

# Business Process Synopsis

<b>PROCESS NAME:</b>	Faculty Awards Process	<b>ORIGINAL DOCUMENT DATE:</b>	5/19/2019
<b>PROCESS OWNER:</b>	Dean of the College of Technology	<b>LAST REVISION DATE:</b>	4/20/2020
<b>PROCESS MANAGER:</b>	Chair, College of Technology Faculty Affairs Committee	<b>ASSOCIATED POLICY DOCUMENTS</b>	Senate Document 19-16 (approved)

This process synopsis was written by Peter Parker, business analyst in the Technology Computing Network of the T'Challa College of Technology. It is based on a review of relevant documents, and interviews of key subject matter experts in the college and its schools. This synopsis is based on a business process developed and approved by the College of Technology Faculty Affairs Committee in response to the Faculty Senate's approval of Senate Document 19-16, Revised College of Technology Faculty Awards Policy. The policy was subsequently approved by the College of Technology Faculty Senate. The Dean of the College was designated the process owner and accountable for the process' execution.

This document is intended as a prerequisite to modeling the process with the Business Process Model & Notation (BPMN) as a training tool for faculty and staff.

**INSTRUCTOR'S NOTES:** This document has been annotated in red with my comments on the content as may be relevant to your BPMN assignment.

## Process Overview

### A. Brief Description

Every year, the Marvelous University College of Technology honors six faculty for their accomplishments during the previous academic year. The awards are as follows:

- STUDENT-SELECTED TEACHING AWARDS
  - **Stark Award for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence**  
(best teacher in the College of Technology as selected by its students)
  - **McCoy Award for Graduate School Teaching Excellence**  
(best teacher in the College of Technology as selected by its students)
- PEER-SELECTED AWARDS
  - **Strange Award for Excellence in Instructional Development**  
(best teacher in the College of Technology as selected by his/her faculty peers)

*Note: Compared to the Stark and McCoy Awards, the basis for the Strange award looks at a more comprehensive definition of teaching that focuses on curriculum development, course development, pedagogy, learning experimentation, lab development, learning innovation, and learning assessment. Also, it is inclusive of both undergraduate and graduate education.*

- **Banner Award for Excellence in Research and Discovery**  
(best researcher in the College of Technology as selected by his/her faculty peers)
- **Rogers Award for Excellence in Service and Engagement**  
(best faculty member in external public service to community, economic development, government, K-12 education, etc. as selected by its faculty peers)
- **Romanov Award for Excellence in Internationalization**  
(best faculty member in internationalization of teaching and research)

This business process standardizes much of how the College's academic schools must nominate faculty for these awards, and then how the College will then subsequently select the six award winners from those final nominees.

## **B. Process Scope**

This process is applicable to the academic schools in the T'Challa College of Technology. Each academic school offers one or more academic programs. But each school is only allowed to nominate one faculty member for each of the six College awards

**INSTRUCTOR NOTE:** *For example, the Information Technology school offers programs in cybersecurity and forensics, computer graphics and visualization, data management and analytics, computer information systems, project and process management, network engineering and administration, and software engineering and programming. It awards bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, doctoral degrees, and teaches core computing courses and electives to students in other colleges and schools.*

## **C. Historical Perspective**

For several decades, the faculty awards process was somewhat ad-hoc, and managed primarily by deans and school heads. Schools selected their nominees by various methods, some of which were controversial. A somewhat more formal process of student and faculty committees and committees selected final award winners from the nominees, but this was not consistently executed from year-to-year.

More recently, the College *Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)* was charged by the Faculty Senate with defining new policies and expectations for the faculty awards process in response to faculty concerns and complaints about fairness and consistency. The College of Technology Faculty Senate subsequently approved a new policy, *Senate Document 19-16 Revised College of Technology Faculty Awards Selection Policy*. That policy transferred responsibility for the process from deans and school heads to the College FAC and established new expectations for consistency and fairness to the process.

