

CODE

OF THE

DEPARTMENT OF

COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS

(Revised December 2, 2010)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Title Page		i
Table of Contents		ii
Section I	Mission and Objectives	1
	A. Mission Statement	1
	B. Statement of Objectives	1
	C. Educational Philosophy	2
Section II	Organization and Administration	4
	A. Department Chair	4
	B. Academic Faculty	6
	C. Faculty Meetings	8
	D. Department Chair Election	9
	E. Salaries	10
	F. Travel	11
	G. Summer Teaching	11
	H. Personnel	11
	I. Operational Evaluation	11
	J. Committees	12
Section III	Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures	12
	A. Department Workload Policy	12
	B. Appointment of Faculty	13
	C. Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees	16
	D. Procedures for Promotion	17
	E. Procedures for Tenure	19
	F. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Advisory Committees	20
Section IV	Faculty Evaluation, Promotion & Tenure (P & T) Standards, and Disciplinary Actions	20
	A. Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation	20
	B. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	22
	C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	25
	D. Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Period Review of Untenured Faculty	29
	E. Annual Probationary Period Review of Untenured Faculty	30
	F. Disciplinary Action for Tenured Faculty	31
	G. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews	32

Section V	Student Grade Appeals and Faculty Grievances	35
	A. Graduate Student Evaluation	35
	B. Student Grade Appeal Procedures	37
	C. Faculty Grievance Procedures	38
Section VI	Procedures for Changing the Department Code	39
Section VII	Relationship to University Code	39
Signature Page		40

CODE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Section I: Mission and Objectives

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Computer Information Systems is teaching and advising, research and service/outreach. The scope of this mission includes:

- 1) Offering quality information technology curriculum to diverse undergraduate and graduate students while being cognizant of the professional expectations of individual students, the general public, government, and profit and not-for-profit businesses locally and regionally;
- 2) Providing individual student and/or group academic and professional development advise on an as-requested or as-needed basis;
- 3) Pursuit of scholarly output commensurate with a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University involving theoretical and applied research including publications in premier or high quality journals that results in regional, national and international recognition;
- 4) Pursuit of contracts and grants that result in publications and other forms of scholarly productivity; and
- 5) Providing service internally to the university and externally to professional societies and organizations, including outreach to the general community.

B. Statement of Objectives

The objectives of the Department of Computer Information Systems are:

- 1) To provide a comprehensive curriculum in the discipline of Computer Information Systems at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In providing this curriculum, the department seeks to maintain an effective balance between excellence in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, university and public service, while consistently maintaining a high level of professional standards that are recognized within the university, the Colorado business community, and academia.
- 2) To develop and maintain a program of professional research and scholarly productivity that results in publications in premier and high quality information technology (IT) journals plus premier and high quality journals in related disciplines.
- 3) To employ effective and innovative methods of instruction that result in a positive and constructive learning environment whereby students emerging from our programs possess technical skills and abilities that prepare them for immediate positions of responsibility upon graduation supported by life-long learning skills.
- 4) To provide service to other departments within the College of Business, University and community at large, including professional societies relevant to the academic and research interests of departmental faculty.

C. Educational Philosophy

As its educational philosophy, the department seeks to discover and disseminate knowledge in information systems (IS), including the decision sciences and related disciplines, and to provide the framework and methodology to analyze, design, and manage complex computer-based information systems. Active pursuit of knowledge including computer technology, information systems, quantitative methods, and functional business areas, is

undertaken to meet these objectives. Characteristics to be developed by student majors at the undergraduate level include but are not limited to:

1. The ability to interact with others, listen to and understand the views of others, and to articulate and explain complex ideas both orally and in writing.
2. The ability to formulate and solve quantitative models and to recognize the kinds of situations in which they apply.
3. Development of a general knowledge of basic hardware/software components of a computer system and their configuration patterns.
4. The ability to program in high-level computer language(s).
5. Development of general knowledge in the functional areas of business, including business processes.
6. The ability to develop systems specifications in terms of functions, modules, and interfaces.
7. The ability to integrate various computer related tools and techniques in a problem solving environment.
8. Development of a knowledge and awareness of emerging technologies in the field of computer information systems.

Additional characteristics developed at the graduate level include but are not limited to:

1. General awareness of research methodology and the important sources of information for updating technology.
2. Knowledge of how information systems are superimposed on organizational patterns--at the operational, control, and planning levels.
3. The ability to articulate a knowledge-based opinion on important issues regarding information technology and the impact of systems on society, including global systems issues.
4. An understanding of the positive and negative impact of information systems on the various functional areas and administrative units of an organization.

Section II: Organization and Administration

A. Department Chair

1. Philosophically and administratively, the Department of Computer Information Systems shall operate under principles of faculty governance as outlined in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (the Manual)*. The Chairperson is the department administrative officer whose duties shall be specified by this Code and the *University Manual*.
2. The department Chairperson has the general responsibility for all faculty/staff activities which may affect the professional status of the department and/or which are in the best interest of the college and university. These responsibilities include but are not restricted to the following:
 - a. Develop and strengthen academic programs; develop and strengthen faculty competence; provide leadership in construction of sound curricula to meet educational needs of students; cooperate with and assist other departments in matters affecting the university, college and department in its educational and research programs; recruit faculty; promote and maintain department morale.
 - b. Advise the Dean on all administrative and policy matters relating to the department.
 - c. Administer academic and financial matters within the department to promote student achievement and professional opportunities for faculty members; including equity in travel, resources and faculty teaching responsibilities. The department Chairperson shall account for and report on all departmentally controlled fund balances and proposed department spending as requested by any member of the department faculty eligible to vote at a regularly scheduled department meeting.
 - d. Initiate recommendations for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, midpoint tenure review, salary, and dismissal of faculty members.
 - e. Assist in the preparation of reports called for by higher administrative authorities or by agencies of the institution charged with coordinating the general program of the university.

- f. Develop harmonious working relationships within the department, college and university, other educational institutions, business, government, consumer groups, the community, and professional societies and business-related organizations as appropriate.
- g. Meet with representative students of the department on a regular basis or as requested for the purpose of discussing curriculum, program development, advising, perceived problems, and other matters pertaining to improving academic programs and the overall academic experience.
- h. Participate in faculty duties by teaching the equivalent of a half-time teaching load or teaching load as may be directed by the Dean, serving on committees as appointed, maintaining professional involvement in their area of interest, serving as a voting member of the college Administrative Committee, and advising students.
- i. Coordinate the recommendation and/or selection of faculty members for department, college and university standing or ad hoc committee assignments, attempting also to minimize time intensive committee responsibilities for untenured, tenure-track faculty.
- j. Delegate administrative functions to other members of the department whenever deemed necessary; however, if the Chairperson is temporarily unable to fulfill his/her duties for any reason, a regular full-time or regular part-time faculty member of the department can be either appointed by the department Chairperson to act in his/her absence or be recommended by the voting faculty members of the department. In either case, the Dean of the College of Business shall approve and appoint the selection of a temporary department Chairperson.
- k. Call at least one departmental meeting during each semester of the regular academic year. All voting faculty and other interested persons should be given a minimum one-week electronic or written notice of these meetings, together with a stated agenda. Minutes of all actions taken at departmental meetings will be distributed by written or electronic means by the department Chairperson or his/her delegate to all members of the department in a timely manner and maintained for at least five years in a departmental file. All department meetings, regular and special, may be conducted according to Roberts Rules of Order As Revised.
- l. Assign members of the department faculty to graduate student advisory committees in a reasonable and equitable manner. (See Section III.F)
- m. Meet each semester with part-time faculty to review their performance from the previous semester.

