

COCIS Operating Procedures

Table of Contents

I. Purpose of Operating Procedures	2
II. Mission, Vision, and Values	2
III. College Structure, Leadership, and Meetings	3
IV. Governance and Voting Policies	6
V. Faculty Appointments and Hiring	7
VI. Development, Promotion, and Tenure	7
VII. Faculty Workload	14
VIII. Faculty Expectations, Reviews, and Professional Development	16
IX. Programs, Curriculum, and Policies	21

COCIS Operating Procedures

Adopted by a vote of the faculty October 15, 2020

I. Purpose of Operating Procedures

(*cf. IG Section 1.4.B*)

These Operating Procedures (OPs) operationalize the governance, administrative structure, roles and responsibilities, and academic processes of the College. These procedures are subordinate to the University Implementation Guidelines, the Faculty Policy Manual, University policies, and state and federal regulations. In cases where an apparent conflict arises, those documents supersede the Operating Procedures in all cases. The processes laid out in this document shall be followed to the extent reasonable and possible with good faith by both faculty and administration.

The OPs shall be adopted and revised by a vote of the College faculty, with a two-thirds supermajority within each academic unit. This is required for both adoption and revision, as specified in Section IV of this document. Regardless of the outcome of a faculty vote, the OPs shall not take effect and become valid until they have been approved by the Dean and the Provost. The OPs shall be revisited and reaffirmed annually, as outlined in Section IV.

All prior Implementation Guidelines within the individual academic units of the College are null and void. Academic units within the College may develop and adopt their own Working Processes (WP) documents to supplement the College OPs; however, unit-level WPs must be approved by the academic unit Director and the Dean, and may not conflict with the College OPs.

These OPs were adopted by the COCIS faculty on October 15, 2020, approved by the Dean on October 15, 2020, and approved by the Provost on October 15, 2020.

II. Mission, Vision, and Values

Adopted by a vote of the faculty on May 8, 2020.

Mission. The College of Organizational, Computational, and Information Sciences at Simmons University integrates the disciplines of business, computing, mathematical, information, and library sciences, cultivating achievement and mastery through the creation, exploration, preservation, synthesis, and dissemination of knowledge. Our community of educators and learners is committed to the intellectual, personal, and professional growth and creative expression of our students, faculty, and staff. We nurture a supportive and collaborative environment by embracing the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion, developing the next generation of critical thinkers, problem solvers, and principled leaders who can solve the global challenges of the 21st century.

Vision. COCIS will address global challenges facing society by applying data, information, and computation to innovate, collaborate, transform organizations, and increase the common good. Our highly collaborative, cross-disciplinary environment will nurture emerging leaders who are dedicated to making

a difference in the world by understanding and leveraging the interrelatedness of information, people, and the world around us.

Values. The core values by which COCIS prioritizes and guides the implementation of its mission and vision are:

- Creativity and Innovation
- Respect and Compassion
- Excellence and Achievement
- Diversity and Equity
- Integrity and Authenticity
- Teamwork and Collaboration

III. College Structure, Leadership, and Meetings

The College consists of three academic units: the Division of Mathematics, Computing, and Statistics; the School of Business; and the School of Library and Information Science. Each of these units is headed by a Director, who is appointed by the Dean (with approval by the Provost) through an internal or external search that includes faculty input and consultation. The School and Division Directors are the *academic unit heads* referred to in the University Implementation Guidelines,¹ and are referred to as *academic unit Directors* throughout this document. The Dean shall provide and maintain an updated description of the responsibilities of academic unit Directors. (Refer to: “COCIS Academic Unit Director Responsibilities.”)

Each academic unit includes academic offerings that may include graduate and/or undergraduate programs, concentrations, or tracks. These academic offerings are overseen by Program/Track/Concentration Directors or Leads. By default, the academic unit Director serves as the head for any program or may delegate this responsibility to an appointed faculty member, through an open and transparent process. Program/Track/Concentration Director/Lead positions may (but do not always) carry a course release or additional compensation stipend, depending on the specific responsibilities and program. Each academic unit shall provide and maintain updated descriptions of the responsibilities of the heads of their academic offerings, as well as any other faculty administrative position that carries either a course release or an additional compensation stipend. All course releases and additional compensation must be approved by the Dean and the Provost.

COCIS Secretary and Parliamentarian

The COCIS Faculty Secretary is elected at the first Fall meeting for a one-year term. The Secretary facilitates elections for COCIS positions and for elected Faculty Senate positions that are held by members of COCIS. Responsibilities of the Secretary include:

- Verify the list of voting faculty and maintain the list over the course of the academic year.
- Ensure that election procedures as established elsewhere in this document are followed.

The COCIS Parliamentarian is elected at the first Fall meeting for a one-year term. The Parliamentarian oversees parliamentary procedures, particularly discussion and voting during meetings. The Parliamentarian is expected to have a basic understanding of Robert’s Rules of Order.

¹ [Implementation Guidelines, v2020.1.3, p. 1.](#)

COCIS Faculty Senators

(See Faculty Senate Bylaws for additional information.)

COCIS elects three Faculty Senators, each of whom serves a staggered three-year term. These Senators must hold a primary appointment in one of the academic units within COCIS. Senators are nominated and elected by COCIS faculty; elections are conducted by the Simmons Faculty Senate.

General duties include:

- COCIS Senators represent the faculty of the College at all meetings, discussions, and votes of the Faculty Senate.
- COCIS Senators keep the faculty of the College informed regarding the work of the Senate by reporting at both COCIS and academic unit faculty meetings and via email as needed.

