

SIMMONS COLLEGE

School of Library and Information
Science

Implementation Guidelines of the
Faculty Policy Manual

Approved June 14, 2011

Revisions Approved by the SLIS Faculty:

October 9, 2013

March 10, 2015

November 18, 2015

Additional edits:

February 26, 2016

May 16, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. GENERAL MATTERS	1
1.1 DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF <i>FACULTY POLICY MANUAL</i>	1
1.2 FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.....	1
1.3 MISSION OF THE COLLEGE	1
1.4 ACADEMIC FREEDOM	1
1.5 DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES.....	1
1.7 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRUSTEES, PRESIDENT, PROVOST, DEANS AND FACULTY	1
1.7.E.2 Voting Faculty.....	2
1.8 FACULTY SENATE.....	2
1.10 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.....	2
SECTION 2. APPOINTMENTS, RETENTION AND LEAVES.....	2
2.1.B Tenure-Track Appointment.....	2
2.1.E Faculty Hiring.....	2
2.2 FACULTY TIME STATUS	2
2.2.A Full-time Faculty.....	2
2.2.C.2 Other Professional Activities.....	3
2.3.D Other Types of Appointment.....	3
2.3.D.3 Visiting Professor.....	3
2.3.E Faculty Serving as Administrators	4
2.4.A Committee on Promotion and Tenure.....	4
2.4.A.1 Composition	4
2.4.A.2 Functions of RTA.....	4
2.4.A.2.1 Functions of Review Committees	5
2.4.A.3 Confidentiality	6
2.4.B The Dean and the Provost.....	6
2.4.C Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	6
2.4.C.1 Excellence as a Teacher	7
2.4.C.2 Achievement in Research and Professional & Academic Scholarship ..	7
2.4.C.3 Contributions to Service Related to the Mission of the College	7
2.4.C.4 Needs of the College, School, and Department or Program	7
2.4.D Tenure Policies	8
2.4.D.1 Eligible Faculty.....	8
2.4.D.2 Probationary Period	8

2.4.D.2a General	8
2.4.D.2b Tenure	8
2.4.D.2c Prior Service at Other Institutions	8
2.4.E Schedule for Faculty Promotion and Tenure Candidate	8
2.4.F Dossier Preparation	10
2.4.F.1 Promotion to Associate Professor	10
2.4.F.2 Promotion to Professor	11
2.4.F.3 Letters of Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion	11
2.5 REVIEWS OF FACULTY	12
2.5.A Reviews of Faculty with Tenure-Track Appointments	12
2.5.A.1 Annual Review	12
2.5.A.2 Mid-point Review	12
2.5.A.4 First Year Review	14
2.5.B Review of Tenured Faculty	15
2.5.B.1 Annual Review	15
2.5.B.2 Review for Promotion to Professor	15
2.5.B.3 Periodic Developmental Multi-Year Review (PDMYR)	16
2.5.B.3.b PDMYR Process	16
2.5.C Review of Faculty with Contract Appointments	17
2.5.C.1. Professors of Practice and Lecturers	17
2.5.C.2 Adjunct Faculty	18
2.5.C.3 Visiting Professors	18
2.6.A Professional Development	19
2.6.B.3 Types of Sabbaticals	19
2.6.B.6 Written Report	19
2.6.D. Contract Faculty Career (Professional) Development Assignments	19
2.6.D.3 Types of Professional Development Assignment	19
2.6.E Course Reduction Vouchers for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work for Tenure-Track Faculty	19
SECTION 6. AMENDMENTS TO <i>FACULTY POLICY MANUAL</i>	20
APPENDICES	21
Appendix 1: Indicators of Strong and Excellent Performance	21
Appendix 2: SLIS Faculty Review Activities Calendar	23
Appendix 3: SLIS Dossier Contents	26
Appendix 4: PDMYR Professional Development Plan	29

These Implementation Guidelines (IG) have been developed to supplement the Simmons College Faculty Policy Manual (FPM) 2010-2017, as required in Section 1.5 of the Faculty Policy Manual. The section numbering used in these IG is that of the FPM, and the IG should be read in conjunction with the FPM. Not all of the sections of the FPM are covered in the IG; only those sections requiring further specification are included.

SECTION 1. GENERAL MATTERS

1.1 DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF *FACULTY POLICY MANUAL*

The Faculty of the Simmons College's (the "College") School of Library and Information Science (SLIS) has adopted the IG to augment the College's FPM. These guidelines are consistent with the FPM, follow the same format, and elaborate and expand on SLIS-specific policies and procedures.

1.2 FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The SLIS Faculty supports the three core principles articulated in the FPM: a commitment to meaningful participation of faculty in decisions that advance the mission of the College; a commitment to academic freedom; and a commitment to the pursuit of collective excellence and social justice through teaching, research, scholarship and creative works, and service.

1.3 MISSION OF THE COLLEGE

The SLIS Faculty supports the mission of Simmons College, as described in the FPM. The Faculty also recognizes its leadership role in the information professions.

1.4 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The SLIS faculty is committed to the principles of academic freedom for all faculty members, whether tenured or untenured, full-time or otherwise, as outlined in the FPM.

1.5 DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

SLIS developed these guidelines through a collaborative process between the Voting Faculty and the Dean. Both the Dean and Faculty have agreed to these Implementation Guidelines. At the April 13, 2011 faculty meeting the Faculty approved the IG. The Faculty approved a revised version, incorporating input from the Provost, on June 14, 2011. The faculty approved additional revisions on October 9, 2013 and March 18, 2015.

The Dean's Office is responsible for organizing the IG revision process, including the submission of proposed new and amended implementation guidelines to the Provost for review and approval as required by Faculty Policy Manual. Faculty at all ranks, in all programs, and in all categories should be represented, to the degree possible, in the IG revision process. IG revisions should include a mechanism for periodic reappraisal of criteria for promotion, tenure, and review. IG review committees will include the Associate Dean(s), the SLIS Parliamentarian, and the chair of the Committee of Rank, Tenure, and Appointments (RTA).

1.7 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRUSTEES, PRESIDENT, PROVOST, DEANS AND FACULTY

The SLIS Faculty supports the roles of the Trustees, President, Provost, Deans and Faculty, as outlined in the FPM.

1.7.E.2 Voting Faculty

The voting members of SLIS include the President, the Provost, the Dean, and all full-time and proportional tenure-stream and contract faculty, including those on sabbatical, or other kinds of approved leave, and those with joint appointments, as specified in Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 of the FPM. All Adjunct and Visiting Faculty as defined in Section 2.1.D and 2.3.D.3 of the FPM may attend faculty meetings, but do not have voting privileges.

1.8 FACULTY SENATE

The SLIS Faculty supports the role of the Faculty Senate, as outlined in the FPM.

1.10 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

The SLIS Faculty is committed to the principles of the personal ownership of intellectual property rights for all Faculty members, as outlined in the FPM.

SECTION 2. APPOINTMENTS, RETENTION AND LEAVES

For the purposes of these implementation guidelines, the phrase *appropriate faculty* in the FPM refers to the SLIS Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Appointments (RTA) except where otherwise specified.

2.1.B Tenure-Track Appointment

A new faculty member, who is hired into a tenure-track position without a completed doctorate, has two years from the time his or her contract begins to complete the degree. A tenure-track faculty member who has not obtained the doctorate at the end of his or her second year will not receive renewal of his or her contract.

