**CODE**
Approved by Faculty: November 4, 2022
Submitted: November 7, 2022


DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES


COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

# Table of Contents

# Section 1: Mission and Vision

## 1.A Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies is to promote the optimal development of individuals, families, and communities in the context of the larger social environment. We strive for excellence in research, teaching, service, engagement, and outreach. We value inclusive, honest, and critical dialogue in a supportive academic community. Research and education in HDFS is lifespan oriented, and considers multiple levels of influence on development. Our signature areas of expertise include: risk, resilience, and developmental psychopathology; treatment, intervention, and prevention science; emotion, regulation, and relationship processes; adult development and aging; and cultural context and diversity. The foundation for all these pursuits is our belief that the strengths of individuals, families, and communities can be optimized.

## 1.B Vision Statement

Enhancing Healthy Development: Through training and research, we examine human development across the lifespan in the context of families, schools, communities, and culture.

## 1.C Commitment to 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.

- 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.
- Integrity: We are accountable for our actions and will act ethically and honestly in all our interactions.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

# Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization

## 2.A Department Head

The administration of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies shall be the responsibility of the Department Head. The Department Head shall serve as an ex-officio member of the standing committees, except in cases involving a conflict of interest. In no case will they have a vote. The Department Head shall be selected as specified in the University Code (E.4.3). The term of office of the Department Head shall be in compliance with the University Code. The duties of the Department Head shall be those specified in the University Code.

## 2.B Unit Leadership

### 2.B.1 Assistant/Associate Department Head

The Assistant/Associate Department Head will serve as executive when the Department Head is absent. The Assistant/Associate Department Head shall be nominated for appointment by the Department Head and duties are at the discretion of the Department Head. This appointment must be approved by a majority of the voting faculty and will be for a three-year term. The selection process for the Assistant/Associate Department Head will be conducted no later than August of the academic year following the end of the three-year term of office. The Assistant/Associate Department Head shall be eligible for reappointment. The Assistant/Associate Department Head shall hold the academic rank of associate professor or professor.

Specific responsibilities include: serve as executive when department head is absent; represent department head at meetings when requested; serve on executive advisory committee to department head; assistance with course scheduling and general oversight of undergraduate and graduate programs; oversee collection of undergraduate and graduate program outcomes assessment information; and oversee projects of importance to the department as needed.

Typically, the person will be appointed first as Assistant Department Head. Appointment as or promotion to Associate Department Head will be determined by the Department Head and based on scope and complexity of duties, and independence in performing such.

### 2.B.2. Graduate Programs Director

- The Graduate Programs Director is elected by the tenured/tenure-track faculty for a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Specifically, the GPD does the following:
- Works with the committee members to set the agenda, goals, and timelines for each semester and year.
- Works with the Communications Coordinator and graduate committee to market each of the graduate programs for recruiting purposes.
- Facilitates faculty mentor/advisor selection for first year master's and doctoral students in coordination with the graduate committee and faculty.
- Serves as a liaison with the Graduate School on issues related to policies, funding, and procedures.
- Assigns graduate teaching and research assistants in coordination with the graduate committee and HDFS faculty.

- Supports curricular changes (e.g., CIM system) and coordinates with the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Director to represent HDFS at the CHHS Curriculum Committee.
- Organizes admissions and serves on the admissions committees for the Applied Developmental Science and Prevention Science programs.
- Serves on the CHHS scholarship committee.

### 2.B.3 Graduate Student Affairs Director

- The Graduate Student Affairs Director (GSAD) is elected by the HDFS faculty for a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person can be on the tenure-track/tenured or contract-continuing faculty. Specifically, the GSAD does the following:
- Collaborates with the graduate committee to develop and implement policies and procedures for student conduct and outcomes assessments of student success initiatives.
- Advises graduate students on their course of study and facilitates career development.
- Facilitates faculty mentor/advisor working relationships by working with students on individual issues such as accommodations or student challenges and supporting faculty when dealing with student issues.
- Collaborates with the graduate committee and Communications Coordinator to develop and implement programming or events (e.g., recruitment events, professional development workshops, Q&A sessions).

### 2.B.4 Prevention Science (PS) Program Director

- The PS Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The PS Director will be elected to a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Specifically, the PS Director does the following:
- Oversees both the in-person PS masters program and the online Masters of PS program (MPSP)
- In conjunction with the GPD, responds to potential applicants' requests for information and assists with admissions to the PS graduate program .
- Works with the Communications Coordinator to market the PS program for recruiting purposes.
- Facilitate PS students' career development.
- Collaborates with the Director of the Prevention Science Center and CSU Online on issues related to the Online PS certificate and masters program.

### 2.B.5 Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) Program Director

- The MFT Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The MFT Director will be elected to a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member, a clinical member of AAMFT, an AAMFT-approved supervisor, and a licensed (or license-eligible) Marriage and Family Therapist in Colorado. Specifically, the MFT Director does the following:
- Chairs the MFT Committee (MFTC)
- In conjunction with the GPD, responds to potential applicants' requests for information.
- Works with the Communications Coordinator to market the MFT program for recruiting purposes.
- Works with the MFTC on admissions (application reviews, interview selections, and final admissions).
- Works with MFTC to screen, select, and integrate into the program any additional approved supervisors or supervisor candidates.

- Works with the Communication Coordinator to plan and implement various MFT-specific events (e.g., interviews, orientations).
- Participates in the ADS interviews for MFT track interested applicants.
- Coordinates program accreditation and ensure compliance with COAMFTE and informs COAMFTE of policy and curricular changes that are approved.
- Oversees the COAMFTE rubric process for completed thesis to facilitate MFT students' career development.
- Oversees advising of first-year MFT graduate students, until an advisor is selected.
- Leads the process of Students of Concern for clinical and professional issues.
- Updates and disseminates policies of the MFT Program to the MFT students.

## 2.B.6 Applied Developmental Science (ADS) Program Director

- The ADS Program Director is elected by the HDFS faculty. The ADS Program Director will be elected to a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be a tenured faculty member. Specifically, the ADS Director does the following:
- In conjunction with the GPD, responds to requests for information about the ADS program,
- Works with the Communications Coordinator to market the ADS program for recruiting purposes.
- Coordinates admissions to the ADS graduate program.
- Facilitates ADS students' career development.
- Serves on the committee that evaluates whether the master's theses and coursework from other programs and institutions of incoming ADS students qualifies to satisfy requirements of the ADS program.
- Teaches HDFS 600 if teaching workload and responsibilities permit.
- Coordinates the annual reviews of ADS students.
- Updates and disseminates policies of the ADS Program to the ADS students.

## 2.B.7 Undergraduate Academic Affairs Director (UAAD)

The UAAD is elected by the HDFS faculty. The UAAD will be elected to a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be of Associate Professor or Professor rank. Duties include:
- Leads activities in the areas of undergraduate curriculum development, academic policy, and teaching effectiveness.
- Oversees HDFS Undergraduate academic programs.
- Support student learning and experiences, academic program initiatives, and faculty teaching.
- Receives and evaluates all requests for changes in the undergraduate academic courses and programs that must ultimately be reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Programs Committee, Department faculty, and College and University Curriculum Committees.
- Supports the expansion and infusion of inclusive pedagogy, diversity, and equity in the undergraduate curriculum.
- Develops and implements policies and procedures related to transfer evaluations, substitution, waivers, and outcome assessment efforts.
- Develops and implements policies and procedures for academic outcomes assessment efforts, including supporting faculty teaching effectiveness professional development.

- Works collaboratively with the Director of Undergraduate Student Affairs, Director of Online Programs, University Honors faculty and program, ECE Coordinator, Director of Undergraduate Advising, and GIM Coordinator, providing oversight and support.
- Partners with the HDFS Graduate Programs Director to represent HDFS at the CHHS Curriculum Committee and related broader University academic initiatives; UAAD's charge is to advocate and oversee curricular changes on behalf of the HDFS undergraduate programs.
- Serves as part of the Executive Advisory Committee.

## 2.B.8 Undergraduate Student Affairs Director (USAD)

The USAD is elected by the HDFS faculty. The USAD will be elected to a 3-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The person shall be of Senior Instructor or Assistant Professor rank or higher. Duties include:

- Leads activities in the areas of undergraduate co-curricular, student development, and student success.
- Develops and revises undergraduate student policies.
- Works collaboratively with the Director of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Director of Online Programs, University Honors faculty, and program, ECE Coordinator, Director of Undergraduate Advising, and GIM Coordinator, providing oversight and support.
- Oversees student conduct and professional and career development.
- Responsible for student clubs, groups, and co-curricular activities.
- Supports the expansion and promotion of diversity, equity, and inclusions as central to all student success initiatives and programs.
- Oversees implementation of student success initiatives in collaboration with CHHS and the Office of the VP for Student Success.
- Supports undergraduate recruitment and admissions efforts, including summer orientation, Ram Welcome, and the Office of Admissions recruitment events – in collaboration with the HDFS Undergraduate Advising Office.
- Develops and implements policies and procedures for outcomes assessment of student success initiatives.
- Serves as part of the Executive Advisory Committee.

## 2.B.9 Center for Family and Couple Therapy (CFCT) Director

The CFCT Director is appointed by the Department Head, after consulting with the MFT faculty. The Director is appointed to a one-year term and is eligible for reappointment. The person shall be a full-time faculty member, a clinical or associate member of AAMFT, an AAMFT-approved supervisor (or supervisor candidate), and a licensed (or license-eligible) Marriage and Family Therapist in Colorado. Duties involve general oversight of the CFCT, including:

- Management of the CFCT, including recruiting clients, developing and implementing policies, and supervising the CFCT Assistant Director and graduate assistant.
- Facilitation of MFT students' transition into the CFCT and into the various clinical rotations.
- Assurance that MFT students comply with the legal and ethical aspects of MFT practice and respond to client grievances.
- Maintenance of the CFCT database.
- Coordination of research and outreach/engagement activities in the CFCT.
- Development and maintenance of budget and sound business plan.

### 2.B.10 Child Trauma and Resilience Assessment Center (CTRAC) Director

The CTRAC Director is appointed by the Department Head, after consulting with the MFT faculty. The Director is appointed to a one-year term and is eligible for reappointment. The person shall be a full-time faculty member, a clinical or associate member of AAMFT, an AAMFT-approved supervisor (or supervisor candidate), and a licensed (or license-eligible) Marriage and Family Therapist in Colorado. Duties involve general oversight of the CTRAC, including:

- Management of the CTRAC, including recruiting clients, developing and implementing policies, and supervising the CTRAC Assistant Director and CTRAC clinicians.
- Facilitation of MFT students' involvement in assessments.
- Assurance that MFT students and CTRAC clinicians comply with the legal and ethical aspects of MFT practice and respond to client grievances.
- Maintenance of the CTRAC database.
- Coordination of research and outreach/engagement activities in the CTRAC.
- Development and maintenance of budget and sound business plan.

### 2.B.11 Prevention Research Center (PRC) Executive Director

The PRC Director is appointed by the Department Head, after consultation with the HDFS faculty. The Director is appointed to a five-year term and is eligible for reappointment. The person shall be a full-time tenured faculty member with demonstrated expertise in Prevention Science. Duties involve general oversight of the PRC; including:

- Management of the PRC, including developing and implementing policies, and supervising PRC staff.
- Coordination of research and outreach/engagement activities in the PRC.
- Working with PRC staff and affiliate faculty to develop research programs and generate external funding.
- Development and maintenance of budget and sound business plan.

### 2.B.12 Director of Undergraduate Advising

The Director of Undergraduate Advising is hired by the Department Head. The Director is an Administrative Professional. Duties of the Director include:

- Develop and oversee Department's advising service to resident and on-line students.
- Develop resources and training opportunities to enhance faculty advisers' knowledge of academic advising policies and procedures for undergraduate students.
- Coordinate HDFS registration activities each term.
- Oversee HDFS student success initiatives including peer advising, mentoring, ConX groups, and projects initiated by the Department, College or University.
- Directly supervise HDFS Academic Success Coordinators and assigned Graduate Assistants.
- Represent HDFS on the College Key Advisers' Committee if assigned by dean's office.
- Help to implement faculty directives regarding the undergraduate program, including the recruitment of new majors; orientation efforts, particularly advising and career development; and monitor student progress toward graduation.
- Serve on Undergraduate Programs Committee.
- Chair department Scholarship Committee and attend as chair all scholarship meetings and events.
- Serve on College Scholarship Committee as departmental representative.
- Assist Practicum and Internship Coordinators to ensure smooth placement processes.

- Collaborate with faculty on the Early Childhood Major (ECE) committee to support the competitive teacher license program, incorporating current state-wide director qualification requirements and honoring articulation agreements.

## 2.B.13 Online Program Coordinators

The Department Head appoints the HDFS Online Program Coordinators based on the faculty's expertise and online teaching experience. There are two positions that include the following responsibilities:

**Online Programs Operations Coordinator (OPOC):**
- Work with the Online Programs Student and Teaching Success Coordinator (STSC) to oversee the management, development, and quality of all HDFS online programs.
- Develop course schedules and offerings for each semester, including assigning instructors to courses.
- Develop marketing and program growth plans with CSU Online leadership, the HDFS Department Head, and the HDFS Online Programs STSC.
- Provide annual reports of program growth metrics and outcomes.
- Oversee annual budget that is developed in conjunction with Department Head.
- Serve on Undergraduate Programs and Graduate Programs Committees as needed.
- Coordinate and attend an in-person meeting with the HDFS Online STSC, CSU Online, HDFS undergraduate and graduate program directors, and the HDFS Department Head at least once a year.
- Along with STSC, co-lead Online program and faculty development meetings at least two times per year.

**Online Programs Student and Teaching Success Coordinator (STSC):**
- Work with the Online Programs Operations Coordinator (OPOC) to ensure the quality of learning, teaching, and student experiences in all HDFS online programs.
- Oversee faculty professional development, support, and onboarding.
- Work with HDFS undergraduate & graduate academic and student affairs directors as needed to ensure course quality, student success, and curricular requirements are met.
- Oversee faculty course development process & schedule in conjunction with CSU Online.
- Work with HDFS undergraduate academic advising to support online student success and academic achievement.
- Support HDFS graduate advising in cooperation with CSU Online to support online student success and academic achievement.
- Coordinate and attend an in-person meeting with the HDFS OPOC, CSU Online, HDFS undergraduate and graduate program directors, and the HDFS Department Head at least once a year.
- Along with OPOC, co-lead Online program and faculty development meetings at least two times per year.

## 2.B.14 Engagement and Extension Committee

The HDFS Extension Programs Director is appointed by the Department Head and chairs the Engagement and Extension Committee (EEC). The Director also serves as liaison to CSU Extension, including serving on Extension committees as appropriate and develops and manages the HDFS Extension budget in collaboration with HDFS Department Head. In addition to the Director, EEC membership shall include no fewer than two appointed faculty. Duties of the EEC include:

- To keep abreast of university initiatives in relation to engagement and Extension.
- To make recommendations to the faculty about the HDFS code as it relates to engagement of scholarship, teaching, service and Extension.
- To build capacity towards engagement-related scholarship, teaching, service and Extension among faculty.
- To provide recommendations to the department head on faculty incentives supporting engagement and Extension.
- To encourage faculty to maintain and initiate new engagement and/or Extension projects/programs.
- To measure impact of HDFS-related engagement and Extension.
- To serve faculty, when needed, as advisors on their engaged and/or Extension projects and connect faculty to Extension agents and professionals with similar interests.
- To work with the communications team to disseminate HDFS engagement and Extension stories.

## 2.C Unit Personnel

### 2.C.1 Academic Faculty

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

### 2.C.2 Administrative Professionals

The Department follows the definition of Administrative Professional as outlined in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section D. Administrative Professional include all personnel who are exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes, but are not faculty positions. Administrative professionals include the officers of the University and the professional staff of the Board, 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.

### 2.C.3 State Classified Staff

The Department follows the definition of State Classified Staff as outlined in the Colorado Classified Employee Handbook.