## **D. Business Process Objectives**

1. Ensure that all eligible faculty receive appropriate consideration for the six faculty awards. Also ensure that ineligible faculty do not receive awards (which had become an occasional problem). See policy document for latest eligibility rules.
2. Ensure that the College 's schools follow a consistent and fair subprocess to select nominees for each of the six faculty awards.
3. Ensure that the College follows a consistent and fair subprocess to select the winners of the six faculty awards.
4. Ensure that the Office of the Dean competes appropriate post-award activities culminating in a faculty awards banquet. This is especially important in the event of appointment of a new dean or his/her direct reports.

## **E. Impacts to Other Related Business Processes**

The Stark Award winner and the McCoy Award winners are subsequently nominated for the Stanley Lee Awards for Teaching Excellence (across the entire university). While the Lee Awards process is separate from the College of Technology faculty awards process, the process timing must be synchronized such that the College winners are forwarded to the Provost (chief academic officer of the university) in time for subsequent consideration for the Lee Awards.

It should be noted that the University Senate is has recently implemented university-level awards for research and internationalization. And there is discussion of an engagement award. It is likely that the College of Technology would annually and automatically submit its award winners as candidates for any each university award.

Technically, all award winners are communicated to the Office of the Provost for subsequent university-wide recognition at an annual university wide awards event, and for official university press releases.

University award selection activities are considered out-of-scope for this college faculty awards process (except for reporting winners to the Office of the Provost).

## Stakeholders Overview

This business process applies only to the College of Technology and its affiliated schools. The following groups and individuals (alphabetized by major groups) either participate in the awards process or communicate with the awards process.

- **Award-eligible faculty** in the College of Technology are considered the “primary benefactor” of the faculty awards process. Most full-time faculty are eligible to be nominated for the various awards. Some participate in selecting award nominees and winners of some awards, but only if they are not nominated – if nominated for any award, the new policy dictates that they can no longer participate in the selection process for that award. Those who have won a college faculty in the past three years is ineligible for that same award in the current year.
  - **Candidate faculty** – For purposes of this process, “candidate” refers to any eligible faculty member who is being considered as a nominee of his/her school as the nominee for a specific College-level award.
  - **Nominee** – For purposes of this process, “nominee” refers to a faculty candidate who has been selected from the among the other candidates in his/her academic school as that school’s final nominee for a specific College-level award (as previously described)
  - **Winner** – For purposes of this process, “winner” refers to a faculty member who was selected from all of the school nominees as the winner of a specific College-level award. As noted earlier, some winners may be subsequently nominated for university awards that are out of scope for this College-level process. But the College-level process needs to communicate its winners as candidate university award nominees to the Office of the Provost.

***INSTRUCTOR HINT:** The award-eligible faculty of the College of Technology should be considered external to the process because this process was created for them – thus, they are this process’ customer. But they do communicate with the process (e.g., submission of their written brief).*

- The **Office of the Dean of the College of Technology**. The Dean essentially “owns” (sponsors) the faculty awards process and participates in some its activities. The Dean is the chief academic officer and leader over all the schools in the College of Technology. The school heads administratively report to the Dean. The Dean can also delegate some activities to others in his or her office – but ultimately the Dean is accountable for those activities. Common designees of the dean include associate deans, assistant deans, directors, and administrative assistants in the Office of the Dean.
  - Note that the Dean establishes a calendar of events every academic year. That calendar includes a few deadlines for the awards process; however, that is not considered the part of the awards process because it establishes dates and deadlines for many other annual college events.
  - The Dean also establishes all committees and chairs for the College at the beginning of every academic year. This includes the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). The FAC Chair plays a significant role in the faculty awards process. However, the Dean’s appointment is not considered the part of the awards process because it includes establishing many other committees.
- The **College of Technology Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (FAC)**. Every year, the FAC Chair (or their designee from the FAC) is accountable to correctly execute and oversee the faculty awards process according to current policies and procedures. S/he or designee is also a participant in the process. This

FAC Chair's oversight was a major change since school heads previously ran the process within in their schools.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *While the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is responsible for the design and improvement of the faculty awards process; however, only the FAC Chair or designee is an annual participant.*