2.1.E Faculty Hiring

A search committee will be formed to manage and coordinate faculty searches in a given year. The search committee works closely with the Dean and faculty members with relevant subject expertise during the search process. The search committee membership consists of a chair, three to four faculty members appointed by the Dean (of whom at least one is an untenured tenure-track faculty member), and a student representative (elected by the Library and Information Science Student Association, the Student Chapter of the Association for Computing Machinery, or the Children's Literature Advisory Group, depending on focus of the faculty search). A staff representative may be invited to join the search committee. The chair of the search committee will be a tenured member of the faculty. The director of the program for which the hired faculty will teach will be an *ex officio* member.

2.2 FACULTY TIME STATUS

2.2.A Full-time Faculty

The Dean, in consultation with the Provost, may grant course releases or assignment variations for specific purposes. Faculty may teach varying numbers of courses depending on their other School responsibilities, such as directing programs, chairing certain committees, and other administrative duties. Additionally, faculty members have the opportunity to receive a course release through working under externally funded

grants that cover a percentage of their time.

SLIS reserves the right to adjust its calendar within the limits of the Simmons College calendar so that for the LIS and Children's Literature programs there are at least 14 class meetings for each course during the fall and spring semesters and 12 class meetings during the summer. Graduate classes may be held during undergraduate reading and examination periods. The Computer Science program follows the Simmons College calendar.

2.2.C.2 Other Professional Activities

When a faculty member engages in extraordinary outside non-teaching activities during the academic year (whether remunerated or voluntary) related to the faculty member's area of expertise at Simmons, the faculty member is responsible for seeking the Dean's approval in writing prior to engaging in the outside activity. The faculty member and the Dean share responsibility to ensure that such external activities do not create conflicts of interest or conflicts of commitment as outlined in the FPM. Faculty members are required to report on professional activities to the Dean in their annual reports.

A faculty member's outside teaching appointment and/or other professional activity may not normally exceed twenty percent (20%) of the responsibilities of a full-time faculty member, consistent with the FPM.

2.3.D Other Types of Appointment

2.3.D.3 Visiting Professor

Anyone on the SLIS faculty may recommend an individual, who holds academic rank at another institution of higher education, to become a visiting professor. However, that position should be reserved for high need teaching areas or funded positions, and be for a designated limited time. The core criteria for selecting a visiting professor include:

- Course content knowledge and ability to communicate it
- The types of experiences that enhance one's teaching
- Willingness to make the time commitment to the SLIS program and the education of SLIS students
- Involvement in scholarly publishing and service to the profession
- The Ph.D. degree (preferred)

A candidate for Visiting Professor will go through the same process (on campus interviews, presentation, and letters of recommendation) as would be the case for an applicant for a full-time faculty position.

Anyone who holds a visiting position becomes a non-voting member of the SLIS faculty. That person may be invited to serve on SLIS committees, may advise SLIS students, and may interview prospective SLIS students. If a subsequent position on the full-time faculty emerges, anyone in a visiting position may apply but will not receive any special consideration.

2.3.E Faculty Serving as Administrators

Faculty serving as full-time administrators will remain eligible to serve as voting members of the faculty within SLIS, but may be ineligible for certain service roles or SLIS/college-wide committee memberships, when those roles or committee memberships present a conflict of interest.

2.4.A Committee on Promotion and Tenure¹

2.4.A.1 Composition

The standing Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Appointments (RTA), which is advisory to the School's Dean and faculty, consists of three tenured professors elected by the faculty of the School for staggered three-year terms, who will not put themselves forward for promotion during membership on the committee. Members of RTA are elected in the week prior to the May faculty meeting (or by extraordinary election as needed). All terms of committee appointment take effect on September 1 and continue until August 31 because this committee's responsibilities dictate year-round service. The RTA committee will appoint a chair from among its members. The chair will serve a one-year term.

The Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Appointments is responsible for establishing, training, supervising, and supporting individual three-person review committees for First Year reviews, Promotion and Tenure (P&T) cases, and Periodic Developmental Multi-Year Reviews (PDMYR). The composition of each review committee is determined through random assignment from among full-time and proportional tenured faculty members eligible to serve as outlined below.

- **First Year reviews:** all tenured faculty members (the term of service is from September 1 to August 15)
- **Promotion and Tenure cases** (the term of service is from July 1 to December 1):
 - **Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor:** all tenured faculty members
 - **Promotion to Professor:** all tenured faculty members holding rank of full professor
- **PDMYR** (the term of service is from September 1 to May 1): all faculty members holding rank equal to or greater than the candidate

Although attempts are made to ensure equitable distribution of committee membership among faculty members, on occasion, faculty members will serve on more than one committee. Faculty members on sabbatical or on other forms of approved leave are not expected to serve on SLIS committees during their sabbatical or period of leave.

2.4.A.2 Functions of RTA

In addition to the responsibilities set forth in section 2.4.A.2 of the FPM, the general functions of RTA are:

¹ SLIS uses the name *Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Appointments* (RTA) for its promotion and tenure committee.

- Making recommendations to the Dean on initial appointments, including visiting and contract faculty appointments, in accordance with criteria specified in the FPM (Sections 2.1 and 2.3) and these Implementation Guidelines.
- Establishing, training, supervising, and supporting First Year review, P&T, and PDMYR committees, as described above in SLIS IG 2.4.A.1.
- Ensuring consistency across all review activities and compliance with the FPM and the SLIS Implementation Guidelines.
- Consulting on peer evaluation of teaching. Peer evaluation is the responsibility of individual First Year review, P&T, mid-point review, and PDMYR committees.
- Reviewing, compiling, and submitting promotion and tenure reviews and recommendations to the Dean and the Provost, by December 1 in accordance with the criteria specified in the SLIS IG.
- Managing the voting site for P&T cases.
- Reviewing, compiling, and submitting PDMYR recommendations and First Year reviews to the Dean at the appropriate time in the review calendar in accordance with the criteria specified in the SLIS Implementation Guidelines.
- Conducting, compiling, and submitting mid-point reviews and recommendations to the Dean and Provost at the appropriate time in the review calendar in accordance with the criteria specified in the SLIS Implementation Guidelines.
- Providing an annual report on the activities of the committee to the Dean.
- Consulting with the Dean on appointments to Distinguished Professor.
- Consulting with the Dean on issues related to course releases, suspension of the tenure clock, prior service credit for new appointments, waiver of probationary period, and other issues directly related to promotion, tenure, appointments, faculty development, etc.

2.4.A.2.1 Functions of Review Committees

Each review committee established by RTA is responsible for:

- Appointing a chair
- Conducting peer evaluation of teaching of the candidate under review
- Working with the candidate to maintain the review schedule
- Reviewing the dossier
- Preparing and submitting a final report to RTA as specified in the relevant review calendar

In addition to the above, P&T committees are responsible for the following tasks:

- Organizing and running one or more meetings of the eligible voting faculty² to discuss and vote on the candidate based on the criteria established in the FPM and elaborated on in the SLIS IG

² For decisions involving tenure, “eligible voting faculty” is defined as full-time or proportional tenured faculty members.

- Ensuring that the review materials are made available in a timely manner to RTA to post in the P&T voting site
- Communicating roles and responsibilities of the eligible voting faculty prior to discussion and decision making
- Ensuring that the final reports reflect the discussion, voting, and recommendation of the eligible voting faculty
- Submitting the final P&T reports to RTA to review for clarity, style, consistency, and compliance with the FPM and SLIS IG

2.4.A.3 Confidentiality

SLIS adheres to the College's policies regarding confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process as described in the FPM. All materials, with the exception of public documents (e.g., student evaluations), considered by the committees and their deliberations related to those materials are confidential within the committees. The annual report of RTA is deposited in the College archives as a confidential document.