- n. Call a special meeting of the department as requested by a minimum of three faculty eligible to vote for the purposes of discussing and voting, as necessary, topic(s) specifically requested by those requesting a special meeting.
- o. Delegate, as required, those portions of Chairperson responsibilities to an Assistant Chairperson, if this position is formally established, or a voting member of the department, with responsibilities clearly defined and communicated to the faculty.
- p. Other duties as may be required or as directed in the administration of the department.

B. Academic Faculty

2. All members of the faculty who hold regular full-time, regular part-time, or transitional appointments at any rank, and who are administratively responsible to the department Chairperson, herein known as eligible faculty members, shall have the right to participate in the conduct of all relevant departmental business unless excepted elsewhere. Additional qualifications may exist such as participation in P&T, annual and midpoint review processes. However, unless extended on an individual basis, only eligible faculty members can participate in a vote to: a) recommend the department Chairperson, b) recommend progress or lack thereof as part of an annual or midpoint review of tenure track faculty, c) recommend or deny tenure and/or promotion, d) vote to approve or disapprove any formal evaluation of the department, and e) vote to approve changes to the department code. Voting privileges may be extended to other members of the faculty on a limited basis. Limitations must be clearly defined and communicated in writing for each individual to whom voting privileges are specifically extended. All extensions of voting privileges shall be recorded as part of either regular or special department meeting minutes.

3. Faculty members with special or temporary appointments, faculty affiliates, and retired faculty shall have general faculty privileges and the use of departmental facilities. They may also attend all departmental meetings and are encouraged to participate but will have no formal voting privileges unless specifically extended to an individual on a case-by case basis, including limitations, by a majority of eligible faculty members in attendance at a special or regularly scheduled departmental meeting. Non-voting attendees at a departmental meeting may be excused during voting portions of a meeting at the discretion of the department Chairperson or a majority vote of the faculty eligible to vote.
4. Major departmental policies shall be determined by the department Chairperson in collaboration with eligible faculty, plus those to whom voting privileges are specifically extended, in announced regular or special departmental meetings. All department votes are to be governed by a simple majority of eligible faculty, plus those to whom voting privileges are specifically extended, unless otherwise stated in the department or University Code.
5. All eligible faculty members plus special appointments, or those who are administratively responsible to the department Chairperson, may be requested to participate, as appropriate, in distance learning or MBA programs. Participation in these programs should be distributed in an equitable manner based on course needs, individual and departmental interests, and scheduling continuity.
6. As a normal job responsibility, faculty are expected to participate in a range of department and college functions such as regular and special department meetings, college meetings, department or college sanctioned social events, graduation activities,

plus events as may be requested by either the department Chairperson or Dean. This is in addition to responsibilities such as department committees, college committees, ad hoc committees as may be created by the department Chairperson or Dean, plus a range of University Faculty Council or special committees. Faculty on sabbatical or on leave are exempted from these responsibilities.

7. Eligible faculty are obligated to participate in P&T and promotion committee processes and may not recuse themselves from such responsibilities without a valid excuse such as medical. Faculty on sabbatical or on leave is encouraged to participate in these activities to the extent possible.

C. Faculty Meetings

1. Any voting faculty member who cannot attend a regular or special department meeting may designate in writing to the department Administrative Assistant, or the department Chairperson, an eligible faculty member who shall have their proxy vote. However, no more than one proxy vote in writing or electronically transmitted shall be held by any faculty member at a properly called meeting. Persons holding proxies shall announce this at the beginning of any meeting where a vote may be anticipated. Meeting minutes shall capture proxy information.
2. This Code shall permit electronic voting on issues raised but not decided at a regular or special department meeting. In addition, at times when the department Chairperson would like to record a vote on a specific issue without calling a department meeting, he/she may request a vote by electronic means. Electronic voting rules include the following:

- a. The terms majority or two-thirds majority shall include all faculty eligible to vote plus those to whom voting privileges have been extended. A reasonable time limit may be imposed for voting. Votes not cast within the reasonable time limit as established by the department Chairperson shall be counted as an abstention.
- b. No electronic vote shall be requested when it is known or reasonably can be assumed to be known, that one or more voting members may or will not be in electronic communication with their office.
- c. A record of all electronic votes shall be maintained in a department file in the same manner as regular or special meeting minutes. Unless required elsewhere, names of those voting for or against a specific motion shall not be maintained; a tally of votes recorded shall be maintained for the written record. The department Chairperson shall have at least one member of the faculty, or the department Administrative Assistant, validate and verify all electronic votes.
- d. A request for an electronic vote may be vetoed in writing or electronically and transmitted to the department Chairperson by any single eligible faculty member. Examples that would suggest vetoing a request for an electronic vote include a motion where the requestor may desire a secret ballot, or where it is perceived that additional information and/or discussion of issues is required.
- e. Any voting member of the department may ask for an extension of the time limit to vote. Should this request be denied by the department Chairperson, every attempt shall be made to clarify to all voting members why this request is being denied.
- f. A request for electronic voting shall not be used by any voting member of the department, or the department Chairperson, as a means to either limit or restrict discussion of the issue at hand. Electronic discussion of issues may take place prior to an electronic vote. The department Chairperson shall make every effort to insure that debate has been exhausted before a request to vote electronically is requested or called for.

D. Department Chair Election

1. Procedures for selecting the department Chairperson and the term of office are outlined in the University Code (see C.2.4.2.2.b and c., E.3.3, and E.7). When selecting a department Chairperson, however, it is recommended that members of the search committee from within the department called for in the University *Manual* (E.3.3) be

composed of only eligible faculty members, plus those to whom voting privileges have specifically been extended to include this subject. It is further recommended that the search committee consist of at least one male and at least one female faculty members.

2. The department Chairperson shall normally serve a five-year term and shall not serve more than two consecutive terms of office unless recommended by a majority of the faculty within the department eligible to vote and as approved by the Dean of the College of Business. Faculty are entitled to provide the Dean with input and recommendations, for or against, the appointment of anyone as department Chairperson. Appointment of the department Chairperson is the responsibility of the Dean.

