other persons who would be helpful in selecting the appropriate Investigator. If the Secretary of the Faculty and the Provost cannot agree on an Investigator, the President shall select one after reviewing the Secretary of the Faculty's and the Provost's recommendations. The Provost will promptly provide the Respondent with the name of the Investigator. As soon as possible, but no later than three (3) calendar days after delivery of the identity of the Investigator, the Respondent should inform the Provost (in writing) of any potential conflicts of interest about the selected Investigator. The Provost will collaborate in good faith with the Secretary of the Faculty in considering the nature of the potential conflict and in determining if a change is necessary. Following such good faith collaboration, the Provost shall determine if a change is necessary. The Provost's decision regarding any conflicts with the Investigator is final.
- b) The investigation conducted by the Investigator should focus on the violation(s) alleged in the Complaint. The investigation will include the review of documentation or other items relevant to the reported conduct as well as separate interviews with the Complainant, the Respondent, and any witnesses whom the Investigator believes will provide necessary and relevant information. The Respondent will have the opportunity to provide the Investigator with written notice of the names and contact information of potential witnesses with whom they would like the Investigator to speak, together with a brief explanation of how the persons, documents, and/or items are relevant to the reported conduct. The Respondent may also provide the Investigator with any documentation or other items they would like to be considered. The Investigator will exercise discretion in determining what information and questions to consider and which potential witnesses will be interviewed.
- c) The purpose of the investigation is not to look for evidence of misconduct unrelated to the allegations in the Complaint. To the contrary, the investigation should focus on the violation(s) alleged in the Complaint. However, if in the normal course of gathering evidence, the Investigator discovers evidence of other potential violations of this Policy that are separate from or in addition to the allegations in the original Complaint, then the Investigator should inform the Dean (in writing) of the new allegation. The Dean shall notify the Respondent of the additional potential violations and give the Respondent ten (10) days to provide a written response to the additional potential violations. This deadline may be extended by the Dean as

necessary under the circumstances. The Dean will treat any new unrelated allegation as a separate Complaint starting at Section 6 of this Policy (Initial Review of Allegations).

#### 8. Procedures Following the Investigative Phase

- a) The Investigative Report:** After the investigation is completed, the Investigator will deliver an Investigative Report to the Dean. The Investigative Report shall:
- i. include a clear Statement of Charges that specifies the conduct that allegedly violates this Policy, the particular section(s) of this Policy allegedly violated, the time period when the conduct allegedly occurred, and any other information necessary to give the Respondent fair notice of the charges and alleged violations;
  - ii. include a summary of the information presented during the investigation including a section where the Investigator points out relevant consistencies or inconsistencies (if any) between different sources of information;
  - iii. not include a recommendation or a determination as to whether the Respondent has committed misconduct or what sanctions may be appropriate. These determinations will be made by the Judicial Committee (see below).
- b) Review by the Respondent:** Within five (5) business days of receiving the Investigative Report, the Dean will provide the Respondent with a copy of the Investigative Report. The Respondent shall respond in writing to the Statement of Charges included in the Investigative Report. The Respondent will also have an opportunity to submit written comments to the Dean about the Investigative Report within five (5) business days of receiving the Report. The time to submit written comments may be extended if the Dean concludes, in his/her sole discretion, that additional time is warranted. After reviewing the submission, if any, from the Respondent, the Dean may determine that additional investigation is required, in which case the Investigator will supplement the Investigative Report and submit a final Investigative Report to the Dean. Any submissions made by the Respondent, as well as any other documentation deemed relevant by the Investigator, will be attached to the Investigative Report. Within three (3) business days of receiving the final Investigative Report, the Dean will provide the Respondent with a copy of the final Investigative Report.
- c) Convening the Judicial Committee:** After receipt of the final Investigative Report, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall appoint a six member Judicial Committee (“Committee”) comprised of three senior administrators and three faculty members from outside the Respondent’s home department.
- a. The faculty members shall be selected from the elected members of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) and the elected faculty members of the Campus Hearing Board (CHB).
  - b. The senior administrators shall be selected from a pool of senior academic administrators.

Once the Committee has been appointed, the Dean shall notify the Respondent in writing of the names of the members of the Committee. Within five (5) days, the Respondent may challenge the composition of the Committee based on alleged bias or conflict of interest. If a challenge is raised, the remaining members of the Committee shall determine whether bias or a conflict exists. If a bias or conflict is found, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty shall select a replacement from the pool of elected FRC and CHB members or from other academic administrators, as appropriate.

**d) Roles and Responsibilities of the Judicial Committee.** Within ten (10) days following the establishment of the Committee (and the resolution of any challenge(s) based on bias or conflict of interest), the Committee should meet and select one faculty member and one senior academic administrator to serve as Co-Chairs.

The Judicial Committee will obtain the Investigative Report from the Dean and convene to review the Investigative Report. The Judicial Committee, in its discretion, may request the Investigator to attend a Judicial Committee meeting and answer questions. The Judicial Committee, in its discretion, may request the Investigator to conduct additional investigation on specific points. In addition, the Judicial Committee must interview the Complainant and the Respondent (where those individuals are available and willing to be interviewed) and, in its discretion, may request to speak with any other individual identified in the Investigative Report as well as any other individual with relevant information including individuals identified by the parties.

The Judicial Committee may request the parties that participated in the investigation to appear at a hearing to answer questions posed by the Judicial Committee. The Respondent should indicate whether the Respondent waives the holding of a hearing. If a hearing is to take place, then:

- i. The Committee Co-Chairs should promptly set a schedule for the hearing and the other disclosures and responses addressed in this section. The hearing schedule may take place over several days, as necessary. Before setting the schedule, the Committee Co-Chairs should discuss the proposed schedule with the Respondent. Once the schedule is set, the Committee Co-Chairs may allow reasonable extensions of time upon request.
- ii. The Committee Co-Chairs shall provide the Respondent with copies of all materials the Committee intends to use at the hearing and the names of witnesses expected to testify. Thereafter, the Committee Co-Chairs may supplement these materials as necessary with adequate notice given to the Respondent.
- iii. The Respondent shall provide the Committee Co-Chairs with copies of all materials the Respondent intends to use at the hearing and the names of any witnesses expected to testify. Thereafter, the Respondent may supplement these materials as necessary with the permission of the Committee Co-Chairs.

At the hearing:

- i. The Respondent shall have an opportunity to present the Respondent's defense to the Committee including any documents, witnesses or other evidence. The Respondent should be allowed, within reasonable limits set by the Committee Co-Chairs, to question witnesses.
- ii. The Committee will not be bound by rules of evidence applicable in a court of law, and may admit any evidence which, in its opinion, is of probative value in deciding the issues involved. If any facts are in dispute, the Committee shall determine the order in which evidence is offered at the hearing and the process for questioning witnesses.

The Committee shall conclude its review of the case (including the hearing) and make a decision within sixty (60) days after the establishment of the Committee (and the resolution of any challenge(s) based on bias or conflict of interest). All findings and determinations of responsibility and sanctions will be made based on a preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires the determination of whether it is more likely than not that a fact exists or a violation of this Policy occurred.

Upon reaching a determination by majority vote (4 to 2, 5 to 1, or 6 to 0), the Committee shall provide a written report to the Dean, the Provost, the Respondent and the Complainant consisting of: (i) the Committee's factual findings; (ii) a decision as to whether the Respondent committed misconduct; (iii) any sanction; and (iv) the rationale for these decisions addressing the merits of any reasonable explanation or defense provided by the Respondent; and (v) the *numerical* vote of the Committee without identifying individual votes.

In the case of a tie vote (3 to 3), the Committee shall deliver its report (with its factual findings, with appropriate rationale both for and against a finding of responsibility, and without a determination of responsibility and sanctions) to the President. The Committee's report shall indicate that the vote was tied and whether the three faculty members all voted to find the Respondent not responsible. The President will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. In all such cases, the President shall consider the matter and consult with the Judicial Committee and the Secretary of the Faculty before making a decision.

- i. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did not* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible then the President shall make a final written decision with supporting reasons about whether the Respondent committed misconduct and any sanctions to be imposed. The President's final written decision shall be delivered to the Provost, the Complainant, the Respondent, and the Judicial Committee. The Respondent, the Complainant, and the Provost shall also receive the Judicial Committee's written report.
- ii. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible and the President *agrees* with the faculty position, then the President will notify the Judicial Committee, the Dean, the Provost, the Complainant and the Respondent that the Respondent has been found not responsible. The Respondent, the Complainant, and the Provost shall also receive the Judicial Committee's written report.
- iii. If the three faculty members on the Judicial Committee *did* all vote to find the Respondent not responsible and the President *disagrees* with the faculty position, then the President will state the reasons for doing so, in writing, to the Judicial Committee and the Respondent and shall provide an opportunity for a response from the Respondent before transmitting the Judicial Committee's report and the supporting materials relevant to the matter, to the Board of Trustees. The Board's review will be based on the supporting materials relevant to the case, and it will provide the opportunity for argument, oral or written or both, at the hearing, by the parties and one of the faculty members on the Judicial Committee, or by their representatives. If the Board is inclined to find the Respondent responsible, then the Board shall state the basis for its inclination in writing and return the proceedings to the Judicial Committee for reconsideration. The Committee will then reconsider, taking into account the Board's comments and receiving new evidence, if necessary. The Board of Trustees will make a final decision only after study of the Committee's reconsideration. The Board's final written decision shall be delivered to the President, the Provost, the Complainant, the Respondent, and the Judicial Committee. The Respondent shall also receive the Committee's written report.

## 9. Appeals

- a) The Respondent may appeal any finding of misconduct and any sanction to the President within two (2) weeks after the Respondent received notification of the decision. If the Respondent is appealing from a decision made by the President (where the Committee vote had been tied) then the appeal should be directed to the Chair of the Board of Trustees. The

President (or Board Chair) will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case.

- b) Before the President (or Board Chair) decides the appeal, the President (or Board Chair) shall consult with the Judicial Committee Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty. The President (or Board Chair) should issue a decision within thirty (30) days of receiving the appeal. The President's (or Board Chair's) decision shall be final in all cases except cases involving a sanction of termination of employment or revocation of tenure.
- c) If the President (or Board Chair) imposes a sanction of termination of employment or revocation of tenure, the Respondent may appeal the finding of misconduct and the sanction to the full Board of Trustees within two (2) weeks after the President (or Board Chair) notifies the Respondent of the imposition of the sanction. If the Respondent appeals to the full Board, the Chair of the Board (or Board Vice-Chair in a case where the appeal was decided by the Chair), following good faith collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, shall appoint a committee of five (5) faculty members (who have not had prior involvement in the case) who will make a recommendation regarding the finding of misconduct and the sanction imposed. The faculty committee will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. The faculty committee will summarize the basis for its recommendation in a written report to the Board Chair (or Board Vice-Chair) within thirty (30) days. The Board Chair (or Board Vice-Chair) should issue a written decision within thirty (30) days of receiving the faculty committee's report. The Board Chair's (or Vice-Chair's) decision shall be final.
- d) Other than interim institutional actions which may already be in effect, any finding of misconduct, and the imposition of any sanction, will be stayed while an appeal is pending before the President or the Board of Trustees.
- e) If a faculty member is dismissed or suspended without pay, the faculty member's salary ends at a future time to be determined by the Board of Trustees.

#### 10. Provisions Common to the Misconduct Review Process

- a) *No Bias or Conflicts of Interest:* To the maximum extent practicable, steps should be taken to ensure an impartial and unbiased process, including participation of persons who have no conflicts of interest that could affect their ability to be objective and unbiased.

In cases where allegations of misconduct have been brought against the Dean or the Provost, or where there is a claim of bias or conflict of interest involving the Dean or the Provost, then the President shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest and adjust the process as necessary. The President's decision on such questions shall be final. In cases where allegations of misconduct have been brought against the President, or where there is a claim of bias or conflict of interest involving the President, then the Provost shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest and adjust the process as necessary.

In the case when allegations have been brought against the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chair of the Committee on Governance will play the role of the Secretary of the Faculty in this policy.

- b) *Duty of Honesty:* Any person who knowingly makes a false statement – either explicitly or by omission – in connection with any part of the process will be subject to separate disciplinary action. A false or unfounded report of misconduct determined to have been made in bad faith and dishonesty is a serious offense. Such offenses should themselves be investigated under the appropriate WPI policy and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment or other affiliation with WPI. A report made in good faith is not considered false merely because the evidence does not ultimately support the allegation of

violation of the Policy.

- c) *Good Faith Participation by the Parties and Witnesses:* The investigation is a neutral fact-gathering process. Although participation in the process is not required, the Complainant, the Respondent, and all witnesses are expected to participate in good faith in the process set forth in this Policy, and they may be required by WPI to attend meetings related to the process. Any person who knowingly interferes with the reporting, investigation, or resolution of matters under this Policy may be subject to separate and/or additional disciplinary action.
- d) *Confidentiality:* Proceedings concerning misconduct often raise difficult issues for those making the allegations, for those who are the subject of the allegations, and for those responsible for reviewing the allegations. Review of the allegations should therefore be conducted promptly and with care and sensitivity. All participants in the review process under this Policy are expected to maintain confidentiality to protect the privacy of all involved, to the extent possible and as permitted by law. Participants should keep in mind the effect that allegations can have on reputations, even if the allegations are not sustained by the proceedings.
- e) *No Retaliation:* Retaliation is typically a significant adverse action taken against an individual because the individual participated in a review process. Retaliation is a serious offense. No one shall be retaliated against for participating in a review of a misconduct allegation in good faith as a Complainant, a witness, a factfinder, or investigator or in any other capacity. Reasonable efforts should be made to counter potential or actual retaliation against these complainants, witnesses and committee members. A complaint of retaliation may be investigated and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including terminating the individual's relationship with WPI.
- f) *Record Keeping:* The Provost should receive and maintain all records relating to proceedings under this Policy including all notices to and from the parties, all written reports, all decisions, all appeals by the parties, and all decisions involved in the appeals process under this Policy.
- g) *Special Measures.* If there is no finding of misconduct, the University should make reasonable and practical efforts as appropriate to restore the reputation of the Respondent. Any such concerns by the Respondent should be directed to the Provost for follow up with other administrators as appropriate.



### **G. Review Of Tenured Faculty**

The Departmental Peer Review Committee will review each tenured faculty member's teaching performance every six years. A faculty member may request a more frequent review. The Peer Review Committee will prepare a written report with copies going to the teacher being reviewed, the Department Head and the departmental file.

## **H. Definitions of Joint Appointments of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

(Endorsed by COG, February 10, 2005)

*Dual Appointment* (Salary is split between two departments)

- Faculty member carries current rank title in both home and in second department (e.g. Professor of Biology/Biotechnology and Professor of Management).
- Set percentage (e.g. 50%) of salary is allocated to each of the two departments.
- Faculty member participates in all activities of both departments with full rights and privileges.
- Home department is listed first.

*Collaborative Appointment* (Salary is fully maintained by home department)

- Faculty member carries current rank title in both home and in second department (e.g. Professor of Biology/Biotechnology and Professor of Management). However, the second title is intended to foster interdepartmental collaboration.
- Faculty member salary is 100% budgeted in home department.
- Appointment is made to facilitate student advising, teaching and research. Course teaching would not be expected in the second department. However, advising, project advising, graduate advising (including thesis and dissertation advising) and research would be expected.
- Can be Advisor of Record for all project, thesis, and dissertation work.
- Home department is listed first.
- The appointment in the collaborative department will be for a maximum of five years and renewable on request.

To request either type of appointment, a memo bearing the signature of both department heads should be forwarded to the Provost, specifying which type of appointment and outlining the reason(s) for the request. If the Provost concurs, an appointment letter will be sent to the faculty member.

## **I. Guidelines for Searches to Fill Academic Administrative Positions\***

(Approved by the Faculty, May 2007)

### i. Academic Administrative Positions:

An academic administrative position is defined as a faculty appointment in which the primary responsibilities of the position are to lead faculty and to work with and on behalf of them to oversee substantial elements of WPI's degree-granting undergraduate or graduate programs, and/or to provide leadership, vision, and guidance in working with and on behalf of faculty to enhance their scholarship. Academic administrative positions are held by faculty who work with other faculty across several departments, programs, or other similar academic units. Examples of academic administrative positions include the Provost, Associate or Assistant Provosts, and the Deans and Associate Deans of Arts & Sciences, Engineering, Business, Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, the Interdisciplinary and Global Studies Division, and the First Year Experience.<sup>11</sup> Non-academic administrative positions include, but are not limited to those in admissions, enrollment management, student life, research administration, corporate and professional education, development, and marketing.

### ii. Formation of the Search Committee:

When an academic administrative position is to be filled from either inside or outside of WPI, a search committee of nine members is formed consisting of three elected faculty, one faculty member appointed by the Committee on Governance, one faculty member appointed by the Provost, two members appointed by the President, and two students appointed jointly by the President and by COG. The President, the Provost, and COG will collaborate on all appointments to ensure balance of the committee's membership and to select the Chair of the search committee. If the search is for the Provost, the President will make three appointments.

If the responsibilities of the position cross all departments, then all faculty participate in the process to choose the three elected members of the search committee. In this case, there is no restriction on the departmental affiliations of the faculty members who may be appointed. If, on the other hand, the responsibilities of the position do not cross all departments and programs, then the elected members of the committee will be chosen by those faculty and from among those departments that fall under the responsibilities of the position. In this case, at least one of the appointed faculty members must be from outside the academic departments that fall under the responsibilities of the position.

### iii. Conducting the Search:

The work of the search committee begins when the Provost (or the President, when the search is for Provost) provides it with a complete description of the responsibilities of the position. There is an understanding between the Provost, the President, the search committee, the candidates, and the WPI community that the job description will not change substantially throughout the search and for a reasonable period of time after an appointment is made to fill the position. At the outset of the search, the committee will meet with representatives from Human Resources for advice on relevant legal matters, and, throughout the search, will consult with those representatives whenever it is necessary to do so.

The job description will be used in soliciting nominations for the position. The search committee will evaluate the applicants and select appropriate candidates to be interviewed for the position.

---

<sup>11</sup> Deans, Associate Deans, or Assistant Deans of a school or college, if such positions were created, would be an academic administrative position that crossed all faculty and programs within that school.

It is the responsibility of the search committee to conduct the search in such a manner that all members of the faculty, administration, and staff who would interact in a substantive way with the appointee be given the opportunity to review the candidate's resume, meet with the candidate, ask questions of the candidate, and provide both written and oral feedback to the committee. The search committee may invite members of the staff to meet with the committee and/or serve as resources for the search.

Because input from students is so highly valued, it is also the responsibility of the search committee to solicit input from appropriate representatives of the student body, arrange meetings between students and each candidate, and obtain written and oral input from the students about the candidates with whom they have met.

iv. Evaluating the Candidates:

The search committee will provide a detailed evaluation of each candidate to the Provost, with its preferences made clear and with a digest of the feedback from the community included. The Provost will then share the information with the President, and jointly the President and Provost will select one of the candidates to fill the open position. If the search is for a Dean, then the President and Provost will select a candidate to be recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval. If the search is for the Provost, then the committee's evaluations will be given directly to the President, who will make the selection for approval by the Board of Trustees. If none of the candidates is acceptable to them, the President and/or the Provost will discuss their reasons with the search committee, and will either request that the search committee continue the search process, or that the search begin anew with the formation of a new search committee and a new solicitation for the position.

## **2. POLICIES REGARDING ACADEMICS AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

### **A. Statement of Values for Undergraduate Education\***

(Endorsed by the WPI Faculty, May 6, 2004)

1. WPI's programs shall emphasize fundamental concepts, knowledge, and skills, and ensure that students are able to apply them within the context of their major disciplines.
2. WPI's programs shall emphasize the development of students as effective thinkers and communicators, able to use evidence to present their ideas with logic, clarity, and persuasion.
3. Programmatic breadth in general, and balance between technical and humanistic components in particular, are the hallmarks of a WPI undergraduate education. In addition to educating students in their major discipline, WPI's programs shall provide students with a broad preparation for fulfilling lives as responsible professionals and informed citizens.
4. Grounded in project and course experiences, a WPI education shall provide a firm foundation for life-long learning in a variety of fields. WPI programs shall emphasize inquiry-based learning and open-ended problem solving. Students shall bear a considerable responsibility for learning outside of the classroom.
5. WPI's programs shall be sufficiently flexible so as to allow students significant choice in and responsibility for planning their courses of study. Faculty, via the central teaching tasks of project and academic advising, shall ensure that student learning experiences encourage critical reflection, decision making, and personal growth.
6. WPI's programs shall emphasize the scientific, technical, societal, and humanistic contexts in which knowledge is applied and constructed. Educational activities shall challenge students to make connections between disciplines, to consider multiple viewpoints, and to appreciate the consequences of their actions. The curriculum shall prominently feature integrative and interdisciplinary activities.
7. WPI's learning environment and educational activities shall balance personal responsibility and individual accountability with cooperation, collaboration, and mutual respect. Members of the community shall be encouraged to value academic integrity, and to become conscious of the value that such integrity confers to themselves and to the community.
8. WPI shall be committed to assessment and improvement of student learning.

