CODE FOR THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

SEPTEMBER 2021

This Code for the School of Social Work was approved by a minimum two-thirds majority of the Department faculty eligible to vote at a regularly scheduled meeting held on May 5, 2021. Section 1.G was added after a School Council vote approving the language by a minimum two-thirds majority on March 2, 2022. Section 2.D.8 was added after an electronic vote in which a quorum and majority vote was reached on August 19, 2022. Section 6F was amended by a School Council vote with a minimum two-thirds majority on May 5, 2023. Section 2C2a was amended by a School Council vote with a minimum two-thirds majority on August 16, 2023.

Table of Contents

Section 1: VISION, MISSION, AND GOALS OF THE SCHOOL AND PROGRAMS

1.A Vision

The School of Social Work will advance social, environmental, and economic justice, promote equity and equality, alleviate oppression, and enhance human health and well-being across local and global community systems.

1.B Mission

The School of Social Work provides exemplary education, applied research, and transformative outreach toward the accomplishment of our vision.

1.C Principles of Community

1. The School stands for courageous and resolute adherence to professional ethics and values by honoring commitments and upholding the highest standards of academic and scientific integrity.
2. The School is committed to academic rigor, seeking to define and address emerging social challenges through interdisciplinary collaboration and critical inquiry that inspires innovation.
3. The School respects, honors, and values individual differences and diverse ideas. Using a lens of intersectionality, each person is treated with dignity, care, and respect.
4. The School cultivates a trusting and transparent environment through inclusive planning and decision-making with full, accurate, and timely communication of information.
5. The School proactively responds to emerging trends and issues through social engagement and experiential learning, which are integrated in all aspects of our teaching, research, and service.

1.C.1 Colorado State University's Principles of Community

The Principles of Community support the Colorado State University mission and vision of access, research, teaching, service and engagement. A collaborative, and vibrant community is a foundation for learning, critical inquiry, and discovery. Therefore, each member of the CSU community has a responsibility to uphold these principles when engaging with one another and acting on behalf of the University.

1. **Inclusion**: We create and nurture inclusive environments and welcome, value and affirm all members of our community, including their various identities, skills, ideas, talents, and contributions.
2. **Integrity**: We are accountable for our actions and will act ethically and honestly in all our interactions.
3. **Respect**: We honor the inherent dignity of all people within an environment where we are committed to freedom of expression, critical discourse, and the advancement of knowledge.
4. **Service**: We are responsible, individually and collectively, to give of our time, talents, and resources to promote the well-being of each other and the development of our local, regional, and global communities.
5. **Social Justice**: We have the right to be treated and the responsibility to treat others with fairness and equity, the duty to challenge prejudice, and to uphold the laws, policies and procedures that promote justice in all respects.

1.D Core Values

1. **Integrity**
   a. Uncompromising adherence to professional ethics and principles
   b. Cultivating or demonstrating trust and honesty in how we relate to each other / in all encounters and situations
   c. Awareness of how we interact with one another as human beings – this means, to be honest, trust the good intentions of our colleagues, show up authentically
   d. The courage to stand where you're standing and the tenacity to hold what you believe
   e. Professional and personal
2. **Transparency** --- alternatively, Open and Inclusive
   a. Clear, open, honest communication
   b. Inclusion in decision-making
   c. Full, accurate, timely disclosure of information
   d. Group power and group decision-making, in terms of how we operate as a group and how we teach empowerment
   e. Courage
3. **Respect**
   a. Dignity, worth
   b. Unconditional positive regard
4. **Empathy**
   a. Compassion
5. **Innovative** Excellence
   a. Moving forward with a spirit of scientific inquiry, teaching innovation, and a broader view of "what belongs" to Social Work
   b. Passionate, systematic curiosity and inquiry
   c. Inspiring innovation in our students
   d. Academic excellence; thinking differently about problems and solutions
   e. Recognizing how we act within larger systems and seeking interdisciplinary collaborations – Integrated thinking, ecosystems perspective
   f. Being relevant, timely, and responsive
   g. Integrated knowledge
   h. Community of knowledge seekers
   i. Passionate curiosity
6. **Social Action/Service/Active Engagement** (or Framework or Lens)
   a. Unwavering commitment to creating change
   b. ACTING towards or in the spirit of social justice
   c. Commitment to action, to improvement, to change
   d. Being change agents
   e. Being responsive to changing landscapes; being aware of constantly changing contexts/variables and fluid in our responses

1.E   School of Social Work Goals

1.E.1 Research

Conduct high impact interdisciplinary research, which incorporates principles of social, economic and environmental justice and seeks to improve lives and well-being for all.

1. Maintain the highest standards of ethical scientific integrity and inquiry.
2. Advance the social work knowledge base regarding diverse populations by conducting culturally responsive research.
3. Move the social work field of practice forward through increasing peer reviewed, research-based publications, presentations, and student mentoring.
4. Increase interdisciplinary research and grant activities to enhance theoretical innovation, scientific methodology, and outcomes.
5. Conduct translational research responsive to Social Work Grand Challenges and emerging trends impacting social work practice and policy.

1.E.2 Teaching/Mentoring/Advising

Through exemplary teaching, mentoring, and advising, prepare students with critical thinking and practice skills to generate change that advances social, economic and environmental justice and improves human well-being.

1. Maintain high retention and graduation rates through exemplary advising, teaching, and mentoring.
2. Provide high-impact, experiential learning opportunities such as field education, practicums, service learning, study abroad, and community engagement.
3. Advise and mentor students for leadership, professional development and lifelong learning.
4. Create a culture of challenging academic standards and expectations based on theoretically informed scientific inquiry and best practices.
5. Infuse cultural diversity and inclusion across the curriculum and the learning environment.
6. Educate students to apply critical thinking to analyze current systems, formulate interventions and advocate for improved human rights and well-being.

1.E.3 Outreach, Service, and Engagement

The School of Social Work will lead engagement between the University and communities to promote life-long learning and advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

1. Actively engage with local and global communities to promote service quality and equity for all persons.
2. Engage in academic-community partnerships to conduct and disseminate research that informs community-based programs and services.
3. Expand student opportunities for engagement with local and global communities to learn and practice cultural humility.
4. Provide opportunities for social action and advocate for human rights and environmental justice at all system levels.

1.E.4 Diversity

As recognized leaders, the School will utilize critical lenses to promote diversity, equity, social justice, human rights, and inclusive excellence through culturally responsive education, research, and outreach.

1. Educate about the systemic effects of race, racism and the mechanisms of power and privilege as they perpetuate oppression and marginalization.
2. Develop a culturally inclusive School environment and activities that promote self-awareness, cultural humility, respect and appreciation for the dignity and worth of all people.
3. Increase diversity among students, faculty and staff.
4. Increase faculty and student participation in multi-cultural curriculum projects and pedagogical training in diversity and cultural responsiveness.
5. Cultivate a student body that respects diversity and addresses inequities through education, research, and outreach.
6. Increase faculty engagement and leadership in opportunities to promote inclusive excellence across local, regional and global communities.

1.E.5 Resources

The School will provide the administrative support and resources necessary to accomplish identified goals.

1. Acquire and maintain appropriate technology to support the needs of faculty, staff, and students.
2. Identify funding for building revitalization.
3. Create funding base for supporting students through increasing scholarships and research/teaching assistantships.
4. Provide resources for faculty and staff professional development.
5. Increase number of faculty.
6. Allocate sufficient resources to allow for effective and efficient school functioning.
7. Establish class sizes that allow for engaged learning.

1.E.6 PhD Program Mission

The PhD program prepares scholars to advance the art and science of Social Work through education, research, and the pursuit of social justice.

1.E.7 PhD Program Goals

This is accomplished by preparing PhD graduates to:

1. Empower future social work practitioners through state-of-the-art pedagogical approaches to professional education.
2. Engage in compelling, interdisciplinary research that enhances health and well-being across local and global community systems.
3. Generate and disseminate knowledge through education and research that transforms professional practice and social policy.
4. Advance social, environmental, and economic justice through professional education, community-engaged scholarship, and transformative leadership in the field.

1.E.8 MSW Program Mission

The mission for the MSW program at CSU is to prepare versatile leaders for professional, ethical Advanced Generalist practice in complex, diverse, and dynamic contexts. The School will provide cutting-edge, experiential education, based upon scientific inquiry, that is responsive to evolving needs of local and global communities.

1.E.9 MSW Program Goals

Through experiential learning, in the pursuit on social, economic, and environmental justice, the goals of the Advanced Generalist MSW program are to prepare graduates who:

1. Serve as skilled practitioners who engage in ethical, autonomous, and multi-disciplinary practice across system levels utilizing a Person-in-Environment perspective.
2. Serve as leaders who advance social, economic, and environmental justice, promote human rights, and engage in social action to eliminate oppressive conditions for all people.
3. Serve as leaders that value and appreciate human relationships and diversity in its multiple forms and who model and advocate for inclusive practices and cultural humility.
4. Practice life-long learning, engage in scientific inquiry, and utilize critical thinking to inform practice at all system levels.
5. Critically apply relevant theories and social work values to engage, assess, intervene and evaluate practice within changing contexts at all systems levels.

1.E.10 BSW Program Mission

The BSW program prepares generalist social workers who will advance social, economic, and environmental justice, will promote equity and equality, will alleviate oppression, and will enhance human health and well- being across local and global community systems. The BSW program provides high impact educational opportunities for students to learn best professional practices, embrace scientific inquiry, and foster respect for diversity using a person-in-environment framework across local and global contexts.

1.E.11 BSW Program Goals

This is accomplished by preparing Generalist social workers who:

1. Respect diversity, promote social, economic, and environmental justice, advance equity and inclusion, and engage in diversity and difference in practice with all client systems.
2. Utilize critical thinking skills and appropriate theoretical foundations, including a person in environment perspective, to
   a. Engage with diverse constituencies across system levels,
   b. Assess with diverse constituencies across system levels,
   c. Intervene with diverse constituencies across system levels,
   d. Evaluate practice in ever-changing contexts.
3. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
   a. Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research.
   b. Apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings.
   c. Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy and service delivery.
4. Engage in policy and community practice to promote social and economic justice and human rights.

    a. Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services, and global Social welfare and social service

    b. Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services

    c. Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human right and social, economic, and environmental justice

    d. Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental

5. Are prepared for lifelong learning and professional practice that is consistent with the principles, values and ethics of the NASW Code of Ethics.

6. Practice and behave in a manner that is consistent with the principles, values and ethics of the NASW Code of Ethics.

    a. Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context.

    b. Use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations.

    c. Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication.

    d. Use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes.

    e. Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

7. Collaborate with other disciplines to prevent conditions that limit human rights and to enhance the quality of life for all persons.

    a. Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

    b. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies.

    c. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment of data from clients and constituencies.

    d. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions clients and constituencies.

    e. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes.

1.F   School Commitments and Activities

The School mission is fulfilled by six generic activities.

1.F.1 Faculty Support

Faculty members are provided with space, office supplies, and administrative support 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. School representatives also serve as liaison to outside units, relaying information to faculty relevant to their needs and professional interests.

1.F.2 Educational Milieu

The School supports efforts directed at establishing among students, staff, and faculty a broad and genuine appreciation of diverse perspectives and critical analysis. The School is committed to ensuring respect within the School of differing perspectives. The School adopts and follows the CSU Principles of Community (Section 1.C.1) as core professional expectations in communication and behavior. The School is committed to the pursuit of academic excellence in all its research, teaching, service, and

outreach activities.

1.F.3 Teaching

The School prepares undergraduate BSW students for entry-level professional positions in social services and also prepares students for entry into graduate programs. At the graduate level, the School prepares MSW students for leadership positions in social services working with individuals, groups, organizations, and communities. In addition, the School prepares doctoral (Ph.D.) students for careers as professors and researchers.

1.F.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.

1.F.5 Service

Faculty serve the School, College, University, professional organizations, international, national, and state agencies by providing expertise in best practices and evaluation of services. The School's responsiveness is associated with its emphasis on the application of science as well as recognition of the importance of community citizenship.

1.F.6 Outreach and Engagement

The School supports the translation of science into programs and policies through outreach and engagement activities.

1.G CSU and School of Social Work Pronoun Commitment

1.G.1 CSU Pronoun Statement

The School of Social Work at Colorado State University is committed to creating a culture and climate that respects and honors people of all identities.

Like our names, pronouns (i.e., zir, they, per, she, he) reflect how we want to be respected in our identities. This is especially important for those who are Transgender, non-binary, and gender non-conforming.

We often ascribe pronouns to individuals they may or may not use. Assuming identities based on observation or stereotype can result in unintended harm by using the wrong pronouns, misgendering, or potentially outing someone. Referring to someone by pronouns they use is one way to demonstrate respect for them as a person.

Respect is included in our Principles of Community. As such, we support and encourage those who choose to share their pronouns in professional and academic spaces, including wherever names are

provided, such as meeting and classroom introductions, name badges, email signatures, and course syllabi.

By creating space for people who choose to share their pronouns, we foster an inclusive culture that is welcoming for all.

1.G.2 School of Social Work Pronoun Commitment

As outlined in the Principles of Community, the School of Social Work commits to:

- Supporting SSW community members in sharing pronouns in all introductions if comfortable doing so
- Using affirming pronouns in all interactions
- Continuously fostering gender-inclusive environments throughout the school year in the classroom and department spaces.
- Including the CSU Pronoun Statement in all syllabi

We also commit to holding our community accountable by:

- Supporting students to bring forward concerns about the misuse of pronouns
- Offering avenues for restorative justice as desired by impacted individuals. Impacted individuals can choose a staff member to support them through restorative justice within the School of Social Work, or at the university level (bias reporting or restorative justice programs at the university). Restorative justice includes, but is not limited to creating opportunities for mediated conversations, learning opportunities, and/or apologies.
- Calling in members of the School of Social Work community and guests.
- Ensuring instructors and students follow the School of Social Work Pronoun Commitment and facilitate gender-safe environments.
- Nurturing an inclusive School of Social Work community to move toward a brighter future for transgender, non-binary, gender non-conforming, and gender diverse persons.

Section 2: SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS, AND ORGANIZATION

2.A School Director

The principal administrator of the School shall be the School Director and is the initial person in the administrative chain to the president.
- The Director/Department Head shall be selected as specified in the University Code (E.4.3)
- The term of office of the Director shall be in compliance with the University Code.
- The duties of the Director shall be those specified in the University Code.
- Additional Duties: The Director may appoint faculty members to assist with the administration of the School such as, but not limited to, Assistant Director, Ph.D. Program Director, MSW Graduate Programs Director, BSW Undergraduate Program Director, Field Education Director, Director of CLOE, Social Work Research Center Director, and HABIC Director. Designated titles, responsibilities, and length of service are at the discretion of the Director and may be individually negotiated.

2.B School Leadership

2.B.1 Doctoral Program Director

The Director of the Doctoral Program in the School of Social Work has the responsibility to provide the direction and oversight of all aspects of the PhD program, including admissions, curriculum, advising, and other logistics of the program. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

2.B.2 MSW Programs Director

The MSW Graduate Programs Director has the responsibility of the oversight of all aspects of the MSW program, including curriculum, advising, and logistics. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

2.B.3 BSW Program Director

The BSW Undergraduate Program Director has the responsibility to oversee BSW classes, advising, and logistics of the bachelors program in the SOSW. Other duties may include those assigned by the Director of the School of Social Work. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

2.B.4 Field Education Director

The Director of Field Education is responsible for the oversight and direction of all aspects of the Field Education Program, including curriculum, advising, and logistics. The Field Education Director works with and supervises the BSW and MSW Field Coordinators to ensure quality and consistency across all programs.

2.B.4.1 BSW Field Program Coordinator

The BSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the BSW Program.

2.B.4.2 MSW Program Field Coordinator

The MSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the MSW Program.

2.B.5 Assistant Director

The Assistant Director of the School of Social Work works collaboratively with the Director to manage internal operations and communications, facilitate the Administrative Team, identify and facilitate strategic planning for program growth opportunities, revenue generation, and implicit School enhancements such as culture and climate. The Assistant Director chairs the School's curriculum committee and serves as the representative to the College Curriculum Committee. As needed, the Assistant Director serves as the Director's designee.

Please see Appendix G for detailed roles and responsibilities.

2.C School Personnel

2.C.1 CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual

Section E.2 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual defines the following types of appointments, specifies terms of service, and describes rights and privileges. These types of appointments are cited here to clarify which entities in the School are involved in making the appointment.

- Academic Faculty are defined as one of the six basic types of appointments (Section E.1 of the [Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual](#)). "They are tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, contract faculty, continuing faculty, adjunct faculty, and faculty on transitional appointments. Only faculty members holding tenure-track appointments at the time of consideration are eligible to acquire tenure. … Full-time is defined as the academic year or a minimum of nine (9) months. Part-time is defined as any fraction of time less than one hundred (100) percent, but not less than fifty (50) percent of full-time."
  - o **Continuing and Contract Appointments**: Nontenure track faculty will be initially hired on continuing appointments. After 5 years of service, a faculty member may request to be appointed on a 2-3 year contract.
  - o **Adjunct Appointments:** The School Director approves these temporary appointments based on a specific, temporary need in the Department.
  - o **Transitional Appointments**: Transitional appointments are negotiated between the faculty member and School Director 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.
  - o **Joint Academic Appointments:** Faculty who request a joint appointment with another School should clear this request through the Director. Requests for joint appointments by faculty members in other Schools are to be reviewed by the faculty.
  - o **Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments**: The Director reviews joint academic and administrative professional appointments for approval. For the School of Social Work, the designation of joint academic and administrative-professional will be considered for those who are full-time administrative professionals who also carry out academic roles such as teaching and service and who have carried this role for at least 2 years. Criteria for joint appointment include: a) teaching at least 6 credits per year; b) serving at least one time per year on BSW honors committees, MSW committees, or PhD committees; and c) serving actively on at least one School standing committee.
  - o **Faculty Affiliate and Visiting Faculty Appointments**. The Director reviews both Faculty Affiliate appointments and Visiting Faculty appointments for approval. Affiliate faculty will be appointed for a one-year term renewable annually.
- 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 directors) 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:
  - o A member of the academic faculty may request emeritus/emerita status from the School at the same time of retirement from the University. The Director 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.

- o Privileges associated with this appointment are issuance of a permanent faculty identification card, listing on the faculty mailing lists, and full library privileges.
- Administrative Professionals are "positions that are exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes, but are not faculty positions. … Administrative professionals include … heads of administrative units and intercollegiate athletics, and other staff with exempt status as specified by Colorado statute. This includes, but is not limited to, certain professional research positions and the professional staff of the Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension, and the Colorado State Forest Service" (Section D.1.2 of the Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual).
    - o **Selection/Hiring:** Selection of administrative professionals is made according to university policy and guidelines established by the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) at Colorado State University. The Director gains approval to search from the Provost, develops the job description with the supervisor, appoints the search committee, and coordinates the search according to guidelines established by OEO. The committee, working through the college OEO coordinator, carries out the search according to established processes and procedures. The selected candidate for the position is subject to approval by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Colorado State University Central Administration. In addition, a background check is required on the selected candidate before an offer can be made.
    - o **Workload of Administrative Professionals:** The workload of administrative professionals may include activities in the domains of service, outreach, and practice; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and teaching. The proportion of activities in each of these domains shall reflect and be consistent with administrative professionals' particular job descriptions. Administrative professionals shall clarify their workloads with their respective supervisors and negotiate any possible changes on an annual basis at minimum and more frequently as needed. Administrative professionals may have their workloads adjusted if they obtain external funding that supports work directly related to their designated responsibilities and job descriptions. Administrative professionals who submit a proposal for external funding shall discuss and negotiate, prior to submitting the proposal, any desired future adjustments to their workload with their respective supervisors.
    - o **Service/Outreach/Practice Responsibilities:** Primary responsibilities of administrative professionals in the School typically fall in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Service, outreach, and practice activities may include:

        - Providing direct and indirect services to individuals, groups, and systems;
        - Acting as consultants and educators;
        - Providing leadership to and managing programs including but not limited to developing and evaluating programs, managing budgets, overseeing personnel, overseeing public relations, etc.;
        - Providing service to the School, College, University, and/or professional groups and organizations.

