

**CODE**

*Approved by Faculty: April 26, 2013*

**DEPARTMENT OF  
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES**

COLLEGE OF APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES  
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Section A: MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT .....	3
Section B: DEPARTMENT COMMITMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.....	3
B.1 Faculty Support	
B.2 Educational Milieu	
B.3. Teaching	
B.4 Scholarship	
B.5 Service	
B.6 Outreach	
Section C: ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT .....	4
C.1 Department Head	
C.2 Assistant Department Head	
C.3 Graduate Programs Director	
C.4 Family and Developmental Studies Program Director	
C.5 Marriage and Family Therapy Program Director	
C.6 Applied Developmental Science Program Director	
C.7 Undergraduate Program Director	
C.8 Director, Center for Family and Couple Therapy	
C.9 Executive Director, Early Childhood Center	
C.10 Advising Coordinator	
C.11 Departmental Governance	
Section D: COMMITTEES OF THE DEPARTMENT.....	8
D.1 Ad Hoc Committees	
D.2 Curriculum and Programs Committee	
D.3 Admissions Committee for Selection of Graduate Students	
D.4 Advisory Committee	
D.5 Outcomes Assessment Committee	
D.6 Scholarship Committee	
D.7 Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure Program Committee	
Section E: DEPARTMENT MEETINGS .....	10

---

Section F: RELATIONS WITH STUDENTS .....	11
F.1    Student Interest Groups	
F.2    Student Grievances	
F.3    Graduation Expectations	
F.4    Undergraduate Supervised Research and Teaching Experiences	
Section G: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS/HIRING .....	12
G.1    Appointments to Faculty	
G.2    Spousal Hires	
G.3    Other Appointments	
G.4    Graduate Faculty	
Section H: TENURE, PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT .....	14
H.1    Tenure and Promotion Committee	
H.2    Policies and Procedures Regarding Tenure and Promotion	
H.3    Mentoring	
Section I: EVALUATION OF FACULTY .....	21
I.1    Annual Performance Reviews	
I.2    Periodic Reviews of Tenured Faculty	
I.3    Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Phase I Comp. Reviews	
I.4    Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Phase II Comp. Reviews	
I.5    Sabbatical Leave	
Section J: MISCELLANEOUS PROCEDURES .....	26
J.1    Departmental Evaluation	
J.2    Review of the Department Code	
J.3    Code Amendments	
Appendices: .....	27
A.    Professional Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty	
B.    Tenure and Promotion Standards	

- A. MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT:** The mission of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies is to promote the optimal development of individuals and families in the context of the larger social environment. We strive for excellence in research, teaching, service, engagement, and outreach. We value open, honest, and critical dialogue in a supportive academic community. Research and education in HDFS covers the lifespan, and considers context as a prime influence on development. Our signature areas of expertise include: risk, resilience, and developmental psychopathology; treatment, intervention, and prevention science; emotion, regulation, and relationship processes; adult development and aging; and cultural context and diversity. The foundation for all these pursuits is our belief that the strengths of individuals and families can be optimized.
- B. DEPARTMENT COMMITMENTS AND ACTIVITIES:** The departmental mission is fulfilled by six generic activities. These activities create an environment conducive to the generation and transmission of knowledge to improve the well-being of individuals and families; open exchange of ideas; professional courtesy; and mutual respect.
- B.1 Faculty Support:** Faculty members are provided with space, office supplies, and clerical and staff services sufficient to meet day-to-day needs. Support for faculty is found in the form of travel funds and purchases of goods and services as funding permits. Departmental representatives also serve as a liaison to extra-departmental units, relaying information to departmental faculty relevant to their needs and professional interests.
- B.2 Educational Milieu:** The Department supports efforts directed at establishing among students, staff, and faculty a broad and genuine appreciation of diverse perspectives and critical analysis. The Department is committed to ensuring respect within the department of differing perspectives. The Department is committed to the pursuit of academic excellence, in all its research, teaching, service, and outreach activities.
- B.3 Teaching:** The Department prepares baccalaureate students (B.S.) for entry-level professional positions in human services across the lifespan. The Department also prepares students for entry into graduate programs in the social and behavioral sciences. At the graduate level, the Department prepares master's degree (M.S.) students (a) for leadership positions in human services; (b) as marriage and family therapists, meeting clinical standards set by the Commission on Accreditation, for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE); and, (c) for entry into doctoral programs in the social and behavioral sciences. In addition, the Department prepares doctoral (Ph.D.) students for careers as professors and developmental researchers through the Applied Developmental Science program in HDFS.
- B.4 Scholarship:** Scholarship contributes to the knowledge base of the profession. Research is comprised of technical reports of empirical analyses, research summaries, and theoretical statements addressing basic and applied issues in the field. Faculty are expected to publish regularly in peer-reviewed outlets with significant impact to the field. Scholarship is also reflected in the receipt of competitive extramural funding, and faculty are expected to fund their research programs. Scholarly writing also addresses professional issues in the academic community. Topics addressed include institutional issues as well as curricular topics within graduate and undergraduate education. The Department subscribes to an apprentice model of graduate education. Graduate students are expected to work closely with faculty in all aspects of the research enterprise.

- B.5 Service:** The Department faculty serve the University, professional organizations, international, national, and state agencies by providing faculty expertise in human development and family studies responsive to requests for services. The Department's responsiveness is associated with its emphasis on the application of science as well as recognition of the importance of community citizenship.
- B.6 Outreach and Engagement:** The Department supports the translation of science into programs and policies through outreach and engagement activities. This includes, but is not limited to, the integration of Cooperative Extension efforts into the Department.

### C. ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT

- C.1 Department Head:** The administration of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies shall be the responsibility of the Department Head. The Department Head shall serve as an ex-officio member of the standing committees, except in clear cases involving a conflict of interest. In no case will s/he have a vote.
- C.1.1.** The Department Head shall be selected as specified in the University Code. (E.4.3.)
  - C.1.2.** The term of office of the Department Head shall be in compliance with the University Code.
  - C.1.3.** The duties of the Department Head shall be those specified in the University Code.
- C.2 Assistant Department Head:** The Assistant Department Head will serve as executive when the Department Head is absent. Duties of the Assistant Department Head include, but are not limited to, preparation of institutional and departmental reports and overseeing the undergraduate and graduate programs and curriculum.
- C.2.1.** The Assistant Department Head shall be nominated for appointment by the Department Head. This appointment must be approved by a majority of the voting faculty and will be for a three-year term. The selection process for the Assistant Department Head will be conducted no later than August of the academic year following the end of the three-year term of office. The Assistant Department Head shall be eligible for reappointment.
  - C.2.2.** The Assistant Department Head shall be a tenured faculty member holding the academic rank of professor.
  - C.2.3.** Specific responsibilities include: serve as executive when department head is absent; represent department head at meetings when requested; serve on executive advisory committee to department head; course scheduling and general oversight of undergraduate and graduate programs; oversee collection of undergraduate and graduate program outcomes assessment information; catalog copy; and oversee projects of importance to the department as needed.
- C.3 Graduate Programs Director:** The Graduate Programs Director is elected by the tenured/tenure-track faculty for a 3-year term, and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Duties include:
- C.3.1.** Oversee admissions to graduate programs.
  - C.3.2.** Work with program leaders to facilitate faculty mentor/advisor selection for first year master's students.

- C.3.3.** Oversee assignment of and facilitation of funding opportunities for graduate students.
  - C.3.4.** Assign graduate teaching assistants.
  - C.3.5.** Serve on scholarship committee.
  - C.3.6.** Provides departmental review of master's theses and dissertations for students whose advisor is a program director.
  - C.3.7.** Chair the HDFS Graduate Programs Committee.
  - C.3.8.** Serve on the HDFS Executive Advisory Committee.
- C.4 *Family and Developmental Studies (FDS) Program Director:*** The FDS Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The FDS Director will be elected to a 3-year term, and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Duties include:
- C.4.1.** In conjunction with the Graduate Programs Director, to respond to requests for information about the FDS program, recruit applicants to the FDS Graduate Program, and to assist with admissions to the FDS graduate specialization.
  - C.4.2.** To oversee advising of first year graduate FDS students until advisor is selected.
  - C.4.3.** To provide departmental review of FDS students' theses, unless the FDS Program Director is also the student's advisor. In this case, the graduate programs director will provide the departmental review.
  - C.4.4.** To serve as an advocate for the FDS Program within the Department, College, University, nationally, and internationally.
  - C.4.5.** To serve on the HDFS Graduate Programs Committee.
  - C.4.6.** To facilitate FDS students' career development.
- C.5 *Marriage and Family Therapy Program Director:*** The MFT Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The MFT Director will be elected to a 3-year term, and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member, a clinical member of AAMFT, an AAMFT-approved supervisor, and a licensed (or license-eligible) Marriage and Family Therapist in Colorado. Duties include:
- C.5.1.** To coordinate program accreditation and ensure compliance with COAMFTE.
  - C.5.2.** In conjunction with the Graduate Program Director to respond to requests for information about the MFT Program, to recruit applicants to the MFT Graduate Program, and to assist with admissions to the graduate specialization in marriage and family therapy.
  - C.5.3.** To serve as an advocate for the MFT Program within the Department, College, University, nationally, and internationally.
  - C.5.4.** To serve on the HDFS Graduate Programs Committee, and to inform COAMFTE of policy and curricular changes that are approved.
  - C.5.5.** To ensure that information about the policies of the MFT Program are disseminated.
  - C.5.6.** In collaboration with the other MFT Committee members, to screen, select, and integrate into the program any additional approved supervisors or supervisor candidates.

- C.5.7. To provide departmental review of FDS students' theses, unless the FDS Program Director is also the student's advisor. In this case, the graduate programs director will provide the departmental review.
  - C.5.8. To facilitate MFT students' career development.
  - C.5.9. To oversee advising of first year MFT graduate students, until advisor is selected.
- C.6 *Applied Developmental Science (ADS) Program Director:*** The ADS Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The ADS Director will be elected to a 3-year term, and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Duties include:
- C.6.1 In conjunction with the Graduate Programs Director, to respond to requests for information about the ADS program, to recruit applicants to the ADS Graduate Program, and to assist with admissions to the ADS graduate specialization.
  - C.6.2 To serve as an advocate for the ADS Program within the Department, College, University, nationally, and internationally.
  - C. 6.3 To serve as a member of the HDFS Graduate Programs Committee.
  - C.6.4 To facilitate ADS students' career development.
  - C.6.5 To serve on the committee that evaluates whether the master's theses and coursework from other programs and institutions of incoming ADS students qualifies to satisfy requirements of the ADS program.
  - C.6.6 To review ADS student dissertations to determine that they meet departmental expectations for dissertation studies, unless the ADS director is also the student's advisor. If the ADS director is the student's advisor, the departmental review will be performed by the Graduate Programs Director
- C.7 *Undergraduate Program Director:*** The Undergraduate Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The Undergraduate Program Director will be elected to a 3-year term, and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Duties include:
- C.7.1 Receive and evaluate all requests for changes in the Undergraduate Program that must ultimately be reviewed and approved by the Department faculty and College and University Curriculum Committees.
  - C.7.2 Develop and implement policies related to transfer evaluations, substitution and waivers, and outcome assessment efforts.
  - C.7.3 Chair the Undergraduate Programs Committee.
- C.8 *Director, Center for Family and Couple Therapy:*** The CFCT Director is appointed by the Department Head, after consulting with the MFT faculty. The Director is appointed to a one-year term, and is eligible for reappointment. The person shall be a full-time faculty member, a clinical or associate member of AAMFT, an AAMFT-approved supervisor (or supervisor candidate), and a licensed (or license-eligible) Marriage and Family Therapist in Colorado. Duties involve general oversight of the CFCT, including :
- C.8.1 Management of the CFCT, including recruiting clients, developing and implementing policies, and supervising the CFCT Assistant Director and graduate assistant.
  - C.8.2 Facilitation of MFT students' transition into the CFCT, and from the CFCT into internship sites.

- C.8.3 Ensurance that MFT students comply with the legal and ethical aspects of MFT practice, and to respond to client grievances.
- C.8.4 Maintenance of the CFCT database.
- C.8.5 Coordination of research and outreach/engagement activities in the CFCT.
- C.8.6 Development and maintenance of budget and sound business plan.

**C.9 *Executive Director, Early Childhood Center:*** The ECC Executive Director is hired by the Department Head, after consultation with the HDFS faculty. The Executive Director is a non-tenure track Assistant or Associate Professor appointed to a one-year term, and is eligible for reappointment. Duties include:

- C.9.1.** Overseeing all management and business functions of the ECC, including direct supervision of the ECC Director of Operations, ECC Director of Student Learning and the ECC Financial and Operations Coordinator.
- C.9.2.** Strategic development and fund-raising to support the ECC, in collaboration with the HDFS department head and office of development
- C.9.3.** Strategic planning and development of research infrastructure in ECC and training and research partnerships with faculty in HDFS and other units on campus
- C.9.4.** Development, implementation , and oversight of data tracking systems for outcome evaluations, annual reports, and benchmarking activities related to ECC visibility, reputation, and quality
- C.9.5.** Development of partnerships within national community of lab schools.

**C.10 *Advising Coordinator:*** The Advising Coordinator is hired by the Department Head. The Advising Coordinator is an Administrative Professional. Duties of the coordinator include:

- C.10.1 Serve as HDFS Key Adviser to resident and on-line students.
- C.10.2 Develop resources and training opportunities to enhance faculty advisers' knowledge of academic advising policies and procedures for undergraduate students.
- C.10.3 Revise and update the Undergraduate Handbook
- C.10.4 Coordinate HDFS registration activities each term
- C.10.5 Select, train, and oversee the HDFS Peer Advisers.
- C.10.6 Directly supervise HDFS Academic Support Coordinators and online Advisor.
- C.10.7 Represent HDFS on the College Key Advisers' Committee.
- C.10.8 Help to implement faculty directives regarding the undergraduate program, including the recruitment of new majors; orientation efforts, particularly advising and career development; and monitor student progress toward graduation.
- C.10.9 Integrate online advising with functions of advising office, including supervision of the online advisor.
- C.10.10 Serve on Scholarship Committee.