## **B. WPI Undergraduate Learning Outcomes\***

(Endorsed by the WPI Faculty, May 6, 2004)

Graduates of WPI will:

1. have a base of knowledge in mathematics, science, and humanistic studies;
2. have mastered fundamental concepts and methods in their principal areas of study;
3. understand and employ current technological tools;
4. be effective in oral, written and visual communication;
5. function effectively both individually and on teams;
6. be able to identify, analyze, and solve problems creatively through sustained critical investigation;
7. be able to make connections between disciplines and to integrate information from multiple sources;
8. demonstrate global and intercultural competency by developing the capacity to identify, explain, and critically analyze the forces (such as cultural, historical, political, economic) that shape the self and others as they engage with local and global communities;
9. be aware of personal, societal, and professional ethical standards;
10. have the skills, diligence, and commitment to excellence needed to engage in lifelong learning;

WPI shall be committed to regular review of its undergraduate offerings in light of these Undergraduate Learning Outcomes. CAP and UOAC recommend that the Outcomes be conveyed to the Board of Trustees, be conveyed to current and future faculty and undergraduate students, and be included with the Mission and Goals Statements in future editions of the Undergraduate Catalog and the Faculty Handbook.

## **C. Policies Regarding the Awarding of Grades**

### 1. Faculty Guidelines for Project Grading\* (Approved by Faculty, October 9, 2014)

#### *Background*

Pronounced grade inflation for MQP, IQP, and Sufficiency activity is evident over the last twenty years. This has, in turn, resulted in a steady increase of the percentage of students graduating with honors. Furthermore, data indicate that project grading standards vary considerably from department to department. This not only creates an inequity with respect to honors, but may create barriers to student or faculty participation in multidisciplinary project activities.

#### *Recommendations*

Each term a student is registered for a project, the student receives a grade reflecting judgment of accomplishments for that term.

Upon completion of the project, students will receive an overall project grade. It is important to note that this grade reflects not only the final products of the project (e.g., results, reports, etc.), but also the process by which they were attained. No amount of last-minute effort should turn a mediocre project effort into an A.

The available grades and their interpretations are as follows:

- A: This grade denotes *excellent work* that attains all of the project goals and learning outcomes. The product and process of this work meet all of the expectations and exceed them in several areas.
- B: This grade denotes *consistently good work* that attains the project goals and learning outcomes. The product and process of this work meet but generally do not exceed all of the expectations.
- C: This grade denotes *acceptable work* that partially attains project goals and learning outcomes. The product and process of this work meet some but not all expectations.
- SP: This grade denotes *satisfactory progress* and certifies sufficient accomplishments to earn credit for that term. Faculty who assign this grade should provide clear feedback to the student regarding his or her progress during the term. The use of the SP grade is discouraged except in circumstances where the faculty member is unable to judge the quality of the work, yet can attest that the granting of credit is appropriate. This is a temporary grade and must be replaced by a permanent grade consistent with the criteria outlined above by, if not before, the end of the project.
- NR: This grade denotes work that did not attain the project goals or learning outcomes and is *insufficient for registered credit*. Both product and process were inconsistent with acceptable project work at WPI as outlined above..
- NAC: This grade is reserved for *performance that is unacceptable*. It might mean that a student's performance (or lack of it) has seriously impeded group progress, or it has embarrassed the group, a project sponsor, or WPI. Note that this grade remains on the transcript.

The results of a project should be such that an outside reviewer would reasonably deem the project as being worthy of the credit and grade given, based on evidence such as the project report.

In light of the above grading criteria, it is strongly suggested that a formal project proposal or contract be developed early in the project activity, so that all participants in the activity have a clear understanding of the project goals and advisor and student expectations.

## 2. Policy on Graduate Grade Appeals and Grade Changes\*

(Approved by the Faculty, October 9, 2003)

The purpose of the Grade Appeal Policy is to provide the student with a safeguard against receiving an unfair final grade, while respecting the academic responsibility of the instructor. Thus, this procedure recognizes that:

- Every student has a right to receive a grade assigned upon a fair and unprejudiced evaluation based on a method that is neither arbitrary nor capricious; and,
- Instructors have the right to assign a grade based on any method that is professionally acceptable, submitted in writing to all students, and applied equally.

Instructors have the responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades. Course and project grading methods should be explained to students at the beginning of the term. WPI presumes that the judgment of the instructor of record is authoritative and the final grades assigned are correct.

A grade appeal shall be confined to charges of unfair action toward an individual student and may not involve a challenge of an instructor's grading standard. A student has a right to expect thoughtful and clearly defined approaches to course and research project grading, but it must be recognized that varied standards and individual approaches to grading are valid. The grade appeal considers whether a grade was determined in a fair and appropriate manner; it does not attempt to grade or re-grade individual assignments or projects. It is incumbent on the student to substantiate the claim that his or her final grade represents unfair treatment, compared to the standard applied to other students. Only the final grade in a course or project may be appealed. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as clerical error, prejudice, or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

Only arbitrariness, prejudice, and/or error will be considered as legitimate grounds for a grade change appeal.

**Arbitrariness:** The grade awarded represents such a substantial departure from accepted academic norms as to demonstrate that the instructor did not actually exercise professional judgment.

**Prejudice:** The grade awarded was motivated by ill will and is not indicative of the student's academic performance.

**Error:** The instructor made a mistake in fact.

This grade appeal procedure applies only when a student initiates a grade appeal and not when the instructor decides to change a grade on his or her own initiative.

This procedure does not cover instances where students have been assigned grades based on academic dishonesty or academic misconduct. Academic dishonesty or misconduct are addressed in WPI's Academic Honesty Policy.

Also excluded from this procedure are grade appeals alleging discrimination, harassment or retaliation in violation of WPI's Sexual Harassment Policy, which shall be referred to the appropriate office at WPI as required by law and by WPI policy.



The Grade Appeal Procedure strives to resolve a disagreement between student and instructor concerning the assignment of a grade in a collegial manner. The intent is to provide a mechanism for the informal discussion of differences of opinion and for the formal adjudication by faculty only when necessary. In all instances, students who believe that an appropriate grade has not been assigned must first seek to resolve the matter informally with the instructor of record. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, the student must present his or her case in a timely fashion in the procedure outlined below. Under normal circumstances, the grade appeal process must be started near the beginning of the next regular academic semester after the disputed grade is received.

#### *Student Grade Appeal Procedure*

1. A student who wishes to question a grade must first discuss the matter with the instructor of record as soon as possible, preferably no later than one week after the start of the next regular academic semester after receiving the grade. In most cases, the discussion between the student and the instructor should suffice and the matter will not need to be carried further. The student should be aware that the only valid basis for grade appeal beyond this first step is to establish that an instructor assigned a grade that was arbitrary, prejudiced or in error.
2. If the student's concerns remain unresolved after the discussion with the instructor, the student may submit a written request to meet with the appropriate Department Head or Program Coordinator within one week of speaking with the instructor. The appropriate Department Head or Program Coordinator will meet with the student within one week and, if he or she believes that the complaint may have merit, with the instructor. After consultation with the appropriate Department Head or Program Coordinator, the instructor may choose to change the grade in question, leave the grade unchanged, or petition the Committee on Graduate Studies and Research to change a grade. The Department Head or Program Coordinator will communicate the result of these discussions to the student.
3. If the matter remains unresolved after the second step, the student should submit a written request within one week to the Provost's Office to request an Ad hoc Faculty Committee for Appeal of a Grade. The Associate Provost will meet with the student and will ask the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) to appoint the ad hoc Committee for Appeal of a Grade. The FRC, in consultation with the Associate Provost, will select the members of the ad hoc committee. The Chair of the FRC will convene the ad hoc committee and serve as its non-voting chair. The ad hoc committee for appeal of a course, thesis credit or dissertation credit grade will be composed of three faculty members. The Department Chair, Program Coordinator or Departmental Graduate Coordinator from the instructor's Department will be chosen as one member of the ad hoc committee. The other two appointees to the ad hoc committee may be any other faculty member as long as there are no conflicts of interest with either the student or the instructor. Apparent conflicts of interest would include the student's thesis or dissertation advisor, members of the student's graduate committee, faculty members with close research collaboration or project advising relationships with the instructor. The ad hoc committee would examine available written information on the dispute, would be available for meetings with the student and with the instructor, and would meet with others as it sees fit.
4. Through its inquiries and deliberations, the ad hoc committee is charged to determine whether the grade was assigned in a fair and appropriate manner or whether clear and convincing evidence of unfair treatment such as arbitrariness, prejudice, and/or error might justify changing the grade. The ad hoc committee will make its decisions by a majority vote. If the committee concludes that the grade was assigned in a fair and appropriate manner, the ad hoc committee will report its conclusion in writing to the student and the instructor. The decision of the ad hoc committee is final and not subject to appeal. If the ad hoc committee

determines that compelling reasons exist for changing the grade, it would request that the instructor make the change, providing the instructor with a written explanation of its reasons. Should the instructor decline, he or she must provide a written explanation for refusing.

5. The ad hoc faculty committee, after considering the instructor's explanation and upon concluding that it would be unjust to allow the original grade to stand, will then determine what grade is to be assigned. The new grade may be higher than, the same as, or lower than the original grade. Having made this determination, the three members of the committee will sign the grade change form and transmit it to the Registrar. The instructor and student will be advised of the new grade. Under no circumstances may persons other than the original faculty member or the ad hoc faculty committee change a grade. Should the ad hoc faculty committee feel that the instructor's written explanation justifies the original grade, the ad hoc committee will report this in writing to the student and instructor and the matter will be closed. The written records of these proceedings will be filed in the student's file in the Registrar's Office.

#### *Faculty Grade Change Procedure*

The Student Grade Appeal Procedure affirms the principle that grades should be considered final. The principle that grades for courses, thesis credit and dissertation credit should be considered final does not excuse an instructor from the responsibility to explain his or her grading standards to students and to assign grades in a fair and appropriate manner. The appeal procedure also provides an instructor with the opportunity to change a grade for a course or project on his or her own initiative. The appeal procedure recognizes that errors can be made and that an instructor who decides that it would be unfair to allow a final grade to stand due to error, prejudice or arbitrariness may request a change of grade for a course or project without the formation of an ad hoc committee. An instructor may request a grade change by submitting a course, thesis credit or dissertation credit grade change request in writing to the Registrar at any time prior to a student's graduation.

### 3. Policy on Undergraduate Grade Appeals and Grade Changes\*

(Approved by the Faculty, December 5, 2002)

The purpose of the Grade Appeal Policy is to provide the student with a safeguard against receiving an unfair final grade, while respecting the academic responsibility of the instructor. Thus, this procedure recognizes that,

- Every student has a right to receive a grade assigned upon a fair and unprejudiced evaluation based on a method that is neither arbitrary nor capricious; and,
- Instructors have the right to assign a grade based on any method that is professionally acceptable, submitted in writing to all students, and applied equally.

Instructors have the responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades. Course and project grading methods should be explained to students at the beginning of the term. WPI presumes that the judgment of the instructor of record is authoritative, and the final grades assigned are correct.

A grade appeal shall be confined to charges of unfair action toward an individual student and may not involve a challenge of an instructor's grading standard. A student has a right to expect thoughtful and clearly defined approaches to course and project grading, but it must be recognized that varied standards and individual approaches to grading are valid. The grade appeal considers whether a grade was determined in a fair and appropriate manner; it does not attempt to grade or re-grade individual assignments or projects. It is incumbent on the student to substantiate the claim

that his or her final grade represents unfair treatment, compared to the standard applied to other students. Only the final grade in a course or project may be appealed. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as clerical error, prejudice, or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

In a grade appeal, only arbitrariness, prejudice, and/or error will be considered as legitimate grounds for an appeal.

**Arbitrariness:** The grade awarded represents such a substantial departure from accepted academic norms as to demonstrate that the instructor did not actually exercise professional judgment.

**Prejudice:** The grade awarded was motivated by ill will, and is not indicative of the student's academic performance.

**Error:** The instructor made a mistake in fact.

This grade appeal procedure applies only when a student initiates a grade appeal and not when the instructor decides to change a grade on his or her own initiative.

This procedure does not cover instances where students have been assigned grades based on academic dishonesty or academic misconduct, which are included in WPI's Academic Honesty Policy. Also excluded from this procedure are grade appeals alleging discrimination, harassment or retaliation in violation of WPI's Sexual Harassment Policy, which shall be referred to the appropriate office at WPI as required by law and by WPI policy.

The Grade Appeal Procedure strives to resolve a disagreement between student and instructor concerning the assignment of a grade in a collegial manner. The intent is to provide a mechanism for the informal discussion of differences of opinion, and for the formal adjudication by faculty only when necessary. In all instances, students who believe that an appropriate grade has not been assigned must first seek to resolve the matter informally with the instructor of record. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, the student must present his or her case in a timely fashion in the procedure outlined below. Under normal circumstances, the grade appeal process must be started near the beginning of the next regular academic term after the disputed grade is received.

### *Student Grade Appeal Procedure*

1. A student who wishes to question a grade must discuss the matter first with the instructor of record as soon as possible, preferably no later than one week after the start of the next regular academic term after receiving the grade. In most cases, the discussion between the student and the instructor should suffice and the matter will not need to be carried further. The student should be aware that the only valid basis for grade appeal beyond Step One is to establish that an instructor assigned a grade that was arbitrary, prejudiced, or in error.
2. If the student's concerns remain unresolved after the discussion with the instructor, the student may submit a written request to meet with the appropriate Department Head, within one week of speaking with the instructor. For a grade in a course, independent study, Sufficiency Project, or Major Qualifying Project (MQP), the appropriate person is the instructor's Department Head. For a grade in an Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP), the appropriate person is the Dean of the Interdisciplinary and Global Studies Division (IGSD). If the instructor of record is a Department Head or the Dean of the IGSD, then the student should request to meet with the Associate Provost, who will serve as the appropriate Department Head in this step. The appropriate Department Head will meet within one week with the student, and, if he or she believes that the complaint may have merit, with the instructor. After consultation with the Department Head, the instructor may choose to let the grade remain, to change a course grade, or to petition the Committee on Academic

Operations to change a grade for a Degree Requirement (MQP, IQP, or Sufficiency). The Department Head will communicate the result of these discussions to the student.

3. If the matter remains unresolved after Step Two, the student should submit a written request within one week to the Provost's Office to request an ad hoc Faculty Committee for Appeal of a Grade. The Associate Provost will meet with the student, and will ask the Faculty Review Committee to appoint the ad hoc Committee for Appeal of a Grade. The FRC, in consultation with the Associate Provost, will select the members of the ad hoc committee. The Chair of the FRC will convene the ad hoc committee and serve as its non-voting chair. The ad hoc committee for appeal of a grade in a course, independent study, Sufficiency Project, or MQP will be composed of three faculty members chosen in the instructor's department or in closely allied fields. The ad hoc committee for appeal of a grade in an IQP will be composed of the instructor of record's Department Head and two faculty members who are experienced advisors of IQPs chosen from any department. Appointees to the ad hoc committee must not have any apparent conflicts of interest with the instructor of record (which might include but are not limited to frequent co-advising or research collaboration). The committee would examine available written information on the dispute, would be available for meetings with the student and with the instructor, and would meet with others as it sees fit.
4. Through its inquiries and deliberations, the ad hoc committee is charged to determine whether the grade was assigned in a fair and appropriate manner, or whether clear and convincing evidence of unfair treatment such as arbitrariness, prejudice, and/or error might justify changing the grade. The ad hoc committee will make its decisions based on a majority vote. If the committee concludes that the grade was assigned in a fair and appropriate manner, the ad hoc committee will report its conclusion in writing to the student and instructor and the matter will be considered closed. If the ad hoc faculty committee determines that compelling reasons exist for changing the grade, it would request that the instructor make the change, providing the instructor with a written explanation of its reasons. Should the instructor decline, he or she must provide a written explanation for refusing.
5. The ad hoc faculty committee, after considering the instructor's explanation and upon again concluding that it would be unjust to allow the original grade to stand, will then determine what grade is to be assigned. The new grade may be higher than, the same as, or lower than the original grade. Having made this determination, the three members of the committee will sign the grade change form and transmit it to the Registrar. The instructor and student will be advised of the new grade. Under no circumstances may persons other than the original faculty member or the review committee change a grade. Should the ad hoc faculty committee feel that the instructor's written explanation justifies the original grade, the ad hoc committee will report this in writing to the student and instructor and the matter will be closed.

#### *Faculty Grade Change Procedure*

The Student Grade Appeal Procedure affirms the principle that grades should be considered final. The principle that grades for courses or projects should be considered final does not excuse an instructor from the responsibility to explain his or her grading standards to students and to assign grades in a fair and appropriate manner. The appeal procedure also provides an instructor with the opportunity to change a grade for a course or project on his or her own initiative. The appeal procedure recognizes that errors can be made and that an instructor who decides that it would be unfair to allow a final grade to stand due to error, prejudice or arbitrariness may request a change of grade for a course or project without the formation of an ad hoc committee. An instructor may request a grade change in one of two ways. First, for courses, an instructor may submit a course grade change in writing to the Registrar at any time prior to a student's

graduation. Second, for Degree Requirements (MQP, IQP, and Sufficiency), an instructor must submit a petition to the Committee on Academic Operations (CAO) to change the grade.

**D. Policy on Initiating and Terminating Departments or Programs\***

(Approved, January 28, 1991)

*Policy on Creating, Merging, Realigning or Eliminating Academic Programs and Research Facilities*

Should the Administration propose creating, merging, realigning or eliminating an academic program or major academic or research facility, that proposal shall be conveyed to the Committee on Governance when it has been advanced to the stage of serious consideration, but before any commitments to action have been made. The Committee shall conduct a critical review of the proposal, which may include referring it to other committees for consideration. Upon receipt of all relevant information, the Committee on Governance will frame a recommendation to the Administration and present it to the Faculty for its approval.

### **3. CERTAIN POLICIES ON FACULTY BENEFITS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

#### **A. Consulting Policy**

(Faculty Handbook, 1980)

The University encourages members of the faculty to do consulting work and, where appropriate, to expand consulting activities into on-campus research programs.

Participation as a consultant for extra compensation should be cleared with the Department Head concerned, and while time is made available for such participation, it must not substantially detract from full-time salaried responsibilities to the University.

Ordinarily, outside consulting work or participation in a university-industry program for extra compensation should not exceed the equivalent of one day per week. Participation in industry-sponsored programs requiring the equivalent of more than one day per week should be undertaken with released time from teaching with no additional compensation beyond the "one day equivalent." Each member of the faculty who undertakes consulting work or research is encouraged to seek that kind of activity which will enhance his or her long-range professional development.

In work for industry, routine testing in competition with established commercial testing laboratories is discouraged, unless no commercial testing facilities are reasonably available. More than casual use of University facilities for outside consulting work is discouraged. Where the Department Head believes that such use is justified, the Director of Research Administration must be consulted and a formal contract should be entered into between the University and the client to be sure that appropriate charges are made. Modest use of special campus facilities should compensate the Department for such use.

In all work with industry, arrangements should be made with the sponsor to permit adequate publication of results, where appropriate, without jeopardizing the proprietary interests of the sponsor.

#### *Endorsements and Letterhead*

The University letterhead is not to be used for promotion of one's own business interests or for any purposes other than University business.

#### **B. Retirement Plan**

Faculty are required to participate in WPI's retirement plan on the first day of the month following completion of twelve months of continuous service, if in an eligible class of participants, and working at least 1000 hours per calendar year. The waiting period will be waived for anyone with one year of continuous service as a non-student at any non-profit educational organization or teaching hospital, or already participating in TIAA/CREF immediately prior to the start of employment at WPI.

Detailed information on WPI's Retirement Plan is available in the Summary Plan Description available in the Human Resources office.

### **C. Policy on Sabbatical Leaves\***

(Approved by COAP, June 1999. Approved by the Provost, June 1999)

(Amended by the Faculty, May 8, 2012)

(Amended by the Faculty, April 16, 2020)

#### *1. Basic Objectives*

Leaves of absence, and particularly sabbatical leaves, are among the most important means by which a teacher's effectiveness may be enhanced, a scholar's usefulness enlarged, and an institution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of leaves is therefore of vital importance to WPI, and faculty members are strongly encouraged to take advantage of this mechanism to help promote their professional competence. The major purpose of leaves is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new, or renewed, intellectual achievement through study, research, and writing.

The term "sabbatical" normally applies to a leave of absence in which a faculty member receives partial or full salary from WPI. Faculty exchanges between two institutions, leaves without salary, and the performance of full-time duties assigned by WPI at off-campus locations are not part of the sabbatical program.

Because both the institute and the individual benefit as a result of a sabbatical leave, both share in the cost of such a leave. At WPI such sharing is both through financial support by the institute and through the assumption by colleagues of the academic responsibilities of absent faculty members. A faculty member should apply for a leave far enough in advance that temporary replacements of high quality can be obtained. Each application for sabbatical leave should include a well-designed and serious program with clearly stated objectives that will maximize the professional development of the faculty member involved.

Sabbatical leaves may be taken for a full academic year or a half academic year. All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to apply for a full-year or half-year sabbatical leave after 6 years of full-time service since their most recent hiring at WPI or since their previous sabbatical. Time spent on unpaid leave or less than half-time activity, although considered continuous service, do not count as full-time service toward sabbatical leave.