### 2.C.4 Voting Eligibility

The faculty who may serve and vote in department governance, except when specified otherwise in the code (for example, only tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote on tenure), are tenured, tenure-track, contract and continuing faculty holding full-time appointments and holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. Full-time faculty holding the rank of Instructor, Senior Instructor or Master Instructor may serve and vote in departmental governance upon approval by a majority vote of the voting faculty. Adjunct appointments and Administrative Professionals are strongly welcomed and encouraged to provide advisory input but do not have voting rights in the Department. With the exception of tenure and promotion decisions, voting on departmental issues may be held either in faculty meeting or via email. Faculty members on sabbatical are eligible to vote on department matters provided they acknowledge having had

sufficient opportunity to review relevant material. In those instances when an elected program director or committee member is absent from the University for an extended period of time, that member will be replaced by another individual elected by full-time faculty as a replacement for the period of absence. In the case of absence owing to resignation, the newly elected member will complete that term of service vacated by the former member.

## 2.D Committees

### 2.D.1 Ad Hoc Committees

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

### 2.D.2 Graduate Programs Committee

Membership shall consist of the Graduate Programs Director, the Graduate Student Affairs Director, the MFT Program Director, the PS Program Director, and the Applied Developmental Sciences Program Director. The Graduate Programs Director serves as chair of this committee. Duties of the Graduate Programs Committee include:

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

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

### 2.D.3 Undergraduate Programs Committee

Membership shall consist of the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Director, Undergraduate Student Affairs Director, the ECE Licensure Coordinator, the Online Program Coordinators, the GIM Coordinator, the Director of Undergraduate Advising, the Coordinator of Experiential Learning, and the department representative to the CHHS Curriculum Committee. The Undergraduate Academic Affairs Director serves as chair of this committee, with the support of the Undergraduate Student Affairs Director. Duties of the Undergraduate Programs Committee include:

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

- To review departmental undergraduate program direction, course offerings.

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

### 2.D.4 Admissions Committees for Selection of Graduate Students

The PS admissions committee shall consist of the Graduate Programs Director, an elected member of the HDFS tenured or tenure-track faculty, and the PS Program Director.

The MFT admissions committee shall consist of the MFT tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Graduate Programs Director.

The ADS admissions committee shall consist of the ADS Program Director, an elected member of the HDFS tenured or tenure-track faculty, and the Graduate Programs Director.

### 2.D.5 Outcomes Assessment Committee

The Outcomes Assessment Committee will be charged with overseeing annual outcomes assessment reporting as well as 6-year departmental program reviews. The committee will consist of the Department Head, the Graduate Programs Director, the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Director, and appointed members of the faculty.

### 2.D.6 Scholarship Committee

The Scholarship Committee is comprised of the Graduate Programs Director, the Director of Undergraduate Advising, and a faculty member elected by the faculty. The elected faculty member serves as the representative to the College Scholarship Committee and serves for a 3-year term. Duties of the Scholarship Committee include:
- Apprise the HDFS faculty and students of scholarships and other funding opportunities available to HDFS students.
- Coordinate efforts to solicit scholarship applications from HDFS majors.
- Coordinate the selection of HDFS scholarship awardees based on individual scholarship criteria.
- Maintain records of scholarship selection procedures.
- Represent HDFS on the College Scholarship Committee.
- Work with the College Development Officer and the HDFS External Advisory Council to increase HDFS scholarship funds.
- Coordinate efforts to enhance and promote general scholarships in the Undergraduate Program including the University Honors Program.

### 2.D.7 Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure Degree Committee

The ECE licensure degree committee is led by 1 full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty member from HDFS who works with the Center for Educator Preparation (CEP) co-coordinator. The HDFS ECE faculty coordinator is appointed by the Department Head, after consulting with the faculty, is appointed to a 3-year term, and is eligible for reappointment. The committee also includes the ECE pre-advisor, and the ECC Associate Director of Student Learning. The ECE faculty lead will work with the CEP faculty lead to:
- Advise students enrolling in the ECE program, including recruiting students, developing, and implementing policies, and coordinating admissions.
- Collaborate with colleagues in CEP regarding all administrative matters.
- Collaborate with HDFS faculty on content areas.

- Ensure that the HDFS course of study is in compliance with the standards set by the Colorado Department of Education.

### 2.D.8 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice (DEIJ) Action

The DEI Action Team is led by 1 or 2 (co-) chairs). The (co-) chair also serves on the CHHS Diversity Committee. Members include one undergraduate student, graduate students, staff, and faculty appointed by the Department Head. Terms are for one-year and eligible for reappointment. The DEI Action Team will lead the department with the ultimate goal of creating a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive department. The committee may decide to divide into subcommittees, depending on annual goals, that support undergraduate and graduate climate and success, research climate and success, faculty training and activities, clinical work, recruitment and retention, and communications.

## 2.E Unit Meetings

- Meetings of the faculty shall be called by the Department Head at least monthly during each academic term excepting summer. An e-mail announcement will be distributed to faculty members in advance of the meeting. A minimum of one faculty meeting a year shall include a discussion of departmental budget priorities and allocations within the context of the Strategic Plan. Additional faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the Department Head, the Advisory Committee, or at the request of at least three faculty members or a Committee Chair. Agenda items for faculty meetings may be submitted by any member of the faculty, no later than 3 days before the faculty meeting.
- Attendance at faculty meetings is mandatory. Exceptions are granted for illness, attendance at professional meetings that cannot be scheduled at another time, conference travel, and special circumstances (e.g., sabbatical leave, family medical leave).
- A record of action taken at faculty meetings shall be maintained by the Department Head, or by an appointed faculty or staff member. A summary of decisions made during a scheduled meeting shall be distributed to all faculty and staff.
- The Head of the Department serves as Chair for purposes of conducting faculty meetings. All eligible faculty members may vote on issues presented for action; the Chair may vote only in the event of a tied vote.
- Motions called for a vote may be decided by either a live vote or by email ballot, but the type of vote (in person or email) will be declared prior to the vote. In the case of a live vote, section E.6 below will apply. In the case of an email vote, all faculty members (including those not present at the meeting or on sabbatical) may vote provided they have sufficient opportunity to review relevant material.
- 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.
- Unless an executive session has been formally called, meetings of the faculty shall be open to student observers; students in attendance may speak on an issue at the pleasure of the faculty, as determined by majority vote.
- The parliamentary authority for the department faculty shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

# Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

## 3.A Faculty Appointments and Ranks

### 3.A.1 Faculty Appointment Types

#### *3.A.1.a Basic Types of Faculty Appointments*

Section E.2.1 of *CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* defines the following basic types of appointments, specify their terms of service, and describe their rights and privileges.

1) Tenured and tenure-track Appointments: These appointments are limited to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Only faculty members holding tenure-track appointments at the time of consideration are eligible to acquire tenure. If a tenured faculty member changes to a contract, continuing, or adjunct appointment, s/he must relinquish tenure and retire from the university. A tenured faculty member who wishes to gain emeritus/emerita status must apply prior to the time s/he relinquishes tenure and retires.

2) Continuing and Contract Appointments: Non-tenure 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.

3) Adjunct Appointments: The Department Head approves these temporary appointments based on a specific, temporary need in the Department.

4) Transitional Appointments: Transitional appointments are negotiated between the faculty member and Department Head and are approved by the Dean and Provost. The terms under which the appointment are undertaken or subsequently modified shall be negotiated to be mutually beneficial to both the faculty member and the University, and the terms of the contract shall be specified in writing, subject to the review and approval of the Dean and the Provost.

#### *3.A.1.b Other Types of Faculty Appointments*

Section E.2.2 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual defines the following other types of appointments, specify their terms of service, and describe their rights and privileges.

1) Joint Academic Appointments: HDFS faculty who request a joint appointment with another department should clear this request through the Department Head. Requests for joint appointments by faculty members in other departments are to be reviewed by the faculty.

2) Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments: The faculty reviews joint academic and administrative appointments for approval.

3) Faculty Affiliate and Visiting Faculty Appointments. The faculty reviews both Faculty Affiliate appointments and Visiting Faculty appointments for approval. Affiliate faculty will be appointed for a one-year term, and renewable annually.

#### *3.A.1.c 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 full- or part-time service as faculty shall be eligible at the time of their retirement for an emeritus/emerita title equivalent to their highest professorial rank. Academic personnel who have held administrative positions (including department heads) for five years or more shall be eligible for the emeritus/emerita title for both positions. The procedures and conditions applying to emeritus/emerita status are:

1) A member of the academic faculty may request emeritus/emerita status from the Department at the same time of retirement from the University. The Department Head and the Dean of the College shall forward the request to the Provost. If the requirements for eligibility are met, such forwarding is pro forma. The final decision on granting emeritus/emerita status will be made by the Board of Governors.

2) Privileges associated with this appointment are issuance of a permanent faculty identification card; listing on the faculty mailing lists; full library privileges; and, if possible, the department will provide office lab/office space and clerical support to emeritus/emerita faculty member who continues to do scholarly work.

### 3.A.2 Faculty Ranks

#### *3.A.2.a Professor Ranks*

Faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor must have attained a doctoral degree prior to the time of appointment.

1) Associate Professor Rank: Those appointed as Associate Professor will typically have a minimum of 5 years' experience as Assistant Professor, or the equivalent, and will have demonstrated progressive leadership, visibility, and impact in relevant aspects of the job description.

2) Professor Rank: Those appointed at the level of Professor will typically have a minimum of 5 years' experience as Associate Professor with solid evidence of national and international leadership, visibility and impact in relevant aspects of the job description.

#### *3.A.2.b Instructor Ranks*

Faculty hired at the rank of Instructor, Master Instructor or Senior Instructor to teach HDFS courses must have a master's degree at minimum.

1) Those appointed as Senior Instructor will have a minimum of 5 years of experience as Instructor and progressive development in teaching skills and curricular development, with increasing leadership in service.

2) Those appointed as Master Instructor will have a minimum of 5 years of experience as Senior Instructor and demonstrated evidence of leadership and mentorship as a teacher, contribution to curriculum innovation and development, and ongoing and demonstrated leadership and contribution in relevant service.

## 3.B Workload Policy

Faculty hired as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor both on and off the tenure track will have a workload that includes expectations for scholarship, service, and teaching. Faculty hired as Instructor, Master Instructor, or Senior Instructor will have a workload that includes expectations for service and teaching.

### 3.B.1 Service

- Tenure-Track & Tenured faculty, the standard workload distribution is expected to reflect about 15% service.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily teaching, the standard workload distribution will reflect 10-20% service.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily research, the standard workload distribution will reflect 10% service.

- Faculty who are hired as Instructor, Master Instructor or Senior instructor to teach HDFS courses will have workload distributions of about 5-10% service.

### 3.B.2 Teaching
- Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty, the standard workload distribution is expected to reflect about 50% teaching.
- HDFS graduate level courses are typically taught by Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily teaching, the standard workload distribution will reflect 70-80% teaching.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily research, the standard workload distribution will reflect 10% teaching.
- Faculty who are hired as Instructor, Master Instructor or Senior instructor to teach HDFS courses will have workload distributions of about 90-95% teaching.

### 3.B.3 Research
- Tenure-Track & Tenured faculty, the standard workload distribution is expected to reflect about 35% research.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily teaching, the standard workload distribution will reflect 5-10% research.
- Non-tenure-track faculty who are hired to do primarily research, the standard workload distribution will reflect 80% research.
- Faculty who are hired as Instructor, Master Instructor or Senior instructor to teach HDFS courses will have workload distributions of about 0% research.

### 3.B.4 Engagement

Outreach and engagement activities may be integrated into a faculty's teaching, research, and/or service efforts. These activities are defined as the development and implementation of education, consultation, or service activities for the benefit of individuals, groups, populations, or organizations. Faculty members describe the "placement" of these activities in their effort distribution with the Department Head. Outreach and engagement activities are not a mandated component of every faculty member's effort distribution but may be included when appropriate to the mission of the department or college and the goals of the faculty member.

### 3.B.5 Summer Assignments
- 9-month faculty doing work above and beyond their regular duties or teaching a summer course are eligible for summer pay through grants or department funds as stipulated in the budget.
- 12-month faculty will be assigned teaching as per the standard workload equivalent to three 3-credit courses per summer.

## 3.C Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees
- For promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty, the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty in the Department who hold the rank (or higher) that the candidate seeks.

Non-tenure-track faculty may provide input to the Committee but may not vote on promotion or reappointment.

- For promotion of non-tenure-track faculty, the promotion committee is comprised of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, along with faculty on continuing or contract appointments who hold the rank the candidate seeks. Non-tenure-track faculty may vote on promotion of contract and continuing appointment faculty.
- The Department Head does not serve as a member of the Committee.
- The Committee is responsible for reviewing all documents for promotion, tenure and reappointment of faculty members, and presenting the Department Head with a written recommendation, including a numerical vote from the T&P Committee for granting or denial of tenure, promotion and/or reappointment.
- If a committee cannot be constituted of at least three HDFS faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member under consideration, then additional members shall be from faculty in the College of Health and Human Sciences at the discretion of the T&P Committee.

### 3.C.1 Chair and Co-Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee

- The Chair and Co-Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee are to be elected from its membership. The people so elected must hold the rank of Professor. If the Department Head is a member of the tenured faculty, s/he may cast a vote in electing the Committee Chair and co-Chair.
- After an election held at the beginning of Fall semester, a Committee Chair serves a three-year term. Although no term limits are specified, the Committee is encouraged to not elect the same individual to fill more than two consecutive terms. Ideally, the Co-Chair is elected on a different year from the Co-Chair so that their terms are staggered. In many cases, the Co-Chair may serve as the next elected Chair of the T&P committee.
- If the Committee Chair will be away from campus for an extended period of time (e.g., sabbatical leave) or leaves the University before the term has expired, the Committee will elect another individual to complete the term of office, which may be the current Co-Chair.
- The Committee Chair also serves as the Department's representative to the College of Health and Human Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. When the Committee Chair is unable to participate in College P&T Advisory Committee meetings called by the Dean, the Co-chair may attend and act on her/his behalf. The Committee Chair prepares and distributes meeting agendas and other materials in advance. In instances where a meeting will focus on evaluating a faculty applicant for promotion, tenure and/or reappointment, Committee members should be given at least three weeks advance notice.

## 3.D Procedures for Tenure

- University standards and guidelines regarding tenure are described in Sections E.10 and E.12 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual: http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/FacultyCouncil/sectione.htm. College standards and guidelines are in Attachment 1.
- The Department adopts a general policy of not awarding early tenure. Only in exceptional cases, where a newly appointed faculty member has the rank of professor, or where previous academic experience is considered by prior agreement, can the individual be recommended for tenure immediately. The awarding

of tenure in this instance must conform to the standards and guidelines described in this document and university policy.