- The administrative **School Head** in the College. Each school in the college has a School Head. The school heads are the chief academic officers and leaders of their respective academic disciplines. In the new awards process, they lost a lot of power and control, but they are still involved. They did lose voting privileges in all awards. Like the Dean, school heads can delegate responsibility for some of their assigned tasks, but the school heads are ultimately accountable. Common designees of school heads include assistant heads, senior faculty, academic counselors, and administrative assistants.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *There are eight school heads, and each does the same activities in our awards process. Therefore, it would be redundant (and cluttered) to depict a separate swimlane for every school head.*

- A few **students** in each school of the College of Technology. They serve on selected nomination and award-selection committees for two awards. The use of the College of Technology Student Council was eliminated by the new process to insure equal student representation by all schools.
  - Stark Nominating Committee (one per school)
  - McCoy Nominating Committee (one per school)

These nominating committees are created annually inside each School by their school heads. They consist of students (undergraduate students for Stark; and graduate students for McCoy). The college awards policy states current eligibility requirements for these students. The committees are chaired by the school heads (or their designees) but only students are allowed to vote. Each committee is charged to identify candidate faculty members in their schools for the Stark and McCoy Awards, solicit written briefs from those candidates, and then select a single nominee for each award.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *The activities assigned to each school's nominating committee are the same; therefore, a single swimlane can be used to represent all of these two nominating committees.*

- Stark Award Committee (one per school)
- McCoy Award Committee (one per school)

These award committees consist of student representatives for each school's nominee (undergraduate students for Stark; and graduate students for McCoy). The college awards policy and procedures state current eligibility requirements for these students. The committees are chaired by the Dean (or their designees) but only the students are allowed to vote. Each committee is charged to select the winner of their award from its school nominees.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *The activities assigned to each school's award committee are the same; therefore, a single swimlane can be used to represent all of these two award committees.*

- A few **faculty** in each school of the College of Technology. They serve on selected nomination and award-selection committees for four awards. Any faculty member being considered for a specific award is ineligible to serve on any committees associated with that award.
  - Strange Nomination Committee
  - Banner Nomination Committee
  - Rogers Nomination Committee
  - Romanov Nomination Committee

These nomination committees (one-to-four per school) consist of full-time faculty from their school. The term ‘Committee’ is a bit of a misnomer since a couple schools simply use a special meeting of their full faculty as the group. Other schools appoint separate committees for each award. And still others assign responsibility to an existing permanent committee in their school. The FAC decided not to interfere with these different historical preferences.

These committees are chaired by non-voting school heads (or their designees). Only full-time faculty are allowed to vote. Each committee or group is charged to identify candidate faculty members in their schools for the four awards, solicit written briefs from those candidates, and then select a single nominee from their school for each award.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *Because the activities assigned to each school’s nominating committee are the same, a single swimlane can be used to represent all these nominating committees.*

- Strange Award Committee
- Banner Award Committee
- Rogers Award Committee
- Romanov Award Committee

Each of these award committees consist of a faculty representative from each school. The committees are chaired by the Dean (or their designees) but only faculty representatives are allowed to vote. Each committee is charged to select the winner of their award from its school nominees.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *The activities assigned to each school’s award committees are the same; therefore, a single swimlane can be used to represent these four award committees.*

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *In theory, a single lane could represent all six awards; however, it could become an overly complex process because there are subtle differences between the student- and peer-selected awards. In particular, peer-selected awards use SharePoint to access briefs, but that is not allowed for student-selected awards that must rely on manual distribution of briefs.*

- The **College of Technology Business Office**. Every college has its own business office to act as a liaison to university Financial Services and Human Resources. Because some faculty awards carry cash prizes or personal professional development funds, this requires their external interaction with the awards process. Fund transfers and checks must be initiated by the Dean’s office. They will eventually become SAP business transactions, but that is out of scope for our awards process.
- The **Office of the Provost**. The Provost is the chief academic officer for the entire university. The dean of each college (including the College of Technology) reports to the Provost. The Provost does not directly participate in the college awards process; however, winners of the college faculty awards

across the entire university must ultimately be reported to the Provost for both formal university recognitions, and for eligibility for a few equivalent university-level awards (such as the Stanley Lee Award for Marvelous University Undergraduate Teaching).