#### *2. Financial Arrangements*

- a. A full year sabbatical leave is taken at one-half of the faculty member's academic year salary. Half-year leaves are taken at full salary. If the faculty member obtains salary support from outside sources, WPI's contribution will not exceed that required to maintain the faculty member's normal salary. Exceptions to this policy must be negotiated before the leave starts.
- b. Faculty members on sabbatical leave will receive WPI benefits based only on actual WPI compensation.
- c. WPI, on occasion, may provide some displacement expense to faculty members who leave the campus on sabbatical leave for an entire academic year, depending on the particular circumstances.
- d. Funds will be provided to departments with faculty on sabbatical leaves to cover necessary teaching obligations.

#### *3. Procedures for Review and Award*

- a. Faculty members should submit requests for sabbatical leaves to their Dean on or before December 15 for proposed leaves in the following academic year.



An application for a sabbatical leave must contain all the supporting information including the objectives of the sabbatical leave and the benefits to the faculty member, the department, and to WPI. The application should also include information on previous leave(s) of absence taken by the faculty member, past contributions to WPI, a letter of invitation from any institution at which the faculty member plans to work, and the sources and amounts of external funding.

- b. The application should be accompanied by supporting documentation from the faculty member's department head. This documentation should include a review of the faculty member's proposed sabbatical program with regard to its appropriateness; the impact of the sabbatical on department operations; and the department recommendation on the proposed sabbatical. In the case of an application for a sabbatical leave by a department head, this additional documentation will be supplied by the appropriate Dean.
- c. The appropriate Dean reviews all application materials and supporting documentation, and forwards his/her recommendation to the Provost with copies of the sabbatical checklist and the recommendation to the Committee on Appointments and Promotion. The Committee on Appointments and Promotion will maintain record-keeping and monitoring role.
- d. The Provost reviews all leave applications, together with recommendations from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, and makes the final determination of the request.
- e. Notification of the award will be made no later than the time of issuance of appointment letters.

#### **D. Summer Supplemental Salary**

(Modified, April 14, 2011 and October 14, 2011)

##### *Support Provided by Institute Funds:*

Compensation for summer academic activities (including independent study courses, project work and thesis advising) and summer educational youth programs (e.g. Frontiers, STRIVE, and GEMS) will be paid on a lump sum basis. Payment will be made on the last business day of the month in which the activity ends. These will be coordinated by the Summer Programs Office.

Payroll Authorization forms should be submitted to the Provost's office by the respective Department Head for faculty assigned administrative summer responsibilities (e.g. Acting Head, etc.).

First- or second-year faculty members scheduled to receive summer support should contact the Provost's office before June 1 of the year(s) in which the summer support is to be paid.

##### *Sponsored Research/Restricted Accounts:*

WPI policy allows faculty members with summer salary and employee benefits budgeted on a sponsored project to receive supplemental income.

Monthly compensation for work performed during the summer will be paid at the rate of 1/9 of the faculty member's regular academic year salary.

Authorization forms for summer salary to be charged to sponsored or restricted accounts must be completed, approved by the Department Head, and forwarded to the Provost's office before the 10<sup>th</sup> of the month in which the salary is to be paid. Faculty members may indicate whether or not pension (TIAA/CREF) contributions should be made and charged to the grant.

Please check with the Office of Sponsored Programs regarding any restrictions on the total amount of supplemental pay allowed by a particular contract or grant.

##### *Compensation Limitations:*

WPI place no restriction on maximum faculty compensation. Additional duties may receive additional compensation beyond the regular monthly rate. However, faculty with sponsored research projects must comply with limitations on compensation or "total effort" imposed by the granting agency.

Payment for teaching and research activities must be received as salary. From time to time contributions may be made to faculty members' professional development accounts but these deposits may not be taken in place of salary.

WPI does not contribute to faculty pension plans for summer academic (non-research) activities.

#### **E. Unpaid Leaves**

On occasion, faculty members may wish to pursue a professional opportunity off-campus and request a leave of absence without salary and fringe benefits. WPI expects the host institution to assume the institutional costs of benefits. These leaves can be for periods of time that fit in with the academic program, up to a maximum of 2 years, and should involve experience in government, industry, or academia that contributes to the professional development of the faculty member. This type of leave requires the approval of the appropriate department head, Dean, and the Provost.

When a faculty member takes an unpaid leave the department may employ replacements at salaries up to the normal budgeted salary of the faculty member on leave. Any surplus in the budgeted salary accrues to the WPI general account.

Unpaid leave requests should take the form of sabbatical leave requests, which are accompanied by documentation from the department head.

**F. The Fringe Benefits Committee\***

(Amended by the Faculty, October 14, 2016)

The Fringe Benefits (FBC) is responsible for reviewing and proposing changes to the WPI fringe benefits offerings with special attention paid to the evaluation and recommendation of health care plans and health insurance providers, tuition benefits, disability plans, and retirement policies.

Recommendations from the FBC are passed to the Committee on Administrative and Financial Policy (FAP). In those instances when FAP does not accept FBC's recommendations, the two committees should meet in an attempt to resolve their differences.

The FBC consists of a Chair to be selected from FAP from among its faculty members, two members of the Faculty selected by the Committee on Governance (COG), and two additional members of the Faculty selected by FAP. Faculty members of the FBC (other than the Chair) will serve three-year staggered terms. Current faculty members who have not completed three years of service will continue on FBC.

Although formally the FBC is constituted as above, operationally it invites two continuing non-tenure-track faculty members (continuing NTTs), and five members of the WPI staff to join its deliberations and to vote on matters related to benefits that are of equal concern to WPI Faculty, continuing NTTs, and staff. One continuing NTT is selected by COG and the other is selected by FAP. Each continuing NTT serves a three-year term. The five members of the WPI staff are chosen by the V.P. of Human Resources to serve three-year staggered terms.

Either the V.P. of Human Resources or the Benefits Administrator serves as the liaison between the FBC and the Department of Human Resources. The liaison provides information requested by the FBC to conduct its deliberations in an informed manner. Neither the V.P. of Human Resources nor the Benefits Administrator should serve as one of the five invited voting WPI staff members.

## 4. CERTAIN LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH WPI

### A. Conflict of Interest Policy

(Presented to the Faculty, December 16, 2016. Adopted by the Board of Trustees, February 24, 2017)

#### ***Intention:***

Worcester Polytechnic Institute is committed to ensuring that its research and other activities are conducted in a manner that upholds the integrity and credibility of its faculty, staff, students, and associates. This policy establishes a shared ethical standard of ensuring that relationships with business entities are transparent, grounded in objectivity, and do not improperly influence professional judgment, exercise of WPI responsibilities, or performance of WPI-related activities. This policy and its procedures promote compliance with all applicable federal and state laws, regulations, and sponsor policies regarding financial conflict of interest, including among others the policies of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, and private foundations.

WPI recognizes the value of entrepreneurship, as well as engagement in external organizations and activities. It encourages faculty, staff, and students to engage in appropriate outside relationships and activities, including consulting and starting their own companies. However, the financial interests that accompany such relationships may lead to real or apparent financial conflicts of interest. These financial interests need to be disclosed, reviewed, and managed in accordance with this policy and the associated procedures.

#### ***Who is covered?***

This policy applies to all faculty and exempt staff employed by WPI. It also applies to all other individuals with responsibility for the design, conduct, or reporting of sponsored research at WPI, including students, consultants, and affiliate faculty.

#### ***Annual Disclosure:***

Annually, covered individuals, including those who are temporarily away from campus (e.g., leave, sabbatical), must complete a Conflict of Interest (COI) Disclosure listing all significant financial interests and relationships/commitments outside of WPI which are related to their institutional responsibilities at WPI. "Institutional responsibilities" may include, but are not limited to teaching, research, departmental administration, committee membership, purchasing of goods and services etc. Covered individuals must disclose their own financial interests as well as those held by members of their families.

#### ***Updated Disclosure:***

In addition to the annual disclosure requirements, all covered individuals must complete a new disclosure within 30 days of a substantial change in a business or financial interest that relates to their WPI institutional responsibilities. A "substantial change" includes, but is not limited to, the acquisition of a new financial interest or an increase in the value of an existing financial interest to a value that qualifies it as a significant financial interest.

#### ***What must be disclosed?***

Covered individuals must disclose all significant financial interests ("SFIs") that reasonably appear to be related to the individual's institutional responsibilities. An SFI must be disclosed even if the individual does not believe that it creates a conflict of interest.

Significant Financial Interests include any of the following when reasonably related to the covered individual's institutional responsibilities:

1. Remuneration. Any remuneration (income) received from an outside entity in the calendar year preceding the COI disclosure, or anticipated during the calendar year following the disclosure. Disclosure is required when the annual amount received from an entity is \$5,000 or greater.

2. Equity Interests. Any equity (ownership) interests in a business entity. This includes stock, stock options, warrants, futures, purchase rights, or convertible securities. Disclosure is required when the market value of the equity exceeds \$5,000 for a given entity, or when a covered individual owns 5% or more of an entity's total equity. Equity in non-publicly-traded entities, or any other equity where the value cannot be readily determined through reference to market prices, must be disclosed regardless of the amount or value.
3. Royalties Paid in Connection with Intellectual Property Rights. The value of any royalties paid in connection with intellectual property rights, e.g., patents and copyrights, and any agreements to share in royalties related to such rights.
4. Travel Expenses. Covered individuals must disclose travel that is estimated to exceed \$5000 and is paid for or reimbursed by an outside entity (except as described in the following section). New sponsored travel expenses should be reported within 30 days of the trip by way of an updated disclosure.

***Disclosure Not Required:***

Covered individuals are not required to disclose the following:

1. Salaries, royalties, or other remuneration paid by WPI to the covered individual. This includes remuneration paid from grant funds awarded to WPI.
2. Income (including honoraria) from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by a federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education.
3. Income from service on advisory or review panels for a federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education.
4. Income and equity related to certain investments, such as mutual funds or blind trusts, where the covered individual does not directly control the investment decisions being made.
5. Travel expenses paid for or reimbursed by a governmental agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education.

***Review:***

WPI's Chief Compliance Officer or designee will review each annual or updated disclosure. The Chief Compliance Officer, in consultation with the individual's Department Head, will determine if any of the disclosed SFIs constitute a real or apparent conflict of interest.

If the individual disclosing the SFI has any active research projects or proposals, the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) will conduct a further review. OSP will determine (1) whether or not the SFI is related to the individual's research, and (2) whether the SFI could constitute a real or apparent conflict of interest.

If the Chief Compliance Officer and/or OSP believe that a disclosed SFI could constitute a real or apparent conflict of interest, they will refer the matter to the Conflict Management Committee (CMC).

***Conflict Management Committee:***

The Conflict Management Committee is charged with determining (1) whether or not it is possible to manage an identified conflict of interest, and (2) if so, what conditions and restrictions are needed in order to do so. The committee may issue a written Conflict Management Plan describing these conditions in detail. Conflict Management Committee membership shall consist of a faculty member selected annually by the Committee on Governance (COG) to chair the committee, the Chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR), an additional member selected by CGSR, the Vice Provost for Research, Chief Compliance Officer, the Director of Sponsored

Programs (non-voting), Associate Director, Post-Award & Compliance (non-voting), and HR Compliance Manager (non-voting). COG shall also annually appoint an alternate to the Committee to serve in the event of the recusal or absence of one of the other appointed faculty members. In the event that more than one alternate is needed, the Vice Provost for Research shall appoint additional alternates as necessary. Recusal shall be required when it appears that a member of the Conflict Management Committee will be unable to fairly judge a potential conflict raised by a disclosure statement.

***Appeals Process:***

Should the individual not agree with the Conflict Management Committee's conditions or restrictions, he/she can appeal in writing to the Provost within ten (10) days after receipt of notification from the Vice Provost for Research, detailing why such conditions and restrictions are inappropriate. The Provost will then consult with the Conflict Management Committee and make a decision, which will be final.

***Human Subject Protocols:***

Disclosures associated with the submissions of protocols for Institutional Review Board (IRB) review will be reviewed following the same process as for sponsored research proposals. Protocols will not be approved until all conflicts are resolved or addressed in a management plan.

***Reporting to Funding Agencies:***

The designated institutional official will report financial conflicts of interest or non-compliance to PHS in accordance with PHS regulations. If the funding for the research is made available from a prime PHS-awardee, such reports shall be made to the prime awardee prior to the expenditure of any funds and within 60 days of any subsequently identified financial conflict of interest such that the prime awardee may fulfill their reporting obligations to the PHS.

***Sanctions:***

In the event of an individual's failure to comply with this Policy, the Conflict Management Committee may suspend all relevant activities or take other disciplinary action until the matter is resolved to the committee's satisfaction. The institution will promptly notify sponsors, if applicable, of the action taken.

***Retrospective Review:***

In addition, if a Financial Conflict of Interest was not identified or managed in a timely manner, WPI will complete a retrospective review of the covered individual's activities and the research project to determine whether the research conducted during the period of non-compliance was biased in its design, conduct or reporting. If bias is found, WPI will promptly notify the sponsor and submit a mitigation report in accordance with applicable regulations.

***Training:***

Individuals will comply with training requirements mandated by sponsors. OSP will notify individuals of such requirements when applicable. Sponsors may require the completion of training prior to the expenditure of grant funds.

***Record Retention:***

WPI will retain all disclosure forms, conflict management plans, and related documents for a period of three years from the date the final expenditure report is submitted to the sponsor, unless any litigation, claim, financial management review, or audit is started before the expiration of the three-year period. In that case, the records shall be retained until all litigation, claims or audit findings involving the records have been resolved.

***Public Accessibility:***

With regard to any PHS-funded research, WPI will make accessible to the public, within five business days of written request, information concerning any Significant Financial Interest disclosed to the institution that meets all of the following criteria:

1. The Significant Financial Interest is related to the PHS-funded research;
2. WPI has determined that a conflict of interest exists; and
3. The Significant Financial Interest is still held by the individual.

***Subrecipients:***

Subrecipients on federal grants and contracts must have an active and enforced conflict of interest policy that meets the requirements of the funding agency. If a subrecipient does not have such a policy, they will be required to comply with WPI's policy.

***Definitions:***

Family means the covered individual's spouse/partner, dependent children, and any other dependents living in the covered individual's household.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Any boards established or contracted to review protocols for human subjects research whether federally funded or not.

Public Health Service or PHS means the Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and any components of the PHS to which the authority of the PHS may be delegated (including the National Institutes of Health).

Sponsored Research means any research-related activity, including training, which is funded by a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or fellowship awarded to WPI.

**B. WPI Policy of Indemnification for Faculty, Professional Staff and All Other "Exempt" Employees**

(Approved by the Board of Trustees, February, 1986)

WPI shall indemnify all of its Faculty, Professional Staff and all other "Exempt" Employees including those who serve at its request as Faculty, Officers, Employees or other Agents of any other organization in which WPI has an interest, and their respective heirs, administrators, successors and assigns, against any and all expenses, including amounts paid upon judgments, counsel fees, and amounts paid in settlement (before or after suit is commenced), actually and necessarily incurred by such persons in connection with the defense or settlement of any claim, action, suit, or proceeding, whether civil or criminal, or both, in which they, or any of them, are made parties, or a party, or which may be asserted against them or any of them, by reason of being or having been in one of the above-described relationships of WPI, or of such other organization. No indemnification shall be provided for any person with respect to any matter as to which he shall have been adjudicated in any proceeding not to have acted in good faith in the reasonable belief that his action was in the best interests of WPI and conformed to the requirements of his employment. Each person to be indemnified shall provide WPI with an undertaking to repay the amounts advanced on his behalf if he shall be adjudicated not to have been entitled to indemnification, which undertaking may be accepted without reference to the financial ability of such person to make repayment.



## **C. Intellectual Property Policy**

(Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 13, 2016)

### **Part One: Policy Summary:**

It is the policy of Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) to encourage creativity and entrepreneurship among its faculty, students, and staff. WPI invests in this endeavor by making available its own facilities, equipment, personnel, and information resources. WPI also actively seeks specific support for creative activity from external sources, both public and private.

The Policy supports the strategic goals of creating an outstanding student experience that promotes personal and intellectual development; recruiting and retaining excellent students, faculty and staff; and strengthening research, and scholarship, as well as institutional financial resources.

Inventions, discoveries, and creative works that are developed by individuals at WPI, may have commercial as well as scientific and scholarly value. The intent of this policy is to provide incentives that foster creative activity and to help assure that any such intellectual property produced will be exploited for the benefit of the creator(s), WPI, and the public. To help meet these policy objectives, WPI makes available from the Office of Intellectual Property and Innovation's, technical and legal assistance to protect ownership of intellectual property and to aid in its commercial development.

The specific aims of this policy are the following:

1. to encourage creativity among, WPI faculty, students and staff;
2. to increase the likelihood that ideas, inventions, and creative works produced at WPI are used to benefit the public;
3. to protect the traditional rights of the creator(s) with respect to owning the products of their intellectual endeavors;
4. to assure compliance with the provisions of contracts with external sponsors; and
5. to provide that, when intellectual property is introduced for commercial development, the creator(s) and WPI share any net profits, where appropriate.

### **Part Two: Scope of Policy**

#### **1.0 Who Is Covered: WPI Personnel Community**

For purposes of this policy, WPI personnel community refers to WPI faculty members (this includes full time, part time, tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty), visiting faculty, postdoctoral scholars, researchers (research associates, scientists and engineers, and postdoctoral fellows), visiting scholars, investigators, administrators, office and technical staff, students, contractors (as appropriate), consultants, and all others whose work affiliation is with WPI, whether compensated by WPI or not. WPI personnel are obligated under this policy when their creative work is developed partially or entirely during performance of their WPI responsibilities or when it involves the use of WPI resources such as space, facilities, equipment, staff, or funds, as stipulated for the particular circumstances described in the sections below "Determination of Rights for Patentable Subject Matter" for both patentable and copyrightable material.

As a condition of affiliation with WPI, members of the WPI personnel community are bound by all WPI policies, including this one.

#### **2.0 What Is Covered: Intellectual Property**

All intellectual property produced at WPI by its personnel (defined above) is covered by this policy. Intellectual property shall consist of, for example and without limitation: inventions, creative works, patentable subject matter, copyrightable materials, know-how, electronic or paper documents, software, multimedia or audiovisual materials, and photographs. For purposes of this policy, intellectual property is divided into two categories:

- 2.1 “Patentable intellectual property” shall include, without limitation, all inventions, discoveries, know-how (despite the fact that these may not benefit from patent protection) and discoveries or other material that is patentable under US law (whether or not produced in the US), as well as all software that is excluded from “copyrightable material” (whether or not patentable under US law).
- 2.2 “Copyrightable intellectual property” shall include, without limitation, all creative works, electronic or paper documents, software, multimedia or audiovisual materials, and photographs, and any other materials that may be copyrightable under US law (whether or not produced in the US).
- 2.3 All research lab notebooks, data sets, data images, gene constructs, reagents, animal, human and plant cell lines, model organisms remain the exclusive property of WPI.

## **2.1 Patentable Intellectual Property**

*Responsibility for Disclosure of Patentable Intellectual Property:* WPI personnel who alone, or in association with others, create patentable subject matter with any use of WPI resources are responsible for disclosing the patentable subject matter to WPI. Such disclosure shall be made in a timely manner when it can be reasonably concluded that a patentable subject matter has been created, and sufficiently in advance of any publications, presentation, or other public disclosure to allow time for possible action that protects rights to the intellectual property for the creator and WPI (<http://www.wpi.edu/offices/ipi/forms.html>).

*Determination of Rights to Patentable Subject Matter:* Except for Patentable Intellectual Property developed independently and without WPI resources as noted below, all Patentable Intellectual Property produced by WPI Personnel shall be deemed "work made for hire" and be WPI's sole and exclusive property. WPI will assert ownership rights to patentable intellectual property developed under any of the following circumstances:

- 2.1.1 Development was funded by an externally sponsored research program or by any agreement that allocates rights to WPI.
- 2.1.2 Development required use of WPI resources (for example but not limited to facilities, equipment, funding, or personnel). WPI has rights to patentable material derived from research carried out with any use of WPI resources. However, patentable material developed independently by the creator outside of normal duties associated with the creator's position and with no use of WPI resources or facilities is vested with the creator and/or with the organization whose resources were used.
- 2.1.3 The creator was assigned, directed, or specifically funded by WPI to develop the material.
- 2.1.4 Material was developed by administrators or staff in the course of their employment duties and constitutes “work for hire” under US law.

## **2.2 Copyrightable Intellectual Property**

*Responsibility for Disclosure of Copyrightable Intellectual Property:* In contrast to historical business practice, the tradition of academic institutions is to give its personnel the right to retain ownership of their copyrightable products. This policy protects that traditional right and personnel are not obligated to disclose the creation of copyrightable material, even when the product might have commercial value, unless the material was developed under one of the qualifying conditions listed in the next section, in which case the creator is responsible for timely disclosure.

*Determination of Rights to Copyrightable Intellectual Property:* Except for Copyrightable Intellectual Property developed independently and without WPI resources as noted below, all Copyrightable Intellectual Property produced by WPI Personnel shall be deemed "work made for hire" and be WPI's sole and exclusive property. To the extent that copyrightable material is developed for courses or curriculum at WPI by such individuals, and as a condition of employment by WPI, the creators of such copyrightable material grant a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to WPI to use of such material for educational and research purposes. WPI will assert ownership rights to copyrightable intellectual property developed under any of the following circumstances.