    - o Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: Administrative professionals recognize and value research, scholarship, and creative activities. The activities of administrative professionals in this domain are typically closely tied to and integrated with their primary responsibilities in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Research, scholarship, and creative activities may include:

        - Publishing in refereed and non-refereed forums;
        - Disseminating new knowledge from outcome-oriented services;

- Presenting their work in refereed and non-refereed public forums;
- Providing continuing education;
- Procuring and implementing external funding; and
- Participating in professional specialty area activities.
  - o Teaching: Administrative professionals recognize the value of teaching. The activities of administrative professionals in this workload domain are typically closely tied to and integrated with their primary responsibilities in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Teaching can be formal and informal in nature and may include activities such as:

    - Teaching courses in the social work curriculum;
    - Providing guest lectures in the School, campus-wide, or externally;
    - Monitoring curricular content related to specialty areas;
    - Serving as fieldwork educators;
    - Supervising and training graduate student employees and graduate teaching assistants; and
    - Developing training and educational materials, including training tutorials and modules.
- State Classified Personnel "are appointed by the Executive Director and Chief Human Resource Officer of the Human Resources Department. These employees are classified according to and are governed by State Personnel Rules and Regulations and University policies." Details on the hiring process, duties, annual evaluations, and other aspects of the position may be found in the Human Resources Manual.

2.C.2 Voting and Decision Making

Voting matters are brought to School Council for a vote through the appropriate committee. For example, a curricular matter must first be discussed and voted on by the Curriculum Committee before a motion on the matter can be proposed in Council. As appropriate, committees should solicit perspectives on matters from students and committee nonmembers who have a vested interest in issues under deliberation. Both committees and individuals may bring issues not requiring a vote to School Council for discussion.

2.C.2.a School Governance

Employees of the School who may serve and vote in School Council are those who have appointment as tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, CCAF, joint academic appointment, administrative professionals, and State Classified staff with a half time (.5 FTE) or greater appointment. Criteria for joint appointment include: (a) teaching at least 6 credits per year; (b) serving at least one time per year on BSW honors committees, MSW committees, or Ph.D. committees; and (c) serving actively on at least one School standing committee. The student body of each academic program (BSW, MSW, Distance MSW, and PhD) will annually elect a Program Representative to serve and vote in School Council. The four program representatives will gather feedback from their student colleagues and represent their will on voting matters. Council members may vote on School issues with the exception of tenure and promotion decisions, which are made by the tenure and promotion committee. Although the ultimate decision in hiring personnel is made by the hiring authority, the School uses a participatory process to inform that decision: The search committee solicits recommendations related to candidates' job qualifications from all members of the Council.

2.C.2.b Voting Rights

In exercising one's voting right, it is assumed that attendees are engaging in informed decision making based on their expertise and scope of work. In that context, abstention can be a valued vote. Anyone should abstain from voting if there is a conflict of interest or an insufficient basis for making an informed vote. In this context, "abstain" is neither "yes" nor "no" but instead is a valid representation of personal choice based on the preceding considerations.

2.C.2.c Voting by Proxy

Voting may be held either in School Council or via email. Voting may be done by proxy. Individuals on sabbatical or personal/family leave are eligible to vote on School matters provided they acknowledge having had sufficient opportunity to review relevant material and they intend to return to the school as an at least .5 FTE.

2.D   Committees of the School

2.D.1 Curriculum Committee

The Committee membership shall be the Task Leader for each curricular area: HBSE, Policy, Large Systems, Small Systems, Research, and Field. The Chair of the Curriculum Committee shall be the Assistant Director or co-chaired by BSW and MSW Program Directors, who shall have voting. Task Groups will consist of those teaching in each curricular area. The Curriculum Committee's function is to:

- manage and evaluate proposed course changes in light of CSWE Accreditation Standards and School outcomes.
- provide leadership in the development and coordination of the School's efforts in curriculum revision for the BSW, MSW, and PhD programs.
- provide oversight that Master Syllabi are created, disseminated, and followed to assure consistency across sections for meeting CSWE Standards and measurement consistency.
- review and approve all proposals for new courses before submitting them to the School Council for final decision.
- approve required textbooks and monitor delivery of the curriculum to minimize duplication, maintain consistency among sections, and evaluate the match between the level of student learning.
- submit to the School Council for final decision proposals for modification and/or change in the curriculum design or graduation requirements. Such a proposal shall be approved by a majority vote of the Curriculum Committee before submission to the School Council for final decision.
- submit new courses, after School approval, to the College Curriculum Committee.
- The Curriculum Committee shall set forth the form and content required for such proposals and the standards by which the course proposals will be judged. Experimental courses and group studies that substitute for a required course shall be referred to the Curriculum Committee for approval to avoid overlap and enable the setting of program priorities. With committee approval, experimental courses may be offered for two semesters after which they shall be submitted as a proposal for a new course within existing university policy. Certificates may be offered upon approval of Curriculum Committee and with University approval. The School Council shall ratify any changes in the standards for judging new courses. For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting shall be by simple majority of those voting. Any voting member may appeal any decision by the Curriculum Committee in regard to new courses to the School Council if the council, by a simple majority vote, agrees to hear the appeal.

2.D.2 Outcomes Assessment Committee

The Outcomes Assessment Committee is charged with planning and overseeing regularly scheduled data collection and conducting outcomes assessment, the results of which shall include data-driven recommendations to relevant committees to support continuous program improvements and outcomes-generated University and accreditation required reports that will be presented to the faculty at the annual fall retreat. The committee will consist of at minimum the MSW Program Director, the BSW Program Director, and the Field Education Director and will be chaired by the Outcomes Coordinator.

2.D.3 Student Affairs and Admissions Committee

Membership in the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee shall consist of a minimum of three academic faculty members and the Graduate Programs Coordinator. The Student Affairs and Admissions Committee has primary responsibility for developing and recommending to the School Council policies and procedures for the admissions process to the MSW program. The committee is responsible for implementing those policies and procedures in the selection of the applicants to be admitted and reporting the applicant pool and those selected for admission to the School Council. The Student Affairs and Admissions Committee is responsible for recommending policy and, when requested, carrying out the procedures relative to matters of students waiving of courses or curriculum requirements (within existing university and school policy), recommendations for readmission in the case of an academic dismissal, and the matriculation status of graduate students. This committee is responsible for reporting to the School Council proposals for changes in the principles, policies, and procedures by which those recommendations are to be made. A student who wishes to appeal a grading decision should be informed of the process described in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual and explained in Informational Appendix H of this Code. Oversight of the School's guidelines for this process is the responsibility of this committee.

2.D.4 Administrative Team

The Administrative Team shall advise the Director on all significant matters facing the School. The Administrative team shall include the Director, the Assistant Director, the PhD Program Director, the MSW Graduate Programs Director, the BSW Undergraduate Programs Director, the Director of Field Education, and one elected faculty member.

2.D.5 Scholarship Committee

Membership shall consist of three faculty members appointed by the Director. Responsibilities include:
- To select a committee member who will serve on College Scholarship Committee and chair the School Scholarship Committee.
- To nominate individuals for awards at all levels.
- To encourage students to apply for existing scholarships and awards.
- To develop workshops to encourage/instruct students for application process.

2.D.6 Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee

The constitution of the TMP Committee is described in Section 3.E. The committee is to conduct annual progress toward tenure reviews of TTF and give performance reviews to CCAF at third year in rank and upon request in order to give constructive feedback to faculty for professional development. For tenure-track faculty a letter shall be written related to progress toward tenure. The TMP Committee

also is the first in the line of decision making for tenure and promotion and performance evaluations of TTF and promotion for CCAF. Applicants for tenure and promotion in rank are to be reviewed by tenured faculty at or above the candidate's rank for which they are applying. CCAF applying for promotion are to be reviewed by the full TMP Committee.

The School's detailed document on TMP is found in Appendix A. Any tenured, tenure-track member, or CCAF can propose changes in tenure and/or promotion standards, criteria, or procedures for their rank's standards. Proposed changes will be submitted to the TMP Committee Chair who, in turn, will submit them to the TMP Committee for discussion. Any recommended changes shall be reviewed by both TTF and CCAF faculty. If recommended changes are approved by a 2/3 vote of TTF and CCAF, they shall be added to the School's Code.

2.D.7 Committee for Social Justice

The School of Social Work Diversity and Human Rights Committee strives to provide leadership and direction to the School of Social Work as the school implements diversity initiatives in accordance with its diversity plan.

2.D.8 Research Committee

The research committee will develop and enhance opportunities for research advancement in the SSW. The research committee will obtain resources to increase the research opportunities within and outside the school with the goal of building infrastructure, community-engaged partnerships, interdisciplinary collaborations, training and mentorship, and funding to support our research mission. The committee is part of the research infrastructure plan, and will be used as a touchpoint for issues in the school related to research.

2.D.9 Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees may be established at the discretion of, and members appointed by, the Director or a standing committee chairperson. Such committees shall be formed to serve for prescribed, limited periods of time, and all deliberations and suggested actions shall be forwarded to the person who appointed the committee for appropriate action. Upon completion of the task, a report shall be made to the Director and faculty, and the committee shall be dissolved.

2.E   School Council Meetings

2.E.1 Meetings

Meetings of the School shall be called by the School Director at least monthly during each academic term except summer term. Meetings are listed as part of the School's master schedule. An email announcement will be distributed to faculty members in advance of the meeting. Additional faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the School Director, the Administrative Team, or at the request of at least three faculty members or a Committee Chair. Agenda items for faculty meetings may be submitted by committee chairs. Minutes will be taken by faculty on a rotating basis and saved to the School drive.

2.E.2 Attendance

Attendance at School Council is expected for all voting members and is optional for nonvoting members, dependent upon whether voting is an agenda item. There may be instances where a lab or

center director represents the interests of voting-eligible staff members, and acts on their behalf. 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). Faculty must notify the Director in advance whenever possible and are responsible for reviewing minutes of the meeting and responding to action items as needed.

2.E.3 Record

A record of action taken at faculty meetings shall be maintained by an appointed faculty or staff member. A summary of decisions made during a scheduled meeting shall be distributed to all faculty and staff on the School drive.

2.E.4 Votes

A faculty member selected by vote at the Fall Retreat serves as Chair for purposes of conducting faculty meetings. All eligible council members may vote on issues presented for action.

2.E.5 Motions

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

2.E.6 Quorum

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.

2.E.7 Council

Unless an executive session has been formally called, School Council shall be open to part-time faculty and student observers. Those in attendance are invited to speak on issues and, in the spirit of the values of social work, those comments will be duly considered by the Council.

2.E.8 Parliamentary Authority

The parliamentary authority for the School faculty shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

2.E.9 Professionalism and collegiality

Decision-making is focused on issues that affect the overall program and direction of the School, including policies. It is expected that the Director and faculty work with others in a manner that is respectful, honest, collaborative, transparent, and committed to the greater good of the School. To achieve this expectation, the Director and faculty shall:

1. Base decisions on credible argument, scholarship, and/or evidence.
2. Be guided in decision-making by the School's Mission and Goals.
3. All faculty and staff shall consistently demonstrate a commitment to being good citizens of the School by upholding high standards of collegiality, by respectfully and

directly communicating with others, and by working effectively as team members to advance the greater good of the School, its vision, and its mission.

4. Seek to maximize agreement among faculty on decisions whenever possible. The Director retains final decision-making authority based on current or anticipated School, college, and university needs and priorities and input from individual faculty members and the school's committees and Administrative Team as specified in the Manual (C.2.6.2).

2.F   School Organization: Institutes and Centers

2.F.1 Social Work Research Center

The purpose of the Social Work Research Center is to study social work interventions in areas such as child welfare and juvenile delinquency while promoting evidence-based research, practice, and policy. The SWRC provides research and program evaluation services to child welfare agencies, human services providers, governmental entities, and community groups. SWRC also collaborates with social work faculty and other interdisciplinary programs across the university on research and evaluation initiatives. The goals of SWRC are to conduct applied research to bridge the gap between theory and practice in social work and disseminate research on best practices to social service organizations and child welfare agencies through publications, conferences, and training venues.

2.F.2 Center for Life-long Learning and Outreach Education

The Center for Life-long Learning and Outreach Education will develop, administer, and integrate degree and nondegree educational programs that extend outside the on-campus degree programs of the School of Social Work. The Center will exercise oversight to maintain high quality programs that are consistent with the mission and goals of the School of Social Work, the College of Health and Human Sciences, and Colorado State University. The Center will foster increased faculty and student involvement in community improvement as resources for social workers and human service personnel, providing lifelong learning opportunities, and engaging alumni in both providing and participating in the educational opportunities offered by the Center.

2.F.3 Human-Animal Bond in Colorado

The love of a companion animal is uncomplicated and unconditional, naturally received and returned by people of all ages. It is in this spirit that Human-Animal Bond in Colorado was founded. Established in 1993 at Colorado State University's College of Health and Human Sciences - School of Social Work, HABIC is a program that effectively uses the powerful human-animal bond in therapeutic settings.

Section 3: FACULTY ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

3.A   Faculty Appointments and Ranks

3.A.1 Tenure-track and full-time contract and continuing appointments

Tenure-track and full-time contract and continuing appointments are the result of a national search conducted by a School search committee appointed by the Director. In the case of a School Director, the Dean of the College of Health and Human Science initiates the search and the Dean appoints the search committee. All faculty being considered for full-time tenure track appointments must be judged by School faculty to possess the requisite skills necessary to attain tenure at the academic rank being sought. This requirement mandates that an essential criterion in tenure track 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 School needs and long-term priorities.

3.A.2 Search Committees

It is the responsibility of the School Director to appoint a search committee when it is known that there will be an open faculty position. The School Director may appoint one doctoral graduate student and one external member to the search committee. 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 of acceptability to the School Director. In each phase of the appointment process, Affirmative Action guidelines of the College and the University shall be followed.

3.A.3 Definition of Faculty

The Department follows the definition of faculty as outlined in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, Section E.1. The faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor (clinical or research), Master Instructor, Senior Instructor, Instructor). All faculty members shall have the academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment.

3.A.4 Faculty Hires

Faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor must have attained a doctoral degree prior to the time of appointment. Faculty hired at the rank of Instructor, Master Instructor or Senior Instructor must have a Master's degree at minimum.

3.A.5 Faculty Workload

Faculty hired as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor will have a workload that includes expectations for scholarship, service, and teaching. In the case of tenure-track hires, the standard workload distribution is expected to reflect approximately 50% teaching, 35% research and 15% service.

In the case of nontenure-track hires at the research faculty rank, the standard work- load distribution will be based upon extramural research funding up to 90% and 10% service.

Nontenure-track hires at the clinical faculty rank, the standard workload distribution will be 80% instruction, 10% research and 10% service.

Faculty who are hired as Instructor, Master Instructor, or Senior Instructor will have workload distributions of about 90% teaching/advising and 10% service.
Other service loads may be negotiated based upon administrative responsibilities that are at will of the Director.

3.B   Workload Policy

Academic faculty refers to regular tenured and tenure track (at least 50% appointment in School of Social Work) faculty, faculty on continuing or contract appointments, joint academic and

administrative-professional faculty, and transitional faculty (see *Manual*, E.2). These individuals, working individually and together, advance the School's mission and vision by engaging in some combination of teaching/advising, research, and service to the school, college, and university as well as outreach to Colorado, the nation, and the world. Responsibilities of academic faculty are described in the *Manual,* D.3 (See D.3.3. as a professional, E.5.2 as a faculty member, and E.5.3 on teaching and advising).

3.B.1 Workload distribution

Faculty workload includes a combination of teaching, research, and service, the proportion of which varies based on School and faculty needs and interests. In the School of Social Work, a standard semester load is 15 credits and 9 credits during summer semester. To compute workload related to course instruction, the standard teaching of 12 credits per year may be comprised of lecture, seminar, or recitation courses. A 3-credit course comprises 10% of annual load or 20% of semester load. A 2-credit course is 13% of a semester load. Faculty workload percentages in teaching and advising may also reflect significant effort invested in teaching-focused activities such as development of new courses, significant course revisions, curriculum innovation, academic and research advising, or mentoring of other educators. Teaching assignments are determined annually in the spring before the next academic year. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to teach a minimum of one 3-credit course per academic year unless special arrangements have been negotiated with the Director based on extramural funding and/or workload.

Outreach/engagement activities (not service) are not a mandated component of every faculty member's effort distribution but are to be included when appropriate to the mission of School and college and also goals of the faculty member.

Outreach/engagement activities may be integrated into any one of the three workload domains, and are defined as the development and implementation of education, consultation, services, or outreach (e.g. direct service, ongoing consultation, or training) for the benefit of individuals, groups, populations, or organizations locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally. Faculty members negotiate the "placement" of outreach/engagement activities in their effort distribution with the Director annually. Outreach and engagement activities of tenured and tenure-track faculty must be integrated with their programs of research and/or scholarly teaching.

Because the School seeks to build on the strengths of all members, faculty workloads may vary based on the strengths and needs of the individual faculty member in addition to the needs of the School as a whole. Faculty members who maintain a high level of research productivity may have a higher percent effort in research and scholarship and a lower percent effort in teaching and advising. Conversely, faculty members whose main passions and energies are devoted to teaching may have a higher percent effort in teaching and advising and a lower percent effort in research and scholarship.

For these reasons, each faculty member is expected to negotiate his or her workload with the Director. Negotiations between the Director and faculty pertaining to workloads shall take into consideration the needs of the School in addition to the faculty member's areas of interests and expertise, including potential for optimal contribution to the School:

- Teaching and advising activities;
- Research needs and productivity;
- Current and anticipated salary support from extramural funding including any related buy-out of courses;
- Service commitments within the School, college and/or campus wide; and

- Any other factors that may influence workloads.

The Director may change a faculty member's negotiated workload in response to unforeseen circumstances if doing so is in the best interest of the School as a whole. Should this situation occur, the Director shall notify the faculty member of any changes as soon as possible. Should faculty anticipate any changing circumstances that may impact their workload in the foreseeable future (e.g., anticipated new grant funding, changing service commitments), they shall notify the Director as soon as possible in order to examine and discuss workload implications in a proactive manner.

3.B.2 Academic Faculty Responsibilities

3.B.2.a Teaching and advising (Section E.12.1 of the Manual)

All academic faculty share responsibilities for teaching and advising. With respect to teaching, the faculty endorse a learning paradigm that is focused on improving the quality and depth of students' learning. In a learning paradigm, it is the responsibility of faculty to create learning environments and to utilize pedagogical methods that:
- Are cooperative, collaborative, and supportive;
- Expect and hold students accountable to active learning and engagement;
- Elicit student discovery;
- Help students grow from an epistemological stance of absolute knowing (i.e. viewing knowledge as received from experts, fixed and existing in absolute form) to contextual knowing (e.g. viewing knowledge as fluid, incomplete, and uncertain but able to be judged as more or less substantiated);
- Empower students to construct their own knowledge based on a synthesis of expert opinion and research evidence as well as their own and others' experiences and perspectives; and
- Strive to employ principles of universal design for learning as feasible to address differences in student learning styles.

The learning environments that faculty utilize include not only the classroom, interactive laboratories, and a variety of community settings, but also contexts that support students' out-of-class academic work, i.e. independent study and completion of scholarly assignments and program requirements. To assure consistency and integrity of a learning paradigm throughout the academic curriculum, regular or special appointment faculty are assigned to mentor temporary faculty teaching a newly-assigned course. This teaching- related mentorship and supervision may be considered part of the faculty member's teaching workload if it is performed in conjunction with assignment to a specific course. Advising serves primarily academic and research purposes, but also includes supervision of student researchers and graduate teaching assistants.

3.B.2.b Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity (Section E.12.2 of the Manual)

Each faculty member in a tenure line is expected to participate in ongoing scholarship that advances the mission and vision of the School as well as the larger professional, academic, and global communities. Faculty holding special appointments may participate in research/scholarship with approval from the Director, but this is not considered a requirement of the appointment unless seeking/considering attainment of a higher rank.