**C.11 *Online Program Director.*** The online program director is appointed by the Department Head. Duties include:

- C.11.1.** Oversee the online degree program and associated courses
- C.11.2.** Develop course schedules and offerings for each semester, including assigning instructors to courses
- C.11.3.** Oversee course development

- C.11.4. Develop marketing and program growth plans
- C.11.5. Provide annual reports of program growth metrics and outcomes
- C.11.6. Oversee annual budget that is developed in conjunction with Department Head
- C.11.7. Serve on Undergraduate Programs Committee

**C.12 Departmental Governance:** The faculty who may serve and vote in department governance, except when specified otherwise in the code, are tenured and tenure-track academic faculty holding full-time appointments. Special appointment and senior teaching appointment faculty may serve and vote in departmental governance - except on issues of budget and personnel - upon approval by a majority vote of the voting faculty. Temporary appointments and Administrative Professionals may provide advisory input but do not have voting rights in the Department. With the exception of tenure and promotion decisions (see section H. Tenure and Promotion, below) voting on departmental issues may be held either in faculty meeting or via email. Faculty members on sabbatical are eligible to vote on department matters provided they acknowledge having had sufficient opportunity to review relevant material. In those instances when an elected program director or committee member (see next section) is absent from the University for an extended period of time, that member will be replaced by another individual elected by tenure-track faculty as a replacement for the period of absence. In the case of absence owing to resignation, the newly elected member will complete that term of service vacated by the former member.

#### **D. COMMITTEES OF THE DEPARTMENT:**

**D.1 Ad Hoc Committees:** Ad hoc committees may be appointed by the Department Head, or by simple majority of the faculty, to accomplish specific tasks. The task shall be clearly defined and presented to the faculty. Upon completion of the task a report shall be made to the Department Head and faculty. Upon completion of the task, the committee shall be dissolved.

**D.2 Graduate Programs Committee:** Membership shall consist of the Graduate Programs Director, the MFT Program Director, the FDS Program Director, and the Applied Developmental Sciences Program Director. The Graduate Programs Director serves as chair of this committee.

**D.2.1.** Duties of the Graduate Programs Committee include:

- a. To receive from or make recommendations to the graduate faculty and/or Department Head suggestions or ideas regarding graduate procedures and policy within the Department.
- b. Develop and evaluate graduate program curricular requirements within the Department
- c. Review departmental graduate program direction, course offerings.
- d. To receive and act upon graduate student petitions pertaining to graduate curriculum or policy.
- e. To review periodically the graduate program and initiate changes as needed related to policies, procedures, or graduate course offerings.



**D.2.2.** All significant curriculum changes (i.e., programs of study; new or major course changes) will go to the full faculty for approval.

**D.3 *Undergraduate Programs Committee:*** Membership shall consist of the Undergraduate Programs Director, the ECE Licensure coordinator, the online program director, the GIM coordinator, the internship and practicum coordinators, and the advising coordinator.

**D.3.1** Duties of the Undergraduate Programs Committee include:

- a. To receive from or make recommendations to the faculty and/or Department Head suggestions or ideas regarding undergraduate procedures and policy within the Department.
- b. To receive and act upon undergraduate student petitions pertaining to undergraduate curriculum or policy.
- c. To review periodically the undergraduate program and initiate changes as needed related to policies, procedures, or undergraduate course offerings.
- d. To develop and evaluate undergraduate program curricular requirements within the Department.
- e. To review departmental undergraduate program direction, course offerings.

**D.3.2** All significant curriculum changes (i.e., programs of study; new or major course changes) will go to the full faculty for approval.

**D.3.3** The Undergraduate Programs Committee will elect from its membership the representative to the College Curriculum Committee.

**D.4 *Admissions Committee for Selection of Graduate Students:***

**D.4.1.** The FDS admissions committee shall consist of the Graduate Programs Director, an elected member of the HDFS faculty, and the FDS Program Director.

**D.4.2.** The MFT admissions committee shall consist of the MFT faculty and the Graduate Programs Director.

**D.4.3.** The ADS admissions committee shall consist of the ADS Program Director, an elected member of the HDFS faculty, and the Graduate Programs Director.

**D.5 *Executive Advisory Committee:*** The Executive Advisory Committee's function is to advise the Department Head on all significant matters facing the Department. The Department Advisory Committee shall include the Department Head, the Assistant Department Head, the Chair of Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Graduate Programs Director, and the Undergraduate Programs Director. The Department Head will maintain an archived record of committee business and decisions.

**D.6 *Outcomes Assessment:*** The Outcomes Assessment Committee will be charged with overseeing annual outcomes assessment reporting. The committee will consist of the Department Head, the Graduate Programs Director, the Undergraduate Program Director, and will be chaired by an elected member of the faculty.

**D.7 *Scholarship Committee:*** The Scholarship Committee is comprised of the Graduate Programs Director, the Department Key Advisor, and a faculty member elected by the faculty. The elected faculty member serves as the representative to the College Scholarship Committee, and serves for a 3-year term. Duties of the Scholarship Committee include:

- D.7.1. Apprise the HDFS faculty and students of scholarships and other funding opportunities available to HDFS students.
- D.7.2. Coordinate efforts to solicit scholarship applications from HDFS majors.
- D.7.3. Coordinate the selection of HDFS scholarship awardees based on individual scholarship criteria.
- D.7.4. Maintain records of scholarship selection procedures.
- D.7.5. Represent HDFS on the College Scholarship Committee.
- D.7.6. Work with the College Development Officer and the HDFS External Advisory Council to increase HDFS scholarship funds.
- D.7.7. Coordinate efforts to enhance and promote general scholarship in the Undergraduate Program including the University Honors Program.

**D.8 *Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure Program Committee:*** The ECE licensure program committee is led by 1 full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty member from HDFS who works with the School of Teacher Licensure and Principal Preparation (STEPP) co-coordinator. The HDFS ECE Coordinator is appointed by the Department Head, after consulting with the faculty, is appointed to a 3-year term, and is eligible for reappointment. The committee also includes the ECE pre-advisor, and the ECC Associate Director of Student Learning. The ECE Coordinator will work with the STEPP co-coordinator to:

- D.8.1. Advise students enrolling in the ECE program, including recruiting students, developing and implementing policies, and coordinating admissions.
- D.8.2. Collaborate with colleagues in STEPP regarding all administrative matters.
- D.8.3. Collaborate with HDFS faculty on content areas.
- D.8.4. Ensure that the HDFS course of study is in compliance with the standards set by the Colorado Department of Education.

## **E. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS**

- E.1** Meetings of the faculty shall be called by the Department Head at least monthly during each academic term excepting summer. An e-mail announcement will be distributed to faculty members in advance of the meeting. A minimum of one faculty meeting a year shall include a discussion of departmental budget priorities and allocations within the context of the Strategic Plan. Additional faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the Department Head, the Advisory Committee, or at the request of at least three faculty members or a Committee Chair. Agenda items for faculty meetings may be submitted by any member of the faculty, no later than 3 days before the faculty meeting.
- E.2** Attendance at faculty meetings is mandatory. Exceptions are granted for illness, attendance at professional meetings that cannot be scheduled at another time, conference travel, and special circumstances (e.g., sabbatical leave, family medical leave).
- E.3** A record of action taken at faculty meetings shall be maintained by the Department Head, or by an appointed faculty or staff member. A summary of decisions made during a scheduled meeting shall be distributed to all faculty and staff.
- E.4** The Head of the Department serves as Chair for purposes of conducting faculty meetings. All eligible faculty members may vote on issues presented for action; the Chair may vote only in the event of a tied vote.
- E.5** Motions called for a vote may be decided by either a live vote or by email ballot, but the type of vote (in person or email) will be declared prior to the vote. In the case of a live

vote, section E.6 below will apply. In the case of an email vote, all faculty members (including those not present at the meeting or on sabbatical) may vote provided they have sufficient opportunity to review relevant material.

- E.6** For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting in all matters, except where parliamentary rules dictate otherwise, shall be by simple majority of those voting.
- E.7** Unless an executive session has been formally called, meetings of the faculty shall be open to student observers; students in attendance may speak on an issue at the pleasure of the faculty, as determined by majority vote.
- E.8** The parliamentary authority for the department faculty shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

## **F. RELATIONS WITH STUDENTS**

**F.1 *Student Interest Groups:*** The departmental faculty shall encourage and promote the professional and academic development of the undergraduate majors and graduate students. This shall include support and assistance for student interest groups. At least one faculty member or administrative professional shall serve as an adviser to each student interest group. With advisor and Department Head approval, a graduate student may serve as advisor to an undergraduate group.

### **F.2 *Student Grievances***

**F.2.1.** Student grievances regarding evaluation of students, conduct of course instructors, or faculty advisement are best dealt with in the department where the grievance has originated. In each case the Department will follow the policies and procedures outlined in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (see section I.5). These procedures will be reprinted in the HDFS Graduate Student Handbook, and will be available to undergraduates through HDFS faculty advisers and peer advisers.

- a. If the Department Head finds that a student's grade appeal merits convening an appeals committee, this Committee shall be constituted as follows. The Committee Chair will be selected at random from among tenured faculty in the College of Applied Human Sciences, excluding those in HDFS. Two HDFS faculty will be selected at random from among the tenured faculty in the department, excluding those who are on leave.
- b. Committee members who have a conflict of interest in the case – a friend or relative of the student, the instructor involved in assigning the disputed grade – will be excused from service, and another name will be drawn as above.
- c. If a graduate student appeals the grade, the remaining two committee members will be selected at random from among second-year students in HDFS.
- d. If an undergraduate student appeals the grade, the remaining two committee members will be selected at random from a pool of 25 junior and senior HDFS majors who have been identified by the Undergraduate Program Director; maturity and judgment are relevant considerations in forming this pool.

- F.2.2.** Grievances that cannot be resolved in the Department will be forwarded to the CSU Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services.
    - F.2.3.** Any grievances involving academic integrity or student misconduct will be reported to the CSU Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services. The Department Head will be notified in such instances.
  - F.3** ***Graduation Expectations:*** It is the policy of HDFS to expect students to have completed degree requirements prior to participating in Commencement. For undergraduates, this includes the completion of all coursework. For graduate students, this includes the completion of coursework and the successful defense of the thesis. For students planning to participate in Spring commencement, an exception will be made to allow students to walk in the ceremony if the major degree requirements are met (e.g., thesis defended before the ceremony) and all that is remaining to be completed is coursework that will be completed in the following summer.
  - F.4** ***Undergraduate Supervised Research and Teaching Experiences:*** Students enrolling in supervised research work with faculty (i.e., HDFS 498) are expected to have a cumulative GPA of 3.0. Exceptions may be made based on a compelling written rationale by the supervising faculty to the Department Head. Students enrolling in supervised college teaching (i.e., HDFS 484) will be juniors or seniors who have a cumulative major GPA of 3.0 and a grade of A in the course they will be assisting in. No exceptions will be made to these criteria.

## **G. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS/HIRING**

### **G.1** ***Appointments to Faculty***

- G.1.1.** Regular (tenure-track) appointments are the result of a national search conducted by a departmental search committee or, in the case of a search for a department head, by the Dean of the College of Applied Human Sciences. The search committee is appointed by the Department Head. All faculty being considered for full-time tenure track appointments must be judged by HDFS faculty to possess the prerequisite skills necessary to attain tenure at the academic rank being sought. This requirement mandates that an essential criterion in hires will be the demonstration of a critical mass of research skills sufficient to prepare and publish scholarly work on a regular basis, and demonstrated evidence or potential (in the case of junior hires) to secure extramural funding. Other important criteria include qualifications to teach courses in the discipline and fit with departmental needs and long-term priorities.
      - G.1.2.** It is the responsibility of the Department Head to appoint a search committee when it is known that there will be an open faculty position. The Department Head may appoint one doctoral graduate student or external member to the search committee, who will serve as a nonvoting member. The search committee prepares a position announcement and conducts the search for qualified candidates. Applicant folders of finalists invited for interviews (excepting external letters) will be available to all faculty for review and evaluation within the parameters of current OEO requirements. The search committee develops procedures and schedules for interviewing candidates, if such interviews are authorized, and makes recommendations

to the Department Head. In each phase of the appointment process, Affirmative Action guidelines of the College and the University shall be followed.

**G.2 Spousal Hires:** HDFS endorses spouse/partner hires by CSU, and encourages the University to provide support to departments to do so. A "partner" shall be defined in terms of Colorado statutes related to common-law marriages. The Department's role in supporting spouse/partner hires shall be as follows:

**G.2.1.** When HDFS has hired a faculty member through a competitive search, and that person's spouse/partner is a candidate for a position elsewhere on campus: The Department Head is encouraged to provide support and resources necessary to hire the spouse/partner, depending on (a) consent of the faculty and (b) budgetary constraints and the likely impact on HDFS resources.

**G.2.2.** When HDFS is asked to hire the spouse/partner of someone who receives a job offer elsewhere on campus: If the appointment would be regular full-time or part-time position, the appointment is to be reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The applicant must meet the criteria established in Appendix B, Tenure and Promotion Standards, of the Department Code.

**G.3 Other Appointments**

**G.3.1.** Section E.2 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual define the following types of appointments, specify their terms of service, and describe their rights and privileges. These types of appointments are cited here to clarify which entities in the Department are involved in making the appointment.

- a. Special Appointments: Special appointments are approved by the Department Head after discussion with the faculty.
- b. Temporary Appointments: The Department Head approves temporary appointments based on a specific, temporary need in the Department.
- c. Transitional Appointments: Transitional appointments are negotiated between the faculty member and Department Head and are approved by the Dean and Provost. The terms under which the appointment are undertaken or subsequently modified shall be negotiated to be mutually beneficial to both the faculty member and the University, and the terms of the contract shall be specified in writing, subject to the review and approval of the Dean and the Provost.
- d. Joint Academic Appointments: HDFS faculty who request a joint appointment with another department should clear this request through the Department Head. Requests for joint appointments by faculty members in other departments are to be reviewed by the faculty.
- e. Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments: The faculty reviews joint academic and administrative appointments for approval.