2.4.B The Dean and the Provost

The Dean gives substantial weight to the reports and recommendations of RTA and the individual review committees. In the event that a committee makes a recommendation with which the Dean disagrees (either for or against), the Dean will discuss the process of the review and their respective recommendations at a meeting between the Dean, Provost and/or President, and the committee, as mandated by section 2.4.B of the FPM. If the Dean rejects the committee's recommendation, she or he will so advise the committee. The Provost will receive the recommendations of both the committees and the Dean.

2.4.C Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The period of untenured appointment should be seen as a time of probation with annual appraisal, as required by the College and SLIS, of the suitability of the faculty member for an academic career. It is a time for growth and development of a candidate's teaching abilities, scholarship, involvement in the professional and academic communities, and leadership and organization skills. The values of industry, consistency, initiative, self-discipline, and originality are assumed to be the foundation of this development. The reviews for tenure and/or promotion will focus on teaching, scholarship and research, and service, and the sufficiency and excellence of the record in the appropriate categories. All promotion, irrespective of level, should be viewed as steps toward full professorship. No rank below that of full professor should be considered terminal.

Following the guidelines set forth in the FPM (2.4.C.1-3), the following criteria for promotion and tenure will be applied by the school: each level of review will focus on the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. In their reviews, committees will assign one of the following three levels of performance to each area of assessment: *excellent*, *strong*, and *not strong*. Pursuant to the mission of the college, all candidates for promotion and tenure must demonstrate excellence in teaching. In addition, successful candidates must demonstrate excellence in at least one of the two remaining areas of evaluation, and strength in the third. Decisions regarding promotion and tenure reflect the needs of the school; thus, the needs of the College, School, Department, or Program will be considered a fourth criterion for promotion and tenure.

See Appendix 1 for examples of performance indicators for excellent and strong.

2.4.C.1 Excellence as a Teacher

In accordance with the FPM, the School considers teaching excellence a necessary prerequisite for both promotion and tenure. The following are considered primary documents in this evaluation process: SLIS-conducted peer evaluations³ of teaching from the First Year, Mid-point, and P&T reviews, student evaluations of teaching effectiveness as administered by SLIS or the College, and the candidate's written self-assessment of his or her teaching. Additional student input in the form of unsolicited letters or messages from the period being evaluated may be included by candidates in their dossiers as documentation supporting the case for *excellence as a teacher*. These letters or messages must be signed (or the sender otherwise self-identified) and dated.

2.4.C.2 Achievement in Research and Professional & Academic Scholarship

Professional and scholarly development can be demonstrated by an ever-emerging, consistent record of high quality professional, scholarly, and/or creative activity and involvement in the larger professional and academic communities. That record would ordinarily comprise activities that include research, articles, books and book chapters, reviews, conference proceedings, other creative or professional works, professional presentations, professional consulting activities which involve research, and other contributions relevant to the candidate's discipline.

2.4.C.3 Contributions to Service Related to the Mission of the College

Service related to the mission of either the School or the College consists of contributions of time and effort by faculty members to activities such as service on standing or ad hoc committees, participation in governance, service in curriculum or program development, advising students, and department or program service. Various forms of involvement with students beyond the classroom, and other service to the College and SLIS mission, within and beyond the Simmons campus, are other examples.

SLIS expands on service expectations by also expecting its faculty to contribute to the enrichment and development of the information professions. Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to demonstrate leadership in SLIS, the College, and the external community.

The service activities of candidates might include, but are not limited to, local service (e.g., membership or chairing SLIS or college-wide committees, advising student groups, organizing colloquia open to the community, making presentations to SLIS or the College on topics of interest) and external professional service (e.g., holding significant office in professional organizations, giving keynote addresses, reviewing grant proposals for funding agencies, serving on editorial boards of professional journals), and consulting activities involving professional service.

2.4.C.4 Needs of the College, School, and Department or Program

Section 2.4.C.4 of the FPM mandates that the P&T committees consider "the needs of and constraints affecting the College, the applicable School, and applicable Department or Program." Before the promotion and tenure review, the P&T

³ In these Implementation Guidelines the phrase *peer evaluation* refers to the summative classroom evaluations conducted by First Year review, P&T, Mid-point review, and PDMYR committees.

committee and the Dean discuss any institutional/departmental needs of the School that may affect tenure and promotion decisions.

2.4.D Tenure Policies

2.4.D.1 Eligible Faculty

The tenure policy of Simmons College specified in the FPM should be followed without exception.

2.4.D.2 Probationary Period

2.4.D.2a General

All initial appointments, except those at the ranks of Full Professor and tenured Associate Professor, should be probationary. The ranks of Instructor and Assistant Professor are non-tenured, whereas the ranks of Associate Professor and Full Professor are usually tenured.

Initial and subsequent appointments at the rank of:

- Instructor should normally be for no more than two years. The appointment letter from the Dean specifies a one-year renewable appointment.
- Assistant Professor should be for one year. The appointment letter from the Provost should specify a one-year renewable appointment.
- Associate Professor (not yet tenured) should receive a one-year contract that may be renewed. (If the Associate Professor is tenured, the issue of probationary period is moot.)

2.4.D.2b Tenure

Typically, a tenure-track candidate shall teach a minimum of five years as an Assistant Professor at Simmons before consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. An Assistant Professor must be considered for promotion to Associate Professor during the sixth year of his or her appointment as Assistant Professor unless, due to exceptional circumstances, as outlined in the FPM 2.4.G.1-3, a deferment of consideration is requested by the Assistant Professor. In the event that the Provost asks the Dean for his/her input on a request for deferment of consideration, the Dean shall consult with RTA. The conditions under which an individual may return from an unapproved leave of absence to a tenure track appointment will be negotiated by the individual with the Dean and will be subject to the needs of the School.

2.4.D.2c Prior Service at Other Institutions

RTA will assist the Dean in the determination of the rank and the amount of prior service that will be credited to a new appointment.

2.4.E Schedule for Faculty Promotion and Tenure Candidate

Any faculty member who is eligible to be considered for promotion or tenure shall initiate the promotion or tenure consideration process, normally at the start of the sixth year. While SLIS primarily adheres to the tenure and promotion schedule specified in 2.4.E of the FPM, the IG calendar below contains some modified dates to allow sufficient

time for the evaluation of the candidate's promotion and tenure materials.

An application for tenure and/or promotion can be withdrawn at any stage up to the day the recommendations are sent to the Faculty Review Committee of the Board of Trustees in anticipation of their February meeting.

The following table provides relevant due dates for SLIS faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure. More information can be found in the text of the FPM and the SLIS IG.