All faculty- or student-generated research proposals must be reviewed and approved by at least one of the following Colorado State University boards, according to the type of research conducted:
- Protection of animal subjects - Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee(IACUC)

- Ethical use of controlled substances - Drug Review Committee (DRC)
- Protection of human participants - Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- Responsible use of biohazardous agents and rDNA - Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)

All Principal Investigators (PIs) and Co-PIs involved in human subjects research protocols must have completed CSU's Human Subjects Protection Training sponsored by the Institutional Review Board for Colorado State University.

3.B.2.c Service

Consistent with Section E.12.3–Service of *The Manual,* academic faculty members engage in service at both university and professional levels that advance the vision and mission of the School as well as the interests of the college and university, the community, and the profession and/or related disciplines. Service is generally considered to include:
- Participation in all faculty meetings unless excused by the Director;
- Committee work at the School, College, and University levels;
- Professional service in and presentations to organizations locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally; and
- Service on editorial boards as jurors and as grant proposal reviewers.
- Committee work at all levels can vary from very low effort (one or two meetings a year with little work outside of meetings) to very high effort (multiple hours per week).

Committee assignments are made by the Director based on School needs and balanced with individual faculty needs and interests. Workload associated with professional service is negotiated with the Director based on the expected effort involved, the match between that effort and the vision, mission, and needs of the School as well as the individual career trajectory, interests, and responsibilities of the faculty member. While it is expected that senior faculty members will undertake greater service roles based on their expertise, junior faculty members shall also participate in service activities to contribute new perspectives, develop expertise, and further the mission of the School, college, and university. Faculty generating personal income through consulting, fee-for-service, and/or workshop revenues must report these activities in the annual Conflict of Interest form completed by all faculty members. Conflict of interest is fully discussed in Section D.7.7 of the *Manual*. All faculty are responsible for being fully familiar with this content if involved in consulting relationships with external organizations.

3.C Formation of Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committees

Members of the TMP Committee who are eligible to vote on promotion must be at a higher level than the faculty member under consideration, and for promotion of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, only tenured committee members are voting members (CSU Faculty Manual Section E.13.2). At minimum, three eligible CCAF are to serve on the TMP committee when reviewing a CCAF member's application for promotion and elected from among the Senior and Master Instructors by CCAF each year. A CCAF may serve as co-chair of the committee when CCA faculty are being considered for promotion. If fewer than three CCAF from the School are eligible to vote on a promotion, then up to three CCAF who are of higher level than the faculty member under consideration shall be selected from among disciplines similar to Social Work (e.g., Human Development and Family Studies; Occupational Therapy; School of Education, Psychology).

3.D Procedures for Tenure

Procedures for tenure are described in Appendix A and Appendix F. The first formal step is for the candidate to complete a thorough, polished Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application (aka

the dossier) as well as teaching, research, and service statements. Next, in May of the year one applies for tenure, the Director and TMP Committee identify and contact a slate of external reviewers that includes nominations from the candidate (see Appendix F). The candidate's updated application materials and the external reviewers' letters typically are reviewed by the TMP Committee in late September, with the decision letter sent to the candidate within 10-14 days. The School Director then completes a separate review, which is received by the candidate within 10-14 days. The dossier and reviewers' letters then are reviewed by the CHHS dean, with input provided by the CHHS Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, before the application materials are sent to the Provost's office. The candidate is given the opportunity to respond to the reviews at each of these stages of the review process.

3.E   Procedures for Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

Procedures for promotion are similar to those described in 3.F, although the composition of the TMP Committee may differ given that members must be Full Professors in order to review an application for promotion to Full Professor.

3.F   Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty

For CCAF, the Director's annual performance review constitutes an annual assessment of progress toward promotion as does the midpoint (third year) review. If a CCAF intends to apply for promotion, it is recommended that they have their dossier reviewed again by the TMP Committee no later than two years prior to the date they plan to apply so that they are afforded an opportunity to strengthen their case.

The same process as described in 3.F above is followed for CCAF applying for promotion, with the exceptions that (a) fewer reviewer letters are required, (b) some reviewers may be recruited from CSU departments outside of Social Work, and (c) at least three CCAFs must be empaneled on the TMP Committee.

For tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and promotion, no fewer than 5 letters must be received from reviewers external to the university. For CCAF, at least 1 letter external to the university must be received, although more is ideal. The remaining of 5 letters minimum may be solicited from on-campus faculty in kindred disciplines or who are familiar with the candidate's content area and/or skill set (e.g., teaching; research).

If the TMP Committee's vote does not support promotion, the justification for the negative vote should provide guidance as to actions the applicant needs to take in order to make a more compelling case for promotion. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, professional development workshops and regular mentoring. The TMP Committee also will conduct midpoint reviews of CCAF, but will not be involved in annual performance reviews.

3.G   Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees

The **graduate faculty** shall consist of all SOSW and joint appointment to SOSW tenured and tenure-track faculty possessing a doctoral degree. They are eligible to serve as chairs of graduate student committees and/or thesis advisers. By CSU Graduate School policy, Instructors in the School may co-advise but not advise. 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 for MSW and PhD committees are found in the Graduate Handbook. By CSU Graduate School

policy, Instructors in the School may co-advise but not advise.

- For the **MSW program**, faculty appointments to graduate student committees are described in the MSW Handbook, section on Procedures for the Appointment of Plan B Graduate Committees: In the final semesters of course work, research faculty identify a committee to support and evaluate student projects. The Plan B research committee consists of three members. The chairperson of the research committee is the student's SOWK 698 Advanced Research and Social Work Capstone course instructor, who also serves as their research advisor. Of the remaining two members, one must be a social work faculty member and one must be a faculty member from a department/unit outside social work to represent the Graduate School. Committees must receive signatory approval from the Director of the School of Social Work.
- For the **Ph.D. program**, faculty appointments to graduate student committees are described in the Ph.D. Handbook in the Graduate Committee section: Early in the program, students identify potential mentors who can chair the committee. With the chair's guidance, the student identifies at least three additional committee members, two within the School and one from another CSU department. This section of the handbook details criteria to consider in selecting committee members, and why and how committee members might be changed or replaced.

Section 4: FACULTY EVALUATION, T&P STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

4.A Annual Performance Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member is responsible for submitting a written self- assessment to the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion (TMP) Committee no later than January 20th, following the end of the calendar year for which he/she is being evaluated. Annual Performance Reviews will be conducted in a two-tier process for tenure-track faculty seeking or considering advancement to a higher rank. First, materials will be submitted to the TMP Committee and a letter will be written. The second part of the process requires the Director to review materials submitted by the faculty and the TMP Committee and write a separate review.

All academic faculty shall participate in annual comprehensive reviews of performance; refer to Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Salary Increases and Section E.13 Advancement in Rank (Promotion) of the *Manual*. Performance reviews are intended to assist faculty in achieving tenure and/or promotion, to facilitate continued professional development, to refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and/or to assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University. These reviews must be conducted in such a way that they are consistent with the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights.

Each faculty member is responsible for submitting a written self-assessment to the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee or the CCAF Review Committee no later than January 20th, following the end of the calendar year for which they are being evaluated. (Please see information on external reviewers and timelines in the TMP Addendum). The written self-assessments of faculty who are eligible and choose to be evaluated based on their job description must include: (1) a comprehensive and honest assessment of their performance related to each area of responsibility in their job descriptions, using the criteria of superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory; and (2) evidence supporting their self-assessment.

The Director may create the annual evaluation with input from the direct supervisor of each person being reviewed but the evaluation shall be the responsibility of the Director. The TMP Committee writes a letter in response to submitted materials which is shared with the Director, the faculty member, and a

copy is kept for the faculty member's file. The letter utilizes submitted materials by the faculty member, evidence of outcomes of work, and the grid in Appendix A.

The Director may seek external evaluations of the faculty member's performance that are specifically related to his or her responsibilities. The written self-assessments of faculty who use the School's grid must include: (1) comprehensive and honest assessments of their performance in each benchmark area using the criteria of superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory; and (2) data sources that provide supporting evidence of the faculty member's self-assessment, as described in the grid.

Decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases are linked to the evaluation of the faculty member's work in the areas of teaching/advising, research/scholarly/creative activity, and in service/outreach.

The faculty member shall receive a copy of the evaluation. Copies shall also be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file, and a copy filed in the Dean's Office. The annual evaluation documents shall be forwarded to the Dean for review per College policy. Any suggestions, questions, and/or concerns are to be discussed with the Director. A faculty member has a right to prepare a written response to his or her annual evaluation, which becomes part of the annual evaluation. As well, the faculty member may grieve her or his annual evaluation to the Director according to the procedures outlined in Section K of the *Manual.*

4.A.1 Evaluation of teaching and advising

Evidence of teaching effectiveness shall be based upon a faculty member's portfolio which contain (1) peer evaluations, which should occur biannually or more frequently as deemed appropriate by the Director), (2) examples of curriculum or course improvements and innovations that occurred during the year of the evaluation, (3) quantitative measures from student course evaluations; and (4) other evidence the faculty member considers relevant to an evaluation of his or her teaching and advising, including education-related outreach and engagement activities. Additional evidence may include solicited or unsolicited letters from graduates as well as current students, in addition to evaluations or unsolicited letters from conference/workshop attendees. While anonymous comments may not be used in the faculty member's summative annual evaluation, all faculty must share all written comments, both anonymous and signed, with the Director on an annual basis for the purpose of formative assessment geared at improving instructional processes. The faculty member may choose to share anonymous student comments with the Director either during his or her annual evaluation meeting or at a separate meeting before or after completion of the annual evaluation.

4.A.2 Evaluation of research/scholarship/creative activity

Academic faculty who have research as part of their workload expectations are expected to be active scholars, producing new knowledge within one or more of the four scholarship domains of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and/or application. A critical gauge of successful scholarship is the faculty member's output of published theoretical works and research findings in respected peer-reviewed academic journals and effectiveness procuring funding from external sources. Additionally, evaluations of research and scholarship effectiveness may consider:
  - The individual faculty member's perspective of the fit within and contribution to the particular body of literature the faculty member attempts to inform;
  - The value of the work according to peer evaluations;
  - The degree to which published works have been referenced by and requested by others;
  - The value of scholarly contributions as judged by publication in professional magazines and letters

of response from practitioners or service recipients;
- Research associated with outreach and engagement activities; and
- Awards for significant professional accomplishment.

4.A.3 Evaluation of service

Consistent with Section E.12.3 in The Manual, academic faculty engage in service at university and professional levels that advance the vision and mission of the School as well as the interests of the college and university, the community, and the profession. University service is evaluated based on an academic faculty member's timely and effective participation in important School activities, including regularly scheduled faculty meetings and special events, as well as assigned committees at School, college, and university levels. Professional service is evaluated through the amount and quality of the faculty member's participation and contributions to the long-term improvement of teaching, scholarship, and the profession.

The TMP Committee will write a letter evaluating the faculty member's performance as a whole to evaluate it for progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The TMP writes a letter in response to submitted materials which is shared with the Director and the faculty member, and a copy is kept for the faculty member's file. The letter utilizes submitted materials by the faculty member, evidence of outcomes of work, and the grid in Appendix A.

The Director's evaluation must be in writing and discussed with the faculty member during an annual evaluation meeting. For tenure track faculty and special appointment faculty seeking or considering advancement to a higher rank, two letters are to be written: One letter that evaluates the one-year annual performance and a second letter that evaluates the faculty member's research, teaching, and service as a whole in terms of progress toward tenure.

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.

4.A.4 Faculty Activity Report

The annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) follows a specified format established by the School. 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. The faculty member completes an annual activity report and presents it to the TMP Committee in advance by January 20th.

4.A.5 TMP Committee

The TMP Committee completes a report. The report is forwarded to the Director and the faculty member under review. Upon receipt of the FARs, the Director 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.

4.A.6 Annual Conference

During the annual conference, the Director 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. A final version of the written summary will be

completed following the conference and shall be provided by the Director 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 Health and Human Sciences.

4.A.7 Annual Performance Review

During the annual performance review, each faculty member and the Director shall agree to the distribution of faculty effort across the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service.

4.A.8 Tenure

Generally, for the first one-third of their pre-tenure years, nontenured 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. 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.

4.A.9 Performance Criteria

Criteria for evaluating performance and documenting activities in teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/outreach are described in Appendix A.

4.A.10 Teaching Evaluations

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). 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 TMP 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.

4.B Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Review

The comprehensive midpoint review is conducted in the third year after hire of the pretenure faculty member. The midpoint evaluation during the probationary period is an important document for assistant professors. It provides valuable feedback on progress towards tenure so that any necessary adjustments can be made well before the ultimate decision is made. It also serves as a record of formal communication so that the institution can be sure that a consistent and accurate message to the faculty member was delivered. These evaluations become part of the promotion dossier. The midpoint evaluation may also include some external evaluation as well, but should certainly include the TMP Committee's input.

4.C 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).

4.C.1 Phase I

The University requires all tenured faculty, excepting those on transitional appointments, to be reviewed at intervals of 5 years, or following two consecutive annual reviews within a 5-year period reflecting a less than satisfactory performance in the overall evaluation of teaching, research, and service (Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (AFAPM) , Section E.14.3.1). A "less than satisfactory" evaluation is defined as an evaluation of "below expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in teaching or research. By School code, the Chair of the School's Tenure, Merit, and Promotion (TMP) Committee may work collaboratively with the School Director in the evaluation of Phase I comprehensive reviews, at the request of the School Director 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.

If faculty performance in the Phase I comprehensive performance review merits an overall unsatisfactory or below expectations in the teaching and research areas, the School Director, the Chair of the TMP Committee, and the faculty member will design a professional development plan to assist the faculty member in satisfactorily meeting departmental expectations. The Chair of the TMP 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 School Director. The School Director and Chair of the TMP 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.

4.C.2 Phase II

a. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the School Director 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 AFAPM). 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 TMP 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.

b. In an effort to ensure impartiality of the members of this committee, the Chair of the TMP 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 reasons for the challenge; the reasons will be reviewed by the Chair of the TMP 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.

c. If the second challenge is taken by the faculty member, the entire TMP 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.

d. 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 School's promotion and tenure standards. 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.

e. The School Director will submit copies of their 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. The faculty member is encouraged to provide a written response speaking to the areas that were rated as unsatisfactory as well as areas that the faculty member feels were not properly considered is encouraged.

f. After meeting once, the Phase II Review Committee has the option to request additional information from the School Director, faculty member being reviewed, or other parties they believe would aid their deliberations. Following final deliberations, the Committee will send forward a written recommendation that supports one of the three following outcomes:
   1. The faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by the School.
   2. There are deficiencies, but they are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent. No further action is necessary if either of the two aforementioned outcomes is identified
   3. There are deficiencies that are substantial and chronic or recurrent.

g. Further action is required if the latter outcome is identified. Where deficiencies are identified that must be corrected, the School Director will design a professional development plan to address those deficiencies and set a timeline for accomplishment of each element of the plan. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor (School Director) on the design of the professional development plan. The Dean of the College must approve this development plan.

h. In the case of Outcome 3, the TMP 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 School Director, and eventually to the Dean and Provost.

i. Timeline for Phase II reviews
   1. Phase II review initiated by School Director (following unsatisfactory Phase I review)
   2. Peer Review Committee (PRC) selected by TMP Chair (10 days after Phase II review is initiated by School Director)
   3. PRC meets to examine materials; may request additional information if needed (10 days after Committee is formed)
   4. PRC submits a written report/evaluation to the School Director and to the faculty member (10 days after PRC meets to review)
   5. Faculty member prepares and submits a written response to the School Director and to the PRC (10 days after PRC report is received by faculty member and School Director).
   6. If the outcome is "no further action," the review process is ended (see Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
   7. If outcome is "further action required" (see Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual), then the following occurs: "Deficiencies must be remedied:" School Director and faculty member design a professional development plan (within 10 days after

faculty member submits written response to the School Director and the PRC).

4.D Annual Probationary Period Review

See section 4.A above for details on the annual review process involving the School Director and the TMP Committee.

4.E Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

See [Appendix A](#) for specific promotion criteria in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

4.E.1 Quality indicators for promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, it is expected that the candidate:
- Has developed a focused track of scholarship that is recognized as an important line of inquiry by reputable and knowledgeable scholars at a national or international level;
- Has demonstrated sustained progress toward excellence in teaching;
- Has met assigned service obligations with a high level of professionalism;
- Has demonstrated a commitment to professional development; and
- Has demonstrated professionalism and collegiality by participation in respectful and constructive dialogue and decision-making in faculty meetings and other School Work committees, and commitment to teamwork consistent with the School's mission and vision.

4.E.2 Quality indicators for promotion to Full Professor

The [Provost's guidelines](#) on promotion and tenure at Colorado State indicate that a full professor should be a university leader who has contributed in a major way to the mission of his or her School and college as well as the entire university. Successfully maintaining a level of productivity considered sufficient for promotion to associate professor is insufficient for promotion to full professor. Rather, a successful candidate for full professor is expected to demonstrate qualitative differences in the scope and level of his or her contribution well beyond those that supported promotion to associate professor. These guidelines provide an important context for the following quality indicators:
- Has maintained a focused track of scholarship that is recognized as an important line of inquiry by reputable and knowledgeable scholars at national and/or international level;
- Has demonstrated consistent and sustained excellence in teaching;
- Has met assigned service obligations, including leadership roles at the School, College or University level;
- Has demonstrated professionalism and collegiality by participation in respectful and constructive dialogue and decision-making in context of faculty meetings and other School Work committees, and commitment to teamwork consistent with the School's mission and vision with a high level of professionalism.

4.F Promotion Standards for CCAF on Professor Ranks

For promotion to the level of Associate Research Professor, the candidate must meet the criteria related to research that apply for the promotion of tenure track faculty to Associate Professor. As described in the College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS) guidelines, "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." Primary if not exclusive weight will be given to research endeavors, depending upon one's effort distribution. As stated in the

CHHS tenure and promotion guidelines, "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." This will typically mean an evaluation of Superior using the criteria in the School's TMP Standards (Section 4.E and Appendix A).

4.G Promotion Standards for CCAF on Instructor Ranks

Continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty (CCAF), together with tenure track faculty (TTF), are integral to the development and performance of programs of the highest quality for undergraduate and graduate education, professional preparation, and outreach. Both CCAF and TTF are critical to advisory, supervisory, instructional, knowledge generation, and administrative demands of these programs. The School of Social Work relies on high-quality CCAF, in conjunction with TTF, in order to meet the evolving demands for state- of-the-art student development and to assist in shaping policy in professional preparation. Similarly, NTT Research faculty contribute in important ways to the research programs of Social Work and the broader discipline by funding individual and collaborative research projects and through dissemination of that research. As well, CCAF promote the vitality of the School through effective administration of programs and mentoring of students.

Unlike the appointments of TTF, it is not unusual for the workload and expectations for CCAF to change meaningfully from year to year. The roles of Clinical faculty, for example, can include, but are not limited to: undergraduate and graduate instruction, field education, programmatic leadership, and so on. 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 School is to achieve its missions. Given the proclivity for the job descriptions of CCAF to change, a letter from the School Director to the CCAF member clearly stating the anticipated workload will be written by May 1st of each academic year if possible, to outline workload expectations for the following academic year. This date is critical to allow CCAF time to prepare for their duties, including course preparation, the following fall. This letter must state the expectations of the CCAF in terms of teaching, research, and/or service/ administration. For all positions above Instructor, the workload and expectations must conform to expectations for successful review, reappointment, and/or promotion, similar, but not identical, to those specified for TTF.

Mentoring can occur at the School or other levels and can be either formal or informal. Current CCAF and TTF can serve as mentors, and can assist new faculty in understanding the department, college, and university expectations for CCAF. Mentors will also serve as a resource to new faculty in the areas of teaching or research, program development, and service/administrative activities, as appropriate.

For reappointment and/or promotion of CCAF, the School requires that annual reviews include assessment of the candidate's teaching, research, service, and administrative duties *as applicable* to that individual's contracted responsibilities. CHHS Code notes that one must at least exceed expectations to be considered for promotion.
- Teaching faculty are expected to be excellent teachers who provide intellectual leadership in curriculum as well as the education and preparation of our students. They should develop and implement highly engaging, rigorous courses that reflect the conceptual framework, research, practice, and knowledge base of the profession, and which satisfy the expected learning objectives established for the courses they teach. CCAF who provide field work supervision as part of their instructional load are expected to engage in intellectual and practice leadership

that promotes the professional development of students, and contributes to the School's teaching mission.