- 2.2.1 Development was funded by an externally sponsored research program or by any agreement, which allocates rights to WPI.
- 2.2.2 WPI personnel was assigned, directed, or specifically funded by WPI to develop the material, or WPI has negotiated an understanding or formal contract with the creator.
- 2.2.3 The material was developed with extraordinary or substantially more use of WPI resources than would normally be provided for the creator's employment duties. This might occur as disproportionate use of staff time, networks, equipment, or direct funding.
- 2.2.4 Works created by non-faculty independent contractors on behalf of WPI, unless otherwise specified in a written agreement between such independent contractor and WPI. Such contractors do not share in the creator's portion of Net Royalty Income (as defined below under "Income Distribution").
- 2.2.5 Laboratory Notebooks, data sets, biological materials.

*Scholarly and Artistic Works Exception:* "Scholarly and Artistic Works" means copyrightable and copyrighted works that are in the nature of academic and scholarly works of authorship and works of visual art, including but not limited to photography, film, audio-visual works, sculpture, painting, choreography and the like. "Scholarly and Artistic Works" include by way of example 1) scholarly articles and papers written for journal publication (rights to these is assigned to the publisher as a condition for publication), presentations and scholarly papers prepared for seminars and conferences, pedagogical works, and teaching and curriculum materials (including classroom lectures, seminars and presentations reduced by or for the author to written or other recorded form); and 2) paintings, drawings, musical compositions and performances, dramatic compositions and performance, poetry, fiction and other works of artistic expression authored by WPI faculty, post-graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows and postdoctoral associates ; provided that, the definition shall not apply to the works of WPI Students authored pursuant to activities undertaken as Teaching Assistants that are Scholarly or Artistic Works as described in this paragraph will remain the property of their authors.

"Scholarly and Artistic Works" shall be and remain the property of their Authors ("Individually-Owned Works") unless such copyrighted works are (i) developed as part of a WPI project, program or activity that is the subject of an external WPI agreement; (ii) developed within the scope of employment by non-faculty WPI Employees; or (iii) developed as part of a WPI- Commissioned project. All Scholarly and Artistic Works described in the preceding sentence under (i), (ii), or (iii) are WPI-Owned.

### **2.3 Intellectual Property Created by Students**

It is the general policy of WPI that WPI Students shall have ownership rights in Intellectual Property developed by them independently, except where it is developed using WPI funds, part of any project, Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP), Major Qualifying Project (MQP), directed study,

directed research, or where WPI has external obligations with respect to Student Intellectual Property, such as via a contract with a company, or where there are federal funds involved. If there are no WPI external obligations for the Intellectual Property, Student Intellectual Property may assign to WPI and be treated as a WPI Invention.

If there is Student Intellectual property that is free from WPI external obligations the Students may choose to enter into an agreement with WPI for the value of that Intellectual Property. Such value will not exceed 1% of the current value of that Intellectual Property. The waiver provisions of this Policy shall apply to WPI Students (Section 6).

Activities undertaken by WPI Students receiving financial aid as tuition assistance shall not be considered “WPI funds” unless such assistance consists of employment at WPI (including, but not limited to teaching assistantships) or is charged against a grant, contract or other agreement between WPI and an external funding source.

As a condition of study or a degree award, each student shall grant to WPI a non-exclusive, royalty-free, non-commercial license to reproduce and publicly distribute, including by electronic means, copies of the student’s work in which the student retains copyright.

### **3.0 Significant Use of WPI Resources**

Generally, an invention, software, or other copyrightable material, will not be considered to have been developed using WPI funds or facilities if:

- 3.1 only a minimal amount of unrestricted funds has been used; and
- 3.2 the Intellectual Property has been developed outside of the assigned area of research of the inventor(s)/author(s) under a research assistantship or sponsored project; and
- 3.3 only a minimal amount of time has been spent using significant WPI facilities or only insignificant facilities and equipment have been utilized (note: use of office, library, machine shop facilities, and of traditional desktop personal computers are examples of facilities and equipment that are not considered significant); and
- 3.4 the development has been made on the personal, unpaid time of the inventor(s)/author.

### **4.0 Intellectual Property Developed Under Sponsored Research Agreements**

Ownership of copyrightable and patentable intellectual property developed pursuant to an agreement with any sponsor will be governed by the provisions of that agreement.

Government and nonprofit sponsors generally allow rights to intellectual property that arise from the research program to vest with the institution, subject to certain retained rights held by the federal government. Under special circumstances, sponsors, including government agencies, will provide for the institution to retain title to all intellectual property that arises in the course of the research program, with the sponsor retaining an option to acquire commercialization rights through a separate license agreement.

### **5.0 Special Agreements**

Since WPI aims to encourage creativity, it reserves the right to allow some flexibility in applying this policy. The inventor(s) or author(s) may request the VPR Office to release the intellectual property to them, at their own expense, unless other agreements exist.

### **6.0 Waiver or Return of Rights**

WPI may determine that WPI will not take ownership of invention or WPI may, after initially exercising ownership, determine that WPI will no longer pursue or maintain intellectual property protection, for example in cases without a revenue producing license. Where WPI determines that it will not pursue or maintain intellectual property protection and licensing of WPI-Owned Intellectual

Property, it will promptly and in writing advise the inventor(s) or author(s). To the extent permitted by external obligations, including any applicable laws and regulations, WPI may consider application by inventor(s) or author(s) for alternative funding of prosecution or maintenance of intellectual property, or waiver of ownership rights and the terms under which such waiver may be made. WPI will not consider requests for waiver of ownership with respect to any invention or software program unless all inventors and authors, as legally determined, concur with the request for waiver. Ownership waivers, if granted, will be made to all relevant inventors and authors as joint owners. Waiver agreement terms between WPI and the inventor(s) will include a perpetual, royalty-free right and license retained by WPI to use the invention or software for its own education and research purposes, and will be further subject to any external obligations as may be required.

#### **7.0 Administration of Intellectual Property Policy**

Except as otherwise specified in this policy or as otherwise duly authorized by WPI, the IPI department has responsibility for the interpretation, implementation and oversight of this Policy. The IPI department will issue such administrative guidelines and procedures to facilitate Policy as may be reasonable and consistent with it. In accordance with otherwise applicable WPI policy or contract terms, WPI may also pursue disciplinary, or civil or criminal action, for Policy violations. These duties are delegated to the Director of Intellectual Property and Innovation

WPI personnel who wish to pursue the commercialization of their independently developed and owned intellectual property through WPI may offer such intellectual property to WPI by following the administrative process outlined above.

#### **8.0 Income Distribution**

**Costs and Net Royalty Income:** Unless otherwise agreed, Net Royalty Income shall mean Gross Royalties in the form of cash or cash proceeds whether from the sale of equity or obtained in licensing transactions, less all commercialization costs, including but not limited to, previous and ongoing billed costs for protection of intellectual property, marketing, legal fees and other licensing costs.

**Distribution of Net Royalty Income:** With respect to intellectual property owned by WPI hereunder, Net Royalty Income shall be distributed (usually annually) as follows:

- 50% Creator(s) (personal)
- 5% Creator(s) Department
- 5% Creator(s) Office of the Dean
- 5% Office of Intellectual Property and Innovation
- 35% WPI

It is encouraged for the Department share give priority to the inventor's laboratory if at all possible. The funds should be directed towards a continued investment in research and technology development. Dean and Department shares may involve multiple Deans or Departments. If this occurs, the split will go according to how the inventors have agreed to split their share.

Note that Intellectual Property created by students may have a different distribution per the conditions in section 4.

The creator will receive personal royalties as income. If the creator chooses to donate a portion of the royalties to research, the creator may do so in accordance with the policy and procedures of the Development Office of WPI and in accordance with local, state and federal tax policies.

Where all or a portion of the Royalty Income received by WPI is in shares of stock, stock options, warrants or other indicia of ownership ("Equity"), Inventors and Authors shall be entitled to shares to be negotiated with the company. If Inventors and Authors obtain Equity from the company, WPI Equity will be wholly owned by WPI. For all other Inventors/Authors who did not receive Equity from

the Company, WPI, upon occurrence of a liquidation event, distribute cash according to the distribution agreed upon among the inventors in their original invention disclosure.

WPI may postpone the distribution of Net Royalty Income when future expenses relating to the applicable technology, such as patent prosecution costs, or an infringement suit, are reasonably anticipated.

#### 8.1 Creator Equity Participation

Creators may receive equity in return for their contributions as founders or consultants only in accordance with specific WPI policies. Annually, creators must fully disclose their equity positions and shall otherwise be and remain in compliance with the WPI Conflict of Interest policies.

### **9.0 Conflict of Interest and Conflict Avoidance in Equity Transactions**

Where a Creator(s) holds or will acquire an equity or founder's stock and/or option position in a company to which Intellectual Property that the Creator(s) helped develop is licensed by WPI, WPI will accept an equity position in lieu of royalty. In all such situations, Creator(s) who remain in the employ of WPI will not use WPI students for research and development projects sponsored by the company without expressly disclosing to students the inventor(s)' equity ownership interest in the company and without the express approval of the academic department head or other appropriate administrative unit supervisor. In addition, inventor(s) will not restrict or delay access to their research results so as to benefit the company (apart from any WPI- authorized agreement with the company) and will not engage in such other activities that may create a presumption of conflict of interest between their activities as faculty or staff of WPI and their activities with or on behalf of the company. The limitations and conditions of this paragraph are in addition to those required by WPI's conflict of interest or other related policies.

### **10.0 Survival of Terms**

All licenses and rights granted to WPI will survive any termination of employment or end of enrollment by a student as applicable.

### **11.0 Conflict Resolution**

When a disagreement arises between WPI and the inventor(s) concerning the interpretation of this policy, an Intellectual Property Appeal Board (the "Appeal Board") will be appointed and convened to resolve the disagreement. Appeals shall state explicitly what is in dispute and be submitted in writing to the President of WPI and to the Committee on Governance. When a request for an appeal is received, an Appeal Board shall promptly be appointed.

- 11.1 The Appeal Board is composed of five persons, three appointed by the Committee on Governance and two appointed by the WPI administration. The COG-appointed members shall be members of the faculty chosen from a current list of tenure-track faculty members who have agreed to serve on the Appeal Board if so requested, and who have a variety of experience. In making their respective appointments, COG and the WPI Provost will seek to ensure that some of the appointees are familiar in detail with this policy and its past applications, and some of the appointees are familiar with the technical area of the intellectual property under consideration. No person with a special interest in the outcome of its decisions, including people who have participated in the decision that is under appeal, shall be appointed to the Appeal Board.
- 11.2 The Appeal Board shall promptly meet, elect a chair, and hear the appeal. The Appeal Board shall receive written briefs from each party to the dispute, take oral presentations open to all parties and their counsels, and receive written emendations to the written briefs.

The Appeal Board shall have the power to summon witnesses and documents necessary to reaching its decisions. The Appeal Board shall consider all relevant facts, policies, and precedents, and then reach a decision. The Appeal Board shall report its decision in a written finding that includes the principal arguments leading to its conclusions.

#### **12.0 Use of WPI Name, Mark, or Insignia**

The WPI name, seal, or logo may not be used:

1. in conjunction with any private or commercial enterprise;
2. in tandem with the advertisement of any product;
3. by any individual or group promoting itself.

Any questions regarding the use of the WPI name, seal, or logo should be referred to the WPI Chief Marketing Officer.

##### 12.1 Changes to this Policy

The Provost will periodically initiate review of this Policy to address legal developments and to reflect experience gained in its administration. Policy changes will be made in accordance with governance and applicable legal requirements.

#### **D. Anti-Hazing Policy**

(Updated by SOF through the VP for Student Affairs, August 15, 2016)

In December 1987, the anti-hazing legislation, Chapter 269, Sections 17 through 19, was amended by the Legislature in Chapter 665 of the Acts of 1987. The amendment increases the criminal penalties for hazing infractions and alters the manner in which institutions notify individuals of the law.

Specifically, WPI is required to inform groups, teams or organizations of the provisions of M.G.L. MA State Law Chapter 269, Section 17, 18 and 19. A club officer must read Sections 17, 18, and 19 of this law and pass out a copy to each member of the organization. Once you have shared the information with your organization:

1. Print out the Anti-Hazing Policy Form and complete the bottom portion.
2. Print out the Anti-Hazing Signature Sheet and have all of your members sign it.
3. Return both forms to the Student Activities Office. These materials must be submitted on a yearly basis to SAO for Recognition purposes. The due date for these forms is October 1.

Not only is hazing against the law, but it is a practice which diminishes the integrity of individuals and their organizations. Hazing is clearly defined with the sections of the law, and has no place in our society, particularly at an institution of higher education.

WPI is committed to emphasizing that all organization activities be made constructive, educational and safe. Therefore, in support of the university's commitment to the mental, emotional and physical well-being of every student, it is the policy of the University and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that "hazing" in any form be prohibited, and its practices in any fashion be condemned.

#### **E. Statement on Affirmative Action**

(Updated by SOF through Human Resources, August 15, 2016)

WPI is committed to the principles of equal opportunity for all persons and it is the policy of WPI to affirmatively seek, employ, and promote the best qualified employees, students, and applicants without regard to race, sex, age, color, national origin, religion, genetic identity, disability, gender identity or expression, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, transgender status, veteran status, or any other protected status. This policy applies to the total WPI community and is designed to comply with both the spirit and letter of governing state and federal laws. It is expected that this policy, as well as the WPI Affirmative Action Plan will be effectuated by employees, students and others who act on behalf of WPI.

All supervisors, managers, and administrators are responsible for helping the campus fulfill its equal opportunity responsibilities. This is accomplished by making good faith efforts toward meeting affirmative action goals and ensuring a workplace that is free of discrimination and harassment. WPI's goal is to employ and retain a diverse workforce of the best-qualified individuals.

##### **Employment of Minorities and Women**

The Institute's Affirmative Action Program is intended to expand our efforts to guarantee equality of opportunity in employment and in education and to reduce underrepresentation and underutilization of minorities and women at WPI. For all Institute categories of employment, our objectives are to achieve a representation of minorities and women that is at least in proportion to their current availability and to provide new opportunities for career development which both stimulate and respond to their changing interests and aspirations. WPI's obligations as a federal contractor under Executive Order 11246 includes the development of an affirmative action program which provides for analysis of utilization of minorities and women in all job groups in each organizational unit.



### **Employment of Disabled Individuals**

The Institute's program for the employment of individuals with disabilities is intended to expand WPI's efforts to provide opportunities for employment and advancement for qualified persons with disabilities. The Institute will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of physical or mental disability in regard to any position for which the employee or applicant is qualified.

WPI's obligations as a federal contractor under Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, include an assessment of all employment practices to assure that any adaptation that permits the employment or advancement of individuals with disabilities is reasonably accommodated, provided it does not cause undue hardship to the employer. Some individuals may require flexible work schedules, worksite accommodations, or auxiliary aids in order to perform the required duties of a job. Reasonable accommodation to needs such as these is the Institute's affirmative action responsibility under the law.

Inquiries regarding this policy may be directed to the Benefits Administrator in the Office of Human Resources

### **Employment of Disabled and Other Covered Veterans**

In compliance with the Vietnam-Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, as amended, and the 2002 Jobs for Veterans Act (JVA), as amended, WPI does not discriminate against any qualified employee or applicant for employment because he or she is a veteran with a disability or other covered veteran. WPI, in this respect, takes affirmative action to employ, advance in employment, and treat without discrimination, veterans with disabilities and other covered veterans.

A covered veteran is a person in one of the following categories:

- Armed Forces Service Medal Veteran: Any veteran who, while serving on active duty in the U.S. military, ground, naval or air service, participated in a United States military operation for which an Armed Forces service medal was awarded pursuant to Executive Order 12985.
- Recently Separated Veteran: Any veteran during the three year period beginning on the date of such veteran's discharge or release from active duty in the U.S. military, ground, naval or air service.
- Other Protected Veteran: A person who served on active duty in the U.S. military, ground, naval or air services during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized.
- Disabled Veteran: A veteran of the U.S. military, ground, naval or air service who is entitled to compensation (or who but for the receipt of military retired pay would be entitled to compensation) under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, or a person who was discharged or released from active duty because of a service-connected disability.
  - A disabled individual is defined as any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person's major life activities, or has a record of such impairment, or is regarded as having an impairment. ("Life activities" are those which affect employability; "substantially limits" means the degree that the impairment affects employability.)

As a government contractor, WPI will take affirmative action to ensure that job applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to their race, creed, color, national origin, sex, or other protected classifications.

WPI also invites all employees to voluntarily self-identify themselves to the Office of Human Resources. More information can be found on our [website](#).

## **F. WPI Sexual Misconduct Policy\***

(Approved by the Faculty May 8, 2018; Approved by the Board of Trustees May 11, 2018)

### **WPI SEXUAL MISCONDUCT POLICY<sup>12</sup>**

#### **Introduction: WPI's Commitment to a Campus Free from Sexual Misconduct**

WPI is committed to maintaining a learning and working environment that is free from sexual misconduct, remedying the effects of such misconduct when it occurs, and preventing its re-occurrence. The prohibition of sexual misconduct applies to everyone at WPI, including all faculty members (including academic administrators), staff members (including non-academic administrators), students, trustees, alumni and all visitors to the WPI campus.<sup>13</sup>

#### **Application of this Policy**

This Policy applies whenever sexual misconduct occurs: a) on WPI property; or b) off WPI property if: i) the sexual misconduct was in connection with a WPI or WPI-recognized program or activity; or ii) the sexual misconduct may have the effect of creating a hostile environment for a member of the WPI community.

#### **Definitions**

##### **a. Sexual Misconduct**

“Sexual misconduct” is prohibited under this Policy. Sexual misconduct is a broad term that includes sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, gender motivated stalking, relationship abuse, engaging in certain inappropriate relationships, and retaliation against a person reporting sexual misconduct or participating in any investigation or proceeding related to this policy, all as defined below. This definition of sexual misconduct includes sexual assault (e.g. rape, fondling, incest, or statutory rape) as defined by the Clery Act, a federal law on campus safety and security. Sexual misconduct can occur between individuals who know each other, individuals who do not know each other, individuals who have an established relationship, and individuals who have previously engaged in consensual sexual activity. Sexual misconduct can be committed by persons of any gender identity, and it can occur between people of the same or different sex. Use of alcohol or other drugs will not excuse any behavior that violates this policy.

##### *1. Sexual Harassment*

Sexual Harassment is unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature, including sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, when:

Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic standing;

Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for significant employment decisions (such as advancement, performance evaluation, or work schedule) or academic decisions (such as grading or letters of recommendation) affecting that individual;

---

<sup>12</sup> This Policy supersedes all WPI policies dealing with Sexual Misconduct including the “Sexual Misconduct Policy” in the Student Responsibilities and Code of Conduct, the “Sexual Harassment Policy” in the WPI Employee Benefits and Policies Manual, and the “Sexual Harassment Policy” in the Faculty Handbook.

<sup>13</sup> Probationary staff, part-time employees, visitors, and employees subject to a letter of appointment or a collective bargaining agreement may be subject to a different disciplinary process in accordance with applicable policies and terms of their appointment.

The conduct is sufficiently severe or pervasive that a reasonable person would consider it intimidating, hostile, or abusive and it adversely affects an individual's educational, work, or living environment.

A partial list of examples of conduct that might be deemed to constitute sexual harassment if sufficiently severe or pervasive include:

Examples of verbal sexual harassment may include unwelcome conduct such as sexual flirtation, advances or propositions or requests for sexual activity or dates; asking about someone else's sexual activities, fantasies, preferences, or history; discussing one's own sexual activities, fantasies, preferences, or history; verbal abuse of a sexual nature; suggestive comments; sexually explicit jokes; turning discussions at work or in the academic environment to sexual topics.

Examples of nonverbal sexual harassment may include unwelcome conduct such as displaying sexual objects, pictures, or other images; invading a person's personal body space, such as standing closer than appropriate or necessary or hovering; displaying or wearing objects or items of clothing which express sexually offensive content; making sexual gestures with hands or body movements; looking at a person in a sexually suggestive or intimidating manner; or delivering unwanted letters, gifts, or other items of a sexual nature.

## 2. *Sexual Assault*

Sexual assault is any intentional sexual contact or activity that occurs without the consent of any individual involved.

## 3. *Sexual Exploitation*

Sexual Exploitation is purposefully taking sexual advantage of another person without consent. Examples of sexual exploitation include:

- Sexual voyeurism, such as watching a person undressing, using the bathroom or engaged in sexual activity without the consent of the person observed.
- Taking pictures or video or an audio recording of another person engaging in sexual activity or exceeding the boundaries of consent (such as allowing another person to hide in a closet and observe sexual activity or disseminating sexual pictures without the photographed person's consent).
- Engaging in sexual activity with another person while knowingly infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or other sexually transmitted disease (STD) without informing the other person of the infection.
- Administering alcohol or drugs (such as "date rape" drugs) to another person without their knowledge or consent.

## 4. *Gender-motivated Stalking*

Stalking is defined as a pattern of actions or course of conduct directed at a specific person over time that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear. This policy covers those instances where the stalking of a person is motivated by the person's real or perceived gender, sex, or sexual orientation. For the purposes of this definition, "course of conduct" means two or more acts, including, but not limited to, acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means, follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about a person, or interferes with a person's property.

