Code of the School of Education
College of Health and Human Sciences
Colorado State University
Voted On and Approved September 14, 2021
Revisions Voted On and Approved September 12, 2022
*Items noted in blue font will be addressed during Fall 2023

Table of Contents

Section 1: Mission, Vision, and Values

Mission Statement
Through teaching, research, and practice the School of Education seeks to positively affect the lives of individuals, communities, and organizations, locally and globally. This work is guided by our collective commitment to collaboration, innovation, relevance, and courage in the face of systemic and pervasive inequities and injustices. *(Approved Fall 2022)*

Vision Statement
The School of Education at Colorado State University will be known for our development and support of practitioners and scholars who embrace and enact the principles of justice, equity, and inclusion in all educational efforts. We will do this work   in ways that are collaborative, courageous, innovative, relevant, impactful, and respectful of the individuals, communities, and organizations with whom and for whom we work. *(Approved Fall 2022)*

Commitment to Principles of Community
The School of Education follows Colorado State University's Principles of Community of Inclusion, Integrity, Respect, Service, and Social Justice (see Appendix A).

Our Values and Educational Philosophy
The School of Education at Colorado State University will be known for our development and support of practitioners and scholars who embrace and enact the principles of justice, equity, and inclusion in all educational efforts. We will do this work   in ways that are collaborative, courageous, innovative, relevant, impactful, and respectful of the individuals, communities, and organizations with whom and for whom we work. *(Approved Fall 2022)*

Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization

The *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM) guides the procedures at Colorado State University and its content takes precedence over the School of Education Code in all instances. The Code follows the recommended headings in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* as appropriate.

2.A. Department Head/School Director

The School of Education (SOE) Director is the administrative and academic officer and is the initial person in the administrative chain to the Board of Governors. Members of the SOE report to the Director. The SOE Director has responsibility for policies, procedures, and activities that affect the professional status of the SOE and the University. The SOE Director is selected as specified in the University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (AFAPM E.4.3). The term of the SOE Director will be five years, with the potential for reappointment based on satisfactory annual evaluations. Faculty and staff input regarding the SOE Director's administrative performance will be solicited annually by the Dean.

The duties of the SOE Director are specified in the University *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM C.2.4.2.2).

2.B. Unit Leadership

The Leadership Team is comprised of Program Coordinators from each of the 8 academic units (i.e., Adult Education and Training (AET); Center for Educator Preparation (CEP); Counseling and Career Development (CCD); Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS); Educational Equity and Transformation (EET); Higher Education Leadership (HEL); Organizational Learning, Performance and Change (OLPC; Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) within the SOE. The role of the Leadership Team is to provide consultative advice, recommendations, and support to the SOE Director on academic and non-academic matters such as personnel issues, budgetary planning, strategic planning, public relations actions, development planning, SOE website, Code review and recommended revisions. The Leadership Team also consults and provides recommendations regarding responses to requests from external sources such as the Dean's office, central administration, or external constituencies and agencies. Leadership Team members include the SOE Director, the Associate Directors of the SOE, Director/Co-directors of CEP, Coordinators of each academic degree and specialization, and at least one representative from the SOE Graduate Programs Office. The SOE Assistant to the Director and other administrative professionals may also attend Leadership Team meetings at the request of the SOE Director.

The Leadership Team shall meet at the request of the SOE Director. Each specialization or degree program will have at least one voting member of the Leadership Team. The Director and associate directors are not voting members. The associate director(s) may vote to break a tie. To the extent that topics discussed by the Leadership Team and decisions emerging from those discussions are allowable for public access (i.e., non-personnel issues), the SOE Director will update the faculty of these issues and decisions at the subsequent meeting of the SOE faculty. Minutes from Leadership Team meetings will be posted and available on the SOE P: drive and sent to all faculty after approval by the Leadership Team.

Although the Leadership Team will make recommendations to the SOE Director as noted above, some policy issues are more appropriately discussed by the faculty as a whole. The SOE Director, the Leadership Team, and the faculty may identify certain issues to be discussed and acted upon at general faculty meetings. The Leadership Team is required to meet with the Director a minimum of twice per semester.

The minutes of Leadership Team meetings shall be taken by a staff member appointed by the SOE Director. Minutes are to be distributed to all faculty members and will be made available to College leadership upon request (proposed edit 5-16-22)

When decision-making occurs at the Leadership Team meetings, the following procedures shall be in place:

1. No matters shall be acted upon unless they are included on the agenda.

2. Whenever possible, a consensus approach shall be used to allow for maximum discussion of items under consideration. For purposes of transacting business, the Leadership Team will use a quorum vote of two-thirds majority from the members who are not on approved leave.

3. In consultation with the Leadership Team, the SOE Director may appoint individuals from the faculty to one or more of the administrative positions listed below to assist the SOE Director. Compensation for individuals appointed to these positions will be negotiated at the time the appointment is initially made. These positions will be established for an initial period of three years, with re-appointments contingent upon annual review of satisfactory performance. Individuals may hold these positions for successive three-year periods. The specific responsibilities for each position are assigned by the SOE Director as needed.

   • Associate Director of SOE

   • Director or Co-Directors of the Center for Educator Preparation (CEP)

   • Associate Director of Graduate Studies

   • Associate Director for Online Programs and Distance Education

2.C. Unit Personnel

- Unit Personnel definitions, responsibilities and appointments are found in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (sections AFAPM D.1, AFAPM D.3, and AFAPM D.5).

- Academic Faculty – Per section AFAPM E.1 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, "The faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, master instructor, senior instructor, instructor, and faculty affiliate) and the University President. All faculty members shall have the academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment."

- Administrative Professionals – Per section AFAPM D.1.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, "Administrative professional positions are positions that are exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes but are not faculty positions. The classification of a particular position as an administrative professional position must be coordinated with Human Resource Services."

- State Classified Staff - Per section 1 of Colorado State University's Human Resources manual, "State classified personnel are appointed by the Executive Director and Chief Human Resource Officer of the Human Resources Department. These employees are classified according to and are governed by State Personnel Rules and Regulations and University policies. See Section 3 of the Human Resources Manual for details."

- Student employees - Per section 5 of Colorado State University's Human Resources manual, "An eligible student employee is described as an undergraduate or graduate, admitted for enrollment as a regular certificate/degree-seeking student at Colorado State University, carrying at least one Registrar's credit per term during the academic year. The student must be registered by the census date for each term. (GUEST students are not eligible). The student must be able to demonstrate eligibility to work by completing Form I-9.

- Graduate students who are "continuously registered" or undergrads who are on Planned Leave may be employed as student employees but are subject to withholdings for the Student Employee Retirement Plan (Refer to Section 1 of the Human Resources Manual).

  Continuous Registration must be completed before the census date for both fall and spring terms in order for the graduate student to be employed as a student employee. The application for Planned Leave – Undergraduates must be submitted no later than 12:00 pm the Thursday prior to the start of classes each term. During the summer, students are not required to register for credits if they were registered the prior spring and are registered for the coming fall or are admitted for fall."

- Voting Eligibility - "Excluding tenure and promotion decisions, all faculty and staff members whose primary assignment is in the School of Education, and who are employed by the School of Education for 50% or more of their time (I.e., minimum of 20 hours per week) are eligible to vote on departmental issues presented at SOE meetings and/or in committee meetings." (suggested edit 9-7-22)

2.D. Committees

Unless otherwise specified, SOE representatives to College or University committees (excluding Faculty Council) shall be nominated by the Director in consultation with the Leadership Team or may be elected by the faculty. Additional names may be proposed from the floor at the designated faculty meeting.

Each fall semester, the SOE Director shall initiate the election/appointment of standing committee members following procedures outlined in the SOE Code.

Individuals wishing to serve on ad-hoc committees/workgroups should make their wishes known to the SOE Director who shall appoint these committees on an annual basis. Current committees include but are not limited to Tenure & Promotion; Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (S-JEDI); Awards; and Curriculum. Additional workgroups to be convened as needed and appropriate.

Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee - (*See Section 3.C. for further information.*)

Faculty Council

As outlined in the University *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (AFAPM C.2.1.3.1),* each academic unit shall elect one (1) faculty representative to the CSU Faculty Council. All faculty representatives shall hold regular full-time, regular part-time, or transitional appointments and will not hold an administrative appointment of more than half-time (0.5) at the level of assistant/associate dean or above. A representative to the Faculty Council who becomes ineligible will cease to hold this position. A special election will be held to install a new Faculty Council representative. Faculty Council representatives are voted in by a majority of full-time faculty. This and all votes within our School of Education can occur in person or via email as per the Director's prerogative.

Other Committees

The School of Education has a variety of other standing and ad hoc committees/workgroups that differ from year to year. Needed committees will be determined by the Leadership Team in consultation with the Director. Typically, standing committees have included or been related to curriculum, assessment, advising, awards, student diversity and academic success, and other key needs of the unit.

2.E. Unit Meetings (Faculty and Staff Meetings)

School of Education Faculty and Staff Meetings

1. The SOE Director shall call SOE meetings for all faculty and staff during the academic year (fall and spring semesters) and a minimum of one (1) School of Education meeting each semester is required. Meeting dates shall be established early in the academic year and an agenda shall be distributed by the SOE Director at least 24 hours in advance of each meeting. Additional meetings may be called by: 1) the SOE Director; 2) upon request of the faculty; and/or 3) Leadership Team. A written notice and an agenda shall be distributed in advance. It is recommended that faculty meetings not be called during either the first week of classes or finals week of any semester. Attendance at/participation in SOE meetings is expected and strongly encouraged.

2. The minutes of SOE meetings shall be taken by a staff member appointed by the SOE Director. Minutes are to be distributed to all faculty members, and the Dean and are available to the public.