Academic Leadership Team

The Academic Leadership Team (ALT) shall be composed of one elected faculty representative from each of the academic units, the Dean, and the academic unit Directors. The Director of Operations shall participate on the ALT as an *ex officio* member with voice but no vote. The ALT's responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- Collaboratively build the agenda of the COCIS faculty meetings.
- Facilitate COCIS meetings and work with the Dean's office to finalize and distribute meeting agendas and minutes.
- Support College-level decision making through formal and informal input to the Dean.
- Preserve the confidentiality of sensitive discussions that occur within ALT meetings.
- Bring additional faculty voices into ALT's decision making and information sharing processes.
- Work collaboratively within ALT to grow the COCIS culture, including a continuous refinement of OPs, celebration of accomplishments, and social events.
- Facilitate faculty elections for representation on Simmons-wide committees, ensuring that Simmons faculty are nominated for appropriate Simmons-wide committees, such as Ad Board and Honor Board, for which COCIS must/may have representation as detailed by the FPM.
- Support the Dean's process of including faculty feedback in staff performance reviews.

College-Level Meetings

During the academic year, the Dean shall schedule regular meetings with the faculty, typically monthly, following the university-wide meeting calendar. The College-level meetings shall follow Robert's Rules of Order. All voting faculty members, Directors, and the Dean are invited to attend these meetings. Staff, adjunct faculty, and guests may attend at the invitation of the Dean and/or ALT. During a College meeting, the faculty may elect to move into Executive Session by a vote of 2/3 of the voting faculty. Executive session includes only the voting faculty^[SEP.]. The Academic Leadership Team shall collaboratively determine the agenda for these meetings, focusing on issues that impact the full college, including:

- Discussion of College-wide decisions and issues.
- Updates on University-wide strategy and operations.
- Votes affecting COCIS, including adoption and revision of OPs.
- Senate work; votes for Senate representation and other Simmons-wide committees.
- Work on synergies and college-wide strategies.

- Diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts.
- College-wide strategy, mission, vision, and values.
- Fostering college-wide culture through social events, celebration of achievements, sharing of accomplishments.
- Appointment of COCIS Secretary, Parliamentarian, and committee members.
- Discussion of budgets (to encourage transparency, the Dean shall discuss budgets and gather recommendations from faculty twice annually).

COCIS academic units and programs shall hold regular faculty meetings. Academic unit meetings shall address issues including, but not limited to:

- Strategic directions.
- Division/school-level mission and vision.
- Assessment plans and procedures.
- Development and approval of academic student policies.
- Votes on curriculum and granting of degrees.
- To encourage transparency, on a regular basis, the academic unit Directors shall share budget considerations and solicit input.
- Establishment and updating of academic unit WPs.

COCIS Committees

Committees at the College level include the Technology Committee, the Awards Committee (to encourage and facilitate nominations for internal and external faculty recognitions), and the College Contract Promotion Committee (see Section VI).

Each academic unit shall establish a Curriculum Committee and a Mentoring, Development, and Review Committee (see Section VI). Schools and Divisions may have additional committees as appropriate for the particular academic unit. The composition and operation of these committees shall be established by the academic unit's WPs.

If not otherwise specified in these OPs or in the academic units' WPs, the chairs and members of College- and School/Division-level committees shall be appointed by the Dean or academic unit Director, respectively, with faculty input.

Ad hoc committees may be created by Deans, academic unit Directors, or faculty as the need arises.

COCIS Technology Committee Charter

Adopted by a vote of the faculty on October 16, 2019.

The COCIS Technology Committee (CTC) will advocate for students, faculty, and staff technology needs within COCIS, and will work to advise the Dean and other stakeholders on technology-related needs within the College. The CTC will provide a central location where COCIS faculty and staff can share their technology-related needs both in and out of the classroom. CTC will maintain an ongoing dialog with the Dean, Simmons Technology, the Simmons-wide Academic Technology Committee, and the faculty, staff, and students of COCIS. CTC will assess needs and develop proposals for technology

initiatives that support COCIS, provide guidance and advice as new projects are considered, and facilitate communication among stakeholders.

Composition. The CTC will be composed of at least three and no more than seven faculty members and will include at least one representative from each of the three academic Divisions of the College. The Dean will appoint committee members each Fall, or as needed, after soliciting nominations from the faculty (which may include self-nominations). The committee chair will be elected by a vote of the committee members. The COCIS Technology Manager will be an *ex officio* member, with voice and vote.

IV. Governance and Voting Policies

Voting Eligibility

All full-time and proportional (50% or greater) COCIS faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, contract faculty, and academic unit Directors regardless of appointment status) are eligible to vote on College-level issues. Faculty on sabbatical or leave are eligible to participate, but if they do not participate, they shall not be counted against the quorum requirements. Visiting faculty, research faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff are not eligible to vote. The Dean is not eligible to vote. Policies that have implications for academic unit or College-level resources are subject to approval by the academic unit Director and Dean.

Voting Procedures

Votes may be held synchronously or asynchronously. Adoption of OPs shall be voted on only by secret ballot. Other votes may be held by “show of hands” or through non-anonymous email votes, unless any eligible voting member requests a secret ballot, in which case a secret ballot will be used. Secret balloting may be accomplished via paper ballots or anonymized electronic voting. In the case that eligible faculty members are participating remotely during a synchronous secret ballot, they may cast their votes by notifying a designated staff member, who will prepare the paper ballot according to their instructions. Such voting shall not be construed as proxy voting.

Quorum

If the number of eligible voting members is odd, a quorum shall consist of half of those eligible to vote, rounded up to the nearest whole number. If the number of eligible voting members is even, a quorum shall consist of half plus one. Faculty on sabbatical or leave who choose not to participate shall not be counted against the quorum (i.e., they shall not be included in the number of eligible voting members when determining the size of the quorum). No in-person vote shall be held unless a quorum is present. Eligible voting members who are virtually present at an in-person meeting shall be given the opportunity to vote. No electronic vote shall be deemed valid unless a quorum has cast a vote.