Stalking can take many forms. Examples include, but are not limited to, two or more instances of the following conduct (that also meet the definition of stalking above): following a person; appearing at a person's home, class or work; continuing to contact a person after receiving requests not to; leaving written messages, objects, or unwanted gifts; vandalizing a person's property; photographing a person; and other threatening, intimidating, or intrusive conduct. Stalking may also involve the use of electronic media such as the internet, social networks, blogs, cell phones, texts, or other similar devices (often referred to as cyberstalking). Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, non-consensual communication, telephone calls, voice messages, emails, texts, letters, notes, gifts, or any other communication that are repeated and undesired.

#### 5. *Relationship Abuse*

Relationship abuse is defined as behavior that serves to exercise control and power in an intimate relationship. The behaviors can be physical, sexual, psychological, verbal and/or emotional. Relationship abuse can occur between current or former intimate partners who have dated, lived together, have a child together, currently reside together on or off campus, or who have otherwise connected through a past or existing relationship. It can occur in opposite-sex and same-sex relationships.

Examples of relationship abuse include but are not limited to: attempting to cause or causing bodily injury by hitting, slapping, punching, hair pulling, kicking, sexual assault and/or other forms of unwanted physical contact that cause harm; knowingly restricting the movements of another person; isolating or confining a person for a period of time; controlling or monitoring behavior; being verbally and/or emotionally abusive; and exhibiting extreme possessiveness or jealousy.

#### 6. *Sexual or Romantic Relationships in the Workplace or Academic Environment*

**With undergraduate students.** Except in rare and unusual circumstances involving preexisting relationships, sexual and romantic relationships between WPI employees<sup>14</sup> and undergraduate students are inappropriate and are prohibited.

**With graduate students.** Implicit in the area of professionalism is the recognition by those in positions of authority that in relationships with graduate students there is always an element of power and consent to a romantic relationship that may not be valid where either person in the relationship has direct or indirect power or control over any aspect of the other person's academic or employment environment. Therefore, sexual and romantic relationships between employees and graduate students are prohibited where there is a supervisory relationship between the employee and the graduate student.

**With supervisees.** It is incumbent upon members of the WPI community to refrain from abusing, and seeming to abuse, the power with which they are entrusted, because relationships between supervisors (including TA's and RA's) and supervisees are fundamentally asymmetric in nature, may be the product of subtle or not-so-subtle coercion, or may lead to favoritism for the subordinate. If a student employee (i.e. TA, RA, PLA, undergraduate student assistant, or work-study student) is assigned to a course and has a preexisting sexual or romantic relationship with one of the enrolled students, he or she is obligated to inform the instructor of the course so that alternative arrangements can be made.

#### 7. *Retaliation*

---

<sup>14</sup> The term "employees" in this context does not include students who are employed by the University (e.g. TAs, RAs, PLAs, undergraduate Student Assistants, and work-study students).

Retaliation means any materially adverse action or threat taken or made against an individual, including through third parties and/or legal counsel, for making a report of misconduct or participating in any investigation or proceeding related to this policy. Retaliation includes threatening, intimidating, harassing, or any other conduct that would discourage a reasonable person from engaging in activity protected under this policy, such as seeking services, receiving interim protective measures and accommodations, and/or reporting misconduct. Retaliation includes maliciously and purposefully interfering with, threatening, or damaging the academic and/or professional career of another individual before, during or after the investigation and resolution of a report of misconduct under this policy in response to and/or on account of the report of misconduct. This provision only applies to reports made or information provided in good faith, even if the facts alleged in the report are determined not to be accurate.

**b. Consent**

1. *What is Consent?*

Consent is the positive, unambiguous, and voluntary agreement to engage in specific sexual activity throughout a sexual encounter. Consent must be an informed, deliberate and voluntary decision to engage in mutually acceptable sexual activity. It is the responsibility of the person who initiates sexual activity to make sure consent is received from any other person(s) involved. WPI recognizes that there are a wide variety of sexual interactions, that there is no single way to communicate consent, and that context matters. At all times, each party is free to choose where, when, and how they participate in sexual activity. Accordingly, when evaluating whether sexual activity was consensual, WPI will consider the entirety of the sexual interaction and the relevant circumstances.

Consent is active not passive. Individuals should be able to clearly articulate why and how they believed they received consent and what they considered to be indications of consent as they engaged in sexual activity. Consent must be received for each sexual act. It is important to remember:

- Consent to one sexual act does not constitute or imply consent to another act.
- Previous consent does not imply consent to future sexual activity.
- Consent cannot be assumed based on the parties' relationship or sexual history.
- Consent can be withdrawn at any time before or during sexual activity.

2. *What is Not Consent?*

Consent may not be inferred from silence, passivity or a lack of objection. The absence of a negative response, such as silence or a failure to resist, does not equal consent. Some behaviors and comments that do not indicate affirmative consent include but are not limited to:

- "I don't know"
- "Maybe"
- A head shake
- Lack of objection
- Not fighting back
- A verbal "no" that may sound indecisive or insincere

3. *Consent Can Never Be Given By:*

- Someone who is incapacitated. It is a violation of this Policy to engage in sexual activity with a person who an individual knew or should have known was incapacitated. A person can be incapacitated through the use of drugs, alcohol or any

other intoxicating substance, medications or when they are unconscious, asleep or otherwise unaware that sexual activity is occurring.

- Someone under the legal age of consent. The legal age of consent in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is sixteen (16).
- Someone who is mentally disabled or cognitively impaired. It is a violation of this Policy to engage in sexual activity with a person whose mental disability or cognitive impairment renders them incapable of giving consent and the disability/impairment is known or should have been known to the non-disabled sexual partner.

4. *Consent and the Use of Alcohol or Drugs:*

The use of alcohol or drugs does not relieve an individual of the obligation to obtain consent before initiating and/or engaging in sexual activity.

### **Obligations of Employees to Report Sexual Misconduct**

a. **Responsible Employees**

1. All employees (except Confidential Resource Advisors; identified below) who learn of a violation of this Policy involving students are required to immediately report such information to the Title IX Coordinator or a Deputy Coordinator.
2. All supervisors (except Confidential Resource Advisors) who learn of a violation of this Policy are required to immediately report such information to the Title IX Coordinator or Deputy Coordinator.
3. Employees will receive regular training in their duty to report sexual misconduct.

b. **Confidential Resource Advisors**

The following employees, who will receive regular training, may serve as confidential advisors for students and are not required to report violations of this Policy:

1. Employees of Student Health Services.
2. Employees of the Student Development and Counseling Center.
3. A chaplain or religious advisor working at WPI.
4. WPI Ombudspersons and any other individual with appropriate training who is specifically appointed by WPI for the purpose of serving as a confidential resource advisor.

### **Resources Available in Cases of Sexual Misconduct**

Anyone who has experienced sexual misconduct or is aware of someone who may have been the victim of sexual misconduct is strongly encouraged to report such misconduct and to take advantage of resources available on campus and in the community.

a. **Reporting Sexual Misconduct Immediately After a Sexual Assault**

If you or someone you know has recently been assaulted:

- Go to a safe place as soon as you can.
- In an emergency, call campus police at 508-831-5555, or 5555 from a campus phone or via a blue light phone on campus. If it is not an emergency, then call the WPI Police Department at 508-831-5433.

- Seek medical attention. The WPI Student Development and Counseling Center offers counseling appointments to all students. The Emergency Room at UMass Medical Center offers services and support for people who have experienced sexual assault. WPI Police can provide students with an escort to the hospital.
- Try to preserve all physical evidence.
- If you are the victim of a sexual assault, try not to wash your face or hands, bathe, brush your teeth, drink or eat, douche, or change clothes if you can avoid it. If you do change your clothes, put all clothing you were wearing at the time of the assault in individual paper bags (not plastic). It is important to preserve as much evidence as possible should you later decide to press criminal charges.

**b. Reporting Sexual Misconduct to the Title IX Coordinator and or Deputy Title IX Coordinators**

The Title IX Coordinator plays an integral role in carrying out the University’s commitment to provide a positive learning, teaching and working environment free from sexual misconduct and discrimination. Any student, faculty member, or staff member who has concerns about sexual misconduct is encouraged to seek the assistance of those listed below. They will provide information on resources for assistance and options to address concerns. Those options may vary depending on the nature of the situation, whether the individuals involved are students, faculty, or staff members, the wishes of the individuals involved regarding confidentiality, and whether the individuals involved prefer to proceed formally or informally.

During business hours, anyone who has experienced sexual misconduct or is aware of someone who may have been the victim of sexual misconduct may contact the Title IX Coordinator or any Deputy Title IX Coordinator. Contact information for the Title IX Coordinator and Deputy Coordinators can be found [HERE](#).

**c. Reporting Sexual Misconduct Anonymously**

If you are concerned about a visitor, student, faculty, or staff member who may have experienced a Title IX violation or may have committed a Title IX violation, you may report the situation anonymously by clicking [HERE](#). In that case, you will not be contacted and will remain anonymous. If you wish, you may include your contact information, so we may contact you if we have additional questions.

**NOTE:** This is not a system to use for emergencies. In case of an emergency, regardless of time of day, in which someone’s well-being is in jeopardy, please contact Campus Police at +1-508-831-5555.

**Initial Steps and Investigation of Reports of Sexual Misconduct**

**a. Initial Steps**

All reports of alleged sexual misconduct will be referred to the Title IX Coordinator. Within five business days of receiving such a report, the Title IX Coordinator or their designee<sup>15</sup> will take several initial steps. These initial steps will include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Encouraging the person who has allegedly experienced sexual misconduct (the “Complainant”)<sup>16</sup> to meet with the Title IX Coordinator to discuss the nature and

---

<sup>15</sup> As necessary and appropriate, the Title IX Coordinator may designate a Deputy Title IX Coordinator or another qualified person to assume the Title IX Coordinator’s responsibilities under this Policy.

<sup>16</sup> Throughout this Policy, the term “Complainant” refers to the person who experienced sexual misconduct regardless of who reported the misconduct.

circumstances of the reported conduct. If the person who has reported the alleged sexual misconduct is not the person who has experienced the sexual misconduct, then the person who has made the report should have the opportunity to meet with the Title IX Coordinator to discuss the nature and circumstances of the reported conduct.

2. Notifying the Complainant about their rights and options under this Sexual Misconduct Policy, including the right to report and the right to decline to report the matter to campus police and/or to local law enforcement, the options for reporting to WPI, and the availability of medical treatment, counseling, and other resources, both on and off campus.
3. Meeting with the person who has allegedly committed sexual misconduct (the “Respondent”) to explain the allegation and to get their version of events, and providing that person with the option and adequate opportunity to provide a written response to the allegations. The Respondent should be notified about their rights under this Sexual Misconduct Policy, and about the availability of counseling and other on- and off-campus resources.
4. If the Complainant requests that the process not move forward, the Title IX Coordinator will weigh that request against WPI’s obligation to address any risk of harm to the Complainant or other individuals in the community, and the nature of the incident or conduct at issue. If, following the receipt of an alleged violation of this Policy, the person who allegedly experienced sexual misconduct declines to participate in the investigation or resolution process or requests that the process not proceed, the Title IX Coordinator may decide to close the investigation or choose to continue the process without the person’s participation.
5. Assessing the reported conduct to determine whether the circumstances warrant appropriate interim measures including, but not limited to, no-contact orders, interim suspension of a student, deadline extensions, reassignment of housing, or placing an employee on paid leave prior to completing an investigation. Failure to comply with an interim measure may lead to additional disciplinary action.
6. Assessing whether the behavior alleged constitutes a violation of this Policy and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of such misconduct may be identified. If the Title IX Coordinator determines that the reported conduct would not trigger this Policy, they will advise both the Complainant and the Respondent in writing, and based on the information gathered may also refer the reported conduct to the appropriate administrator or department for handling consistent with any other applicable policy. If the Title IX Coordinator determines that the reported conduct does fall under this Policy, then the case will proceed to the Investigation Phase, as described below.

**b. The Investigation Phase**

1. *Notice of an Investigation:* If it is determined that an investigation is required, the Title IX Coordinator will send a written notice to the Complainant (or “party”) and to the Respondent (or “party”) (collectively, the “parties”). The notice will include a sufficiently detailed description of the allegations, the portions of this Policy that are alleged to have been violated, and any interim measures in place about which either party should be made aware. This written notice does not constitute a finding or a determination of responsibility.

The notice will also state that if either party requires any kind of accommodation due to disability pursuant to the ADA or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, it is the responsibility of that party to make the Title IX Coordinator aware of the need for an accommodation. The Title IX Coordinator will work with each of the parties and as applicable, Office of Disability Services (for students) and/or the 504 Coordinator (for employees) to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available.



2. *Information about Advisors:* Each party may have a single advisor present during any investigative proceeding, including any related meeting, interview, or hearing. Any person may serve as an advisor, including an attorney. Each party must provide the name and contact information of their advisor to the Title IX Coordinator within five business days of receiving notice of an investigation. Advisors may communicate with their advisee but may not may not speak or otherwise communicate on behalf of a party. Advisors are subject to the same confidentiality obligations applicable to others in attendance.
3. *Designation of Role of the Investigator:* The Title IX Coordinator shall designate at least one unbiased, qualified investigator(s)<sup>17</sup> to conduct a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation of the reported conduct and prepare a report of investigative findings (the “Investigative Report”).<sup>18</sup> More than one investigator may be designated or the investigation may be conducted by the Title IX Coordinator. Investigator(s) need not be employees of WPI. The Title IX Coordinator will provide each of the parties with the name of the Investigator(s). As soon as possible, but no later than three (3) calendar days after delivery of the identity of the Investigator(s), the parties should inform the Title IX Coordinator (in writing) of any potential conflicts of interest about the selected Investigator(s). The Title IX Coordinator will consider the nature of the potential conflict and determine if a change is necessary.<sup>19</sup> The Title IX Coordinator’s decision (in appropriate collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, as described in footnote 9) regarding any conflicts regarding the investigator(s) is final.
4. *Nature of the Investigation:* The investigation will include separate interviews with the Complainant (unless that person chooses not to participate in the investigation), the Respondent, and any witnesses whom the Investigator(s) believe will provide necessary and relevant information. The investigation will include the review of documentation or other items relevant to the reported conduct.
5. *Identification of Potential Witnesses and Documentation:* The parties will have the opportunity to provide the Investigator(s) with written notice of the names and contact information of potential witnesses with whom they would like the Investigator(s) to speak together with a brief explanation of how the persons, documents, and/or items are relevant to the reported conduct. The parties may also provide the Investigator(s) with any documentation or other items or questions they would like to be considered or posed to any witness or the other party. The Investigator(s) will exercise discretion in determining what information and questions to consider and which potential witnesses will be interviewed.
6. *Participation in the Investigation:* Participation in the process (by providing information to the Investigator(s), responding to questions from the Investigator(s), responding to information provided by a party or a witness, etc.) is not required, but the Investigation will proceed even if a party or witness declines to participate. During the investigation, the parties will have an equal opportunity to participate. If a party initially declines but then later in the Investigation decides to participate, the Investigator(s) may consider that timing when

---

<sup>17</sup> The investigator shall be deemed “qualified” if the individual has received training in conducting Title IX investigations and has the requisite professional experience to conduct the investigation.

<sup>18</sup> If the Respondent is a faculty member, the Title IX Coordinator will collaborate with the Secretary of the Faculty, in appointing the Investigator and in rendering a decision regarding any potential conflicts of interest involving the investigator.

<sup>19</sup> If the Respondent is a faculty member, the Title IX Coordinator will collaborate with the Secretary of the Faculty in making a decision about whether or not to disqualify an Investigator when the faculty member objects based on a potential conflict of interest. If a party raises an objection based on a potential conflict of interest involving the Title IX Coordinator serving as investigator, the role of the Title IX Coordinator in deciding about whether a conflict exists, and whether another investigator should be designated, will be assumed by the President.

determining the credibility of the information/evidence offered and the weight to give that information/evidence.

7. *Investigation Prohibitions:* The Investigator(s) will not gather or consider information related to either party's sexual history with other persons except as relevant to the alleged violation, as determined in the sole discretion of the Investigator(s).
8. *Coordination with Law Enforcement:* The Investigator or designee may contact any law enforcement agency that is conducting its own investigation to inform them that a WPI investigation is also in progress; to ascertain the status of the criminal investigation; and to determine the extent to which any evidence collected by law enforcement may be available to WPI in its investigation. At the request of law enforcement, the Investigator may delay the investigation temporarily while an external law enforcement agency is gathering evidence. The Investigator will generally resume the investigation when notified that law enforcement has completed the evidence-gathering stage of its criminal investigation.

**c. Optional Informal Resolution Procedure**

At any time prior to convening a Judicial Panel (defined below), a Party may contact the Title IX Coordinator to request an informal resolution of a complaint. All parties and the Title IX Coordinator must agree to informal resolution for this option to be used. If the Title IX Coordinator determines that informal resolution is appropriate, the Title IX Coordinator will attempt to reach a resolution. The allegation will be deemed resolved when the parties expressly agree to an outcome that is acceptable to them and is approved by the Title IX Coordinator in consultation with other appropriate administrators.

**Procedures Following the Investigative Phase of a Title IX Investigation**

- a. **The Investigative Report.** After the Investigation Phase, the Investigator(s) will deliver an Investigative Report to the Title IX Coordinator. The Investigative Report should include a description of the alleged sexual misconduct, and a summary of the information presented during the Investigation Phase including a section where the Investigator(s) point out relevant consistencies or inconsistencies (if any) between different sources of information. The Investigative Report will not include a recommendation or a determination as to whether a party has violated the Sexual Misconduct Policy or what sanctions may be appropriate. These determinations will be made by the Judicial Panel, as described below.
- b. **Review by the Parties.** Within five (5) business days of receiving the Investigative Report, the Title IX Coordinator will provide each party with a copy of the Investigative Report. Each party will have an opportunity to submit written comments to the Title IX Coordinator about the Investigative Report within five (5) business days of receiving the report. The time to submit written comments may be extended if the Title IX Coordinator concludes, in his/her sole discretion, that additional time is warranted. After reviewing the submissions, if any, from the parties, the Title IX Coordinator may determine that additional investigation is required, in which case the Investigator will supplement the Investigative Report and submit a final Investigative Report to the Title IX Coordinator. Any submissions made by either party, as well as any other documentation deemed relevant by the Investigator(s), will be attached to the Investigative Report. Within three (3) business days of receiving the final Investigative Report, the Title IX Coordinator will provide each party with a copy of the final Investigative Report.
- c. **Convening the Judicial Panel.** The Title IX Coordinator will convene a five-member Judicial Panel (the "Judicial Panel") from a previously established pool of WPI faculty members elected by the Faculty to the Campus Hearing Board, staff members and students trained to decide sexual misconduct cases. The process for selecting staff members and students for the pool and

the training process for all members of the pool is set by the Title IX Coordinator in collaboration with the Dean of Students Office, the Secretary of the Faculty, and the Human Resources Department. Students will only serve on panels where the Respondent is a student. If the Respondent is a student, the Judicial Panel should include a student member unless either party elects not to have a student serve on the Judicial Panel. If the Respondent is a faculty member, the Judicial Panel should include at least three faculty members. If the Respondent is a staff member, the Judicial Panel should include at least three staff members. The Title IX Coordinator will provide the parties with the names of the persons assigned as the Judicial Panel members for their case. As soon as possible, but no later than three (3) business days after delivery of the identity of the assigned Judicial Panel members, the parties should inform the Title IX Coordinator in writing of any conflicts of interest regarding the members assigned to the Judicial Panel. If a conflict of interest is raised regarding any of the individuals assigned to the Judicial Panel, the Title IX Coordinator will consider the nature of the conflict and determine if different individuals should be assigned to the Judicial Panel. The Title IX Coordinator should consult with other WPI personnel (and shall collaborate with the Secretary of the Faculty in the case of any conflict of interest raised by a faculty member who is a party in the case or with respect to a proposed Judicial Panel member who is a faculty member) to assess any conflicts of interest. The Title IX Coordinator's decision (in appropriate collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty) regarding any conflicts is final. The Title IX Coordinator will then submit the Investigative Report to the Judicial Panel members who will set a schedule for the Judicial Panel to convene a hearing or hearings.

**d. Training Members of the Judicial Panel**

Proper training is a vital aspect of the integrity of the judicial process. Therefore, all members of the Judicial Panel shall receive appropriate orientation and training, in keeping with applicable law and national best practices. Training and orientation shall be overseen and approved by the Title IX Coordinator.

- e. Role and Responsibilities of the Judicial Panel.** The Judicial Panel will obtain the Investigative Report from the Title IX Coordinator and convene to review the Investigative Report. The Judicial Panel, in its discretion, may request the Investigator(s) to attend a Judicial Panel meeting and answer questions. The Judicial Panel, in its discretion, may request the Investigator(s) to conduct additional investigation on specific points. The Judicial Panel must request the parties that participated in the investigation to appear and answer questions posed by the Judicial Panel. In addition, the Judicial Panel, in its discretion, may request to speak with any individual identified in the Investigative Report as well as any other individual with relevant information including individuals identified by the parties.