- Research Professors are expected to be productive in high-quality publications and research grants. Faculty who provide mentoring to students as a part of their duties are expected engage in intellectual and practice leadership that promotes the professional development of students, and contributes to the School's teaching mission.
- CCAF with primarily administrative responsibilities are expected to demonstrate significant leadership and exceptional administration of their programs in accordance with the particular assignments of their position.

All CCAF are also expected to demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in service at the school, college, university, local, state and national levels, as appropriate to their job descriptions.

In all cases of review, faculty members who are reappointed shall receive a detailed letter that provides formative feedback assisting the CCAF in their professional development. For CCAF whose direct supervisor is a program director, the School Director will solicit formative feedback from the program director. The School Director's letter shall include areas of strength to sustain success, areas for improvement, and an evaluation of whether or not the 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 TMP Committee will evaluate CCAF according to the same performance levels that are described in the School's Procedures for Annual and Periodic Comprehensive Reviews of Performance for Tenure and Non- Tenure Track Faculty Positions ("TMP Standards") for the areas that are appropriate to the appointment. Additional types of evidence for teaching performance are listed in section 4.G.2 (below) that relate to classroom instruction and supervision of experiential activities.

4.G.1 Professional Development of CCA Teaching Faculty

- All course instructors in Social Work are expected to be familiar with current theories, research, and best practices that are pertinent to the course(s) they teach; see Teaching Criteria 3-5 in the TMP Standards. Accordingly, Teaching Faculty are expected to provide evidence related to their professional development in the content area(s) in which they instruct, and how such learning is implemented and assessed. 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.
- 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 and how such learning is implemented and assessed. 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.

4.G.2 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 sections below outline evidence that either must be provided in support of promotion, or that is optional but possibly beneficial in strengthening one's case for promotion. Detailed lists of various standards (referred to in the sections below as "Criteria") for teaching/advising, research, and service/administration are found

in the TMP Standards document.

- **Required**: A teaching portfolio that contains
    - ✓ A statement of teaching philosophy and demonstration of how it is effectively implemented —**Essential and Significant**
    - ✓ Curriculum vitae
    - ✓ Copies of each annual job letter
    - ✓ A description of professional development activities in relation to content knowledge as well as pedagogical approaches—Essential and Significant.
    - ✓ 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 ratings for instructor effectiveness and course impact.
    - ✓ Curriculum development and course materials (e.g., syllabi, Web-based materials)
    - ✓ Reflections on teaching and learning effectiveness
    - ✓ Special recognitions for teaching, including selection for special teaching activities and selection to teach honors or special courses
    - ✓ Summary of assessment of advising effectiveness
    - ✓ Summary of mentoring activities (Criteria 7-9 of TMP Standards) The following information may be beneficial to provide in an appendix
    - ✓ Signed recommendations and letters from students; student course surveys; clinical or fieldwork supervision evaluations
    - ✓ A summary of students' written comments
    - ✓ 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)
- **Peer reviews of teaching performance** (Teaching Criterion 1)—**Essential and Significant**. 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.
    1. **Optional**: Reviews by peers or TILT 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., Canvas 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
    2. **Required**: Letters from external peer reviewers. These reviewers often will be department heads in peer departments. The procedures described on the Provost's [website](#) will be followed, with the exception that the materials provided to the external reviewers will be limited to what is described in 1-3 above and 6 below (as appropriate).
    3. For promotion to Senior Instructor, 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 "exceeds expectations" or "superior" in teaching.

4. In addition to progressive development on the criteria for Senior Instructor, promotion to Master Instructor requires the following:
   - ✓ Evidence of teaching scholarship must be provided (Criterion 6 of TMP Standards). This would include grants, journal publications, book chapters, and/or books related to teaching and learning. Essential and Significant
   - ✓ Evidence of depth and breadth of leadership in the teaching arena, in addition to teaching scholarship (Criterion 6 of TMP Standards). Essential and Significant
   - ✓ Evidence of leadership related to mentoring (Criteria 8 and 9 of TMP Standards). Essential and Significant

4.G.3 Assessment of Effective Administration and Service.

A combination of:
- ✓ Evidence of effective leadership within the School of Social Work
- ✓ Evidence of significant and effective program development
- ✓ Demonstrated significant contribution to the mission and goals of the School and university as evidenced by successful execution of administrative or managerial duties outlined in appointment terms and described in the TMP Standards (Service criteria 10-13 and Engagement criteria 1-5);
- ✓ Participation in School, college, university committees and functions (necessary but not sufficient)
- ✓ Leadership in School, college, and university committees and functions
- ✓ Receipt of sustained performance evaluations based on position requirements that demonstrate a record of exceeding expectations
- ✓ Demonstrated ability to support, assist, and add value to other faculty in their research, education, and service initiatives.

4.H Disciplinary Action for Faculty

Consult the appendices in the *Manual* that address disciplinary actions related to sexual harassment, discrimination, bullying, and research misconduct.

4.I Mediation and grievance procedures

As stated in Section K of the *Manual*, academic faculty are "covered members" of the university. As such, academic faculty:
- Shall attempt to mediate grievable conflicts prior to filing a grievance complaint.
- Have the right to initiate a grievance in accord with requirements set for in Section K.8 of the *Manual*, The right to grieve.

Section 5: ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS AND STATE CLASSIFIED STAFF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

As described in Section D.1.2 of The Manual, administrative professional positions are positions that are exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes but are not academic faculty positions. The classification of a particular position as an administrative professional position must be coordinated with Human Resource Services. Administrative professionals work to advance the School's mission and vision through their contributions in the domains of service, outreach and practice; research, scholarship and creative activity; and teaching. The various contributions of administrative

professionals across these domains may also be undertaken campus-wide, throughout the state of Colorado, as well as nationally and internationally.

5.A   Annual Performance Evaluation

Administrative professionals shall participate in annual comprehensive evaluations of their performance. Annual evaluations are intended to assist administrative professionals in achieving professional excellence, facilitate their continued professional development, and align their professional interests with their particular job descriptions. Administrative professionals with joint academic appointments shall also use the Administrative Professional Evaluation. The School Director conducts the annual evaluation for Administrative Professionals and joint academic and administrative professionals where there is not an immediate supervisor other than the Director, and those with joint faculty appointments. Annual evaluations are conducted by the immediate supervisors of Administrative Professionals who do not have joint appointments.

The School's policies and procedures for conducting annual reviews are consistent with Section D.5.5 of *The Manual* on the evaluation of administrative professionals.

5.B   Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals

The School follows the guidelines for Administrative Professional employment as indicated by the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section D. The procedures for promotion of Administrative Professionals are outlined in the Promotion and Salary Increase Process for Administrative Professionals and Faculty document.

5.C   Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff

Promotions of State Classified Staff are discussed in Section 3 of the Human Resource Manual: "Employees may be promoted in the following ways: 1. Open competitive and promotional comparative analysis which put the employee on eligible lists for referral to vacant, higher level, positions. 2. Reclassification based on changes in job duties and responsibilities, provided the incumbent employee meets the minimum qualifications for the new level of the position. 3. Satisfactory completion of training in a class identified as an Intern class." According to Human Resource criteria, "Open competitive examinations are open to all state residents who meet the general requirements for that class of work. Promotional examinations are open only to university employees who meet the general requirements for the position classification and who presently occupy a university state classified personnel position or who are on a reemployment list (previously certified employee who was laid off for lack of work, lack of funds, or reorganization). Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) position review requests may be filed when assignments have changed sufficiently to warrant a change in position title. Supervisors or any University employee may initiate these requests once a year. Positions targeted as in-house promotional or training opportunities, and which have gradually accepted related advanced duties, will be audited, and reclassified by State Personnel."

5.D   Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

As described in Section D.5.6 of *The Manual,* all administrative professionals are "employees at will" and their employment is subject to termination by either party at any time. The authority to terminate most administrative professionals has been delegated to the President by the Board. The vice president in charge of an academic School or administrative unit must review and approve any recommendations concerning the termination of administrative professionals on any grounds, except for terminations at

the end of the stated employment period, before the action is presented for final approval.

5.E   Grievance and Mediation Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

As stated in Section K the *Manual*, administrative professionals are "Covered Members" of the university. As such, administrative professionals:
- Shall attempt to mediate grievable conflicts prior to filing a grievance complaint.
- Have the right to initiate a grievance in accord with requirements set for in Section K.8 of the *Manual*, The right to grieve.

Section 6: STUDENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

6.A   Student Employees

Student employees will perform duties that assist in an academic program, routine general labor, and general office duties. These employees are treated as hourly personnel for payroll purposes. Students may be hired as student hourly or work-study employees and are at-will employees. For each fall and spring semester that a Student employee or graduate assistant appointment is in effect, the student must be registered for at least one resident-instruction credit**.**

Students should receive an evaluation at the end of each semester with a formal written evaluation at least once per year. As stated in the CSU Human Resources HR Manual (March 2020), "Supervisors should complete a written evaluation of the student's performance at the following time intervals: Within 30 days of hire (informal with documentation or formal evaluation form), at the time of any pay increases or promotions, after one year of employment, and at the time the position is terminated."

6.B   Graduate Student Evaluation

6.B.1 MSW Students

Procedures for evaluating **MSW students'** performance and progress are detailed in the current MSW Handbook, specifically in the following sections:
- Successful completion of Field Practicum: Students are informed of criteria for evaluating their performance in field via the field education syllabi, orientation, learning plan, and the evaluations, which measure student performance with respect to the program competencies and practice behaviors. Formal polices regarding the NASW Code of Ethics, background check policy, problems in field, procedures for grievances, and evaluation of student performance are documented in the field education materials. These criteria are reviewed in field orientation and discussed in the field education materials for students, field instructors, on-site supervisors, and the affiliated agencies in the field education program.

6.B.2 Ph.D. Students

Procedures for evaluating **Ph.D. students'** performance and progress are detailed in the current Ph.D. Handbook, specifically in the following appendices:
- Appendix E: Procedures for Student Development and Accountability: The mentor and faculty annually evaluate students in terms of low level of concern, high level of concern, or ready for graduation (rating form is Appendix G). Procedures that follow from each category of concern are detailed in Appendices G and H.

- Appendix F: Academic Standards Acknowledgement Form, signed by the student.
- Appendix G: Professional Performance Assessment. This process outline of six competency areas guides faculty members and students in conducting progress reviews, with areas of strength and concern discussed in annual meetings with appropriate faculty members, program directors, and the student.
- Appendix H: Professional Improvement Plan. If the professional performance assessment identifies concerns that need to be addressed, this document provides a description of the outcomes that need to be achieved, the steps needed to achieve the outcomes, a timeline, and consequences for not achieving the identified outcomes.

6.C   Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants

Students enrolling in supervised research work with faculty (i.e., SOWK 495: Independent Study) are expected to have a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or greater. Students enrolling in supervised college teaching (i.e., SOWK 384) will be juniors or seniors who have a cumulative major GPA of 3.00 or greater and a grade of A in the course they will be assisting in. Exceptions may be made based on a compelling written rationale by the supervising faculty to the School Director.

6.D. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants

6.D.1 Graduate Assistantships

The department is responsible for determining whether a student qualifies for a graduate assistantship. All graduate assistants must meet the Graduate Assistantship – Terms and Conditions of Appointment as detailed in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin. Department faculty and program directors can reference policies related to appointing assistants and more on the Assistantship Appointment Policies webpage of the Faculty and Staff section of the CSU Graduate School Website. New Graduate Teaching Assistants are required to complete GTA Training (in Canvas).

6.D.2 GTAs and GRAs in the MSW Program

Information about GTAs and GRAs in the **MSW program** is provided in the section of the MSW Handbook on Graduate Assistants: Each year, graduate assistantships (GA) may be available to full-time graduate students. GA's might take the form of Graduate Teaching or Graduate Research Assistantships. The GA is typically responsible for working 10-20 hours per week throughout the semester. The GA receives compensation for this work based on a formula provided by the University. Depending on the nature of the GA, tuition may or may not be reimbursed at the in-state tuition rate. Roles of a Graduation Research Assistant might include but not limited to: literature reviews, data entry, data cleaning, data transcribing, conducting interviews, facilitating focus group discussions, preliminary data analysis, clerical duties, and proof reading.

6.D.3 GRAs in the Ph.D. Program

Information about GRAs in the **Ph.D. program** is provided in the section of the Ph.D. Handbook on Mentoring for Graduate Research Assistants: A mentoring agreement form must be submitted to the PhD program director at the beginning of each academic year that outlines goals and expectations for both the mentee and mentor and is signed by both parties. This mentoring agreement is intended to support an effective mentor relationship between graduate research assistants and their faculty/research staff mentors. It should outline key goals/tasks and mutually agreed expectations for both parties. The draft agreement is provided in Appendix D of the Handbook.

6.E   Student Grievances

Philosophy of the grievance process--it is the responsibility of an academic school and the faculty to ensure that the learning environment is welcoming and respectful to students, faculty, and administrative staff. Students are expected to adhere to the standards of conduct and personal integrity that are in harmony with the NASW Code of Ethics, the educational goals of the institution, and university regulations and to respect the rights, privileges, and property of other people as outlined in the CSU Code of Conduct and the CSU General Catalog under Policies and Guiding Principles or the Graduate Catalog. See Appendix H for details.

6.F   Student Interest Groups

The School shall encourage and promote the professional and academic development of the undergraduate and graduate students. This shall include support and assistance for student interest groups. At least one School employee shall serve as an adviser to each student interest group.

The School recognizes the Student Association of Social Workers (SASW) as the primary mechanism for student governance, and as an organizing body for student engagement with the School and broader community. The leadership of the SASW includes 4 Program Representatives from the BSW, MSW, MSW Distance, and PhD programs in addition to a President, Communications Coordinator, and Financial Officer. One school employee will be appointed by the School Director to serve as the Adviser to the SASW. Membership in the SASW is extended to all students of the School of Social Work upon enrollment.

The SASW will coordinate the annual election of a BSW Program Student Representative, an MSW Program Student Representative, an MSW Distance Program Student Representative, and a PhD Program Student Representative. These four Program Representatives will each be voting members of School Council during their elected academic year. Program Representatives will be elected by popular vote of the students within each academic program (e.g., BSW students will elect the BSW representative). The Program Representatives are expected to understand and represent, the will of the students in their academic program as they represent their interests within the School Council.

Section 7: PROCEDURES FOR REVISIONS TO SCHOOL CODE

7.A   Signatures Approving of the School Code

The School Code shall be reviewed by the voting faculty (tenured, tenure track, and special appointment faculty) in the year prior to the end of each term of the Director (normally 5 years). This code may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote when a quorum is present. For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. The amendment shall be presented for a first reading and distributed at least one week before such meeting. A second reading will be followed by a vote.

Amendments to the Code may originate with the Director or any eligible voting faculty member at any time. Each amendment will be reviewed by the Director prior to presentation to the full academic 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 School faculty (tenured, tenure track, and special appointment faculty). Appendices to this code may be created or amended by a simple majority vote.

Approvals of the School Code will involve the School Director, Dean, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Provost.

7.B   Relationships to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual

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

Section 8: MENTORING

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 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. Mentoring can occur in a broad sense (e.g., mentorship related to career development or progress to tenure and promotion) or in more limited capacities (e.g., mentorship related to teaching a particular type of class). 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. Mentoring can occur at the School or other levels and can be either formal or informal. See Appendix A for a detailed description of the range of mentoring activities.

8.1   School's 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.
- Mentors should be knowledgeable and competent.
- Interest, empathy, compassion, and respect are essential.
- Mentors should be open, honest, and generous in sharing their experiences, especially difficulties they encountered and how they were solved (or not). Optimism and enthusiasm are valued.
- The ability to clearly communicate constructive feedback is critically important.
- All faculty are expected to share information and provide suggestions and support as part of the department's esprit de corps. Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher, as well as those at the rank of Senior or Master Instructor, have a formal expectation to engage in and report on mentoring activities on an annual basis, as described in Appendix A: "Provides responsive and effective mentorship to colleagues" and "takes a leadership role in mentoring activities."

8.2   Career mentoring

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 pretenure faculty member will be mentored, for the first semester, by the chair of the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee and the School Director. An orientation meeting will typically focus on what mentoring involves, potential benefits, responsibilities, suggestions, and troubleshooting strategies. In subsequent meeting, the TMP 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 School Director and TMP 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 may be included to form a team of mentors. Consideration also should be given to including a nontenure track faculty (CCAF) member (or administrative profession who is an experienced adviser/instructor) to provide support and guidance related to exemplary teaching and advising.

d) CCAF who anticipate applying for promotion shall establish a mentoring group of 2-3 TTF and/or CCAF, in collaboration with the School Director as necessary. Mentoring can occur at the School or other levels, and can be either formal or informal. Mentors assist CCAF in establishing goals and assessing their own performance. The mentoring team can assist new faculty in understanding the department, college, and university expectations for CCAF. Mentors will also serve as a resource to new faculty in the areas of teaching or research, program development, and service/administrative activities, as appropriate.

Section 9: SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION

The School is committed to continuous self-evaluation with the goal of professional and program improvement. Professional evaluation has been described above. The self-evaluation of the school is done through the appointment of an Outcomes Coordinator. This person shall collaborate with the Curriculum and Evaluation Committee and the BSW, MSW, and PhD Directors to identify measures to be used for measuring impacts of curriculum, field education, student learning, and outcomes geared toward assuring the School is meeting criteria for reaccreditation and CSWE EPAS standards. The Outcomes Coordinator also reports data to the University as part of the ongoing reporting.

Data are collected throughout the academic year in specific classes and at specific times. The data are processed and tabulated for reporting purposes. The findings for the prior year are reported to the faculty at the Fall Retreat each year. Any successes are celebrated. Any indications of the School and Programs not meeting their self-imposed goals will be discussed. Adjustments proposed will be deliberated by the Curriculum and Evaluation Committee and recommendations will be put forward. Procedures related to the School evaluation shall be followed as prescribed within the University Code.

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

APPENDIX A

PROMOTION STANDARDS FOR TENURE-TRACK, TENURED, AND CONTRACT/CONTINUING FACULTY

Unanimously Voted and Approved 5.22.17

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
College of Health and Human Sciences
Colorado State University

A. TEACHING, ADVISING, AND MENTORING: Teaching, mentoring, and advising are overlapping activities of vital significance to the professional growth of both student and faculty, and this domain is a key consideration in tenure and promotion decisions. The School of Social Work requires for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure that the candidate must "exceed expectations" for teaching, advising and mentoring. The benefits of effective, individualized, and responsive teaching, mentoring, and advising are seen at both the individual level and at the School level when such efforts are provided to students and to less-experienced faculty, particularly those belonging to underrepresented, disadvantaged, or otherwise disenfranchised groups. Many examples of preferred teaching, mentoring, and advising activities are described below, although it I s recognized that additional activities not listed here might also constitute outstanding performance in the teaching, mentoring, and advising area, and that no one faculty member will engage in all, or perhaps even most, of these activities.

B. ASPIRATIONAL GOAL: Through teaching, advising and mentoring activities, the School promotes student achievement of the program's curricular objectives and professional competencies in all learning contexts.

C. As described in [A Statement on Integrative Learning](#) by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "Integrative learning comes in many varieties: connecting skills and knowledge from multiple sources and experiences; applying skills and practices in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually." To promote integrative learning, faculty are encouraged to strive for the greatest possible congruence of written materials (e.g., course syllabi, study guides, assignments, or readings) with the overall curriculum design. Faculty are also expected to be responsive to University expectations regarding teaching and advising as described in Section E.5.3 [Guidelines on Teaching and Advising](#) of the *Manual*.