- f. Faculty Affiliate and Visiting Faculty Appointments. The faculty reviews both Faculty Affiliate appointments and Visiting Faculty appointments for approval. Affiliate faculty will be appointed for a one-year term, and renewable annually.
- g. Senior Teaching Appointments. The Department Head will initiate the process for granting Senior Teaching Appointments. The Department Head shall ask the Department Appointment Committee, defined as the HDFS Tenure & Promotion Committee, to vote by ballot for or against the appointment of the faculty member being considered. Criteria for eligibility for consideration are specified in Section E.11 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

- G.3.2.** Emeritus Appointment. As stated in Section E.3 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Academic faculty members who have completed ten years or more of regular full-time or regular part-time service as faculty shall be eligible at the time of their retirement for an emeritus/emerita title equivalent to their highest professorial rank. Academic personnel who have held administrative positions (including department heads) for five years or more shall be eligible for the emeritus/emerita title for both positions. The procedures and conditions applying to emeritus/emerita status are:
- a. A member of the academic faculty may request emeritus/emerita status from the Department at the same time of retirement from the University. The Department Head and the Dean of the College shall forward the request to the Provost. If the requirements for eligibility are met, such forwarding is pro forma. The final decision on granting emeritus/emeriti status will be made by the Board of Governors.
  - b. Privileges associated with this appointment are issuance of a permanent faculty identification card; listing on the faculty mailing lists; full library privileges; and, if possible, office lab/office space and clerical support provided to each emeritus/emeriti faculty member who continues to do scholarly work.

**G.4. Graduate Faculty:** The graduate faculty shall consist of all HDFS and joint appointment to HDFS tenured and tenure-track faculty possessing a doctoral degree. They are eligible to serve as chairs of graduate student committees and/or as thesis advisers. The Graduate Faculty can come together and make a decision regarding the appropriateness of others to serve in this role consistent with Graduate School policy. Graduate faculty may also be assigned to teach graduate level courses. Procedures for selecting a graduate student adviser are found in the Graduate Handbook.

## H. TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT

**H.1 Tenure and Promotion Committee:** The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty in the Department. An exception to this policy is that the Department Head does not serve as a member of the Committee. The Committee is responsible for reviewing all documents for promotion, tenure and reappointment of

faculty members and presenting the Department Head with a written recommendation for granting or denial of tenure, promotion and/or reappointment. In considering applicants for promotion in rank, only those tenured at or above the rank of the applicant shall vote. If a committee cannot be constituted of at least three HDFS faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member under consideration, then additional members shall be drawn by lot from faculty of higher rank who are on the promotions committees of the Schools of Social Work and Education.

**H.1.1.** The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee is to be elected from its membership. The person so elected must hold the rank of Professor. If the Department Head is a member of the tenured faculty, s/he may cast a vote in electing the Committee Chair. After an election held at the beginning of Fall semester, a Committee Chair serves a three-year term. Although no term limits are specified, the Committee is encouraged to not elect the same individual to fill more than two consecutive terms. If the Committee Chair will be away from campus for an extended period of time (e.g., sabbatical leave) or leaves the University before the term has expired, the Committee will elect another individual to complete the term of office. The Committee Chair also serves as the Department's representative to the College of Applied Human Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. When the Committee Chair is unable to participate in College P&T Advisory Committee meetings called by the Dean, the chair may appoint another member of the Committee to attend and act on her/his behalf. The person so appointed by the Chair must hold the rank of Professor.

**H.1.2.** The Committee Chair prepares and distributes meeting agendas and other materials in advance. In instances where a meeting will focus on evaluating a faculty applicant for promotion, tenure and/or reappointment, Committee members should be given at least three weeks advance notice.

## **H.2 *Policies and Procedures Regarding Tenure and Promotion***

**H.2.1.** Applications for tenure and/or promotion are initiated by the Department Head, consulting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenure and/or promotion applications initiated by the Department Head must begin with consultation with the faculty member(s) affected.

**H.2.2.** All applications for tenure and/or promotion must be submitted using the form in current use by the University.

**H.2.3.** The mid-point comprehensive review and yearly internal progress toward tenure reviews must be submitted using the form in current use by the University. The mid-point comprehensive review will be conducted on the same timetable as the annual reviews.

**H.2.4.** The Department Head and the Committee Chair will jointly maintain a timetable for the review of all non-tenured faculty. This timetable must also identify individuals who might request early promotion and/or tenure.

**H.2.5.** Annually (at the beginning of Fall Semester for those being reviewed internally for reappointment, and at the end of the prior Spring Semester for those being officially reviewed for tenure and promotion), the Department Head will forward to the Committee Chair a memo requesting a

written recommendation of all faculty to be considered for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. The memo should also identify faculty who will be considered for a “midpoint” comprehensive review. This memo should include a timetable for completion of the recommendation wherein the Tenure and Promotion Committee is given at least 6 weeks to complete the requested review and submit a recommendation to the Department Head. After receipt of the memo from the Department Head, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will in turn notify the individual faculty who will be reviewed by the Committee. This notification must indicate the nature of the review, the documentation that will be required, and the date by which this documentation will need to be available for review.

- H.2.6.** Using as evaluation criteria the tenure and promotion standards published in current Department (see Appendix B for benchmarks), College and University documents, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will carefully review each application for tenure and/or promotion. After a formal Committee vote, the Committee Chair will prepare a written recommendation, and submit it to the Department Head. The recommendation must include the results of the Committee’s vote to grant or deny tenure/promotion, or to support/not support reappointment. A recommendation for or against reappointment should identify strengths and weaknesses in progress toward tenure. A recommendation to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion should describe the applicant’s performance and activity relative to tenure/promotion standards published in current Department, College, and University documents.
- H.2.7.** It is the responsibility of the Department Head to review the Committee’s recommendations, to add his/her own recommendation, and to forward both recommendations to the Dean of the College, together with the completed application.
- H.2.8.** In instances where the Committee’s vote indicates the existence of “majority” and “minority” positions with regard to the final recommendation, the Committee Chair is to work closely with faculty representing these points of view in preparing the final recommendation. Preferably, members of the Committee representing the minority position will write the minority section of the recommendation. If Committee members representing the minority position do not prepare a written statement to be included in the final recommendation, it is the responsibility of the Committee Chair to do so. In the latter case, the Committee Chair should work as closely as possible with Committee members representing the minority position. In instances where the recommendation to the Department Head includes both majority and minority positions, the Committee Chair should call another meeting of the Committee to discuss the final draft and review both positions.
- H.2.9.** In instances where the Committee’s recommendation does not include majority and minority positions, it is not necessary for the Committee to reconvene. Instead, the Committee Chair may simply distribute a draft copy of the recommendation to members of the Committee who voted on the



recommendation, and request written feedback. If necessary, the Committee Chair subsequently incorporates this feedback into the final recommendation. The Committee Chair then forwards the recommendation to the Department Head, retains an archive copy of the recommendation in the applicant's file, and distributes copies of the recommendation to all Committee members.

- H.2.10.** All members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee are expected to vote. Before voting on an applicant's tenure, promotion and/or reappointment, each member of the Committee is expected to have thoroughly reviewed all materials submitted by the applicant. It is also desirable that Committee members be familiar on an on-going basis with the applicant's published research as well as teaching skills. Reasons for abstentions will be noted by the chair in the report to the Department Head.
- a. Faculty on sabbatical may vote only if they have the opportunity to review materials. If on sabbatical, votes will be submitted via fax to the confidential department fax machine. Email votes will not be accepted.
  - b. In the case of votes for promotion and for tenure, a meeting of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be held wherein each candidate is discussed. Following the meeting, a mandatory 24-hour (minimum) moratorium will be held before voting may begin. At the end of the moratorium, ballots will be distributed by email to faculty members, who will have 72 hours to vote. Ballots must be returned to the front office and faculty must sign a ledger that they have voted. Actual votes are anonymous.
- H.2.11.** Confidentiality of discussions of Committee business is of utmost importance. All who attend and participate in Committee meetings must hold in strict confidence the information discussed, the votes taken, and the recommendations made. Note: Since information shared via e-mail is not secure, all Committee members and the Department Head are to avoid transmitting sensitive and confidential information through this medium.
- H.2.12.** The Committee's recommendations regarding tenure and/or promotion are to be shared with the applicant at the time the recommendation is received by the Department Head. It is the responsibility of the T&P Chair to share the Committee's recommendation with the applicant.
- H.2.13.** Actions involving reappointment of non-tenured faculty are also considered annually by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Department Head and Committee Chair are to meet jointly with the faculty member to share the evaluation of the tenured faculty vis-à-vis progress toward tenure and promotion. The Department Head will write the formal letter regarding reappointment only after reviewing the findings and recommendations of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and after conducting an evaluative conference with the faculty member and the Committee Chair.
- H.2.14.** Criteria for tenure and promotion are those established by the Department and are to be consistent with College guidelines and University policy. These criteria are contained in the most recent version of the Department's

Promotion and Tenure Standards (see Appendix B). Published criteria are also found in the College Code, and the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (section E. 12). All Committee members are expected to acquire and maintain current copies of these documents, and to periodically review the tenure and promotion criteria and guidelines published in them. Prior to Committee deliberations regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Chair is expected to review with Committee members the relevant criteria to be used in evaluations and recommendations. It is the responsibility of the Committee Chair to ensure that (a) Department's criteria for promotion and tenure are consistent with those published in College and University documents, and (b) during their first semester of employment, all non-tenured faculty (tenure-track) have copies of Departmental, College and University documents containing information regarding criteria and procedures relevant to tenure and promotion.

- H.2.15.** Any member of the faculty can propose changes in tenure and/or promotion standards, criteria or procedures. Proposed changes will be submitted to the Committee Chair who, in turn, will submit them to the Committee for discussion.
- H.2.16.** When negotiations in hiring new faculty explicitly address expectations and/or timetables for promotion and tenure, the Department Head is to work closely with the Committee Chair (following guidelines in CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, section E.10.4.1.1). In instances where early tenure will be part of the negotiated contract, the Committee Chair must poll the Committee and report the vote to the Department Head. The Department Head must share the results of the vote with the individual with whom negotiations are being conducted. Copies of the relevant part of final contract letters are to be sent by the Department Head to the Committee Chair, who will maintain an archive copy.
- H.2.17.** Extensions of the pre-tenure probationary period shall follow policy in Section E.10.4.1.2 of the CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual).
- H.2.18.** Both the Department Head and the Committee Chair have access to a variety of sources of information on non-tenured and non-fully promoted faculty. The Department Head and Committee Chair are to share as much information as is needed to help the Tenure and Promotion Committee make informed decisions and recommendations regarding tenure, promotion and/or reappointment. On occasion, this may require that the Committee Chair invite the Department Head to participate in Committee deliberations. This participation may include providing information regarding tenure performance expectations shared with the applicant, and informing the Committee of the applicant's annual faculty evaluations that pertain to tenure, promotion and/or reappointment.
- H.2.19.** Information required by the Committee to make informed recommendations about reappointment may also require that evaluators external to the University be requested to review an applicant's dossier.

Information required by the Committee to recommend promotion or tenure must include external letters of evaluation. The Committee must follow the University policies and guidelines described in current material published by the Office of the Provost.

**H.2.20.** Dossiers of non-tenured faculty are to be kept in the Department Office, and formally updated annually by January 15. The Committee Chair is responsible for reminding applicants of this deadline, and in helping the applicant in the preparation of the dossier. Although the dossier must be updated annually, applicants are strongly encouraged to add to their file throughout the year. These additions may include copies of publications, research grant proposals, course syllabi, etc. Committee members are encouraged to “visit” these files several times throughout the year in order to be familiar with the ongoing work of applicants. Applicants are also encouraged to invite Committee members to attend classes.

**H.2.21.** From time to time, members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee may be absent from campus (e.g. on sabbatical leave) during Committee deliberations. In such cases, the absent Committee member(s) may request that the Committee Chair mail copies of the application materials to her/him. The absent Committee member(s) may also participate in the Committee vote as long as the vote is received on or before a deadline to be specified by the Committee Chair.

**H.2.22.** For each non-tenured faculty member as well as for each non-fully promoted faculty member intending to seek promotion within the next year, the Committee Chair will maintain a file that contains “formal” documents relevant to reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. These documents might include, but not be limited to, the following: (a) copies of relevant correspondence between the Department Head and the faculty member (e.g. a summary of relevant tenure and promotion information abstracted from the contract letter, and position/job description), (b) copies of the Committee’s recommendations to the Department Head, (c) copies of aggregated Committee votes, (d) copies of votes and written decisions submitted by individual Committee members, (e) copies of correspondence between the Committee Chair and the faculty applicant, (f) copies of relevant correspondence between the Department Head and the Dean (e.g., recommendations for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion), and (g) copies of annual evaluations.

**H.3 Mentoring.** Mentoring is a relationship in which a more experienced faculty member acts as a guide, role model, and sponsor of a less experienced student or faculty member. Mentors assist a protégé’s pursuit of becoming a full member of the professoriate in two broad ways: (a) psychosocial support, through advocacy, collegiality, and mutual enrichment of experiences; and (b) instrumental help, by means of advice, counsel, challenge, organizational socialization, and information about the norms and standards of the profession as well as competencies necessary for success.

**H.3.1. Department Approach.** Our approach to mentoring is informed by the qualities of effective mentors and mentoring programs: Structured activities with regular meetings, at least in the first year of the mentoring

relationship, work best. This requires a willingness to devote substantial thought, time, and effort to mentoring.

- a. Mentors should be knowledgeable and competent; full professors are typically preferred.
- b. Interest, empathy, compassion, and respect are important if not essential. However, close friends do not necessarily make for effective mentoring relationships when there is an evaluative component, such as feedback about teaching skills or progress toward tenure. Untenured faculty are less likely to disclose their needs for information and support if they believe that they will be judged unfavorably, which is why the mentoring relationship should be defined primarily if not exclusively in terms of support rather than evaluation.
- c. Mentors should be open, honest, and generous in sharing their experiences, especially difficulties they encountered and how they were solved (or not) as well as their passions related to academia. Optimism and enthusiasm are valued; bitterness is not.
- d. The ability to clearly communicate constructive feedback is important, especially once mentors and protégés have bonded.

**H.3.2. Training.** Mentors should be trained in effective strategies before they are paired with protégés. Such training should clarify the mentor's role, especially related to the type of guidance that is most beneficial for career development and success in academia. As well, it may be helpful to employ a checklist of mentor qualities and activities so that mentoring teams can monitor their progress in meeting protégé's needs.