In general, a Complainant, witness, or Respondent who had the opportunity to participate during the Investigation but elected not to participate will not be permitted to participate verbally in the hearing or submit documents prior to the hearing. The Judicial Panel may permit a Complainant, witness, or Respondent who did not participate in the Investigation to participate in the hearing upon a showing of good cause. Exceptions of this nature are expected to be rare. The possibility of a law enforcement investigation or criminal court proceedings will generally not be considered good cause for an exception. In general, documents that have not been submitted during the Investigation may not be presented to the Judicial Panel, although the Judicial Panel may permit documents to be submitted that were not part of the Investigation upon a showing of good cause. The Judicial Panel may, however, consider the fact that the documents were not provided during the Investigation when determining the credibility of the information/evidence offered and the weight to give that evidence.

The Judicial Panel will decide by majority vote whether the Respondent is responsible for violating the Sexual Misconduct Policy, whether sanctions are appropriate and, if so, what those sanctions shall be. The Judicial Panel should state the basis for such decisions in a document maintained with records relating to the case.

- f. **Standard of Proof.** All findings and determinations of responsibility and sanctions will be made using a preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires the determination of whether it is more likely than not that a fact exists or a violation of the Sexual Misconduct Policy occurred.
- g. **Rights of the Parties.** Throughout the process, the parties shall have:
- the presumption of innocence;
  - the opportunity to present evidence and respond to allegations of sexual misconduct;
  - the opportunity to present a defense; and
  - the opportunity to offer witnesses to be interviewed by the Investigator and questioned by the Judicial Panel. Neither party will be permitted to question or cross-examine the other party during any hearing held by the Judicial Panel.
- h. **Sanctions.** A finding of responsibility for Sexual Misconduct can result in a wide range of sanctions, depending on the circumstances of a particular case. When the Respondent is a student, examples of sanctions include community service, counseling, probation, suspension from residence hall, suspension from the university for one or more terms, expulsion from WPI. When the Respondent is a staff member or a faculty member, examples of sanctions include community service, counseling, probation, reassignment of duties, suspension with pay, suspension without pay, and termination of employment at WPI. In deciding an appropriate sanction, the Judicial Panel shall consider the following factors:
- the nature and circumstances of the misconduct;
  - the impact of the misconduct on the person who experienced Sexual Misconduct;
  - the disciplinary history of the Respondent;
  - any other mitigating or aggravating circumstances in order to reach a fair and appropriate resolution in each case.

### **Notification of Decision**

Upon reaching a determination of responsibility by majority vote, the Judicial Panel will provide a written notification of its decision to the Title IX Coordinator. The written notification will consist of a statement of the allegations, the Judicial Panel's factual findings, a decision as to whether the Respondent committed Sexual Misconduct, any sanction, and the rationale for these decisions. This written document shall be maintained with records relating to the case.

The Title IX Coordinator will forward to the parties simultaneously (i) the Judicial Panel's written notification described above; and (ii) the procedures for either party to appeal. The Title IX Coordinator will also inform other WPI officials as necessary and appropriate.

### **Appeals**<sup>20</sup>

All appeals (in Section "a" below) and special appeals (in Section "b" below) should be delivered to the Title IX Coordinator who will transmit the appeal to the appropriate Appellate Officer.

---

<sup>20</sup>All Appellate Officers, including the President and Board Chair, will receive Title IX training.

**a. Appeals Available to Either Party**

Within seven (7) business days following the delivery of the notice of the Judicial Panel's determination of responsibility and sanction, either Party may appeal the decision and/or sanction to the appropriate Appellate Officer. If the Respondent is a student, the Appellate Officer is the Vice President for Student Affairs. If the Respondent is a faculty member, the Appellate Officer is the Provost (unless the Respondent is a full-time faculty member who the Judicial Panel has determined should be dismissed or suspended, in which case Section b. below applies). If the Respondent is a staff member, the Appellate Officer is the Vice President of Talent and Chief Diversity Officer.

If potential bias or conflict of interest is raised by either party regarding the Appellate Officer, the President will consider the nature of the potential bias or conflict (and, before deciding the matter, shall collaborate on the matter with the Secretary of the Faculty in the case of any conflict of interest raised by a party who is a faculty member) to assess any conflicts of interest and determine if a different individual should be assigned the role of Appellate Officer. The Appellate Officer shall not be involved in the appeal until the President has resolved any questions of conflict of interest.

The party submitting the appeal must set forth in detail the grounds for appeal and must identify or attach all materials to be considered in the appeal process. The Title IX Coordinator will provide a copy of the appeal submitted by one party to the other party, and the other party may submit any additional materials that they wish to have considered in the appeal process within seven (7) business days of receipt of the appeal.

Within 14 business days after receiving an appeal (including additional materials, if any), the Appellate Officer will decide the merits of the appeal. In deciding the appeal, the Appellate Officer should review evidence considered by the Judicial Panel and may also consult with the Investigator(s), the Judicial Panel, or any other individual that the Appellate Officer deems appropriate.<sup>21</sup> In a case where the Appellate Officer overturns a decision of the Judicial Panel, the Appellate Officer shall first consult with the Investigator(s), the Judicial Panel, and any other individual that the Appellate Officer deems appropriate.

Sanctions may be imposed, in full or in part, while an appeal is pending.

The decisions concerning responsibility and sanction, if any, and reasoning of the Appellate Officer(s) will be provided in a written document and will be final, except for circumstances that permit a Special Appeal, as described below. The written document shall be maintained with records relating to the case.

The Appellate Officer will forward the written document to the Title IX Coordinator, and the Title IX Coordinator will inform the parties simultaneously of the outcome of the appeal by forwarding to them the Appellate Officer's written document.

**b. Special Appeals with respect to a Respondent who is a Full-Time Faculty Member Involving a Recommended Sanction of Dismissal or Suspension**

The following appeal process applies in two cases:

1. As the sole method of appeal of a determination by a Judicial Panel that a Respondent who is a full-time faculty member should be dismissed or suspended; and

---

<sup>21</sup> Because the President may have a role in the appellate process involving full time faculty members facing suspension or dismissal, the appellate officer shall not communicate with the President regarding a full-time faculty member's appeal.

2. As an appeal of a determination by the Appellate Officer that a Respondent who is a full-time faculty member should be dismissed or suspended when that determination was made on appeal of a Judicial Panel's decision not to impose such sanctions on the Respondent.

Such appeals appeal will be subject to the following procedure:

The Respondent may appeal (both the finding of responsibility and the sanction) to the President within fourteen days after the Title IX Officer notifies the Respondent of the imposition of the sanction by the Judicial Panel or within fourteen days after the Appellate Officer imposes a sanction of suspension or dismissal on the first appeal. The appeal to the President should state why the Respondent believes the determination of responsibility and/or the sanctions were inappropriate. The appeal must also set forth in detail the grounds for appeal and must identify or attach all materials to be considered in the appeal process. The Title IX Coordinator will provide a copy of the appeal to the Complainant (if that person has not declined to participate in the investigative and judicial case). The Complainant may submit a response to the Title IX Coordinator within five days of receiving a copy of the appeal. The Title IX Coordinator will forward that response to the President.

Before the President decides the appeal, the President should consult with the previous Appellate Officer (if there were one) and the Secretary of the Faculty. The President should issue a decision within thirty days of receiving the appeal. If the decision will take longer than thirty days, the President should inform the parties of the additional time necessary to render a decision. The decisions concerning responsibility and sanction, if any, and reasoning of the President will be provided in a written document. The written document shall be maintained with records relating to the case.

The President will forward the written document to the Title IX Coordinator, and the Title IX Coordinator will inform the parties simultaneously of the outcome of the appeal by forwarding to them the President's written document.

If the President decides to impose a sanction of dismissal or suspension, the Respondent may appeal the sanction to the Board of Trustees within fourteen days after the Respondent is notified of the President's decision. If the Respondent appeals to the Board, the Chair of the Board, in collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, shall appoint a committee of five faculty members who will make a recommendation regarding the sanction imposed. The faculty committee will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. The faculty committee will summarize the basis for its recommendation in a written report to the Board Chair within thirty days. The Board Chair should issue a written decision within thirty days of receiving the faculty committee's report. If the decision will take longer than thirty days, the Board Chair should inform the parties of the additional time necessary to render a decision. The decision and reasoning of the Board Chair will be provided in a written document. The written document shall be maintained with records relating to the case. The Board Chair will forward the written decision document to the Title IX Coordinator, and the Title IX Coordinator will inform the parties simultaneously of the outcome of the appeal by forwarding to them the Board Chair's written document.

The Board Chair's decision shall be final.

### **Timeframe for Completing the Investigation and Disciplinary Process**

WPI will endeavor to complete the investigation and disciplinary Judicial Panel process, if any, within sixty (60) days of the delivery of the written notice of investigation to the parties. This period does not include the time for any appeal. Timeframes set forth in this Policy may be extended for good cause. WPI's overarching goal is that the process should be prompt, fair, and impartial.

## Additional Matters

- a. **No Conflicts of Interest.** To the maximum extent practicable, steps should be taken to ensure an impartial and unbiased process, including participation of persons (including investigators) who: (1) have sufficient qualifications and training to carry out a thorough evaluation of the relevant information; and (2) have no unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation that could affect their ability to be objective reviewers.

In cases where the Title IX Coordinator has a conflict of interest, a Deputy Title IX Coordinator appointed by the President will serve in the Title IX Coordinator's role. In cases where the Appellate Officer has a conflict of interest, the President shall appoint another Appellate Officer.. In cases where allegations of Sexual Misconduct have been brought against the Title IX Coordinator, the Vice President for Talent/Chief Diversity Officer, the Provost, or the President, then the process outlined in this policy will be adjusted accordingly to avoid any conflicts of interest. Except in cases involving the President, the President shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest. The President's decision on such questions shall be final.

- b. **Duty of Honesty.** Any person who knowingly makes a false statement – either explicitly or by omission – in connection with any part of the process will be subject to separate disciplinary action. A false or unfounded report of misconduct determined by WPI to have been made in bad faith and dishonesty is a serious offense. Such offenses will themselves be investigated under the appropriate WPI policy and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment or other affiliation with WPI. A report made in good faith is not considered false merely because the evidence does not ultimately support the allegation of violation of the Policy.
- c. **Good Faith Participation by the Parties and Witnesses.** The investigation is a neutral fact-gathering process. Although participation in the process (providing information to the Investigator(s), responding to questions from the Investigator(s), responding to information provided by a party or a witness, etc.) is not required, the Complainant, the Respondent, and all witnesses are expected to participate in good faith in the process set forth in this Policy, and they may be required by WPI to attend meetings related to the process. Any person who knowingly interferes with the reporting, investigation, or resolution of matters under this Policy may be subject to separate and/or additional disciplinary action
- d. **Duties of Promptness and Care.** Proceedings concerning Sexual Misconduct often raise difficult issues for those making the allegations, for those who are the subject of the allegations, and for those responsible for reviewing the allegations. Review of the allegations should therefore be conducted promptly and with care and sensitivity.
- e. **Duty of Confidentiality.** The University will administer any complaint of sexual misconduct using the process described in this Policy while providing the utmost degree of privacy and confidentiality possible under the circumstances of each matter and as permitted by law. All participants in the review process under this Policy are expected to maintain confidentiality to protect the privacy of all involved, to the extent possible and as permitted by law. Participants should keep in mind the affect that allegations can have on reputations, even if the allegations are not sustained by the proceedings. Thus, only those people with a need to know should be informed of a complaint. Any participant in the process set forth in this Policy who violates their duty of confidentiality may be subject to discipline under the appropriate WPI policy.
- f. **Recording the Proceedings.** The parties are not permitted to make video, audio, or other electronic, photographic, or digital recordings of any meetings or proceedings held under the

Sexual Misconduct Policy or these procedures or the Investigative Phase. The Title IX Coordinator may make exceptions to this prohibition in limited circumstances if he or she concludes, in his or her sole discretion, that a recording is warranted, and upon written request of the party seeking the recording that explains the need for the recording.

- g. **Record Keeping.** The Title IX Coordinator should receive and maintain all records relating to proceedings under this Policy including all notices to and from the parties, all reports of Investigators, all decisions by a Judicial Panel, all appeals by the parties, and all decisions by Appellate Officers and others involved in the appeals process under this Policy.
- h. **Special Measures.** If there is no finding of Sexual Misconduct, the University should make reasonable and practical efforts as appropriate to restore the reputation of the Respondent. Any such concerns by the Respondent should be directed to the Title IX coordinator for follow up with other administrators as appropriate.
- i. **Information about Title IX.** Such information, including about filing a complaint with the Department of Education related to this Policy, may be obtained from the Office of Civil Rights at the United States Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20202-1100; 800-421-3481 TDD: 800-877-8339; [OCR@ed.gov](mailto:OCR@ed.gov).
- j. **More information** about Title IX at WPI may be found at <https://www.wpi.edu/offices/title-ix>.
- k. **Evaluation.** The Title IX Coordinator shall annually evaluate the effectiveness of the Policy with respect to meeting the needs of Complainants and Respondents during the process.



## **G. WPI Policy on Research Conduct\***

(Approved by the Faculty, December 12, 2017; Approved by the Board of Trustees, December 15, 2017)

### **Introduction**

The integrity of the University and its academic endeavors require that teachers, researchers, advisors and other members of its community be dedicated to maintaining the highest ethical standards in their professional activities. Unethical behavior in research and scholarship strikes at the heart of the scholarly and educational enterprise. A shared understanding of expectations and responsibilities is, therefore, critical — not only to the quality of the research enterprise but also to the collegial life of this community.

Supervisors must enforce the highest standards for conducting research and creating and maintaining records of the research. The risk of misconduct increases in an environment where there is a lack or deficiency of supervision. Specifically, faculty supervisors, principal investigators, laboratory and center directors and Department Heads, should clearly articulate standards and protocols for research, scholarship, and creative work, through discussion and review of research, and, when possible, with written guidelines and training that adhere to best practices.

In recognition of the need to maintain the highest standards in research conduct, WPI has developed the following policy to respond to allegations of research misconduct<sup>22</sup> and to inform members of the community of the appropriate channels for bringing such matters to the attention of the University.<sup>23</sup> This policy applies to Research Activities conducted at WPI or by WPI faculty, staff, fellows, students.

The appropriate institutional response to research misconduct will vary with the facts and circumstances of each case. In addition to requiring correction of the research record, WPI has recourse to a variety of disciplinary actions against individuals whose conduct violates this policy, including, in severe cases and following applicable procedures, expulsion of a student, termination of an employee, or revocation of tenure.

The procedures described in this policy are consistent with requirements that apply to the review and reporting of allegations of research misconduct arising in the context of certain federally sponsored research. This Policy should be reviewed and updated periodically in order to ensure compliance with applicable legal requirements.

### **Students**

If a student is involved in the review of an allegation of Research Misconduct (whether as a Complainant, as a Respondent, or as a person from whom information about allegations is obtained), fact finders and investigators must seek guidance from the Office of the Vice Provost for Research regarding the legal and policy requirements that may apply.

---

<sup>22</sup> This policy is based upon the federal regulations governing research misconduct in connection with United States Public Health Service (“PHS”)-supported activities and will be interpreted and applied so as to be in compliance with those regulations. WPI has also determined that this policy will be applied as the minimum standard to all allegations of research misconduct, regardless of the funding source(s) or whether the scholarly activity is funded. Institutional response to research misconduct allegations in areas not PHS-supported will follow the same general principles except for the actual involvement of PHS. In the event another research sponsor has additional requirements beyond those covered by this policy, all research funded by that source will be subject to those additional requirements.

<sup>23</sup> This policy replaces the prior policy entitled “Policy and Procedure for Removal of Tenured Faculty Member for Cause” adopted in 1969 as it relates to matters concerning research misconduct. This policy also replaces the Research Misconduct Policy passed by the Board of Trustees on December 13, 2013 and the Research Misconduct Policy passed by the Faculty on January 23, 2014.

Except as they may be subject to the requirements of grants, sponsored research or research funded by a governmental authority, allegations of Research Misconduct committed by students will be addressed in accordance with provisions of the Student Code of Conduct dealing with Student Academic Dishonesty.

### **Definitions**

**Research Activities** are proposing, conducting, processing, reviewing, or reporting the results of research or other scholarly inquiry.

**Research Misconduct** is Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism in Research Activities or Deliberate Interference. It does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

- **Fabrication** is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- **Falsification** is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the Research Record.
  - **Research Record** is the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific or other scholarly inquiry and includes, but is not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records (both physical and electronic), progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, and journal articles.
- **Plagiarism** is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- **Deliberate Interference** is intentionally causing material harm to the research or scholarly work of others, and may include damaging or destroying the property of others, such as research equipment or supplies; disrupting active experiments; or altering or deleting products of research, including data and program codes.

**Complainant** is an individual who reports allegations of **Research Misconduct**.

**Respondent** is an individual who is the subject of allegations of **Research Misconduct** at WPI.

**WPI Advisor** is a WPI community member of the Respondent's choice, not the Respondent's family member or subordinate, who may participate and provide support to a Respondent in any meeting in connection with a review under this Policy. The role of the WPI Advisor is to provide support and guidance, not to be a substitute for the Respondent, who is the primary participant.

**Preponderance of the Evidence** is proof by information that, compared with the information opposing it, leads to a conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.

**Impartial and Unbiased Persons** are those who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation.

### **Duty to Report**

Each member of the WPI community has a responsibility to report any conduct that they believe in good faith to be Research Misconduct at WPI. There may be circumstances in which, prior to taking that action, it would be appropriate for the Complainant to discuss any concerns with the prospective Respondent. Consultation and guidance is always available from the Vice Provost for Research or from senior academic officers (e.g. Deans, Department Heads, laboratory Directors), who themselves are bound by a Duty to Report.

All allegations of Research Misconduct, wherever initially received, must be conveyed promptly to the Vice Provost for Research. A supervisor who becomes aware of possible Research Misconduct, either from the supervisor's own observations or because of reports, has a responsibility to bring allegations of Research Misconduct directly to the Vice Provost for Research in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.

If a supervisor feels that the Vice Provost for Research is not the appropriate official to whom to report allegations in a particular case, the allegations may be reported to the Provost. If a Complainant reports allegations to a supervisor and the supervisor fails to forward the allegations to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research or the Provost, then the Complainant should report the allegations to the Vice Provost for Research or the Provost directly.

### **Standard of Proof for a Finding of Research Misconduct**

In order to enter a finding of Research Misconduct, WPI must determine by a preponderance of the evidence that:

- the Respondent engaged in Research Misconduct; and
- the Research Misconduct marked a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant academic community; and
- the Respondent committed the Research Misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly.

### **Assessment and Review Process**

#### **Initial Assessment:**

Upon receipt of an allegation of Research Misconduct, within 5 *business* days the Vice Provost for Research will conduct an initial assessment of the allegations, to determine whether the alleged misconduct falls within the scope of this Policy. The Vice Provost for Research may appoint an impartial fact finder with appropriate expertise to conduct this initial assessment and to make a recommendation to the Vice Provost for Research.

If the Vice Provost for Research determines that the allegations do not fall within this Policy, the Vice Provost for Research will either close the matter or refer it to another office at WPI with authority or responsibility over the matter.

If the Vice Provost for Research determines that the allegations do fall within this Policy, the Vice Provost for Research will initiate a two-stage review process under this Policy. The decision of the Vice Provost for Research to initiate or not to initiate a review is final.

#### **Subsequent Two-Stage Review Process:**

- The *first stage of review* (the "Inquiry") under this Policy consists of preliminary fact-finding stage to decide whether to recommend to the Provost a further, formal review. The Inquiry should begin within 30 days after the Vice Provost for Research's initial assessment of the allegations. Once initiated, the Inquiry normally must be completed within 60 calendar days.
- If after the Inquiry, there is a decision by the Provost to initiate a further review, WPI will proceed to a second stage of review (the "Investigation"), which entails a formal review leading to a recommendation to the Provost whether or not WPI should make a finding of Research Misconduct—and, if so, what the appropriate sanction should be. If a formal investigation is warranted, it shall begin within 21 days of the conclusion of the Inquiry, and it is normally to be completed within 120 days once it has begun.

Interim Institutional Actions:

At any point in the process, the Vice Provost for Research may institute appropriate interim institutional actions to protect the community, public health, federal or other governmental funds and equipment, and the integrity of the Public Health Services (PHS) supported research process. For such actions, the Vice Provost for Research should state the basis for such decision in a document maintained with records relating to the case and provided to the Respondent.

**First Stage of Review: Inquiry**

The Inquiry consists of information gathering and fact-finding to determine as a preliminary matter whether an allegation of Research Misconduct warrants further, formal review. The Inquiry should begin within 30 days, if called for, after the Vice Provost for Research's initial assessment of the allegations.

The Vice Provost for Research will appoint three impartial fact finders to conduct the Inquiry. If necessary, fact finders may be found from outside the WPI community. At this time, the Vice Provost for Research will provide written notice to the Respondent that an Inquiry has been initiated. The written notice ordinarily summarizes the allegations under review and advises the Respondent of the right to select a WPI Advisor to support the Respondent in the course of the proceedings. The Respondent will be given an opportunity to respond, in writing, to the Vice Provost for Research within 10 days following the Respondent's receipt of the allegation. The Respondent may, in lieu of a WPI Advisor, have legal counsel for assistance or support during the Inquiry stage of the process.