Description of Teaching

Teaching is among the most important of faculty responsibilities and can occur in a multiplicity of formal and informal settings. Moreover, the faculty represents a key asset of CSU's School of Social Work. The School's faculty consistently evidence excellence in the area of teaching, mentoring, and advising, whether they are working with BSW, MSW or doctoral students in formal academic or classroom contexts, interacting with students and colleagues and practitioners in the field. Effective, high-quality teaching, mentoring, and advising makes a substantial contribution to the creative development and professional advancement of social work students, social work faculty, and the profession of social work.

The School of Social Work expects its faculty to provide high-quality instruction, to consistently model professionalism and core social work values in their instructional efforts, and to demonstrate expertise in the content areas in which they teach. Faculty are also expected to continuously develop and enhance their

teaching skills, accomplishing this goal in part through participation in activities designed specifically to improve teaching effectiveness and to contribute generally toward ongoing curriculum development. As faculty members progress in their teaching careers, the School of Social Work expects its faculty to assume leadership roles in an array of teaching-related activities, including development of new courses; presentations of lectures, and trainings to the larger University community as well as local, regional, and national public and professional audiences; and to assume key teaching-related administrative roles.

Description of Mentorship

  The School of Social Work places great value on faculty mentoring of students and faculty colleagues. Mentoring has been defined as a professional relationship in which a knowledgeable and experienced person —the mentor—assists another person—the mentee—in developing specific skills and knowledge that will enhance the professional and personal growth of the mentee. Mentors might coach the mentee regarding development of a specific skill or might focus holistically on the mentee's professional development. Mentors can also assist mentees by sharing their resources and professional networks and by encouraging mentees to take professional risks (with substantial payoffs) within the context of a safe learning environment. Mentoring activities can be subdivided into formal and informal activities, and distinguished from activities related to teaching, advising, and coaching. For the purpose of granting tenure and promotion, the School of Social Work gives particular attention to the provision of mentoring to social work students through directing independent study courses and regularly conducting individual consultations with students regarding their professional development; such mentoring is considered especially important in granting tenure and promotion. Similarly, the provision of responsive and effective mentorship to fellow faculty members is highly valued, and can include helping less-experienced faculty colleagues acquire advanced skills and knowledge in rese arch, scholarship, and publication; career development; teaching philosophies, strategies, and techniques; and to otherwise provide social work faculty colleagues with support, expertise, and assistance when needed. Truly exceptional faculty will demonstrate leadership in a number of mentoring areas, including assisting students and faculty members in acquiring grants, winning awards, or publishing in professional journals; exceptional faculty will also provide intensive mentorship and support to students and faculty who are struggling with academic or professional issues.

Service to the BSW Program

  Service in support of the BSW program encompasses a wide range of activities that are essential to maintaining a strong and thriving community of learning. Contributions to the BSW program might include mentoring students for honors theses; planning and/or participating in the BSW advising seminar, Ram Welcome, and graduation events; and participating in student-initiated activities.

Service to the MSW Program

  Service in support of the MSW program encompasses a wide range of activities that are essential to maintaining a strong and thriving community of learning. Contributions to the MSW program might include hiring and mentoring students as research or program assistants; planning and/or participating in the MSW program orientation; assisting with recruitment, post recruitment, and graduation events; and participating in student-initiated activities.

Service to the Doctoral Program

  Finally, service to the School's doctoral program related to the teaching, mentoring, and advising domain can include serving as Chair or Member of doctoral dissertation committees, providing formal and/or informal mentoring to doctoral students, contributing to the teaching mission of the doctoral program,

supervising doctoral student teaching and/or research assistants, and providing administrative leadership to the doctoral program.

Criteria and Evidence for Promotional Review

Table 1 presents the criteria consistent with favorable tenure and promotions decisions; the 15 criteria are categorized in areas of teaching (6 criteria), mentoring (3 criteria), BSW program-related (2 criteria), MSW program-related (2 criteria), and doctoral program-related (2 criteria). In addition, the table includes 99 evidentiary indicants of professionally meritorious activities consistent with fulfillment of the 15 teaching, mentoring, and advising criteria for tenure and promotion. The School recognizes that few faculty will demonstrate excellence across all criteria. However, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have made significant contributions to the teaching mission of the CSU School of Social Work across a range of criteria and to evidence an ongoing commitment to their professional improvement in teaching, mentoring, and advising. Table 1a gives guidelines for evaluation.

Sources and types of information to aid in assessing a candidate's performance in the teaching, mentoring, and advising domain may include student teaching evaluations; peer- observation teaching evaluations; number and breadth of courses taught; number of new courses developed; number and variety of activities completed to enhance teaching, mentoring, and advising skills; receipt of teaching awards; quality of course syllabi; receipt of grants related to pedagogy; publication of instructional curricula and other teaching materials such as textbooks and articles focused on pedagogy; documentation of innovative teaching accomplishments; number of doctoral dissertations chaired; and number of publications co-authored with doctoral and master's degree students. Candidates may compile these and related materials into a teaching portfolio that explicitly addresses their teaching, mentoring, and advising activities and achievements.

Teaching

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
1. Provides high quality instruction	**Effectiveness of teaching materials** • Assures syllabi are in compliance with Master Syllabi requirements. • Clearly communicates course requirements and grading system (S, Student Evaluations [SE]) • Demonstrates consistency among objectives, units of study, and assignments (S) • Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, theories, methods, and techniques in related areas (S) • Develops syllabi of sufficient depth and breadth (S) • Addresses major professional and practice issues pertinent to course content (S) **Effectiveness of course instruction** • Organizes material well and structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning (peer evaluations [PE], SE) • Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students (PE, SE) • Uses a variety of teaching methods and media to respond to varied student learning styles (S, PE, SE) • Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest and thought, pacing material well (PE, SE) • Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level (PE, SE) • Uses flipped classrooms, high impact learning, team-based learning or other cutting-edge pedagogies (PE, SE) • Evaluates students fairly and appropriately (PE, SE) • Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness such as mid-course evaluations (PE, SE) • Receives positive student evaluations (SE) • Receives positive evaluations from direct peer observation (PE) • Has received teaching awards or other professional recognition of teaching excellence (CV, substantiation of awards) • Interacts with students (including those with special educational and behavioral challenges) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn (PE, SE, examples of written feedback provided to students) • Is able to involve students in critical thinking about their academic work and their practice experience (PE) • Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art technological advances (PE, SE) • Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback (SE, examples of written feedback to students) • Is sensitive to students' needs in course work and is able to respond to such needs appropriately (SE) • Has a strong grasp of the knowledge and skills of the field in which he or she teaches and synthesizes such knowledge and skills in course content (S, PE, SE) • Enriches teaching by including stakeholders (e.g., clients, providers, advocates, interdisciplinary experts) in course development and implementation (S, SE)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
2. Models professionalism and the core social work values of service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relation-ships, integrity, and competence	• Creates an affirming and inclusive climate for student learning and professional development (PE, SE) • Consistently models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness (PE, SE) • Creates and fosters learning experiences in and outside of the classroom that help students grow in self-awareness and understanding of privilege and oppression (PE, SE) • Responds appropriately and respectfully to student questions and comments (PE, SE) • Is regularly on time and well prepared for class (PE, SE) • Makes herself or himself available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails (S, SE, and examples of e- mails with time stamps) • Promotes understanding of professional social work values and ethics (PE, SE) • Uses the inherent authority of the faculty position in accordance with the NASW Code of Ethics (PE, SE)
3. Demonstrates expertise in content area	• Has significant practice experience in the course content area and draws on that experience appropriately, thereby demonstrating practice competence in the classroom (CV, PE, SE) • Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area (CV, SE) • Has capacity to integrate theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom (PE, SE) • Guest lectures in the classes of colleagues (CV, PS)
4. Continues to develop and enhance teaching skills; participates in activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness	• Attends faculty development workshops (CV, attendance certificates) • Uses resources from CSU TILT (TP) • Manifests steady progress in teaching expertise, including course preparation, structure, readings, and achievement of course objectives as evidenced by course evaluations (PE,SE) • Exhibits increasing breadth in teaching and instructional experiences over time (PE,SE)
5. Contributes to curriculum development	• Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction (PE, S, SE) • Incorporates current and diverse readings that reflect latest developments in the profession (S) • Makes positive and active contributions to curriculum task groups (CV, PE)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
6. Takes a leadership role in any of the above teaching areas	• Develops new online courses (CV, course descriptions) • Develops and organizes a new certificate program (CV and program description) • Obtains teaching or training-related grants (CV, grant award letters) • Develops innovative technologies and teaching techniques (PE, S, SE, publications) • Publishes social work textbooks (CV) • Publishes other instructional materials (CV) • Directs school-wide educational programs (e.g., BSW Program, MSW Program, PhD program) (CV) • Develops distance education courses (CV, S) • Disseminates new information at professional conferences such as CSWE or SSWR (CV, conference proceedings) • Develops international immersion courses (CV) • Gives presentations/workshops, symposia, and lectures to the greater University community and to local, regional, and national public audiences (CV)

Mentoring

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
7. Provides responsive and effective mentorship to students	• Directs independent studies (TP) • Regularly meets with students around their professional development (SE, TP) • Encourages students to join professional organizations, attend conferences, and make presentations (SE, TP) • Regularly reaches out to individual students from non-dominant groups such as students of color, LGBTQ, international, military, and older students to provide support and advice (SE) • Works with and provides support to student groups (CV) • Continues to provide career advice and mentoring to students after graduation (TP)
8. Provides responsive and effective mentorship to colleagues	• Works collaboratively with other faculty members to provide support, expertise, and assistance when needed (PE) • Mentors less experienced faculty in teaching philosophies, strategies, and techniques (PE) • Mentors less experienced faculty in research, scholarship, career, and skill development (PE)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
9. Takes a leadership role in mentoring activities	• Provides mentorship resulting in students obtaining grants, winning awards, or publishing in highly regarded journals (SE, TP, examples of students' work) • Provides intensive mentorship to struggling students so they are able to successfully complete their programs (SE) • Provides mentorship to junior colleagues resulting in their selection for awards, funding, publishing, or other honors (TP) • Is nominated for or wins a mentoring award (CV, proof of award/nomination)

Service to the BSW Program

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
10. Makes contributions to the School's BSW program	• Mentors BSW students for honors thesis work (CV, TP) • Assists with planning or directly participates in orientation (CV, TP) • Assists with planning or directly participates in BSW advising seminar (CV, TP) • Participates in school recruitment efforts (e.g., information sessions, campus visits, diversity recruitment events), activities for accepted students (e.g., orientation, Fall Kickoff) and/or graduation events. (CV, TP,)
11. Provides leadership to the BSW program	• Supports student-organized activities by assisting with advocacy day, social events, and special curricular events. • Acts as faculty liaison to the BSW Student Group (CV, SE) • Serves as dual degree or certificate program liaison (CV, TP) • Leads a study abroad trip (CV, SE, TP) • Leads a service/research trip (CV, TP) • Develops opportunities for students or initiatives that promote student growth and the BSW program as a whole (CV, TP)

Service to the MSW Program

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
12. Makes contributions to the school's MSW program	• Hires and mentors MSW students for research or program assistantships (CV, TP) • Assists with planning or directly participates in orientation (CV, TP) • Assists with planning or directly participates in MSW professional development workshops (CV, TP) • Participates in school recruitment efforts (e.g., information sessions, campus visits, diversity recruitment events), activities for accepted students (e.g., orientation, Fall Kickoff) and/or graduation events. (CV, TP,) • Supports student-organized activities by assisting with advocacy day, social events, and special curricular events.

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
13. Provides leadership to the School's MSW program	- Acts as faculty liaison to the MSW Student Group (CV, SE) - Serves as dual degree or certificate program liaison (CV, TP) - Leads a study abroad trip (CV, SE, TP) - Leads a service/research trip (CV, TP) - Develops opportunities for students or initiatives that promote student growth and the MSW program as a whole (CV,TP)

Service to Doctoral Program

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents)
14. Makes contributions to the School's doctoral program	- Chairs dissertation committees (CV, TP) - Reviews doctoral program applications (CV, TP) - Serves as a member of a doctoral dissertation committee (CV, TP) - Provides funding for a doctoral student (CV, TP) - Provides formal and informal mentoring to doctoral students (CV, TP) - Supervises and mentors doctoral students as graduate research assistants (CV, TP) - Otherwise contributes to the teaching mission of the doctoral program (CV, TP) - Supervises a doctoral student during his or her teaching practicum (CV, TP) - Receives positive student evaluations for doctoral course instruction (CV, SE, TP) - Receives positive peer observation evaluations for doctoral course instruction (CV, PE, TP) - Participates in preparation and evaluation of doctoral program content and research prelim examinations (CV, TP)
15. Provides leadership to the doctoral program	- Chairs/directs the doctoral program (CV, TP) - Chairs multiple dissertation committees (CV, TP) - Provides funding for multiple students (CV, TP)

Note: **CV** = curriculum vitae; **EL** = external letters; **FAR** = Faculty Activity Report; **LS** = letters of support; **PE** = peer evaluations, **PL** = publications list; **TMP** = Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee review; **PS** = personal statement; **S**= syllabus; **SE** = student evaluations, **TP**= Teaching Portfolio]

Table 1a: 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.

A. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Research-based and extraordinarily effective innovations successfully and systematically incorporated into courses and effectiveness is documented externally Receives funding for course or program redesign Demonstrates impact by external adoption of materials/ curriculum Receives award or formal acknowledgement for curriculum development. Leading Curricular Task Group work with timely and necessary outcomes.	Is acknowledged as "excellent" by internal and/or external peer review Demonstrates innovative pedagogical approaches Creates /engages with new and impactful technology tools Highly engaged in in Curricular Task Group work with some leadership activities. Develops new online/hybrid courses. Chairs student research committee. Integrates knowledge and/or perspectives from other disciplines	Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, theories, methods, evidence base practices, and techniques in related areas Utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art technological advances Makes positive and active contributions to Curricular Task Group work. Member of student research committee. Makes herself or himself available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails Consistently models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness Syllabi are in compliance with Master Syllabi Has a strong grasp of the knowledge and skills of the field in which he or she teaches and synthesizes such knowledge and skills in course content Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness such as mid-course evaluations Develops course materials and course content for first time and is acknowledged as "good" by peer review.	Courses and syllabi out-of-date; Minimal activity in instructional innovation Does not follow Master Syllabi Is not available to students. Evidence of not challenging students appropriately. Evidence that there is nonattendance to issues of diversity and inclusiveness. Operating in contradiction to NASW Code of Ethics Not attending/being engaged in Curricular Task Group work.	Little evidence of coherent course construction; No activity in instructional innovation Does not follow Master Syllabi Disrespectful approaches to student learning needs and differences. Not showing up for class without prior arrangement. Little evidence of maintaining up- to-date knowledge of subject matter. Operating in contradiction to NASW Code of Ethics

II B. CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE (i.e., Teaching) The Department Head will determine expectations based on data provided on CSU departmental evaluations, including range and average, for across 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.

B. CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

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

C. STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
a. Undergraduate Evidence of outstanding advising Student receives award or recognition for mentored project Students present mentored work at research/creativity day	Advises student groups/organizations in addition to regular load Provides supervised research experience	Evidence of good advising	Little evidence of or poor advising	No evidence of or extremely poor advising No student advisees Complaints about bad advising

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

B. **RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP:** Research and scholarship are vital part of advancing the science of our profession and important to teaching quality. Research includes systematic collection and analysis of information for generation of new knowledge, its refinement, application, and/or its capability of solving important social problems. Faculty research contributes to the foundation of the social work knowledge base and creates new scholarship to guide all types of direct and macro social work practice and policy. Table 2 delineates the research activities and the measurement of these activities for tenure and promotion evaluations. The overarching goal is to evaluate the candidate's conceptual, theoretical, and empirical contributions to knowledge development.

1. Demonstrated thematically focused[1] scholarship that contributes to knowledge in area(s) of expertise in relationship to a scholarly agenda, college mission, profession/associated disciplines, and societal needs: publication record.
2. Demonstrated impact of the work and influence on the work of others.
   - "White Papers" that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice
   - Invitations to present the work, conduct 'webinars' or other media presentations of the work, visiting scholars coming to learn about the work
   - Indices of others' use of candidate's work (e.g., ResearchGate, Google Scholar)
   - Students/post-doctoral graduates continue to extend candidate's scholarly impact in their own work post-graduation
   - Competitive peer-reviewed funding is awarded to support the work
   - Grants/contracts awarded to support outreach and engagement activities related to the

---

[1] "Thematic focus" is indicated by the candidate. If a candidate's area of inquiry or the central theme of the work includes subthemes, these should be discussed along with how they connect to the main theme. If more than one main theme is relevant, the candidate should clearly identify how they are interconnected.

body of work
- Recruited to provide consultation to others around the body of work

3. **Pattern of ongoing research/scholarly productivity**
- Productivity continues over time (e.g., external reviewer feedback concerning how productivity relates to norms in the field
- Evaluating patterns of productivity should take into consideration variations in candidate's assigned workload distribution, as well as the time and effort necessitated by developing new collaborative partnerships and/or new project start-up
- Continued competitive and/or peer-reviewed funding of the work

4. **Demonstrated unique contributions to a line of inquiry and/or work is innovative**
- External reviewer feedback that candidate has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession
- Narrative concerning the rationale for the research/scholarly activities presents convincing argument that the line of inquiry is unique and important
- Other indicators that the work is innovative in terms of methodology, perspective, and/or is an emerging area of scholarship/inquiry

5. **Emerging reputation as a scholar in the field**
- Recognition by professional organizations and/or statement by external reviewers that the candidate is beginning to become recognized by others for scientific or scholarly contributions
- Invitations to present at recognized forums
- Invitations to review abstract submissions, manuscripts, or grant proposals in the field
- Beginning trend of positive citations in others' published work
- Graduate student/postdoctoral fellowship applicants selecting the program at OSU because candidate will serve as a mentor

6. **Research and scholarly activities conducted ethically and with integrity. Conduct of research and scholarly activities, including but not limited to:**
- full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research conducted
- ethical treatment of all collaborators (e.g., students, postdoc fellows, junior faculty, community partners)
- adherence to ethical and integrity principles for publication, presentation, and other forms of dissemination

Criteria and Evidence for Promotional Review

Table 2 presents 14 criteria related to research and scholarly activity. Under these criteria are listed 33 individual evidentiary indicants of professionally meritorious activities consistent with fulfillment of these 14 criteria. The School requires one to "exceed expectations" for promotion and tenure to Associate Professor. Table 2a gives guidelines for evaluation.

The first five criteria are **essential** elements of scholarship and must be met. Some candidates will choose some or all of the next nine criteria (Criteria 6 thru 14) to demonstrate excellence. Criteria 6 through 14 can be considered specific indicators of the fundamental activities explicated in Criteria 1 thru 5. Tenure track faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure should demonstrate an ability to support their research agendas. Candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate that their work is increasingly interdisciplinary, impactful, (as evidenced by publications, affiliations, and collaborative relationships) and has a national impact on the science and practice of social work. Faculty should display an increasingly independent and autonomous track record for securing grant and contract support as they are promoted through the faculty ranks. Faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor should display skills to lead increasingly complex research projects as a

Principal Investigator, as well as, support junior faculty colleagues and doctoral students within the School.

 The benchmarks for research and creative activity are based on a standard workload, which provides 40% effort in this area. If a faculty member's workload differs from the standard, it is expected that the benchmarks for productivity will be calibrated accordingly.