- Applications for tenure and/or promotion are initiated by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Head. The Department Head then advises the Tenure and Promotion Committee about the upcoming review.
- All applications for tenure and/or promotion must be submitted using the form in current use by the University, which is posted here: https://provost.colostate.edu/faculty-administrative-professionals/
- For tenure-track faculty, the mid-point comprehensive review and yearly internal progress toward tenure reviews must be submitted using the form in current use by the University. The mid-point comprehensive review will be conducted on the same timetable as the annual reviews.
- The Department Head and the Committee Chair will jointly maintain a timetable for the review of all faculty. This timetable must also identify individuals who might request early promotion and/or tenure.
- Annually (at the beginning of Fall Semester for those being reviewed internally for reappointment, and at the end of the prior Spring Semester for those being officially reviewed for tenure and promotion), the Department Head will forward to the Committee Chair a memo requesting a written recommendation of all faculty to be considered for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. The memo should also identify faculty who will be considered for a "midpoint" comprehensive review. This memo should include a timetable for completion of the recommendation wherein the Tenure and Promotion Committee is given at least 6 weeks to complete the requested review and submit a recommendation to the Department Head. After receipt of the memo from the Department Head, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will in turn notify the individual faculty who will be reviewed by the Committee. This notification must indicate the nature of the review, the documentation that will be required, and the date by which this documentation will need to be available for review.
- Using as evaluation criteria the tenure and promotion standards published in current Department, College and University documents, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will carefully review each application for tenure and/or promotion. After a formal Committee vote, the Committee Chair will prepare a written recommendation, and submit it to the Department Head. The recommendation must include the results of the Committee's vote to grant or deny tenure/promotion, or to support/not support reappointment. A recommendation for or against reappointment should identify strengths and weaknesses in progress toward tenure. A recommendation to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion should describe the applicant's performance and activity relative to tenure/promotion standards published in current Department, College, and University documents.
- It is the responsibility of the Department Head to review the Committee's recommendations, to add their own recommendation, and to forward both recommendations to the Dean of the College, together with the completed application. The applicant will be given 7 days to provide a written response to each recommendation if s/he so chooses. The application may not move forward in process during the 7 days subsequent to each recommendation.
- In instances where the Committee's vote indicates the existence of "majority" and "minority" positions with regard to the final recommendation, the Committee Chair is to work closely with faculty representing these points of view in preparing the final recommendation. Preferably, members of the Committee representing the minority position will write the minority section of the recommendation. If Committee members representing the minority position do not prepare a written statement to be included in the final recommendation, it is the responsibility of the Committee Chair to do so. In the latter case, the Committee Chair should work as closely as possible with Committee members representing the minority position. In

instances where the recommendation to the Department Head includes both majority and minority positions, the Committee Chair should call another meeting of the Committee to discuss the final draft and review both positions.

- In instances where the Committee's recommendation does not include majority and minority positions, it is not necessary for the Committee to reconvene. Instead, the Committee Chair may simply distribute a draft copy of the recommendation to members of the Committee who voted on the recommendation and request written feedback. If necessary, the Committee Chair subsequently incorporates this feedback into the final recommendation. The Committee Chair then forwards the recommendation to the Department Head, retains an archive copy of the recommendation in the applicant's file. In order to protect privacy of sensitive materials, individual copies of the recommendation will not be emailed to Committee members, rather, the final documents will be stored on the secure, access-limited shared drive dedicated to the specific Tenure & Promotion Committee Meeting; thus ensuring that only approved Committee members have access to these documents.

- All members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee are expected to vote. Before voting on an applicant's tenure, promotion and/or reappointment, each member of the Committee is expected to have thoroughly reviewed all materials submitted by the applicant. It is also desirable that Committee members be familiar on an on-going basis with the applicant's published research as well as teaching skills. Reasons for abstentions will be noted by the chair in the report to the Department Head.

- A faculty member within the department who holds an administrative appointment (as defined in section K.11.2) of more than half-time is eligible to vote as part of the department Tenure and Promotion Committee, as long as that faculty member does not participate in the review process at the college or university level.

- Faculty on sabbatical may vote only if they have the opportunity to review materials. If on sabbatical, votes will be uploaded as a document into a secure folder identified by the Chair or Administrative lead. Email votes will be accepted if sent through a secure, password protected, campus email service that the college IT department determines is appropriate.

- In the case of votes for promotion and for tenure, a meeting of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be held wherein each candidate is discussed. Ballots are provided on the secure shared drive containing meeting materials which can only be accessed by voting Committee members. Following the meeting, a mandatory 24-hour (minimum) moratorium will be held before faculty can upload their confidential ballots to the secure shared drive. At the end of the moratorium, faculty members will have 72 hours to vote. Actual votes are anonymous. The Chair will write up to 2 reminder emails to Committee members in an effort to obtain votes from all eligible faculty members. At the conclusion of the voting period, the Chair will count the votes, calculate mean ratings across the relevant aspects of the candidate's workload, and summarize the comments in a formal letter to the applicant (see below). The first draft of the letter will be posted on the secure folder within one week of the meeting and Committee Members will receive an email with a link to the document for review and comment. Committee members will be invited to comment on revised versions of the letter until all members approve of the document. The Chair will endeavor to expedite this process, so that the candidate and Department Head receive a copy of the final letter within two weeks of the Tenure & Promotion Committee meeting. In complex situations, this process may take longer; however, timely processing of the Committee's letter will be a high priority for the Chair.

- Confidentiality of discussions of Committee business is of utmost importance. All who attend and participate in Committee meetings must hold in strict confidence the information discussed, the votes taken, and the recommendations made. Note: Since information shared via e-mail is not secure, all Committee members

and the Department Head are to avoid transmitting sensitive and confidential information through this medium. Thus, we will devote a confidential, secure folder for each meeting and only those Committee members who are eligible to view the documents will have access to the meeting folder.

- The Committee's recommendations regarding tenure and/or promotion are to be shared with the applicant at the time the recommendation is received by the Department Head. It is the responsibility of the T&P Chair to share the Committee's recommendation with the applicant and to be available to discuss the process with the candidate, if needed. The candidate has seven (7) days to submit a rebuttal to the Committee's letter to the Department Head and the Chair. This rebuttal will accompany the letters from the Committee and the Department Head throughout the review process (e.g., College, University review).

- Actions involving reappointment of pre-tenure faculty are considered annually by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Department Head and Committee Chair are to meet jointly with the faculty member to share the evaluation of the tenured faculty vis-à-vis progress toward tenure and promotion. The Department Head will write the formal letter regarding reappointment only after reviewing the findings and recommendations of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and after conducting an evaluative conference with the faculty member and the Committee Chair.

- Criteria for tenure and promotion are those established by the Department and are to be consistent with College guidelines and University policy. These criteria are contained in the most recent version of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Standards (see Section 4). Published criteria are also found in the College Code, and the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (section E. 12). All Committee members are expected to acquire and maintain current copies of these documents, and to periodically review the tenure and promotion criteria and guidelines published in them. Prior to Committee deliberations regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Chair is expected to review with Committee members the relevant criteria to be used in evaluations and recommendations. It is the responsibility of the Committee Chair to ensure that (a) Department's criteria for promotion and tenure are consistent with those published in College and University documents, and (b) during their first semester of employment, all non-tenured faculty (tenure-track) have copies of Departmental, College and University documents containing information regarding criteria and procedures relevant to tenure and promotion.

- Any member of the faculty can propose changes in departmental tenure and/or promotion standards, criteria or procedures. Proposed changes will be submitted to the Committee Chair who, in turn, will submit them to the Committee for discussion.

- When negotiations in hiring new faculty explicitly address expectations and/or timetables for promotion and tenure, the Department Head is to work closely with the Committee Chair (following guidelines in CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, section E.10.4.1.1). In instances where early tenure will be part of the negotiated contract, the Committee Chair must poll the Committee and report the vote to the Department Head. The Department Head must share the results of the vote with the individual with whom negotiations are being conducted.

- Both the Department Head and the Committee Chair have access to a variety of sources of information on non-tenured and non-fully promoted faculty. The Department Head and Committee Chair are to share as much information as is needed to help the Tenure and Promotion Committee make informed decisions and recommendations regarding tenure, promotion and/or reappointment. On occasion, this may require that the Committee Chair invite the Department Head to participate in Committee deliberations. This participation may include providing information regarding tenure performance expectations shared with the applicant, and informing the Committee of the applicant's annual faculty evaluations that pertain to tenure, promotion and/or reappointment.

- Information required by the Committee to make informed recommendations about reappointment may also require that evaluators external to the University be requested to review an applicant's dossier. Information required by the Committee to recommend promotion or tenure must include external letters of evaluation. The Committee must follow the University policies and guidelines described in current material published by the Office of the Provost.
- Dossiers of non-tenured faculty are to be kept in a secure folder on the department's P-drive, and formally updated annually by February 15. The Committee Chair is responsible for reminding applicants of this deadline, and in helping the applicant in the preparation of the dossier. Although the dossier must be updated annually, applicants are strongly encouraged to add to their file throughout the year. These additions may include copies of publications, research grant proposals, course syllabi, etc. Committee members are encouraged to "visit" these files several times throughout the year in order to be familiar with the ongoing work of applicants. Applicants are also encouraged to invite Committee members to attend classes and complete peer evaluations of teaching.
- From time to time, members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee may be absent from campus (e.g. on sabbatical leave) during Committee deliberations. In such cases, the absent Committee member(s) may request that the Committee Chair mail copies of the application materials to her/him. The absent Committee member(s) may also participate in the Committee vote as long as the vote is received on or before a deadline to be specified by the Committee Chair.
- For each non-tenured faculty member as well as for each non-fully promoted faculty member intending to seek promotion within the next year, the Committee Chair will maintain a file that contains "formal" documents relevant to reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. These documents might include, but not be limited to, the following: (a) copies of relevant correspondence between the Department Head and the faculty member (e.g. a summary of relevant tenure and promotion information abstracted from the contract letter, and position/job description), (b) copies of the Committee's recommendations to the Department Head, (c) copies of aggregated Committee votes, (d) copies of votes and written decisions submitted by individual Committee members, (e) copies of correspondence between the Committee Chair and the faculty applicant, (f) copies of relevant correspondence between the Department Head and the Dean (e.g., recommendations for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion), and (g) copies of annual evaluations.

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

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

**Performance Levels**

The task of the Tenure and Promotion (T & P) Committee is to evaluate faculty performance related to promotion based on workload distribution in the areas of teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/engagement. For each performance area, an overall evaluation is to be made, using five categories: "superior," "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "below expectations," and "unsatisfactory," and is determined by the majority rating of the T&P Committee. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure are expected to demonstrate "superior" in research and at least "exceeds expectations" in teaching and "meets expectations" in service/engagement. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate "superior" in research and teaching and at least "exceeds expectations" in service.

**Progressive Development & the Portfolio Format**
Candidates are expected to demonstrate progressive development through a portfolio format. The summative document is the CSU T&P Dossier, available on the Provost's website: https://provost.colostate.edu/faculty-administrative-professionals/. The candidate is responsible for ensuring the current form is used. A document outlining the organizational framework for the portfolio documentation is available from the T&P Chair and/or the Department Head. A folder containing policies, tools and other relevant information about Tenure & Promotion within the department is also located on the department shared Teams drive.

Progressive development encompasses faculty members' activities to become mature scholars, competent teachers, and leaders in service and outreach. Progressive development implies that faculty members have appropriate goals and plans related to their research, teaching, and service; and that they demonstrate steps and seek professional development in order to achieve these goals. Candidates should craft specific narratives for each section of their dossiers, provide evidence of professional development activities and must use multiple forms of evidence (supporting documents) to demonstrate impact in teaching, service, and research. Examples of supporting evidence are provided in Appendix A.

**Decision-Making Model**
HDFS adopts a judgment model in making decisions about tenure and promotion. A judgment model is well suited to a department that is interdisciplinary and applied in orientation, because the paradigms and types of scholarly work vary across faculty. In a judgment model, the determination of "effective" or "outstanding" emphasizes quality, relevance and impact and requires thoughtful deliberation on a case-by-case basis. In a judgment model, these standards guide discussions of individual candidates, but do not provide a prescriptive path. The specific goals, interests, workload, and priorities of an individual faculty member provide the background context for each decision in the tenure and promotions process. Thus, embedding concise narrative summaries within the promotion application itself will provide important context for review.

**External Peer Review**
External peer review is required as part of the promotion documentation for rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and for tenure. External reviewers are to evaluate the quality of the applicant's work, focusing mainly on the candidate's primary area of work which, for most faculty on the tenure track, is in research. External reviewers are also asked to comment on the impact of the faculty member's contributions to her/his discipline or area of expertise. The purpose of external reviews is to provide additional evaluation of impact from several experts in the field of a faculty member who is applying for tenure and/or promotion.

The department follows University procedures in selecting external reviewers. All applications for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on the Tenure Track must include information provided by no fewer than five external reviewers. External reviewers should be recognized scholars in areas representative of the scholarly work published by the faculty applicant, but not have extensive, direct experience collaborating or publishing with the applicant. External reviewers are sought for their objectivity, experience, and knowledge of the candidate's area of expertise and scholarship. They should also hold a rank at or above the rank being sought by the candidate and, in most cases, be employed at a university that could be considered an institutional peer or better. Department heads and Tenure & Promotions Chairs from similar universities often have the experience and familiarity with the process to serve as effective external reviewers. Well-selected external evaluators are expected to have unique and important insights into the quality and impact of an applicant's scholarly work, her/his participation and impact in professional service activities outside the University, and/or the role of the applicant in scholarly mentoring. Teaching, advising and service within the University community will typically not be the focus of an external review for Tenure Track Faculty.

Only specific parts of the candidate's dossier will be provided to External Reviewers; specifically, the CV portion of the dossier with narratives embedded within each relevant area of the workload distribution. These narratives should be crafted with the external reviewers in mind. Deeper statements, with more introspection and self-reflection, should go into the Attachments for internal review.

Evaluations from external reviewers are to remain confidential and are not to be made available to the candidate unless required by law. Neither the source nor direct quotes from reference letters are to be conveyed to the candidate. The content of these letters is not to be discussed other than in meetings of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

## 3.F Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty

For continuing and contract faculty, a comprehensive review of progress toward promotion will be held after the third full year of employment and following the procedures in place for the mid-point review of tenure-track faculty.

**Performance Levels**

The task of the Tenure and Promotion (T & P) Committee is to evaluate faculty performance related to promotion based on workload distribution in the areas of teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/engagement. For each performance area, an overall evaluation is to be made, using five categories: "superior," "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "below expectations," and "unsatisfactory," as determined by the majority rating of the T&P committee. Standards and performance evaluation requirements for promotion in the various CCF tracks are outlined in Appendix B.

**Progressive Development and the Portfolio Format**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate progressive development through a portfolio format. Progressive development encompasses faculty members' activities to become mature scholars, competent teachers, and leaders in service and outreach. Progressive development implies that faculty members have appropriate goals and plans related to their research, teaching, and service/engagement; and that they demonstrate steps and seek professional development in order to achieve these goals. Candidates will provide evidence of professional development activities and must use multiple forms of evidence (supporting documents), to demonstrate impact in teaching, service, and research. Candidates are required to embed specific narratives that describe their activities within each area of focus and provide context for the review. Examples of supporting evidence are provided in Appendix B. Guidelines for structuring an electronic portfolio are available from the T & P Chair and will be given to all new hires as part of the orientation process.

**Decision-Making Model**

HDFS adopts a judgment model in making decisions about promotion. A judgment model is well suited to a department that is interdisciplinary and applied in orientation, because the paradigms and types of scholarly work vary across faculty. In a judgment model, the determination of "exceeds expectations" or "superior" emphasizes quality, relevance and impact and requires thoughtful deliberation on a case-by-case basis. In a judgment model, these standards guide discussions of individual candidates, but do not provide a prescriptive path. The specific goals, interests, workload, and priorities of an individual faculty member provide the background context for each decision in the promotion process. This requires active, diligent oversight and participation on behalf of the members of the T & P Committee.

**External Peer Review**

For CC 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 CC Faculty on the Professor track, the goal will be to obtain 3-5 evaluations from external reviewers for applications for Associate Professor or Professor. One of these external reviewers could be recruited from other departments within CSU, but not within HDFS. The department follows University procedures in selecting external reviewers.

## 3.G Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees

The graduate faculty shall consist of all HDFS and joint appointment to HDFS tenured and tenure-track faculty. They are eligible to serve as chairs of graduate student committees and/or as thesis advisers. The Graduate Faculty can convene and make a decision regarding the appropriateness of others to serve in this role consistent with Graduate School policy. Procedures for selecting a graduate student adviser are found in the Graduate Handbook.