- **Awards Suppliers.** These are local businesses that create, manufacture, and sell various certificates, plaques, trophies, and other tokens of appreciation given out to award nominees and winners at an annual College of Technology Faculty Recognition Banquet in late-April.

**INSTRUCTOR CLARIFICATION:** *Some of the above stakeholders directly participate in the process (meaning they do the work of the process), and others are external to the process (meaning that they only provide net inputs or receive net outputs from the process). Faculty may fall into both categories. For example, almost all college faculty are eligible for the awards. But some faculty also participate in committees that do work the process.*

## Process Timing

### A. Timing and Volume

This process is executed only once per academic year.

**INSTRUCTOR NOTE:** The “academic year” is defined as fall semester through spring semester as opposed to the “fiscal year” which is July 1 through June 30.

This process is triggered by the start of each new fall semester, specifically one week before the fall semester starts. That is when academic-year faculty report to work every fall. That provides time for update of online policy and procedure documents, and a kickoff orientation meeting for internal stakeholders.

This process ends near the end of the spring semester with a completion of recognition banquet during which College nominees and winners are announced and honored in full faculty convocation. It should be noted that recognition banquet honors far more than just these six faculty awards.

There has never been any kind of abnormal end where the recognition banquet did not happen. Even in the pandemic year, a virtual banquet was held. Furthermore, all six awards have always been given every year, even though on occasion some schools may not have had a nominee for a given award (either because they did not feel they had a viable nominee; or by disqualification of process, nominee, or document; or for failure to meet an absolute deadline).

### B. Pre-conditions of the process

The following conditions must be true before this awards process can be started.

1. The Dean must officially appoint the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The chair is selected by the Dean from the members of the Faculty Senate. Every year, the chair has many other responsibilities. But the FAC Chair is responsible for managing the awards process in accordance with the approved process, policies, and practices.
2. The Dean must issue the College of Technology “Calendar of Events” that includes many events and deadlines, some of which correspond to the faculty awards process. The chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee must work backwards from these published deadlines to establish additional deadlines for that year’s execution of the faculty awards process.
3. The IT Director or designee of the *Technology Computing Network (TCN)* must update membership and read or write privileges in the College of Technology *SharePoint Faculty Awards web site* that is home to all policy documents, flowcharts, and templates used by the process.
  - They delete any faculty and staff who have left the college and adding any new faculty and staff. Most faculty get at least read-only access to the public portions of the *SharePoint Faculty Awards web site*.



- They delete and add any former and new school deans, heads and support staff. They get read-only permission to the entire **SharePoint Faculty Awards web site**, except for the Dean and FAC Chair who get full read-write permission.
- The TCN director or designee works with the FAC Chair to obtain and post any new policy, process, and template documents or versions that need to be posted in public portion of the **SharePoint Faculty Awards web site**. Any nomination briefs from the previous year are archived for access only by the Dean or FAC Chair.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** Recall that any pre-conditions of a process are NOT activities considered to be part of the process. Lessons taught you how to document pre-conditions of a business process in BPMN.

### C. Post-conditions of the process

After the awards process is completed for the academic year until the following things should happen in preparation for the subsequent year:

1. All nominee briefs should be archived in *SharePoint*. This should happen after the recognition banquet but sometime before the end of the spring semester.
2. History of winners should be updated in *SharePoint* database.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** Recall that any post-conditions of a process are NOT activities considered to be part of the process. Lessons taught you how to document post-conditions of a business process in BPMN.