Date	Due
1st week of Feb.	RTA chair reminds faculty members of the timing, available documentation, and activities involved in the various SLIS reviews
Mar. 1-31	Candidates may voluntarily meet with RTA to discuss dossier contents and preparation
Apr 1	RTA chair sends a reminder that those seeking tenure and/or promotion must notify the Dean and RTA by May 1 st
May 1	Candidate informs Dean and RTA as to intent to go up for tenure and/or promotion in rank
May 1-31	RTA coordinates the establishment of the P&T committees with terms of office from July 1 to December 31
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track faculty
Mid July	Dean, P&T chair, and candidate for tenure or promotion in rank meet to discuss process and potential external reviewers
Aug. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean and candidate supply names of external reviewers and short description of each with rationale as to why they were chosen Tenure and/or promotion dossier due for review to P&T committee
Aug. 1-31	P&T committee begins initial review of tenure and/or promotion dossier to provide feedback to candidate
Aug. 5	Dean finalizes the list of external reviewers
Aug. 10	Dean contacts external reviewers, requests indication of willingness
Sept. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final P&T dossier due to the P&T committee and the Dean Dean sends dossier and instructions to external reviewers P&T committee(s) establishes dates and times in mid-November for tenured faculty to meet and discuss P&T case(s)
1st week of Sept.	RTA reminds faculty members of the timing, available documentation, and activities involved in the various SLIS reviews
Sept. 30	Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion in the next academic year
Sept. to Nov.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P&T committee visits all classes for peer evaluation of teaching P&T committee and the Dean discuss any institutional/departmental needs of the School that may affect tenure and promotion decisions (fourth criterion for tenure and promotion)
Mid-Oct.	P&T chair checks with Dean about status of external letters
Nov. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External reviewers' comments due

Date	Due
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters are anonymized before being shared with the Tenured Voting Faculty in the Moodle voting site
1st two weeks of Nov.	Eligible faculty review P&T dossier, anonymized external reviewer comments, and supporting materials
Mid-Nov.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P&T meeting(s) held to discuss promotion and tenure case(s) Eligible faculty vote on P&T candidates
Mid-Nov. to Nov 27	P&T committee writes final recommendation report
Nov. 28	P&T committee's recommendation report goes to RTA for review for clarity, style, consistency, and compliance with the FPM and SLIS IG
Nov. 30	Last day to add additional content to the dossier
Dec. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTA sends compiled report of P&T recommendations to Dean and Provost Dossiers and external letters are sent to the Provost's office
Dec. 15 or soon thereafter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's tenure and/or promotion recommendations go to Provost and RTA Dean verbally communicates the P&T recommendations made by the SLIS tenured faculty and the Dean to the P&T candidates (if they wish to know) and to RTA
Feb. to Mar. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure and promotion decisions announced The Provost and the Dean inform the candidate verbally of the recommendation and approval by the Board as soon as possible. The Dean will inform the Chair of RTA verbally after the candidate has been informed of the outcome. The President and Provost notify RTA, Dean, and faculty member in writing no later than 1 week after meeting.
	A faculty member who receives notification of denial of tenure has five business days after official notification of denial of tenure in which to send to the Provost a request to meet with the Dean, RTA, the Provost, or the President.

2.4.F Dossier Preparation

A candidate's dossier for tenure and/or promotion provides evidence of performance on the criteria specified in section 2.4.C. SLIS has chosen not to rank the three criteria beyond what is discussed in the FPM, but Appendix 1 of the IG does provide examples of activities that are indicators of strong or excellent performance in the three criteria. Each item in the dossier can serve as evidence of achievement in more than one criterion for tenure and/or promotion. Contents of the dossier are to be organized as outlined in Appendix 3. Dossier materials should be made available online in a secure, password-protected repository. The candidate should provide log-in information to the Dean and the chair of the candidate's P&T committee, and should also supply the Dean with a hard copy of the curriculum vitae, personal statement, reflections, and no more than five samples of scholarship.

The fourth criterion for tenure, "institutional/departmental need" will also be addressed by the P&T committee and the Dean in their recommendation letters to the Provost.

2.4.F.1 Promotion to Associate Professor

Excellence as a teacher is inextricably linked with, and a product of, the development of professional reputation and stature. Promotion to the associate professorship should therefore, in addition to those points outlined in the FPM, depend on

significant professional activity at the local, regional and/or national level, and on meaningful contributions to the internal life and program of the School.

2.4.F.2 Promotion to Professor

For consideration for promotion to the rank of full professor, in addition to those points outlined in the FPM, there should be substantial evidence of capacity and willingness to discharge successfully the responsibilities for educational leadership of a senior member of the faculty (teaching, scholarship, and service to the School and College), and contribute substantially to the growth and progress of the academic community. Promotion to the full professorship should be a result of achievement of national/international reputation and stature in both teaching and non-teaching areas of specialization. The candidate for the full professorship should be recognized as an “authority” or leader through a number of activities such as publication, direction of research, speaking, consultant work, and professional office. *See also:* IG 2.5.B.2.

2.4.F.3 Letters of Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion

The candidate who is applying for tenure and promotion shall provide the Dean with a list of 3-5 possible external reviewers along with a brief description and rationale for each name on the list. The description, at minimum, will include:

- the names, positions, ranks, and institutions of the potential reviewers;
- the relationship to the candidate or how they are known;
- the reason they were included on the list and their status or role in the discipline; and
- a potential reviewer’s curriculum vitae and/or webpage.

The Dean will also compile a list of 3-5 possible external reviewers. From the pool of names the Dean shall consolidate, finalize, and rank the list of potential reviewers. The Dean will contact the top five reviewers to determine their availability to provide a written review in a timely manner; if necessary, the Dean may contact subsequent reviewers from the list. At least three reviews, but no more than five are required pursuant to the FPM. If more than three reviews are received all reviews must be submitted with the application. Reviewers will normally hold academic rank and tenure status equal or higher than the rank and status sought. Those selected as reviewers should be “arm’s length of the candidate” and not have a close relationship to the candidate, such as that of a doctoral advisor or close collaborator. Reviewers should provide copies of their curriculum vitae along with their reviews.

Reviewers will be sent a cover letter identifying the criteria that they should address in their evaluation, and a copy of the relevant pages from the FPM and IG referring to the criteria on which candidates are to be reviewed. Reviewers will be given access to the secure repository, but may choose to receive a hard copy of these materials as well or instead. Hard copy for reviewers will consist of the following items from the candidate’s promotion and tenure dossier: curriculum vitae, personal statement, reflections, and no more than five samples of scholarship. Reviewers will be asked to:

- Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate’s scholarly/research interests and activities in terms of their importance, and his/her promise for further growth as a scholar.
- Comment on the degree of recognition already achieved by the candidate in his/her discipline, noting any distinctive contributions.

- Comment on the candidate's degree of professional service.
- Provide any additional insights that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for promotion and tenure.

Reviewers will be asked to submit the letters of recommendation to the Dean by November 1. The Dean will share the letters with the candidate's P&T committee. The letters will be reviewed by RTA and the P&T committee and will be discussed in both the P&T committee's and the Dean's reports. The letters will be anonymized and then shared with the Tenured Voting Faculty along with the other materials related to the candidate's case in the Moodle site used for tenure and promotion cases. The letters are to be viewed within the Moodle site and not distributed in any other manner. They will be provided to the Provost's office in a package sent separately from the dossier to ensure confidentiality.

2.5 REVIEWS OF FACULTY

2.5.A Reviews of Faculty with Tenure-Track Appointments

2.5.A.1 Annual Review

Faculty with tenure-track appointments (Assistant and Associate levels) are subject to annual, first-year, mid-point, and end of probationary period reviews. The Dean conducts all annual reviews in accordance with the College's policies.

Per the FPM, the annual review, at a minimum, will entail a written self-assessment, qualitative and quantitative measures of teaching performance, and a written assessment by the tenure-track faculty member's Dean. In addition to the periodic summative reviews conducted by committees constituted under RTA, faculty are encouraged to engage in informal peer evaluations of teaching, and to include feedback from these activities as part of their reflections on teaching. The Dean will consult with RTA on any changes or additions to the annual review process as per the FPM 2.5.A.1.