Either before or when the Respondent is notified, the Office of the Vice Provost for Research will promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the records and other evidence needed to conduct proceedings under this Policy and will sequester them in a secure manner. The Office of the Vice Provost for Research will provide Respondent with reasonable, supervised access to the records or, when appropriate, copies of the records. The Office of the Vice Provost for Research may seek additional records or other materials that may be potentially relevant during the course of the review.

Oversight for the Inquiry process will be provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. The Inquiry should, to the extent reasonably possible, be limited to a review of documentary materials, including the Respondent's written response to the allegations. The fact that an Inquiry has been initiated should be made known only to the Respondent and other persons with a need to know.

At the conclusion of the Inquiry, the Inquiry Committee will prepare a draft written report summarizing the process and information reviewed and recommending whether to proceed with an Investigation. The draft Inquiry report should identify the name and position of the Respondent, a description of the allegations, the PHS support (if any), including the specific grant or contract, and should explain why the allegations do or do not warrant an investigation.

A recommendation to proceed should be based on whether there are reasonable grounds to conclude that the allegations may have substance and that Research Misconduct may have occurred based on the information reviewed. In either case, the Respondent will be given a copy of the draft Inquiry report and an opportunity to respond within a reasonable time period set by the Vice Provost for Research. Such response will be reviewed by the Inquiry Committee before finalizing the Inquiry report. In addition, any comments provided by the Respondent will be included as an appendix to the final Inquiry report. The final Inquiry report should state the number (but not the names) of the members of the Inquiry Committee who voted that an allegation warrants further review. The final Inquiry report will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for Research.

The Vice Provost for Research will review the Inquiry report and may ask the fact-finding committee for additional review or explanation. If this additional review by the fact-finding committee results in revisions to the report, the Respondent will have a further opportunity to submit written comments before any supplemental final Inquiry report is resubmitted to the Vice Provost for Research.

The Vice Provost for Research will submit a final Inquiry report to the Provost along with a written recommendation whether or not to proceed with an Investigation. The Provost will then decide whether or not to proceed with an Investigation. Before the Provost decides to proceed with an investigation, the Provost shall consult with the fact-finding committee and with the Secretary of the Faculty. If a majority of the Inquiry Committee voted not to proceed with an Investigation, but the Provost decides that there should be an Investigation, then the Provost should state the basis for such decision in a document maintained with records relating to the Investigation.

Following these consultations, the Vice Provost for Research will send written notice to the Respondent of the Provost's decision whether or not to proceed with an Investigation. The Complainant, if known, will be informed whether an Investigation will or will not be initiated.

The Inquiry, including preparation of the final Inquiry Report and the decision of the Provost on whether an investigation is warranted, must be completed within 60 calendar days of initiation of the Inquiry, unless the Vice Provost for Research determines that circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the Vice Provost for Research approves an extension, the inquiry record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60 day period.

Within 30 days of a finding by the Provost that an investigation is warranted, the Provost shall provide ORI (and any other funding agency or authority required to be notified) with a copy of the Inquiry report, regardless of the vote of the Inquiry Committee.

### **Second Stage of Review: Investigation**

If a formal investigation is warranted, it shall begin within 21 days of the conclusion of the Inquiry. The Vice Provost for Research initiates the Investigation by requesting the Secretary of the Faculty (SOF) and the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) to appoint a five member investigation committee ("the Committee") to be selected from elected FRC members who have the expertise to evaluate the particular issues and evidence involved in the alleged misconduct. The faculty members must be unbiased toward the Complainant, Respondent and witnesses. (If there are not five unbiased elected FRC members with the required expertise, then the SOF and FRC chair will appoint the required number of qualified faculty from outside the FRC. If the Respondent or Complainant is either the SOF or FRC Chair, then the other will appoint the Committee.) The Committee shall elect its own Chair who shall be responsible for determining the manner in which the witness interviews and other procedures will be conducted by the Committee.

The Vice Provost for Research will provide written notice to the Respondent that the Investigation has been initiated. The written notice will:

- summarize the allegations;
- advise the Respondent of the Respondent's right to the support of a WPI Advisor or legal counsel in the Investigation; and
- identify the members of the investigation Committee.

The Respondent may challenge the composition of the Committee, if s/he believes that one or more of its members is biased. The remaining members of the Committee shall determine whether bias exists and otherwise act to ensure its own credibility. The Committee shall request that the Chair of the FRC and the Secretary of the Faculty replace a committee member when appropriate.

The Investigation consists of a formal examination and evaluation of all relevant information to determine if Research Misconduct occurred. The Investigation will typically include an examination of all relevant documentation and interviews of individuals who may have relevant information about the research in question. The Investigation Committee may review the Inquiry findings but is not bound by the findings of the Inquiry.

Oversight of the Investigation and specific guidance as it proceeds will be provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Research.

As the Investigation proceeds, the Office of the Vice Provost for Research should provide the Respondent with reasonable updates and opportunities to respond to information obtained in the investigation.

Throughout the Committee Investigation process, the Respondent is entitled to the presumption of innocence, and:

- shall have the opportunity to respond to allegations of Research Misconduct;
- shall have the opportunity to present a defense;
- shall have the opportunity to offer witnesses to be interviewed by the Committee; and
- may, in lieu of a WPI Advisor, have legal counsel for assistance or support.

Once the Investigation is completed, the Committee will prepare a draft written report offering a judgment based on the evidence as to whether the Respondent has committed Research Misconduct, and if so, its level of severity. If the Committee determines Respondent has committed Research Misconduct, it shall also recommend disciplinary action. The report should summarize the facts and analysis that support those conclusions, addressing the merits of any reasonable explanation or defense provided by the Respondent, and including the *numerical* vote of the Committee without identifying individual votes.

The Respondent will be provided with a copy of the draft Investigation report with an opportunity to respond within a reasonable time period set by the Vice Provost for Research. Such response will be considered by the Committee before the Committee takes a final vote, makes its final recommendation for disciplinary action, and issues its final Investigation report. In addition, any comments provided by the Respondent will be included as an appendix to the final Investigation report. The final Investigation report will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for Research.

The Vice Provost for Research will review the Investigation report and may ask the Investigation Committee for additional review or explanation. If this results in revisions to the report, the Respondent will have a further opportunity to submit written comments before any supplemental final Investigation report is resubmitted to the Vice Provost for Research.

The Vice Provost for Research will submit the final Investigation report to the Provost and the Respondent along with a written recommendation whether or not WPI should make a finding of Research Misconduct. If the Vice Provost for Research recommends a finding of Research Misconduct, he or she will also recommend disciplinary actions to be taken. Before the Provost makes a finding of Research Misconduct, the Provost shall consult with the Committee and with the Secretary of the Faculty.

If the Provost finds that Research Misconduct has been committed, the Provost shall decide on appropriate disciplinary actions, which may include, but are not limited to, formal reprimand, suspension, expulsion, revocation of degree, change in WPI status, revocation of tenure and termination of employment. If a majority of the Investigation Committee voted that the Respondent did not commit Research Misconduct but the Provost decides that the Respondent did, or if the Provost

decides on a disciplinary action that is different than the action recommended by the Investigation Committee, then the Provost should state the basis for such decisions in a document maintained with records relating to the investigation.

The Vice Provost for Research will provide written notice of the Provost's decision to the Respondent. The Complainant, if known, will be informed whether there was a finding of Research Misconduct. However, WPI officials will not notify the Complainant of any disciplinary action taken. The Vice Provost for Research will send the final report to ORI (and any other funding agency or authority required to be notified), regardless of the vote or the disciplinary action recommended by the Investigation Committee.

The Investigation is to be completed within 120 days of beginning it, including conducting the Investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to ORI. However, if the Vice Provost for Research determines that the Investigation will not be completed within this 120-day period, the Vice Provost for Research will submit to ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay.

### **Appeals**

The Respondent may appeal any finding of Research Misconduct, and any sanction other than termination of employment or revocation of tenure to the President within two weeks after the Provost notifies the Respondent of the imposition of the sanction. The grounds of any appeal of a finding of Research Misconduct shall be limited to two instances:

- a) when there are alleged procedural violations that are substantial and material and which would have changed the outcome of the case; and
- b) when the Investigation Committee voted that the Respondent did not commit Research Misconduct but the Provost finds that Research Misconduct has occurred.

Before the President decides the appeal, the President shall consult with the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty. The President should issue a decision within thirty days of receiving the appeal. The President's decision shall be final.

If the Provost imposes a sanction of termination of employment or revocation of tenure, the Respondent may appeal the sanction to the Board of Trustees within two weeks after the Provost notifies the Respondent of the imposition of the sanction (or within two weeks after the President decides an appeal of a finding of Research Misconduct based on grounds a) or b) described above. If the Respondent appeals to the Board, the Chair of the Board, in collaboration with the Secretary of the Faculty, shall appoint a committee of five faculty members who will make a recommendation regarding the sanction imposed by the Provost. The faculty committee will have access to all written reports and materials relevant to the case. The faculty committee will summarize the basis for its recommendation in a written report to the Board Chair within thirty days. The Board Chair should issue a written decision within thirty days of receiving the faculty committee's report. The Board Chair's decision shall be final.

Other than interim institutional actions which may already be in effect, any finding of Research Misconduct, and the imposition of any sanction imposed by the Provost, will be stayed while an appeal is pending before the President or the Board of Trustees.

### **Special Measures**

The Provost has the authority to mitigate the effects of the misconduct, including withdrawing WPI's name and sponsorship from pending abstracts and papers, notifying individuals known to have relied

upon research that was affected by the misconduct, and taking formal steps to correct or retract publications and the Research Record.

If there is no finding of Research Misconduct, all reasonable and practical efforts if requested and as appropriate, should be made to protect and restore the reputation of the Respondent. All reasonable and practical efforts should be made to protect or restore the position and reputation of any complainant, witness or committee member and to counter potential or actual retaliation against these individuals.

### **Provisions Common to Misconduct Review Process**

#### **No Conflicts of Interest**

To the maximum extent practicable, steps should be taken to ensure an impartial and unbiased process, including participation of persons (including fact-finders and investigators) who: (1) have sufficient expertise to carry out a thorough evaluation of the relevant information; and (2) have no real or perceived unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation that could affect their ability to be objective reviewers.

In cases where the Provost has a conflict of interest, the President shall serve in the Provost's role. In cases where the Vice Provost for Research has a conflict of interest, the Provost will serve in that role. In cases where allegations of Research Misconduct have been brought against the Vice Provost for Research, the Provost or the President, then the process outlined in this policy will be adjusted accordingly to avoid any conflicts of interest. The President shall resolve any questions of bias or conflict of interest. The President's decision on such questions shall be final.

#### **Confidentiality**

Proceedings concerning Research Misconduct often raise difficult issues for those making the allegations, for those who are the subject of the allegations, and for those responsible for reviewing the allegations. Review of the allegations should therefore be conducted promptly and with care and sensitivity.

All participants in the review process under this Policy are expected to maintain confidentiality to protect the privacy of all involved, to the extent possible and as permitted by law. Participants should keep in mind the effect that allegations can have on reputations, even if the allegations are not sustained by the proceedings. Thus, only those people with a need to know should be informed of a complaint.

#### **No Retaliation**

No one shall be retaliated against for participating in a review of a misconduct allegation in good faith as a Complainant, a witness, a factfinder, or investigator or in any other capacity. Reasonable efforts should be made to counter potential or actual retaliation against these complainants, witnesses and committee members. Retaliation is typically a significant adverse action taken against an individual because the individual participated in a review process. Retaliation is a serious offense. A complaint of retaliation may be investigated and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including terminating the individual's relationship with WPI.

#### **False Accusations or Testimony**

A false or unfounded report of misconduct determined by the Institute to have been made in bad faith and dishonesty in the context of an Inquiry or Investigation are serious offenses. Such offenses may themselves be investigated and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment or other affiliation with WPI.



**Duty to Cooperate and Preserve and Produce Information**

All members of the WPI community must cooperate with efforts to review allegations of Research Misconduct.

While the destruction or absence of, or failure to provide upon request, information relating to allegations of Research Misconduct is not misconduct per se, such failure may be considered to be evidence supporting a finding of Research Misconduct when the evidence shows the Respondent had relevant information and intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly destroyed it; had the opportunity to maintain the information but did not do so; or maintained the information and failed to produce it in a timely manner in connection with a Research Misconduct proceeding, with the result that the Respondent significantly departed from accepted practices of the relevant academic community.

**Record Keeping**

The Office of the Vice Provost for Research is the custodian of records relating to proceedings under this Policy.

**Notice to Sponsors**

To the extent a sponsor requires notification from WPI that research it funded has become the subject of proceedings under this Policy, the Vice Provost for Research will supply that notification. In addition, the Vice Provost for Research will give applicable sponsors written notice of any decision of the Provost entering a finding of Research Misconduct at WPI.

## 5. DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

### **A. Educational Development Council**

(Updated by the SOF, August 15, 2016)

The Educational Development Council (EDC) is an administratively appointed committee whose responsibilities include:

- Conducting an internal small grants program to promote educational innovation and improvement;
- Conducting the annual selection process for the Romeo L. Moruzzi Young Faculty Award for Innovation in Undergraduate Education
- Serving as an advisory committee to the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center.

Membership of the EDC includes the Director of the Morgan Teaching and Learning Center, a faculty member appointed by the Committee on Academic Policy, a faculty member appointed by the Committee on Governance, a faculty member appointed by the Provost, and an undergraduate student appointed by the Student Government Association.

Faculty serve for staggered three-year terms.

### **B. Research Development Council\***

(Approved by the Faculty, January 18, 2018)

#### *Roles and Responsibilities*

The role of the Research Development Council (RDC) is to serve as an advisory board to the Vice Provost for Research (VPR). RDC provides advice and assistance to the VPR on the development of research, research planning, and research policy. The specific roles and responsibilities of the RDC are:

1. Strategic planning to maximize research productivity of faculty and staff and to support highly innovative, transformative research
2. To make recommendations regarding internal review of pre-proposals for limited submission opportunities
3. To make recommendations regarding internal research funding programs
3. To review and recommend updates to the indirect cost return (ICR) reinvestment model as needed
4. To develop yearly RDC budget recommendation, including, but not limited to support of:
  - a. repair and maintenance of research instrumentation;
  - b. multi-institutional research initiatives;
  - c. internal research funding programs for all disciplines; and
  - d. cost sharing.
5. To coordinate research infrastructure requests in support of new Faculty recruitment across all disciplines with Department Heads, Deans and the Provost
6. To make recommendations regarding research infrastructure

### Membership

The Research Development Council consists of the Vice Provost for Research and 8 faculty members with a record of significant scholarly research contributions. Faculty members serve staggered 3-year terms. Any member can be reappointed after a minimum of one year between terms.

- a. One faculty member is appointed by the Dean of Foisie Business School.
- b. Two faculty members are appointed by the Dean of Engineering.
- c. Two faculty members are appointed by the Dean of Arts and Sciences.
- d. One faculty member is appointed annually by the VPR.
- e. One faculty member is appointed by the COG.
- f. One faculty member is appointed by the Committee on Graduate Studies and Research.

The Vice Provost for Research staff will provide the RDC with administrative and staff support.

## 6. AWARDS AND AWARD COMMITTEES

### **A. Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Teaching**

#### *Creation of the Award*

The Board of Trustees voted the following recommendation by one of its committees, at the Annual Meeting on June 6, 1959:

That a FACULTY AWARD be established to give recognition from time to time to a faculty member who, in the judgment of a suitable committee of the faculty, is an outstanding teacher who has made a notable professional contribution.

It is important in the concept of this award that only faculty members known for excellence in teaching be eligible.

The professional contribution could be in any appropriate category, including distinguished excellence in teaching; writing a fine textbook; study or teaching; conceiving an idea of great importance to the advancement of the engineering profession or of engineering education; directing or conducting outstanding research; creating an important invention; carrying out some distinguished service to the Institute, the community, the Nation or to mankind.

Nominations should be made to the Board of Trustees by a committee of the faculty. The Executive Committee of the Faculty might perform this function. However, there would seem to be greater merit in having a special committee for this important, time-requiring purpose – made up of faculty with a rotating membership involving, after a starting period, at least three years of service per member. Such a committee might well be chosen by faculty members who have served at WPI for more than a designated number of years. It is proposed that a committee of the faculty be designated to prepare Governing Rules relating to the Faculty Award and to the Faculty Award Committee, its composition, organization, and operations. These Governing Rules should be subject to approval of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, with counsel of the Institute President and Executive Vice-President.

It is proposed that the Board of Trustees specify that except in most unusual circumstances, not more than one such award will be made per year, and that there shall be no requirement that such an award be made each year.

It is proposed that the award consist of an appropriately worded, hand-illuminated, framed certificate or a suitably designed and worded, wood-mounted plaque. In addition, it is proposed that at some suitable, prominent location at the Institute, there be an appropriate plaque on which will be inserted the names and years of Faculty Award recipients. Further, it is proposed that the Journal or handbook of the Institute include the names of Faculty Award recipients who are currently on the WPI faculty, together with a terse statement of the faculty contribution recognized in each case.

As to the occasion for presenting such awards and as to other questions which may arise, it is proposed that the faculty committee assigned responsibility for formulating Governing Rules be given such additional responsibilities also – their decisions similarly to be subject to approval of the Board Chairman.

#### *Governing Rules Relating to the Faculty Award*

(Faculty Award Committee - April 13, 1960)

In the selection of the recipient of the Faculty Award, the Faculty Award Committee acted in accordance with the general instructions provided in the action of the Board of Trustees and used the following criteria in making its choice.

First, and foremost, the recipient had to satisfy the requirement of being an outstanding teacher. The Committee realized at the start of its deliberations that what constituted an “outstanding teacher” would, of necessity, involve intangibles incapable of being transformed into clearly stated language. With this in mind, the Committee felt that the teacher would have to be judged as a whole, rather than by a strictly numerical rating system assigning certain weights to fixed categories. However, the Committee did examine each nomination with respect to the degree to which some of the following attributes of an excellent teacher were met.

The excellent teacher is sincerely interested in both the students and his subject matter. He has the knack of “getting his material across.” He is devoted to the persistent and patient search for truth, and is anxious to share his learning experiences with others. The first-rate professor has far more than the average ability and desire to communicate. He is excited about the why and how of many things.

An important part of the reward of an outstanding teacher is in the stimulation of the students’ intellectual curiosity, and the feeling that he has played a significant role in their resulting growth. Frequently, his approach is imaginative and sensitive. He expects and obtains a high level of accomplishment. This demands, among other things, ability on the instructor’s part to equitably evaluate the work of his students. His interest in them is further evidenced by a willingness to patiently discuss their problems with them. He is respected by his students and is esteemed by his colleagues for his knowledge, scholarship and intellectual integrity. Usually such a person is considered as an authority in his chosen field, and is so recognized by other authorities in that field.

In addition to the above attributes the Committee also took into account other scholarly and professional contributions of the nominee such as publications, consulting work in his field, activities in professional organizations, research, and public service. And finally, the recipient’s career was characterized by generous service to Tech.

In summary, the selection of the recipient was made on the basis of the individual as a whole.

The following rules were also drawn up and followed in making the selection:

1. The recipient had to be a full time member of the faculty actively engaged in teaching at the time that the selection was made.
2. Members of the administration were ineligible in spite of the fact that they had been members of the faculty in the past.
3. Heads of departments, unless they were carrying more than a half teaching load, in addition to their administrative duties, were ineligible.
4. Members of the Faculty Award Committee were ineligible.
5. Each member of the faculty was invited to submit one or more nominations.
6. Each member of the Committee was invited to submit one or more nominations.

*Organization of the Award Committee*  
(Committee on Governance, November 20, 1995)

The selection committee for the Trustees’ Award for Outstanding Teaching was established by recommendation of the Committee on Governance, November 20, 1995, as follows:

COG recommends to the Provost and the Trustees’ Committee on Academic Policy and Student Affairs the following composition for the award committee: five faculty, including the three most immediately prior recipients (if willing and able to serve); one faculty member nominated by COG from a slate selected by CAP, CSA [now CASL], and CGSR; and one faculty member nominated

by the Provost; five students, including four undergraduates nominated by SGA and one graduate student nominated by GSA. The faculty serve rolling three-year terms; the students one-year terms.

## **B. Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Scholarship**

### *Rules:*

1. The Selection Committee shall consist of the three most recent recipients of the awards, the Associate Provost and a person selected by the Committee on Graduate Studies & Research. The chair of the committee should be the award recipient serving the third year. If the committee cannot be wholly formed in this manner, then the Chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies and Research shall make appointments as necessary.
2. Except in most unusual circumstances, not more than one such award will be made per year. There is no requirement that the award be made each year.
3. The name of the nominee selected should be given to the Provost by March 28.
4. The recipient must be a member of the WPI faculty as defined in the Constitution of the WPI faculty.
5. Members of the Selection Committee and previous recipients of the award are ineligible.
6. Nominations may be submitted by members of the faculty, department heads, administrators, and students.
7. In the 2003-2004 academic year the recipient will be selected for creative scholarship for Engineering and Management; in 2004-2005 Natural, Computer and Mathematical Sciences; in 2005-2006, Humanities and Social Science; in 2006-2007, Engineering and Management; 2007-2008 Natural, Computer and Mathematical Sciences. This five-year cycle will start again in 2008-2009.
8. The award should be for continuing creative scholarship over at least a five-year period at WPI rather than for a particular single accomplishment, although naturally an individual brilliant accomplishment should be weighed by the Committee.
9. The Selection Committee will select the award recipient by considering the creative scholarship of the nominees. They may solicit scholarship materials from the nominators, nominees, department heads, or others as necessary. Such supporting materials should reflect a minimum five-year period at WPI.
10. Revisions of these rules may be initiated by the Selection Committee. Proposed changes will be submitted to the Provost.