3. When decision-making occurs at the SOE meetings, the following procedures shall be in place:

    a. Unless otherwise agreed upon, no matters shall be acted upon unless they are included on the agenda.

    b. Whenever possible, a consensus approach shall be used to allow for maximum discussion of items under consideration. For purposes of transacting business, action items will require a vote by at least two-thirds of those eligible to vote and who are not on approved leave. A list of all voting faculty and staff shall be presented by the SOE Director at the first regular faculty and staff meeting in the fall term.

6. Voting exceptions exist for tenure and promotion decisions. Only T&P Committee members vote on tenure and promotion decisions (*see Formation of Tenure and Promotion Committees* for membership, page 12. Amendments or revisions to the SOE Code must be voted on by two-thirds majority of the full-time faculty who are not on approved leave (*see Signatures Approving the School Code, section 7.A., page 29).*

2.F. Unit Organizational Chart and Operations Evaluation Process
See: [SOE Org Chart Updated (9-4-22) .pdf](#)

2.G. Accreditation and Evaluation Procedures

1. Program Reviews

Program Review of the operations of the SOE shall be conducted every six years, following the guidelines and procedures established by the Provost/Academic Vice President. A workgroup of faculty and administrative professionals shall be appointed by the SOE Director in consultation with the Leadership Team to coordinate the preparation of the Program Review report. This Program Review Committee may call upon specific program faculty to prepare or contribute to sections of the report. The Program Review Report shall be presented to the SOE faculty for review prior to submission to the Dean and Provost/Academic Vice President. Departmental operations to be evaluated shall include undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, outreach programs, and other programs represented in the SOE objectives.

If members of the SOE faculty or the SOE Director are acutely dissatisfied with the operations of the SOE, they may initiate a request for an interim self-study. If the request comes from the SOE faculty, at least one-half of those eligible must sign the request for an interim self-study before it can be conducted. This request is to be submitted to the Dean who shall follow the procedure outlined for the regular self-study after notifying the SOE Director and the eligible faculty members of the request for an interim self-study.

2. Accreditation Reviews

When the SOE programs are subject to review by associations, the SOE Director, in conjunction with Program Coordinators, shall coordinate the accreditation process, appointing committee(s) of faculty members to prepare needed reports and materials. The committees may call upon specific program faculty to prepare or contribute to sections of the report.

Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

3.A. Faculty Appointments and Ranks
(refer to the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* for details)

It is the policy of Colorado State University to seek the best-qualified candidates available for all positions within the limitations imposed by the availability of resources, level of the appointment, unique requirements of the position, and the talent pool. In the process of searching for and appointing persons to faculty positions, participation by those who will be professional peers and colleagues or who will be subject to direct

supervision of the new appointee is strongly encouraged in all cases and is specifically required for some types of appointments. The authority to approve faculty appointments has been delegated by the Board to the President, and the President has further delegated this authority to the Provost. Recommendations at each level (department, department head, and dean) shall be reversed at higher levels only for compelling reasons that shall be stated in writing to each of the recommending bodies. The School of Education follows the definition of faculty appointments and ranks as outlined in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (Section AFAPM E.1 and AFAPM E.2*).*

It is the philosophy of the SOE to maintain diverse perspectives among the faculty. The SOE is committed to diversity in terms of ethnic or racial backgrounds as well as gender, sexual orientation, and other identities that provide and nurture a multicultural collegium of faculty, students, and staff. University policy relative to Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action shall be followed in both spirit and intent. Sections AFAPM E.2 and AFAPM E.4 within the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* specify University selection and appointment policies and procedures.

1. Decisions relative to the nature and responsibilities for regular (new or replacement) positions, non-tenure track (includes Contract, Continuing and Adjunct Appointment Faculty (CCAF) positions, or full-time temporary positions shall rest with the faculty, SOE administration, and the college dean. The needs of the SOE shall be the primary consideration relative to qualifications.

2. After approvals have been granted at the college and university levels, the SOE Director shall appoint a Search Committee, ensuring appropriate representation from the SOE as well as outside constituencies. The Search Committee shall follow all University employment policies and Office of Equal Opportunity Guidelines in conducting the search.

3. Prior to advertising a position, the Search Committee must develop a position description. The final approval of SOE position descriptions rests with the Dean, Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), and Provost.

4. Faculty shall be invited to recruit and nominate individuals for the position as well as participate in interviews. The Search Committee shall solicit comments from faculty relative to strengths and weaknesses of the candidates. Whenever possible, faculty shall have opportunities to discuss candidate qualifications in an open forum.

5. Taking into consideration recommendations of faculty, the Search Committee shall recommend finalist(s) to the SOE Director, who shall consider all input for recommendation to the College Dean. The College Dean is the hiring authority.

6. Non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty positions (instructor and professor tracks) will be filled following the same procedures described here. At appointment, the Director shall define, in writing, the conditions and expectations for each new non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member. The Director will provide the non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member a copy of the School Code and the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*. A current non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty may, when qualified, submit their application in searches for tenure track positions in the School of Education. If a non-

tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member is hired into a tenure track position, prior years of service as a non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member may be considered toward the required probationary tenure.

7. Other types of appointments such as transitional appointments, joint appointments, faculty affiliate appointments, visiting faculty appointments, university distinguished professorships, and emeritus faculty appointments shall be made in accordance with the policies and procedures specified in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (Section AFAPM E.2 and AFAPM E.3).

General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty as described in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM E.6).

1. The conditions and expectations of every appointment shall be confirmed in writing. Any subsequent modifications of the appointment shall also be confirmed in writing after the faculty member and the administrator have mutually determined the new conditions. The faculty member shall receive a copy of these documents.

2. All faculty members who are on regular full-time or regular part-time appointments and who have not earned tenure, shall be appointed for a period of either one (1) year, three (3) years, or an open-ended contract. All faculty members on non-tenure track (contract and continuing) appointments shall be appointed "at will."

3. Faculty members on multi-year contracts shall be appointed for periods of one (1) to five (5) years for research and one (1) to three (3) years for teaching.

4. A multi-year contract does not carry any guarantee that the contract will be renewed, even though the duties of the employee may have been discharged satisfactorily.

5. Renewal of a multi-year contract does not entitle the individual to further renewals, a tenure track appointment, or to a decision concerning tenure.

6. Renewal or extension of multi-year contracts may be made at any time during or after the onset of the contract and shall meet the same conditions required for the initial contract as specified in Sections AFAPM E.2.1.3 and AFAPM E.2.1.4.

7. If the contract is not renewed and the individual was originally 'at-will' and entered into a multi-year contract, employment as a senior teaching or special appointment faculty reverts to 'at will' as specified in Sections AFAPM E.2.1.3 and AFAPM E.2.1.4.

8. **If the SOE Director does not propose to reappoint a non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member holding a regular full-time or regular part-time appointment, the faculty member shall be informed in writing that the appointment will not be renewed. This must be done by March 1 during the first year of employment, by mid-November during the second year, and at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of the appointment in succeeding years. (*This section will be revisited and clarified in the Fall of 2023).**

9. A non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member holding a regular full-time, regular part-time, or multi-year contract may be disciplined or terminated for cause without

following the procedures of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual,* Section AFAPM E.15 for tenured faculty. Such actions may be grieved as described in Section K.

10. The School of Education follows the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM E.2) guidelines specifically related to faculty governance and appointment types *(last revised December 6, 2018).*

11. If a decision made at a higher administrative level will have the effect of altering or reversing a decision made at a departmental level regarding conditions of employment, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary, then, before this change can take effect, the department head must be notified in writing of both the proposed change and the reasons for this change, and they must be given the opportunity to submit a written reply.

3.B. Workload Policy

The responsibilities of academic faculty are specified in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM E.5)*.* The SOE Director, along with the advice of the Leadership Team, shall be responsible for the assignment of duties to faculty members within the unit. Faculty members within each degree program and specialization are responsible for establishing and implementing the curricula, scheduling courses, selecting instructors with Director approval, identifying appropriate journals to submit publications and funding opportunities for their master's and/or doctoral students.

1. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate performance in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, as outlined in their workload allocation. Although assignments may differ, the SOE standard recommended load for tenure track faculty is: (a) Teaching (40% of workload), Advising (10% of workload), Research and Scholarly Activities (35% of workload), and Service and Engagement (15% of workload). Non-standard workload efforts, reflecting administrative responsibilities, external funding arrangements, increased advising responsibilities, or other circumstances may be approved by the SOE Director.

2. Unlike the appointments of tenured or tenure track faculty, it is not unusual for the workload and expectations for non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty to vary in nature from program to program and also to change from time to time. These different and shifting roles are essential if the School of Education is to achieve its mission. Given the proclivity for the job descriptions and workloads of non-tenure track faculty (contract and continuing) to differ between faculty, a letter from the School Director to the non-tenure track (contract and continuing) member clearly stating the workload expectations upon hiring will be provided. Any anticipated workload changes (from the previous academic year) will be written by May 15th of each academic year to outline workload expectations for the following academic year. This date is critical to allow non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty time to prepare for their duties, including course preparation, the following fall. This letter must state the expectations of the non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty in terms of teaching, research, advising, and/or service/administration. No letter is required if the workload remains the same as

the previous academic year.

- Service
SOE standard recommended **service/engagement** workload for NTT (CCA) faculty = 15%

- Teaching/Advising
SOE standard recommended **teaching/advising** workload for NTT faculty = 50% teaching – equivalent to five (5) courses per academic year – and 10% advising

- Research
SOE minimum recommended **research and scholarly activities** workload = 5% for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (contract and continuing)

- Engagement
(See **Service** above.)

- Summer Assignments are to be discussed and approved in advance with the SOE Director.

3.C. Formation of Tenure and Promotion Committees

The Tenure and Promotion (T&P) committee is composed of all tenured and non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty in the School of Education who hold the rank (or higher) that the candidate seeks. The committee will include Master Instructors when a tenure track or non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member is seeking promotion to Associate Professor. (See Appendix D for tenure track and non-tenure track (contract and continuing) equivalent rankings). When a tenure track or tenured faculty member is seeking promotion, eligible non-tenure track faculty (contract and continuing) (at rank or higher) are eligible to serve on the committee and provide input but may not vote on promotion or tenure.