E. Salaries

1. The annual evaluation process for each faculty member leading to salary recommendations for the following fiscal year begins with the faculty member completing a college-wide calendar year *Annual Faculty Activity Report*. Data from these reports, plus course evaluation summaries for the calendar year spring and fall semesters respectively, are organized by the department Chairperson for comparative purposes. Each faculty member shall be evaluated on a weighted point basis employing the category weights (%'s) (see Section III.A) multiplied by a numeric evaluation as assigned by the department Chairperson. Recommended raise figures shall be forwarded by the department Chairperson to the Dean for review. The Dean shall have final authority in recommending adjustments to base salary. All recommendations for salary increase must be approved by the President.

2. The department Chairperson issues each faculty member an *Annual Faculty Evaluation-Summary Report*, which is to be signed by the faculty member as having received, but not necessarily agreeing with, the evaluation report. Once departmental budget figures for the following fiscal year are known, the Chairperson issues each faculty member a written notice of change in salary accompanied by a written statement outlining summary details of the process used to calculate individual salary increases. Additionally, the following may also be considered as part of the overall salary determination process:
 - a. An across-the-board "cost of living" increase.
 - b. One-time considerations such as promotion, awards, or special recognition.
 - c. Upward adjustments in cases of diversity and/or gender.

There is no implied right to any salary adjustment should any of these conditions exist.

Salary adjustments for purposes of retention may be recommended by the department Chairperson and must be approved by the Dean.

F. Travel

Travel in conjunction with participation in professional meetings, relevant professional development, and professional training is encouraged. Conditional on the availability of departmental resources, each faculty member shall be entitled to at least one funded professional trip per year, subject to approval by the department Chairperson. It is the prerogative of the department Chairperson as to whether or not a trip report will be required in conjunction with travel supported by departmental funds.

G. Summer Teaching

Priority in summer teaching assignments shall be given to tenured and tenure track faculty.

H. Personnel

The Department recognizes the ultimate authority of the Board of Governors or as may be delegated by the Board to the President for decisions regarding appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal.

I. Operational Evaluation

1. Evaluation of departmental operations shall be conducted as requested by the Dean, the Provost, a majority vote of eligible faculty members at a regular or special department meeting, or as part of a periodic, e.g., six year evaluation, or as specified in the university Code (*Manual C.2.4.2.2.d*). The scope of any review may address departmental mission, objectives and operations including undergraduate and graduate teaching and advising, research, service and outreach, plus other activities and programs as directed. An eligible faculty member may be appointed by the department Chairperson to lead or assist with any evaluation process. The Chairperson may direct any evaluation process if requested to do so and shall report findings to the faculty, the Dean, Provost, the departmental Advisory Council, and any internal/external sources as may be appropriate.
2. If any three members of the departmental faculty are acutely dissatisfied with the operations of the department, a request can be made to the department Chairperson with copy to the Dean for an interim evaluation of the department and/or the department Chairperson. This process must conform to procedures outlined in the university Code

(*Manual C.2.4.2.2.d*). A special meeting of eligible faculty members may be called by three faculty members eligible to vote for the purpose of requesting an interim evaluation.

J. Committees

Standing Committees of the department shall consist of the a) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, b) Graduate Curriculum Committee, c) Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee. The P&T Committee shall become a Promotion Committee, including differences in eligibility requirements, in the case of consideration of promotion to the rank of (full) Professor.

Section III: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

A. Department Workload Policy

1. The department should schedule courses and assign faculty teaching loads on a fair and equitable basis. The department does not support course ownership by individual faculty members. Course assignments to promote faculty development and curriculum enhancement are encouraged.
2. Any workload policy is essentially concerned with the credit (percent of one's workload) given for teaching and advising, research and scholarly productivity, and service including outreach.
3. The percentage of faculty effort associated with each of the evaluative categories including teaching and advising, research and publications, and professional activities including service and outreach, shall be established by each faculty member in

conjunction with the department Chairperson per a timetable established by the department Chairperson each year. Percentages must add to 100%. The College Workload Policy may serve as a guide to percentages in each category that are permitted.

4. Buyouts for Externally Funded Research may be negotiated with the department Chairperson as a means of reducing one or more elements of a faculty member's overall workload portfolio. To the extent possible, buyouts and buyout rates are to be negotiated in advance with the department Chairperson and appropriate college personnel and at a rate consistent either within the College or as may exist in policy at the University level.

B. Appointment of Faculty

1. In seeking out and appointing any regular full-time, regular part-time, special, temporary or transitional faculty members, the department will adhere to non-discrimination, affirmative action and other policies of the university as outlined in the *Manual*, and/or other relevant university policies, procedures or documents.
2. To the extent possible, new tenure-track hires should be evaluated based on disciplinary or specialization needs of the department with consideration given to strategic directions of the college.
3. Any special or temporary faculty members employed by the department/university will be appointed by the department Chairperson after appropriate consultation with department faculty as appropriate or as requested.

4. The department Chairperson will initiate the search for new or replacement regular full or part-time faculty by appointing a departmental search committee. This committee will consist of at least three eligible faculty members. The search committee should to the extent possible follow these procedures.
 - a. Locate potential applicants following advertising procedures consistent within the university and as practiced within the discipline, including national advertising in professional publications, notices at appropriate annual meetings, electronic postings, and announcement letters to other academic institutions. The position description used as a basis for preparing advertising materials shall take into account the desired expertise or technical profile desired in a new hire. Additionally, the search committee shall request and screen employment documents, seek and evaluate internal and external letters of reference, recommend potential candidates and initiate visitation schedules as appropriate. The search committee must establish control procedures to insure the confidentiality of all materials provided by a candidate or received in reference to the candidate, including that persons outside the formal search process neither have access to materials provided the search committee nor the opportunity to gain access, while understanding also potential legal consequences of disseminating or violating a breach of candidate confidentiality.
 - b. During visitation, ensure that all resident departmental faculty members have an opportunity to interview the candidate(s). Any department faculty member on Leave or Sabbatical should be consulted and, where practical, invited to meet the candidate(s). Interviews should be arranged with the department Chairperson and with the Dean and/or Associate Dean(s) of the College of Business. The candidate(s) should also be interviewed by faculty and administrative personnel in other departments as appropriate and time permitting.
 - c. The search committee will, as the result of a majority vote, forward the names of the final candidate(s) that are deemed acceptable, either ranked or unranked as may be required, to the department faculty after carefully considering the following criteria, all in addition to specific criteria and requirements as detailed in the job announcement: (1) Teaching and advising potential, (2) Research and publication potential, (3) Service potential, and (4) Overall needs of the department and college (such as MBA programs).
 - d. Names of final candidate(s) deemed acceptable will be determined by a majority vote of the eligible faculty, plus those to whom voting privileges are specifically extended. The name of the candidate(s) deemed acceptable shall be submitted to the department Chairperson. The department Chairperson shall have the right of

approval or disapproval of any final candidate(s) proposed by the search committee. Disapproval by the department Chairperson shall be stated in writing to the search committee and Dean and must not be based on arbitrary or capricious reasons. Upon approval, the department Chairperson shall be responsible for presenting final candidate names and credentials first to the Dean and then the University Office of Equal Opportunity for approval to proceed, and before any offer to any candidate is made. If more than one candidate is deemed acceptable for a given position, the final selection will be made by the Dean after consultation with both the department Chairperson and the search committee.