# Section 4: Faculty Evaluation, Tenure & Promotion Standards, and Disciplinary Actions

## 4.A Annual Performance Evaluation

- Each faculty member employed at least .5 FTE, along with all classified staff and administrative professionals, participate in an annual evaluation of performance relative to the particular responsibilities of the position, and the particular objectives which have been previously established for the faculty member for the current year. The faculty member completes an annual activity report and presents it to the Department Head in advance of an annual evaluation conference.
- The annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) follows a specified format established by the Department. Generally, the Annual FAR describes the faculty member's professional commitments and specific accomplishments in the areas of research, education, service and outreach. The report also allows the faculty member to describe her/his goals for the coming year. The annual FAR is due to the department head by January 15. A conference between the faculty member and department head is scheduled following receipt of the FAR and prior to February 28.
- During the annual conference, the Department Head will (a) discuss the faculty member's previous year's performance; (b) point out ways to improve as well as maintain competent performance; and (c) reach agreement on the objectives for the faculty member for the following year. For pre-tenured faculty, the first part of the conference will include the T&P Chair and will be directed at progress toward tenure and promotion. For continuing and contract faculty, a joint meeting will occur as part of the 3-year review. For associate professors or senior instructors interested in promotion to the next level, a joint meeting will occur in the 3rd year post initial promotion.
- A written summary will be completed following the conference and shall be provided by the Department Head to the faculty member following the annual conference. The faculty member may append a statement to that summary. Copies of these documents will be forward to the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences.
- Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall be in compliance with the College and University Codes.
- During the annual performance review, each faculty member and the Department Head shall agree to the distribution of faculty effort across the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service. For the overall good of the Department, and dependent on faculty skills and career interests, differential effort loads are considered. These loads will be negotiated between the Department Head and the individual faculty member.
- Generally, faculty on the tenure track holding the rank of Assistant Professor are expected to commit relatively less time to service and more time to teaching and research, particularly during the first one third of their pre tenure years. In particular, when fiscally possible, new Assistant Professor hires on the tenure track will be given "release time" from service and a reduced teaching load to jump-start their research program.
- Faculty may utilize external funds to buy out of classes at 10% of their full-time 9- or 12-month salary, depending on appointment as 9- or 12-month employee. 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. For faculty with career development awards that provide at least 75% of salary coverage, the load will consist of 1 course annually and minimal service requirements.

- With regard to service, pre-tenure faculty are expected to serve on at least one departmental committee during their first five years, preferably after their second year of employment, and to be involved in service activities in professional organizations at the national level. Service at the college or university level is not encouraged until after pre-tenure faculty members have completed three years of employment. During the latter two thirds of faculty members' pre tenure years, they should allocate up to 15% of their effort to service, again giving priority to departmental service.

- In general, the percentage of effort devoted to service should not exceed that allocated to research or teaching.

- Faculty hired at the rank of Associate Professor will be expected to engage in department, college, or university service at an earlier time in their employment trajectory than that expected of pre-tenure Assistant Professors, but the percentage of effort expended on service should not exceed that for research or teaching. Tenured faculty, particularly those at the rank of Professor, may be given more latitude in how they distribute their effort across the three areas. However, it shall be the responsibility of the Department Head to ensure that an overall balance among the three activities exists across all faculty in the Department.

- Criteria for evaluating performance, and documenting activities, in teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/outreach are described in Appendix D, Annual Performance Standards.

- 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 following University procedures. Survey results are viewed on the course survey website by the faculty member. As noted in Section E.12.1 of the Manual, Student Course Survey results are one source of information that can be used to document teaching effectiveness for annual performance evaluations and for T&P decisions. Faculty are expected to include summaries of course evaluations for their annual evaluations and may also include signed peer evaluations. Evidence of teaching success and innovation will be listed in the annual FAR; supporting documentation will be maintained by the faculty member.

## 4.B Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

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

During the third year of appointment for pre-tenured faculty, a major "mid-probationary" review will be conducted. This mid-probationary review will follow the procedures in Section E.14.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Note: Annually, prior to preparing a portfolio to be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for review, pre-tenured faculty should carefully review (a) departmental guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, (b) Sections E.10 and E.12 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual, and (c) the most recent edition of the College's Guidelines for Faculty Performance. Questions regarding the preparation of portfolios should be directed to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

## 4.C Comprehensive Performance Reviews

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 and outreach.

### 4.C.1 Phase I

The University requires all tenured faculty, excepting those on transitional appointments, to be reviewed at 1) intervals of five years, or 2) following two consecutive annual reviews within a five-year period reflecting a less than satisfactory performance in the overall evaluation of teaching, research, and service. A "less than satisfactory" evaluation will be defined as an evaluation of "below expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in teaching or research. By departmental code, the Chair of the department's Tenure/Promotion Committee may work collaboratively with the Department Head in the evaluation of Phase I comprehensive reviews, at the request of the Department Head or faculty member being reviewed, including the development of any professional development plans which may be instituted prior to determination of the need for a Phase II review.

If faculty performance in the Phase I comprehensive performance review merits an overall unsatisfactory or below expectations in the teaching and research areas, the Department Head, the Chair of the Tenure/Promotion Committee, and the faculty member will design a professional development plan to assist the faculty member in satisfactorily meeting departmental expectations. The Chair of the Tenure/Promotion Committee, in participating in this process, is to provide additional input, but is not required to be in agreement with the review status given by the Department Head. The Department Head and Chair of the Tenure/promotion Committee will consult and evaluate together the faculty member's progress on the development plan. If the progress made on the Phase I developmental plan is considered unsatisfactory at the end of their mutually agreed upon timeline, a Phase II Comprehensive Review is required.

### 4.C.2 Phase II

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

b)   In an effort to ensure impartiality of the members of this committee, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will select four members who best represent the diverse perspectives of the department. The faculty member being reviewed has the right to challenge committee composition in one of two ways: (a) to challenge one member of the chosen committee by giving written reasoning for the challenge; the reasoning will be reviewed by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and another

selection will be made if the cause of the challenge is seen as valid or (b) to challenge the entire committee composition, giving written justification for the challenge.

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

c)   The Phase II Review Committee will review the faculty member's performance according to criteria for evaluation of faculty performance found in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (Sections E.9 and E.12) and the HDFS Department's Promotion and Tenure Standards document. These standards must be viewed in light of the individual's annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or tenure (whichever is most recent) along with the assigned responsibilities and effort distribution over the period in question.

d)   The Department Head 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. A written response by the faculty member speaking to the areas that were rated as unsatisfactory as well as areas that the faculty member feels were not properly considered is encouraged.

e)   After meeting once, the Phase II Review Committee has the option to request additional information from the Department Head, faculty member being reviewed, or other parties they feel would aid their deliberations. Following final deliberations, the Committee will send forward a written recommendation which supports one of the three following outcomes:

(1)  Outcome 1: The faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by their academic unit.

(2)  Outcome 2: There are deficiencies, but they are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent. Note: No further action is necessary if either of the two aforementioned outcomes is identified

(3)  Outcome 3: There are deficiencies that are substantial and chronic or recurrent.

f)   Further action is required if the latter outcome is identified. Where deficiencies are identified which must be corrected the Department Head will design a professional development plan to address those deficiencies and set a time-line for accomplishment of each element of the plan; the faculty member will be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor (Department Head) on the design of the professional development plan. The Dean of the College must approve this development plan.

g)   In the case of Outcome 3, the Committee will provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review and the faculty member will have 10 working days in which to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the committee review and the faculty member's response will be forwarded to the Department Head, and eventually to the Dean and Provost.

h)   Timeline for Phase II reviews

(1)  Phase II review initiated by Department Head (following unsatisfactory Phase I review)

(2)  Peer Review Committee (PRC) selected by T&P Chair (10 days after Phase II review is initiated by Department Head)

(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 Department Head and to the faculty member (10 days after PRC meets to review)

(5)  Faculty member prepares and submits a written response to the Department Head and to the PRC (10 days after PRC report is received by faculty member and Department Head).

(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": Department Head and faculty member design a professional development plan (within 10 days after faculty member submits written response to the Department Head and the PRC).

## 4.D Annual Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Extensions of the pre-tenure probationary period shall follow policy in Section E.10.4.1.2 of the CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

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

Tenure-Track (TT) faculty at Colorado State University (CSU) are on a promotional pathway from Assistant to Associate to Professor. The normal expectation is that a faculty member will have five years of full-time experience at a rank prior to being considered for advancement. University standards and guidelines regarding promotion are described in Sections E.12 – E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual: https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-e/#E.13. College standards and requirements are in Attachment 1.

In the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS), all TT faculty have doctoral degrees. TT faculty typically have 35% effort devoted to research, 15% effort devoted to service, and 50% effort devoted to teaching. Variations in workload occur based on grant buy-out, start-up and other factors, and are determined during the annual performance review process with the department head. All faculty are evaluated based on workload distribution.

**Evaluation of Progress to Tenure and Promotion**

All TT faculty receive a detailed annual evaluation from the Department Head that provides formative feedback to the TT faculty member. This includes an evaluation of whether or not the TT faculty member is on track for promotion and/or tenure as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion. During the pre-tenure years, and following the first year of employment, the T&P committee will also complete a formative evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. An important part of this process includes a meeting

during the annual evaluation that includes the candidate, the Department Head, and the Chair of the T&P committee. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss progress toward tenure and promotion and resolve any questions in perspective about progress in a constructive and formative way.

A comprehensive review of progress toward promotion will be conducted by the T &P committee during the first three years of full-time employment at each rank. Feedback will include (a) commentary on activities reflective of effective (or better) performance, (b) suggestions and recommendations to enhance career development, and (c) concerns about progress in an area that require action to be taken in order for future performance to merit promotion. The mid-probationary review during the 3rd year of pre-tenure employment is required by the University and will follow University guidelines and procedures. The three-year review at the associate level with tenure is an optional departmental level process but strongly encouraged for those seeking advancement to Professor.

**Early Advancement in Rank**
The normal expectation is that an individual will have five years of experience at a rank prior to being considered for promotion. Only in exceptional cases will there be serious consideration of early promotion. The awarding of both promotion and tenure in this instance must conform to the standards and guidelines described in this document and university policy.

**University Standards and Guidelines**
See the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Sections E.12-E.13 for university standards and guidelines for promotion. http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/FacultyCouncil/sectione.htm.

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

a. Perform teaching, advising, and service assignments in a manner consistent with standards established for all faculty members and detailed in the *Manual*.
b. Use University funds, facilities, equipment, supplies, and staff only in the conduct of University duties, exceptions to be made only under specific University policies or when established commercial rates are paid.
c. Maintain a high level of discretion and respect in personal and professional relations with students, faculty members, staff, and the public.
d. Compensate University personnel (including students) fairly for work performed which is related to professional activities beyond one's University assignment.
e. Recognize fairly and accurately the extent of the contribution of others to one's professional work.
f. Avoid non university activities that could significantly interfere with carrying out assigned University responsibilities.
g. Refrain from disclosing confidential information that was acquired by nature of one's activities as an academic faculty member or administrative professional (for example, see C.R.S., 1973, 18-8-402, Misuse of Public Information).
h. Abide by University policies pertaining to patents, publication, copyrights, consulting, off-campus employment, and conflict of interest as detailed in the *Manual*.

i. Refrain from selling complimentary textbooks.

j. Eschew academic misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, in proposing, conducting, or reporting research, or in scholarly or creative endeavors, or in identifying one's professional qualifications.

## 4.E.1 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (TT)

In order to advance from Assistant to Associate Professor, candidates should have a minimum of five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor and are evaluated during their sixth year of employment. **Departmental standards emphasize the importance of a strong early career research trajectory, with consensus amongst faculty that demonstration of "Superior" in research, and "Exceeds Expectations" in either Teaching or Service (and Meets expectations in the 3rd area) are necessary for promotion to Associate Professor in HDFS.** Specific considerations are discussed below:

> Research/Scholarship: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of "Superior" for research, which includes selection of an area of study that is significant to HDFS and can be developed into a cohesive program of research that distinguishes the candidate as an independent researcher with a growing reputation in the field. A record of a steady flow of publications in high quality, high impact refereed journals and other scholarly outlets, with ongoing dissemination of original work at conferences and professional meetings is expected. This does not require a specific number of publications per year; rather an active, ongoing research effort that demonstrates a planful approach to scholarship. Evidence of research productivity is also reflected in progressive activity toward obtaining external funding. The strategic approach to grantsmanship is an important consideration in the evaluation of these criteria. See Appendix A for criteria and corresponding evidence.

> Teaching and Advising: Performance evaluation for teaching includes classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, student mentoring, published scholarly activity related to pedagogy and evidence of the external impact of such endeavors. See See Appendix A for criteria and corresponding evidence.

> Service and Outreach/Engagement: Performance evaluation for service and outreach/engagement includes departmental citizenship and participation in faculty meetings, and engagement as appropriate to job description. See Appendix A for criteria and corresponding evidence.

## 4.E.2 Promotion to the Rank of Professor (TT)

In order to advance from Associate to Professor, candidates should have a minimum of five years of full-time service as an Associate Professor but a more salient criterion is demonstration of national and international reputation for significant and impactful research contributions. Departmental standards emphasize the importance of a productive research program, active engagement in graduate education/scholarly mentoring, and establishing a national/international reputation as a well-respected figure in their own field. **Promotion standards within HDFS specify that a candidate must demonstrate "Superior" performance in research AND either Teaching or Service, along with "Meets Expectations" in the third area**. Specific considerations are discussed below:

> Research/Scholarship: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of "Superior" for research, which includes an established reputation at the national and international level in an area of emphasis that is recognized and highly regarded amongst scholars in their own field. A record of a

steady flow of publications in high quality, high impact refereed journals, with ongoing dissemination of original work at conferences and professional meetings consistently over the past five years is expected. A proportion of these publications and presentations must be judged to be original contributions to the field, and ideally would appear in the top-tier journals in one's area. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member is a primary or senior contributor or author of the majority of these publications/presentations. A consistent record of obtaining extramural funding as principal investigator or Co-PI is expected, with a proportion of funding coming from federal sources or other prestigious and competitive sponsors. See Appendix A.

Teaching and Advising: Performance evaluations for Teaching include integrating teaching into research activities, graduate student mentoring/training in research activities, successful production of doctoral students, classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovations, and contributing to the learning of other faculty and colleagues. See Appendix A.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Performance evaluation for service and outreach/engagement includes departmental citizenship and participation in faculty meetings, and engagement as appropriate to job description. See Appendix A.

## 4.F Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks

Contract and Continuing Faculty (CCF) eligible for promotion at Colorado State University (CSU) are on contract or continuing appointments and are categorized into either an Instructor track or a Professor track. The Professor promotional pathway is Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The normal expectation is that a faculty member will have five years of full-time experience at a rank prior to being considered for advancement. University standards and guidelines regarding promotion are described in Sections E.12 – E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual:
https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-e/#E.13

Those on the Professor track have doctoral degrees. CCF usually have a primary focus in either Teaching, Research, or Service/Engagement (includes faculty with administrative/leadership positions). General estimates of workload distributions for each focus are described below:
- CC Teaching Faculty typically have 80% effort devoted to teaching ("primary function"), with small amounts of time allocated to secondary and tertiary functions (e.g., research/scholarly & creative work or service/engagement).
- CC Research Faculty typically have 80% devoted to research ("primary function"), with small amounts of time allocated to secondary and tertiary functions (e.g., teaching or service/engagement).
- CC Service/Engagement Faculty typically have 80% devoted to service/administration ("primary function"), with small amounts of time allocated to secondary and tertiary functions (e.g., research/scholarly & creative works, teaching).

Reviews for promotion of CCF will be based on the individual faculty member's workload distribution. Highest standards are set for the person's primary function and standards for secondary/tertiary functions are set based upon workload distribution. If the distribution has changed over the years of employment, the Committee will anchor their review in the predominant distribution across the candidate's academic career at CSU, while also recognizing the shift in workload distribution over time. CCF Candidates for promotion are encouraged to

embed concise summary narratives within all relevant sections of their dossier to contextualize their professional development within their individual roles and priority areas.

**Evaluation Toward Promotion**

All CC faculty receive a detailed annual evaluation from the Department Head that provides formative feedback to the CC faculty member. This includes an evaluation of whether or not the CC faculty member is on track for promotion as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion. A comprehensive review of progress toward promotion will be offered by the T &P committee after the third year of full-time employment at each rank (i.e., "mid-point review"). Feedback will include (a) commentary on activities reflective of effective (or better) performance, (b) suggestions and recommendations to enhance career development, and (c) concerns about progress in an area that require action to be taken in order for future performance to merit promotion. The midpoint review process will mirror that of the "mid-course" review process for Tenure Track Faculty.