Proxy Voting

Proxy voting shall not be permitted under any circumstances.

Voting Results

The initial vote regarding the adoption of the OPs will be considered to pass only if (a) there is a participating quorum at the College level and (b) two-thirds (rounding down) of those voting in each

academic unit vote for adoption. All other votes (including annual reaffirmation and/or revision of OPs) shall pass if a simple majority of those voting are in favor of the resolution.

Operating Procedures

The COCIS OPs shall be revised or reaffirmed annually, with a review period announced at the March meeting, and a vote for revision or reaffirmation at the May COCIS meeting. In the event that the OPs are not reaffirmed, a working group shall be formed to identify specific concerns and to develop a proposed revision. The working group should include both supporting and dissenting faculty. A negative vote on reaffirmation notwithstanding, the OPs once adopted shall remain in force until revised a majority of voting eligible faculty.

Advance Notice

Proposals for changes in policies or other significant initiatives requiring a vote will be circulated electronically at least one week ahead of the planned vote.

V. Faculty Appointments and Hiring

(*cf. IG Section 2.1.E*)

In appointing academic unit Directors, the following practices shall be followed:

- For external searches, the search committee shall include faculty representation from the academic unit and will normally invite at least three candidates to visit campus.
- For any opening, internal candidates will be solicited and considered. If internal candidates apply, faculty will provide input as they do for external candidates.
- Faculty will have the opportunity to meet the finalist candidates (internal and external) and to provide feedback on each candidate to the search committee and to the Dean.

For all tenure-stream positions, the academic unit Director will appoint a search committee chair (with the Dean's approval), and the academic unit Director and Chair will populate the committee. Contract faculty positions may use a similar search committee process, or may follow a more streamlined process, as deemed necessary by the Dean or academic unit Director in consultation with the faculty.

The Dean shall develop, circulate, and maintain a comprehensive faculty search process document that includes faculty input and that follows best practices for equitable hiring.

VI. Review, Promotion, and Tenure

(*cf. IG Sections 2.5 and 2.6*)

The procedures in this section are intended to clarify and instantiate the general procedures laid out in the IGs. Specific dates that are set by the IGs are marked with an asterisk (*); additional dates that are internal to COCIS are marked with a caret (^). In the rare cases where an earlier date is set by the COCIS OPs than specified in the IGs, both dates are shown.

Although the annual faculty reviews are part of promotion and tenure dossiers, in COCIS, the ratings in those annual reviews should not themselves be used as direct or sole evidence of performance level.

Rather, the other evidence in the dossier (course evaluations, peer evaluations, evidence of scholarship, etc.) should be evaluated as a whole at the time of promotion and/or tenure.

Student course evaluations are used in COCIS as a component of overall teaching evaluations, along with evaluative peer observations and other qualitative and quantitative measures as established by the academic unit's WPs. To ensure a reasonable sample size, course evaluations shall be used only when there are four or more responses. In addition to the factors listed in the IGs ([section 2.5.C.1](#)) such as possible bias, level of course difficulty, and baselining against comparable courses, evaluations of teaching performance should take into account the overall course load (number of students and course preparations), sample size, and response rate in student course evaluations, as well as measures of improvement or consistency of quality over time.

Mentoring, Development, and Review Committees

Each academic unit shall establish a standing Committee for Mentoring, Development, and Review (MDR) that oversees the processes of faculty review, promotion, and tenure, as well as mentoring and development of faculty. Each MDR committee shall ordinarily be composed of 1-3 tenured faculty members. The process for selecting members and specific MDR responsibilities may vary among academic units and shall be established by the WPs of the respective unit. (In some smaller units, the MDR role may be held by the academic unit Director as a "committee of one.")

The roles of the MDR include:

- Ensuring that all new faculty (tenure-track faculty and contract faculty in the first three years of their appointment) are assigned mentors, and that mentoring expectations are established and periodically reviewed.
- Supporting the professional development and ongoing mentoring of Associate Professors in their progression towards promotion to full Professor.
- Overseeing the tenure-stream faculty review process, including mid-point reviews, promotion and tenure, tenure, and PDMYR processes.
- Suggesting Local Promotion and Tenure Committee members for each tenure-stream candidate for promotion and/or tenure, in consultation with the academic unit Director (see below).
- Establishing Midpoint Review Committees for each tenure-stream faculty member.
- Ensuring that periodic peer evaluations are scheduled and completed, and that peer evaluation records are made available as needed in the faculty review and promotion process.
- Ensuring that adjunct faculty are periodically reviewed.

Local Promotion and Tenure (LPTC) / Mid-Point Review (MPRC) Committees

An LPTC shall be established for each candidate for promotion and tenure, during the spring semester preceding the review year ([IG 2.5.A.1.b](#)). An MPRC shall be established for each candidate for mid-point review, during the spring semester of the review year ([IG 2.6.A.2](#)). The MDR shall propose members for each LPTC/MPRC, following IG criteria, and the Dean shall appoint the final committee members in light of these recommendations, and in consultation with the Director. As specified in the IGs, academic unit heads with full-time administrative appointments are not eligible to serve on LPTCs or MPRCs ([IG 2.5.A.1.b](#) and [IG 2.6.A.2](#)). In COCIS specifically, the SLIS Director (who holds a full-time administrative appointment) may not serve on an LPTC/MPRC; however, the MCS and B-school Directors (who carry part-time administrative appointments and also serve as regular faculty members in the academic units)

are eligible to serve on LPTCs/MPRCs. In addition, in COCIS, at least one member of any LPTC or MPRC should be suggested based on their familiarity with the candidate's research area. Other members shall be recommended using a process established by the academic unit's WPs.