The T&P Committee Chair, who is appointed by the Director of the School of Education, is responsible for establishing all committee meeting dates for the T&P process within the first two weeks of each semester.

The Director of the School of Education will also appoint a non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member as the T&P Committee Co-Chair for Non-Tenure Track (contact and continuing) Faculty Promotion. This chair is responsible for working with the T&P Committee Chair to establish committee meeting dates for the promotion process for non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty within the first two weeks of each semester. The Co-Chair for Non-Tenure (contract and continuing) Track Faculty Promotion with also work with the T&P Committee Chair on other activities and processes that need to be undertaken for non-tenure track faculty promotion (annual reviews, three-year reviews, promotion meetings, etc.).

At a minimum, at least three of the T&P Committee members need to be non-tenure track (CCA) in the year a non-tenure track (CCA) faculty member is being considered for

promotion. If fewer than three non-tenure track (CCA) faculty from the School of Education are eligible to vote on a promotion, then the T&P Committee shall invite up to three non-tenure track (CCA) faculty who are at the rank or higher than the faculty member under consideration from other departments/schools outside of the School of Education.

3.D. Procedures for Tenure & Promotion

The specific policies and procedures on conferring tenure and/or promotion are found in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, Sections AFAPM E.10.4. The SOE adheres explicitly to these policies and procedures.

SOE Policies for Tenure & Promotion

- Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor must hold a doctoral degree.

- The rank of a newly appointed faculty member will be specified in the position description, and the search committee must recommend individuals whose performance has been consistent with the expectations for that rank.

- **In cases where faculty rank has not been specified for the hire and after consultation with the T&P Committee, the SOE Director will assign rank in alignment with the expectations for that rank with agreement of the Dean. (Note: we are seeking clarification of this statement from the College and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs – Fall 2023)**

- A newly appointed faculty member who has been awarded tenure at another academic institution and has the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may be recommended for tenure immediately with the approval of at least two-thirds of the tenured faculty.

SOE Procedures for Tenure & Promotion

1. Deadlines for submission and renewal of tenure and promotion materials are established each year by the Provost's office, and in succession, the CHHS Dean's office.

2. The SOE Director will provide, early in the fall semester, a list and summary statements of all tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track candidates to be reviewed during the academic year and will advise the dean if there are concerns with applicants.

3. The faculty member will complete the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application* available from the Office of the Provost, submitting the application and support materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the date(s) established each year.

4. In Spring, prior to the fall semester when T&P candidate applications are due, the T&P Chair and Committee shall identify a list of seven or more potential external

reviewer/scholars who are qualified to evaluate the credentials of the candidate and who agree to provide a letter of evaluation in a timely manner during the application process. The Chair and Committee may consult with the SOE Director and/or program area faculty, as needed, to identify potential external reviewers. The expectation is to obtain letters from at least five (5) external reviewers at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. It is further advisable that the majority of the letters come from well-respected institutions. Selection of evaluators from industry or governmental agencies who have appropriate scholarly credentials is acceptable. While it is appropriate for the candidate to suggest persons familiar with their work, the majority of external evaluations must come from referees suggested by the SOE Tenure and Promotion Committee and SOE Director. Letters from colleagues/collaborators who might stand to benefit from the success of the candidate or who are known to be close personal friends are not to be included. The candidate has no privilege of vetoing external reviewers but may indicate individuals whom they consider to be inappropriately biased. The Director or T&P Chair should contact reviewers to assure they feel qualified and are willing to provide letters of evaluation. External review letters should be sent to the School Director or T&P Chair. Only the SOE tenure and promotion committee, the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS), the SOE Director, the CHHS T&P Advisory committee members, and the administrative assistants who assist with the compilation and transmittal of candidate dossiers will have access to these letters. These letters are to remain confidential and not available to the candidate. Neither the source nor direct quotes from reference letters are to be conveyed to the candidate. The SOE Director or T&P Committee Chair should paraphrase key points in the letters (no direct quotes) and provide them to the candidate. Copies of the candidate's vitae and selected publications, along with a professional statement from the candidate and the SOE T&P criteria, should be provided to the outside evaluators during spring semester, so evaluators have sufficient time to prepare their evaluation prior to the fall semester application due date. (Further information regarding External Reviewer guidelines is provided in the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application*, Part VI.)

5. The T&P Committee will conduct the faculty review and voting processes for promotion and/or tenure actions. Signed ballots with a rationale for the vote shall be required from eligible faculty members, and a promotion and/or tenure decision shall be by a simple majority vote. Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion shall be provided an opportunity to appear in person before the Committee if they so choose.

6. On the date established each year, the T&P Committee shall forward to the SOE Director the faculty vote and comments and the T&P Committee vote and comments, along with minority opinions. At the same time, the Committee shall also notify the candidate(s) in writing of the faculty decision(s).

7. The SOE Director shall review the materials received from the T&P Committee. The SOE Director will make a recommendation and justification for the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion. The SOE Director will send faculty materials and recommendations to the Dean by the date established each year if the recommendation is to grant tenure and/or promotion.

8. The Dean shall review the materials received from the SOE Director, and in discussion with the College T&P Committee, will make a recommendation and justification for the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion, forwarding the appropriate materials and recommendations to the Provost/Academic Vice President on the date established each year.

9. Following a review and discussion with the Council of Deans, the Provost/Academic Vice President's recommendation is forwarded to the President.

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

In accordance with the College of Health and Human Sciences promotion and tenure guidelines, "Promotion to Associate Professor requires the demonstration of at least exceeds expectations in instruction/advising/mentoring, and research/scholarly/creative activity along with at least meets expectations in service/outreach. Advancement to Professor requires demonstrated sustained, quality contributions to the body of knowledge through research/ scholarship/creative activity and the candidate is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis. Evidence of extensive continuing scholarly activity is present. The record should include a substantial number of refereed publications or juried works aligned with the faculty members' effort distribution and the faculty member's workload."

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

All promotion procedures will follow the same policies as for tenure track faculty (as outlined in Section 3.D of the SOE Code) with the following exceptions and clarifications:

1. Promotion Timeline: Promotions within a track (instructor or professor) can occur after a faculty member has completed at least five years at their current rank. A faculty member may bring in time at rank from other positions and/or institutions (considered in the same way as for tenure-track or tenured faculty). This will be negotiated upon hiring. The promotion process is not automatic after five years; it must be initiated, by the faculty member seeking promotion, and approved by the SOE Director, T&P Chair and T&P Committee and Co-Chair for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion. Early promotion should follow the same policy as for tenure-track faculty and should be allowed in cases where the faculty member's record is significantly above the standard expectations. Effective beginning the 2020-2021 academic year, non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty will follow the promotion timeline outlined in Section 3.D.

2. Three Year Review: All non-tenure track faculty members (instructor and professor tracks) will participate in an annual review process and will be eligible to participate in the annual salary exercise as outlined in this Code. They will also participate in an annual review and three-year review with the SOE Tenure and Promotion Committee to review progress toward promotion. The annual written report will be

due November 10 (See 4.D. for further details.) The three-year review is intended to be similar in purpose and format to the tenure track faculty mid-point review. However, as non-tenure track faculty may choose not to seek promotion after five years, the mid-point may not occur at the same time for all non-tenure track faculty.

3. Promotion Criteria: See Appendix D for information on the general promotion criteria for non-tenure track faculty on the instructor and professor tracks.

4. Defining Promotions: Moving to the equivalent rank between tracks (i.e., senior instructor to assistant professor or master instructor to associate professor) is not considered a promotion. The candidate for promotion and the Director of the School of Education will determine if the faculty member is eligible and desires to change tracks (see the minimum criteria for each track in Appendix C and D).

5. Promotions for Faculty on the Instructor Track: All policies and procedures are the same for those seeking promotion on the Instructor track.

6. Non-tenure track faculty members seeking promotion should clearly outline their workload and work percentage for the period of time under consideration for promotion. It should be noted that the application of criteria for promotion should appropriately reflect the effort distribution of faculty and in cases where the effort distribution has varied over the last five years, the evaluation for promotion should take that into account. Some reasonable representation of workload distribution over the five-year period would be appropriate. This is important as the work expectations for non-tenure track faculty are most likely significantly different from those on the tenure track. All those involved in reviewing promotion materials should be aware of the exact nature of the faculty member's work so that they are fairly evaluated based on their workload expectations. This information should be shared with the SOE Tenure and Promotion Committee and all external reviewers.

7. Internal/External Review Letters: Internal and/or external review letters are required for all non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion. The SOE will follow the requirements of the University in terms of the number of internal and/or external review letters needed unless the requirements of the College of Health and Human Sciences are more stringent. In that case, the requirements of the College will be followed.

8. Faculty members applying for promotion to senior or master instructor must hold at least a master's degree.

9. All letters will follow the same procedures as outlined in Section 3.D.4.

3.G. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees

•   Role and Function of an Advisor (modified from Graduate School Guidelines)

For some programs, as part of the admission process and based on the student's interests, a student will be matched with a faculty member who will serve as their advisor. Students have the opportunity to select their advisor when they form a committee and submit the program of study (GS-6) form. Advisors play a crucial role in graduate level programs and the advisor has the primary responsibility for overseeing the graduate academic program. The advisor serves as the student's advocate, directs the student's research, and contributes to the intellectual and professional development of each student. Advisor and committee members must meet appointment and title requirements established by the Graduate School (see Graduate and Professional Bulletin for more details).

- Graduate Committee Function

The committee's function is to guide the master's student in the development of a thesis, portfolio, or project and the doctoral students in the preliminary examination, dissertation proposal, and dissertation research. The committee ensures the best contribution to the field that the graduate student can make and that the students are prepared, subsequently, to do productive research. The advisor serves as the chairperson of the graduate committee. All committee members must hold graduate faculty status. The advisor should assist the student in selecting appropriate faculty members for their committees.