**Early Advancement in Rank**

The normal expectation is that an individual will have five years of experience at a rank prior to being considered for advancement. Only in exceptional cases will there be serious consideration of early promotion. These cases will be characterized by outstanding performance assessed through evaluation both internal and external to the University.

**PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

Although not listed as one of the three major criteria to be used in faculty review for promotion, faculty are expected to adhere to the University's Code of Ethical Behavior described in Section D.9, Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-d/#D.9) and CSU's Principles of Community (Appendix A). Academic faculty members, staff and administrative professionals at Colorado State University should be aware that their personal conduct reflects on the integrity of the University and should take care that their actions have no detrimental effect on the institution. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to:

a. Perform teaching, advising, and service assignments in a manner consistent with standards established for all faculty members and detailed in the Manual.
b. Use University funds, facilities, equipment, supplies, and staff only in the conduct of University duties, exceptions to be made only under specific University policies or when established commercial rates are paid.
c. Maintain a high level of discretion and respect in personal and professional relations with students, faculty members, staff, and the public.
d. Compensate University personnel (including students) fairly for work performed which is related to professional activities beyond one's University assignment.
e. Recognize fairly and accurately the extent of the contribution of others to one's professional work.
f. Avoid non university activities that could significantly interfere with carrying out assigned University responsibilities.
g. Refrain from disclosing confidential information that was acquired by nature of one's activities as an academic faculty member or administrative professional (for example, see C.R.S., 1973, 18-8-402, Misuse of Public Information).
h. Abide by University policies pertaining to patents, publication, copyrights, consulting, off-campus employment, and conflict of interest as detailed in the Manual.
i. Refrain from selling complimentary textbooks.
j. Eschew academic misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, in proposing, conducting, or reporting research, or in scholarly or creative endeavors, or in identifying one's professional

qualifications.

## 4.F.1 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (CCF)

### 4.F.1.a Associate Professor: Primarily Teaching

Faculty on the Professor track with a focus on teaching have doctoral degrees and usually have 80% effort devoted to teaching, approximately 10-15% effort devoted to either Service/Engagement or Research/Scholarship, and 5-10% effort devoted to either Service/Engagement or Research/Scholarship.

Standards and performance evaluation requirements to advance are outlined in Appendix B. Candidates will provide evidence of professional development activities and must use multiple forms of evidence (supporting documents) to demonstrate impact. In order to advance to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor, and meet the expectations described below:

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" for teaching**, which includes classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, student advising and mentoring, and professional development. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of **"Meets Expectations"** across these aspects of service: department, college, university, and state service; professional/community service; and editorial/grant/professional review. (Note: If candidate's workload description is 15% or more for service work, expectations are set for "Exceeds". See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Research and Scholarship: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of **"Meets Expectations"** and have a record of non-refereed scholarly publications and presentations and/or a record of contributing to refereed publications. (Note: If candidate's workload description is 15% or more for research/scholarly work, expectations are set for "Exceeds Expectations"; See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

### 4.F.1.b Associate Professor: Primarily Research

Faculty on the Professor track with a focus on research have doctoral degrees and usually have 80% effort devoted to research, 10-15% effort devoted to service, and 5-10% effort devoted to teaching/advising. Standards and performance evaluation requirements to advance to Associate Professor and Professor are outlined in Appendix B. Candidates should provide evidence of professional development activities and must use multiple forms of evidence (supporting documents), to demonstrate impact.

In order to advance to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" in Research, AND "Meets Expectations" in both Service/Engagement and Teaching/Advising** and meet the criteria below:

Research and Scholarship: Candidates for Associate Professor with a research focus must obtain a performance evaluation of "Superior" in the areas of: refereed publications and presentations, impact of scholarly work, grants, national/international reputation, and professional development.

See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Meets Expectations" in Service/Outreach across these aspects of service: department, college, university, and state service; professional/community service; and editorial/grant/professional review. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Meets Expectations" in Teaching which may classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, and student advising and mentoring. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

### 4.F.1.c Associate Professor: Primarily Service/Engagement

Faculty on the Professor track with a focus on Service/Engagement have doctoral degrees and usually have 80% effort devoted to Administration or other Service/Engagement roles, approximately 15% effort devoted to either Teaching or Scholarship, and approximately 5% devoted to either Teaching or Scholarship. Standards and performance evaluation requirements to advance are outlined in Appendix B. Candidates should provide evidence of professional development activities and must use multiple forms of evidence (supporting documents), to demonstrate impact.

In order to advance to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" in Service/Engagement, AND "Meets Expectations" in both Research/Scholarship and Teaching/Advising.**

Service/Engagement: Candidates for Associate Professor with a Service focus must obtain a performance evaluation of "Superior" in the areas of administrative leadership and service to the department, college, university, and/or state/community engagement. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Research/Scholarship: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Meets Expectations". See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Meets Expectations" in Teaching, which may classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, and student advising and mentoring. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

## 4.F.2 Promotion to the Rank of Professor (CCF)

### 4.F.2.a Professor: Primarily Teaching

In order to advance to the rank of Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" in teaching, AND "Exceeds Expectations" in their Secondary focus (either Service/Engagement or Research/Scholarship) AND "Meets Expectations" in their Third focus** (either Service/Engagement or Research/Scholarship).

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of "Superior" for

teaching, which includes classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, student advising and mentoring, and professional development. Candidates must also demonstrate a leadership role in teaching. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus) across these aspects of service: department, college, university, and state service; professional/community service; faculty or professional mentorship; and editorial/grant/professional review. Candidates must also demonstrate a leadership role in service. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Research and Scholarship: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus) for research or scholarship. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

### 4.F.2.b Professor: Primarily Research
In order to advance to the rank of Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" in research, AND "Exceeds Expectations" in their Secondary focus (either Service/Engagement or Teaching) AND "Meets Expectations" in their Third focus (either Service/Engagement or Teaching).**

Research and Scholarship: Candidates for Professor with a research focus must obtain a performance evaluation of "Superior" in the areas of: refereed publications & presentations, impact of scholarship, grants, national/international reputation, and professional development. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" in Service/Outreach (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus) across these aspects of service: department, college, university, and state service; professional/community service; and editorial/grant/professional review. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Teaching and Advising: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" in Teaching (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus), which may classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, and student advising and mentoring. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

### 4.F.2.c Professor: Primarily Service/Engagement
In order to advance to the rank of Professor, candidates should have a minimum of a doctoral degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" in Service/Engagement, AND "Exceeds Expectations" in their Secondary focus (either Teaching or Research/Scholarship) AND "Meets Expectations" in their Third**

**focus (either Teaching or Research/Scholarship).**

Service/Engagement: Candidates for Professor with a Service focus must obtain a performance evaluation of "Superior" in the areas of administrative leadership and service to the department, college, university, and/or state/community engagement. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Research/Scholarship: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" in Research/Scholarship (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus) See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Teaching and Advising: Depending on their workload distribution, candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of "Exceeds Expectations" in Teaching (if this is their Secondary focus) or "Meets Expectations" (if this is their Third focus), which may classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, and student advising and mentoring. See Appendix B for criteria and corresponding evidence.

## 4.G Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks

Contract and Continuing Faculty (CCF) eligible for promotion at Colorado State University (CSU) are on contract or continuing appointments and are categorized into either an Instructor track or a Professor track. The Instructor promotional pathway is Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Master Instructor. The normal expectation is that a faculty member will have five years of full-time experience at a rank prior to being considered for advancement. University standards and guidelines regarding promotion are described in Sections E.12 – E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual: https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-e/#E.13

In the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS), those on the Instructor track have master's degrees and workloads that are typically 90-95% teaching and 5-10% service.

Reviews for promotion of CCF will be based on the individual faculty member's workload distribution. Highest standards are set for the person's primary function and standards for secondary/tertiary functions are set based upon workload distribution. If the distribution has changed over the years of employment, the Committee will anchor their review in the predominant distribution across the candidate's academic career at CSU, while also recognizing the shift in workload distribution over time. CCF Candidates for promotion are encouraged to embed concise summary narratives within all relevant sections of their dossier to contextualize their professional development within their individual roles and priority areas.

**Decision-Making Model**

HDFS adopts a judgment model in making decisions about promotion. A judgment model is well suited to a department that is interdisciplinary and applied in orientation, because the paradigms and types of scholarly work vary across faculty. In a judgment model, the determination of "exceeds expectations" or "superior" emphasizes quality, relevance and impact and requires thoughtful deliberation on a case-by-case basis. In a judgment model, these standards guide discussions of individual candidates, but do not provide a prescriptive path. The specific goals, interests, workload, and priorities of an individual faculty member provide the

background context for each decision in the promotion process. This requires active, diligent oversight and participation on behalf of the members of the T & P Committee.

**Evaluation Toward Promotion**

All CC Faculty receive a detailed annual evaluation from the Department Head that provides formative feedback to the CC Faculty member. This includes an evaluation of whether or not the CC Faculty member is on track for promotion as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion. A comprehensive review of progress toward promotion will be offered by the T &P committee after the third year of full-time employment at each rank (i.e., "mid-point review"). Feedback will include (a) commentary on activities reflective of effective (or better) performance, (b) suggestions and recommendations to enhance career development, and (c) concerns about progress in an area that require action to be taken in order for future performance to merit promotion. The midpoint review process will mirror that of the "mid-course" review process for Tenure Track Faculty.

**Early Advancement in Rank**

The normal expectation is that an individual will have five years of experience at a rank prior to being considered for advancement. Only in exceptional cases will there be serious consideration of early promotion. These cases will be characterized by outstanding performance assessed through evaluation both internal and external to the University.

**PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

Although not listed as one of the three major criteria to be used in faculty review for promotion, faculty are expected to adhere to the University's Code of Ethical Behavior described in Section D.9, Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-d/#D.9) and CSU's Principles of Community (Appendix A). Academic faculty members, staff and administrative professionals at Colorado State University should be aware that their personal conduct reflects on the integrity of the University and should take care that their actions have no detrimental effect on the institution. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to:

   a. Perform teaching, advising, and service assignments in a manner consistent with standards established for all faculty members and detailed in the Manual.
   b. Use University funds, facilities, equipment, supplies, and staff only in the conduct of University duties, exceptions to be made only under specific University policies or when established commercial rates are paid.
   c. Maintain a high level of discretion and respect in personal and professional relations with students, faculty members, staff, and the public.
   d. Compensate University personnel (including students) fairly for work performed which is related to professional activities beyond one's University assignment.
   e. Recognize fairly and accurately the extent of the contribution of others to one's professional work.
   f. Avoid non university activities that could significantly interfere with carrying out assigned University responsibilities.
   g. Refrain from disclosing confidential information that was acquired by nature of one's activities as an academic faculty member or administrative professional (for example, see C.R.S., 1973, 18-8-402, Misuse of Public Information).
   h. Abide by University policies pertaining to patents, publication, copyrights, consulting, off-campus employment, and conflict of interest as detailed in the Manual.
   i. Refrain from selling complimentary textbooks.

Eschew academic misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, in proposing, conducting, or reporting research, or in scholarly or creative endeavors, or in identifying one's professional qualifications

### 4.G.1 Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor

Faculty on the Instructor track have master's degrees and workloads that are typically 95% teaching and 5% service. Standards and performance evaluation requirements to advance to Senior Instructor and Master Instructor are outlined in Appendix C.

In order to advance to the rank of Senior Instructor, candidates should have a minimum of a master's degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Instructor, and must meet the expectations described below:

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Exceeds Expectations" for teaching**, which includes classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, clinical supervision, student advising and mentoring, and professional development. See Appendix C for criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Meets Expectations" for service and outreach/engagemen**t, which includes departmental citizenship and participation in faculty meetings, and engagement as appropriate to job description. See Appendix C for criteria and corresponding evidence.

### 4.G.2 Promotion to the Rank of Master Instructor

In order to advance to the rank of Master Instructor, candidates should have a minimum of a master's degree and five years of full-time service at the rank of Senior Instructor, and must meet the expectations described below:

Teaching and Advising: Candidates must have a performance evaluation of **"Superior" for teaching**, which includes: classroom teaching performance, curriculum development and instructional innovation, student advising and mentoring, and professional development. Candidates will also demonstrate a leadership role. See Appendix C for specific criteria and corresponding evidence.

Service and Outreach/Engagement: Candidates must obtain a performance evaluation of **"Meets Expectations"**, and demonstrate leadership in service, as well as faculty or professional mentoring. See Appendix C for criteria and corresponding evidence.

## 4.H Disciplinary Action for Faculty

The Department follows the University's policies regarding disciplinary action for 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, Master Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Instructor). All faculty members shall have the academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment.

## 4.I Grievance Processes for Faculty

The Department follows the University's policies regarding disciplinary action for faculty as outlined in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section K. The faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Master Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Instructor). All faculty members shall have the academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment.

# Section 5: Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff Administrative Policies & Procedures

## 5.A Annual Performance Evaluation

Annual Performance Evaluation In accordance with the AFAPM (https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section-d/), all administrative professionals and state classified staff and participate in an annual evaluation of performance relative to the individual roles and responsibilities of the position, and the goals, which have been previously established for the individual for the current year. A departmental form is used to assess the performance of Administrative Professionals. University deadlines and procedures are followed to assess the annual performance of state classified staff (AFAPM, section D.10). The immediate supervisor holds a formal annual conference with each individual as part of the evaluation, during which the supervisor and employee discuss performance. The completed evaluation is provided in writing and signed by the immediate supervisor and the employee, who thereby indicates receipt of the evaluation. A signed copy shall be provided to the Dean and the employee.

## 5.B Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals

The Department follows the guidelines for Administrative Professional employment as indicated by the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section D.

### 5.B.1. Research Professionals

Procedures for promotion of research professional shall be in accordance with section D.5.3 of AFAPM.

### 5.B.2. Academic Success Coordinators and Advisors

Procedures for promotion of academic success coordinators and academic advisors shall be in accordance with the Colorado State University Academic Success Coordinator/Academic Advisor Professional Advancement Structure.

### 5.B.3. Other Administrative Professionals not Delineated Above

Procedures for promotion of all other administrative professionals shall be in accordance with section D.5.3 of AFAPM.

## 5.C Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff

The Department follows the guidelines for State Classified Staff employment as indicated by the Classified Personnel Council and HR at Colorado State University.

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

Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff All disciplinary action for state classified staff shall be in accordance with the HR manual, Section 3: State Classified Personnel, Corrective and Disciplinary Actions.

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

Grievance Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff The Department believes that the best approach to grievances is prevention through communication. Staff should deal directly with their

supervisor or Department Head to achieve satisfactory resolution of issues through appropriate communication. In the event that there is communication difficulty between a staff member and the supervisor or Department Head, the Department may provide an advisory body of staff for the purpose of attempting to arbitrate the concern through local communication. In the event that these measures do not satisfactorily resolve issues, staff and departments are referred to AFAPM section K for general grievance procedures established at the University for specifics about the process and time limitation relevant to the grievance process. Human Resources manages state classified grievances, see the HR Manual, Section 3. State Classified Personnel Grievance Process

# Section 6: Student Policies and Procedures

## 6.A Student Employees

All student employees must be enrolled as undergraduate students at Colorado State University for Fall and Spring employment. Preference is usually given to hiring students who qualify for Work-study. Students may remain as non-work-study for summer session positions but can only work past graduation as designated by Colorado State's HR regulations.  Please see CSU's Student Employment Handbook for reference: https://hr.colostate.edu/hr-community-and-supervisors/classification-and-compensation/student/.

## 6.B Graduate Student Evaluation

The purpose of the annual review of Applied Developmental Science (ADS) doctoral students, Prevention Science masters students, and Marriage and Family Therapy masters students in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) is to provide students with systematic feedback on their academic and professional growth. Evaluations enable the faculty to acknowledge student accomplishments and to identify potential problems before they become serious. It also exposes graduate students to professional performance reviews that take place in many career settings after graduate school. For a more detailed list of criteria used to determine satisfactory progress, please refer to the ADS, PS, and MFT handbooks located in Canvas resources for faculty.