Note 1: The Award is conferred for scholarship and research in a discipline regardless of the individual's department.

Note 2: The term "creative scholarship" encompasses creativity exemplified in works such as musical composition and poetry.

### **C. Board of Trustees' Award for Outstanding Academic Advising**

Resolution Re: Trustees' Award For Outstanding Academic Advising – February 2000

*Intention:*

In recognition of the important role that academic advisors play in guiding and mentoring students through states of professional and personal development, the WPI student chapter of Tau Beta Pi, the national engineering honor society, has for about 10 years presented an annual award for outstanding academic advising. This faculty member is selected based on input from the entire WPI student body.

The students of Tau Beta Pi, wishing to enhance the status and recognition of academic advising on the WPI campus, are requesting that the WPI Board of Trustees establish a WPI Trustees' Award for Outstanding Academic Advising, to be awarded at Faculty Convocation along with the current awards for outstanding teaching and outstanding creative scholarship. It is their hope that this award would gain the prestige already accorded to the existing two Trustees' Awards, and that it would carry the same monetary stipend. The faculty Committee on Advising and Student Life voted to endorse this recommendation at their meeting of January 26, 2000, and WPI's senior administration endorses that recommendation.

*Resolution:*

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees, upon the recommendation of the senior administration of WPI, hereby establishes the Trustees' Award for Outstanding Academic Advising to be presented annually and to carry with it a stipend equal to the then current stipends for the Trustees' Awards for outstanding teaching and outstanding creative scholarship.

### **D. Romeo L. Moruzzi Young Faculty Award for Innovation in Undergraduate Education**

Romeo Moruzzi grew up in the north end of Boston and served with the U.S. Air Force in Europe during World War II. After the war, he graduated from Northeastern, received his Master's Degree from Harvard and his Doctor of Engineering degree from Yale.

In 1954, after several years on the faculty of the University of Connecticut, he joined the Electrical Engineering Department of WPI. He set exceptionally high standards for his students while always concerned with their personal welfare. As the years went on, he served not only as a role model for his undergraduates, but a valued mentor to the younger faculty.

In the late 1960s, Romeo became a campus leader in two historic developments. Through his efforts, and at some risk to his own position he was the person primarily responsible for bringing tenure to the faculty of WPI. In 1969, he was one of the six faculty elected to the WPI Planning Committee which developed and promoted the famous "Two Towers" series. These documents revolutionized education at WPI, and in May 1970, they were accepted by the faculty for implementation as the WPI Plan.

Romeo retired from WPI in the late 1980s and passed away in 1993. It is in his memory that the Romeo L. Moruzzi Award has been established to recognize innovation in undergraduate education by a young faculty member. The Educational Development Council accepts nominations and selects the award winner on an annual basis.

## **E. Denise Nicoletti Trustees' Award for Service to Community**

(Approved by the Trustees, March 2, 2003)

**Award Title:** Denise Nicoletti Trustees' Award for Service to Community

### **Award Description:**

This award is in memory of Denise Nicoletti, a faculty member in Electrical and Computer Engineering from 1991-2002, whose passion for life and humanity touched many lives. The award is intended to keep her spirit alive in the WPI community.

The award consists of an engraved plaque and a check. At the initiation of the award the amount of the check is \$1500; this amount may increase commensurate with the other Trustee Awards.

### **Eligibility**

1. The award may be given annually to a faculty or staff member with a minimum of one year of full time or part time employment at WPI at the time of his/her nomination.
2. Previous award winners are not eligible.

### **Award Criteria**

1. The candidates for the award will be judged based on demonstrated passion and action in serving the needs of a community and genuine care for the enrichment of life for others. Service to WPI and other communities will be valued equally.
2. The service being evaluated for this award must go above and beyond the candidate's regular job description.
3. If there is no outstanding candidate in a given year, the award will not be given.
4. A maximum of one award may be made each year.

### **Nomination**

Candidates will be determined by an open nomination process. Anyone inside or outside WPI may submit nominations. Nominations must include:

- Name of the nominee.
- Name and contact information of the nominator (self-nominations are acceptable).
- The capacity in which the nominator has known the nominee, and the length of time.
- Description of the nominee's eligibility for the award (at least 1-2 paragraphs). Please provide whatever information you believe would be helpful to the committee.
- Names and contact information of others who would be familiar with the candidate's qualifications.

The committee may seek additional information from the nominator or others.

Nominations must be submitted to the President's Office or other designated location, with a target deadline of November 1 of each year, in hard copy or by email.

### **Selection Committee**

The selection committee will consist of:

- Two faculty members, to be selected by the Provost;
- Two staff members, to be selected by Assistant Vice President of Human Resources
- One graduate student, to be selected by the Graduate Student Organization;
- One undergraduate student, to be selected by the Student Government Association;



- At the committee's discretion, an additional member from outside the WPI community may be added;
- After the first year in which the award is given, the committee will also include the most recent available award winner. If no previous award winners are available to serve, the committee will consist of the persons listed above.

### **Presentation**

It is suggested that the current "Faculty Honors Convocation" be renamed "WPI Honors Convocation", be reorganized appropriately, and the presentation be made at that event.

### **The Spirit of Denise Nicoletti**

Professor Denise Nicoletti was a member of the WPI faculty from 1991 until July 22, 2002.

She was the first tenured female faculty member in the history of Electrical and Computer Engineering Department. During eleven years of association with WPI she made major contributions to knowledge in her discipline, brought the outside world of engineering into her classroom, and became a mentor and a role model for WPI female students as well as new faculty/staff. Such was her compassion and commitment to each student that she greatly aided the academic success of the first blind student who graduated in electrical engineering at WPI.

Among her many contributions to the local community were the dissemination of science knowledge among youngsters, and the encouragement of young girls to "think engineering," to aspire to become tomorrow's scientists and astronauts. This thrust culminated in the foundation of Camp Reach in 1996 and an NSF-funded project for developing pre-engineering curricula for grades K - 6.

All of her activities were marked by concern for the disadvantaged and for the student in trouble. She upheld high standards of fairness and ethical conduct, and she stood up for the rights of women on the WPI campus. She contributed broadly to the welfare of students and to the advancement of WPI, leaving an indelible mark with her teaching, advising and her humane attitude. She accomplished all these things within the context of her family and local community, being a mother, a wife, and an active member of her church congregation.

## 7. CATEGORIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS AT WPI \*

(Approved by the Faculty, March 22, 2012)

### A. The Role of the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

The tenured and tenure-track Faculty at WPI play the primary role in fulfilling the University's academic mission and in shaping and delivering WPI's academic programs. The tenured and tenure-track Faculty is distinct in that it shares in the governance of the University with the governing body and its appointed administrative officers.

### B. Categories of Non-Tenure Track Faculty and their Roles:

- Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Continuing non-tenure track faculty members are full-time employees of the University who are hired with the expectation that they will have significant and continuing academic responsibilities at WPI. Such faculty members may have a focus in either teaching or research, but they make a range of contributions, including different forms of service to the University. They are an integral part of the fabric of the campus.
- Adjunct Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Adjunct non-tenure track faculty are part-time employees of the University who play specific roles. Some adjunct faculty members develop long-term relationships with WPI and take on significant responsibilities. Other adjunct faculty members may be hired for a specific limited period of time with no expectations that they will take on significant ongoing responsibilities.

### C. Others with Teaching and Research Responsibilities at WPI:

- Visiting Faculty: Visiting faculty members are Assistant, Associate, or (full) Professors who are visiting *from* some other institution, for periods up to one full year. Appointment as a Visiting faculty member would not be made for other full-time non-tenure track appointments.
- Post-Doctoral Scholars: Postdoctoral scholars are individuals who have received a doctoral degree (or equivalent) and are engaged in a temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training to enhance the professional skills and research independence needed to pursue his or her chosen career path.

### D. Titles:

- **for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:** The titles for tenured and tenure-track faculty members are limited to Assistant, Associate and (full) Professor.
- **for Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty:**

Instructor/Lecturer; Senior Instructor/Lecturer; or Assistant, Associate, and (full) Teaching Professors: These are full time non-tenure track faculty members who are hired primarily to contribute to the teaching mission of WPI. The titles of Assistant, Associate, and (full) Teaching Professor will be awarded only to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with teaching credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank. Instructor and Lecturer are equivalent positions.

Assistant, Associate, and (full) Research Professors: These are full-time non-tenure track faculty members who are hired primarily to contribute to the research mission of WPI. These titles Assistant, Associate, and (full) Research Professor will be awarded only to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with research credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

Professors of Practice: These are full-time non-tenure track faculty members who, by virtue of their non-academic industry-related experiences, are hired to bring a unique, current area of expertise to teaching. This experience and expertise must be distinct from that which would be

brought by a conventional tenured or tenure-track faculty member and should be aligned with a specific institutional need or required area of expertise.

- **for Adjunct Non-Tenure Track Faculty:**

Adjunct Instructor/Lecturer; or Adjunct Teaching Professor: These are assigned to individuals hired on a part-time basis to contribute to the teaching mission of WPI. The title of Adjunct Teaching Professor will be made to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with teaching credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank. These are part-time non-tenure track faculty members who are hired primarily to contribute to the teaching mission of WPI.

**E. Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion Procedures for Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty:**

- For Instructor/Lecturer and Senior Instructor/Lecturer:

*Term(s) of Appointment:* Initial appointments at the Instructor/Lecturer or Senior Instructor/Lecturer will be for one-year terms. Subsequent appointments can be for one-, two-, or three-year terms. All appointments, regardless of their duration, will be reviewed on an annual basis.

*Initial Appointment:* The evaluation for initial appointment of an Instructor/Lecturer or a Senior Instructor/Lecturer will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director, Dean, and Provost. The candidates for these positions must have an advanced degree or its equivalent appropriate for the course(s) to be taught. In addition, the candidate must have some level of documented teaching experience appropriate for the course(s) to be taught.

*Evaluations:* After the initial appointment, the Instructor/Lecturer or Senior Instructor/Lecturer will have established a record of teaching at WPI. Continuing performance evaluations, based on course evaluations, project evaluations, and other relevant feedback, will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director (with input from departmental and/or program faculty members), the appropriate Dean, and the Provost on a year-by-year basis. These annual evaluations will include a written evaluation to be kept on file.

*Promotions:* Recommendations for promotion from Instructor/Lecturer to Senior Instructor/Lecturer or from Instructor/Lecturer (of either level) to Assistant Teaching Professor will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director (with input from departmental and/or program faculty members) and the appropriate Dean, and presented to the Provost for action. These recommendations will be made based on the evaluations accounting for course evaluations, project evaluations, and other relevant feedback. Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor will be made only to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with teaching credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

- For Assistant, Associate, or (full) Teaching Professor:

*Term(s) of Appointment:* Initial appointments of Assistant, Associate, or (full) Teaching Professors will be for one-year terms. Subsequent appointments can be for one-, two-, or three-year terms. All appointments, regardless of their duration, will be reviewed on an annual basis. Multi-year appointments may be shortened due to unforeseen changes in WPI's strategic needs. The titles of Assistant, Associate, and (full) Teaching Professor will be awarded only to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with teaching credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

*Initial Appointment:* The evaluation for the initial appointment of an Assistant, Associate, or (full) Teaching Professor will be made by a search committee consisting of a Department Head and/or Program Director and at least two tenured faculty members. This group could be the same as the Department's standing tenure committee. The initial appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors will require approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The initial appointment of Associate or (full) Teaching Professors will require both review by COAP and approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The candidate for an Assistant, Associate, or (full) Teaching Professor position should have both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and teaching credentials and accomplishments appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

*Evaluations:* After the initial appointment, the Assistant, Associate, or (full) Teaching Professors will have established a record of teaching at WPI. Continuing evaluation of teaching performance, based on course evaluations, project evaluations, and other relevant feedback, will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director, the appropriate Dean, and the Provost on a year-by-year basis. Annual performance evaluations will also take into consideration any other activities described in the official letter of appointment from the Provost. These annual evaluations will include a written evaluation to be kept on file.

*Promotions:* Recommendations for promotion to the Associate and (full) Teaching Professors level will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director (with input from departmental and/or program faculty members) and the appropriate Dean, reviewed by COAP, and then passed to the Provost for action. The standards used to grant these promotions should be identical (with respect to teaching performance and credentials) as those used in the corresponding promotions of the tenured faculty (see Section 7F).

- For Assistant, Associate, or (full) Research Professors:

*Term(s) of Appointment:* Terms of appointments of Assistant, Associate, or (full) Research Professors are negotiated on a case-by-case basis with one- or two-year appointments the most common. The titles of Assistant, Associate, and (full) Research Professor will be awarded only to those individuals with both a Ph.D. degree (and the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and with research credentials appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

*Initial Appointment:* The evaluation for the initial appointment of an Assistant, Associate, or (Full) Research Professor will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director, and members of the WPI Faculty whose research is most relevant to the work to be done by the candidate. The initial appointment of an Assistant Research Professor will require approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The initial appointment of Associate or (full) Research Professors will require both review by COAP and approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The candidate for an Assistant, Associate, or (full) Research Professor position should have both a Ph.D. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and research credentials and accomplishments appropriate to the corresponding tenured or tenure-track rank.

*Evaluations:* After the initial appointment, the Assistant, Associate, or (full) Research Professors will have established a record of research at WPI. Continuing performance evaluations, based primarily on research accomplishments at WPI, will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director, members of the WPI Faculty whose research is most relevant to the work done by the candidate, the appropriate Dean, and the Provost on a year-by-year basis. Annual performance evaluations will also take into consideration any other activities described in the official letter of appointment from the Provost. These annual evaluations will include a written evaluation to be kept on file.

*Promotions:* Recommendations for promotion to the Associate and (full) Research Professor level will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director (with input from members of the WPI Faculty whose research is most relevant to the work done by the candidate and from other departmental faculty members as is appropriate) and the appropriate Dean, reviewed by COAP, and then passed on to the Provost for action. The standards used to grant these promotions should be identical (with respect to research performance and credentials) as those used in the corresponding promotions of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members (see Section 7F).

- For Professors of Practice:

*Term(s) of Appointment:* Initial appointments of Professors of Practice will be for a maximum of five years. All appointments, regardless of their duration, will be reviewed on an annual basis. Multi-year appointments may be shortened due to changes in WPI's strategic needs.

Professors of Practice are full-time non-tenure track faculty members who, by virtue of their non-academic industry-related experiences, are hired to bring a unique, current area of expertise to teaching. This experience and expertise must be distinct from that which would be brought by a conventional tenured or tenure-track faculty member and should be aligned with a specific institutional need or required area of expertise.

After five years at WPI, if the Professor of Practice has maintained significant relevant currency within the field, has demonstrated high quality performance at WPI, and there remains a strong continued institutional need that still cannot be filled by hiring a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, then a Professor of Practice may receive an additional appointment (reviewed annually) for a maximum of three years. Multi-year appointments may be shortened due to changes in WPI's strategic needs. Subsequent (maximum) three-year appointments can be made under the same circumstances as the first three-year appointment. Such appointments may be shortened due to changes in WPI's strategic needs.

*Initial Appointment:* The evaluation for the initial appointment of a Professor of Practice will be made by a search committee consisting of a Department Head and/or Program Director and at least two tenured faculty members. This group could be the same as the Department's standing tenure committee. The initial appointments of Professors of Practice will require both review by COAP and approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The candidate for Professor of Practice should, by virtue of his or her non-academic industry-related experiences, bring a unique current area of expertise to teaching. This experience and expertise must be distinct from that which would be brought by a conventional tenured or tenure-track faculty member and should be aligned with a specific institutional need or required area of expertise. The review by COAP should be based on the extent to which these criteria are met, and on the quality of the candidate's experience to date.

*Evaluations:* After the first year at WPI, the Professor of Practice will have established a record of teaching at WPI. Annual evaluations will include assessment of high quality teaching (based on course evaluations, project evaluations, and other relevant feedback) and documented evidence that the Professor of Practice has maintained significant relevant currency in the field. These evaluations will be made by the Department Head and/or Program Director, the appropriate Dean, and the Provost, and will also take into consideration any other activities described in the official letter of appointment from the Provost. These annual evaluations will include a written evaluation to be kept on file.

*Appointments beyond five years:* After five years, the Department Head and/or Program Director (with input from members of the department and/or program and the appropriate Dean) may recommend that a Professor of Practice receive subsequent (maximum) three-year appointments,

to be reviewed annually subjected to the annual evaluations described above. These three-year appointments are to be reviewed by COAP and passed on to the Provost for action. The Professor of Practice to be reappointed, should by virtue of his or her non-academic industry-related experiences, continue to bring a unique current area of expertise to teaching. This experience and expertise must be distinct from that which would be brought by a conventional tenured or tenure-track faculty member and should be aligned with a specific institutional need or required area of expertise. The review by COAP should be based on the extent to which these reappointment criteria are met, on the quality of teaching performance (and of any other activities described in previous appointment letters) at WPI, and on documented evidence that the Professor of Practice has maintained significant relevant currency in the field (see Section 7F). These appointments are contingent on a continued institutional need for the Professor's of Practice specific area of expertise. Any multi-year appointments may be shortened due to changes in WPI's strategic needs.

**F. Criteria for promotion to the indicated non-tenure track ranks:**

(Approved by the Faculty, April 17, 2014)

- **Assistant Teaching Professor** The candidate for promotion to assistant teaching professor must possess a PhD. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and have demonstrated effective teaching ability.
- **Associate Teaching Professor** The candidate for promotion to associate teaching professor must have completed at least three years as an assistant teaching professor, and will normally have completed at least five years. The candidate must have exhibited high quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate). High quality teaching can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): course evaluations; faculty peer evaluations; evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum, and graduate student work; freshman advising, academic advising; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).
- **(Full) Teaching Professor** To be considered for promotion to teaching professor, an associate teaching professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth and development of qualities of leadership. This usually requires at least five years as an associate teaching professor. The candidate must have recent accomplishments of high quality in teaching as well as demonstrated leadership in some aspect of teaching. This leadership must be recognized by peers within WPI, and acknowledgement by external peers would be viewed favorably. High quality teaching can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): course evaluations; faculty peer evaluations; evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum, and graduate student work; freshman advising, and academic advising; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses. In evaluating teaching qualifications, the Committee on Appointments and Promotions will consider innovations in teaching and adaptability to the needs of WPI, effectiveness as measured by students, alumni, and colleagues, and the candidate's overall impact and importance in WPI academic programs. Leadership accomplishments in teaching may be demonstrated by some or all of the following: exceptionally high quality teaching that serves as a model for others, development of new courses or other academic activities such as project experiences, leadership in curricular

revisions or other academic initiatives within WPI, leadership of teaching and learning related grant proposals and funded projects, publications and presentations related to teaching, and leadership roles in appropriate professional organizations. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

- **Associate Research Professor** The candidate for promotion to associate research professor must have completed at least three years as an assistant research professor, and will normally have completed at least five years. The candidate must have exhibited high quality scholarship. High quality scholarship can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, conference papers, and/or book chapters; books; exhibitions, and performances; professional awards; citations in the professional literature; presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals and grants awarded; offices held in professional societies; journal editorships; reviews of papers and proposals; and patents. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (such as faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).
- **(Full) Research Professor** To be considered for promotion to research professor, an associate research professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth and development of qualities of leadership. This usually requires at least five years as an associate research professor. The candidate must have recent accomplishments of high quality and demonstrated leadership in scholarship/creativity. This leadership must be recognized by peers within WPI, and by knowledgeable people outside WPI. Scholarship and/or creativity can take many forms. It may be demonstrated, for example, by publications in respected research or scholarly journals, by non-routine presentations at meetings of professional or scholarly societies or at seminars at other colleges, or by authorship of well-regarded textbooks or monographs. Creativity may be shown, for example, by applying knowledge as a consultant or inventor, and through artistic publications, exhibitions, or productions. In evaluating this activity, the Committee will consider how it is regarded by knowledgeable peers. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

**G. Criteria for re-appointment as Professor of Practice** The candidate for re-appointment as Professor of Practice must demonstrate that he/she continues to bring a unique current area of expertise, by virtue of non-academic industry-related experiences, in an area of institutional need, to teaching, and that his/her teaching performance is of high quality. The professional expertise and continued currency in the field must be supported by documented evidence, such as by reviews from knowledgeable persons external to WPI. Appropriate activities could include such industry-related experiences as summer or part-time positions, production of commercial designs or other artifacts, consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance,

leadership positions in recognized professional societies, relevant, active service on boards of directors, documented continuing professional education experiences, scholarly or professional publications or presentations, and significant participation in professional conferences.