- e. If the candidate(s) deemed acceptable is/are not hired, the search committee will repeat the activities outlined above until discontinued by the Dean, or department Chairperson in consultation with the search committee and Dean.
5. Reappointment of tenure-track faculty members shall be at the discretion of the department Chairperson and Dean. The department Chairperson shall consult with the department tenure and promotion (P&T) committee concerning all reappointments. The Chairperson shall convey to the P&T committee in writing and in a timely manner any decision that is in disagreement with a majority of the P&T committee recommendation.
6. Only in the rarest of cases shall the department seek to hire a regular tenure-track faculty member via a 'directed hire' process, or where a request would be made to vacate normal Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) procedures. Any effort to hire a regular full-time or regular part-time faculty member via a directed hire process would require both Chairperson and Dean approval and must be presented to the department faculty for approval to proceed including a written argument and rationale.

C. Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees

1. For consideration to (full) professor, the department Chairperson shall constitute a promotion committee consisting of all (full) professors in the department. The department Chairperson, college Dean, Provost and University President may not be a

member of this committee. Department faculty consisting of eligible Assistant and Associate Deans may individually elect to serve on this committee unless their administrative appointment is of such a nature that serving would create a conflict of interest situation; however election to serve shall be made at the beginning of their duties as assistant or associate dean and before any candidate for promotion is to be considered, or upon implementation of this code. Assistant or Associate Deans who elect to serve on a promotion committee are encouraged to neither offer to provide or provide, formally or informally, additional input to the Dean and in regard to the Dean's decision to support or not support a recommendation for promotion. The department Chairperson shall appoint the chair of the promotion committee. In the absence of at least three (full) professors in the department, procedures outlined in the *Manual* shall prevail (see E.13.1). In the event that a minimum of three (full) professors do not exist within the department, the department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean together shall complete the formation of a promotion committee in an unbiased manner, including by lot, from eligible faculty (non-administrative) members in College of Business departments with interests complementary to computer information systems and the candidate under consideration.

2. For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the department Chairperson shall constitute a P&T committee consisting of all tenured eligible faculty members in the department at the rank of associate professor or professor. The department Chairperson, college Dean, Provost and University President may not be a member of this committee. Department faculty consisting of eligible Assistant and Associate Deans may elect to

serve on this committee unless their administrative appointment is of such a nature that serving would create a conflict of interest situation; however election to serve shall be made at the beginning of their duties as assistant or associate dean and before any candidate for promotion is to be considered, or upon implementation of this code.

Assistant or Associate Deans who elect to serve on a P&T committee are encouraged to neither offer to provide or provide, formally or informally, additional input to the Dean and in regard to the Dean's decision to support or not support a recommendation for P&T. The department Chairperson shall appoint the chair of the committee. In the event that a minimum of three associate and full professors do not exist within the department, the department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean together shall complete the formation of a P&T committee in an unbiased manner, including by lot, from faculty (non-administrative) members in College of Business departments with interests complementary to computer information systems and the candidate under consideration.

D. Procedures for Promotion

1. The promotion committee shall be responsible for informing the candidate who is seeking promotion to associate professor or professor all applicable rules, procedures, report formats, timetable, and additional information as necessary in order to properly complete all required documentation. As appropriate, the chair of the promotion committee may meet with the candidate as required or requested. The chair of the promotion committee will also arrange for external evaluation letters focusing on research strengths/weaknesses of the candidate's research and scholarly productivity

record to date, versus teaching/advising and service. The committee will issue its report to the department Chairperson with copy to the Dean documenting deliberations leading to a committee vote indicating either a positive or negative recommendation for promotion to professor, including minority positions. Those in the minority shall be afforded the opportunity to attach or append a minority report consisting of a statement of minority views and rationale. This statement, if included with the promotion committee report, shall be prepared and coordinated by a member of the minority and submitted simultaneously with the majority report and per a timetable as may be specified by either the Dean or department Chairperson.

2. A vote tally including the number for and against promotion shall be recorded (without names associated with any vote) and documented as part of the report. The candidate shall be apprised the outcome of this vote as soon as practicable after the report has been prepared and sent to the department Chairperson. In those cases where a faculty member may eventually leave the University, all written records shall be preserved for a minimum of five years beyond the person's departure, and in a permanent file for those faculty that eventually retire from the University. The committee shall be instructed as to the importance of maintaining confidentiality of all information pertaining to this personnel matter.
3. In the event that the candidate seeking promotion to associate professor or professor is the department Chairperson, the report from the promotion committee shall be sent to the Dean. In the event that the candidate seeking promotion to associate professor or

professor is the department Chairperson, the Dean shall appoint the chair of the promotion committee.

E. Procedures for Tenure

1. The tenure, or P&T committee as applicable (see *Manual* E.13 regarding concurrent recommendations for promotion with tenure), shall be responsible for informing the candidate who is seeking tenure all applicable rules, procedures, report formats, timetable, and additional information as necessary in order to properly complete all required documentation. As appropriate, the chair of the committee may meet with the candidate as required or requested. The committee chair will also arrange for external evaluation letters focusing on research strengths/weaknesses of the candidate's research and scholarly productivity record to date, versus teaching/advising and service. The committee will issue its report to the department Chairperson with copy to the Dean documenting deliberations leading to a committee vote recommending either a positive or negative vote for tenure and promotion to associate professor, including minority positions. Those in the minority shall be afforded the opportunity to attach or append a minority report consisting of a statement of minority views and rationale. This statement, if included with the promotion committee report, shall be prepared and coordinated by a member of the minority and submitted simultaneously with the majority report and per a timetable as may be specified by either the Dean or department Chairperson.
2. A vote tally including number for and against tenure and promotion shall be recorded (without names associated with any vote) and documented as part of the report. The

- candidate shall be apprised the outcome of this vote as soon as practicable after the report has been prepared and sent to the department Chairperson. In those cases where a faculty member may eventually leave the University, all written records shall be preserved for a minimum of five years beyond the person's departure, and in a permanent file for those faculty that eventually retire from the University. The committee shall be instructed by the chair as to the importance of maintaining confidentiality of all information pertaining to this personnel matter.
3. In the event that the candidate seeking tenure is the department Chairperson, the report from the tenure committee shall be sent to the Dean. In the event that the candidate seeking tenure is the department Chairperson, the Dean shall appoint the chair of the tenure committee.

F. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Advisory Committees

Each faculty member is expected to serve on their fair share of graduate student advisory committees. Committees will normally be formed by recommendations from the student's graduate advisor and consisting of faculty members with interests generally consistent with the students' interests. Students may request specific committee members or graduate advisor and these requests shall be respected to the extent possible. The department Chairperson shall monitor the composition of these committees, and make any needed adjustments, so that no faculty member has a significantly disproportionate number of assignments.