- a. Upon hire, a new untenured faculty member will be mentored, for the first semester, by the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. An orientation meeting will typically focus on what mentoring involves, potential benefits, responsibilities, suggestions, and troubleshooting strategies. In subsequent meeting, the T&P Chair will help the new faculty member (a) draft a mentoring and career plan, (b) orient to the department and university, and (c) network with other potential mentors.
- b. At the end of the new hire's first semester, he/she will select a primary mentor, in consultation with the Department Head and T&P Chair. Among the factors involved in this assignment are match of research interests (not limited to content area but also considering applied vs. basic as well as preferred methodology), the protégé's unique needs, complementarity of personalities, and the workload of senior faculty.
- c. The mentor and protégé are strongly encouraged to meet on a regular basis (e.g., monthly for at least the first semester) in order to establish a supportive working relationship. By the beginning of the protégé's second year, an additional 1-2 tenured faculty will be included to form a team of mentors. Once protégés' initial, pressing needs have been addressed, regular meetings may then

evolve with more emphasis on modeling, advocacy, and support. It is important to note that when mentoring is viewed as remedial, both parties are likely to disengage from it, in part because the protégé may no longer view the mentor as a supportive advocate.

**H.3.3. Evaluation.** “Successful” typically is defined in terms of (a) the degree of involvement by both mentor and protégé, (b) the feeling that someone cares, (c) mentees’ needs being met, (d) new skills developed, (e) networks established with kindred researchers and reduced sense of isolation, (f) assistance in completing grants and manuscripts, and (g) understanding the political and social climate of the university. It must be emphasized that effective mentoring is undermined when protégés believe their mentors are judging them, so this (judgmental) aspect should be monitored as part of any assessments. Given that little is known about mentoring between faculty members, it is recommended that the Department conduct a systematic evaluation of the benefits and pitfalls of its approach to mentoring. One important benefit of regular evaluations is that they are likely to promote consistent, high-quality mentoring because when mentor-protégé pairs know that they have to complete regular assessments of the process, it is enough of an impetus to have regular, structured meetings. As well, one component of faculty annual evaluations is involvement in mentoring; formal evaluations from protégés of mentoring relationships should be collected as part of tenured faculty members’ annual evaluations.

## I. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

**I.1 Annual Performance Reviews:** Each faculty member on regular appointment, whether tenured or not, all special appointments, and all administrative professionals participate in an annual evaluation of performance relative to the particular responsibilities of the position, and the particular objectives which have been previously established for the faculty member for the current year. The faculty member completes an annual activity report and presents it to the Department Head in advance of an annual evaluation conference.

- I.1.1.** The annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) follows a specified format established by the Department. Generally, the Annual FAR describes the faculty member’s professional commitments and specific accomplishments in the areas of research, education, service and outreach. The report also allows the faculty member to describe her/his goals for the coming year.
- I.1.2.** Upon receipt of the FAR, the Department Head will draft a summary evaluation using the current form on the Provost’s website. The draft summary will be sent to the faculty member in advance of the annual meeting, and discussed during the meeting.
- I.1.3.** During the annual conference, the Department Head will (a) present an evaluation to the faculty member; (b) point out ways to improve as well as maintain competent performance; and (c) reach agreement on the objectives for the faculty member for the following year. For untenured faculty, the first part of the conference will include the T&P Chair and will be directed at progress toward tenure and promotion.

- I.1.4.** A final version of the written summary will be completed following the conference and shall be provided by the Department Head to the faculty member no later than 7 days following the annual conference. The faculty member may append a statement to that summary. Copies of these documents will be shared with the Dean of the College of Applied Human Sciences.
- I.1.5.** Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall be in compliance with the College University Codes.
- I.1.6.** During the annual performance review, each faculty member and the Department Head shall agree to the distribution of faculty effort across the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service. A standard teaching load, involving 50% of one's time, consists of 12 credits of Type A courses per academic year plus student advising and Type B instruction/supervision (e.g., supervised college teaching, independent study, internship, thesis supervision). Typically, faculty will devote 30-35% of their time to research and 10-20% of their time to service. However, for the overall good of the Department, and dependent on faculty skills and career interests, differential effort loads will be considered. These loads will be negotiated between the Department Head and the individual faculty member.
- I.1.7.** Generally, for the first one-third of their pre-tenure years, non-tenured faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor are expected to commit relatively less time to service and proportionately more time to research and teaching. In particular, when fiscally possible, new Assistant Professor hires will be given "release time" from service and a reduced teaching load to jump-start their research program.
- I.1.8.** With regard to teaching, the normal load is 2/2. Faculty may buy out of classes at 10% of their 9-month salary. Guidelines for buy-outs stipulate that faculty may first buy out of a course, then buy out of 10% FTE related to their research time, then contribute to summer salary or additional course buy-outs. Faculty with sufficient extramural funds can buy out down to a minimum load of 1 course/annually. In career awards that provide at least 75% of salary coverage, the load will consist of 1 course annually and minimal service requirements.
- I.1.9.** With regard to service, non-tenured faculty are expected to serve on at least one departmental committee during their first five years, preferably after their second year of employment, and to be involved in service activities in professional organizations at the national level. Service at the college or university level is not encouraged until after non-tenured faculty members have completed three years of employment. During the latter two-thirds of faculty members' pre-tenure years, they should allocate up to 15% of their effort to service, again giving priority to departmental service.
- I.1.10.** In general, the percentage of effort devoted to service should not exceed that allocated to research or teaching.
- I.1.11.** Non-tenured faculty hired at the rank of Associate Professor may be expected to engage in department, college, or university service at an earlier time than that expected of non-tenured Assistant Professors, but the

percentage of effort expended on service should not exceed that for research or teaching. Tenured faculty, particularly those at the rank of Professor, may be given more latitude in how they distribute their effort across the three areas. However, it shall be the responsibility of the Department Head to ensure that an overall balance among the three activities exists across all faculty in the Department.

**I.1.12.** Criteria for evaluating performance, and documenting activities, in teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/outreach are described in Appendix A, Annual Review Benchmarks.

**I.1.13.** Each semester, faculty shall evaluate their teaching in order to improve their instruction and courses. The Student Course Survey shall be given in all classes each semester as part of this evaluation process (see AFAPM Section I.8). A designated student is to collect completed surveys in a sealed envelope and return them to the Department office, where they will be forwarded to University Testing Services for tabulation. Prior to forwarding to University Testing Services, the Department Head may elect to scan the surveys so that s/he can provide timely support in addressing any issues. This scan is used proactively, constructively, and not as part of the evaluation. Survey results are viewed on the course survey website by the faculty member. As noted in Section E.12.1 of the Manual, Student Course Survey results are one source of information that can be used to document teaching effectiveness for annual performance evaluations and for T&P decisions. Faculty are expected to include summaries of course evaluations for their annual evaluations and may also include signed peer evaluations. Evidence of teaching success and innovation will be listed in the annual FAR; supporting documentation will be maintained by the faculty member.

**I.2 Periodic Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty:** Periodic comprehensive reviews serve the purpose of faculty development rather than accountability and disciplinary sanctions. This statement acknowledges that faculty already are subject to a variety of regular evaluations that maintain accountability, and the University Code specifies procedures to be followed should a faculty member be deemed incompetent. Instead, periodic comprehensive reviews are meant to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service, to “revitalize and redirect faculty energies, particularly in light of changed career stages, new pedagogical developments, and new disciplinary or institutional directions” (American Association of University Professors, 1997, p. 45).

**I.3 Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews**

**I.3.1** The University requires all tenured faculty, excepting those on transitional appointments, to be reviewed at intervals of five years, or if there are two consecutive annual reviews within a five year period reflecting a less than satisfactory performance in the overall evaluation of teaching, research, and service. A “less than satisfactory” evaluation will be defined as an evaluation of “below expectations” or “unsatisfactory” in teaching or research. By departmental code, the Chair of the department’s Tenure/Promotion Committee may work collaboratively with the Department Head in the evaluation of Phase I comprehensive reviews, at

the request of the Department Head or faculty member being reviewed, including the development of any professional development plans which may be instituted prior to determination of the need for a Phase II review.

- I.3.2 If faculty performance in the Phase I comprehensive performance review merits an overall unsatisfactory or below expectations in the teaching and research areas, the Department Head, the Chair of the Tenure/Promotion Committee, and the faculty member will design a professional development plan to assist the faculty member in satisfactorily meeting departmental expectations.<sup>1</sup> The Department Head and Chair of the Tenure/promotion Committee will consult and evaluate together the faculty member's progress on the development plan. If the progress made on the Phase I developmental plan is considered unsatisfactory at the end of their mutually agreed upon timeline, a Phase II Comprehensive Review is required.

#### **I.4. Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Phase II Comprehensive Reviews**

- I.4.1 Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the Department Head determines that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the Phase I Review or demonstrates neglect of professional performance (see Section E.15.4.1 of University Code). At that point, a Phase II Peer Review Committee will be called consisting of three tenured members of the faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member under consideration, and the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. If there are not more than three tenured faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member under consideration, additional review committee members will be drawn by lot from other departments within the College.

- I.4.2 In an effort to ensure impartiality of the members of this committee, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will select four members who best represent the diverse perspectives of the department. The faculty member being reviewed has the right to challenge committee composition in one of two ways: (a) to challenge one member of the chosen committee by giving written reasoning for the challenge; the reasoning will be reviewed by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and another selection will be made if the cause of the challenge is seen as valid or (b) to challenge the entire committee composition, giving written justification for the challenge.

*Note: If the second challenge is taken by the faculty member, the entire T&P Committee will meet to review the faculty member's written concerns and will vote to either uphold the Chair's original selection or vote to reconstitute the review committee.*

- I.4.3. The Phase II Review Committee will review the faculty member's performance according to criteria for evaluation of faculty performance found in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (Sections E.9 and E.12) and the HDFS Department's Promotion and Tenure

---

<sup>1</sup> The Chair of the Tenure/Promotion Committee, in participating in this process, is to provide additional input, but is not required to be in agreement with the review status given by the Department Head.



- Standards document. These standards must be viewed in light of the individual's annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or tenure (whichever is most recent) along with the assigned responsibilities and effort distribution over the period in question.
- I.4.4. The Department Head will submit copies of his/her evaluations of the faculty member's past performance, a copy of any development plans that have been implemented, and a letter summarizing the basis of the unsatisfactory evaluation. The faculty member will submit the materials presented at each annual review for the period in question. If not included in these aforementioned documents, the faculty member will also provide student or peer evaluation of courses taught within the last two years, copies of publications, grant proposals, or other scholarly writing, and a listing of service or administrative responsibilities for the period in question. A written response by the faculty member speaking to the areas that were rated as unsatisfactory as well as areas that the faculty member feels were not properly considered is encouraged.
- I.4.5. After meeting once, the Phase II Review Committee has the option to request additional information from the Department Head, faculty member being reviewed, or other parties they feel would aid their deliberations. Following final deliberations, the Committee will send forward a written recommendation which supports one of the three following outcomes:
- a. Outcome 1: The faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by his or her academic unit.
  - b. Outcome 2: There are deficiencies, but they are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent. *Note: No further action is necessary if either of the two aforementioned outcomes is identified*
  - c. Outcome 3: There are deficiencies that are substantial and chronic or recurrent. .
- I.4.6. Further action is required if the latter outcome is identified. Where deficiencies are identified which must be corrected the Department Head will design a professional development plan to address those deficiencies and set a time-line for accomplishment of each element of the plan; the faculty member will be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor (Department Head) on the design of the professional development plan. The Dean of the College must approve this development plan.
- I.4.7. In the case of Outcome 3, the Committee will provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review and the faculty member will have 10 working days in which to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the committee review and the faculty member's response will be forwarded to the Department Head, and eventually to the Dean and Provost.
- I.4.8. Time Line for Phase II reviews
- a. Phase II review initiated by Department Head (following unsatisfactory Phase I review)

- b. Peer Review Committee (PRC) selected by T&P Chair (10 days after Phase II review is initiated by Department Head)
- c. PRC meets to examine materials; may request additional information if needed (10 days after Committee is formed)
- d. PRC submits a written report/evaluation to the Department Head and to the faculty member (10 days after PRC meets to review)
- e. Faculty member prepares and submits a written response to the Department Head and to the PRC (10 days after PRC report is received by faculty member and Department Head).
- f. If the outcome is “no further action”, the review process is ended (See Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
- g. If outcome is “further action required” (see Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual), then the following occurs:
  - (a) “Deficiencies must be remedied”: Department Head and faculty member design a professional development plan (within 10 days after faculty member submits written response to the Department Head and the PRC).

**I.5 *Sabbatical leave:*** The Department Head reviews applications for sabbatical leave, and recommends approval to the Dean. In instances where more than one application for sabbatical leave is submitted the Department Head will consider the following criteria: Time since last sabbatical; stage of career; quality of sabbatical proposal in terms of clearly articulated goals; and work load balance in the department.

1.5.1 If the Department Head requests a sabbatical leave, his/her proposal shall be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, and its recommendation shall be forwarded to the College Dean.

1.5.2 All applications for sabbatical leave must be submitted to the Department Head no later than one month prior to the time when sabbatical leave requests are to be received in the Dean’s office.

## J. MISCELLANEOUS PROCEDURES

**J.1. *Departmental Evaluation:*** Procedures related to the departmental evaluation shall be followed as prescribed within the University Code.

**J.2. *Review of Department Code:*** The Department Code shall be reviewed by the faculty in odd numbered years, and in the year prior to the end of each term of the Department Head (normally 5 years).

**J.3. *Code Amendments:*** Amendments to the Code may originate with the Department Head or any eligible faculty member at any time. Each amendment will be reviewed by the Department Head prior to presentation to the full faculty for review. In exceptional circumstances any part of this code may be suspended for one year. All amendments or suspensions to the Code shall require a two-thirds majority vote of the eligible department faculty.

No statement in this document shall be interpreted in a fashion inconsistent with the *CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*

**APPENDIX A:**  
**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES**  
**Professional Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

**I. OVERVIEW**

This document has been prepared by faculty and is designed to provide accountability and rationale for annual faculty ratings. Specific guidelines and expectations for tenure and promotion are in Appendix B.

**PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS**

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate performance in all three areas of the academic mission: teaching and advising (usually 50% of workload), research and scholarly activities (usually 35% of workload), and service and outreach (usually 15% of workload). Non-standard workload efforts reflecting administrative responsibilities, Cooperative Extension responsibilities, external funding arrangements, or other circumstances, may be approved by the Department Head. However, all faculty should demonstrate continuing effort in each area. When activities are not clearly documented by categorical information (e.g. publications), it is the faculty member's responsibility to obtain necessary additional information (e.g. external reviews, letters from appropriate people), the focus of which is demonstrating impact of activity. It is expected that all members of the faculty will demonstrate the highest of professional standards across all areas of the academic mission and in all activities and interactions both internal to the department and as representatives of the department with external audiences.