- SOE Graduate Committee Change of Advisor or Faculty Member and Additional Information

As a student progresses through their program, they may want to change their assigned advisor or replace a committee member for a variety of reasons. Once a student's program of study and committee is approved by the CSU Graduate School, any committee changes require a Change of Committee Petition (GS-9A) form. Changes must be approved by the School of Education and CSU Graduate School. If necessary, faculty members may step down from a committee after discussions with the affected student. Changes in the committee are not permitted from the time a doctoral student submits their intent to complete the preliminary exam through completion of the preliminary exam.

Additional information on masters and doctoral committees as well as other policies and guidelines are found in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin and the SOE Doctor of Philosophy Program Handbook.

Selection and Appointment of Adjunct Faculty who wish to serve on Graduate Committees

1. Adjunct faculty who would like to serve as advisors for graduate students in the School of Education must present their curriculum vitae to the Program Coordinator of the specialization or degree for approval or denial. The Leadership Team is then notified of approvals.

a. Candidates who serve in this role must hold the degree equivalent to that being sought by the student (M.A., M.Ed., M.S., Ph.D., or Ed.D.).

b. Candidates must demonstrate expertise and continued engagement in research, scholarship, and/or professional practice in the educational specialization sought by the student.

2. Adjunct faculty who serve as advisors within the School of Education will be evaluated annually. Annual evaluations will be conducted by program coordinators/CEP Co-Directors. All students will be asked to submit an Advisor Survey for feedback on their advisor(s), which will be sent annually by the School of Education Graduate Programs officer. These surveys will be used to assist program coordinators in evaluating the advising performance of advisors.

    a. Advisors must provide effective advisement of their graduate student advisees.

    b. Advisors must demonstrate expertise and continued engagement in research, scholarship, and professional practice in their students' area(s) of educational specialization.

    Part-time, temporary faculty members who serve as advisors can be removed from their advising roles during their appointed time frame for egregious conduct or for neglect of their advising responsibilities. As appropriate, the Leadership Team may make a recommendation to the Director regarding removal of a part-time/adjunct faculty member.

3. Evaluation of Part-Time Adjunct Faculty (revised May 2022)

    Annual Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty in SOE All individuals who teach at least one course in a calendar year in any School of Education (SOE) program, and who also do not engage in the SOE faculty annual performance review process, will engage in the evaluation process described here. These individuals will be referred to as adjunct faculty.

    Schedule of Evaluations

    a. Adjunct faculty who teach at least two semesters in the calendar year (spring, summer, and/or fall), will be evaluated for all courses taught the previous calendar year in the following spring of each year. For example, if an adjunct faculty taught courses in the spring and summer of 2022, they would be evaluated for those courses in spring 2023. Individual programs can decide on the timing of evaluations within the spring semester, but they must be completed no later than the last day of the spring semester.

    b. Evaluations for adjunct faculty who only teach during one semester in a calendar year will occur the semester immediately following the semester in which they taught. For example, if a faculty member teaches one course in the summer, their evaluation will occur in the fall. Evaluations need to be completed by the last day of the semester in which they occur.

    c. If an adjunct faculty member will not be hired to teach a course(s) in a subsequent calendar year, the program coordinator(s) may choose to not conduct an evaluation of their work in the previous year.

    d. Program coordinator(s) are responsible for informing all adjunct faculty of this evaluation schedule in a timely manner. Program coordinator(s) are also responsible for scheduling evaluation meetings or communicating due dates for submission of materials if no meeting is held.

e. Adjunct faculty members will need to have their evaluation materials submitted to their program coordinator(s) at least two weeks in advance of their scheduled evaluation date.

Evaluation Process

a. All adjunct faculty evaluations will be conducted by the program coordinator(s) in the program in which they teach. In the Center for Educator Preparation (CEP) the CEP director(s) are the program coordinator(s). The SOE Director can be consulted on or included in the evaluation of any adjunct faculty member at the request of the program coordinator(s) and/or the adjunct faculty. The program coordinator(s) will provide the adjunct faculty member and the SOE Director a written summary of all evaluations. The adjunct faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a written response to the summary, if they choose.

b. If a program has a large number of adjunct faculty to evaluate, the coordinator(s) may choose other individual(s) to assist with the evaluation process. For example, they can appoint another faculty member (adjunct or full time) with knowledge of the program and who exhibits high-quality teaching practices to serve as a peer observer and provide feedback to the program coordinator(s).

c. Program coordinator(s) can decide if they will hold meetings with adjunct faculty or if they will only review the written materials provided by the adjunct faculty. Individual adjunct faculty members can request a meeting, if they choose.

d. By the assigned date, the adjunct faculty member will provide the following review materials to the program coordinator(s):

i. CSU Course Surveys from all course(s) taught during the evaluation period.

ii. A brief written reflection of their teaching successes and challenges during the evaluation period and a statement of what else they may need to be successful. In addition, individual programs may choose to require and/or encourage adjunct faculty members provide:

iii. At least one teaching goal drawn from the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, addressing at least one domain. For those who teach multiple courses, the goal(s) can be specific to a certain course or cover multiple courses. Goal(s) can also span multiple years. The adjunct faculty should provide a progress update on their goal(s) from the review period (if applicable) and a goal(s) for the upcoming review period.

iv. A peer evaluation of teaching.

e. All review materials provided by the adjunct faculty member and the written evaluation summary provided by the program coordinator(s) will be kept in individual faculty files, housed within SOE.

f. It is important that adjunct faculty have access to and be encouraged to partake in professional development and other supports to improve and refine instructional skills

(for example, the Academic Success Workshops offered through TILT.) At a minimum, opportunities and options should be communicated to adjunct faculty members by program coordinator(s) during their annual evaluations.

3.H. Eligibility and Application for Sabbatical

The School of Eligibility will follow eligibility and application guidelines as outlined in the university's Human Resource and Faculty Manuals. See Faculty Manual, Section F.3 - https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-manual-section- f/#F.3.4. **(In Fall 2023, the SOE will discuss how best to process simultaneous requests for sabbatical leave.)**

> "The University offers tenured faculty members the possibility of sabbatical leaves. According to state statute, a faculty member may not take sabbatical leave more often than once every seven (7) years. According to University policy, a faculty member does not become eligible for sabbatical leave until the accumulation of six (6) years of service as a tenured or tenure-track faculty member at Colorado State University since the faculty member's initial appointment or most recent sabbatical leave. A faculty member in a tenure-track position may apply for sabbatical leave prior to being granted tenure, and such leave may be granted subject to the condition that the faculty member receive tenure prior to beginning the sabbatical leave. However, a faculty member must have tenure in order to take sabbatical leave."

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

4.A. Annual Performance Evaluation

Faculty Performance shall be conducted in accordance with the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual,* Section (AFAPM E.14). See Appendix D of this Code for additional details on preparing materials and rating categories for faculty annual reviews.

All full-time faculty (50% or greater FTE) are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance consistent with the tenure system (as relevant), academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights (see *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual,* Section AFAPM E.14). The purposes of Faculty Reviews are to (a) assist faculty in achieving tenure, promotion, or reappointment, (b) facilitate continued professional development, (c) refocus professional efforts when appropriate, (d) assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University, and (e) to guide the SOE Director in making recommendations regarding the allocation of merit and equity pay as part of the annual salary exercise. The evaluation of tenure and non-tenure track faculty members' annual performance shall be based on the calendar year (January through December).

The School of Education requires that all temporary faculty be evaluated by the program coordinator on an annual basis. The Leadership Team in conjunction with the SOE Director shall determine the annual evaluation process.

1. In early December, the Director shall forward to all tenure and non-tenure track faculty (contract and continuing appointments) the procedures, templates, and timelines for the Annual Performance Review (APR). By January 20, each tenure line and non-tenure line faculty member shall submit a portfolio to the SOE Director documenting annual performance in teaching, advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. The APR portfolio shall include (a) the completed Colorado State University Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report, (b) an updated vitae, (c) a narrative explaining the work done during the preceding calendar year, (d) other supporting materials (see Appendix B), and (e) an optional three-year plan.

2. The portfolio materials submitted by the tenure line and non-tenure track faculty (contract and continuing appointments) shall be reviewed and evaluated by the SOE Director. The SOE Director uses the benchmarks rubric in *Appendix B* to guide their professional judgment in assigning ratings. Evaluation ratings will reflect individual workload considerations, specifically addressing the differing responsibilities and effort distributions of the faculty member.

3. The University requires the reporting of each faculty member's annual performance rating on a university-generated standardized form. The SOE Director shall have the responsibility for relating the rating scale to the university form and reporting the performance rating for each faculty member to the Dean of CHHS who signs the forms and forwards information to the Provost/Academic Vice President.

    a.   By March 10, faculty identified above shall meet with the SOE Director to discuss the annual performance ratings and plans. Both the SOE Director and faculty member shall sign off on the Annual Performance Review and yearly workload percentages.

    b.   The SOE Director shall complete the final assessment and include a short statement substantiating the assessment in each area.

    c.   The SOE Director will complete for each tenure track and non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member a salary letter outlining any merit or equity increase for the next academic year at the earliest possible date. The salary letter information is based upon the annual evaluation ratings, state appropriations, and college allocations.

    d.   A tenure track or non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty member may not be rated with an overall evaluation of Superior or Exceeds Expectations if the rating in any of the four categories falls below the Below Expectations rating.

    e.   Depending upon the availability of funding from the University, merit and equity pay increases shall be based on the following:

        i. All tenure track and non-tenure track faculty whose overall rating is in the Meets Expectations category shall receive a percentage of their salary as a merit increase determined by the SOE Director. Merit increases are based upon the

available university raise pool, faculty salary pool, and fringe pool.

ii. Tenure and non-tenure track (contract and continuing) faculty members whose overall rating falls below Meets Expectations shall receive a smaller percentage of salary as a merit and equity increase.

iii. The SOE Director shall have the option to use a portion of the salary exercise allotment for equity and other administrative or discretionary salary adjustments.