Date	Due
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track faculty • Dean's annual review meetings with tenure-track faculty

2.5.A.2 Mid-point Review

The mid-point review occurs during the third year of probationary status and is conducted by RTA. It may occur no later than after three academic years of probationary status, unless an extension is granted under Section 2.4.D.2. Any such extension must be requested in writing by the faculty member and approved in writing by the Dean.

For this review, RTA bases its report on the faculty member's mid-point review dossier. To round out the view of excellence as a teacher, RTA visits each class to conduct peer evaluation of teaching in the semester specified by the review calendar (see SLIS IG 2.4.C.1).

The committee forwards its written review to the Dean and the Provost, with a copy to the faculty member. After the mid-point review, the Dean meets with the faculty

member to discuss the results of the mid-point review, as well as the process for seeking promotion and tenure. A follow-up letter will be sent to the faculty member.

Mid-point review dates vary based on initial appointment date. Two calendars are presented below based on different initial starting dates. The first calendar outlines the process for those who start in July; the second is for those who start in January.

Mid-point review calendar for those who begin July 1st

Date	Due
July 1 (end of year 2)	Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for mid-point review in the next academic year
Feb. to Apr.	RTA class visits for mid-point review
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 (end of year 3)	Mid-point review dossier due to RTA and the Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track faculty
July 1-31	RTA writes faculty assessment
Aug. 1	RTA's mid-point review recommendation goes to faculty member, Dean, and Provost
Aug. 1-31	Dean meets with faculty member to discuss mid-point review
Sept. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's mid-point review letter to faculty member Dean notifies RTA that mid-point review is complete

Mid-point review calendar for those who begin January 1st

Date	Due
Jan. 1 (end of year 2)	Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for mid-point review in the next academic year
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track faculty
Sep. to Nov.	RTA class visits for mid-point review
Jan. 1 (end of year 3)	Mid-point review dossier due to RTA and the Dean
Jan. 1-31	RTA writes faculty assessment
Feb. 1	RTA's mid-point review recommendation goes to faculty member, Dean, and Provost
Feb. 1-28	Dean meets with faculty member to discuss mid-point review
Mar. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's mid-point review letter to faculty member Dean notifies RTA that mid-point review is complete

Contents of the Mid-point Review Dossier

Faculty members undergoing mid-point review will submit a dossier to RTA on July 1 (or on January 1, depending on the initial start date of the candidate). While similar to the tenure and promotion dossier, the contents focus only on the first three years of

the appointment. Dossier materials should be made available online in a secure, password-protected repository. The candidate should provide log-in information to the Dean and the chair of RTA.

A candidate's mid-point review dossier provides evidence of performance on the criteria specified in section 2.4.C. Each item in the dossier can serve as evidence of achievement in more than one criterion for tenure and/or promotion. Contents of the dossier are to be organized as outlined in Appendix 3.

2.5.A.4 First Year Review

While First Year review is not required by the FPM, SLIS strongly believes that newly hired tenure-track faculty should receive as much support for career development as possible, and beginning in their first year on the tenure track. Each tenure-track faculty member starting at SLIS shall receive a comprehensive review at the end of his or her first year of hire. The review will not be completed until after the first anniversary of initial appointment and course evaluations have been received. Once the faculty member's First Year review committee has completed its review of the faculty member's dossier and teaching evaluations, the committee and the faculty member will meet to discuss the review, professional development, and progress toward tenure. The Dean is expected to incorporate the committee's report as well as the faculty member's student course evaluations into the annual review meeting with the faculty member.

The review will be based on the faculty member's dossier as described in Appendix 3, on course evaluation data from students, and on reports from peer-reviewed classroom visits. To assess the faculty member's progress toward excellence as a teacher, the First Year review committee conducts a peer review of teaching, visiting one classroom session in each semester of the faculty member's first year. If problems in teaching are identified, the committee shall so advise the Dean and the committee has the option of conducting additional classroom visits in an effort to identify issues and recommend improvements to benefit both the faculty member and SLIS students.

Tenure-track faculty members are required to begin developing their tenure and promotion dossiers in the year that they join the SLIS faculty. The practices of evaluation, self-reflection, and careful data management will be useful throughout an academic career. To support this activity, the Dean's office, in coordination with RTA, will hold annual workshops addressing dossier contents and preparation for faculty and new tenure-track faculty are expected to attend these professional development workshops.

Dossier materials should be made available online in a secure, password-protected repository. The candidate should provide log-in information to the chair of the First Year review committee.

For faculty starting in January, the review process will begin in the following academic year.

First Year review calendar

Date	Due
May 1-31	RTA coordinates the establishment of the First Year review committees with terms of office from Sept 1 to August 15
July 1	Faculty member begins developing dossier when arriving at SLIS
Sept. to Nov. & Feb. to Apr.	Peer evaluation of teaching takes place.
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track faculty
July 1	First-year dossier due to the review committee and the Dean
July 1 to August 15	First Year committee reviews first-year dossier and supporting material; recommendations go to RTA, and shortly thereafter, to the faculty member, and the Dean
Sept. 1-15	The Dean discusses the first-year review during the faculty member's annual review meeting (dates may be subject to change).

2.5.B Review of Tenured Faculty

2.5.B.1 Annual Review

Associate Professors and Professors will participate in the annual review process and will submit an annual review to the Dean for evaluation according to the calendar in 2.5.A.1. In accordance with 2.5.B.1 of the FPM, this review will contribute to the determination of compensation for faculty members.

Per the FPM, the annual review, at a minimum, will entail a written self-assessment and a written assessment by the tenure-track faculty member's Dean. In addition to the periodic summative reviews conducted by committees constituted under RTA, faculty are encouraged to engage in informal peer evaluations of teaching, and to include feedback from these activities as part of their reflections on teaching. The Dean will consult with RTA on any changes or additions to the annual review process as per the FPM 2.5.B.1.

Date	Due
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review meetings with tenured faculty

2.5.B.2 Review for Promotion to Professor

In accordance with 2.4.F.2, an Associate Professor with tenure may request consideration for promotion at any time. However, it is customary that the faculty member holds tenured rank for at least three years prior to seeking promotion to full professor.

The schedule for consideration of promotion request follows the calendar provide in these implementation guidelines at 2.4.E.

While similar to the tenure dossier, the contents focus on the post-tenure period and on the demonstration of national and/or international standing through outstanding

contributions to professional, scholarly, and/or creative activity relevant to the candidate's discipline. The candidate should be recognized as a leading authority in the relevant discipline and should demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching and excellence in either scholarship or service, if not both.

Contents of Promotion Dossier

A candidate's dossier for promotion to full professor provides evidence of performance on the criteria specified in sections 2.4.C and 2.4.F.2. Each item in the dossier can serve as evidence of achievement in more than one criterion for promotion. While the dossier follows the same structure as the dossier prepared for promotion to Associate Professor outlined in Appendix 3, it reflects the activities of the applicant since promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to the content outlined in Appendix 3, the dossier should include written reports of the outcomes of any sabbaticals taken during the period since promotion to Associate Professor and any annual performance reviews or Dean's annual review letters to faculty during that period. The fourth criterion for promotion, "institutional/departmental need" will also be addressed by the P&T committee and the Dean in their recommendation letters to the Provost.

2.5.B.3 Periodic Developmental Multi-Year Review (PDMYR)

2.5.B.3.b PDMYR Process

Tenured faculty will participate in a multi-year review process every six years following the awarding of tenure to encourage, support, and recognize continued development. These faculty members will create a PDMYR dossier describing their achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, and service, which will be assessed by the faculty member's PDMYR committee. The evaluation process will proceed according to the guidelines set forth in the subsections of FPM 2.5.B.3 and will reflect the contents of the dossier outlined in Appendix 3.