**TIMELINE**

By Jan 15, each faculty member shall submit the following to the Department Head: (a) the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) for the preceding calendar year; (b) an updated vita; and (c) signed CSU Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Forms. Supporting materials such as student course evaluations, student products, unsolicited letters, advising evaluations, award or other recognition letters, copies of published, accepted, or submitted articles, book contracts, etc., will be held by the faculty member, but made available as necessary. The Department Head will prepare a draft of the CSU Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report and forward that to the faculty member prior to the annual meeting between the Department Head and faculty member. These meetings are held in advance of the college deadline for evaluations to be submitted; the meetings are usually in February and early March. The summary will be drafted based on the FAR as applied to the guidelines (see the following pages) in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. ***Variations are expected to occur based on work-load distribution variations (i.e., percent of effort in each area), contract status (i.e., 9- vs 12-month appointment), as well as stage of career (i.e., the level of expectation of performance for senior faculty is greater than for junior faculty).*** During the annual meeting, the draft summary will be discussed. Following the meeting, the Department Head will forward the final summary (incorporating any changes agreed upon during the meeting) to the faculty member for signature. For all faculty below the rank of tenured professor, this summary shall include a discussion of the assessment of progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Faculty may request an appointment with the Department Head at any time during this process, but are expected to meet formally once.

## GUIDELINES

These guidelines ***are not*** to be considered all-inclusive. Instead, they represent examples of the kinds of behaviors anticipated to achieve a specific rating (depending on faculty rank), and other types of evidence may be included to document performance. Additionally, given the unique combinations of activities which may represent a faculty member's performance, the Department Head will use reasonable discretion in matching performance to the guidelines, and will make judgments relative to quality of the nature of the research (e.g. longitudinal studies, difficult to reach populations) and its outlet (i.e., journal status and impact) – ***all in the context of workload, contract status (i.e., 9- or 12-months), and career stage***. It is understood that a small quantity of superior quality work may lead to the same or even better evaluation than a larger quantity of average quality. Thus, the guiding principal is demonstration of impact, and the ability to communicate that impact to a larger audience that is broader than one's specific area of expertise. Finally, it is understood that the guidelines are considered holistically rather than compartmented check-offs. Thus, within a category, superior demonstration of one aspect may weight a category rating more than others, such that one does not *necessarily* have to have a superior in all aspects of that domain to get a superior (for example, receipt of a large grant, papers in the pipeline but not published, and no conference presentation could earn an exceeds or superior rating, depending on the factors involved in that individual case, or in the case of a junior faculty, a number of papers, a submitted grant, but no funding might earn a superior or exceeds expectations depending on factors in that case). The overall rating, however, is based on category score weighted by percent of effort.

## II. TEACHING AND ADVISING GUIDELINES

The expectations for teaching and advising for the Department of Human Development and Family Studies comprise 50% of faculty load (unless otherwise approved by the Department Head). Faculty who take on administrative or extensive external funding responsibilities may buy down to a 1/1 load, and in exceptional cases down to 1 course/year (see code). The following Teaching and Advising Guidelines represent exemplars of the kinds of behaviors faculty members may use to document their performances. Teaching and Advising includes the categories of curriculum development and instructional innovation, classroom performance, advising, and student mentoring. The following expectations refer to all aspects of course delivery: on-line; residential; and cooperative extension. In the following, therefore, "course" is equivalent to "workshop". "Students" and "workshop participants" are used synonymously.

**II A. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION** (i.e., materials). Evidence of innovation can be demonstrated by evidence of peer review; awards; grants to improve content; evidence of adaptation or improvement, and curriculum committee review.

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Research-based and extraordinarily effective innovations	Is acknowledged as "excellent" by internal and/or external peer	Instructor appropriately adapts course content based on	Courses and syllabi out-of-date; Minimal activity in	Little evidence of coherent course construction;

---

successfully and systematically incorporated into courses and effectiveness is documented externally	review	student needs (i.e., using previous course evaluations to update courses), content requirements, etc.	instructional innovation	No activity in instructional innovation
Receives funding for course or program redesign		Develops course materials and course content for first time and is acknowledged as “good” by internal and/or external audiences (i.e., review of materials – exams, assignments, syllabus, WebCt site, etc.).		
Demonstrates impact by external adoption of materials/ curriculum				
Receives award or formal acknowledgement for curriculum development				

---

**II B. CLASSROOM/WORKSHOP PERFORMANCE** (i.e., Teaching) The Department Head will determine expectations based on data provided on CSU departmental evaluations, including range and average, for across HDFS courses and within courses (i.e., graduate and undergraduate) that are taught. Peer review is encouraged for all faculty as a supplement to course evaluations.

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Outstanding student (or participant) evaluations in all classes or workshops taught	Strong student (or participant) evaluations in all classes or workshops taught	Good student (or participant) evaluations in all classes or workshops taught	Weak student (or participant) evaluations in one or more classes/workshops	Poor student (or participant) evaluations in one or more classes/workshops
Receives teaching award	Nominated for teaching award		Evidence of weak teaching performance (e.g., some missed classes, documented student complaints, etc.)	Evidence of poor teaching performance (e.g., frequently missed classes or documented student complaints, unprofessional conduct in classes, etc.)

**II C. STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING.** This section refers to *student* (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoc) mentoring; faculty mentoring is addressed in service/outreach. The majority of undergraduate advising is conducted by the professional advising office; sub-section (a), therefore, refers primarily to career advising and mentorship for undergraduates. All faculty are expected to mentor graduate students via inclusion in their own work, and participation as chair or member of committees to advise the student's work. The number of graduate advisees is not as important a criterion as is timely progress and evidence of professional socialization (e.g., joint authorship on papers or conference presentations).

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
<b>a. Undergraduate</b> Evidence of outstanding advising	Advises student groups/organizations in addition to regular load	Evidence of good advising	Little evidence of or poor advising	No evidence of or extremely poor advising
Student receives award or recognition for mentored project	Teaches Type B course in addition to regular load	Participates in departmental career fair, interviews for HD 286		No student advisees
Students present mentored work at research/creativity day	Provides supervised research experience			Complaints about bad advising

**b. Graduate**

Collaborates with students in writing and presentations leading to publication in refereed journals or presentations at local, state, regional, national, or international conferences	Collaborates with students in writing and presentations leading to publications in non-refereed publications or presentations at local meetings or conferences	Mentors students in their classroom writing endeavors, encouraging submission for publication	Minimal student mentoring	No student mentoring
Collaborates with student in applying for a grant and student receives it	Collaborates with student in applying for a grant	Students graduating on time	Significant number of graduate students not making timely progress toward graduation	Does not participate in grad committees
Student advisee wins national award/grant or other accomplishment	Student advisee wins university or state award/grant	Students graduating to another program or to job or postdoc	Only serves as grad committee member	
		Serves as chair or co-chair on committees		

**III. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP GUIDELINES**

The expectations for Research and Scholarship for the Department of Human Development and Family Studies are that faculty contributions comprise 35% of workload (unless otherwise approved by the Department Head). All faculty with more than a 10% research workload are expected to engage in a program of research, with efforts made toward publication, grant submissions, and conference presentations.

There are a number of guidelines for scholarship, but the most significant are external funding and publication record. A major test of the quality of scholarship is peer review, and this includes the receipt of funding to support a scholarly program of research, as well as publication of that work. Thus, related to publications, the quality (e.g., widely cited manuscript, difficulty of population to study, published in a top tier journal, work translated into foreign languages, invited manuscripts for peer reviewed journal) and number of refereed, peer-reviewed publications are the primary criteria for judging publication scholarship. The type of publication can include empirically based quantitative and qualitative

manuscripts and theoretical and applied/practice papers that offer a significant contribution to the field. Related to external funding, a similar set of guidelines apply: the quality/reputation of the funding agency (e.g., federal peer reviewed through NIH, major national foundation), the size of the award, the amount of indirects, the amount of salary coverage, and the role of the funding in developing one's research program. ***As with all other guidelines for performance, impact and ability to communicate impact are key.***

### III A. PUBLICATIONS

In general, first-authored publications, as well as publications evidencing senior authorship (i.e., faculty member is last but a student or post-doc is first) will be weighed more heavily toward these guidelines than "simple" co-authorship. In addition, the guidelines refer to published works in that year. In press, submitted, and in preparation are evidence of a pipeline and are expected as well. Further, impact of journal will be included such that a paper in a first-tier peer-refereed journal may count more than multiple articles in low-impact journals.

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Multiple high level publications	One significant (top-tier) peer-reviewed publication	One of the following published: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One refereed article,</li> <li>One chapter in a scholarly, edited book</li> </ul>	Minimal publication activity (manuscripts under preparation)	No publication activity
Noteworthy paper that receives external attention (e.g., media, etc)	Multiple publications in second-tier journals	Evidence of pipeline	No evidence of pipeline	
Received research or scholarship award	Nominated for research or scholarship award			

### III B. GRANTS

Grants are tools designed to support a research program. The following are examples of activities that may earn a specific rating, but the overarching criterion will be demonstration of relevance to one's research program – thus, a "shot-gun" approach to funding is not encouraged, but collaborative activities, including those outside the department, that contribute to a defined research portfolio will be weighed favorably. Expectations are also weighed by rank, with greater expectations for more senior faculty, and more modest expectations for those more junior.



<b>Superior</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Initial funding as PI or Co-PI for refereed federal grant with federal indirects	Initial funding as PI or Co-PI for non-refereed grant with less than full indirects but some salary coverage	Submits proposal (PI or Co-PI) for external grant	Consultant or co-investigator on projects outside dept, with no evidence of developing program within dept	Frequently denies opportunity to collaborate on grant or grant writing
Maintains research program for grant or grants of high quality with indirects and significant 9-month salary coverage	Maintains research program for grants annually with less than full indirects, but with some salary coverage	Maintains research program for one grant with no indirects and minimal salary coverage	Submits internal (to CSU) seed grant	No grant development or submission
Funds more than 1 student with assistantship and tuition	Funds 1 graduate student with assistantship and tuition (10 hours or more)	Participates on a grant as a consultant or minimal effort as co-investigator with some buy-out		
	Funds more than 1 graduate student on hourly basis (10 hrs or more)	Internal seed grant funded		
	Submits multiple large grants	Funds graduate student on hourly basis (10 hours or more)		

### III C. PRESENTATIONS/WORKSHOPS

<b>Superior</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Keynote speaker or invited seminar/presentation at international or national professional conference	Presentation at refereed international or national professional conference	Presentation at refereed local, regional, or state professional conference	Submitted abstracts but was denied	No submission of abstracts
Multiple peer-reviewed presentations at national or international professional conferences	Keynote speaker at regional or state conference			

#### IV. SERVICE AND OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES

The expectations for Service and Outreach for the Department of Human Development and Family Studies are that faculty service contributions comprise 15% of load (unless otherwise approved by the Department Head) and include activities both internal and external to the University. The following Service and Outreach Guidelines represent the kinds of behaviors faculty members may use to document their performances. Service may result from assignment, election, or appointment. Service and Outreach includes the categories of department and program service, college and university service, professional service, and community service and outreach. Service accomplishments will be expressed not only in terms of hours of involvement, but in terms of leadership, scope, and depth of influence as well. Thus, as with all other missions, demonstration of impact is important and leadership on one committee that has a very strong impact may count as much or higher than participation in a number of committees or even as chair of a committee. **Administrative assignments (e.g., center director) are considered here as well, and in the following, chair of committee would be considered similarly to director of program or center.** Thus, below the guidelines for committee work are rough guidelines, with the expectation that there will be variability based on type and extent of assignment. It will be the expectation that pre-tenure individuals will have smaller service assignments than individuals post-tenure, and expectations for service will be commensurate with rank (e.g., new junior faculty will not be necessarily expected to serve as chairs of committees to earn superior).

##### IV A. DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, AND STATE SERVICE

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Chair of major Department/University/ State regular or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals	Chair of standing or ad-hoc committees	Membership on one standing or ad hoc departmental or college committee, or multiple time-limited and non-labor-intensive committees	Inadequate committee work (e.g., irregular attendance, assigned tasks incomplete or late, not carrying weight in assignments, etc.	No committee work
Member of multiple major and/or time-consuming department/university/ state committees with accomplishment of set goals	Nominated for College/University/ State service award	Meets committee goals according to timeline		Regularly declines committee assignments (e.g., assigned tasks not completed or containing significant errors, etc.)
Received college/university/ state service award				Work delayed or not getting completed; tasks slipping through cracks; inadequate

	Regularly attends Department faculty meetings	communication with Department Head, students or faculty
	Assigned tasks completed on time	
	Goals addressed and met, tasks completed,	Goals not met, no effort to improve

IV B. FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL MENTORSHIP (NOTE: This is not expected for pre-tenured faculty)

<b>Superior</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Mentors department faculty or cooperative extension professionals in teaching or scholarship on a regular basis, resulting in demonstrated improvement in course, workshop, accepted paper or funded grant, or other significant product	Mentors department faculty in teaching or scholarship (working with another faculty member on writing; working with other faculty to improve teaching) on a regular basis, resulting in submitted paper, grant submission	Collaborates with department faculty in teaching or scholarship  Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts	Minimal faculty mentoring and collaboration, e.g., reviews an article or grant proposal once for a colleague	No faculty mentoring when asked

IV C. PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY SERVICE AND OUTREACH

<b>Superior</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Leadership in national or regional	Leadership in state or local professional	Membership in national, regional, state or local	Inadequate professional participation (e.g.,	No professional activities or memberships,

professional organization	organization	professional organizations (e.g., AAMFT, AgrAbility, APA, GSA, NCFR, SRCD)	minimal attendance at meetings, incomplete tasks, etc.)	avoids professional responsibilities
Receives national or state service award	Service on committees in local or state organizations			
	Service on committees in national organizations			
	Recognition for service at any level; nominated for national/state award; receive local award			

## IV D. EDITORIAL/GRANT/PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

<b>Superior</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Editor of national or international refereed journal	Editorial board of a national or international refereed journal	Reviews at least 2-3 articles annually for refereed journals	Minimal activity (e.g., edits articles for state or local publications)	No activity
Reviews grant proposals for a national funder	Reviews grant proposals for a regional or state funder	Reviews grant proposals for a local funder		
Guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal	Reviews multiple journal articles for multiple journals (an expectation of about 6-8 year)			
	Serves as external reviewer on T&P request from peer institution or better			

## APPENDIX B: PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS

### Department of Human Development and Family Studies College of Applied Human Sciences Colorado State University

The tenured faculty of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) approves the following departmental standards and guidelines for promotion and tenure of all tenure-track faculty, including Extension. Specific guidelines regarding procedures related to the tenure and promotion process are to be found in the main body of the Department's Code (Section H. Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment).