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

Progress toward Promotion - (See *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, Section AFAPM E.14.2).

A comprehensive performance review of each tenure track faculty member shall be conducted by the midpoint of their probationary period at Colorado State University. For example, the normal probationary period for an assistant professor is six (6) years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the end of the third (3rd) year. However, if the assistant professor were given one (1) year of credit for prior service, then the probationary period at Colorado State University would be reduced to five (5) years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the middle of the third (3rd) year.

The use of Family Medical Leave may lead to a delay of the Comprehensive Review.

This midpoint review shall be conducted by a Review Committee consisting of all eligible faculty members of the department, or, if so specified in the department code, by a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the Review Committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in AFAPM E.2.2.2) of more than half-time is not eligible to serve on the Review Committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. The eligible faculty members are all other tenured department faculty members, except for those who choose to recuse themselves. Prior to conducting the review, the members of the Review Committee shall consult with the college dean to discuss the expectations for tenure at administrative levels higher than the department. One (1) of the following three (3) outcomes must be selected by a majority of the Review Committee:

a. The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion;

b. There are deficiencies, but, if they are corrected satisfactorily, the faculty member will be making satisfactorily progress toward tenure and promotion, or;

c. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one (1) or more areas of responsibility, and the Review Committee recommends against further appointments.

Upon completion of the midpoint review, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report. A copy of this report shall be given to the faculty member, who shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if they desire to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost (if one (1) of these persons is the faculty member under review, they will be skipped in the forwarding). Each of the included administrators may add written comments, and copies of these comments will be given to the faculty member, the Review Committee, and each of the administrators. A final comprehensive performance review is required prior to a recommendation concerning tenure.

4.C. Comprehensive Performance Reviews

(See *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, Section AFPAM E.14.3).

- Phase I

The SOE Director shall conduct a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review of all tenured faculty at intervals of five years following the earning of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five-year review period.

This review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the earning of tenure, an updated curriculum vitae, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives.

The SOE Director shall provide an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance. The evaluation should identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. If a faculty member has deficiencies that, in the opinion of the SOE Director, may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review, the SOE Director in consultation with the faculty member should prepare a specific professional-development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations. This plan may include resources, assistance, and opportunities to be made available to the faculty member and a time frame by which the SOE Director will monitor progress toward achieving the planned goals.

If the evaluation from a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review is unsatisfactory, a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

- Phase II

Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the SOE Director determined that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the Phase I Review. A Phase II Peer Review Committee of at least three peers at the same or higher rank shall be appointed by the T&P Committee. The initiation of a Phase II review is not grievable by the faculty member.

This review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vitae, a

self-analysis by the faculty member, a statement of goals and objectives, and peer evaluations and student opinions of teaching. It shall occur within 45 days after the appointment of the Phase II Review Committee.

The Peer Review Committee shall complete its review, using the requirements for tenure and/or promotion to guide their professional judgments in rating each faculty member, taking into consideration the differing responsibilities and effort distributions of the faculty member.

A majority of the Committee must decide on one of two possible outcomes:

1. No further actions are necessary if the faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance as identified by the SOE, or if the deficiencies are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.

2. Further action is required if there are substantial chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied, or the Committee concludes that the conditions set forth in Section AFAPM E.14.3.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* appear to be present.

In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the Peer Review Committee, must be remedied, the SOE Director and faculty member will design a professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and set timelines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The plan must be approved by the Dean.

In the event that conditions set forth in Section AFAPM E.14.3.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* are present, the Committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation. For each outcome, the Committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the SOE Director and in successive steps to the Dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations of the SOE Director and Dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.

The faculty member shall have recourse to the provisions of AFAPM Section K, in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* except where otherwise prohibited (e.g., Section AFAPM E.15) once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendation or decisions made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II may be the basis for a complaint under Section K., of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*.

4.D. Annual Probationary Period Review of Pre-Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty

The SOE Director is responsible for making explicit at the time of employment to the faculty member in that unit the conditions which normally must be met for the earning of

tenure, the procedures by which tenure is awarded, denied, terminated, or withdrawn, and the procedures by which the faculty member may challenge such decisions.

The SOE Director and the faculty member on probationary status are jointly responsible for discussing, at least once annually, prior to the time for the decision on tenure, the faculty member's development and fitness for the position involved and prospects for eventually acquiring tenure. By April 10 of each year, the T&P Committee shall annually provide an independent assessment of progress toward tenure, and a written report summarizing progress toward tenure, and of any perceived deficiencies, to each tenure track faculty member. The faculty member will provide both the SOE Director and the T&P Committee a current Curriculum Vitae, formatted per the Provost's CV guidelines, in advance of these assessments. The committee report shall be shared with the tenure track faculty member and the SOE Director and may include suggestions for workload and effort distribution judged to be supportive of the faculty member's progress toward tenure. The SOE Director shall provide the faculty member a written summary of the evaluation of progress toward tenure and a copy will be provided to the tenure track faculty member and the College Dean. (This report is independent of the annual evaluation covering achievements in the most recent calendar year.)

The SOE Director shall make every effort to encourage and assist the faculty member to fulfill the conditions which will qualify the faculty member for tenure and/or promotion. This may include consulting with the T&P committee members or a subcommittee thereof, regarding suggestions received in the committee's written report summarizing progress toward tenure.

This same process will be completed for non-tenure track faculty in the Instructor and Assistant Professor ranks. The T&P Committee's assessment of progress toward promotion and written report will be completed by November 10 of each year.

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

See Appendix B for specific promotion criteria in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

4.E.1. Promotion to Associate Professor (Tenure-Track):
For promotion to associate professor with tenure, it is expected that the candidate has developed a focused record of scholarship that is recognized as an important line of inquiry by reputable and knowledgeable scholars at a national and/or international level; has demonstrated sustained progress toward excellence in teaching; has engaged in an appropriate level of service; and participated in SOE activities with a commitment to collegiality and teamwork and in the spirit of CSU's Principles of Community (Appendix A).

4.E.2. Promotion to Full Professor (Tenure-Track):
A successful candidate for full professor is expected to demonstrate qualitative differences in the scope and level of their contributions beyond those that warranted promotion to associate professor. Specifically, leadership should be evident across the domains of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service. For appointment at this rank, a candidate must be clearly established with a focused research agenda, have a national reputation, and be highly regarded as a scholar;

mentor students and early career faculty; demonstrate consistent and sustained excellence in teaching; and engage in service and outreach, including leadership roles, across the school, college, university, and community, with a commitment to collegiality and teamwork and in the spirit of CSU's Principles of Community (Appendix A).

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

See Appendix C
- Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor
- Promotion to the Rank of Professor

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

See Appendix D
- Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor
- Promotion to the Rank of Master Instructor

4.H. Disciplinary Action for Faculty

The policies and procedures related to disciplinary action for tenured faculty are found in Sections AFAPM E.15.1 – E.15.11 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.* The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with assuring the integrity of the AFAPM E.15 processes. These sections describe Initiating the Process (AFAPM E.15.1), Operation Procedure (AFAPM E.15.2), Discussion to Achieve a Resolution (AFAPM E.15.3), the Hearing Process (AFAPM E.15.4), Performance of Professional Duties (AFAPM E.15.4.1), Behavior (AFAPM E. 15.4.2), Hearing (AFAPM E. 14.3), Procedures Following the Completion of the Hearing (AFAPM E.15.5), Recommendations for Disciplinary Action (AFAPM E.15.6), Disposition of the Hearing Committee's Report (AFAPM E.15.7), Administrative Action on the Hearing Committee Recommendations (AFAPM E.15.8), Written Records (AFAPM E.15.9), Term of Continuation of Faculty Salary and Benefits Following Termination of Appointment (AFAPM E.15.10), and Time Limit for Action by the Provost (AFAPM E.15.11).

4.I. Grievance Processes for Faculty

Any faculty member disputing their annual evaluation should first request a meeting with the SOE Director to which the faculty member's mentor is also invited if desired. If an agreement about performance is not reached, tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty may request that the respective Tenure and Promotion committee review and provide the SOE Director and the faculty member with an evaluative rating of the annual evaluation materials. If an overall rating from one or more faculty members is revised based upon the appeal process, the raise pool for all will need to be adjusted prior to final review letters being sent.

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

5.A. Annual Performance Evaluation

The SOE Director shall have the responsibility for setting criteria and undertaking annual evaluations of all SOE administrators (e.g., Associate Directors of SOE, Associate Director for Online and Distance Education, (Co) Director(s) of CEP.)

All staff (administrative professionals and state classified) are to be evaluated annually by the SOE Director as part of the annual salary exercise as outlined in the CSU Administrative Professional Council guidelines. For further information, see Section AFAPM D.5.5 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.*

5.B. Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals

- Research Professionals - Contact the Director of Human Resource Services for consideration of research professional advancement levels. Further details can be found in Section D.5.3.3 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* and also the *HR Manual.*

- Academic Success Coordinators and Advisors and Other Administrative Professionals – Approved titles for the advancement of Administrative Professionals can be obtained from Human Resource Services and the Administrative Professional Council Office. See the *HR Manual* found on the Human Resource Services website.\

5.C. Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff

Classifications and promotion procedures can be found in the *HR Manual* at the CSU Human Resource Services website.

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

See the *HR Manual* at the CSU Human Resource Services website.

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

Several CSU Offices assist faculty and administrative professionals with the resolution of grievances and disputes. Three avenues for such claims are outlined briefly in AFAPM Section K. of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.* More information can be found on the website of the University Grievance Officer.

Section 6: Student Employee Policies and Procedures

Student employee definitions, policies and procedures are found in the *HR Manual* at the CSU Human Resource Services website.

6.A. Student Employees

See Section 5 of the Colorado State University, HR Manual.