### Applicable Policies, Practices, and Rules for the Business Process

1. For each school, that school's nominating committees should try to consider multiple eligible candidates for each award. Each of these candidates are then invited to "accept" this consideration by submitting a written nomination brief back to the appropriate nominating committee by a deadline within that school.
2. All briefs should use the Microsoft *Word* templates provided via the College of Technology SharePoint Awards web site.
3. Nomination briefs are not to exceed six total pages (one sided). This rule was intended to end the common practice of nominees using their promotion document or a subset that spans far more than one year's accomplishments. If time permits, a candidate should be given an opportunity to downsize such a document. Regardless, additional pages beyond page six should be stripped/truncated by the FAC Chair before college-level committee meetings to ensure that all candidates receive the same amount of information.
4. Each school's nominees should be selected from only those faculty candidates who actually submitted a written nomination brief. In the interest of fairness to all candidates, late nomination briefs should not be accepted.
5. For the Stark and McCoy Awards only, the nomination brief should include the names and email addresses of at least two students who agree to serve on the corresponding college-level Stark and McCoy Award Committees. The presenters need not have been a member of their school's nominating committee. While more than two names can be submitted, no school should be allowed to have more than two students on either of these awards' selection committees. Evidently, this addresses "equal representation" complaints that were common in the previous ad-hoc process.
6. For the Strange, Banner, and Rogers Awards, the nomination should be supplemented by the name and email address of at least one faculty member who agrees to serve as their representative on the corresponding college-level Strange, Banner, Rogers or Romanov Award Selection Committee. While more than one name can be submitted, no school should be allowed to have more than one faculty member on each of the award selection committees.

## Information Technology Services in Support of the Business Process

1. The business process does not receive central IT services from Information Technology at Purdue (ITaP).
2. The business process receives some decentralized IT services from the College of Technology Computing Network (TCN) department. TCN created has already created a **Faculty Awards website** using Microsoft's teamwork and file sharing tool, *SharePoint*.
3. The *SharePoint Faculty Awards website* consists of the following:
  - "Faculty Awards Process Supporting Documents" database to which all College faculty and staff have read-access. It contains:
    - Awards policies, procedures, and any flowcharts (such as BPMN)
    - Current year's awards calendar
    - Nomination brief templates
    - History of winning briefs (useful for checking eligibility)
  - "Nomination Briefs" database to which only college-level awards committees have read-access. It contains:
    - current year's nomination briefs
      - Stark undergraduate teaching award
      - McCoy graduate teaching award
      - Strange instructional development award
      - Banner research and discovery award
      - Rogers service and engagement award
      - Romanov internationalization award
    - prior years' winners archives (generally purged after five years)
      - Stark undergraduate teaching award
      - McCoy graduate teaching award
      - Strange instructional development award
      - Banner research and discovery award
      - Rogers service and engagement award
      - Romanov internationalization award
  - Only the Dean and FAC Chair have write-access privileges to the above databases.
  - It is important to note that students are never granted any type of access to the SharePoint **Faculty Awards website** or its databases. This is because many sensitive files are stored therein (e.g., budget, promotion and tenure, faculty employment searches, grade appeals, scholarship applications, etc.).
  - It is also important to note that the *SharePoint Faculty Awards website* only supports college-level award activities. Thus, it does not support any nomination subprocesses or activities. And even at the college-level, the two student-selected committees are still not granted access to any college SharePoint website (as stated in the prior bullet).
4. Because students cannot access the SharePoint web site, the student awards are operated using old fashioned, physical duplication and distribution of all documents. This will continue until a secure technical solution can be developed, funded, and prioritized – not likely in the near-term.



5. The FAC Chair is named administrator “write” privileges to the entire site. The Dean or FAC Chair can request additional “write” privileges upon request to TCN.

### Recommended Process Improvements

The following process improvements have been suggested by the FAC.

1. As previously noted, to improve consistency and completeness of the candidate faculty written briefs, a College *SharePoint Faculty Awards website* was just established by the Technology Computing Network (TCN) to provide templates and instructions for the briefs, and to store and access actual briefs as submitted by the faculty candidates (and later used by the award selection committees). This needs to be formally integrated into the business process.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** *I added this to give the exercise at least some small IT perspective. Students are left to properly depict IT services into their BPMN diagrams for the business process. This would also address the current misconception of some that SharePoint is available throughout the new process.*

2. Because the participants (and sometimes the business process) change from year-to-year, it is now required that the FAC Chair annually facilitate a kickoff meeting of all internal College stakeholders (participants other than award-eligible faculty) to walkthrough the latest version of the process, policies, and answer questions.

**INSTRUCTOR HINT:** This activity needs to be included in your process model.