Section IV: Faculty Evaluation, Tenure & Promotion (P&T) Standards, and Disciplinary Actions

A. Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation

1. The department Chairperson shall conduct an annual performance evaluation of each member of the department faculty. This process shall begin with each faculty member completing the *Annual Faculty Activity Report* (or the equivalent including renaming) and submitting to the department Chairperson in the timeframe requested. The evaluation by the department Chairperson shall be concluded within sixty (60) days from notification from the dean's office to initiate this process or per a deadline as established by the Dean. (See Section III.A. concerning Department Workload Policy and E.11 in the *Manual*). This annual evaluation shall be in addition to specific evaluations related to promotion and tenure decisions, including annual and midpoint probationary period reviews. The evaluation shall be summarized in writing and provided the faculty member as part of the process of determining annual salary increases. Faculty members shall sign this evaluation as having received the evaluation while not necessarily agreeing with the evaluation.
2. Every member of the faculty will provide the department Chairperson their student-completed course evaluations for each semester's courses. The evaluations may be on one of several acceptable forms with preference to the university student course survey form.
3. Faculty annual evaluations shall be based on the quality and quantity of performance in fulfilling the faculty member's responsibilities to the department during the period of evaluation.

4. The department Chairperson shall hold an annual conference with each tenured and non-tenured member of the faculty to discuss the results of the annual evaluation. Faculty shall be kept fully advised concerning methods and criteria used in the annual evaluation process, the results of the evaluation, and how the results are being utilized. Any additional practices as outlined in the university Code (*Manual C.2.5*) will also be followed.
5. Every year, in consultation with the department Chairperson, each faculty member shall prepare and submit to the department Chairperson written formal or informal objectives for the forthcoming year that are determined to be consistent with academic and professional growth, including how these objectives relate to the faculty members particular area(s) of expertise and research directions. At the option of either the Chairperson or the faculty member, these written objectives may be included in the faculty member's personnel file. As appropriate, these statements of objectives may be completed as part of completing the *Annual Faculty Activity Report*.
6. Grievance procedures utilized within the department concerning the annual performance evaluation and/or other decisions, recommendations, or actions of the department Chairperson will be in accordance with established university grievance policies. (Section K, *Manual* and Section V. C. of this Code).

B. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

1. The process of granting tenure with promotion to associate professor is initiated by the department Chairperson and requires several steps as outlined in the *Manual* (E.10.5 and E.13). The written recommendation from the departmental P&T Committee shall be forwarded to the department Chairperson. The department Chairperson shall submit a

separate recommendation that shall either concur with the recommendation of the P&T Committee or shall issue a contrary recommendation. The department Chairperson shall forward his/her written recommendation to the Dean and Provost along with the written recommendation from the P&T Committee, including any minority opinions. Those in the minority shall be afforded the opportunity to attach or append a minority report consisting of a statement of minority views and rationale. This statement, if included with the P&T committee report, shall be prepared and coordinated by a member of the minority and submitted simultaneously with the majority report and per a timetable as may be specified by either the Dean or department Chairperson. The granting of tenure and/or promotion should not be considered the right of the faculty member but the result of satisfactory service in accordance with departmental and university regulations.

2. Successful candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor shall demonstrate the ability to fulfill his/her academic career as a productive member of the departmental faculty. Productive membership begins with an assessment of workload responsibilities and accomplishments prior to or since joining the department faculty, to specifically include teaching and advising, research, service, and outreach responsibilities. While primary consideration is given to research that leads to publications in premier and high quality IS/IT journals, and/or premier or high quality journals in related and emerging disciplines, publications in applied journals will also be positively considered. Productive membership in the department includes the potential to remain a continuing research and scholarly contributor at a high level after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor.

3. Research productivity is defined as both the quantity of refereed articles produced and the quality of these articles as represented by a journal's reputation. Included also is funding brought into the university as a result of contract and grant activity. Refereed conference proceedings (international, national, and regional) shall also be taken into account when measuring scholarly productivity, acknowledging also that proceedings generally carry less, or considerably less, weight than publications in premier or high quality journals. Similarly, non-refereed conference presentations and other professional appearances and presentations shall also be considered as indicators of ongoing scholarly productivity efforts. Publication in electronic journals may also be considered. While no specific number of publications is required, including publications in specific journals, a journal's academic ranking is taken into consideration. Each probationary period candidate shall understand that it is the overall record that is being evaluated, including the potential for ongoing contributions at a high level after achieving tenure and promotion to associate professor. Each candidate shall understand also that the category of 'Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity' as employed in the *Annual Faculty Evaluation – Summary Report* issued to each faculty member by the department Chairperson does not have to be the highest percentage category in the process of conducting an annual review, but generally is the dominant category when being considered for tenure with promotion to associate professor. While areas such as community-based and pedagogy-based research are encouraged, publication outlets for these research activities should, to the extent possible, include premier and high-quality journals.

4. Quality teaching is a prerequisite to tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Quality teaching may include positive performance evaluations over time, positive student course evaluations, course syllabi that are current, positive peer reviews, innovative teaching methods, development of case studies, class projects, and/or other forms of evaluation as may be requested by the department Chairperson, P&T committee, or proposed by the probationary period candidate. While extremely important, teaching performance will generally carry less weight in an overall P&T performance review as compared to published research and other scholarly productivity results noting also that teaching/instruction may carry a higher weight in an individual workload policy for a given year or number of years. This is a reflection that the College Workload Policy and the course load demand on faculty generally weights 'Instruction, Advising and Mentoring' at a higher level than other categories for annual review purposes but that research and scholarship is the dominant category when a probationary period candidate is being considered for P&T. To the extent possible, the quality of academic and professional advising will be considered as a complementary activity with quality teaching. The College Workload Policy is a general guide to percentages in each category of workload. It is understood that individual workload percentages may vary considerably between faculty members as agreed to by the department Chairperson.

5. A minimum level of service and outreach, as determined by the department Chairperson, is also necessary for tenure and promotion to associate professor. However, it should be very clear to the probationary period candidate that service and outreach during this

period of one's career is considerably less important, and carries less weight, than either research and publication results, or teaching/advising performance.

6. In evaluation of each candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion to associate professor, workload distribution for the categories of research, teaching and advising, including service/outreach shall be considered by both the P&T committee and the department Chairperson.