6.B. Graduate Student Evaluation

(to be addressed in Fall 2023)

6.D. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants

The School of Education will follow policies and procedures as outlined in the university's Human Resource Manual and the Graduate School Catalog/Bulleting regarding the evaluation of Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants. (see: ⌷; https://catalog.colostate.edu/general-catalog/courses-az/grad/); https://catalog.colostate.edu/general-catalog/courses-az/grad/)

6.E. Student Grade Appeal

Student Grade Appeal procedures shall comply with the guidelines approved by Faculty Council (see the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM Section I.7) and the General Catalog.

Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code

An ad-hoc committee appointed by the Director shall review the SOE Code at least once every five years. In addition to revisions suggested by the Leadership Team, any SOE faculty member may present an amendment or revisions to the SOE Code to the SOE Director in writing at least two weeks before the regularly scheduled faculty meeting at which the amendment is to be discussed. The SOE Director shall distribute copies of the amendment along with the agenda for the faculty meeting, and the vote may be taken at the subsequent faculty meeting. All revisions shall be presented to the faculty for review and approval.

7.A Signatures Approving of the Unit Code

Amendments or revisions to the SOE Code must be passed by a quorum, a two-thirds majority of the full-time faculty who are not on approved leave. All full-time faculty-approved amendments or revisions to the SOE Code shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College and the Provost/Academic Vice President for final approval.

Signatures Approving Adoption of this Code:

This Code for the School of Education was approved by a minimum two-thirds majority of the Department faculty eligible to vote. The vote was completed by electronic ballot on the 14th of September 2021. Subsequent revisions to the SOE Code were voted on and approved by electronic ballot on the 12th of September 2022.

Provost Approval

Signature _____Date_____

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

See The *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (AFAPM). Policies included in the AFAPM supersede individual unit Codes.

Appendices

Appendix A: CSU Principles of Community

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

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.

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

Appendix B provides a description of criteria and forms of evidence for promotion to Associate and Full Professor ranks for Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty, with respect to the areas of Teaching/Advising, Scholarship, and Service. These criteria assume a load of 50% Teaching/Advising, 35% Scholarship, and 15% Service; if a faculty member has a different effort distribution, expectations will be adjusted accordingly. Given the School of Education and CSU's commitment to Social Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (SJEDI), we also include a fourth criterion section outlining expectations for contributions to and/or growth in connection to SJEDI initiatives or outcomes. Faculty members can show evidence of attention to SJEDI through one or more of the domains of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.

It is important to state that the pathway to promotion should be humanizing and affirming. In creating these expectations and examples of promotion standards, we seek to support faculty in a professorial career of excellence that also recognizes balance with their lives outside the academy. It is the goal of the School of Education to support faculty in their achievements, contributions, and professional growth by recognizing that each faculty member will contribute in diverse ways that are equitably valued.

Teaching, Advising, and Mentorship Promotion Criteria

As faculty in a School of Education, value and importance is placed on teaching and advising excellence. Faculty should regularly strive to improve their practices and the impact of those practices on students and learning. Assistant Professors should demonstrate this by creating and updating teaching goals and engaging in professional development activities appropriate to their needs for teaching growth. As is reasonable, they should strive to align these activities with their other workload responsibilities (scholarship and service). As well, Assistant Professors should engage in advising, mentoring, and professional development of students as is fitting for their program needs and as evidenced by a complimentary combination of activities. Both teaching and advising activities should be in an appropriate balance to allow Assistant Professors the capacity to focus on scholarly productivity. Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor should engage at an increased level, while also demonstrating leadership in teaching.

Evaluation of teaching and advising should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, online; lower-division, upper-division, graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidate creates a new or updated yearly teaching goal(s) derived from an evidence-based framework (such as the TILT Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF)) and demonstrates

competence or appropriate levels of growth in accordance with these teaching goal(s). Evidence of effective teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Provides self-reflection
- Provides examples of course improvements and techniques implemented (e.g., active learning, student goal setting, student-centered activities, alignment of objectives/activities/assessments, formative assessments, techniques for building classroom community, etc.) and their measured impact (data) on students. Data may include level of participation, quiz scores, test question scores, student feedback, etc.
- Provides curricular materials (e.g., assessments, use of materials from minoritized groups, resources to make connections beyond the course, etc.)
- Provides course survey data (appropriate TEF domain questions from course survey that align with each of the TEF domains)
- Provides student feedback (e.g., letters, emails, informal surveys, other written comments)
- Provides assessment data
- Provides peer observation and/or review of course material
- Provides discipline licensing exam
- Presents student engagement captured in checks for understanding, response rates, etc.
- Presents improvements based on student feedback and/or outcomes of improvements
- Presents external and/or internal teaching recognition(s) and/or honor(s)
- Creates and exhibits an inclusive environment for all learners
- Provides evidence of personal awareness of assumptions and biases
- Provides examples of inclusive practices in the classroom and curriculum (e.g., clear expectations, opportunities for a wide range of voices, high student involvement and interaction, use variety of teaching methods, content and examples reflect a diversity of contributors and perspectives, support needs of minoritized students (race, disability, international status, veterans, gender identity, etc.), allow opportunities for risk and failure, create class norms for interaction, etc.)

Candidate participates in and integrates professional development related to teaching as evidenced by all of the following:

- Participates in professional development activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, study groups, etc.)
- Provides teaching techniques, materials, concepts, and/or improvements created and/or used based on professional development activities

Candidate serves as an advisor and/or committee member in roles appropriate for the program area (e.g., undergraduate, honors theses, master's theses, master's Plan B, doctoral) Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Provides evaluations and/or testimonials from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers
- Presents external and/or internal advising recognition(s) and/or honor(s)
- Supports students in their academic development (e.g., appropriate course selection, research guidance, graduate committee selections, check in meetings, etc.)

Candidate provides mentorship appropriate for student needs. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Participates in undergraduate and/or graduate mentorship activities (e.g., Alpha Delta Kappa Collegiate Club, Student Outreach Undergraduate Leadership (SOUL), Celebrate Undergraduate Research & Creativity (CURC), Multicultural Undergraduate Research Art and Leadership Symposium (MURALS), Graduate Showcase judge, McNair, etc.)
- Collaborates with and/or mentors students on presentations, publications, and/or grant applications
- Obtains grants that provide student funding
- Supervises independent studies and/or supervised college teaching experiences
- Supervises graduate research or teaching assistants

Candidate supports professional and academic growth of students, including those who are not their official advisees/mentees. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities
- Regularly meets with students around professional development

Promotion to Professor

In addition to the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to engage in the above criteria **at an increased level**. In addition, they are expected to demonstrate **leadership in teaching.** Evidence of leadership in teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Training and supervising graduate teaching assistants
- Serving as coordinator of a course
- Contributing to course or program assessment
- Curriculum revision

Research and Scholarship Promotion Criteria

Research and scholarship are a vital part of advancing our profession. Research includes systematic collection and analysis of information for generation of new knowledge, its refinement, application, and/or its capability to address important educational/social problems. Faculty research contributes to the foundation of knowledge and creates new scholarship to guide or transform educational practice and policy. Below we outline criteria for evaluation of faculty research and scholarship. Evaluating patterns of productivity should take into consideration variations in candidate's assigned workload distribution, as well as the time, resources and effort necessitated by developing new collaborative partnerships and/or new project start-up.

Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Candidate has developed a focused, substantive track record of scholarship that is recognized as an important line of inquiry by reputable and knowledgeable scholars at a national or international level. Evidence, may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Publishes peer reviewed articles in significant scholarly and practitioner journals in their field
- Publishes books or book chapters
- Produces other creative representations of research outcomes including (but not limited to) engaging in research translations as evidenced by publishing of white papers and reports to funders/stakeholders/practitioners
- Presents beginning trend of citations in others' published works
- Conducts presentations and/or keynote addresses at peer reviewed national and international research and/or practitioner conferences
- Receives external and internal research recognitions, honors, and/or fellowships
- Is invited to review abstract submissions, manuscripts, or grant proposals in the field
- Receives external reviewer feedback that a candidate has made a substantial contribution to the discipline and/or profession

*Note that the primary form of publication should be in peer-reviewed journals.

2. Candidate has engaged in efforts, as lead investigator or collaborator, to secure external and internal funding and/or build collaborative/interdisciplinary research partnerships. Evidence may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Applies for or awarded external grants/contracts as needed to support research activities and/or fund graduate students
- Applies for or awarded external grants/contracts to support outreach and engagement activities related to their body of work
- Applies for or awarded internal grants to launch and/or support body of research including outreach and engagement activities
- Show efforts to build collaborative/interdisciplinary research partnerships that may lead to external funding

3. Candidate's research has demonstrated impactful contributions to a line of inquiry, research methodologies, theoretical approaches, and/or positively impacted communities. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:
- Receives external reviewer feedback that candidate has made a substantial contribution to the discipline, methodologies, theoretical applications, policies, practices, and/or communities
- Provides candidate narrative concerning the rationale for research/scholarly activities and presents convincing argument that the line of inquiry is impactful and important
- Provides other indicators that their work is innovative and impactful in terms of methodology, perspective, theory, contribution to policy and/or practice, and/or is an emerging area of scholarship/inquiry
- Provides candidate-led blog posts, podcasts, and/or other forms of research communication that uniquely share insights on research endeavors with communities,

emerging methodologies, and/or theoretical approaches to a wider and more diverse audience

Promotion to Professor

Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to meet the above criteria. Further, it is expected that a faculty member at this rank has an **established record of outstanding achievement in their area(s) of expertise** and **demonstrates leadership in scholarship**. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Maintains an independent research program

- Serves as a lead or collaborating investigator for funded research projects

- Provides leadership of established collaborative research groups

- Demonstrates a record of scholarship that reflects recognition as a leader in their area(s) of expertise

Service, Outreach, and Engagement Promotion Criteria

The School of Education values service, outreach, and engagement and the contribution of faculty to these areas. We seek to honor Assistant Professors in a way that promotes their ability to be productive in areas such as scholarly activity while providing appropriate levels of service depending upon their discipline area, load, etc. Associate Professors are expected to increasingly develop leadership in service, outreach, and engagement during their tenure. Appendix B outlines all criteria with examples of types of evidence.

Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor will show evidence of service (on an annual basis) to their program as well to the School of Education. As appropriate, levels of service may broaden over time to include service to the college and/or university and/or professional and community service.

Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor are expected to continue service to their program, School of Education, profession, and community. Additionally, **levels of service are expected to broaden over time** to include contributions at the college and/or university level as well as leadership roles at the national and/or international level.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The following are examples of types of evidence of criteria for service; faculty are expected to provide evidence of some, but not necessarily all, of the following types of service

Program and Department/SOE

- Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the academic program or

departmental level
- Contributes to the creation of program policies and procedures
- Participates in program and departmental events

Professional and Community Service

- Maintains memberships in professional societies
- Attends professional meetings relevant to position and program needs
- Serves professional organizations as appropriate to time in rank
- Assists in planning professional conferences, including reviewing presentation proposals or proceedings
- Serves state/community related to professional expertise
- Consults for community groups related to professional expertise
- Conducts community workshops, seminars, and/or presentations

Editorial/Grant/Professional Review

- Reviews manuscripts for journals and/or books for publishers
- Serves as a member on review/editorial boards
- Participates in grant review panels

Promotion to Professor

In addition to the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to engage in the above criteria at an increased level. In addition, they are expected to demonstrate their contributions at the college and university levels, provide faculty and professional mentorship, and demonstrate leadership in service through some, but not limited to, the following forms of service:

College and University

- Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the college and university level
- Contributes to the creation of and/or participation in collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the SOE and the college/university

Faculty and Professional Mentorship

- Mentors other faculty in teaching or research and other areas of professional development
- Provides peer evaluations, observations, etc. for other faculty
- Reviews articles/grant proposals for colleagues

Leadership in Service

- Chairs a major school /college/university/state committee
- Assumes leadership role(s) in national, international, regional, or state professional organization(s)
- Serves as Editor or Associate Editor of national or international refereed journal
- Reviews grant proposals for a national agency/organization
- Serves as guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal
- Participates in accreditation reviews at other institutions
- Serves as an external reviewer on T&P requests

Social Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The School of Education is committed to making visible and working toward addressing issues related to Social Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (SJEDI). Given the School of Education and CSU's commitment to Social Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (SJEDI), each faculty member is expected to determine and communicate how they best contribute to this commitment in any of the domains of teaching, advising, scholarship, and/or service/outreach. **It is not expected or desired for the candidate to list within their dossier all contributions to SJEDI. Instead, it is expected that the candidate will focus on the most substantive and meaningful examples of their work that highlight the domain(s) (e.g., teaching/advising, research/scholarship, service) demonstrating growth and/or contributions related to SJEDI.** Below, we outline potential examples of ways in which faculty might highlight their growth and/or contributions in each area*. These examples do not represent an exhaustive list of possibilities for faculty to demonstrate their commitment to SJEDI.

Teaching, Advising, and Mentorship

- Curricular Diversity: Curriculum that prepares students to critically interrogate and engage with a global, multicultural, and rapidly changing world as scholars and citizens

- Access and Success: Pedagogy promoting equitable access to resources and opportunities that create conditions for success in the classroom and other learning environments

- Inclusive Climate: Pedagogy fostering learning environments in which students who are members of underrepresented populations are socially and culturally included

- Participation in professional development aimed at preparing faculty to advise students from underrepresented and underserved populations

- Participation in professional development activities that lead to greater understanding and work toward equity-minded teaching practices

- Mentoring students from underrepresented groups through activities such as guiding and helping them adapt to college

Research and Scholarship

- Research or creative activity in a faculty member's area of expertise that involves addressing inequalities or barriers for inclusion of underrepresented groups

- Intellectual themes or trajectories that examine patterns of representation, incorporation, or inclusion within a faculty member's area of expertise

- Grant seeking or obtaining that provides funding for research that focuses on equity, inclusion, and diversity

- Scholarly productivity in particular texts, data sets, methodological practices, theories, or creative discourses that involve equity and inclusion within a faculty member's area of expertise

- Research interests that contribute to diversity and equal opportunity, for example, research that addresses:
  - Race, ethnicity, gender, multiculturalism, and inclusion on health disparities, educational access and achievement, political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, civil, and human rights
  - Questions of interest to communities historically excluded by higher education

- Artistic expression and cultural production that reflect culturally diverse communities or voices not well represented in the arts and humanities.

Service, Outreach and Engagement

- Contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within and beyond the School of Education and College, through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of colleagues and students.

- Service that works to ensure a curriculum that prepares students to critically interrogate and engage with a global, multicultural, and rapidly changing world as scholars and citizens

- Service that aims to promote equitable access to resources and opportunities that provide conditions for success for students, faculty, and staff

- Service that fosters environments in which students, faculty, and staff who are members of underrepresented populations are socially and culturally included

- Participation in academic preparation, outreach, tutoring, pipeline, or other programs designed to remove barriers facing women, people who are racially/ethnically minoritized, veterans, people with disabilities, and other individuals who are members of groups historically excluded from higher education

*Adapted from the University of Denver: https://duvpfa.du.edu/2021/05/making-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-in-promotion-tenure-and-re-appointment-decisions-visible/

Appendix C: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks and General Promotion Standards

The minimum requirements listed below for promotion to each rank can be adjusted based on the workload of the faculty member (e.g., if the faculty member does not have a research workload, the research minimum requirement will not be considered as a promotion criterion).

Professor Track

Assistant Professor

Minimum Requirement:

- Doctoral degree

Responsibilities:

- Primarily teaching, at least 5% scholarship/research, at least 10% service/outreach/engagement, and additional duties as appropriate (i.e., advising, administration, additional scholarship/research and/or additional administration)

OR

- Primarily research, at least 5% service/outreach/engagement, and additional duties as appropriate (teaching, advising and/or administration)

Associate Professor

Minimum Requirements:

- 5 years' experience as Assistant Professor or equivalent higher education experience (at CSU or another institution)
- Consistent record of excellence in teaching
- Record of positive contributions to the relevant instructional program(s)
- Evidence of engaging in professional development
- Excellence in advising, administration, and/or service/outreach/engagement that draws upon the individual's expertise
- Demonstrated evidence of and potential to make future contributions to research/scholarship

Professor

Minimum Requirements:

- 5 years' experience as Associate Professor or equivalent higher education experience
- Demonstrates sustained record of excellence in teaching
- Sustained record of engaging in professional development
- Demonstrates sustained excellence in advising, administration, and/or service/outreach/engagement that draws upon the individual's expertise

Demonstrated evidence of sustained contributions to research/scholarship

Appendix D: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks and General Promotion Standards

The minimum requirements listed below for promotion to each rank can be adjusted based on the workload of the faculty member (e.g., if the faculty member does not have a research workload, the research minimum requirement will not be considered as a promotion criterion).

Instructor Track

Minimum Requirements:

- Master's degree

Responsibilities:

- Primarily teaching (other duties as appropriate) and at least 5% service/outreach/engagement (may opt out of service requirement for a 5% decrease in salary)

Senior Instructor

Minimum Requirements:

- Master's degree
- 5 years' experience as Instructor or equivalent higher education experience (at CSU or another institution)
- Consistent record of excellence in teaching
- Record of positive contributions to the relevant instructional program(s)
- Evidence of professional development
- Professional service/outreach/engagement that draws upon the individual's expertise

Responsibilities

- Primarily teaching (other duties as appropriate) and at least 10% service/outreach/engagement

Master Instructor

Minimum Requirements:

- 5 years' experience as Senior Instructor or equivalent higher education experience
- Demonstrates sustained record of excellence in teaching
- Increased record of professional development
- Demonstrates sustained service/outreach/engagement that draws upon the individual's expertise

Appendix E: Annual Performance Standards

School of Education Annual Evaluation of Faculty Guidelines

OVERVIEW

This document has been prepared and approved by School of Education (SOE) faculty and is designed to provide accountability and rationale for annual faculty evaluations. *The Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* takes precedence over our School of Education Code.

PERFORMANCE AND WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS

All tenure track faculty members are expected to demonstrate performance in all three areas of the academic mission: teaching and advising (usually 50% of workload), research and scholarly activities (usually 35% of workload), and service and outreach (usually 15% of workload). Non-standard workload efforts reflecting administrative responsibilities, external funding arrangements, or other circumstances, may be approved by the SOE Director. However, all faculty should demonstrate continuing effort in each area.

Non-tenure track faculty may have variations in their loads depending on the work for which they were hired and may or may not reflect the percentages listed for tenure track faculty.

TIMELINE AND PREPARING MATERIALS

By the deadline established each year faculty members shall submit the following to the SOE Director: (a) the Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Report (or Faculty Activity Report - FAR) for the preceding calendar year; (b) a narrative explaining the work done during the preceding calendar year; (c) an updated vita; (d) supporting materials ("Examples of Types of Evidence"); and (e) any additional requirements as set forth each year by the School of Education, College of Health and Human Sciences and/or CSU. Each faculty member will set up a meeting with the Director to review and discuss the yearly materials submitted. These meetings are held in advance of the college deadline for evaluations to be submitted; the meetings are usually in February and very early March. An evaluation summary will be drafted by the Director and the Director and faculty member will sign the form prior to submission to the Dean's office. Exact deadlines for faculty per rank, use of university systems such as Curriculum Vitae format, and other specific processes involved will be sent to faculty by end of fall semester each year. Faculty are expected to meet the stated deadlines unless previous approval has been granted for short extensions.