#### Preamble

The Department of HDFS adopts a judgment model rather than a procedural model in making decisions about tenure and promotion.<sup>2</sup> A procedural model specifies measurable criteria that gauge the merits of the candidate's scholarship and teaching. Such metrics, if applied fairly, minimize the need for decision making by faculty peers. In contrast, a judgment model obligates members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to discuss and evaluate the quality of a candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service contributions. In a judgment model, the determination of "effective" or "outstanding" cannot be made by a formula or defaulted to external reviewers because assessing the *quality* of scholarship, in particular, inherently involves judgments about originality, rigor, substance, and impact on the discipline. As such, rules or standards exist to facilitate judgment, not substitute for it. Each colleague must devote the time and effort to decide whether a candidate's work is excellent and then be able to explain and defend that assessment in a faculty meeting.

A judgment model is well suited to a department that is interdisciplinary and applied in orientation, because the paradigms and types of scholarly work vary across faculty. A judgment model also acknowledges that although quantitative criteria may be useful guideposts, they also have flaws. The definition of high-quality research varies with research area because of training, philosophy of science, and prevailing paradigms. A certain number of publications neither guarantees the award of tenure nor assures its denial,<sup>3</sup> in part because some scholars generate smaller numbers of high-quality publications. Quantitative measures of journal impact are prone to various biases<sup>4</sup> and may not reflect the rigor of the individual study.<sup>5</sup> Student course evaluations may not accurately reflect the quality of instruction.<sup>6,7,8</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Matusov, E., & Hampel, R. (2008). Two approaches to tenure and promotion criteria. *Academe*, 94, 37-39.

<sup>3</sup> Byrnes, J. P. (2007). Publishing trends of psychology faculty during their pretenure years. *Psychological Science*, 18, 283-286.

<sup>4</sup> Garfield, E. (2005, September). *The agony and the ecstasy: The history and meaning of the Journal Impact Factor*. Paper presented at the International Congress on Peer Review and Biomedical Publication, Chicago.

MacRoberts, M. H., & MacRoberts, B. R. (1990). Assessing publication impact. *Bioscience*, 40, 76-77.

<sup>5</sup> Barbui, C., Cipriani, A., Malvini, L., & Tansella, M. (2006). Validity of the Impact Factor of journals as a measure of randomized controlled trial quality. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 67, 37-40.

<sup>6</sup> Darby, J. A. (2007). Are course evaluations subject to halo effect? *Research in Education*, 77, 46-55.

<sup>7</sup> Heckert, T. M., et al. (2006). Relations among student effort, perceived class difficulty appropriateness, and student evaluations of teaching: Is it possible to "buy" better evaluations through lenient grading? *College Student Journal*, 40,

Having highlighted these shortcomings, it also is the case that certain activities are more likely to have an impact on the field and to reflect visibility in the discipline, noteworthy among them being extramural funding that supports programmatic research, publications in top-tier journals, service on editorial boards and grant review panels, and external awards for pedagogical innovations. For all such reasons, these Standards grant candidates for tenure and promotion latitude in how they document the quality of their work. Yet it is also incumbent upon candidates to present the strongest case possible for the excellence and external impact of their endeavors.

## I. AREAS OF FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

### A. *Teaching and the Dissemination of Knowledge*

Teaching and the dissemination of knowledge is designed to develop critical thinking, communication skills, problem solving capabilities, technical expertise, and an awareness and appreciation of varying perspectives in students and clientele; it imparts skills important for the continual quest for knowledge. Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction, such as classroom lecture, but also clinical, laboratory, field, and practicum instruction/supervision; thesis and dissertation direction and critique; and various forms of continuing education and nontraditional instruction. Subsumed within this category would also be the development of pedagogy: Innovations in instructional theory and methods that are publishable and may be supported by grants.

An important aspect of teaching is the advising of undergraduate and graduate students. Undergraduate advising entails the responsibilities of academic guidance and career exploration. Advising of graduate students centers on thesis supervision, academic guidance, career development, and procedural support. Advising of both undergraduates and graduates will always highlight accessibility and open communication.

### B. *Research and the Generation of Knowledge*

Research and the generation of knowledge is the pursuit of new knowledge through investigatory strategies resulting in the dissemination/ publication of findings of utility to the field of individual and family development. These strategies include, but are not limited to: observational, survey, experimental and quasi-experimental, simulation and gaming, design and evaluation methods, clinical methods, and theory construction.

### C. *Service and Outreach*

Service, which includes utilization of knowledge, and outreach occur in three categories: professional service, university governance, and public service.

1. *Professional service* recognizes that HDFS faculty are members of a community of scholars extending beyond the University. These scholarly communities are important in fostering communication and collective action and, as a result, participation in them by faculty represents progress toward advancing new knowledge and the faculty member's growth in their disciplines of interest.
2. *University governance* includes service assignments, including membership on the Faculty Council, membership on various committees which contribute to the faculty role

<sup>8</sup> Heckert, T. M., et al. (2006). Relation of course, instructor, and student characteristics to dimensions of student ratings of teaching effectiveness. *College Student Journal*, 40, 195-203.

in governance of Departments, Colleges, or the University, and membership on search committees and special ad hoc committees charged with specific problems for resolution; part-time special assignments in the College or Department; planning and arranging Department, College, or University events, or involvement in any of numerous other similar activities common in the diversified operations of the University.

3. *Public service* is the provision of professional expertise to individuals, families, and organizations in the region, state, nation, and world.

D. *Considerations*

1. All of the professional activities of faculty can be placed in one of these three categories. For example, faculty who have a primary appointment in Extension may publish rigorous evaluations of outreach programs, which would be considered research; disseminate information about best practices through workshops, which would be teaching; and provide research-based information in response to Extension Agents' inquiries, which would be service.
2. The phrase "scholarly expression" best captures the types of activities that are considered evidence of scholarship. The phrase is more generic, and considers, for example, audio-visual materials as acceptable evidence.
3. It is the individual faculty member's prerogative to determine how his or her activities should be classified. Specific activities cited in this document should be viewed as typical rather than exemplary.
4. Regardless of the categorization of effort, the guiding principle for performance evaluation is demonstration of impact, not simply effort.

E. *Distribution of faculty effort*

During the annual performance review at the end of each academic year, the faculty member and the Department Head shall agree upon the distribution of faculty effort across the three categories of teaching, research, and service for the following year, except by mutually negotiated agreement. Generally, for the first two to three years of their appointment - but preferably up through the third year - Assistant Professors shall distribute their efforts in the following manner: 50% teaching (i.e., four course sections annually as well as advising), 30-40% research, and 5-10% service. Deviations from this load, such as a reduced teaching load, may be negotiated upon hire. During two-thirds of the faculty member's pretenure years, some time should be spent on committee service, but a priority of effort shall be committed to research and teaching. Tenured faculty shall be given more latitude in determining the distribution of their efforts across the three areas. However, it shall be the responsibility of the Department Head to ensure that an overall balance among the three activities exists across all faculty in the Department.

## II. PERFORMANCE LEVELS

The task of the T & P Committee is to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service. For each performance area, an overall evaluation is to be made, using five categories: "Superior," "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "below expectations," and "unsatisfactory." No specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. However, effective performance is described in terms of context and activities rather than criteria. Individual faculty shall have latitude in establishing the context of their activities; the motives, desired impact, and long-range goals on which the faculty member should be considered. In addition to being permissive of personal commentary, the

assessment of effective performance should also consider collegial- and consumer-oriented activities. The following provide examples of the types of activities and evaluations of those activities that could be used to support effective performance.

- A. Effective performance in research and knowledge generation is reflected in examples such as: peer-reviewed published scholarly works; competitive (research) grants and contracts; citations of research in scholarly publications and other sources; memberships on editorial boards and guest reviews; prizes and awards for research and other scholarly endeavors; development of assessment devices; awards of special fellowships for research; selection for participation in special institutes for advanced study; research presentations at professional conferences; personal commentary on selected articles; external reviews of one's work; the quality of the journal in which articles are published; consultantships to groups engaged in scholarly endeavors; providing testimony regarding research to government bodies; being sought out by visiting scholars or invitations to be a visiting scholar. The case must be made for the quality and external impact of the candidate's present and future work.
- B. Effective performance in teaching and knowledge dissemination is reflected in such examples as peer evaluations of instruction; publications or conference presentations in the area of pedagogy; special recognitions for teaching; selection for special teaching activities; selection to teach honors or special courses; providing service on accreditation teams and special commissions; successful competition for instructional grants; membership on grant review panels in the area of teaching; scholarly reviews of articles and books; peer-reviewed articles on University governance; development of innovative instructional methods; providing direction on student works; and advising evaluations. Also relevant are information from student/clientele questionnaires and course or workshop evaluations; compilations of student comments; letters of evaluation from former students; accomplishments of present and former students; clinical supervision evaluations; adoptions of published textbooks; and providing government testimony regarding education. Because continual improvement of courses is a part of good instruction, evidence of these achievements should be furnished.
- C. Effective performance in the area of service and outreach is reflected in such examples as: election to office in professional societies; committee service in professional organizations; nonresearch conference presentations; editorial work for professional journals; membership on accreditation teams; membership on the University Faculty Council (or its committees); department and/or college committee membership; performance in administrative responsibilities; awards/recognition for programs developed or service; grants/contracts for service provision; and selection for grant review panels for service programs. Also relevant are professional consulting for the discipline; selection for special University assignments; client evaluations of the quality of program presentations or other indications of program impact; providing needs assessments; media appearances; performance of clinical services; and being sought out by visiting scholars. In each of these areas relevant evaluation can be obtained from colleagues, consumers, and may also include personal commentary as to effectiveness.
- D. The ranking of a faculty member's activities in a given area will necessarily be a subjective evaluation made both individually and collectively by members of the T & P Committee. Generally, a performance rating of "below expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in a given area will be given when the T & P Committee believes a faculty member's efforts quantitatively and qualitatively do not meet the expectations outlined in the paragraphs above. Conversely, a performance rating of "superior" will be given when a faculty member's efforts quantitatively and qualitatively are judged to be outstanding.



### III. TENURE

- A. University Standards and Guidelines  
University standards and guidelines regarding tenure are described in Sections E.10 and E.12 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual:  
<http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/FacultyCouncil/sectione.htm>
- B. College Standards and Guidelines - See Attachment 1
- C. Departmental Standards and Guidelines  
During the third year of appointment for untenured (tenure-track) faculty, a major “pretenure” review will be conducted. This mid-probationary review will follow the procedures in Section E.14.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Note: Annually, prior to preparing a portfolio to be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for review, nontenured faculty should carefully review (a) departmental guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, (b) Section E.10 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual, and (c) the most recent edition of the College’s Guidelines for Faculty Performance. Questions regarding the preparation of portfolios should be directed to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- D. Awarding of early tenure  
The Department adopts a general policy of not awarding early tenure. Only in exceptional cases, where a newly appointed faculty member has the rank of professor, or where previous academic experience is considered by prior agreement, can the individual be recommended for tenure immediately. The awarding of tenure in this instance must conform to the standards and guidelines described in this document and university policy.

### IV. STANDARDS FOR ADVANCEMENT IN RANK

- A. University Standards and Guidelines  
University standards and guidelines regarding promotion are described in Sections E.12-E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual:  
<http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/FacultyCouncil/sectione.htm>
- B. Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor
1. College Standards and Guidelines - See Attachment 1 (Updated May 2011)
    - (a) Recommendations for tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor should be unusual and are to be based on reasonable expectations that the faculty member involved will eventually meet the qualifications for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Such a recommendation must document the existence of this factor and explain why a promotion recommendation is not also in order at the same time.
    - (b) Promotion to Associate Professor normally requires the demonstration of “exceeds expectations” in teaching and research, and “meets expectations” in service/outreach.
  2. Departmental Standards and Guidelines  
Promotion to Associate Professor is based primarily on superior performance, either for research accomplishments or teaching/advising excellence. Such activity must be considered in terms of the faculty member’s percentage of time designated for teaching and research. Specifically, the following must be documented:

- (a) An evaluation of “superior” in either teaching/advising or research; an “exceeds expectations” rating the other area (teaching or research). In order to be tenured and promoted with teaching as the outstanding area, there must be evidence of sustained, published scholarly activity related to pedagogy (i.e., instructional innovations); funding to support such scholarly activity; and evidence of the external impact of such endeavors.
- (b) The selection of an area of emphasis in research and scholarship significant to HDFS, an area that can be programmatically pursued and with which the faculty member can become identified; e.g., as first author on publications or co-author with graduate students.
- (c) A record of continued publication in refereed journals and other scholarly publications as well as presentations at professional meetings from the time of hire. This does not require a specific number of publications per year; rather an active, ongoing research effort.
- (d) Evidence of progressive activity toward obtaining grants that support the faculty member’s program of scholarship. (This progressive activity must be clearly evident by the major third-year review.) At minimum, this would include the funding of at least one extra-departmental grant and the submission of at least one extramural grant – typically as principal investigator (PI) or co-PI; in most cases, funded. Two examples may help to clarify expectations: One is unlikely to be granted tenure if the only grant activity was receipt of a small grant from the College and a poorly written extramural proposal hastily submitted in the final pre-tenure year. On the other hand, a faculty member with an outstanding publication record might receive tenure without securing extramural funding if she/he had received several extra-departmental grants for pilot research in the first 2-3 years after hire, and then received a fundable score on an extramural proposal after revising it once.

C. Advancement to the rank of Professor

1. College Guidelines

Advancement to Professor normally requires demonstrated excellence in research.

2. Department Guidelines

Promotion to Professor will signify that a faculty member is now an established and respected figure in her/his field. The professor’s research program should not only be productive, but should provide training for graduate students and other faculty.