C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

1. The process of granting promotion to professor for those faculty already tenured is initiated by the department Chairperson and requires several steps as outlined in the *Manual* (E.13). The written recommendation from the departmental promotion Committee shall be forwarded to the department Chairperson. The department Chairperson shall submit a separate recommendation that shall either concur with the recommendation of the promotion Committee or shall issue a contrary recommendation. The department Chairperson shall forward his/her written recommendation to the Dean and Provost along with the written recommendation from the promotion Committee, including any minority opinions. Those in the minority shall be afforded the opportunity to attach or append a minority report consisting of a statement of minority views and rationale. This statement, if included with the promotion committee report, shall be prepared and coordinated by a member of the minority and submitted simultaneously with the majority report and per a timetable as may be specified by either the Dean or department Chairperson. The granting of promotion to professor should not be

considered the right of the faculty member but the result of satisfactory service in accordance with departmental and university regulations.

2. Successful candidates for promotion from associate professor to professor must demonstrate excellence in either research and/or teaching and at least above average in the other category (research or teaching). This person must also have a minimum of an average record in service and outreach.
 - a. Excellence in research and scholarly productivity is defined as a sustainable record of refereed publications since promotion to associate professor including premier or high quality journals employing department/college or external journal rankings. Publications at another institution(s) may be considered. The establishment of a national reputation in a stream of research and scholarly productivity shall be a consideration in promotion to professor. The department Chairperson shall maintain an on-going record of published journal evaluations such that an unbiased and consistent evaluation of credentials is possible.
 - b. Excellence in teaching is defined as consistently high student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching awards, and other forms of recognition indicating the faculty member is at the top of his/her profession in terms of classroom performance, including advising and mentoring activities.
 - c. For comparison purposes, Likert Scale metrics as reported in the *Annual Faculty Evaluation – Summary Report* may be used as an indicator of performance in any evaluative category.
3. For promotion to professor, research productivity may include both the quantity of refereed articles produced over time and the quality of these articles as represented by a journal's reputation. While not a specific requirement for promotion to (full) professor, success in securing a stream of external contract and grant funding may be taken into consideration. However there is an expectation that funded research will result in premier and high quality refereed publications. Refereed conference proceedings (international, national, and regional) may be taken into account when measuring

scholarly productivity, acknowledging also that refereed proceedings generally carry less, or considerably less, weight than publications in premier or high quality journals. Similarly, non-refereed conference presentations and other professional appearances and presentations shall also be considered as indicators of on-going scholarly productivity efforts and establishment of a national and/or international reputation. The promotion committee and department Chairperson are expected to consider a) a journal's academic ranking, b) whether the candidate has made a significant impact or advancement to his/her field as a result of a stream of research and publications over time, and c) the overall value of securing external research funds to the mission and objectives of the department, college, and university.

4. Each candidate shall understand also that the category of 'Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity' as employed in the *Annual Faculty Evaluation – Summary Report* issued to each faculty member by the department Chairperson does not have to be the highest percentage category in the process of conducting an annual review, but may be the dominant category when being considered for promotion to (full) professor.
5. In lieu of a refereed publication, external funding in any given year covering one or more years may be considered the equivalent of a premier or high quality publication at the discretion of the promotion committee when evaluating the contributions of a candidate applying for promotion to professor. However, while it is clear that obtaining external funding and generating publications stemming from external funding may take a considerable period of time, it is also clear that there is an expectation that external funding will produce premier and high quality publications.

6. Any candidate for promotion to professor who has contributed to his or her profession in unusual ways such that a clearly acknowledged national or international reputation has been earned, or is considered a leading spokesperson for a discipline or sub-discipline, or has received unusually high public recognition or awards, may be given special promotion consideration shall any of the above publication, teaching, or service criteria not be met.
7. In evaluating each candidate's qualifications for promotion to professor, workload distribution for the categories of research, teaching and advising, including service/outreach shall be considered by both the promotion committee and the department Chairperson. The College Workload Policy is a general guide to percentages in each category of workload. It is understood that individual workload percentages may vary considerably between faculty members as agreed to by the department Chairperson.
8. In the event that a faculty member seeking promotion to professor is not tenured, then all of the conditions, requirements and processes stated above in Sections III.C., D., and E. shall apply plus standards for tenure as stated in Section IV.B shall also apply.

D. Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Period Review of Untenured Faculty

1. Midpoint is defined for purposes of this Code as a time period approximately halfway to the time when tenure recommendations must be made (see *Manual E.4*). This review shall normally occur during the third year of service for faculty with no credit for service at another university. For example, hires with one year prior service credit at one or more other universities specifically stated in their contract offer letter, may count this

year as year one on the P&T clock and midpoint review shall occur during the second year at Colorado State. As an additional example, for hires with two years of credit at one or more other universities, midpoint shall occur during the second year of service at Colorado State. Candidates with other than one or two years of service credit are specifically advised to ascertain the exact time frame within which a midpoint review is to occur, including a timeframe as may be stipulated in the original offer letter and contract. The *Manual* (E.10.4, E.13) dictates whether credit for service that is indicated in the contract offer letter must be counted as part of the probationary period, or may be counted at the discretion of the probationary period faculty member.

2. A midpoint comprehensive review of a probationary period tenure track faculty member shall be conducted by the departmental tenure committee at the rank of associate professor or above following the reporting format specified for a regular tenure and promotion review, excepting the requirement of external review letters. A meeting between the probationary period faculty member and the tenure committee is at the discretion of the tenure committee. Results of this review shall be communicated in writing both to the faculty member being reviewed, the department Chairperson, Dean, and Provost (see *Manual* E.14.1). Department faculty consisting of eligible Assistant and Associate Deans may individually elect to serve on this committee unless their administrative appointment is of such a nature that serving would create a conflict of interest situation; however election to serve shall be made at the beginning of their duties as assistant or associate dean and before any candidate for promotion is to be considered, or upon implementation of this code. Assistant or Associate Deans who

elect to serve on this committee are encouraged to neither offer to provide or provide, formally or informally, additional input to the Dean and in regard to the midpoint probationary period review.

E. Annual Probationary Period Review of Untenured Faculty (see *Manual E.14.1* and *C.2.5*)

1. Untenured (probationary period) faculty are required to submit to the department tenure committee an annual summary of research progress, articles submitted for review, articles under review, articles accepted for publication and/or published, contract and grant summary information, and other professional information as appropriate, plus teaching and service/outreach information as requested by the committee. This request may come from the tenure committee and department Chairperson simultaneously.
2. While the request for annual data may occur simultaneously with a request from the department Chairperson for equivalent data, and potentially using a common format, e.g., the *Annual Faculty Activity Report* prevalent throughout the college, the use of this data is to be separate from the Chairperson's responsibility of performing an annual performance review that may be used for salary increases.
3. The departmental tenure committee shall review annual data provided by the probationary period faculty member. It is at the option of the tenure committee whether or not a meeting with the probationary period candidate is needed. A brief written summary of this data review, including any recommendations supporting or not supporting continued contract renewal, shall be provided to the department Chairperson with copy to the faculty member and prior to any calendar year reappointment dates that

may established by the Provost's office. This summary shall include constructive and directional feedback and be included in the faculty member's personnel file for the exclusive use in future midpoint or final tenure, or tenure and promotion, deliberations.