Process and Timeline for Mid-Point Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty

This review includes an assessment of the faculty member in light of the Criteria for Promotion and Tenure as established by the University. An assessment of the faculty member's demonstrated capacity to develop and grow sufficiently is required to satisfy the Criteria for Promotion and Tenure as generally applied to tenure candidates ([IG 2.6.A.2](#)).

Steps marked * are specified by the IGs. Items marked ^ are additional or revised steps within COCIS.

Year Prior to Midpoint Review

- *March 15 (prior year): Dean reminds faculty who are scheduled for mid-point review in the following year.
- ^July 1 (prior year): To facilitate the process, the Dean's office establishes an initial folder for the candidates containing:
 - a. Copies of annual reviews for all years of service;
 - b. Course evaluation reports for all years of service;
 - c. List of courses taught, with enrollment numbers, for all years of service.This folder shall be updated as new courses and evaluations become available.

Year of Midpoint Review

Several of the steps are moved earlier in the timeline to facilitate the overall work of the College: specifically, MPRCs are formed in September

- September: The MDR notifies the academic unit Director and Dean of any potential committee members whose home appointment is outside COCIS, to permit coordination of service load balancing across the Colleges. In these cases, the Dean will inform the MDR in a timely fashion whether the service of these outside committee members has been approved by the home College.
- ^September 1: The MDR forwards proposed committee members to the academic unit Director for approval.
- ^September 15: The academic unit Director forwards the approved committee member recommendations to the Dean and to the candidate.
- ^September 20: The Dean verifies the participation of all committee members (including those whose home appointment is outside the academic unit), finalizes the committee, and notifies the MDR, academic unit Director, and candidate of the committee members.
- ^September 30 [this deadline is *April 30 in the IGs]: MPRCs formed by academic unit Directors, in consultation with appropriate faculty and approval of Dean. The members of the committee elect their chair ([IG 2.5.A.1.b](#)).
- *May 31: Candidate submits midpoint review dossier.
- *June 15: MPRC submits letter to Dean.
- *After June 15: Dean meets with academic unit Directors; incorporates their perspectives in recommendations.

- *No later than September 15: Dean meets with the candidate to discuss the candidate’s dossier, recommendations, and implementation plan.
- *October 15: Dean forwards recommendations to candidate and Provost.

Local Promotion and Tenure Committee

The timeline for the process of establishing LPTCs within COCIS is as follows ([IG 2.5.F.1](#)):

Year prior to promotion and tenure evaluation year:

- *September 30: The Dean notifies candidates of their eligibility to apply for promotion (to Associate Professor) and tenure.
- *March 1: Candidates notify the Dean of their intention to apply for tenure and/or promotion (to Associate Professor or full Professor).
- *March 15: The Dean’s office notifies the UPTC and Provost of all candidates in the College for tenure and/or promotion to Associate or full Professor.
- *April 1: The Dean notifies academic units that an LPTC needs to be formed for each candidate.
- ^Between April 1 and April 30, working in close collaboration:
 - The MDR notifies the academic unit Director and Dean of any potential committee members whose home appointments are outside COCIS, to permit coordination of service load balancing across the Colleges. In these cases, the Dean will inform the MDR in a timely fashion whether the service of these outside committee members has been approved by the home College.
 - The MDR forwards proposed committee members to the academic unit Director for approval.
 - The academic unit Director forwards the approved committee member recommendations to the Dean and to the candidate.
 - The Dean verifies the participation of all committee members (including those whose home appointment is outside the academic unit), finalizes the committee, and notifies the MDR, academic unit Director, and candidate of the committee members.
- ^April 30: The LPTC is finalized, and the members of the committee elect their chair ([IG 2.5.A.1.b](#)).
- *By May 1: The Provost and the Chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) meet with candidates and LPTC chairs to discuss the process.
- *By May 1: The Provost and the Chair of the UPTC meet with all candidates for tenure and/or promotion.
- *By May 1: All candidates inform the Dean whether they want to be notified at each step of the P&T process.
- ^By May 1: The COCIS Operations Specialist creates a standard template on Google Drive for the candidate’s P&T materials: a Research Folder structure and a Dossier structure. The candidate uploads their materials directly into this folder.
- *By May 15: LPTC Chair and candidate recommend names of external reviewers to the Dean, including information specified in “External Reviewers,” below. *Neither the candidate nor any*

member of the LPTC should contact any of the proposed external reviewers at any point during this process, nor should the names be shared with anyone who is not on the committee.

- *By May 31: The Dean contacts (or delegates the appropriate academic unit Director to contact) potential external reviewers and secures at least three and no more than five external reviewers. Typically the Dean will secure five external reviewers at this time, to ensure sufficient letters in case a reviewer later becomes unresponsive.
- *By June 1: The candidate notifies the COCIS Operations Specialist when their Research Folder has been finalized. The OS removes the candidate from the folder permissions and creates a unique copy of the Research Folder to be accessed by each of the external reviewers, maintaining confidentiality of materials and reviewer names at all times.
- *By June 15 (or as external reviewers agree to serve): The Dean's office provides access to the Research Folder to each external reviewer and to the LPTC.
- *By June 15: The Dean's office creates the Dossier Folder structure (with a subfolder for each of the elements specified in [IG 2.5.F.1](#)) and uploads the Personal Data Sheet template, course evaluations (for all courses with four or more responses) and enrollments, and faculty annual reviews (since date of hire (tenure candidates) or for the past six years (full professor candidates)) into the Dossier Folder.