Specifically, the following must be documented:

- (a) An evaluation of “superior” in research and teaching and at least “effective” in the third area.
- (b) The faculty member has developed a reputation at the national level in an area of emphasis and is recognized and highly regarded among the scholars/researchers in her/his field.
- (c) A record of continued publication in refereed journals and other scholarly publications, regular presentations at national/international professional meetings over a period of at least seven years. A proportion of these publications and presentations must be judged to be original contributions to the field, and ideally would appear in the top-tier journals in one’s area. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member is a primary contributor or author of the

majority of these publications/presentations.

- (d) Extramural funding as principal investigator or co-PI, typically involving multiple grants to support one's program of research or pedagogical innovations. At least one of these grants typically will be a federal grant or a grant from an organization of similar reputation, such as a prestigious and competitive foundation.

D. External peer review

External peer review is required as part of the promotion documentation for rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and for tenure. External reviewers are to evaluate the quality of the applicant's work in teaching and/or research and the value of the faculty member's contributions to her/his discipline or area of expertise. The purpose of external reviews is to provide evaluation from several experts in the field of a faculty member who is applying for tenure and/or promotion. Well-selected external evaluators are expected to have unique and important insights into the quality and impact of an applicant's scholarly work, her/his participation in professional service activities outside the University, and/or the role of the applicant in scholarly mentoring.

1. All applications for tenure and/or promotion must include information provided by no fewer than five external reviewers. External reviewers should be recognized scholars in areas representative of the scholarly work published by the faculty applicant. They should also hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor for evaluation of promotion to Associate, and hold the rank of Professor for evaluation of promotion to Professor, and in most cases, be employed at a university that could be considered an institutional peer or better.
2. External reviewers may be asked to evaluate a faculty applicant's performance in a number of areas. Foremost among these, however, is an evaluation of the applicant's published research and competencies as a scholar. Evaluations may also center on the applicant's participation in professional service activities outside the University. Teaching, advising and service within the University community will typically not be the focus of an external review. The procedures for selecting external reviewers are found in Attachment 2.
3. Evaluations from external reviewers are to remain confidential and are not to be made available to the candidate unless required by law. Neither the source nor direct quotes from reference letters are to be conveyed to the candidate. The content of these letters is not to be discussed other than in meetings of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

E. Early advancement in rank

The normal expectation is that an individual will have six years' experience at the rank of Assistant Professor prior to being considered for advancement in rank to Associate Professor; and five years at the rank of Associate Professor prior to being considered for advancement to the rank of Professor. Consideration for early advancement in rank in both instances (Assistant to Associate, and Associate to Professor) will be infrequent. Only in exceptional cases will there be serious consideration of early promotion. These cases will be characterized by outstanding performance in knowledge dissemination and knowledge generation. In both of these activity areas, the applicant's performance will have garnered national recognition and visibility. This will be assessed through evaluation both internal and external to the University.

**V. DOCUMENTATION OF PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT: THE PORTFOLIO FORMAT**

“Progressive development” encompasses faculty members’ activities to become mature scholars, competent teachers, and leaders in service and outreach. Progressive development implies that (a) newly hired, untenured faculty do not yet possess all of the skills that they will later in their careers; (b) faculty members do have goals and plans related to their endeavors in research, teaching, and service; and (c) they use foresight and experience to acquire the skills and knowledge to achieve their goals. These assumptions are reflected in the sections that follow: Candidates for tenure and promotion should describe clearly their goals and plans in each area, and they must provide adequate documentation, using multiple forms of evidence, that their accomplishments are having a discernible impact upon the field. Such documentation will be provided throughout the pretenure years as part of annual performance evaluations, and feedback will be provided by the T&P Committee as to the faculty member’s progress. Such feedback will include (a) commentary on activities reflective of effective (or better) performance, (b) suggestions and recommendations to enhance career development, and (c) concerns about progress in an area that require action to be taken in order for future performance to merit an evaluation of “exceeds expectations” or greater. The untenured faculty member is encouraged to respond to recommendations and concerns with clarifications or a plan to address those issues. In the subsequent annual evaluation, the untenured faculty member is expected to describe how those concerns were addressed or will be rectified in the near future. The intent of this process is to mentor untenured faculty toward a successful career in academia.

- A. Faculty members are encouraged to provide a narrative that would “frame” their activities and accomplishments in the performance areas of research, teaching/advising, and service. This narrative permits applicants to describe their goals in each performance area, illustrate how they have been able to orchestrate their activities in the attainment of these goals, and clearly articulate, in a reflective statement for each annual evaluation, their progressive development since hire. Additionally, the narrative would provide the members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee with a context within which to make measured decisions regarding tenure and promotion; to discern themes undergirding an applicant’s work that might not be readily identifiable simply by reading their resume, reprints, or teaching evaluation summaries alone. Deadlines for submitting the required documentation are in Attachment 2 of the HDFS Promotion and Tenure Standards.
- B. In the following sections are illustrations of ways faculty might be able to target and track their “progressive development” within the areas of research, teaching/advising, and service as one progresses through the academic ranks. Note that these illustrations serve the function of examples and do not represent specific mandates. What is important is for the applicant to *clearly* articulate goals in each area, and to describe in *specific terms* how activities have contributed to the attainment of these goals.
  1. Progressive development in teaching/advising  
With regard to teaching/advising, one or more of several dimensions can be used to gauge progressive development:
    - (a) Evidence of an increasingly articulated pedagogy wherein the applicant is able to demonstrate efforts directed at inculcating in students the ability to critically and comparatively analyze research and theory.
    - (b) The extent to which the applicant has been able to impart to students the skill of applying concepts, theories, and methodologies across a variety of substantive

topics.

- (c) A pedagogy wherein the applicant demonstrates increasingly diverse means of evaluating student learning vis-a-vis course objectives and the constraints of teaching assignments.
- (d) Document an Extension applicant's success at enhancing individual and family well being with clientele.
- (e) The design and implementation of experiential learning components of the curriculum.

In order to merit an evaluation of "exceeds expectations" or "superior" in teaching, the candidate must demonstrate evidence that her/his pedagogical innovations have impact beyond the university, which could be shown through refereed publications, extramural grants, and/or external letters.

## 2. Teaching evaluation procedures

All tenure-track faculty, in progress toward tenure and promotion, shall provide at least the three following sources of information to the Tenure and Promotion Committee to enable the Committee to evaluate more adequately the individual's teaching strengths.

- (a) Copies of student evaluation forms for each class (the University does not require this the first time a class is taught by the individual). Copies of all written evaluative comments are valuable to the Committee and are requested; these will be for review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee only, unless the faculty member wishes the material to be forwarded along with their dossier.
- (b) Faculty shall provide a peer teaching evaluation report for the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> years of their teaching. This report can be from a College or University teaching evaluator with whom the faculty member has been working, or from one or more HDFS tenured faculty members who have visited the class on two or more occasions. These teaching evaluation reports might include as many of the criteria noted below as can reasonably be observed or determined through observation and discussion with the faculty member.
  - Engages student intellectually and stimulates desire to learn more about the subject
  - Is knowledgeable about the subject matter
  - Increases students' knowledge of subject matter
  - Effective classroom management; e.g., minimizing distracting behaviors, monitoring classroom climate
  - Clearly presents evaluation criteria for course, written examinations, and projects
  - Grades fairly, objectively, and provides students with adequate feedback
  - Creates a safe climate for open expression of students' ideas and questions
  - Demonstrates respect for diverse perspectives, backgrounds, and values
  - Uses methods that consider a range of learning styles
  - Creates opportunities for problem solving and/or application of course material
  - Facilitates opportunities for students to better understand relevancy of course material for later learning and application
  - Open to feedback and suggestions

- Responsive to individual students' concerns, issues, and circumstances
- (c) Supporting materials that allow the Committee to have a better sense of teaching goals and student evaluation criteria, as related to the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy, shall be included in the dossier. These materials might include:
- Course syllabi
  - Outline or notes for three class sessions, including a description of class activities for each session (e.g., lecture, cooperative problem solving, discussion, role play, debate)
  - Copy of each exam for one course
  - Expanded project descriptions and evaluation criteria (if not in course syllabus)
  - Examples of student projects with instructor's evaluative comments and grading
  - Examples of and commentary on any new or creative instructional approaches or materials
  - Instructor's self-evaluation of the course structure, content, and activities
  - Publications and grants related to instruction
3. Progressive development in research  
With regard to research, at least two dimensions can be used to gauge progressive development:
- (a) One of these is the generation/dissemination of knowledge via refereed publications. Progressive development might be measured through increased peer recognition (e.g., citations or adoption of one's work by others; serving as a consultant), publication of work in journals representing increased degrees of prestige, and/or the level of funding for research (e.g., from intramural to extramural funding sources). Quantitative indices of the quality of one's research – journal Impact Factor, journal rejection rates, citations of one's work – can be helpful, although such indices do have flaws. All of these indicators, as well as other evidence, should be used *in toto* to arrive at a judgment about the visibility and external impact of the candidate's research. Further, such indicators do not absolve members of the T&P Committee from making a careful, thorough evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work.
- (b) A second dimension might be the integrative nature of the applicant's research. For example, progressive development might be assessed via the applicant's ability to develop (with progressive degrees of refinement and effectiveness) theoretical, conceptual and/or methodological approaches that serve the functions of organizing, reorganizing, integrating, synthesizing, disseminating or differentiating knowledge.
4. Progressive development in service and outreach  
With regard to service, at least two dimensions can be used to gauge progressive development.
- (a) One is "penetrance," which captures the scope and depth of influence. The term "penetrance" is a term borrowed from the work of Roger Barker, wherein the connotation referred to the extent to which an individual stands at the periphery

of the action as an observer versus the center of the action as a doer and leader. Applied to the performance area of service, the tenure/promotion applicant could demonstrate progressive development in service by documenting movement from the periphery of participation in department, college, university, community, and/or professional organizations and committees to more central roles indicative of leadership responsibilities. Such documentation could be in the form of testimonials from other committee members, evaluations from beneficiaries of the services, evidence of program impact, reports generated, narratives on contributions to the organization's goals and products, and so forth.

- (b) A second possible dimension of progressive development (as it pertains to the community education aspect of service) might be the applicant's movement from "entertainer" stance to one where the central focus is on translating research into knowledge that can be applied to improve the quality of life for individuals and families.

## VI. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Although not listed as one of the three major criteria to be used in faculty review for promotion and tenure, faculty should be expected to adhere to the University's Code of Ethical Behavior described in Section D.9, *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual* (updated August 2009): Academic faculty members and administrative professionals at Colorado State University should be aware that their personal conduct reflects on the integrity of the University and should take care that their actions have no detrimental effect on the institution. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to:

- a. Perform teaching, advising, and service assignments in a manner consistent with standards established for all faculty members and detailed in the *Manual*.
- b. Use University funds, facilities, equipment, supplies, and staff only in the conduct of University duties, exceptions to be made only under specific University policies or when established commercial rates are paid.
- c. Maintain a high level of discretion and respect in personal and professional relations with students, faculty members, staff, and the public.
- d. Compensate University personnel (including students) fairly for work performed which is related to professional activities beyond one's University assignment.
- e. Recognize fairly and accurately the extent of the contribution of others to one's professional work.
- f. Avoid non university activities that could significantly interfere with carrying out assigned University responsibilities.

- g. Refrain from disclosing confidential information that was acquired by nature of one's activities as an academic faculty member or administrative professional (for example, see C.R.S., 1973, 18-8-402, Misuse of Public Information).
- h. Abide by University policies pertaining to patents, publication, copyrights, consulting, off-campus employment, and conflict of interest as detailed in the *Manual*.
- i. Refrain from selling complimentary textbooks.
- j. Eschew academic misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, in proposing, conducting, or reporting research, or in scholarly or creative endeavors, or in identifying one's professional qualifications

## VII. AMENDMENT OF PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS

- A. Proposals for substantive changes in the Promotion and Tenure Standards document may be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by any two or more tenure-track or tenured faculty members. Proposals shall contain a rationale for the suggested change(s). The Chair shall circulate the proposal to all members of the T&P Committee and consideration of the proposal shall be included as an agenda item in a timely manner. The authors of the proposed change shall present the proposal and its rationale to the T&P Committee. Thereafter, the T&P Committee members will vote on the proposal. If a majority of those voting consider the proposal to have merit, the proposal will be presented at a faculty meeting, where all tenure-track and tenured faculty will have an opportunity to provide input concerning the merits of the proposal. At the next meeting of the T&P Committee, a vote will be taken on the amendment. A 2/3 majority of the voting members is required for the proposal to be accepted into the Promotion and Standards document.
- B. If any change that affects the evaluation of faculty is made to the Promotion and Tenure Standards, the change will be considered as a departmental standard no sooner than one year after it is approved. The standard may be determined, by the T&P Committee, to become effective beyond the one year minimum period, in which case the date will be identified in the Standards document. These time frames shall be determined to ensure that faculty who are being evaluated have reasonable time to meet the new guidelines.

## VIII. SPECIAL APPOINTMENT FACULTY

Special Appointment Teaching Faculty in HDFS, together with tenure track faculty, are integral to the development and performance of programs of the highest quality for undergraduate education, professional preparation, and outreach. Strong teaching faculty are critical to advisory, supervisory, instructional, and administrative demands of these programs. HDFS relies on high-quality Special Appointment Teaching Faculty, in conjunction with tenure track faculty, in order to meet the evolving demands for state of the art professional development and to assist in shaping policy in professional preparation. Similarly, Special Appointment Research Faculty contribute in important ways to the research programs of HDFS and the broader discipline by funding individual



and collaborative research projects and through dissemination of that research. As well, Special Appointment Research Faculty promote the vitality of the graduate programs through effective mentoring and financial support of students.

Unlike the appointments of tenure track faculty, it is not unusual for the work load and expectations for special appointment faculty to change meaningfully from year to year. The roles of Special Appointment Teaching Faculty, for example, can include, but are not limited to: undergraduate and graduate instruction, director of field experiences, supervisor of a program, leadership in field-based initiatives, internship coordination, and so on. Special Appointment Research Faculty will be significantly involved in conducting a visible program of research; they may also be involved in supervision of graduate student research, instruction, departmental and professional service, and outreach. These different roles are essential if the department is to achieve its missions. Given the proclivity for the job descriptions of special appointment faculty to change, a letter from the Department Head to the special appointment faculty member clearly stating the job load and expectations of the faculty member is required not later than May 1<sup>st</sup>. This date is critical to allow special appointment faculty time to prepare for their duties, including course preparation, the following Fall. This letter must state the expectations of the special appointment faculty member in terms of teaching or research, and service/outreach. For all positions above Instructor, the job load and expectations must conform to expectations for successful review, reappointment, and/or promotion, similar, but not identical, to those specified for tenure-track faculty.