F. Disciplinary Action for Tenured Faculty

1. In cases of disciplinary action against a faculty member as specified in the *Manual*, procedures outlined in the *Manual* (currently E.10.7.2.) will be followed with the addition that the Preliminary Committee specified shall consist of tenured members of the department at the same or higher rank than the faculty member for whom disciplinary action is under consideration. If a minimum of six members from within the department does not exist (*Manual* E.10.7.2.2), then selection to achieve a minimum Preliminary Committee size of at least six shall be drawn by lot by the Dean and department Chairperson collectively (excepting the case where the department Chairperson is the party under consideration) from remaining tenured non-administrative (see *Manual* K.12.a) faculty in the College. This Committee membership shall consist of at least one male and at least one female. All Committee members must be at the same or higher academic rank than the faculty member against whom disciplinary action is under consideration. The Dean shall be the sole determinant of any committee size in excess of the required minimum of six.
2. The composition of the Hearing Committee as called for in the *Manual* (currently E.10.7.3.3.b) shall be constituted in the manner outlined in the immediate preceding paragraph.

G. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews

1. The Phase II Review Committee as specified in the *Manual* (currently E.14.2.2) shall be constituted by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean in an unbiased and impartial manner. At least one member of this Phase II Review Committee (aka peer review committee) shall be from within the department and at the same or higher rank than the person undergoing a Phase II review, and at least one member (non-administrator, see *Manual* K.12.a) selected by the Dean from another department within the College at the same or higher rank than the person undergoing a Phase II review. In the case where there are no members of the department at the same or higher rank, then the Dean shall select in an unbiased and impartial manner, including by lot or with written rationale, a minimum of three persons from within the College at the same or higher rank than the person undergoing a Phase II review. The Dean shall be the sole determinant of any committee size in excess of the required minimum of three.
 - a. The person undergoing a Phase II review may dismiss for cause up to two members of a Phase II Review Committee from outside the department as selected by the Dean. Outside members shall then be replaced by the Dean, again by lot or with written rationale, with no further challenges permitted. Individuals selected from within the department of the person undergoing a Phase II review are not subject to dismissal without cause; however the department Chairperson shall not select any faculty member internal to the department where it could reasonably be known that considerable bias and/or prejudice for or against the faculty member may exist. In the case where there are no members within the department without considerable bias or prejudice, then the Dean shall constitute the entire committee in a fair and unbiased manner, including by lot or with written rationale. In the case where the Dean may elect to recuse him/herself from the Phase II process for whatever reasons, then the Provost may elect to appoint an Associate Dean from within the College to assume the role and duties of the Dean.
 - b. The Phase II Review Committee (peer review committee) shall be constituted within thirty working days after the decision to initiate a Phase II review is initiated and communicated to the faculty member, unless a request to the Dean for a time extension is made by either party (faculty member, department Chairperson) within the thirty working days. Any request for extensions shall be documented in writing

including rationale, and provided all parties. The Dean or his/her delegate, may elect to, or not to, grant the extension, but must provide written rationale to all parties if a request to extend is denied. The Dean may extend the deadline for constituting the committee under extenuating circumstances.

- c. The Phase II or peer review committee shall request any and all materials relevant to the decision to initiate a Phase II review. This includes written materials and/or oral input from the faculty member, the department Chairperson, or others as appropriate. All materials shall be reviewed with the perspective of professional standards of the department. Upon reviewing any and all input, the peer review committee shall make a decision as outlined in the *Manual* (currently E.14.2.2) in a reasonable and timely manner, but no longer than one calendar month after being constituted unless an extension is specifically requested by the committee and approved by the Dean. The Phase II process is concluded should the peer review committee conclude either option one or two indicating no further action is required, and continue should either of the two remaining options indicating further action is required (also labeled options one and two in the *Manual*) be concluded.
- d. If the Phase II or peer review committee elects the first of the two options indicating that further action is required, the department Chairperson, in conjunction with the faculty member, shall prepare a specific action plan within ten working days upon receipt of the committee's recommendation. This plan shall include a timetable that will address and respond to deficiencies that resulted in the Phase II review. Either the department Chairperson or the faculty member may make a request to the Dean for an extension of an additional ten working days. This plan shall be submitted to the Dean for approval. The Dean may make changes that are documented in writing and with rationale. Final approval of the plan rests with the Dean. Progress towards achieving the plan's objectives may be requested and assessed at any point including the end of a semester or prior to the preparation of the next annual Activity Report. The department Chairperson, through the Dean, is responsible for communicating both the plan and progress towards the plan to the Provost. With this decision and written recommendation, the responsibilities of the Phase II Review Committee (peer review committee) in conjunction with this first of two options indicating that further action is required, are concluded, excepting any input regarding evaluative metrics per Section IV.G.1.f. below.
- e. Types of information that may be included in an action plan include but are not restricted to: 1) research outlines, funding proposal plans, drafts of articles, articles submitted, reviews of articles submitted, planned writing projects; and/or 2) additional planned teaching evaluations including mid-semester, peer evaluations, teaching improvement plans, consultative plans, syllabi, cases and case notes, project descriptions, lecture outlines, and detailed actions designed to improve classroom performance. The action plan must include specific intended outcomes, results, accomplishments, milestones, and/or expected achievements.

- f. The faculty member, in the manner and time requested, shall provide the department Chairperson and Dean, suggested specific metrics with which to gauge progress against noted deficiencies. These metrics may be overridden and/or supplemented by recommendations proposed by either the Phase II Review Committee (peer review committee), department Chairperson, or Dean. The faculty member and/or department Chairperson or Dean may seek evaluative input internal or external to the department and college as may be appropriate.
 - g. The department Chairperson shall provide formal written evaluation of progress towards accomplishing the objectives of this action plan at a minimum of once per semester with copies provided the faculty member and Dean. The faculty member may elect to respond, as desired, in writing and within ten working days after receipt of any formal evaluation of progress, with copies to the department Chairperson and Dean. The department Chairperson, through the Dean, shall be responsible for communicating and transmitting all information and reports as desired or requested to the Provost. The action plan may be considered as accomplished at any time upon written recommendation of the Department Chairperson to the Dean and as approved by the Dean. This approval by the Dean shall conclude the Phase II process in the case where further action has been recommended and the requirements of option one concerning substantial and chronic deficiencies have been remedied.
 - h. If the peer review committee elects the second of the two options indicating that further action is required, and the conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 of the *Manual* appear to exist, then the faculty member shall be informed in writing within five working days of this vote and decision. In addition to requirements specified in the *Manual*, the faculty member shall have fifteen working days to provide a formal written response to each point cited in the vote and decision. This response shall be directed to the department Chairperson and Dean, with copy to the peer review committee. The Provost shall make the final decision regarding any action or actions to be taken. With this decision and written recommendation, the responsibilities of the peer review committee are concluded, excepting any consultation role requested by either the department Chairperson or Dean.
 - i. Under either of the options indicating that further action is required, the entire Phase II process must be concluded within one year from inception to conclusion, unless specifically extended by the Dean with the approval of the Provost. The faculty member may not obligate the department, College, or University for any costs incurred by the faculty member in seeking internal or external evaluative input, opinions, or advise regarding this Phase II process.
2. As noted in the *Manual* (E.14.2.2), the initiation of a Phase II review is not grievable.