Table 2. Research and Scholarship

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
1. Shows mastery of subject matter—ESSENTIAL & SIGNIFICANT	• Establishes identity within the field beyond School; ultimately has national or international reputation (External letters [EL]). • Respected for written work; Evidence supports candidate's status as a • leader in the field (EL) • Applies sophisticated methodological techniques (TMP review) • Demonstrates forward progression of knowledge and theory with written materials (TMP, publications list [PL]) • Uses range of formats/journals for work[1] (CV, TMP) • Increasingly assuming leadership and contributes to collaborations
2. Displays creativity/originality of work— ESSENTIAL & SIGNIFICANT	• Articulates how work contributes to field in new ways (Personal statement [PS]. • Demonstrates originality of work (EL) • Impact in light of innovation/newly emerging area (EL, PS, CV) • Makes particularly creative contributions (EL, PS)
3. Develops external funding for research— ESSENTIAL & SIGNIFICANT	• Submits proposals to support research (CV) • Secures external funding to support research within the School (gov't, • industry, private sector) [2] (CV) • Funding leads to peer-reviewed publications • Significant leadership role in one or more research teams as PI, Co-PI or Co-I (CV, PL) • Funding leads to focused record of scholarship (CV, PL)
4. Completes data collection, analysis, dissemination— ESSENTIAL & SIGNIFICANT	• Publishes: journals[3], reports. (CV, Letters of Support [LS], TMP, PS, PL, grant proposals). • Develops data collection tools and protocols necessary to carry out planned research (CV, dossier materials)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
5. Disseminates scholarship— ESSENTIAL & SIGNIFICANT	• Works in peer-reviewed journals; presentations; conference proceedings[4] (PL) • Publishes consistently; Impact on the field (EL, TMP) • Publishes at increasing magnitude over time • Clear evidence indicative on continued scholarship beyond promotion • Demonstrates evidence of scholarship impact: citation counts, downloads, impact factors for journals used (PS) • Presents at competitive conferences (TMP) • Presentations evolve into publications in a timely manner • H-factor, journal ranking, citation index, etc. for quality • Research/scholarship awards/honors
6. Engages in professional development	• Presents at workshops or in additional classes to increase knowledge and skill (CV) • Articulates plan for future professional development (PS) • Demonstrates willingness to mentor others and takes on increasingly complex assignments (CV, PS, dossier materials).
7. Engagement: Demonstrates ability to work on complex projects with collaborators at local, state, national, and/or international levels. [5]	• Engages with the field, provides consultation and guidance (CV, LS) • Collaborates on teams or task forces with the purpose of identifying areas of new research • Provides feedback and letters of support from colleagues in agencies and communities (EL, letter from supervisor)
8. Works across disciplinary lines, including publishing in journals outside of social work.	• Candidate's scholarship is used across disciplines, and within the practice community (CV, LS). • Publishes in interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journals (PL)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
9. Develops and/or evaluates social interventions	• Develops manuals for funded applied research (Provides copies of program manuals[6]) • Provides copies of funded program reports [7] • Engages in the creation of tools, protocols, methodologies, or manuals used within the profession in the process of conducting research (PL; presentations)
10. Conducts program evaluations	• Generates grant proposals, contracts (CV)
11. Engages in research translation	• Reports to funders, stakeholders; conferences (CV)
12. Engages in community- based research	• Provides letters of support from agencies and/or collaborators (LS)
13. Develops and facilitates workshops/trainings	• Compiles agenda and compilation of evaluations
14. Experiments with new forms of scholarly work using digital communications	• Generates scholarly work in the following innovative ways: blogs, social media use, website development, DVDs are considered in evaluating candidate's scholarship.[8]

Note: **CV** = curriculum vitae; **EL** = external letters; **LS** = letters of support; **PL** = publications list; **TMP** = Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee review; **PS** = personal statement

---

[1] Tenure track faculty should publish in a range of high-quality journals. The quality of the journals will be considered in the review process. The faculty member should discuss evidence for the quality and appropriateness for her or his journal selections in the personal statement. At the time this document was developed, open access social work journals have proliferated; however, their quality, value, and impact remains uneven. The faculty member is advised to consult senior faculty members concerning their opinions about different publication outlets. Candidates should choose interdisciplinary journals as often as possible.

[2] Faculty should display an increasingly independent and autonomous track record for securing grant and contract support as they are promoted through the faculty ranks. Tenure track faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure should demonstrate an ability to support their research agendas. Faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor should display skills to lead increasingly complex research projects as a Principal Investigator, as well as, support junior faculty colleagues and doctoral students within the School.

[3] Peer-reviewed journal publications have historically been a key element in evaluation of applications for tenure. Senior faculty and external reviewers will always judge both the quality and quantity of articles in the candidate's dossier. Quality and quantity are commonly highly correlated. The School of Social Work has not set a specific number of publications needed for promotion to a higher rank but the candidate must "exceed" expectations in both research and teaching. Dossiers for promotion to Full Professor must document publication activities significantly beyond the candidate's track record from Assistant to Associate Professor. Candidates are advised to seek guidance from senior faculty and mentors if questions arise concerning publication quality and quantity.

[4] These different vehicles for scholarship dissemination do not have equivalent weight in dossier reviews. Senior faculty, mentors, and supervisors should be consulted when questions arise concerning where to invest energy in publishing one's scholarship. For example, presentations and conference proceedings are commonly not given the same weight as peer-reviewed publications in promotion dossiers for tenure-track faculty

[5] Engaged scholarship is an emerging area on campus and in the field. This form of scholarship addresses a critical public concern and advances projects with extensive community collaborations and involvement (e.g., community - based participatory research). Candidates in this area should be given latitude to demonstrate research impact in multiple ways beyond the number of peer-reviewed publications.

[6] Development of a new program manual can be a significant contribution to social work practice. At the same time, the submission of an unpublished program manual in tenure and promotion dossiers usually does not have equivalent weight to peer-review publications.

[7] Reports to funders may be weighted differently in tenure track versus nontenure track faculty promotion dossiers. For tenure-track dossiers, reports to funders usually do not hold the weight of peer-reviewed publications. For nontenure track faculty, generating reports to funders might be central to their job duties, making these reports an important part of their promotion dossiers.

[8] Scholarship dissemination is evolving in new ways based on technological innovations. Faculty members are encouraged to explore innovative ways to disseminate their scholarship and make an impact upon the field. At the time of this update, it is unclear how these new forms of scholarship dissemination should be weighted within promotion dossiers. Junior faculty seeking promotion should consult with senior faculty to understand evolving attitudes in this area.

Table2a: Research and Creative Activities: Each area must be addressed in rating. THIS TABLE IS A GUIDE AND NOT INTENDED AS A RIGID/INFLEXIBLE METRIC. ASSESSMENTS SHOULD BE WEIGHTED BASED UPON TABLE 2 AND GUIDELINES BELOW.

A. Research Trajectory—Peer Reviewed, Scientific Articles

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
3 or more Published Articles & 2 under review	3 Published Articles or 2 Published & 2 under review	2 Published Articles or 1 published article and 2 under review	1 or more articles in process	No publication activity

B. Contract and Grant Development

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
PI or Co-PI of 1 or more federally or nationally funded external grants or contracts	Co-PI of 1 or more federally funded contract or grant. Or 1 funded state grant that has data showing it had similar review criteria and funding rate as NIH. or 1 federal grant as PI submitted in review period that was discussed	PI on 1 or more local, state or internally funded grants Or 2 local/state grants submitted	Key personnel or consultant for an externally funded grant	No involvement in internally or externally funded grant activity

C. Professional Presentations *

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
4 Peer Reviewed (PR) National or international Presentations	3 PR National or International Presentations	2 PR National Presentations	State or local presentations only	No presentations

Guidelines for Evaluation: A mix of articles and grants/contracts provides the primary evidence used in this system. Two questions need to be addressed:

1. Productivity – Relative to complexity of topic and research methods
2. Quality and impact – of research publications related to area, journal ranking, citation scores, impact factors and H-Index

THE ABOVE EVALUATION RATINGS MAY BE INFLUENCED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

- Data from Table 2
- Significance, scope, complexity, dollar amount of the contract or grant funding source such as highly competitive national sources such as NIH/CDC/NSF compared state or private funding
- Is funding leading to the dissemination of knowledge through peer-reviewed journal articles
- Quality of grant critiques
- Sustained/ongoing grant writing and award activities
- Sustained/ongoing record of peer-reviewed journal articles
- Research award

Note: It is not unusual for highly respected journals in social work to have either a low or no impact factor in which case the candidate is responsible for making the case for their quality and impact.

B. **ENGAGEMENT:** Faculty performance for purposes of appointment, promotion, and tenure will include the evaluation of a domain called *engagement*. Faculty engagement includes scholarly, pedagogical, and creative activities for the public good. Engagement includes public service and scholarship emanating from collaborative activities outside of what we have seen as our traditional scholarly community.

Faculty demonstrate engaged scholarship by bringing knowledge development from within the University and partnering with practitioners, scholars, and the public for the cocreation and application of new knowledge. Engaged faculty collaborate with individuals, organizations, and communities to apply that knowledge for the betterment of the community, state, nation, and world.

Suggested evidence of engagement involves work across interdisciplinary lines. It includes community entities associated with our School, the larger University, our profession, state, and global community. Engagement activities include traditional knowledge production, new knowledge co-creation, and knowledge transfers and exchanges that not only heighten individual and collective performance but also have short- and long-term effects that benefit all those involved.

Criteria and Evidence for Promotional Review

Table 3 presents five criteria consistent with favorable tenure and promotion decisions for faculty candidates. In addition, the table lists 33 evidentiary indicants of professionally meritorious activities consistent with fulfillment of these five criteria. Not all faculty members will focus on all of these criteria; however, expertise must be demonstrated in critical subsets to demonstrate a significant level of engagement.

Table 3. Engagement

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
1. Supports the mission and functioning of the School	- Participates in leadership positions on School committees (CV, PS) - Participates in program leadership positions within the School that involve personnel management responsibilities (LS, PS) - Draws on current literature and research in developing and revising policies and programs (PS) - Contributes to the creation of established protocols and operational policies (PS) - Participates in School and student sponsored events (CV, PS) - Integrates external perspectives in the School's operation (EL, PS)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
2. Supports the mission and functioning of the College and University	• Participates as an engaged member of committees (CV, PS). • Participates in leadership position(s) on College/University committees (CV) • Contributes to the creation of efficient and effective communication and collaboration between the college/university and the school (EL) • Engages in personnel responsibilities that foster effective college/university and School collaboration (EL, PS). • Draws upon research and literature in contributing to, developing and revising interdisciplinary policies, collaboration and programs (EL, S). • Participates in college/university sponsored events that showcase the School and its faculty (CV, EL, PS). • Contributes to the creation of collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the School and college/university (EL, PS)
3. Supports the mission and functioning of the Profession	• Participates in leadership position(s) on external professional committees (CV, PS) • Participates in leadership position(s) on external committees such as an editorial board, a manuscript reviewer or abstract reviewer or grant reviewer. • Active membership on professional board(s) that support and guide the profession (CV, EL, PS) • Contributes to creating and sustaining effective communication and collaboration between the school, external professional groups, and university (EL, PS) • Disseminates findings and activities of professional boards and committees to colleagues, students, and field (EL, PS) • Strengthens professional policies and programs by integrating research and evidence based policies and practices (CV, EL,PS). • Positions the profession as clear contributor to the solution of society's complex challenges with the University and larger community (CV, EL,LS, PS).

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
4. Collaborates with others to respond to short- and long- term community, state, and national needs and issues.	• Participates in leadership position(s) with community, state and/or national organizations that impact the welfare of individuals, families and communities (CV, EL, PS). • Serves on external administrative and/or governing boards with community, state and/or national organizations that impact the welfare of individuals, families and communities (CV, EL, PS) • Presents research and evidence-based findings in presentations before boards, study commissions and/or legislative bodies whose work impacts the public (CV, EL, PS) • Recognized with honors and tributes for scholarship, teaching and pedagogy, and/or distinguished service (CV, EL, PS) • Provides leadership and consultation regarding program development, implementation, and/or workforce development with external state and/or national organizations (CV, EL, PS) • Contributes to the design, redesign or adaption of policies and practices that impact service delivery to individuals, families and communities through capacity building technical assistance (CV, EL, PS) • Disseminates and translates knowledge to promote adoption by external organizations of research and evidence based policies and practices through conferences, workshops, other media, training, technical assistance, consultation, and/or user oriented publications (CV, EL, PS, LS) • Contributes to collaborative learning experiences with external community, state and national partners that improve student and practitioner knowledge and skills (CV, EL, PS)

Criteria	Evidence (Supporting Documents
5. Foster research, education, and engagement with the global community	• Participates in program leadership position(s) at the international and global level that influence practice and policy (CV, EL, PS) • Participates on and contributes to the efforts of international and global committees, whose works influences practices and policies that impact individuals, families, communities, and nations (CV, EL, PS). • Employs and draws upon research and evidence-based practices and policies to inform the design of practices and policies at the international and global level (CV, EL, PS). • Demonstrates ability to create and facilitate collaborative relationships that positively impact practice and policy at the international and global level (CV, EL, PS). • Demonstrates the contributions of the discipline and profession to the work of international and global organizations engaged in serving diverse populations (CV, EL, PS, LS). • Creates and supports opportunities for students to participate in and contribute to the efforts of international and global organizations committed to improving the welfare of diverse populations (CV, EL, PS).

Note: **CV** = curriculum vitae; **EL** = external letters; **LS** = letters of support; **PL** = publications list; **TMP** = Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee reviews; **PS** = personal statement

TABLE 3a: Service and Outreach Criteria

To reach any of the rating levels, the service activity for service/leadership roles, committee participation, and community must be equivalent to the criteria identified in any two categories.*

A. Professional service/leadership

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Elected or appointed to a leadership position in a national, international, regional, state professional organization related to social work or social work education	Committee service in professional organizations related to the social work or social work education	Participation in professional activity that promotes the knowledge, skills or values of the profession	Infrequent service in the social work profession	No service activity in the social work profession

And/or

B. University, College, School service, outreach, and leadership

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Leadership position in the University's or College's organizational structure that promotes the School's goals/interests	Participation on two or more College, or University committees or Chair of a standing committee in the School's organizational structure.	Participation on one College or University committees and Regular participation and membership in one School committee	Minimal participation on one School committee	No involvement in committee activity

And/or

C. Community service, outreach, and leadership

Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Three or more community presentations, workshops and Leadership role in 2 or more community organizations	Two community presentations or workshops to community groups and Leadership role in 1 community organization	One community presentation or workshop to a community group and Service role in 1 or more community organizations	No community presentations or No involvement in community organizations	No community presentations and No involvement in community organizations

THE ABOVE EVALUATION RATING MAY BE RAISED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

- Outreach activity in behalf of the School
- Data from Table 3
- Administrative duties assigned by the School's Director
- Nominee or recipient of award for service activities
- Exceptional activity in time, scope, or importance

Note: Scholarship-related activity that will be counted as service: Member of Editorial Board, Reviewer for journals or book(s), Reviewer of abstracts for conference presentations.

*For tenure track faculty it is important to develop a national or international recognition related to an area of expertise and therefore focus on sections A & B above is recommended.

APPENDIX B

Promotion Standards for CCAF: Professor and Instructor Ranks

Instructor

Minimum Requirements:

MSW and at least 2 years post-MSW relevant experience
Master's degree in a relevant discipline may be substituted if teaching in nonpractice courses
LCSW preferred for teaching clinical practice courses

Responsibilities: Teaching Administration (Service)

Senior Instructor

Minimum Requirements:

MSW and at least 5 years at .75 FTE or more at instructor or equivalent higher ed experience

1. Consistent excellence

2. Professional development

3. Mentoring

4. Course development/improvements

5. Professional service

Assistant Professor Clinical or Research

Minimum Requirements:
PhD, DSW, or equivalent terminal degree for non-social work professions (e.g., JD)

Responsibilities for all TTF ranks: Teaching + [Research and/or Service] Research + [Teaching and/or Service]

Master Instructor

Minimum Requirements:
MSW and at least 5 years at .75 FTE or more years at senior instructor or equivalent higher ed experience

Scholarship and Leadership – see TMP Standards

Associate Professor Clinical or Research

Minimum Requirements:
At least 5 years at .75 FTE or more @ Assistant Professor or equivalent higher ed experience

Professor Clinical or Research

Minimum Requirements:

At least 5 years at .75 FTE or more @ Associate Professor or equivalent higher ed experience

Note: This table describes minimum requirements for applying for promotion at different ranks. Specific criteria for promotion are found in Sections 4.F, 4.G, and Appendix A: Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track, Tenured, and Contract/Continuing Faculty.

APPENDIX C

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance. If a faculty member is employed for a semester or two-semesters and does not plan to be rehired, s/he should still be evaluated, though this evaluation rests with the Director.

Comprehensive annual and periodic reviews of performance are designed to allow faculty members the opportunity to reflect on the past year of activities and endeavors and describe and critique their work. As indicated in the *CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual,* the performance of the faculty member should be judged in relation to the following categories: teaching and advising; research and other creative activities; and, service and/or outreach (See Section E.14). Each faculty member is responsible for submitting documentation or examples of their work in order to provide those persons responsible for the evaluation with the necessary material on which to make judgments.

The annual review of pretenure faculty is initiated by the Tenure, Merit and Promotion Committee *(TMP)*, working in concert with the school director. Faculty are informed early in the academic year of the date for submission of annual merit review materials to the committee. The procedures for evaluation of the faculty in the School of Social Work are designed to provide each person with the opportunity to describe her/his accomplishments, successes, and challenges in the areas of teaching, research and creative activities, and service and outreach to the TMP Committee and the Director of the School. Faculty members are asked to discuss the direction(s) they plan to take in the upcoming year as part of the annual review process. Thus, faculty, in concert with the School, can reflect on the calendar year period, stepping back from their day-to-day activities. Because faculty members are at different points in their professional development processes, each annual evaluation should also examine progress in the career ladder. The annual review process parallels the University Tenure and Promotion criteria as specified in the *CSU Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual* (C.2.5 & E.14).

Workload percentages of time devoted to each category of expected faculty activity (and the "other" category) are to be provided by the School Director.

The guidelines and measurement criteria (Tables I, II & III) described in this document, should be viewed as a general expression of the expected standards for faculty productivity, and should not be seen as inflexible.

Faculty Performance Assessment Format for Merit Review

The multiple page format (below) is used by all full-time faculty members who have academic appointments, i.e., lecturer, assistant, associate, and full professor. Persons with administrative assignments or other nonteaching responsibilities (e.g., field director, baccalaureate program director) also use this format; yet, these administrative assignments and responsibilities are evaluated by the immediate supervisor rather than the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion (TMP) Committee.

Faculty are to evaluate their performance during the **previous calendar year** (January through December) in line with the university and college goals and the school's mission and goals. It is recognized that all activities may not fall into these areas, yet part of being a member of this academic community requires faculty to devote a significant part of his or her effort to assisting the university, college, and school in achieving those broad aims.

A recommended format will be provided to faculty for compiling their report of yearly activities about the end of the fall semester by the TMP Committee. This format also allows the faculty member the opportunity to identify professional activities for the upcoming year. This format may be updated from time to time by the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion (TMP) Committee and submitted to faculty for approval. The School Directors will meet with faculty each spring semester to review with the faculty, TMP committee evaluation and his/her own summary statements. This evaluation is provided to each faculty member in a copy of the "Colorado State University: Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report," with the faculty member's appointment information completed and the percent of workload data computed. Faculty members need only identify any errors on this form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING EACH SECTION OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW FORM

Update your Digital Measures files

Faculty should submit, at a minimum, the following materials:

1. The CSU: Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report form with any corrections noted.
2. A cover letter (narrative statement) summarizing reflections and rating his or her own performance in each of the three areas: teaching, research and creative activities, and service and outreach. In addition, include a paragraph describing your goals related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in the areas of teaching, research, and service/outreach (as appropriate). How have you informed yourself in the past year about DEI?
3. Relevant background materials including those as indicated below.
4. An updated Curriculum Vitae

Teaching and Advising

% of Workload: spring semester_____, fall semester _____(must equal the workload percentage provided by the School Director)

Information Sources
In addition to the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy that might be included in cover letter/narrative statement, the faculty member should provide documentation that includes but is not limited to:

1. Student evaluation face sheet summary for each class using the CSU teaching evaluation instrument). The faculty member must submit evaluations from all courses taught during the year.
2. Peer teaching evaluation summary.
3. Notification of nominations for or receipt of award or recognition for teaching
4. Miscellaneous materials that reflect quality of teaching, attention to teaching experience, teaching portfolio, innovative teaching techniques and/or approaches, etc.
5. Unsolicited signed letters/notes from students, etc.