## 6.C Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants

Students enrolling in supervised research work with faculty (i.e., HDFS 498) are expected to have a cumulative GPA of 3.0. Exceptions may be made based on a compelling written rationale by the supervising faculty to the Department Head. Students enrolling in supervised college teaching (i.e., HDFS 484) will be juniors or seniors who have a cumulative major GPA of 3.0 and a grade of A in the course they will be assisting in. No exceptions will be made to these criteria.

## 6.D Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants

Forthcoming.

## 6.E Student Grade Appeal

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

- If the Department Head finds that a student's grade appeal merits convening an appeals committee, this Committee shall be constituted as follows. The Committee Chair will be selected at random from among tenured faculty in the College of Health and Human Sciences, excluding those in HDFS. Two HDFS faculty will be selected at random from among the tenured faculty in the department, excluding those who are on leave.

- Committee members who have a conflict of interest in the case – a friend or relative of the student, the instructor involved in assigning the disputed grade – will be excused from service, and another name will be drawn as above.

- If a graduate student appeals the grade, the remaining two committee members will be selected at random from among students who are in their second year or later in HDFS.

- If an undergraduate student appeals the grade, the remaining two committee members will be selected at random from a pool of 25 junior and senior HDFS majors who have been identified by the Undergraduate Program Director; maturity and judgment are relevant considerations in forming this pool.

- Grievances that cannot be resolved in the Department will be forwarded to the CSU Student Resolution Center.

- Any grievances involving academic integrity or student misconduct will be reported to the CSU Student Resolution Center. The Department Head will be notified in such instances.

# Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code

- The Department Code shall be reviewed by the faculty in odd numbered years, and in the year prior to the end of each term of the Department Head (normally 5 years).
- Amendments to the Code may originate with the Department Head or any eligible faculty member at any time. Each amendment will be reviewed by the Department Head prior to presentation to the full faculty for review. In exceptional circumstances any part of this code may be suspended for one year. All amendments or suspensions to the Code shall require a two-thirds majority vote of the eligible department faculty.
- Proposals for substantive changes in the Promotion and Tenure Standards document may be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by any two or more tenure-track or tenured faculty members. Proposals shall contain a rationale for the suggested change(s). The Chair shall circulate the proposal to all members of the T&P Committee and consideration of the proposal shall be included as an agenda item in a timely manner. The authors of the proposed change shall present the proposal and its rationale to the T&P Committee. Thereafter, the T&P Committee members will vote on the proposal. If a majority of those voting consider the proposal to have merit, the proposal will be presented at a faculty meeting, where all tenure-track and tenured faculty will have an opportunity to provide input concerning the merits of the proposal. At the next meeting of the T&P Committee, a vote will be taken on the amendment. A 2/3 majority of the voting members is required for the proposal to be accepted into the Promotion and Standards document.
- If any change that affects the evaluation of faculty is made to the Promotion and Tenure Standards, the change will be considered as a departmental standard no sooner than one year after it is approved. The standard may be determined, by the T&P Committee, to become effective beyond the one year minimum period, in which case the date will be identified in the Standards document. These time frames shall be determined to ensure that faculty who are being evaluated have reasonable time to meet the new guidelines.

## 7.A Signatures Approving of the Unit Code

This Code for the Department of HDFS was approved by a minimum two-thirds majority of the Department faculty eligible to vote at a regularly scheduled meeting held on May 19, 2021.

Provost Approval

| | |
|---|---|
| Signature | Date |

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

# Appendices

# Appendix A: Examples of Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

**Table 1. Research and Scholarship for TT Faculty**

The T & P Committee will provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," and "Unsatisfactory." No specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Faculty will be evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

The department values interdisciplinary and team science. Faculty are required to describe their role in and contributions to each team publication and to team grants. This is done in two ways: (a) in an overall research statement that is part of both annual and promotion-related reviews; and (b) specifically with a line under each publication and/or grant that briefly states the candidate's role and contribution.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
| --- | --- |
| Refereed Publications & Presentations | Authors several peer-reviewed articles per year in a consistent and programmatic fashion<br>Publishes in high impact journals<br>Edits a journal or special issue<br>Authors or co-authors refereed papers at conferences/meetings<br>Delivers invited presentations at professional conferences or seminars<br>Collaborates with students, postdocs and/or junior faculty on publications and presentations |
| Grants | Submits proposals to support research through competitive external sources<br>Secures funding to support research in a planful manner<br>Develops peer-reviewed publications from funded projects in a timely and focused manner<br>Assumes a significant leadership role in one or more research teams as PI, Co-PI or Co-I<br>Collaborates with students, postdocs and/or junior faculty on grants |
| Scholarly Impact | Demonstrates expertise through a body of focused written work (e.g., series of articles, textbook)<br>Demonstrates forward progression of knowledge, theory and impact<br>Demonstrates national/international impact of work through publications, citations, leadership roles in field and active engagement in scholarly reviews (e.g., study sections for federal grants, editorial roles in important journals in field)<br>Obtains research awards/honors/nominations or special fellowships for research<br>Receives invitations to be a visiting scholar /lecturer<br>Increasingly assumes leadership and contributes significantly to collaborations<br>Conducts scholarly work that is used across disciplines and contexts<br>Provides consultation to groups engaged in scholarly activities |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Provides testimony to government bodies |
| Professional Development | Participates in workshops or in additional classes to increase knowledge and skill |
| | Articulates plan for future professional development |
| | Demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from annual evaluations, mid-course review, mentors, peers, students |
| | Demonstrates willingness to and effectiveness in mentoring others |

**Table 2. Teaching and Advising for CC Faculty**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." No specific and commonly agreed quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

The CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (TILT) developed the Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF) as an organizational structure for reflecting on progress in distinct areas of pedagogy. See TILT: Teaching Effectiveness Framework for descriptions of the seven domains. Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate effectiveness across at least several of the TEF domains and may find that organizing evidence using the TEF is an effective strategy for portfolio creation. TILT has suggested metrics of teaching effectiveness that are noted (*) in the table below and has also provided a goal-setting form to guide measurement within the domains of teaching effectiveness.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Teaching Effectiveness: General | Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness<br>Receives positive student evaluations<br>Receives regular positive evaluations from direct peer observation (live or video)*<br>Has received teaching awards, nominations, or other recognition of teaching excellence<br>Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development<br>Participates in TILT Course Redesign<br>Receives instructional design grant<br>Letters, email, and other written comments from current/former students* (Note: not sufficient without other evidence.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Curricular Alignment | Syllabi are in compliance with university and department requirements and support student learning*<br>Communicates course requirements and grading system clearly<br>Demonstrates consistency among learning objectives, units of study, and assignments<br>Develops syllabi and assignments of sufficient depth and breadth |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Classroom Climate | Structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning<br>Is sensitive to students' needs and responds to such needs appropriately<br>Is regularly on time and well prepared for class<br>Makes herself or himself available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails<br>Organizes course materials effectively (e.g., assignment guidelines, rubrics, exams, online platform, etc.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: | Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students<br>Synthesizes knowledge and skills of course content effectively<br>Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Integrates theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom<br>Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, theories, methods, and techniques in related areas |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Student Motivation | Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest; paces material well<br>Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level<br>Interacts with students (including those with accommodations) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn<br>Involves students in critical thinking about their own learning |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Inclusive Pedagogy | Consistently demonstrates a commitment to and models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Feedback & Assessment | Uses clear grading criteria (guidelines, rubrics)<br>Evaluates students fairly and appropriately<br>Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Instructional Strategies | Demonstrates use of student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery*<br>Examples of course improvements and their effect on student learning*<br>Development of new courses and teaching techniques*<br>Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction<br>Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art tools<br>Uses flipped classrooms, high impact or experiential learning*, service learning* or other cutting-edge pedagogies<br>Uses a variety of teaching methods/media to respond to varied learning styles<br>Provides evidence of student learning achievement* |
| Student Advising/Mentoring | Undergraduate<br>Participates in undergraduate mentorship activities (e.g., SOUL, ConX, CSU CURC Showcase judge)<br>Regularly meets with students around professional development<br>Supervises teaching, research, or independent study<br>Supports student research presentations or publications<br>Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities<br>Advises, co-advises, or service on committees for honors theses<br>Structures and advises students' honors option within courses<br><br>Graduate<br>Collaborates with students writing, presentations, and/or grant applications<br>Mentors student presentations at conferences<br>Mentors student publications<br>Supports student scholarship or grant applications<br>Serves as chair, co-chair, and member of graduate committees |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| | Graduate students with timely graduation<br>Obtains grant that provides graduate research funding<br>Supervises graduate research or teaching assistants<br>Participates in graduate recruitment efforts and attends graduation events |
| Professional Development | Attends faculty development workshops and professional conferences*<br>Uses resources from CSU TILT*<br>Goal setting and self-assessment of placement and evidence of growth on TEF*<br>Evidence of work on/improvement in student success initiatives (e.g., First Four Weeks, Inclusive Excellence)*<br>Manifests steady progress in teaching expertise, including course preparation, structure, readings, and achievement of course objectives as evidenced by course evaluations<br>Exhibits increasing breadth in teaching and instructional experiences over time Obtains peer evaluations and uses this information to improve teaching |
| Leadership Role | Develops or redesigns new online courses<br>Develops and organizes a new certificate program<br>Mentors other faculty in teaching<br>Obtains teaching or training-related grants<br>Develops innovative technologies and teaching techniques*<br>Publishes instructional materials<br>Gives presentations/workshops, symposia, and lectures related to teaching pedagogy to local, regional, and national audiences; provides assessments from workshop attendees*<br>Engages actively in peer evaluations of others' teaching |

**Table 3. Service, Engagement, and Outreach for TT Faculty**

The T & P Committee will provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." No specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Faculty will be evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Department, College, University, and State Service | Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the department, college, university, or state level<br>Contributes to the creation of policies and procedures<br>Contributes to the creation of collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the School and college/university<br>Participates in events that showcase the department, college, or university |
| Faculty and Professional Mentorship | Works collaboratively with other faculty members to provide materials, expertise, and assistance when needed<br>Mentors less experienced faculty in teaching or research philosophies, strategies, and techniques<br>Provides peer evaluations for other faculty<br>Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts |
| Professional/Community Service | Maintains memberships in professional societies<br>Seeks office in professional societies<br>Serves state/community related to professional expertise<br>Consults to community groups related to professional expertise<br>Participates in accreditation reviews at other institutions<br>Conducts community workshops, seminars, and/or presentations |
| Editorial/Grant/Professional Review | Joins review/editorial boards<br>Participates in grant review panels<br>Reviews manuscripts for journals and/or books for publishers<br>Serves as an external reviewer on T&P Request |
| Leadership in Service | Chairs a major Department/College/University/State standing or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals/charge<br>Receives College/University/Local/State service award<br>Assumes leadership role in national, state, or regional professional organization<br>Serves as Editor or Associate Editor of national or international refereed journal<br>Reviews grant proposals for a national funder<br>Serves as Guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal |

# Appendix B: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks

**Table 1. HDFS CCFF Hiring & Promotion Summary** <mark>*Highlighting below indicates change between levels*</mark>

T&P Faculty Performance Evaluations: **S** = Superior; **E** = Exceeds Expectations; **M** = Meets Expectations; **B** = Below Expectations; **U** = Unsatisfactory

| Instructor Track | Professor Track: Primarily Teaching | Professor Track: Primarily Research | Professor Track: Primarily Service |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Instructor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Master's degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Teaching OR Teaching + Service | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Teaching + Service (Research varies) | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Research + Service (Teaching varies) | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Service + Teaching (Research varies) |
| **Senior Instructor:**<br>**EXCEEDS TEACHING & MEETS SERVICE**<br>5 years at Instructor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(E)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/ outreach **(M)** | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR TEACHING + MEETS (RESEARCH & SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>Research/Scholarship **(M)** | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR RESEARCH + MEETS (TEACHING & SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Research & Scholarship **(S)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>Teaching & Advising **(M)**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR SERVICE + MEETS (TEACHING & RESEARCH)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(S)**<br>Research & Scholarship **(M)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Teaching & Advising **(M)**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring |
| **Master Instructor**<br>**SUPERIOR TEACHING & MEETS SERVICE**<br>5 years at Senior Instructor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>    <mark>Leadership role in teaching</mark><br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>    <mark>Leadership role in service</mark><br>    <mark>Faculty or professional mentorship</mark> | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR TEACHING & EXCEEDS (RESEARCH OR SERVICE) & MEETS (RESEARCH OR SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>    <mark>Leadership role in teaching</mark><br>Service/engagement/outreach **(E or M)**[1]<br>    <mark>Leadership role in service</mark><br>    <mark>Faculty or professional mentorship</mark><br>Research & Scholarship **(E or M)**[1]<br>    Publications/Presentations | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR RESEARCH & EXCEEDS (TEACHING OR SERVICE) & MEETS (TEACHING OR SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Research & Scholarship **(S)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>    <mark>Impact</mark><br>    <mark>National/international reputation</mark><br>Service/ engagement/outreach **(E or M)**[1]<br>    <mark>Leadership role in service</mark><br>    <mark>Faculty or professional mentorship</mark><br>Teaching & Advising **(E or M)**[1]<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR SERVICE & EXCEEDS (TEACHING OR RESEARCH) & MEETS (TEACHING OR RESEARCH)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Service/engagement/outreach**(S)**<br>    <mark>Impact</mark><br>    <mark>National/international reputation</mark><br>    <mark>Leadership role in service</mark><br>    <mark>Faculty or professional mentorship</mark><br>Research & Scholarship **(E or M)**[1]<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Teaching & Advising **(E or M)**[1]<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring |

---

[1] depends on workload distribution

**Table 2. Teaching and Advising for CC Faculty: Professor Tracks**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." " Due to the diverse career paths of individual faculty members, no specific and commonly agreed quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

The CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (TILT) developed the Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF) as an organizational structure for reflecting on progress in distinct areas of pedagogy. See TILT: Teaching Effectiveness Framework for descriptions of the seven domains. Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate effectiveness across at least several of the TEF domains and may find that organizing evidence using the TEF is an effective strategy for portfolio creation. TILT has suggested metrics of teaching effectiveness that are noted (*) in the table below and has also provided a goal-setting form to guide measurement within the domains of teaching effectiveness.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Teaching Effectiveness: General | Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness<br>Receives positive student evaluations<br>Receives regular positive evaluations from direct peer observation (live or video)*<br>Has received teaching awards, nominations, or other recognition of teaching excellence<br>Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development<br>Participates in TILT Course Redesign<br>Receives instructional design grant<br>Letters, email, and other written comments from current/former students* (Note: not sufficient without other evidence.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Curricular Alignment | Syllabi are in compliance with university and department requirements and support student learning*<br>Communicates course requirements and grading system clearly<br>Demonstrates consistency among learning objectives, units of study, and assignments<br>Develops syllabi and assignments of sufficient depth and breadth |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Classroom Climate | Structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning<br>Is sensitive to students' needs and responds to such needs appropriately<br>Is regularly on time and well prepared for class<br>Makes herself or himself available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails<br>Organizes course materials effectively (e.g., assignment guidelines, rubrics, exams, online platform, etc.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students<br>Synthesizes knowledge and skills of course content effectively<br>Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area<br>Integrates theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom<br>Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| | theories, methods, and techniques in related areas |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Student Motivation | Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest; paces material well <br> Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level <br> Interacts with students (including those with accommodations) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn <br> Involves students in critical thinking about their own learning |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Inclusive Pedagogy | Consistently demonstrates a commitment to and models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Feedback & Assessment | Uses clear grading criteria (guidelines, rubrics) <br> Evaluates students fairly and appropriately <br> Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Instructional Strategies | Demonstrates use of student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery* <br> Examples of course improvements and their effect on student learning* <br> Development of new courses and teaching techniques* <br> Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction <br> Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art tools <br> Uses flipped classrooms, high impact or experiential learning*, service learning* or other cutting-edge pedagogies <br> Uses a variety of teaching methods/media to respond to varied learning styles <br> Provides evidence of student learning achievement* |
| Student Advising/Mentoring | Undergraduate <br> Participates in undergraduate mentorship activities (e.g., SOUL, ConX, CSU CURC Showcase judge) <br> Regularly meets with students around professional development <br> Supervises teaching, research, or independent study <br> Supports student research presentations or publications <br> Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities <br> Advises, co-advises, or service on committees for honors theses <br> Structures and advises students' honors option within courses <br><br> Graduate <br> Collaborates with students writing, presentations, and/or grant applications <br> Mentors student presentations at conferences <br> Mentors student publications <br> Supports student scholarship or grant applications <br> Serves as chair, co-chair, and member of graduate committees <br> Graduate students with timely graduation <br> Obtains grant that provides graduate research funding |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| | Supervises graduate research or teaching assistants<br>Participates in graduate recruitment efforts and attends graduation events |
| Professional Development | Attends faculty development workshops and professional conferences*<br>Uses resources from CSU TILT*<br>Goal setting and self-assessment of placement and evidence of growth on TEF*<br>Evidence of work on/improvement in student success initiatives (e.g., First Four Weeks, Inclusive Excellence)*<br>Manifests steady progress in teaching expertise, including course preparation, structure, readings, and achievement of course objectives as evidenced by course evaluations<br>Exhibits increasing breadth in teaching and instructional experiences over time Obtains peer evaluations and uses this information to improve teaching |
| Leadership Role | Develops or redesigns new online courses<br>Develops and organizes a new certificate program<br>Mentors other faculty in teaching<br>Obtains teaching or training-related grants<br>Develops innovative technologies and teaching techniques*<br>Publishes instructional materials<br>Gives presentations/workshops, symposia, and lectures related to teaching pedagogy to local, regional, and national audiences; provides assessments from workshop attendees*<br>Engages actively in peer evaluations of others' teaching |