Section V: Student Grade Appeals and Faculty Grievances

A. Graduate Student Evaluation

1. As stated in the Graduate Bulletin, to meet requirements for graduation and to remain in good academic standing, a student must demonstrate acceptable performance in coursework and satisfactory progress in the overall graduate program. Students on probation are subject to dismissal by the academic department or the Dean of the Graduate School. In addition, a student's graduate advisory committee (the Committee) may recommend immediate dismissal, in lieu of probation, upon a finding that the student is making unsatisfactory progress toward the degree and that satisfactory progress cannot reasonably be anticipated.
2. Performance indicators that may lead to a recommendation for an immediate dismissal action may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Failure to follow graduate advisor or Committee documented recommendations regarding specific academic tasks to be undertaken and completed, methodologies to be followed, documentation of work product, or writing as requested.
 - b. Documented instances of plagiarism by a graduate student including but not restricted to research (primary or secondary), falsification of research results, and/or written work presented for thesis or Plan B review to the student's advisor or Committee.
 - c. Poor or non-performance in a Graduate Teaching or Research Assistantship as documented by the student's supervisor or advisor.
 - d. Other acts that are deemed by the advisor or Committee to compromise the academic integrity of the program, e.g., cheating or conspiring to cheat, including acts which, by intent, limit other students to succeed in the program.

Graduate advisors shall inform their graduate advisees of the existence of the

Graduate Bulletin and appropriate sections such as the 'Evaluation of Graduate

Students' and 'Student Rights and Responsibilities.' Graduate students familiarity with the Graduate Bulletin can also be encouraged through general graduate student advising.

3. For Masters' students, periodic evaluation of progress toward the Master of Science degree shall consist of grades in specified coursework plus any documented evidence of failure to comply with program, departmental, college, or University requirements. Additional documented evidence shall include, but is not restricted to, falsification of entrance exam scores, academic scores and/or results from any academic institution, and falsification of resumes.
4. Acts by graduate students, separate or outside their graduate program, may also result in a recommendation for dismissal by the Committee from departmental/college academic programs and/or the college and University. These include, but are not restricted to, personal acts including documented threatening behavior to faculty, staff or others, physical violence, destruction of University property, participation in illegal activities or activities harmful to the University, plus other threatening, destructive, or harmful acts of a non-professional nature.
5. Students who have a contract for a Graduate Teaching Assistantship or Graduate Research Assistantship may have that contract terminated or not renewed for reasons of non-performance or poor performance. Documented examples of non-performance/poor performance of duties may include, but are not limited to, attendance problems, ASCSU evaluations, supervisor evaluations, advisor

evaluations, or student complaints. The mechanisms for termination may be found in the Graduate Bulletin.

6. At any time in which the student's performance may be subject to question to the extent that dismissal is potentially being considered, a formal review and performance evaluation may be conducted by the student's graduate advisor, assistantship advisor, graduate committee, and/or department chairperson. The student shall be advised as to all relevant concerns with an attempt to seek a positive resolution of issues. Failing to seek a positive resolution of issues, any action to recommend dismissal of a graduate student shall be communicated both orally and in writing with specific actions or non-actions resulting in a recommendation to dismiss provided to the student in a timely manner. In any instance where there is a recommendation to terminate a graduate student's participation in the graduate program, or dismissal that is the result of any of the conditions listed in the Graduate Bulletin under the section 'Graduate School Appeals Procedure,' the appeals procedures detailed in this section shall be applicable.

B. Student Grade Appeal Procedures

1. Situations occasionally arise in which an undergraduate student questions the fairness of a grading decision. Specific conditions that may constitute the basis for an appeal are included in Section I.7.1 of the *Manual*. In the case where the faculty member has either left the university or is otherwise unavailable, the department Chairperson shall serve as the person receiving the student's written grading appeal. When the department Chairperson is the person to whom the grading decision is being appealed, then the Dean

or his/her designated representative shall serve as the person receiving the student's written grading appeal. The instructor or party receiving the student appeal shall name one faculty member and one student from within the department. The student filing the appeal shall name one additional faculty member and one additional student from within the department. The Dean or his/her designated representative shall name one additional faculty member from outside the department and who shall serve as voting chair. These five individuals constitute the appeals committee. The committee shall contain at least one male and at least one female member. The appeals committee's decision shall be decided by majority vote and may not be appealed further. Copies of this decision shall be provided to the student, faculty member, advisor, his/her department Chairperson, and the Dean.

2. Graduate students are advised to review the Graduate School Appeals Procedure in the Graduate Bulletin (also see Section V.A above).

C. Faculty Grievance Procedures

A faculty member with a potential grievance against the department Chairperson or other administrator shall first try to resolve the problem with the Chair or appropriate administrator, including the Dean. The faculty member is encouraged to seek all internal assistance to achieving a reasonable solution to the perceived problem and before a formal grievance is filed. The second step shall be an attempt to resolve any issues through mediation (see *Manual* K.4). Failing mediation, faculty are referred to the *Manual* (Section K) as to what may be grieved and the grievance procedure. In no case shall any costs

incurred by a faculty member in the process of reaching a solution to a potential grievance, including legal fees, be assumed by the department.

Section VI: Procedures for Changing the Department Code

The departmental Code may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of eligible faculty members at an announced regular or special meeting. The Code shall be reviewed as required, including incorporating changes as a result of modifications made to the *Manual*, other relevant university policy changes, and/or changes in state or federal law.

Additionally, this Code shall automatically be reviewed in the year prior to the end of each term of the department chair (*Manual C.2.4.2.1.K*). As a matter of courtesy, the Dean will be provided a copy of any newly drafted code, or draft changes to an approved code, for review and comment before the department faculty undertakes a formal vote of approval.

Section VII: Relationship to University Code

If provisions of this department Code should conflict with provisions of the University Code, the University Code shall supersede. (*Manual*, Section C.2.4.3).

*****END OF CODE*****

Signatures Approving Adoption of this Code

1. This Code for the Department of Computer Information Systems, College of Business, was approved by a minimum two-thirds majority of the Computer Information Systems Department faculty eligible to vote at a regularly scheduled meeting held on **December 2, 2010**.

2. Faculty eligible to vote and voting approval of the terms of this CIS Department Code include:

Susan W. Athey

Charles W. Butler

Jon D. Clark

Stephen C. Hayne

John Hoxmeier

Gretchen Irwin

W. John Plotnicki

Robert A. Rademacher

C. A. P. Smith

Daniel E. Turk

Leo R. Vijayarathy

3. Provost approval:

(Date)