Guidelines for Evaluation
In general, it is expected that each faculty member's classroom instruction will reflect adherence to the school's curriculum and that each course will be appropriately planned, use current materials and creative methods to achieve course objectives, and that the faculty member's communication skills will be judged adequate to accomplish course learning goals. In regard to student advising, faculty members should be viewed as available to students outside of class during regularly scheduled office hours. An important aspect of advising is serving on or chairing MSW or PhD research committees. Professional presentations that are essentially a teaching activity (e.g., seminars, workshops) should reflect accurate and effective transmission of knowledge and skills to professional audiences. In

addition, faculty members are encouraged to present materials describing any <u>unique teaching/advising</u> contributions the person has made and to suggest how that unique contribution might appropriately be evaluated.

Evaluative criteria for assessment
See Table I and Ia.

Research/Scholarship/Contract and Grant Activity

% of Workload: spring semester_____, fall semester _____) (must equal the workload percentage provided by the School Director)

Information Sources
In addition to one's own narrative description and critique of his or her scholarly activity, the faculty member should supply documentation that includes but is not limited to:

1. Copies of publications, with publication date and evidence of peer review if not on TMP list of peer reviewed journals. In addition, published materials are prepared by multiple authors the faculty member should provide an indication of the role he or she played in that scholarly effort.
2. Copy of scholarly paper(s) presented at national or international conferences
3. Copy of monograph or other research or creative activity(ies)
4. Copy of grants submitted, and relevant correspondence related to grant/contract/award, as well as indication of the role the faculty member played in preparing the application.
5. Notification of nominations for or receipt of award for research or creative activity
6. Narrative description of grant or contract implementation activity. If multiple people carried out the research or contract activities, the faculty member should provide an indication of the role he or she played in that effort.
7. List of current research committees (master's and doctorate) and honors theses.

Criteria for evaluating professional growth shall include: significant and sustained contributions of high quality to the field: a well-developed, coherent, and focused research plan: originality of thought and creativity; a demonstrated capacity for independent intellectual progress; and innovative contributions to the body of knowledge.

Primary: A mix of articles and grants/contracts, provides the primary evidence used in this system. The grids provided in tables sections A, B and C of table IIa provide suggested ranges related to publications, grants/contracts and presentations. Two questions need to be addressed:

1. Productivity – Relative to complexity of topic and research methods and if working alone in an area of inquiry or with a group, such as on a grant.
2. Quality and impact – of research publications related to area, journal ranking, citation scores, impact factors and H-Indexes[2].

Supplemental: Additional evidence of research and scholarship that supports the primary evidence may include: presentation of peer reviewed scholarly papers; invited publications; awards, honors received; journal or book editing; and leadership of and participation in grant, contract submissions.

The candidate is required to make a case for his/her research trajectory and is in the best position to

---

[2] Note: It is appropriate to describe work in progress in the faculty member's narrative statement, but that effort will not be counted as productivity until it is actually published, funded, or presented.

discuss the quantity and quality of their work relative to a specific area of inquiry.

Evaluative criteria for assessment
See Table II and IIa.

University/Professional/Community Service

% of Workload: spring semester_____ , fall semester _____) (must equal the workload percentage provided by the School Director)

Information Sources
Faculty members should describe and critique their service activities in the cover letter/narrative statement. Documentation should include but not be limited to:

1. Evidence of presentations (to community or general public) presented at local, state, national, and international conferences
2. Copies of materials relevant to service activity, or outreach
3. Copies of letters received related to service/outreach activity

Guidelines for Evaluation
It is expected that each faculty member will be engaged in service activities that benefit the social work program, the College of Applied Human Sciences, Colorado State University, the profession of social work, and/or the broader community (i.e., contributions to the good of society). The work undertaken is expected to be responsibly performed and judged to be effective in accomplishing the intended goals.

Evaluative criteria for assessment
See Table III and IIIa.

Other Assigned Responsibilities

(% of Workload) (should equal the workload percentage provided by the School Director)

Information sources
The faculty member having other assignments such as administrative roles or a "buy- out" of time from the school should describe and critique these activities. Materials appropriate for documenting the performance of the tasks should be presented when appropriate.

Guidelines for evaluation
The performance of these responsibilities is expected to represent high quality work that enhances achievement of the School's mission.

Evaluative criteria for assessment
Evaluative criteria for "other" activities are to be established with the Director of the School.

APPENDIX D

Promotion and Tenure at Colorado State University

Rick Miranda, Provost
Revised February 2013

Process at CSU

Upon hiring, the offer letter should indicate the rank of the position, and indicate the academic year that a consideration for promotion to the next rank (and tenure if applicable) will be made. (This is the 'years of prior service credit' detail.) In the year of consideration, the faculty member will assemble their dossier (typically in the summer) and consult with the Chair and/or the department's P&T committee to develop a list of external reviewers, from whom reference letters are sought. There is a template for the dossier provided on the Provost's web site that should be used.

In the late fall, when the dossier and external letters are in hand, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Department, in conjunction with the faculty eligible to vote, will make a recommendation to the Chair. This follows procedures outlined in the departmental code, and different Departments have different processes for this step. The best practice seems to be that a small ad hoc P&T Committee assists the candidate and the Chair in developing the materials, and that Committee makes a presentation to the full faculty, who provide a recommendation via a written vote. The Chair of the P&T Committee then summarizes the case in a written memo to the Chair, and reports the vote of the faculty.

Occasionally some of the faculty members in the department have serious conflicts of interest with respect to the case (e.g. a relative, or a past formal advisor) and in these cases discussions should be had with the Chair and/or Dean, that may lead to a recusal. It is of paramount importance in these steps that our faculty candidates have solid assurance of fairness and an expectation of balance in considering clear outlier opinions. Absent this, our commitment to the primacy of the faculty's decision comes with a responsibility to provide good-faith peer assessments based on the factual written record and not to abstain from making recommendations in difficult and/or contentious cases.

The Chair then writes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean writes a recommendation to the Provost. Again, different Colleges have slightly different processes for this step, but it is typical that the Dean obtains advice from some group, either a college-level committee or the collection of associate deans and chairs. This assists the Dean in ensuring that processes have been correctly followed and helps to standardize (to the extent that this is possible) the metrics and criteria that different Department faculties may be employing in making their judgments. Following each recommendation, the faculty candidate has the right to supply a written comment, which also becomes part of the dossier.

The full dossiers (without the appendices), including the external letters, and the recommendations from the faculty, Chair, and Dean, and any responses from the candidate, form the core of the material for the Provost-level review. We have lately been asking that this material be provided electronically, in a .pdf file. At the Provost's level, each dossier is studied by the Provost, the Vice-Provosts, and the VPR, and that group meets and discusses each case. Cases that are straightforward are recommended to the President for action. Those that are not are set aside for additional review by the Council of Deans.

Generally, we have asked for the additional review in the following situations:

- The case is early.
- The recommendations (faculty, chair, dean) are not in agreement.
- The recommendations are in agreement, in the negative.
- The faculty vote is not a strong majority.
- The external letters express some significant concerns.

Occasionally we bring cases to the Council of Deans even though we do not have significant concerns, but the case has some illustrative aspect that we could all benefit from exploring. Following the Council of Deans discussion, the Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The Provost and President meet to discuss the cases, and the President presents the final recommendations to the Board, generally at their May meeting.

The Clock

Our general policy here is that, after five years in rank, a promotion is considered not to be an early action. For the case of hiring an assistant professor, say in the summer of 2010, the promotion to associate professor would be considered in the fall of 2015. If successful, the promotion would be effective on July 1, 2016, and the rank of Associate Professor would begin then. In the summer of 2021, the faculty member will have had five years at this rank, and could be considered for promotion to Full Professor in the fall of 2021, and this action would not be "early." In the case above, the tenure decision would also be made as part of the same process in the 2015-16 year.

The period of time a tenure-track professor spends as a nontenured assistant professor is called the probationary period, and it is a rather strict expectation that this will not last more than six years (with the decision being made in that final sixth year). Our faculty manual provides a mechanism for extending the probationary period, with approval; common reasons we generally support include having needed family medical leave.

We occasionally hire assistant professors who have had some prior academic experience. We have the ability to shorten the probationary period, and give "prior service credit" toward the promotion and tenure clock. This should be explicitly stated in the offer letter – we have been rather strict about not giving prior service credit retroactively, after the hiring process.

I have written the above thinking mostly about the hiring of an assistant professor – but similar principles apply when we hire at the associate level. There is not a prescribed probationary period, but the expectations for when a tenure decision or a promotion (to full) decision could be made and not be considered early, would optimally be spelled out in the offer letter.

Early Promotions

Our process does permit the consideration of early promotions, i.e., in a year earlier than that specified in the offer letter, or earlier than five years in rank. Our philosophy has been that such a case must be "well above the bar" – it is not sufficient simply to have a solid case that would be clearly successful if it were on time. Moreover, the standard rises exponentially with the number of years that the case is early. A recent Dean has expressed the opinion that a one-year early case must be well above the bar, one of the best cases seen in the College in the recent past; and a two-year early case must require winning a Nobel Prize! That may be overstating things, but the principle of dramatically escalating the criteria the earlier the case is considered is certainly in force here at CSU.

The rationale is that, as an institution, one of the aspects of the tenure and promotion decision is that we are interested in the ability of the faculty member to sustain productivity over a long time - a career. The shorter the period that productivity is demonstrated, the weaker that 'sustainability' argument may be. An early case should be discussed at both the Dean and the Provost level before being encouraged to be brought forth.

Annual and Midpoint Evaluations

Annual evaluations, and the 'midpoint' evaluation during the probationary period, are important documents for our assistant professors. They should serve to give valuable feedback on performance and progress towards tenure, so that any necessary adjustments can be made well before the moment of truth. They also serve as a record of formal communication, so that the institution can be sure that a consistent and accurate message to the faculty member was delivered. These evaluations become part of the promotion dossier.

The best practice for the annual evaluation is that they are written by the Chair, but have input, in writing, from the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the candidate, each year. It is essential that Department Chairs provide critical and frank assessments of progress towards tenure in these reviews so that young faculty get clear messages about any areas of concern. The midpoint evaluation may also include some external evaluation as well, but should certainly include the P&T Committee's input. With professors with significant interdisciplinary activity or joint appointments, input from others in a supervisory role for that part of the workload on campus should be sought as well. All of these elements can serve as part of an overall mentoring program in the department or college for untenured faculty.

It is essential that candidates be evaluated against their written position descriptions and effort distributions. Although these may be modified slightly year by year, we do not have a "one size fits all" philosophy in our faculty, and our evaluations should reflect that in a careful and individualized way.

External Letters

Our practice here at CSU is to ask for at least five letters of reference from external reviewers; five is a strict minimum, and more are encouraged. Each letter should be from an individual who clearly understands academia well, and if (as is usual) they are in the professoriate, they should be at a rank equal to or greater than the rank being sought. The paramount criteria should be the quality, experience, and reputation of the reviewer, and we should all strive to get the most distinguished possible reviewers to write. A brief description of each reviewer indicating why he or she is appropriate and why their opinion should be compelling should be included in the dossier. The reviewer should ideally be from a peer institution (at least); but occasionally a nationally known scholar who all agrees would be an appropriate reviewer is not at a peer institution; the dossier description should address this. We have a tradition of allowing the candidate to suggest reviewers, but the majority of external letters must be taken from the department's list, not the candidate's.

The external reviewers should have no professional relationship with the candidate. There are some situations where a letter from a co-author or close collaborator might be an appropriate addition to the list. Such a letter should clarify relative contributions among the co-authors and/or collaborators and be clearly labeled as an 'extra' letter in the dossier.

Promotion to Associate Professor

In this and the next sections I would like to delineate some of the criteria and issues that we look for in evaluating promotion and tenure proposals. I do not mean to co-opt the rightful pre-eminence of the faculty in doing this. However, I believe that it is instructive to see how a common philosophy can express itself in a variety of ways across our inhomogeneous institution, and how we can arrive at decisions that are both fair and department-specific, in the main. In evaluating a successful and well-rounded faculty member, we have expectations in teaching effectiveness, in research and scholarly accomplishments, and in service contributions (any of which may include engagement activity). Let us consider each of these in turn.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness. We strive to determine whether the candidate has demonstrated a commitment to, and a capacity for delivering, quality and quantity in their instructional efforts. Our mission as a student-centered university demands that we not undercut our institutional goals by compromising on this important dimension. The types of evidence that demonstrate competence in the instructional role, that are most convincing, include: thoughtful peer and student evaluations, especially when these are driven by a department-level program of assessment; estimates of student learning, both in the classes taught by the professor and in subsequent classes if possible; enrollments in courses taught by the professor; well-organized syllabi that indicate course expectations with clarity; indications of course development (even if minor). We also look for a certain amount of breadth in the instructional assignments: success at a variety of courses, and at a variety of levels (lower division, upper division, and graduate) gives more confidence than evidence of effectiveness in only one course for several years.

Mentoring of graduate students is an important part of our role, and we would expect to have participation in graduate student committees, and evidence of the successful advising of Master's degree students to completion, as part of the dossier. For PhD-granting programs, it may not be possible to have graduated a PhD student during the probationary period, but having PhD advisees is certainly a plus.

It can often be the case that the instructional roles that our assistant professors take on may be their first such experiences in their careers. Effective teaching is not easy, and although engaging a classroom can come more naturally to some than to others, some of our faculty can be expected to have a difficult experience at first. We should not, and do not, demand perfection at the outset, but when problems are identified, we expect to see acknowledgement and adjustment, with the goal of continuous improvement. Professional development in this arena is encouraged and should be highlighted in the dossier.

Evidence of research and scholarly accomplishments. Our overall goal in the evaluation of research and/or scholarly accomplishments is to obtain external validation of the quality and impact of the work. Quantity is also important, but I have been pleased to see, over many years, that here at CSU we have avoided a strict bean-counting approach to these matters, in the main.

It will come as no surprise that basic metrics for success include: refereed publications in respected national or international outlets, or published monographs as appropriate to the discipline; presentations at regional, national, and international conferences; invitations to visit and present at peer (or higher) institutions; external funding activity (writing of proposals, obtaining awards, and obtaining renewals); measured consideration of citations by other authors; meaningful collaborations whose value can be documented; activity in applied research (invention disclosures, patents, etc.); development of a concrete portfolio of creative artistry or performance in (inter)national venues. Scholarly achievements are quite differently expressed, and differently weighted, in various disciplines and departments. Nevertheless, the overriding expectation across the institution is one of external

validation of quality, impact, and national recognition, as measured by evidence in the dossier.

We are especially interested in knowing that the assistant professor has moved well past the research of their terminal degree, and is successful at establishing new and productive lines of inquiry and achievement. Here at CSU we have a well-deserved reputation for interdisciplinary activity. We value that, and at promotion and tenure time we are in a position to reward it. Such work can cause a CV to look a bit different, and we know that. We would never devalue a strong grounding in one's discipline, and the building of a disciplinary reputation with quality and impact. However we do try to take interdisciplinary work into account, in a positive way.

Evidence of service contributions. Most service contributions break into two types: internal and external. Internal service might include membership on departmental, college, or university committees (a good example of the latter would be a Faculty Council committee). External service might include activity in one's professional society, assisting in organizing a workshop, or membership on a grant panel review.

It is common that during the probationary period, assistant professors are called on to do a less-than-average amount of service. Internally, department chairs and P&T committees tend to advise individuals to concentrate on teaching and research activities. Externally, one may not be well-known enough in the national community to attract such assignments. We generally take this into account – but we do expect to see some service roles being successfully dispatched. It is not healthy to isolate our assistant professors from the normal activities that promote the academic value of shared governance.

Evidence of engagement activity. We have recently revised our Manual to allow departments to consider engagement or outreach activities as part of the normal workload of a faculty member (in any of the three areas of teaching, research, and service, as appropriate). In this dimension we will expect the same attention to providing evidence of the quality and impact of the work.

Tenure

We typically act on the promotion-to-associate and on the tenure question at the same time, and with the same dossier (but not always). What is the difference? We know the practical result: promotion comes with a new title, and generally a raise; tenure comes with the expectation of a long-term University commitment to the position. There are several ways to think about the difference in the criteria though, and I find it useful to think in the following terms.

Promotion should acknowledge prior accomplishment, and be a recognition of achievement to date. The conferring of tenure is a significant commitment by the institution to the faculty member, for (hopefully) many years to come, and a strong element of the criteria for tenure is therefore the promise of future accomplishment. Now of course, some of the best evidence for future potential can be prior achievements, and so the two decisions are naturally conflated. There is, though, a subtle distinction in play which is useful to keep in mind.

One way that we have seen this philosophy expressed is when we ask, about someone who has demonstrated success at another institution or in another career path: can this faculty member be successful here at CSU? For this reason, for example, we may well look more closely at the establishment of a CSU-based research and scholarship program for the tenure decision.

Additional questions that I have heard posed for a tenure case are: Would we be honored to have this person represent our department, our college, and our University? Will we be delighted to invest significant resources in the professional development of this candidate, for the benefit of our students, our programs, and our institution? Will this action be improving the department, college, and

university? Are we 'raising the average' in the unit by the tenure decision? If we get convinced that we are, then we start asking about how much. If we are not 7 convinced, then we have problems; and at the Provost level, we will look very critically at cases that come without a strong positive consensus.

Promotion to Full Professor

A full professor at CSU is expected to be a university leader, contributing in a major way to the mission of the department, college, and the entire institution. Solid activity in the major sectors of activity (teaching, research, service) may be expected, and this can include significant engagement contributions.

As noted above, promotion to full professor would generally begin to be considered after five years in the rank of associate professor. Much of the same philosophical criteria for teaching, research, service, and engagement that were noted above for promotion to associate professor are still appropriate: national/international recognition with external validation of the quality and the impact of the work, for example, in the research domain, is still paramount. One question that does arise though is: is it enough to be successful at a level of productivity that was sufficient for promotion to associate professor, for another five years of activity?

Generally, our answer to this is no: we look for more. There is an expectation of some qualitative difference in the scope and level of contributions, for the promotion to full professor. For example, in the instructional arena, the types of activity that would be convincing of university leadership would include: teaching a broader range of classes; designing new courses, or participating substantially in curriculum development; mentoring of several PhD students to graduation. In research, one might expect: undertaking longer-range projects; the establishment of a substantial body of work that cements an expert's reputation; having multiple streams of inquiry in play; invitations to give keynote or other special presentations at conferences or universities, with national and international scope; leading interdisciplinary teams on more complex projects; collaborations with an expanding circle of colleagues, both in and out of CSU. Service contributions could include: chairing committees at the departmental and college levels; regular refereeing and panel reviewing; membership on editorial boards of good journals; leadership in professional societies.

Closing

This document was intended to clarify the basic elements of the process of promotion and tenure here at Colorado State, with special attention paid to the central administration's role. In addition to procedural matters, we tried to expose some of the general criteria that have been used in the recent past to make decisions. Further specific information can be found in our Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, especially sections E.10-13.

APPENDIX E

College of Health and Human Sciences Code

(May 15, 2019)

Section VII. Advancement/Promotion and Tenure (pp. 12-14):

College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure will typically be in rank 5 years and engaged in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and University and professional service. Credit toward the 5 years in ranks may be negotiated and granted when hiring someone who has been in a similar NTTF or TTF position at another like university. The distribution of the assignment may vary based upon primary role and responsibility. 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 in the assigned unit within the College. 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 with objective matching to the expectations for the rank within the unit. Faculty members are normally eligible for consideration for promotion from assistant to associate, or associate professor to professor after five (5) years in rank. The same timelines are expected for promotions within the instructor ranks (instructor, senior instructor, master instructor). 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/or tenure are based on a candidate's record of activities in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service. For faculty with tenure or tenure track appointments 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 on the tenure track 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 examples of impactful refereed/scholarly publications or juried works aligned with the faculty members' effort distribution and the faculty member's workload.

For faculty with contract or continuing appointments (non-tenure track) promotion rubrics will be defined by each unit within the College. These expectations will be clearly identified for promotion within the instructor ranks (instructor, senior instructor, or master instructor) or within the professor ranks (assistant, associate and full professor).