**Table 3. Service, Engagement, or Outreach for CC Faculty: Professor Tracks**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." Due to the diverse career paths of individual faculty members, no specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Department, College, University, and State Service | Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the department, college, university, or state level<br>Contributes to the creation of policies and procedures<br>Contributes to the creation of collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the School and college/university<br>Participates in events that showcase the department, college, or university |
| Faculty and Professional Mentorship | Works collaboratively with other faculty members to provide materials, expertise, and assistance when needed<br>Mentors less experienced faculty in teaching or research philosophies, strategies, and techniques<br>Provides peer evaluations for other faculty<br>Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts |
| Professional/Community Service | Maintains memberships in professional societies<br>Seeks office in professional societies<br>Serves state/community related to professional expertise<br>Consults to community groups related to professional expertise<br>Participates in accreditation reviews at other institutions<br>Conducts community workshops, seminars, and/or presentations |
| Editorial/Grant/Professional Review | Joins review/editorial boards<br>Participates in grant review panels<br>Reviews manuscripts for journals and/or books for publishers<br>Serves as an external reviewer on T&P Request |
| Leadership in Service | Chairs a major Department/College/University/State standing or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals/charge<br>Receives College/University/Local/State service award<br>Assumes leadership role in national, state, or regional professional organization<br>Serves as Editor or Associate Editor of national or international refereed journal<br>Reviews grant proposals for a national funder<br>Serves as Guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal |

**Table 4. Research and Scholarship for CC Faculty: Professor Tracks**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." Due to the diverse career paths of individual faculty members, no specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

As noted in the Faculty Manual (E.12.2), the scholarship of teaching is considered research.

The department values interdisciplinary and team science. Faculty are required to describe their role in and contributions to each team publication and to team grants. This is done in two ways: (a) in an overall research statement that is part of both annual and promotion-related reviews; and (b) specifically with a line under each publication and/or grant that briefly states the candidate's role and contribution.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Non-Refereed Publications & Presentations | Publishes newsletter or magazine articles, book reviews, interviews, encyclopedia entries, book chapters<br>Presents original work via non-refereed forums (e.g., CSU Professional Development Institute) |
| Refereed Publications & Presentations | Delivers invited presentations at professional conferences or seminars<br>Authors or co-authors refereed papers at conferences/meetings<br>Authors or co-authors refereed articles |
| Grants | Submits proposals to support research or teaching<br>Secures internal and/or external funding to support research or teaching<br>Develops peer-reviewed publications from funded projects in a timely and focused manner<br>Assumes a significant leadership role in one or more research teams as PI, Co-PI or Co-I |
| Impact | Demonstrates expertise through a body of focused written work (e.g., series of articles, textbook)<br>Demonstrates forward progression of knowledge, theory, and impact |
| National/international reputation: These criteria are not applicable to faculty with small amounts of time allocated to research/scholarly & creative works | Earns respect for written work and evidence supports candidate's status as a leader in the field<br>Demonstrates evidence of scholarly impact (impact factor, journal prestige, textbook adoption, citation rate, h-index)<br>Presents at competitive conferences<br>Conducts scholarly work that is used across disciplines and contexts<br>Obtains research awards/honors/nominations<br>Receives invitations to be a visiting scholar /lecturer<br>Increasingly assumes leadership and contributes significantly to collaborations |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Professional Development | Participates in workshops or in additional classes to increase knowledge and skill<br>Articulates plan for future professional development<br>Demonstrates willingness to mentor others |

# Appendix C: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks

**Table 1. HDFS CCFF Hiring & Promotion Summary**      *Highlighting below indicates change between levels*

T&P Faculty Performance Evaluations: **S** = Superior; **E** = Exceeds Expectations; **M** = Meets Expectations; **B** = Below Expectations; **U** = Unsatisfactory

| Instructor Track | Professor Track: Primarily Teaching | Professor Track: Primarily Research | Professor Track: Primarily Service |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Instructor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Master's degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Teaching OR Teaching + Service | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Teaching + Service (Research varies) | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Research + Service (Teaching varies) | **Assistant Professor**<br>Minimum Requirements:<br>Doctoral degree in relevant area<br>Responsibilities:<br>Primarily Service + Teaching (Research varies) |
| **Senior Instructor:**<br>**EXCEEDS TEACHING & MEETS SERVICE**<br>5 years at Instructor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(E)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/ outreach **(M)** | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR TEACHING + MEETS (RESEARCH & SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>Research/Scholarship **(M)** | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR RESEARCH + MEETS (TEACHING & SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Research & Scholarship **(S)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>Teaching & Advising **(M)**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring | **Associate Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR SERVICE + MEETS (TEACHING & RESEARCH)**<br>5 years at Assistant Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(S)**<br>Research & Scholarship **(M)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Teaching & Advising **(M)**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring |
| **Master Instructor**<br> **SUPERIOR TEACHING & MEETS SERVICE**<br>5 years at Senior Instructor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>    Leadership role in teaching<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(M)**<br>    Leadership role in service<br>    Faculty or professional mentorship | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR TEACHING & EXCEEDS (RESEARCH OR SERVICE) & MEETS (RESEARCH OR SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Teaching & Advising **(S)**<br>    Classroom teaching<br>    Curriculum development/innovation<br>    Student advising/mentoring<br>    Professional Development<br>    Leadership role in teaching<br>Service/engagement/outreach **(E or M)[1]**<br>    Leadership role in service<br>    Faculty or professional mentorship<br>Research & Scholarship **(E or M)[2]**<br>    Publications/Presentations | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR RESEARCH & EXCEEDS (TEACHING OR SERVICE) & MEETS (TEACHING OR SERVICE)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Research & Scholarship **(S)**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>    Impact<br>    National/international reputation<br>Service/ engagement/outreach **(E or M)[1]**<br>    Leadership role in service<br>    Faculty or professional mentorship<br>Teaching & Advising **(E or M)[1]**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring | **Full Professor**<br>**SUPERIOR SERVICE & EXCEEDS (TEACHING OR RESEARCH) & MEETS (TEACHING OR RESEARCH)**<br>5 years at Associate Professor<br>Progressive development<br>Service/engagement/outreach**(S)**<br>    Impact<br>    National/international reputation<br>    Leadership role in service<br>    Faculty or professional mentorship<br>Research & Scholarship **(E or M)[1]**<br>    Publications/Presentations<br>    Grants<br>    Professional Development<br>Teaching & Advising **(E or M)[1]**<br>    Graduate student advising/mentoring |

---

[2]   depends on workload distribution

**Table 2. Teaching and Advising for CC Faculty: Instructor Tracks**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." Due to the diverse career paths of individual faculty members, no specific and commonly agreed quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

The CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (TILT) developed the Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF) as an organizational structure for reflecting on progress in distinct areas of pedagogy. See TILT: Teaching Effectiveness Framework for descriptions of the seven domains. Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate effectiveness across at least several of the TEF domains and may find that organizing evidence using the TEF is an effective strategy for portfolio creation. TILT has suggested metrics of teaching effectiveness that are noted (*) in the table below and has also provided a goal-setting form to guide measurement within the domains of teaching effectiveness.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Teaching Effectiveness: General | Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness<br>Receives positive student evaluations<br>Receives regular positive evaluations from direct peer observation (live or video)*<br>Has received teaching awards, nominations, or other recognition of teaching excellence<br>Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development<br>Participates in TILT Course Redesign<br>Receives instructional design grant<br>Letters, email, and other written comments from current/former students* (Note: not sufficient without other evidence.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Curricular Alignment | Syllabi are in compliance with university and department requirements and support student learning*<br>Communicates course requirements and grading system clearly<br>Demonstrates consistency among learning objectives, units of study, and assignments<br>Develops syllabi and assignments of sufficient depth and breadth |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Classroom Climate | Structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning<br>Is sensitive to students' needs and responds to such needs appropriately<br>Is regularly on time and well prepared for class<br>Makes herself or himself available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails<br>Organizes course materials effectively (e.g., assignment guidelines, rubrics, exams, online platform, etc.) |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students<br>Synthesizes knowledge and skills of course content effectively<br>Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area<br>Integrates theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom<br>Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| | theories, methods, and techniques in related areas |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Student Motivation | Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest; paces material well<br>Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level<br>Interacts with students (including those with accommodations) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn<br>Involves students in critical thinking about their own learning |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Inclusive Pedagogy | Consistently demonstrates a commitment to and models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Feedback & Assessment | Uses clear grading criteria (guidelines, rubrics)<br>Evaluates students fairly and appropriately<br>Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback |
| Teaching Effectiveness: Instructional Strategies | Demonstrates use of student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery*<br>Examples of course improvements and their effect on student learning*<br>Development of new courses and teaching techniques*<br>Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction<br>Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art tools<br>Uses flipped classrooms, high impact or experiential learning*, service learning* or other cutting-edge pedagogies<br>Uses a variety of teaching methods/media to respond to varied learning styles<br>Provides evidence of student learning achievement* |
| Student Advising/Mentoring | <u>Undergraduate</u><br>Participates in undergraduate mentorship activities (e.g., SOUL, ConX, CSU CURC Showcase judge)<br>Regularly meets with students around professional development<br>Supervises teaching, research, or independent study<br>Supports student research presentations or publications<br>Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities<br>Advises, co-advises, or service on committees for honors theses<br>Structures and advises students' honors option within courses<br><br><u>Graduate</u><br>Collaborates with students writing, presentations, and/or grant applications<br>Mentors student presentations at conferences<br>Mentors student publications<br>Supports student scholarship or grant applications<br>Serves as chair, co-chair, and member of graduate committees<br>Graduate students with timely graduation<br>Obtains grant that provides graduate research funding |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| | Supervises graduate research or teaching assistants<br>Participates in graduate recruitment efforts and attends graduation events |
| Professional Development | Attends faculty development workshops and professional conferences*<br>Uses resources from CSU TILT*<br>Goal setting and self-assessment of placement and evidence of growth on TEF*<br>Evidence of work on/improvement in student success initiatives (e.g., First Four Weeks, Inclusive Excellence)*<br>Manifests steady progress in teaching expertise, including course preparation, structure, readings, and achievement of course objectives as evidenced by course evaluations<br>Exhibits increasing breadth in teaching and instructional experiences over time Obtains peer evaluations and uses this information to improve teaching |
| Leadership Role | Develops or redesigns new online courses<br>Develops and organizes a new certificate program<br>Mentors other faculty in teaching<br>Obtains teaching or training-related grants<br>Develops innovative technologies and teaching techniques*<br>Publishes instructional materials<br>Gives presentations/workshops, symposia, and lectures related to teaching pedagogy to local, regional, and national audiences; provides assessments from workshop attendees*<br>Engages actively in peer evaluations of others' teaching |

**Table 3. Service, Engagement, or Outreach for CC Faculty: Instructor Tracks**

The T & P Committee provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory." Due to the diverse career paths of individual faculty members, no specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to guide the T & P Committee in making these categorical evaluations. Rather, faculty are evaluated based on both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence that they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating specified for advancement to the specific rank.

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Department, College, University, and State Service | Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the department, college, university, or state level<br>Contributes to the creation of policies and procedures<br>Contributes to the creation of collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the School and college/university<br>Participates in events that showcase the department, college, or university |
| Faculty and Professional Mentorship | Works collaboratively with other faculty members to provide materials, expertise, and assistance when needed<br>Mentors less experienced faculty in teaching or research philosophies, strategies, and techniques<br>Provides peer evaluations for other faculty<br>Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts |
| Professional/Community Service | Maintains memberships in professional societies<br>Seeks office in professional societies<br>Serves state/community related to professional expertise<br>Consults to community groups related to professional expertise<br>Participates in accreditation reviews at other institutions<br>Conducts community workshops, seminars, and/or presentations |
| Editorial/Grant/Professional Review | Joins review/editorial boards<br>Participates in grant review panels<br>Reviews manuscripts for journals and/or books for publishers<br>Serves as an external reviewer on T&P Request |
| Leadership in Service | Chairs a major Department/College/University/State standing or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals/charge<br>Receives College/University/Local/State service award<br>Assumes leadership role in national, state, or regional professional organization<br>Serves as Editor or Associate Editor of national or international refereed journal<br>Reviews grant proposals for a national funder<br>Serves as Guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal |

# Appendix D: Annual Performance Standards

## I. OVERVIEW

Faculty members have prepared this document. It is designed specifically to provide accountability and rationale for annual evaluation faculty ratings. Separate guidelines and expectations for tenure and promotion are in Section 4 and Appendices A, B, and C.

**PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS**

Faculty members are expected to ***demonstrate performance*** in areas of the academic mission. The distribution of workload in these areas may vary based on appointment type (i.e., tenure-track, tenured, contract, or continuing). The Department's standard workload distribution for tenure-track and tenured faculty is: **teaching and advising** (usually 50% of workload), **research and scholarly activities** (usually 35% of workload), and **service and outreach** (usually 15% of workload). Yet, non-standard workload efforts may be significantly influenced by additional administrative responsibilities, Extension responsibilities, external funding sources, or other circumstances, which must be discussed and may be approved by the Department Head. All faculty are expected to demonstrate continuing commensurate effort in each area for which they are assigned. When activities are not clearly documented by categorical information (e.g. publications), it is the faculty member's responsibility to obtain necessary additional information (e.g. external reviews, letters from appropriate people) to demonstrate impact of the activity. In line with the land-grant mission of Colorado State University, engagement is valued in each aspect of faculty performance. Contract and continuing faculty typically have workloads that emphasize teaching (usually 80 teaching/advising, 10% service, and 10% research; although individual distributions will vary. <u>All</u> members of the faculty will demonstrate the highest of ***professional standards*** across all areas of the academic mission and in all activities and interactions both internal to the department and as representatives of the department with all external audiences.