During PDMYR, the committee will conduct peer reviews of teaching for each of the faculty member's classes. All tenured faculty members will be reviewed on the basis of the length of time of their tenured appointment and every six years following.

Date	Due
1st week of Feb.	Dean notifies (in writing) RTA faculty scheduled to undergo PDMYR
May 1-31	RTA coordinates the establishment of the PDMYR committees with terms of office from Sept 1 to May 31
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review meetings with tenured faculty
July 1	Voluntary PDMYR requests due to the Dean
Sept. 1	Dean provides to Provost a list of faculty to undergo the PDMYR during the current academic year
Sept. to Nov.	The PDMYR committee conducts peer evaluation of teaching
Jan. 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean will advise each tenured faculty member of upcoming PDMYR in the next academic year • PDMYR dossier due to the PDMYR committee and the Dean

1 st week of Feb.	RTA reminds faculty members of the timing, available documentation, and activities involved in the various SLIS reviews
Apr. 1	PDMYR committee provides conclusions and recommendations to RTA, and shortly thereafter, to the faculty member, and Dean
Apr. 15	Faculty response to PDMYR recommendation, assuming faculty member receives the report on or before April 1. Faculty are given no less than two weeks to respond to a PDMYR report per FPM 2.5.B.3 (j)
May 1	Dean's PDMYR report on individual faculty and resources allocation recommendations to Provost
June 1	Provost reviews and announces PDMYR conclusion(s) to the faculty member, RTA, and the Dean.
June 30	Dean sends to Provost her/his PDMYR summary report that lists the names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year and those for whom a professional development plan was recommended and established with a copy of that professional development plan.

Contents of the PDMYR dossier

On January 31, faculty members undergoing PDMYR submit their dossiers for review to their review committee. Similar to the promotion and tenure dossier, the PDMYR dossier contains materials outlined in Appendix 3, except that the narrative and other components of the dossier should focus primarily on the period of time since being tenured, the period of time since being promoted, or the period of time since the last PDMYR, whichever is appropriate. The focus of this dossier should be on sustained excellence. Additional PDMYR contents include:

- the PDMYR professional development planning document found in Appendix 4,
- the most recent PDMYR if applicable,
- written reports of the outcomes of sabbaticals taken during the period reviewed,
- annual performance reviews or Dean's annual review letters to the faculty member during the review period, and
- all peer evaluations of teaching conducted over the six-year period.

Dossier materials should be made available online in a secure, password-protected repository. The candidate should provide log-in information to the chair of the PDMYR committee.

2.5.C Review of Faculty with Contract Appointments

2.5.C.1. Professors of Practice and Lecturers

Professors of Practice and Lecturers (at all levels) participate in the annual review process. The Dean conducts all reviews. The Dean assesses the submitted annual review, completed course evaluations, and any further quantitative or qualitative measures of teaching performance available. Based on these pieces of documentation, the Dean determines whether the person's contract should be renewed and offers an assessment of that person's teaching, scholarship, and service contributions in line with the requirements of the position's rank and type. The Dean

shares the commentary with the faculty member in an annual letter intended for continued self-development.

Date	Due
June 30	Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	Dean's annual review letter to faculty member

2.5.C.2 Adjunct Faculty

The Panel on Adjunct Review and Recommendation (PARR), a committee that oversees the selection of LIS adjunct instructors, coordinates an evaluation of a new adjunct faculty member at the end of his or her first semester of teaching. This evaluation takes the form of an interview. Prior to the interview, PARR observes the adjunct in a classroom situation where feasible and reviews the course evaluations produced for that semester with the adjunct faculty member. The bulk of the interview consists of discussion of those evaluations and of any issues related to teaching and learning that those evaluations raise, and concludes with suggestions for improvement and development. Based on this discussion, PARR makes a formal written recommendation to the Dean and the LIS program director regarding reappointment. In subsequent semesters, PARR reviews the course evaluations for all adjunct faculty members, regardless of how often a person has taught a course. If the panel members have concerns related to teaching and learning that arise from the evaluations, they will request a written response to the points raised in those evaluations. They may also arrange an interview consistent with the type of interview conducted after completion of the first semester of teaching.

The program faculty in the Computer Science and Children's Literature programs coordinate the evaluation new adjunct faculty who teach in these programs by scheduling classroom visits, meeting with the adjunct faculty and reviewing student evaluations.

2.5.C.3 Visiting Professors

PARR coordinates an evaluation of a new visiting professor at the end of his or her first semester of teaching. This evaluation takes the form of an interview. Prior to the interview, PARR observes the visiting professor in a classroom situation where feasible and reviews the course evaluations produced for that semester with the visiting professor. The bulk of the interview consists of discussion of those evaluations and of any issues related to teaching and learning that those evaluations raise, and concludes with suggestions for improvement and development. PARR will create a summary report of the meeting including any accolades or suggestions for improvement and development. This will contribute to the visiting professor's assessment and may be used to support his or her application for reappointment. In subsequent semesters, PARR reviews the course evaluations for all visiting professors, regardless of how often a person has taught a course. If the panel members have concerns related to teaching and learning that arise from the evaluations, they will request a written response to the points raised in those evaluations. They may also arrange an interview consistent with the type of interview conducted after completion of the first semester of teaching.

2.6.A Professional Development

Opportunities for faculty development will be coordinated by the Leadership Team in conjunction with the Dean's Office.

When funds are available SLIS provides each faculty member with a Faculty Resource Account (FRA), which allocates a set amount of resources for use in travel to meetings and conferences, participation in workshops, books, software, hardware, professional membership dues, and other resources for the development of faculty. If a faculty member purchases software and/or hardware with such funds and leaves the College, the software and hardware purchased with College funds remain College property. Funds are allocated yearly and must be spent within the fiscal year they are awarded. Faculty resource account funds for contract and visiting faculty are negotiated at time of contract.

In addition to the FRA, other development funds are available to faculty at SLIS on a competitive basis. For example, the Emily Hollowell Research Fund is managed by SLIS to support research by faculty. Simmons College also offers funding opportunities for professional development, including faculty travel awards through the Office of Sponsored Research. Faculty members are encouraged to take full advantage of these funds in order to promote professional development, research, and excellence in teaching.

2.6.B.3 Types of Sabbaticals

Workload adjustments that result from faculty being awarded sabbatical leave are decided by the Dean based on the current need of the School.

2.6.B.6 Written Report

The written report of sabbatical activity will be available to SLIS faculty on request.

2.6.D. Contract Faculty Career (Professional) Development Assignments

2.6.D.3 Types of Professional Development Assignment

SLIS supports the release from 50% of one academic year's usual teaching and service workload for up to one semester at 100% of base salary as professional development assignment outlined in the FPM. However, the exact workload adjustment will need to be decided by the Dean and the Contract Faculty member based on the current need of the School.

2.6.E Course Reduction Vouchers for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work for Tenure-Track Faculty

The request to use a course release voucher shall be made no later than October 15 of the academic year prior to the year for which the course release is requested. A Faculty Course Planning Worksheet is completed in conjunction with the appropriate Program Director and Dean, who will make a determination about whether the course release is granted based on the availability of resources. If the request is approved, the Office of the Provost's Tenure Track Faculty Voucher Request form must be completed and submitted to the Provost by April 15.