The Department Head shall, in collaboration with the special appointment faculty member, assist the newly appointed faculty member in identifying one or more mentors. Mentoring is a powerful force in socializing faculty to the norms and goals of their professional community, enhancing professional growth, providing access to informal and formal networks of communication, retention of faculty, and developing leadership abilities. Mentoring can occur at departmental or other levels and can be either formal or informal. Mentors assist special appointment faculty in establishing goals and assessing their own performance. Current special appointment and tenure track faculty can serve as mentors, and can assist new professors in understanding the department, college, and university expectations for Special Appointment Faculty. Mentors will also serve as a resource to new faculty in the areas of teaching or research, program development, and service activities, as appropriate.

For reappointment and/or promotion of special appointment faculty, HDFS requires that review include assessment of the candidate's teaching or research, service, and administrative duties *as applicable* to that individual's contracted responsibilities. Teaching faculty are expected to be excellent teachers who provide intellectual leadership in the education and preparation of our students. They should develop and implement highly engaging, rigorous courses that reflect the conceptual framework, research, and knowledge base of the department and the broader academic discipline, and which satisfy the expected learning objectives established for the courses they teach. Special appointment faculty who provide clinical and field work supervision are expected to engage in intellectual leadership that promotes professional development of students. Special Appointment Research Faculty are expected to be productive in high-quality publications and research grants. Those with administrative appointments are expected to demonstrate leadership and effective administration of their programs in accordance with the

particular assignments of their position. Special appointment faculty are also expected to demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in service at the university, local, state and national levels, as appropriate to their job descriptions.

In all cases of review, faculty members who receive reappointment shall receive a detailed letter that provides formative feedback that assists the special appointment faculty member in her or his professional development. This shall include areas of strength to sustain, areas for improvement, and an evaluation of whether or not the special appointment faculty member is on track for promotion as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion. A copy of each formative feedback letter must be included in the faculty member's file.

The T & P Committee will evaluate special appointment faculty according to the same performance levels that are described in section II of these Standards for the areas that are appropriate to the appointment. Given that the evidence for teaching effectiveness described in section II.B is weighted toward pedagogical *scholarship*, additional types of evidence are listed in section VIII.B (below) that relate to classroom instruction and supervision of experiential activities.

A. Professional Development of Special Appointment Teaching Faculty

1. All course instructors in HDFS are expected to be familiar with current theories, research, and best practices that are pertinent to the course(s) they teach. Accordingly, Teaching Faculty are expected to provide evidence related to their professional development in the content area(s) in which they instruct. Such professional development may include courses taken for credit, CEUs, seminars and workshops, attendance at professional conferences, and regular reading of pertinent research journals and handbooks.
2. Faculty also are encouraged to adopt pedagogical strategies that effectively promote student learning of knowledge and skills. Accordingly, Teaching Faculty are expected to provide evidence of professional development in the arena of pedagogy. Such professional development may include participation in the various programs offered through TILT (e.g., Master Teacher Initiative, Professional Development Institute), workshops offered off campus, and the published literature on effective teaching techniques.

B. Assessment of Effective Teaching and Supervision

Effective teaching is defined broadly in terms of evidence of impact on students as well as the instructional transactions that take place in the classroom or applied setting. The evidence that will be provided in support of promotion to the Associate level consists of the following:

1. A teaching portfolio that contains
  - ✓ A statement of teaching philosophy
  - ✓ Curriculum vitae
  - ✓ Copies of each annual job letter
  - ✓ A description of professional development activities in relation to content knowledge (relevant to each course) as well as pedagogical approaches

- ✓ A list of each course taught during one's appointment, by semester, including credits, number of students enrolled, the range of ratings on the student course survey, and the average rating for "overall course" and "overall instructor."
  - ✓ Curriculum development and course materials (e.g., syllabi, lesson plans, handouts, Web-based materials)
  - ✓ Grading distributions
  - ✓ Reflections on teaching and learning effectiveness
  - ✓ Special recognitions for teaching, including selection for special teaching activities and selection to teach honors or special courses
  - ✓ Signed recommendations and letters from students; student course surveys; clinical or fieldwork supervision evaluations
  - ✓ A summary of students' written comments
  - ✓ Samples of student work (and student self-assessments of their work, as appropriate)
  - ✓ Evidence of integration of critical thinking activities into courses and reports of student demonstrations of relevant critical thinking skills
  - ✓ Evidence of appropriate use of technology in teaching and learning
  - ✓ Evidence of use of engaging activities outside of class sessions (e.g., use of group projects, use of discussion forums, use of ePortfolios, use of wikis)
  - ✓ Evidence of use of collaborative/cooperative activities in courses
  - ✓ Evidence of integration of active and experiential learning activities into courses (as appropriate)
  - ✓ Evaluations of advising (if part of work load)
2. Peer review of teaching performance as described in section V.B.2.b of these Standards. At least one class per year, with two peer observations per class, must be observed in at least three of the years prior to applying for promotion. Video recordings of class sessions (e.g., through TILT) are appropriate for this purpose as long as they are evaluated by a faculty peer.
3. Peer review of some or all of the following:
- ✓ Assignments and assessments created by the faculty member
  - ✓ Assessments (exams, quizzes, etc.) created by the faculty member
  - ✓ Course Web sites (e.g., Blackboard sites)
  - ✓ Courseware and other instructional materials developed by the faculty member
  - ✓ Contributions to the teaching culture in the program or department, such as mentoring of other colleagues, contributions to program development, contributions of instructional materials, participation in TA or GTA training, service on pedagogically oriented committees

Evidence of teaching scholarship should be provided if the faculty member has engaged in activities such as publications related to teaching or studies conducted on teaching and learning.

In addition, letters from external peer reviewers are required. These reviewers will often be department heads in HDFs departments. The procedures described in section V.B of these Standards will be followed, with the exception that the materials provided to the external reviewers will be limited to what is described in VIII.B.1 and VIII.B.2 above.

For promotion to the level of Associate Teaching Professor, the candidate must demonstrate

progressive development in teaching – based on professional development activities, incorporation of effective teaching strategies, and evidence of greater impact on students – with an evaluation of “superior” in teaching. For promotion to the level of Associate Research Professor, the candidate must meet the criteria related to research that are specified in section IV.B.2 of these Standards.

## **Attachment 1**

### **College of Applied Human Sciences Code**

**(May 12, 2011)**

#### **Section VII. Advancement and Tenure (pp. 12-14): College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines/Criteria for and Documentation of Recommendations**

##### ***College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines***

Faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure will typically be engaged in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and University and professional service. Outreach/engagement activities may be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution. Criteria for promotion and tenure relate to performance in these areas. To be considered for promotion or tenure, a faculty member must meet the minimum criteria as stated in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Sections E.9 and E.10.

Promotion in academic rank is awarded on the basis of attainment of levels of achievement appropriate to the advanced rank. Satisfactory performance at one rank is not a sufficient basis for promotion; such performance must be accompanied by growth of the individual to the performance level of the higher rank. Faculty members are normally eligible for consideration for promotion from associate professor to professor after five (5) years in rank. Performance reviews intended to assist faculty in achieving tenure or promotion must follow procedures in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.14.

The level of achievement required for tenure is, in most cases, equal to or higher than that required for promotion to Associate Professor. In particular, the individual should display expertise in areas compatible with current or anticipated programs in the department/school. Except in unusual circumstances noted in the statement of reasons given for the promotion recommendation, when tenure is granted to an assistant professor, the individual shall be promoted concurrently to associate professor (AFAPM C.2.5).

##### ***Criteria For and Documentation of Recommendations***

University standards for promotion and tenure are based on a candidate's record of activities in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service. Promotion to Associate Professor requires the demonstration of at least exceeds expectations in teaching and advising and research/creative activity along with at least meets expectations in service. Advancement to Professor requires demonstrated sustained, quality contributions to the body of knowledge through research/creative activity and the candidate is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis. Evidence of extensive continuing scholarly activity is present. The record should include a substantial number of refereed publications or juried works aligned with the faculty members' effort distribution and the faculty member's workload.

Detailed information and supporting materials are needed by the College administration for the purpose of review. The responsibility for the preparation of such information and documentation lies primarily

with the candidate. Faculty should always check with the Office of the Provost Webpage to assure they are following the most recent guidelines for submitting materials for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The candidate's department/school will prepare a recommendation that discusses the extent to which the candidate meets the relevant criteria and standards specified by the department/school code. The recommendation should report the departmental/school vote, including specification of the numbers of those voting for and against and those abstaining. Any minority opinions concerning the recommendation must be discussed. Any agreements to award previous institutional experience(s) must be detailed in writing and approved by the Dean and Department Head/Director. Guidelines on the desired documentation in each of the areas of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service can be found in departmental/school codes.

**Attachment 2**  
**Procedures for Solicitation of Letters from External Reviewers and Timeline**

1. Names of potential external reviewers are to be solicited both from the faculty applicant and from members of the T&P Committee. The final list of potential external reviewers shall be compiled from names of individuals provided both by the faculty applicant and the T&P Committee. The list of potential reviewers submitted by the faculty applicant should consist of 6-8 names, as should the list produced by the T&P Committee. The T&P list will generally be prepared by the Chair of T & P and one or more T & P member (s) appointed by the Chair. Whenever possible, those T & P members compiling this list should have expertise in the candidates' discipline area. The candidate may also provide a list of persons they feel would not be able to give an unbiased review to the T&P committee. 2. In identifying external reviewers (whether it be by the applicant or by the T&P Committee), the goal is to remove bias and enhance integrity of the process. Potential reviewers should not be individuals, such as the dissertation chair or a collaborator in research, who might find it difficult to objectively evaluate the applicant's work.
3. The lists provided by the faculty applicant and by the T&P Committee should contain the following: (a) name, title/position, address, and phone number; (b) e-mail address; (c) rationale for identifying the individual as an external reviewer including his/her contributions to the field; and (d) professional or personal relationship to the faculty applicant (if any).
4. The T&P Committee Chair will compile a final list, from both the applicant and the T&P Committee, of no fewer than 8 names and will submit this list to the Department Head. This list shall identify the names of reviewers and identify from which list they were drawn. Less than half of these names may be derived from the applicant's list.
5. The Department Head will contact reviewers to be sure they are able to complete the evaluation by the deadline, believe they are qualified, and are willing to provide letters. The Department Head will draw a majority of names from the list supplied by T&P.
6. Only in rare cases will the faculty applicant's entire dossier be sent to reviewers. Generally, external reviewers will be mailed a smaller packet of materials that includes the following:
  - (a) A cover letter prepared by the Department Head and the T&P Chair wherein the following are specified (a) a list of questions to be addressed by the reviewer (see lists below); (b) a description of the materials included in the packet; (c) a description of the nature of the University and the Department including research publication requirements; (d) a description of the teaching and administrative assignments of the candidate, (e) a statement stressing the confidentiality of the evaluation process; and (f) the deadline by which materials must be received.
  - (b) At least 3-6 examples of the faculty applicant's published/in press scholarly work (no fewer than 3 examples for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, and no fewer than 6 examples for promotion to Professor). Note: in-press manuscripts may be included, but the majority of the scholarly work must have been published. The majority of publications sent to reviewers must represent work wherein the faculty applicant is either the sole author and/or the primary contributor. In instances where coauthored work is submitted, the faculty applicant must describe her/his role in producing the work.
  - (c) A statement prepared by the faculty applicant concerning the scholarly work to be reviewed, as well as a description of her/his research program; and
  - (d) A current vita.

This packet of materials should be mailed far enough in advance that the T&P Committee will receive the external reviews before recommendations must be submitted to the Department Head. This will generally require a 1-2 month lead time (see timeline at the end of Appendix B).

7. As mentioned above, external reviewers are to be asked a limited set of questions and/or requests. These items will vary slightly depending on whether the faculty applicant is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, or for promotion to Professor. A suggested format for these items is as follows, following the template on the Tenure & Promotion Application:

*In making your evaluation of (his/her) accomplishments, it would be helpful if you could evaluate and comment on the following:*

1. *Your relationship to the candidate;*
2. *Dr \_\_\_\_\_'s achievements and stature at this stage of (his/her) career;*
3. *The strengths and weakness of (his/her) scholarship and the degree of recognition achieved in (his/her) discipline;*
4. *The scope and significance/originality of his/her research interests and activities or significant contributions to the discipline;*
5. *The scope and significance of his/her collaborative and/or integrative (e.g. interdisciplinary) contributions and their impact on other disciplines.*
6. *How does this individual compare to others in their respective discipline/subdiscipline at this stage of their career?*
7. *Any additional insight that may be helpful to the department's tenure and promotion committee in determining whether or not to recommend that (tenure/promotion) be awarded.*

*When you review Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s materials, please consider that (his/her) distribution of effort within the College of \_\_\_\_\_ at Colorado State is approximately \_\_\_% teaching, \_\_\_% research, and \_\_\_% service. With this in mind, please consider whether the credentials presented would be viewed as 1) well-above average, 2) above average, 3) average, 4) below average, or 5) well-below average.*

8. Requests for external reviews are to be sent under the signature of both the Department Head . External reviews, however, are to be returned to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee who will share them with the T&P Committee, the Department Head, and append them to the application prior to forwarding all material to the AHS Dean.

### **Timeline for Tenure and Promotion**

May 15	Nominations for external reviewers from candidate and T&P Committee
May 30	Solicitations sent to nominees for external reviews (from Department Head)
July 1	Documents sent to external reviewers (see section 6 above)
Sept. 1	Vita to Dean for "early read" with Provost
Sept. 20	External reviewers' letters due
Sept. 30	Completed dossiers available to T&P Committee
Oct. 10	T&P Committee deliberates; drafts recommendation
Oct. 24	T&P Committee recommendation given to candidate and Department Head
Nov. 10	Dossier and recommendations from T&P Committee and Department Head to CAHS Dean
Dec. 15	Dossiers due to Provost