**TIMELINE**

<u>By Jan 15</u>, each faculty member shall submit the following to the Department Head: (a) the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) for the preceding calendar year; (b) an updated vita; and (c) signed CSU Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment forms. Faculty are responsible for uploading information into Digital Measures by this date. Supporting materials to demonstrate their work in the assigned areas of their workload distribution such as course surveys, student products, unsolicited letters, advising evaluations, award or other recognition letters, copies of published, accepted, or submitted articles, book contracts, etc., will be held by the faculty member, but made available as necessary. During January to February (in advance of the March 1 college deadline for submission of annual evaluations), the Department Head will hold a meeting with the faculty member to talk about the year's performance. Following this meeting, the Department Head will prepare a written draft of the CSU Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report and forward that report to the faculty member to ensure accuracy of facts, for faculty signature, and for any commentary the faculty member wishes to append. The summary will be drafted based on the FAR as applied to the guidelines (see the following pages) in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. ***Variations are expected to occur based on workload distribution variations (i.e., percent of effort in each area), contract status (i.e., 9- vs 12-month appointment), as well as stage of career (i.e., the level of expectation of performance for senior faculty is greater than for early-career faculty).*** Faculty may request an appointment with the Department Head at any time during this process, but are expected to meet formally once. For faculty who are pre-

tenure, the meeting will include a discussion about progress toward tenure. A separate document will be written by the Department Head regarding progress toward tenure.

**GUIDELINES**

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

Finally, the overall rating will be based on category score weighted by percent of effort and the consideration of multiple criteria in a given category. Evaluations will include a discussion between the faculty member and the Department Head.

## II. TEACHING AND ADVISING GUIDELINES

The typical expectations for faculty in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies is that teaching and advising comprise 50% of the workload but may vary based on appointment type as specified and approved by the Department Head. Faculty taking on administrative or extensive external funding responsibilities may buy down to a 1/1 load or 1 course/year load (see code). Additionally, faculty without a teaching workload distribution for any given semester will not be evaluated in this category for that time period, unless the faculty member provides evidence of teaching and advising work in this area even without the required workload distribution.

The following Teaching and Advising Guidelines are not all-inclusive, but rather, represent exemplars of the kinds of activities, outputs, and products behaviors faculty members may use to document their performances. Teaching and Advising includes the categories of curriculum development and instructional innovation, classroom performance, advising, and student mentoring. The following expectations refer to all aspects of course delivery in both online and residential settings Community-engaged teaching is valued, and examples include service-learning, community-engaged research as part of university classes, study abroad programs, and online and off-campus education.

II A. **CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION**. Innovation can be demonstrated by evidence of peer review; awards; grants to improve content; demonstration of adaptation or improvement, and curriculum committee review.

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demonstrates evidence of innovation each term the instructor teaches a course that is influenced by both internal and external sources of evidence-based teaching practices | Research-based and effective innovations successfully incorporated into courses and effectiveness is documented externally | Adapts course content based on curriculum requirements, students' needs, and responds to feedback to update courses as needed | Updates course content and refreshes exam or assignments less than once each academic year | Little evidence of coherent course construction<br><br>No activity in instructional innovation |
| Demonstrates impact by external adoption of materials/ curriculum | Receives funding for course or program redesign | Provides evidence for peer evaluations of teaching and responses to feedback | Updates or edits course without evidence-based teaching practices or consideration of essential element forms | Courses and syllabi are out-of-date |
| Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development | Demonstrates evidence of mid-semester evaluations provided by peers or students and demonstrates course edits made based on this feedback, as appropriate | Develops course materials, CANVAS pages, and course content for assigned courses and is acknowledged as "good" by internal and/or external audiences (e.g., via review of course materials – exams, assignments, syllabus, CANVAS site, etc.).<br><br>Participates in professional development in the area of teaching at appropriate intervals based on teaching workload distribution (e.g., TILT course) | | Minimal activity in instructional innovation |

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

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outstanding teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught | Strong teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught | Good teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in most classes taught | No evidence of teaching evaluations or feedback<br><br>Poor evaluations with no or minimal attempt to address feedback | Consistently fails to acquire teaching evaluations or feedback<br><br>Poor teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught |
| Outstanding course survey feedback provided by students in all classes taught | Strong course survey feedback provided by students in all classes taught | Good course surveys feedback provided by students in all classes taught | Weak teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught | Poor course survey feedback provided by students in all classes taught |
| Receives teaching award | Nominated for teaching award | Evidence of attention to addressing constructive feedback from various sources | Weak course survey feedback provided by students in all classes taught<br><br>Evidence of weak teaching performance (e.g., some missed classes, documented student complaints, etc.) | Evidence of poor teaching performance (e.g., frequently missed classes or documented student complaints, unprofessional conduct in classes, etc.) |

II C. **STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING**.
This section refers to *student* (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoc) mentoring; faculty mentoring is addressed in service/outreach. The majority of undergraduate advising is conducted by the professional advising office; sub-section (a), therefore, refers primarily to career advising and mentorship for undergraduates. All tenure-track 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).

**a. UNDERGRADUATE**

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence of outstanding advising (e.g., innovative methods, leading student group activities and service projects)<br><br>Student receives award or recognition for mentored project<br><br>Student presents mentored work at a research/creativity event. | Advises student groups/organizations in addition to regular load<br><br>Teaches Type B (e.g., group study) course in addition to regular load<br><br>Provides supervised research or teaching experience | Evidence of good advising<br><br>Participates in some undergraduate mentorship activities (e.g., departmental career fair, interviews for HD 286) | Little evidence of or poor advising | No evidence of or extremely poor advising<br><br>No student advisees<br><br>Complaints about bad advising |

**b. GRADUATE**

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collaborates with students in writing and presentations leading to ≥1 annual publication in peer-reviewed journals<br><br>Collaborates with students in presentations at regional, national, or international conferences recognized as impactful in one's field<br><br>Collaborates with student in applying for a grant and student receives training or mentored grant or graduate research assistantship<br><br>Student advisee wins national award/grant or other accomplishment and the advisor's influence is evident | Collaborates with students in writing and presentations leading to ≥1 annual peer-reviewed publications or presentation at local or state meetings or conferences<br><br>Collaborates with student in applying for a grant such as a training or mentored grant for the student or grants that provide graduate research assistantship funding<br><br>Student advisee wins university or state award/grant | Mentors students in their classroom writing endeavors, evidence of encouraging submission for publication and presentations at meetings<br><br>Students graduating on time<br><br>Students graduating to another program or to job or postdoc<br><br>Serves as chair or co-chair on graduate student committees | Minimal student mentoring<br><br>Significant number of graduate students not making timely progress toward graduation<br><br>Only serves as graduate student committee member | No student mentoring<br><br>Does not participate in graduate student committees |

# III. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP GUIDELINES

The expectations for Research and Scholarship for faculty in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies are that tenured/tenure-track faculty contributions comprise a typical assignment of 35% of workload, with significant variations expected based upon other factors that influence workload distribution (e.g., external grant funding, additional administrative responsibilities), as approved by the Department Head. There are non-tenure track faculty who will have a workload distribution in this area. Additionally, faculty who do not have a research and scholarship workload distribution for any given semester, will not be evaluated in this category for that time period, unless the faculty member provides evidence of research and scholarship work in this area even without the required workload distribution.

Faculty with a typical (or greater) research assignment are expected to engage in a systematic, sustained program of research, with measurable efforts made toward grant submissions, publications, and conference presentations that, each year, promote progress in core themes relevant to that faculty member's program of research. As a translational field, HDFS values scholarship and research from a broad perspective, from basic questions to application. Methods may be lab-based or community engaged. ***Impact and ability to communicate impact are key factors in demonstrating performance.***

There are a number of guidelines for scholarship, but the most significant are external funding and publication record. A major test of the quality of scholarship is peer review, and this includes the receipt of funding to support a scholarly program of research, as well as publication of that work.

Related to external funding, the quality/reputation of the funding agency (e.g., federal peer reviewed through NIH, major national foundation), the size of the award, the amount of indirects, the amount of salary coverage, and the role of the funding in developing one's research program are all factored into the evaluation of external funding. An additional consideration is the role of the faculty member (e.g., PI, Subcontract PI, Co-Investigator, Other Personnel). The role of PI, or the lead investigator on a research grant, typically denotes that the faculty member is primarily responsible for study conception, proposal writing and/or management, executing study aims, and disseminating results, among other responsibilities. As such, serving as study PI is more likely to develop one's research program than serving as Co-Investigator or Other Personnel. PIs of subcontracts may also greatly contribute to research program development as they may serve similar roles for a significant piece of the overarching study. Thus, the role of Subcontract PI may be considered more favorably than Co-Investigators or Other Personnel, depending upon the scope of work and Subcontract PI's responsibilities.

Related to publications, a similar set of guidelines apply: the quality (e.g., widely cited manuscript, difficulty of population to study, published in a top tier journal, work translated into foreign languages, invited manuscripts for peer reviewed journal) and number of refereed, peer-reviewed publications are the primary criteria for judging publication scholarship. The type of publication can include empirically based quantitative and qualitative manuscripts and theoretical and applied/practice papers that offer a significant contribution to the field.

III A. **PUBLICATIONS**

Generally, first-authored publications and publications evidencing senior authorship (e.g., faculty member is last but a student, post-doc, or earlier-career colleague is first, and/or the faculty member is the corresponding author) will be weighed more heavily toward these guidelines than co-authorship. Note: "Seniority" can be reflected in many ways. Some examples include serving as first or senior (last) author, ownership of data, serving as corresponding author, and demonstration of major mentorship to junior leads on a publication. As with other aspects of impact, the faculty member will need to provide evidence of contribution and impact. In addition, the guidelines refer to published works in that year. In press, submitted, and in preparation manuscripts provide evidence of a pipeline and are expected as well. Further, measures of journal impact will be included in the evaluation such that a paper in a first-tier peer-refereed journal for a particular field of study may count more than multiple articles in low-impact journals. The department values interdisciplinary and team science. Faculty are required to describe their role in and contributions to each team publication. This is done in two ways: (a) in an overall research statement that is part of the annual review; and (b) specifically with a line under each publication that briefly states the faculty member's role and contribution.

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple senior-authored high level publications reflecting a thematic research program | >2 peer-reviewed publications that reflect senior authorship and are published in venues with high impact (e.g., top tier journal in one's field or high impact factor) | 1-2 peer-reviewed publications | Minimal publication activity (manuscripts in pipeline only) | No publication activity |
| Noteworthy paper that receives external attention and recognition from a professional organization | | Evidence of seniority* or leadership in publications for one's career stage | No indicators of senior authorship | No evidence of pipeline |
| | | Evidence of pipeline | | No evidence of forward progress in research program |
| Received research or scholarship award | Multiple, senior-authored publications in second-tier journals reflecting a thematic research program | Evidence of forward progress in program of research | | |
| A scholarly, edited book with demonstrated impact on one's research program and/or field of study | Nominated for research or scholarship award | | | |

III B. **GRANTS**

Grants are tools designed to support a research program. The following are examples of activities that may earn a specific rating, but the overarching criterion will be demonstration of relevance to one's research program – thus, a programmatic approach is encouraged. Collaborative activities, including those activities outside the department, which contribute to a defined research portfolio will also be weighed favorably. Additionally, although faculty are expected to continue a consistent rate of grant proposal submissions, this should not occur at the expense of performance on currently funded grants. For example, the expectation may not be for faculty to submit grant proposals during the first 1-3 years as PI of a 5-year NIH R01 due to the demands required to initiate the project. Expectations are also weighed by rank, with greater expectations for more senior than early-career faculty. The department values interdisciplinary and team science. Faculty are required to describe their role in and contributions to each team grant. This is done in two ways: (a) in an overall research statement that is part of the annual review; and (b) specifically with a line under each grant that briefly states the faculty member's role and contribution.

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

III C. **PRESENTATIONS/WORKSHOPS**

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Keynote speaker or invited seminar/ presentation at international or national professional conference | Senior-authored presentation at refereed international or national professional conference | Senior-authored presentation at refereed local, regional, or state professional conference | Submitted abstracts but was denied | No submission of abstracts |
| Multiple peer-reviewed, senior-authored presentations at national or international professional conferences | Keynote speaker at regional or state conference | | Co-author on abstracts that do not reflect senior contribution | |

# IV. SERVICE AND OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Expectations for Service and Outreach for faculty in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies are that faculty service contributions comprise 15% of load (unless otherwise approved by the Department Head) and include activities both internal and external to the University. The following Service and Outreach Guidelines represent the types of behaviors faculty members may use to document their performances. Service may result from assignment, election, or appointment. Service and Outreach includes the categories of department and program service, college and university service, professional service, and community service and outreach. Service accomplishments will be expressed not only in terms of hours of involvement, but in terms of leadership, scope, and depth of influence as well. Thus, as with all other missions, demonstration of impact is important and leadership on one committee that has a very strong influence may count as much as or higher than participation in a number of committees or even as chair of a committee with a smaller workload.

**Administrative assignments (e.g., center director) are considered here as well, and in the following, chair of a significant committee (e.g., T&P) would be considered similarly to director of program or center.** Thus, the following are rough guidelines for committee work, with the expectation that there will be variability based on type and extent of assignment. It will be the expectation that pre-tenure individuals will have smaller service assignments than individuals post-tenure, and expectations for service will be commensurate with rank (e.g., new early-career faculty will not be necessarily expected to serve as chairs of committees to earn superior).

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

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chair of a major Department/College/University/ State standing or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals/charge | Chair of Department/College/University/State standing or ad hoc committee | Membership on one standing or ad hoc Departmental or College committee, or two or more time-limited and non-labor-intensive committees | Poor performance on a committee and with assigned committee work (e.g., irregular attendance, assigned tasks incomplete or late, not carrying weight in assignments - including asking others to do one's tasks that have been assigned, etc.) | No committee work<br><br>Regularly declines committee assignments (e.g., assigned tasks that are not completed or contain significant errors, etc.) |
| Member of two or more major and/or work-intensive (i.e., frequent meetings, heavy workload or significant product outcome expected, etc.) Department/ College/University/ State committees with accomplishment of set goals | Member of two or more Department/ College/University/ State regular or ad hoc committees<br><br>Nominated for College/University/ State service award | Meets committee goals, accomplishes charge of committee and produces expected outcome according to the timeline | | Work delayed or not getting completed; tasks slipping through cracks; inadequate communication with Department Head, students, or faculty |
| Contributes to committee work and assignments in creative, innovative, and collaborative ways | | Regularly attends Department faculty meetings | Minimal effort to improve when given feedback | Goals not met; no effort to improve when given feedback |
| Received College/University/ State service award | | Assigned tasks are completed on time<br><br>Goals are addressed and met; tasks are completed | | |

IV B. **FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL MENTORSHIP (NOTE: This is expected for faculty who are at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Instructor or Master Instructor)**

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mentors department faculty or cooperative extension professionals in teaching and/or scholarship on a regular basis, resulting in demonstrated improvement in course, workshop, accepted paper or funded grant, or other significant product by the mentee<br><br>Looks for opportunities for the mentee to accomplish their goals and inspires a collegial culture | Mentors department faculty in teaching or scholarship (working with another faculty member on writing; working with other faculty to improve teaching) on a regular basis, resulting in submitted paper and/or grant submission on the part of the mentee<br><br>Encourages mentee to look for opportunities to accomplish their goals | Collaborates with department faculty in teaching or scholarship<br><br>Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts | Minimal faculty mentoring and collaboration (e.g., reviews an article or grant proposal once for a colleague)<br><br>Does not demonstrate a collegial attention to help mentees | No faculty mentoring when asked<br><br>Undermines the work of others |

IV C. **PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY SERVICE AND OUTREACH**

| Superior | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leadership in national, state, or regional professional organization<br><br>Receives national, state, or regional service award | Leadership in state or local professional organization<br><br>Service on committees in local or state organizations<br><br>Service on committees in national organizations<br><br>Recognition for service at any level; nominated for national/state award; receipt of local award | Membership in national, regional, state, or local professional organizations (e.g., AAMFT, APA, GSA, NCFR, SRCD, SRA) | Lack of participation in a national, regional, state, or local professional organizations (e.g., minimal attendance at meetings, incomplete tasks, etc.) | No professional activities or memberships, and/ or avoids professional responsibilities |

## IV D. EDITORIAL/GRANT/PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

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