SECTION 6. AMENDMENTS TO *FACULTY POLICY MANUAL*

These Implementation Guidelines may be amended by a motion and vote of the SLIS faculty. Amendments require the approval of the Provost.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Indicators of Strong and Excellent Performance

For the purposes of tenure and/or promotion and for each review milestone, faculty members are evaluated in three criteria (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) according to three ratings categories: excellent, strong, and not strong. Faculty members are expected to be *at least* strong in all three categories, and ultimately each faculty member should attain a level of excellence in teaching and in either scholarship or service (preferably both). The specific examples listed here reflect the aspects of teaching, scholarship, and service that are valued by the SLIS faculty. This is not meant to be a comprehensive overview or a checklist; a faculty member does not need to accomplish every item listed here in order to be considered excellent, but it serves as a guideline of what activities would be considered strong and excellent. Assessment of activities takes into account the level of effort required; the quality, prestige, and importance of the work; and in terms of research, the extent and rigor of peer review involved.

1. Service

Internal

- Serving in a leadership role for a major SLIS committee or College-wide committee or governance group
- Engaging in extraordinary activities related to student advising, recruitment, and retention
- Organizing colloquia open to SLIS, the College, or the wider community
- Engaging in discipline-related service to the local civic community

External

- Offering continuing education workshops for professional organizations or agencies
- Giving invited guest lectures or keynote addresses nationally or internationally
- Chairing and organizing national or international conferences or symposia
- Holding leadership positions in national or international professional organizations
- Planning events under the auspices of national or international professional organizations
- Serving on national accrediting boards
- Leading a networking activity related to the discipline or the profession (e.g., publishing a respected blog, managing a widely valued online scholarly or professional resource)
- Serving as guest editor of an issue of a professional journal
- Serving as editor of a professional journal
- Consulting to government, business, and other types of agencies
- Speaking to the media on matters related to SLIS, the College, the discipline, or the profession
- Reviewing grant proposals for funding agencies
- Educational services for community groups

2. Scholarship

Publications

A mix of singly-authored and collaboratively-authored publications is desirable, but ultimately the mix will reflect the disciplinary focus of the candidate.

- Article in a peer-reviewed journal

- Paper in a peer-reviewed published conference proceedings
- Authored book
- Edited book
- Chapter in a book
- Peer-reviewed poster
- Creative or other works appropriate to the discipline

Research activities

Although funded research brings luster to the School, it is the nature of some research areas that funding is either unavailable or not necessary.

- Serving as principal investigator on a research project, with or without external funding.
- Serving in other roles in funded or unfunded research projects requiring significant intellectual and administrative input, such as project director, project coordinator

Consulting

- Consulting activities with nationally or internationally known agencies or institutions

3. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by an ongoing, consistent record of high quality performance in and outside of the classroom. That performance is characterized by:

- Extensive content knowledge with evidence of currency in area(s) of expertise and continuing pursuit of knowledge
- Fully articulated course plans or syllabi with appropriate sections required by the School as outlined on the SLIS Faculty Office Wiki
- Clarity in course structure and in instructional goals in the form of student learning outcomes
- Creation of a learning environment which is respectful of students and encourages learning
- Inclusion in courses of relevant resources that will enhance the student's experience and allow students to explore topics further
- Learning activities that
 - are highly relevant to course and instructional goals and outcomes
 - progress coherently
- Well articulated assessment criteria and standards that
 - are clearly communicated to students
 - provide evidence of student comprehension of goals and objectives
 - are congruent with instructional goals and program goals
- Appropriate allocation of time for completion of assignments and understanding of course material
- Return of assignments in a timely manner and with constructive feedback
- Appropriate use of resources, materials, and tools (including technology) that enhance instruction
- Understanding of the characteristics of our student body, and adjusting learning strategies as appropriate to different student needs

Appendix 2: SLIS Faculty Review Activities Calendar

Date	Due
July 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voluntary PDMYR requests due to the Dean First-year dossier due to the review committee and the Dean Mid-point review dossier due to RTA and the Dean (end of yr. 3) Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for mid-point review in the next academic year New faculty members begin developing dossiers when arriving at SLIS
July 1-31	RTA writes faculty assessment for those undergoing mid-point review
July 1 to August 15	First Year committee reviews first-year dossier and supporting material; recommendations go to RTA, and shortly thereafter, to the faculty member, and the Dean
July 1 to Sept.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's annual review letter to tenure-track and contract faculty Dean's annual review meetings with tenure-track and tenured faculty (NOTE: First-year faculty members are listed below at Sept 1-15)
Mid-July	Dean, P&T chair, and candidate for tenure or promotion in rank meet to discuss process & potential external reviewers
Aug. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure and/or promotion dossier due to P&T committee for review Dean and candidate for tenure and/or promotion supply names of external reviewers and short description of each with rationale as to why they were chosen RTA's mid-point review recommendations goes to faculty member, Dean, and Provost
Aug. 1-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean meets with faculty member to discuss mid-point review P&T committee begins initial review of tenure and/or promotion dossier to provide feedback to candidate
Aug. 5	Dean finalizes the list of external reviewers for faculty members under consideration for tenure and promotion
Aug. 10	Dean contacts external reviewers, requests indication of willingness
Sept. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final P&T dossier due to the P&T committee and the Dean P&T committee(s) establishes dates and times in mid-November for tenured faculty to meet and discuss P&T case(s) Dean sends tenure/promotion dossier and instructions to external reviewers Dean provides to Provost a list of faculty to undergo the PDMYR during the current academic year Dean's mid-point review letter to faculty member Dean notifies RTA that mid-point reviews are complete
1st week of Sept.	RTA reminds faculty members of the timing, available documentation, and activities involved in the various SLIS reviews
Sept. 1-15	The Dean discusses the first-year review during the faculty member's annual review meeting (dates may be subject to change).
Sept. 30	Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion in the next academic year
Sept. to Nov.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer evaluation of teaching takes place P&T committee and the Dean discuss any institutional/departmental needs of the School that may affect tenure and promotion decisions (fourth criterion for P&T)

Date	Due
Mid-Oct.	P&T chair checks with Dean about status of external letters
Nov. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External reviewers' comments for tenure/promotion cases are due Letters are anonymized before being shared with the Tenured Voting Faculty in the Moodle voting site
First two weeks of Nov.	Eligible faculty review P&T dossier, anonymized external reviewer comments, and supporting materials
Mid-November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P&T meeting(s) held to discuss promotion and tenure case(s) Eligible faculty vote on P&T candidates
Mid-Nov to Nov. 27	P&T committee writes final recommendation report
Nov. 28	P&T committee's recommendation report goes to RTA for review for clarity, style, consistency, and compliance with the FPM and SLIS IG
Nov. 30	Last day to add additional content to the dossier
Dec. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTA sends compiled report of P&T recommendations to Dean and Provost Dossiers and external letters are sent to Provost's office
Dec. 15 or shortly thereafter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's tenure and/or promotion recommendations go to Provost and RTA Dean verbally communicates the P&T recommendations made by the SLIS tenured faculty and the Dean to the P&T candidates (if they wish to know) and to RTA
Jan. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean notifies (in writing) faculty eligible for mid-point review in the next academic year (end of year 2) Mid-point review dossier due to RTA and the Dean (end of yr. 3)
Jan. 1-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTA writes faculty assessment for those undergoing mid-point review
Jan. 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDMYR dossier due to the PDMYR committee and the Dean Dean will advise each tenured faculty member of upcoming PDMYR in the next academic year
Feb. 1	RTA mid-point review recommendations goes to faculty member, Dean, and Provost
1 st week of Feb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTA reminds faculty members of the timing, available documentation, and activities involved in the various SLIS reviews Dean notifies (in writing) faculty scheduled to undergo PDMYR
Feb. 1- 28	Dean meets with faculty member to discuss mid-point review
Feb. to Apr.	Peer evaluation of teaching takes place
Feb. to Mar. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure and promotion decisions announced The Provost and the Dean inform the candidate verbally of the recommendation and approval by the Board as soon as possible. The Dean will inform the Chair of RTA verbally after the candidate has been informed of the outcome. The President and Provost notify RTA, Dean, and faculty member in writing no later than 1 week after meeting.
	A faculty member who receives notification of denial of tenure has five business days after official notification of denial of tenure in which to send to the Provost a request to meet with the Dean, RTA, the Provost, or the President.
Mar. 1-31	P&T candidates may voluntarily meet with RTA to discuss dossier contents and preparation