Detailed information and supporting materials, including external letters of support, are needed by the College administration for the purpose of review. For NTT faculty on the Instructor track, applications for Senior Instructor must include an evaluation by at least one reviewer who is external to the department, but internal to the university. Applications for Master Instructor must include an evaluation by no fewer than three reviewers who are external to the department, but internal to the university.

For NTT and TT faculty on the Professor track, applications for Associate Professor or Professor must include an evaluation by no fewer than five reviewers who are external to the university. The units follow University procedures in selecting external reviewers. 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/or 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 committee or faculty 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.

APPENDIX F

Procedures for Solicitation of Letters from External Reviewers and Timeline

1. For tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and promotion, no fewer than 5 letters must be received from reviewers external to the university. For CCAF, at least 1 letter external to the university must be received, although more is ideal. The remaining of 5 letters minimum may be solicited from on-campus faculty in kindred disciplines or who are familiar with the candidate's content area and/or skill set (e.g., teaching; research).
2. Names of potential external reviewers are to be solicited both from the faculty applicant and from members of the TMP Committee. The final list of potential external reviewers shall be compiled from names of individuals provided both by the faculty applicant and the TMP Committee. The list of potential reviewers submitted by the faculty applicant should consist of 6-8 names, as should the list produced by the TMP Committee. The TMP list will generally be prepared by the Chair of TMP and one or more TMP member (s) appointed by the Chair. Whenever possible, those TMP 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 TMP committee.
3. In identifying external reviewers (whether it be by the applicant or by the TMP 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.
4. The lists provided by the faculty applicant and by the TMP 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).
5. The TMP Committee Chair will compile a final list, from both the applicant and the TMP Committee, of no fewer than 8 names and will submit this list to the Director. 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.
6. The Director 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 Director will draw a majority of names from the list supplied by TMP.

7. 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 Director and the TMP 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 School 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 TMP Committee will receive the external reviews before recommendations must be submitted to the School. This will generally require a 1-2 month lead time.

8. 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 School'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.

9. Requests for external reviews are to be sent under the signature of both the Director . External reviews,

however, are to be returned to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee who will share them with the TMP Committee, the Director, 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 TMP Committee
May 30   Solicitations sent to nominees for external reviews (from Director) 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 TMP Committee
Oct. 10   TMP Committee deliberates; drafts recommendation
Oct. 24   TMP Committee recommendation given to candidate and Director
Nov. 10   Dossier and recommendations from TMP Committee and Director to CAHS Dean
Dec. 15   Dossiers due to Provost

APPENDIX G

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL

1. *Director***:** The principal administrator of the School shall be the School Director and is the initial person in the administrative chain to the president.
   1.1. The Director shall be selected as specified in the University Code. (E.4.3.)
   1.2. The term of office of the Director shall be in compliance with the University Code.
   1.3. The duties of the Director shall be those specified in the University Code.
   1.4. **Additional duties: The Director may appoint faculty members to assist with the administration of the School such as, but not limited to: Assistant Director, MSW Graduate Programs Director, BSW Undergraduate Director, Director of CLOE, Social Work Research Center Director, and Field Education Director. Designated titles, responsibilities, and length of service are at the discretion of the Director and may be individually negotiated.**

2. *Assistant Director*: The Assistant Director of the School of Social Work works collaboratively with the Director to manage internal operations and communications, facilitate the Administrative Team, identify and facilitate strategic planning for program growth opportunities, revenue generation, and implicit School enhancements such as culture and climate. The Assistant Director chairs the School's curriculum committee and serves as the representative to the College Curriculum Committee. As needed, the Assistant Director serves as the Director's designee.

3. *Doctoral Program Director*: The Director of the Doctoral Program in the School of Social Work has the responsibility to provide the direction and oversight of all aspects of the PhD program including admissions, curriculum, advising, and other logistics of the program. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.
   3.1. Work with the SOSW PhD Graduate Administrative Assistant in the implementation of the application process.
   3.2. Represent the School at all college meetings for the School graduate coordinators.
   3.3. Provide any information regarding the SOSW PhD program as requested by the Graduate School and the College.
   3.4. In collaboration with the Director, select members of the PhD committee, call meetings of the committee and record action steps. This committee reviews all applications, and makes recommendations for admissions, as well as provides curricular and policy recommendations.
   3.5. Oversee recruitment of PhD students.
   3.6. Interview all Doctoral Program applicants.
   3.7. Communicate admission decisions to all PhD applicants.
   3.8. Provide an orientation meeting for all new PhD students as cohorts are admitted.
   3.9. With the assistance of the PhD Graduate Administrative Assistant, respond to students as requested on graduate program policies and required graduate school forms as they progress through the program.
   3.10. Provide guidance and assistance to faculty as needed related to PhD committee processes, prelim exams, proposals and dissertations.
   3.11. Update the PhD Program Manual as needed.
   3.12. Serve as a member of the SOSW Administrative Team.
   3.13. Serve as key advisor to all PhD students until their graduate committee is formed.
   3.14. Recommend to the Director the schedule for PhD classes and potential teaching faculty.
   3.15. Assist with University Assessment of the SOSW Doctoral Program.
   3.16. Represent the SOSW at the annual Group for Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE)

Conference.

4. *MSW Graduate Programs Director:* The MSW Graduate Programs Director's responsibilities are to oversee MSW classes, advising, and logistics of the MSW programs in the SOSW. The responsibilities of the 50% time MSW Program Director are listed below. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

   4.1. Work with the SOSW MSW Graduate Administrative Assistant in the implementation of the graduate application process.

   4.2. Provide any information regarding the SOSW MSW graduate program as requested from the Graduate School and college pertaining to the Graduate program.

   4.3. Represent the School at all college meetings for the School graduate coordinators.

   4.4. Oversee communication and/or meet with potential graduate students.

   4.5. Communicate admission decision to all graduate applicants.

   4.6. Provide an orientation meeting for all new graduate students in the School at the start of each semester.

   4.7. Oversee recruitment of graduate students.

   4.8. Organize an open forum with graduate students at least once per year.

   4.9. Respond to graduate students as requested on such items as graduate program policies, completion of required forms, etc.

   4.10. Update the student MSW Manual as needed.

   4.11. Serve as a member of the SOSW Administrative Team.

   4.12. Serve as first-year MSW advisor.

   4.13. Recommend to the Director the schedule for MSW classes and potential teaching for faculty.

   4.14. Assist with MSW program assessment.

   4.15. Leadership in MSW accreditation reports.

   4.16. Chair the MSW curriculum committee with the BSW Director as Co-Chair.

5. *BSW Undergraduate Program Director***:** The BSW Undergraduate Program Director's responsibilities are to oversee BSW classes, advising, and logistics of the bachelors program in the SOSW. The responsibilities of the 50% time BSW Program Director are listed below. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director. Other duties as assigned by the Director of the School of Social Work.

   5.1. Oversight of a BSW curriculum that is in compliance with CSWE accreditation standards.

   5.2. Conduct Progression to the major for students.

   5.3. Administer key advising for the BSW program.

   5.4. Attend college/university key advising meetings.

   5.5. Distribute information on advising/student resources/systems' changes to faculty.

   5.6. Insure that faculty has training/support/information needed, an appropriate documentation system is established, and students have access to their advisors.

   5.7. Participate in the administrative leadership team.

   5.8. Coordinate activities/orientation for incoming first-year students.

   5.9. Represent the BSW program to potential students and families.

   5.10. Develop/revise printed and electronic publications on the BSW program.

   5.11. Monitor, adjusting as needed, class enrollment.

   5.12. Schedule the BSW classes.

   5.13. Recognize BSW student achievement.

   5.14. Support the BSW faculty in teaching and advising.

   5.15. Assist the director of the school with accreditation issues related to the undergraduate program.

   5.16. Administer and support advising for undergraduate students.

   5.17. Maintain contact with two-year colleges in the state to facilitate the transfer process.

5.18. Meet with potential students to acquaint them with requirements of the BSW program.

6. *Field Education Director*: The Director of Field Education with the following responsibilities:
   6.1. Planning and implementation of field policies, ensuring consistency between campus and distance programs, problem solving, and ongoing development of the Field Education Program.
   6.2. Interview, train, supervise, and oversee all Adjunct Faculty Field Consultants.
   6.3. Assign Faculty Field Consultants each semester.
   6.4. Revise and manage BSW & MSW Field Manuals.
   6.5. Create and revise Field Forms to conform to current EPAS (accreditation) guidelines.
   6.6. Supervise Field Education components of the Distance MSW Program.
   6.7. Plan and manage field agency recruitment, maintenance, and development.
   6.8. Devise and coordinate Field Education Schedules each semester.
   6.9. Plan and conduct Field Instructor orientations each semester.
   6.10. Plan and conduct Faculty Field Consultant orientations each semester.
   6.11. Plan and facilitate ongoing Faculty Field Consultant supervision & development meetings.
   6.12. Conduct MSW student orientation meetings.
   6.13. Conduct/supervise BSW orientation meetings.
   6.14. Interview and place BSW and MSW students for SOWK 488, 588, and 688.
   6.15. Conduct meetings with students who are terminated from placements to determine disposition of field placement, next steps, grades, hours, and other logistics.
   6.16. Consult with Faculty Field Consultants regarding any concerns with a student or agency placement.
   6.17. Collect and record Field course grades.
   6.18. Field Education research and evaluation, addressing Field specifically and evaluation needs of the School of Social Work, the University, and the CSWE accreditation body.
   6.19. Participate in or lead assigned Committees: Field Advisory, Outcomes and Evaluation, Distance MSW Program Advisory, Curriculum and Program Evaluation Committee, Student Advisory Team, Scholarship, Field Coordinator's College, Faculty Field Consultant Advisory meetings (3 per semester).

7. *BSW Field Program Coordinator*: The BSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the BSW Program. Duties include:
   7.1. Develop field agency placements that offer generalist and advanced generalist field experience for students.
   7.2. Conduct training for BSW field instructors, on-site supervisors, and field liaisons to ensure the educational process of students.
   7.3. Conduct orientations for students applying to and entering field placements.
   7.4. Work with students through the application and interview processes for field placement to ensure an appropriate field education experience.
   7.5. Maintain BSW student files in accordance with CSU School of Social Work standards and procedures.
   7.6. Assist with orientation and supervision of field liaisons.
   7.7. Participate in SOSW Field Team to develop and implement field policies and procedures.
   7.8. Assist with monitoring and evaluation of field placements.
   7.9. Coordinate and participate in student advisory committee.
   7.10. Assist in maintaining and enhancing ongoing and timely communication with students regarding program information, receiving feedback and addressing resource needs.
   7.11. Attend and participate in School of Social Work Council meetings and assigned committee meetings.
   7.12. Other duties as assigned.
8. *MSW Program Field Coordinator*: The MSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the MSW Program. Duties include:

8.1. Develop field agency placements that offer generalist and advanced generalist field experience for students.

8.2. Conduct training for MSW field instructors, on-site supervisors, and field liaisons to ensure the educational process of students.

8.3. Conduct orientations for students applying to and entering field placements.

8.4. Work with students through the application and interview processes for field placement to ensure an appropriate field education experience.

8.5. Maintain MSW student files in accordance with CSU School of Social Work standards and procedures.

8.6. Assist with orientation and supervision of field liaisons.

8.7. Participate in SOSW Field Team to develop and implement field policies and procedures.

8.8. Assist with monitoring and evaluation of field placements.

8.9. Coordinate and participate in student advisory committee.

8.10. Assist in maintaining and enhancing ongoing and timely communication with students regarding program information, receiving feedback and addressing resource needs.

8.11. Attend and participate in School of Social Work Council meetings and assigned committee meetings.

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

9. *Social Work Research Center Director*: The SWRC Director works directly with county and state practitioners and policymakers to direct and deliver applied research and evaluation projects, primarily in the area of child welfare and other social work disciplines. This position requires an ability to provide leadership to a diverse group of professionals and stakeholders in a self-directed yet collaborative manner.

The SWRC Director is expected to show substantial accomplishment in research and show promise for future leadership is the field. The SWRC Director is expected to

9.1. Raise research support funding from federal, state, and county agencies.

9.2. Design rigorous research studies and program evaluations.

9.3. Analyze and interpret quantitative and qualitative data collected from a variety of sources.

9.4. Write high-quality research and evaluation reports.

9.5. Publish articles in refereed journals.

9.6. Disseminate findings through trainings, workshops, and conference presentations.

9.7. Effectively complete administrative tasks, including budget oversight and personnel management.

10. *CLOE Director*: The CLOE Director will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful MSW Program. The CLOE Director will collaborate with the MSW Director to lead development and implementation efforts for a successful distance MSW Programs. Additionally, the CLOE Director will coordinate efforts for implementation of certificate programs and CEU classes. Alumni contact and communication will also be conducted by the CLOE Director and Team. Duties include:

10.1. Develop recruitment plan in collaboration with CSU OnlinePlus, provide language, market ideas, etc., and ensure that recruitment and program information on Online Plus website and SOSW website is aligned and accurate.

10.2. Communicate with potential students as needed and in collaboration with OnlinePlus Student Engagement Coordinator for SOSW.

10.3. Arrange for review of all completed applications in collaboration with MSW Coordinator.

10.4. Communicate all necessary information to new students.

10.5. Plan, coordinate, and host orientation on campus for new cohorts.

10.6. Secure appropriate site location, in collaboration with CSU OnlinePlus.

10.7. Develop schedule of courses for each cohort and coordinate schedules between cohorts and instructors.

10.8. Participate as co-facilitator of SAT (Student Advisory Team) monthly calls to address issues that arise from these calls and bring questions and ideas to SAT for advice from student perspective.

10.9. Create weekend face-to-face class schedule at least 18 months out and provide to students.

10.10. Identify and hire or schedule instructors for each MSW course for each cohort, in collaboration with SOSW Director.

10.11. Provide instructors orientation to the Distance MSW Program & schedules, RamCT resources, online teaching, and weekend teaching best practices.

10.12. Coordinate development of hybrid courses with Online Plus, TILT, and instructors.

10.13. Supervise all site coordinators and oversee coordination of all cohort sites (schedules, information flow, problem solving, weather related schedule changes, problem solving in partnership with OnlinePlus regarding problems at the site, etc.).

10.14. Serve as advisor for all Distance MSW Students.

10.15. Develop each cohort as a learning community through regular communication via Canvas's cohort site.

10.16. Ensure that course and program evaluations are completed appropriately.

10.17. Collaborate with SOSW Director to include Distance MSW appropriately in the development of the SOSW strategic plan.

10.18. Collaborate with field team on addressing distance MSW student field and program needs.

10.19. Oversee and manage Distance MSW Program Budget.

10.20. Be "on-call" on weekends classes meet face-to-face to address emergencies.

10.21. Develop, in collaboration with Distance MSW Team, SAT, and appropriate SOSW partners, the policies and procedures needed to address student issues, program development, and management.

10.22. Coordinate with SAT and students regarding the planning of their cohort's graduation hooding ceremony.

10.23. Ensure excellent course development and teaching through collaboration with TILT and instructors, special cohort events twice a year, when students are meeting face-to-face (done in collaboration with SAT) and other creative options as they develop.

APPENDIX H

STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Any student or faculty member having a concern that needs "thinking through" is encouraged to do so with anyone they choose. This enables clarification of whether a problem exists about which he/she may desire to proceed further. The early identification of a grievance is a responsible step toward its resolution. To enable faculty, students, and the school to operate responsibly and sensitively, it is important to keep lines of communication open, to resolve difficulties at as early and as low a level as possible, and to encourage constructive input to maximize and humanize the operation of the program.

A grievance process provides due process to both students and faculty. The process must be designed so neither the student nor the faculty member has the inside track to problem resolution. The purpose of the process is to acknowledge legitimate concerns about grades and other academic matters and eliminate harassment and other forms of intimidation as well as protect faculty members against unjust and unfair accusations.

If students perceive they have been treated unfairly, a way for students to be heard and to be answered with concern and respect will be provided. Because faculty play a major role in evaluating the performance of students, there is an inherent power difference between faculty and students. Faculty must be exceptionally vigilant in their use of language, jokes, and other forms of communication that can be misconstrued as intimidation or harassment. "Administrators of faculty have a heavier responsibility [to eliminate sexual harassment and other forms of personal abuse] because of the roles they play in the creation and maintenance of a campus environment conducive to teaching, learning, and creativity:" Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual.

Definition of a Concern

A concern exists if a student believes there is an issue. The student may be any person associated with the school and/or taking a school course. The concern may relate to academic matters such as a grade, acceptance into a professional program, or other issues. A concern may also be defined as treatment by a faculty member such that one or both parties experience the behavior as personal abuse. If the concern is related to sexual harassment or the University's personal abuse policy, the procedures outlined in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual should be followed.

Identification of the Concern and the Informal Resolution Process

If a student (or students) decides that the concern warrants action, the first step is to communicate in person or in writing the concern to the person (or persons) with whom the student has concern. The student should communicate in writing or in person with the faculty member about this situation within no more than 10 working days of the incident/event. Because a power differential exists between students and faculty, the student may wish to have another person accompany him/her if there is a face-to-face discussion.

The Formal Grievance Procedure

If the informal communication with the faculty members does not resolve the problem, the student may begin the formal grievance process by submitting a written statement to the chair of the school's Student Affairs and Admissions Committee. This written statement must outline the basis for the complaint and the student should attach any corresponding information needed for documentation. At a minimum, the documentation shall include:

- The date and particulars of the incident/event in which the student feels aggrieved;
- A summary of steps that have been taken to deal with the situation; and
- The desired outcome(s) that is/are being sought.

The student(s) making the appeal shall deliver the complaint to the chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee and the date of its receipt must be recorded on the document and initialed by both the student and committee chair.[3] That date becomes the starting point for the formal grievance process.[4] The chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee will notify the faculty member of the formal grievance within no more than five working days of its receipt. The faculty member will have no more than five working days to prepare a written response to the grievance and submit that statement to the committee chair.[5]

If the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee does not find from the written materials that the issue has been resolved in no more than ten working days after receiving the response from the faculty member, the committee will appoint a grievance hearing committee composed of three faculty members and two students to address the complaint. The hearing committee members are to be jointly selected by the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee and the School Director. Anyone directly involved in the grievance or who has previously reviewed the situation with the student or faculty member will be disqualified from serving on the hearing committee.

The hearing committee shall hold hearings on the complaint in no more than ten working days after its appointment. Either party may be accompanied to the hearing by a person of her/his choice who can support the student or faculty member's position. In order to maintain confidentiality in the process and yet to insure a thorough review of the grievance, it is the hearing committee's responsibility to solicit input from persons named by each party. It is suggested, for the sake of clarity and due process, that the hearing committee utilize consultation from the University Ombudsman during this process.

Within five days of the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing committee will provide each affected party, the chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee, and the School Director with a written statement of its decision regarding the merits of the complaint.

---

[3] From this point until the conclusion of the process the committee chair shall be responsible for monitoring the process, maintaining copies of all documentation provided, and preparing a record of the actions taken.

[4] By agreement of both parties, or in the event of pressing emergencies, subject to the written approval of the School Director, the time limits can be extended for reasonable time periods, but should not exceed thirty working days. In the event that parties to the grievance are absent from campus, the chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee may grant up to an additional thirty days at any phase of the process. If the appeal is filed during a summer session, no action will be taken until the beginning of the fall semester.

[5] If either party pursues outside legal action, the school grievance process shall immediately cease.

Should either party disagree with the hearing committee's decision, s/he may appeal to the School Director within no more than five working days of date of the committee's report. The School Director will then review the case within no more than ten working days and provide a written decision regarding the merits of the complaint. The School Director may agree with or overturn the hearing committee's decision.

 Should either party disagree with the School Director's decision, s/he may appeal to the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences within no more than five working days of date of the School Director's report. In that case, the Dean will review the matter within no more than ten working days and produce a written decision regarding the merits of the complaint. The dean may agree with or overturn the decision.

 Should either party disagree with the dean's findings, s/he may appeal within no more than five working days by submitting all written documentation to the Provost/Academic Vice President. The decision of the Provost/Academic Vice President shall be final, in so far as the University's grievance process permits.

  For MSW or PhD Students, for more details regarding the formal rights and responsibility, please see the Graduate Catalog.