In the evaluation year:

- *By September 1: Candidate notifies the Operations Specialist that their electronic Dossier Folder is complete. The OS removes the candidate from the folder permissions, and provides access to the Dossier Folder and the Review Folder to the Dean, LPTC chair and members, and eligible voting faculty (tenured faculty in the home academic unit at or above the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion). External letters are added to the Review Folder only after the candidate's access has been removed. *All individuals who have access to these materials are expected to maintain complete confidentiality. Materials should be accessed through the Google Drive folder and not downloaded to individual computers.*
- ^Between September 1 and October 1: Working with the LPTC, the Dean's office establishes a mechanism for all eligible voting faculty to provide input regarding the candidate's case (in written form and/or during a meeting of the LPTC and eligible voting faculty). The Dean's office also provides a mechanism for eligible faculty to vote on the disposition of the case. The ballot should include four separate votes: Teaching, Research, Service (Excellent, Strong, or Not Strong), and Overall (Recommend tenure/promotion or Do Not Recommend tenure/promotion). The result of the balloting should be provided in a summary (anonymous) to the LPTC chair and to the Dean. The faculty input should be used to inform the LPTC final recommendation, and the LPTC's letter should include the result of the faculty ballot.
- *By October 1: LPTC Chair uploads the LPTC review and recommendation to the Review Folder and notifies the Dean that their work has been completed. The Operations Specialist updates the permissions on the Dossier Folder and Review Folder to remove all access other than the Dean and academic unit Director, then shares both the Review Folder and Dossier Folder with the UPTC.
- *By November 30: The UPTC Chair uploads their review and recommendation to the Review Folder.

- *By December 31: The Dean uploads their review and recommendation to the Review Folder and shares the Review Folder and Dossier Folder with the Provost. In preparing their recommendation, the Dean shall seek and consider the input of the School/College Director.^[P SEP]
- ^February: Following the vote of the Board, the Operations Specialist archives all materials to the O-drive, following COCIS archival practices, and destroys the Google Drive folders (Research Folder, Dossier Folder, Review Folder, and all associated materials).

External Reviewers

External reviewers for tenure and promotion to Associate or full Professor are selected by the Dean with input from both the candidate and the LPTC. No later than May 15 in the year prior to the review year, each candidate and the chair of each LPTC shall provide the Dean with a list of 5-8 proposed external reviewers, along with the following information for each name on the list:

- The proposed reviewer's name, institution, academic unit, and faculty rank;
- A description of why they are an appropriate reviewer (in terms of research area and expertise);
- An affirmation that the reviewer has no known conflict of interest (direct connection to the candidate or other disqualification);
- The reviewer's curriculum vitae and/or webpage;
- The reviewer's contact information (e-mail address).

Neither the candidate nor any committee member should contact the potential reviewers about the letter writing process, nor should they share any potential reviewer names with individuals outside of the committee. After consulting with the academic unit Director and the LPTC Chair, the Dean determines which reviewers to invite, following these principles:

- At least one external reviewer should be from the candidate's list and at least one reviewer should be from the LPTC's list (not counting reviewers that appear on both lists).
- If the candidate's research spans multiple areas, then to the extent possible, the external reviewers should provide coverage of those areas.
- External reviewers should be given access to candidate Research Folders by June 15. Letters from external reviewers are due by September 1.

In general, the Dean invites the external reviewers, but if appropriate, the Dean may request that the academic unit Director participate in the invitation process.

Research Folder Preparation

While each candidate has flexibility in what they include in the Research Folder's "Evidence of Achievement," candidates are encouraged to include a representative sample of 3-5 selected publications that were published during the review period (typically since hire, for candidates for promotion and tenure; and since the time of tenure, for candidates for full Professor). The Research Statement should articulate why these publications best represent the scope of the candidate's work and the impact that it has had on the field. External reviewers are not expected or asked to read all of the candidate's publications, so this selection of publications and accompanying narrative are essential to put the candidate's work in context.

Dossier Preparation

Materials for the electronic *Dossier Folder* for tenure and/or promotion will be provided by the candidate and uploaded into a folder created by the Dean's office, using a template based on the standard structure that is specified by the IGs. The dossier is due from the candidate to the Dean on September 1.

By June 15 prior to the review year, the dean's office will share with candidates the following materials: annual reviews, course evaluations (including average scores), and course enrollments.

College Contract Promotion Committee (CCPC)

The IGs state: "A College Contract Promotion Committee (CCPC) shall be created for the contract faculty being considered for promotion each year. The CCPC shall be composed of tenure stream and contract faculty members (at or above the rank to which promotion is being considered) and include faculty from candidates' academic units."

In COCIS, the CCPC consists of three to five members, including one faculty member from each unit, and up to two additional at-large members. Ordinarily, the committee should include at least one tenured faculty member and at least one contract faculty member; the other committee members may be tenure-stream faculty (at the rank of Associate or full Professor) or contract faculty (at the Associate or full rank) with full-time or proportional appointments. Committee members shall serve two-year terms, staggered to ensure continuity. When a vacancy occurs, the COCIS Secretary shall solicit nominations from the faculty, academic unit Director(s), and Dean, and shall hold a timely election (electronically or in person at a COCIS or academic unit meeting). Typically, these vacancies should be filled near the end of the academic year.

Any member of the CCPC who is undergoing promotion review shall recuse themselves from consideration of their own case. If a candidate is under consideration for a rank of full Professor—NTT or full Professor of Practice, their cases shall be considered by a subcommittee that includes only the members at the rank of full (tenure-stream or contract). If such recusal leaves fewer than three members in the subcommittee, then additional ad hoc members at the appropriate rank from other Colleges will be appointed by the Dean as needed to bring the number of subcommittee members to three.

The responsibilities of the CCPC include:

- Electing a chair, typically at the start of the academic year.
- Notifying contract faculty who are eligible for promotion and/or professional leave. (The Dean's office shall maintain a faculty timeline and shall share the needed information with the committee each year.)
- Providing guidance and advice to contract faculty in preparing dossiers and/or requests for professional leave.
- Reviewing dossiers of contract faculty who have requested consideration for promotion.
- Preparing an assessment of each such candidate, with a written recommendation to the dean.