Date	Due
Mar. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's mid-point review letter to faculty member Dean notifies RTA that mid-point review is complete
Apr. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDMYR committee provides conclusions and recommendations to RTA, and shortly thereafter, to the faculty member, and Dean RTA chair sends a reminder that those seeking tenure and/or promotion must notify the Dean and RTA by May 1st
Apr.15	Faculty response to PDMYR recommendation, assuming faculty member receives the report on or before April 1. Faculty are given no less than two weeks to respond to a PDMYR report per FPM 2.5.B.3 (j)
May 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's PDMYR report on individual faculty and resources allocation recommendations to Provost Candidate informs Dean and RTA as to intent to go up for tenure and/or promotion in rank
May 1-31	RTA coordinates the establishment of the First Year, P&T, and PDMYR committees with terms of office falling between Sept 1 and August 31
June 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost reviews and announces PDMYR conclusion(s) to the faculty member, RTA, and the Dean
June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reviews completed by faculty are submitted to Dean Dean sends to Provost her/his PDMYR summary report that lists the names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year and those for whom a professional development plan was recommended and established with a copy of that professional development plan

See also: individual calendars in the *SLIS Implementation Guidelines of the Faculty Policy Manual*

- Promotion and tenure calendar at 2.4.E
- Annual review calendar at 2.5.A.1
- Mid-point review calendar at 2.5.A.2
- First-year review calendar at 2.4.A.4
- PDMYR calendar at 2.5.B.3
- Professors of Practice and Lecturer's Review calendar at 2.5.C.1

Appendix 3: SLIS Dossier Contents

This appendix contains a list of the contents included in dossiers submitted for first-year, mid-point, and tenure reviews. It is also the basis for dossiers for promotions to full professor and for PDYMR, although these reviews address additional foci or require additional materials. Please see the relevant section of the IG to ensure that all materials needed for a particular type of review are included.

Table of Contents

1. **Current Curriculum Vitae:** The curriculum vitae includes education, employment, publications (sorted according to type with peer-reviewed items listed separately), presentations, awards/memberships, service, and other professional information.
2. **Cumulative Annual Report:** This document is an integrated compilation of the faculty annual reports submitted during the probationary period, including the year of submission. The faculty annual report is the yearly report that each faculty member submits to the Dean, which describes a faculty member's accomplishments for the year.
3. **Personal Narrative:** In no more than 10 pages, this narrative discusses:
 - Achievements related to the criteria for excellence as a teacher; research and scholarship; and service to the mission of the School, College, and the professions or disciplines.
 - Goals for the near future related to the criteria listed above.
4. **Teaching Self-assessment: In addition to the personal narrative, additional information about the candidates teaching is required. Please provide:**
 - a. An outline of course management responsibilities. This includes, at a minimum, the courses taught listed by year and semester, the number of students in each course, and an indication of whether each course was developed entirely or substantially revised by the faculty member.
 - b. Copies of current course syllabi (or links to syllabi available online) for courses taught during the probationary period.
 - c. A self-assessment of teaching that addresses, at a minimum, the points listed below.

Reflection on Teaching Approach and Philosophy

- Teaching philosophy, noting any changes and the reasons for changes
- Teaching and learning strategies and methods, noting any changes and reasons for the changes
- Use of technology and other tools in courses (if applicable), noting how technology is incorporated and its effectiveness (please provide log-ins, URLs or other information needed to access online material, or provide sample pages)
- Use of visiting lecturers, team teaching and other collaborative teaching activities, indicating the reasons and the benefits to teaching and to student learning
- Course evaluations of teaching, noting whether any changes have been made in the approach to teaching or in the courses in response to this feedback
- Processes and outcomes of peer evaluation of teaching

Assessment and Feedback

- The range of assessment practices used in courses
- Feedback to students, noting turnaround time, the extent of feedback, and the nature of the feedback

Integration of Research/Scholarship and Service into Teaching

- Influence of research/scholarship on teaching
- Influence of service activities on teaching

Influence of Teaching

- Any other evidence that indicates the effectiveness and influence of the faculty member's teaching
- Contributions to conferences, seminars, professional society meetings or other meetings on topics about teaching, student learning and educational innovation or development

Course Development

- New courses developed
- Courses the faculty member would like to develop

5. Course Evaluation Summary Data and other Quantitative and/or Qualitative Evidence of Teaching Excellence

- a. Create a quantitative summary of *all* teaching-related data culled from the course evaluations collected for each of the classes taught at the College during the period being reviewed.
- b. Any further quantitative or qualitative evidence of teaching excellence may be appended to this summary (e.g., awards for teaching, student publications emanating from a course, evidence of participation in continuing education related to teaching, letters of appreciation from former students as described in IG 2.4.C.1).

6. Evidence of Achievement in Research, Scholarship and Creative Works

- a. Discuss the foci of and priorities within the faculty member's research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; the process of developing the faculty member's scholarly record; and any achievements in this area, including any research that may involve students, grant applications, or external partners. Demonstrate the importance and impact of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. Evidence may include bibliometric measures such as citation analysis, citation counts, reviews of the faculty member's publications, sales figures, research awards, grants, etc.
- b. Include copies of all articles, books, reviews, cases, portfolios, experiments, grants, copies of any grant proposal under review, scholarly presentations, etc. to support the case for excellence in research, scholarship, and creative works.

7. Discussion of Service

- a. Discuss contributions in the area of service to SLIS, to the College, and to the information professions. Describe roles performed, any leadership assumed, consulting activities, etc. Discuss the impact and importance of contributions in service-related activities. List any accolades and evaluations of professional presentations.

- b. Include copies of significant contributions or products of services-related activities if appropriate (e.g., programs/agenda for conferences and meetings organized, committee reports or committee position papers, slides from professional presentation).
- 8. **Other**
Any other information that the faculty member considers important for the Dean, RTA, and the Provost to know.

Appendix 4: PDMYR Professional Development Plan

The PDMYR candidate should elaborate on goals for the coming year(s), as well as any resources needed to achieve those goals, and should submit the development plan as part of the PDMYR dossier. The development plan is discussed at the meeting of the candidate and the PDMYR committee, and might then be revised before being sent (with the dossier) to the Dean and subsequently the Provost. The intention of the development plan is to suggest the kinds of support the candidate needs to further his or her professional development.

Faculty Professional Development Plan (to document outcome of peer review meeting)

Name:

Goal:		
<u>Activities</u>	<u>Deliverables</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
<u>Resources:</u>		
<u>Mentors (if applicable):</u>		
<u>Follow-up (if applicable):</u>		

[repeat as needed]

Summary by Committee:

☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Needs improvement

Signature _____
(Faculty)

Date _____

Signature _____
(Chair of Committee)

Date _____

Summary by Dean:

Signature _____
(Dean)

Date _____