VII. Faculty Workload

(cf. [IG Section 2.3A](#), [FPM 2.3A](#))

Consistent with the FPM, a typical faculty workload is an annual six-course teaching load for tenure-stream faculty, and an annual seven-course teaching load for contract faculty. Teaching is the primary focus of the faculty workload, with service and research making up the rest of the faculty time.²

A rough estimate is that a single (3- or 4-credit) course or course equivalent constitutes 10% of a faculty member's annual workload allocation. Certain service and/or administrative roles include course reallocation, and grant budgets may include course releases, which must be approved prior to grant proposal submission by the Dean and academic unit Director.³ Individual faculty members may negotiate course releases or other re-allocations of time for other substantial administrative responsibilities, substantial service or research responsibilities with their academic unit Director and the Dean.

Course equivalencies for workload purposes are determined, in consultation with the Dean, at the Division level. These considerations may include disposition of independent studies, directed studies, team-taught courses, laboratory sections, large-enrollment courses, small-enrollment courses, internships, and practica; teaching online vs on-the-ground; teaching in specialty areas vs. supporting the core; number of course preps; course reassignments (administrative and research); additional compensation (administrative responsibilities, overloads, etc.); external grant-funded buyouts.

Factors that may be considered as part of a faculty member's workload:

Teaching

Should include but is not limited to:⁴

- Number of courses taught per semester
- Lab or discussion sessions
- Number of course preparations per semester
- Modality of course offerings
- Contributions to division's course offerings (elective and/or specialty vs. core)
- Contributions to the Undergraduate PLAN
- Independent studies (Undergraduate, Master's, Doctoral)
- Directed studies (with number of students involved)
- Teaching collaborations
- Number of students per course
- Internships and practica supervised
- Number of advisees
- New courses and/or special topic courses developed
- Level of course (100 through 700 level)
- Sharing academic expertise with other faculty (e.g., guest lectures, curricular coaching, etc.)

² [Faculty Policy Manual 2019-2026, 2.3.A., p. 23.](#)

³ [Implementation Guidelines, 2.3.A., p. 9.](#)

⁴ [Implementation Guidelines, 2.5.C.1, pp. 11-12.](#)

Any variances from the “one course” standard, including administrative course releases or stipends, fractional course allocations for lab courses or other sections, or overload payments for work beyond the faculty’s base load must be approved in writing by the academic unit Director and Dean.

Scholarship

Can include but is not limited to:⁵

- Published scholarship and creative work
- Presentations, addresses and panel participation
- Creative or artistic work
- Other evidence of scholarly reputation (e.g., internal and external funding requests (grants), public scholarship, awards for scholarship)

Service

Can include but is not limited to:⁶

- Service to the school or division, including regular attendance and active participation in faculty meetings (e.g., committee work (standing and ad hoc), student academic advising, faculty mentoring, student organization faculty advising, etc.)
- Service to the College, including regular attendance to college faculty meetings
- Service to the University
- Service to the discipline and/or profession
- Service to the community (local, state, national, and/or international)
- Special note should be made of any service that involves administrative responsibility (e.g., chairing a committee or initiative)
- Service done during the summer

Faculty are encouraged to include other “hidden” sources of faculty work when completing their annual Activities and Accomplishments report. These might include: letters of recommendation, career development (resume/cover letter reviews), extracurricular teaching/learning activities, participation in extracurricular events for students and faculty, participation in Convocation and Graduation ceremonies, etc.

Workload Guidelines and Equity

Assessing faculty workload, individually and across the entire faculty, is an important aspect of striving for equity within the College. It is the responsibility of the Dean and academic unit Directors to ensure that there is reasonable equity in allocating workload among the faculty of the Divisions. It is the responsibility of individual faculty to accurately represent their workload within the annual Activities and Accomplishments report.

Criteria and metrics for assessing faculty workload and defining equity within and across academic units should be established by each academic unit Director and regularly communicated to the faculty of that

⁵ [Implementation Guidelines, 2.5.C.2, pp. 12-14.](#)

⁶ [Implementation Guidelines, 2.5.C.3, pp. 14-15.](#)

Division. The Dean's office will collect the annual Activities and Accomplishments reports and provide access to the academic unit Directors (or Director's representative) for processing and analyzing data to support an equitable workload allocation process. The annual workload equity analysis is not prescriptive or evaluative; rather, is intended to provide information to help ensure a balance of assignments (equity). An aggregated Division report shall be shared with all COCIS faculty to provide transparency about the distribution of workload.

Faculty Availability

[IG 2.3.A] "Each College's OPs shall set requirements concerning faculty availability over times when classes are not in session but their appointment letters stipulate that they are available to the University, such as for responses to emails, assistance with admissions, orientation and student events. Unless special consideration has been agreed to in faculty members' appointment letters (e.g. an agreement to serve as chair for a determined period of time in exchange for compensation), nine- and ten-month faculty are free to decline to participate in University activities that are outside the scope of their appointment."

COCIS strives for a collegial atmosphere and culture that respects the importance of faculty summer time to pursue scholarship, professional practice, individual pursuits, and family time, while also recognizing that all faculty (whether 10-month or 12-month) are part of a sustained community that engages in important work throughout the calendar year. COCIS faculty are expected to make a reasonable effort to participate in activities that may occur during the summer that are essential for the success of the academic unit and our students. Typical activities include summer orientation, review of graduate applications, responsiveness to students in spring classes who had an Incomplete grade or who file a grade appeal, and students who seek out advising during the summer. COCIS faculty are also expected to monitor their Simmons email for important information during the summer months, or to provide the Dean's office with an alternate mechanism by which they can be reached.

These goals notwithstanding, faculty cannot be required to participate in specific activities outside of the calendar dates of their contracts and cannot be penalized for being unavailable to engage with those activities.

VIII. Faculty Expectations, Reviews, and Professional Development

(cf. IG Section [2.3](#) and [2.6](#))

Academic Unit Director Evaluations

Academic unit Directors shall be reviewed annually by the Dean during the faculty annual review cycle. Directors who hold non-administrative faculty appointments (B-school and MCS) shall receive a regular faculty annual review in addition to a separate Director performance review. Directors in their final year of an appointment do not receive a Director review, unless they are under consideration for reappointment. During the Director review process, the Dean shall solicit input and feedback from the faculty about the Director's performance.

Expectations in the Areas of Research, Teaching, and Service

According to the IGs, each College's OPs shall establish methods for assessing performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, with consideration for disciplinary differences. In COCIS, these standards shall be established by each academic unit in their WPs. Such standards shall be informed by, and consistent with, accreditation requirements as well as accepted standards within the academic disciplinary community.

Faculty Annual Reviews

The IGs (2.5.C) specify that annual reviews must include quantitative and qualitative measures of teaching performance. Quantitative measures in COCIS shall include student course evaluations (with an emphasis on those questions that measure the instructor's performance). Qualitative measures include the open-ended responses from student course evaluations, where themes or patterns indicate particularly effective or ineffective teaching practices. (Isolated comments from individual students should be taken in context and not used as negative evidence unless other sources confirm the stated concerns.) Evaluative peer assessments will also be done periodically (see below) and may be used in teaching evaluations. Formative peer assessments should not be used directly in evaluating teaching performance, but instructor self-reflection about changes made following a formative peer assessment may be used as a positive indicator. Engagement with professional development in the area of teaching and pedagogical innovation (e.g., CET workshops, conference attendance) may also be used as indicators of positive teaching performance.

Faculty expectations are measured relative to the goals set in the previous year's annual review, overall standards for the academic unit, and unusual circumstances that may have arisen (individually or for the institution) during the review year. Currently, the Simmons faculty annual review process includes three categories: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Needs Improvement. In COCIS, in recognition that excellent teaching is an expectation for all faculty, these categories are broken down as follows:

- **Exceeds Expectations:** The faculty member has performed at an unusually outstanding level, shown marked and significant improvement, and/or made exceptional contributions to the academic unit or Simmons overall in this area.
- **Meets Expectations:**
 - **Excellent:** Corresponds to "Excellent" performance in a given area as specified in the FPM/IGs and Section VI of these OPs.
 - **Strong:** Corresponds to "Strong" performance as above.
 - **Not Strong:** Corresponds to "Not Strong" performance as above. Academic unit Directors *may*, at their discretion, place faculty who exhibit significant weaknesses and concerns in a particular area in this category for a single year, if they have evidence that the faculty member is working to overcome the identified problems. In a second year of problematic performance, the Needs Improvement category must be used.
- **Needs Improvement:** The faculty member exhibits significant weaknesses, has not shown evidence of remediation of these weaknesses, and/or has not been successful despite attempts to remediate. Faculty who receive a Needs Improvement rating in any area will work with their academic unit Directors and an assigned or self-selected mentor to develop an action plan, and

provided with additional support to assist them in becoming more successful in the areas of concern.

Academic units are encouraged to include specific guidelines for expectations in each of these areas within their WPs.

Although the annual faculty reviews are part of promotion and tenure dossiers, in COCIS, the ratings in those annual reviews should not be used as direct or sole evidence of performance level. Rather, the other evidence in the dossier (course evaluations, peer evaluations, evidence scholarship, etc.) should be evaluated as a whole at the time of promotion and/or tenure.

Step	Deadline
Dean reminds faculty of Annual Reviews	April 1
Google folders created for Annual Reviews	April 15
Formal email to faculty to submit CV & self-reflection	April 15
B-School faculty update activities and complete self-reflections in Sedona	May 1
Course evaluation reports created for each faculty; saved to review folders	May 31
Weekly email reminders to faculty re: CV & self-reflection	May 1-31
Weekly email reminders from Sedona to B-School faculty re: CV & self-reflection	May 1-31
Faculty submit updated CVs and self-reflections; saved to review folders	June 1
Academic unit Directors hold Annual Review meetings with faculty	June 1-15
Completed faculty Annual Reviews submitted to Dean	June 15
Annual reviews signed by Dean and uploaded to Workday	June 30

Peer Classroom Observations

The IGs state that “Classroom observations by faculty peers shall occur annually.” In COCIS, classroom observations are an annual activity, although individual faculty members may not be evaluated every year.

Formative peer observations are primarily intended to provide developmental feedback to faculty for their use in reflecting on and improving their teaching over time. Formative peer observations will be coordinated by the MDR committee for each unit periodically on an established schedule as discussed below. The MDR committee for each unit will assign faculty to conduct formative peer evaluations, and assignments may be self-selected, volunteer filled, or identified by random drawing, according to the WPs

of the academic unit. A record of the formative peer observation is maintained by the Dean's office, but the feedback is delivered directly to the faculty member.

Evaluative peer observations are performed for the purpose of assessing teaching performance at regular intervals, to inform promotion, tenure (including midpoint review), annual review, PDMYR, and other formal review activities. Evaluative peer observers will be assigned either by the academic unit Director or the MDR committee in each unit. Evaluative peer observations will use a shared instrument (which may be extended/expanded upon by individual academic units), developed at the College level and maintained by the Dean's office. Evaluative reviews for P&T will rely on trained peer observers and/or MDR committee members. At a minimum, all new faculty will receive evaluative peer observations in their first year. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated in their first year and at least every other year thereafter. Tenured faculty and full-time and proportional contract faculty will be evaluated at least every three years. Processes for assigning faculty to perform evaluative peer observations will be identified in each academic unit's WPs. Evaluative peer observations are delivered to the faculty member, the MDR committee, the academic unit Director, and the Dean, and are retained by the Dean's office.

Both formative and evaluative peer observations should include a review of the following:

- syllabus
- appropriateness of material included
- appropriateness of the level of expectations
- consistency between content delivery, assessment methods, and the established learning objectives
- how student learning is measured
- observations about classroom presentations, activities, and interactions with students (synchronous learning)
- observations about the effectiveness of asynchronous materials and methods (asynchronous learning)

The Dean's office shall maintain a record of formative and evaluative peer evaluations and a repository of evaluative peer evaluations as they occur.

- The schedule for peer evaluations shall be set at the beginning of the year and shared with both instructors and peer reviewers no later than September 30.
- All faculty are expected to participate actively in the peer observation process, by serving as peer observers and by engaging with the assigned observers to schedule the classroom visits.
- Peer observers will meet with the instructor before and after the observation and shall provide their observation in written form. Evaluative peer observations will use the COCIS Peer Evaluation Feedback Form, assessing the class delivery during that particular visit as well as the overall class if appropriate, by reviewing the class syllabus and other materials. Formative peer observations may use the COCIS form or another instrument or format, agreed upon by the peer observer and the faculty member being observed.
- Instructors may provide a written response to evaluative peer observations, including a reflection about how they intend to change their teaching in response to the review and/or addressing any misconceptions or problems that arose during the review process.

- Peer observations should be responsive to the context for and topic of the class, including whether it is an online course (and if so, whether the instructor developed it or is teaching an existing course developed by someone else). Refer to the IGs ([section 2.5.C.1](#)) for important factors that may be taken into consideration during this evaluation.
- A different version of the peer review form is needed for asynchronous online courses (to be designed).

PDMYR

No later than May 1, the Dean shall request the MDR Committees, the academic unit Directors, and the candidates who are scheduled for PDMYR in the following year to provide suggested members for the PDMYR Committees. All PDMYR committee members must be tenured faculty members. For PDMYR committees reviewing full professors, the chair of the committee should be a full professor; the other committee members may be at the Associate or full level.

Clarifications about the PDMYR dossiers:

- “A written report of the outcomes of any sabbatical awarded during the previous six years.” This document should be the submitted sabbatical report.
- “Copies of research, scholarship, and creative works for the previous six years.” These materials should be submitted electronically, unless electronic submission is not possible. If the materials are extensive, representative samples may be submitted; other items should be made available upon request by the committee, the academic unit Director, or the Dean.

The committee feedback should be shared in written form with the candidate no later than March 15, and the committee should then meet with the candidate to discuss the review and recommendations. The final report from the committee to the Dean (due April 1) should include the written feedback, along with recommendations for resources and other developmental activities. These recommendations may include suggested resources such as travel funding for particular activities, student funding to support specific research work, other equipment or materials, course scheduling considerations (such as timing or nature of courses taught during a specific post-PDMYR period), and/or temporary service adjustments. Course releases are no longer part of the PDMYR process and should not be included in the committee’s recommendations.

Step	Deadline
Dean advises PDMYR candidates for the following year of the timing and procedures of the review	May 1
Dean appoints a PDMYR Review Committee for candidates for following year	May 31
Dean's office creates review folders for each candidate; access is given to Dean, academic unit Directors, review committees	May 31
Dean's office sends process dossier memo to each candidate	May 31

Dean gives Provost list of PDMYR candidates	September 1
Dean provides course evaluation reports, enrollment numbers, and annual reviews to candidates	September 15
Candidates submit materials for review	February 1
PDMYR Review Committee gives feedback to candidates	March 15
Review Committee forwards developmental recommendations to Dean; Dean identifies institutional support	April 1
Dean submits developmental and support recommendations to Provost	May 1
Provost reviews developmental recommendations from PDMYR Review Committee & Dean; notifies everyone of decision	June 1

Adjunct Review

The IGs state, “Each College shall establish a regular and periodic process to review adjunct faculty in their Operating Procedures.” In COCIS, each academic unit establishes its own adjunct review processes in their WPs.

IX. Programs, Curriculum, and Policies

(see [IG Section 1.6.E.1](#))

Issues related to academic programs, curriculum, and policies include:

- Adding or eliminating courses, majors, minors, departments, and programs;
- Degree requirements;
- Program review;
- Standards of admission;
- Voting of degree candidates; and
- Graduation requirements.

Adding or Eliminating Courses, Majors, Minors, Academic Units, and Programs

All processes related to adding or eliminating courses, majors, minors, academic units, and programs follow the procedures for voting on changes as they are addressed in the FPM.

- In the B-School and SLIS, the responsibilities for these activities within the academic unit fall to the Curriculum Committee.
- In MCS, the de facto Curriculum Committees consist of the respective program faculty (Math/Statistics or Computing/IT).
- For undergraduate majors, minors, departments, and programs, committee decisions must be forwarded through the academic unit Director to the Dean’s office, which will oversee the process of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) notification and/or approval (see Academic Process Standard Operating Procedure).

- The Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) function and process has not yet been fully developed, but the general process will be similar, following a path from the Committee through the academic unit Director to the Dean's office, which will oversee the process of GCC notification and/or approval.
- For both undergraduate and graduate curriculum changes, the Dean's office will develop an operational process that ensures UCC/GCC approval is followed by the appropriate updates from the Registrar (AARC) and webmaster.
- Proposals to add/drop majors, minors, departments and programs may originate from multiple sources (Provost, Dean, Faculty, Senate, others). The result of any proposal must be accomplished through consultation with the Senate to ensure faculty voice.