INTERPRETING ANNUAL EVALUATION MATERIALS

In evaluating annual faculty work performance, the SOE does not use rigid numerical scales or quantitative formulae associated with performance activity within each of the areas of research, teaching, advising, and service. Given the variability across our specialization areas, a rigid metric does not serve the SOE well. It is understood that the evaluation

guidelines are considered holistically rather than as compartmented check-offs. For example, an exceptional or extraordinary demonstration of one or more aspect(s) may carry more weight depending on the factors involved for the individual faculty member (e.g., faculty appointment type, workload percentage, time in rank).

As well, because of the variability in workload expectations among faculty members, it is difficult to develop one method by which to assess the quality of faculty work. Thus, accomplishments should be expressed in terms of scope, impact, and depth of influence. Providing a clear explanation of and evidence for duties and achievements is the responsibility of each individual faculty member.

Evaluation Ratings

The rubrics for scholarship, teaching, advising, and service are developed to encompass all faculty roles, types of work, and varying workloads within SOE (e.g., pre-tenure, post-tenure, non-tenure track at any rank in both instructor and professor roles, faculty who work in undergraduate and/or graduate programs). The individual faculty member and SOE Director must clearly identify which expectations pertain to the role and stated workload of the faculty member, and thus the areas in which the faculty member can be expected to be evaluated.

Each rubric also contains "Examples of Types of Evidence". Faculty are not expected to provide examples for each item. Rather, these should be used to guide faculty members on the possible types of information they can provide as evidence of their work and accomplishments. The evidence provided will vary based on individual workloads and expectations, as agreed upon by the faculty member and SOE Director.

The Director will provide an overall evaluation of: "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," and "Unsatisfactory" for the areas of teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and an overall evaluation ranking. Faculty will be evaluated based on workload distribution, quality of work, and quality of the evidence they provide.

It also should be made clear that a rating of "meets expectations" indicates that the faculty member is achieving their stated expectations. Ratings of exceeds expectations and superior are reserved for faculty members who are demonstrating exceptional work and not all faculty will achieve these ratings in all categories, nor should they, on a regular basis.

Faculty Development and Progression

It is acknowledged that ongoing development and demonstrable progress for each faculty member is important to consider in the evaluative process. Although evaluations are conducted on a yearly basis, not all work is completed within a single year timeframe. Thus, efforts being put forward to support longer-term projects, not just completed work, are considered in annual evaluation efforts.

This includes the demonstration of efforts toward sustained and long-term development in scholarship, teaching, advising, and service.

Interdisciplinary and Team Initiatives

The SOE values interdisciplinary and team-driven work. Faculty are asked to describe their role in and contributions to team publications, grants, curriculum development, leadership initiatives, and other relevant areas of work. Evidence of team and interdisciplinary work may be included in the narrative statement and/or a line under the relevant activity on the FAR. The faculty member's role and contribution need to be clearly stated.

Narrative Statement

One of the most important pieces for the annual evaluation is a written **narrative statement** prepared by each faculty member. The statement should be used to explain context and give evidence to support the work outlined on the FAR. This statement should not repeat the work and accomplishments as outlined in the FAR. The type of information that is important to incorporate into this narrative includes:

- A developmental teaching plan based on the Teaching Effectiveness Framework (new or updated)

- Impact of the accomplishments achieved throughout the year
- Context for the area(s) in which the faculty member is expected to produce work
- Accomplishments for the year not reflected on the FAR
- Individual faculty development and progression demonstrated through the work for the year
- Role and/or contributions to teams and collaborative efforts
- Directly refer to and explain relevant "Examples of Types of Evidence" included for each workload area (scholarship, teaching, advising, and service)

Essentially, the narrative statement is each faculty member's opportunity to outline and support why their work should earn a particular rating. It also allows each faculty member to explain the impact and importance of their work, particularly if it may be work that is innovative, creative or not well-understood by those not primarily involved with the work. The SOE Director is expected to carefully review and use the narrative during the meeting with each faculty member and also use it to inform the evaluation summary that is submitted to the Dean's office.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, & CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following descriptors of specific performance categories are based on 35% effort distribution for research/scholarship. **If a faculty member has an effort distribution greater than or less than 35% effort devoted to scholarship, the expectations will be adjusted accordingly by shifting the contributions required for each rating.** For example, the items listed as "Exceeds Expectations" based on a 35% effort may appropriately correspond to "Superior" for someone with a 25% effort. In another example, a non-tenure track faculty member with a 10% scholarship workload may use publications written for an agency or the development of a professional tool to achieve a rating. It is also recognized that there exists a fairly normal "ebb and flow" of research publications, such that a single year may be not adequately represent one's research activity during a given evaluation period. For example, an individual may change the focus of scholarship requiring some retooling and pilot work, resulting in less tangible evidence of scholarly productivity. Moving into a new area of inquiry is to be encouraged without penalty, and such change in direction must be considered in the performance evaluation. For some non-tenure track faculty, although workload may not indicate a percentage of research, the dissemination of scholarship has value and makes a contribution regardless. Each individual faculty member must explain their workload, position type,

and justify the corresponding scholarship expected of and achieved by them in their narrative statement.

Faculty should use the table below to help identify potential relevant examples of their work over the past year. Faculty will then write a narrative statement outlining and supporting why this work should earn one of the ratings below. This statement should provide the context and justification for the rating that may not be immediately evident in the Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Report.

Superior- A superior rating will include accomplishment of <u>many </u>of the following:

- 4 or more peer-reviewed publications and/or scholarly/creative works disseminated
- 1-2 presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences, as permitted by SoE funding

- Receipt or continued management of multi-year external funding, with evidence of related scholarly output
- Submission of >2 internal and/or external funding proposals
- 1 invited talk at a conference or university

Exceeds Expectations-

- 2-3 peer-reviewed publications, and/or scholarly/creative works disseminated
- 1-2 presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences, as permitted by SOE funding

- Submission of 1 internal funding proposal and 1 external funding proposal

Meets Expectations-

- 1-2 peer-reviewed publications and/or scholarly/creative works disseminated
- 1-2 presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences, as permitted by SOE funding

- Submission of 1 internal or external funding proposal

Below Expectations-

- 0-1 manuscripts or other scholarly/creative works submitted for publication/dissemination or submission of work fails to result in publication/dissemination
- 0-1 presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences, if permitted by SOE funding
- Lack of evidence of attempts to establish or maintain funded research program
- No internal or external funding proposal submissions

Unsatisfactory-

- No evidence of scholarship
- Despite percent effort allocated to scholarship, not actively engaged in scholarship activity as determined by a lack of disseminated peer-reviewed publications/scholarly publications/other scholarly and creative works, lack of submission of manuscripts or other scholarly/creative work, lack of internal or external funding proposals, and no scholarly presentations at professional meetings.

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, & CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following table is not provided as a list of activities in which faculty members must engage in order to achieve a specific evaluation rating nor are the types of evidence provided an exhaustive list of all possible examples. Rather, it is meant as a tool to use to think broadly about potential types of activities and evidence of those activities that might be provided to explain and elaborate upon scholarship completed by the faculty member.

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Refereed Publications & Presentations	- Authors or co-authors several peer-reviewed articles per year in a consistent and programmatic fashion (may include categories such as submitted, in review, accepted, in press, as part of the narrative) - Publishes in high impact journals - Authors or co-authors refereed papers at conferences/meetings - Presents at national and international conferences - Delivers invited presentations at professional conferences or seminars - Collaborates with students, postdocs and/or junior faculty on publications and presentations
Grants & Funding	- Submits proposals to support research through competitive external sources - Secures funding to support research in a planful manner - Develops peer-reviewed publications from funded projects in a timely and focused manner - Assumes a significant leadership role in one or more research teams as PI, Co-PI or Co-I - Collaborates with students, postdocs and/or junior faculty on grants - Evidence of progression and/or the continued pursuit of funding for proposals under development

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Scholarly Impact	- Demonstrates evidence of scholarly impact (impact factor, journal prestige, textbook adoption, citation rate, h-index) - Demonstrates expertise through a body of focused written work (e.g., series of articles, textbook) - Demonstrates forward progression of knowledge, theory and impact - 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) - Obtains research awards/honors/nominations or special fellowships for research - Receives invitations to be a visiting scholar /lecturer - Increasingly assumes leadership and contributes significantly to collaborations - Conducts scholarly work that is used across disciplines and contexts - Progresses research design, data collection, or other related activity - Provides consultation to groups engaged in scholarly activities - Provides testimony to government bodies - Earns respect for written work and evidence supports individual's status as a leader in the field
Professional Development	- Participates in workshops or in additional classes to increase scholarship knowledge and skill - Articulates plan for future professional development - Demonstrates willingness to and effectiveness in mentoring others
Additional Scholarly and Creative Work *(not inclusive, other examples can be included as appropriate)*	- Publishes newsletter or magazine articles, book reviews, interviews, encyclopedia entries, book chapters, op-ed pieces - Presents original work via non-refereed forums (e.g., the Conversation) - Creates works that support teaching and learning, particularly beyond SOE or CSU
Scholarship of teaching, advising, and service	- Secures internal and/or external funding to support teaching, advising, or service - Shares knowledge and work with colleagues (school, college, and university), students, and/or external audiences through innovative and accessible means (e.g., workshops, symposiums, webinars, development of tools, etc.) - Remains current in the field through attending research colloquia, staying up-to-date on published research, engaging in professional organization offerings, etc. - Uses scholarship of teaching, advising, service knowledge to improve own - work and practice (e.g., course development/revisions, innovative assignments, action research, etc.)

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS: TEACHING

Teaching expectations and performance will be largely guided and informed by the Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF) as developed by The Institute for Teaching and Learning (TILT) at CSU. The framework includes seven domains:

- Curriculum/Curricular Alignment
- Classroom Climate
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- Student Motivation
- Inclusive Pedagogy
- Feedback and Assessment
- Instructional Strategies

On an annual basis, each faculty member will create and/or update a developmental teaching plan that identifies which of the seven domains are priorities with the associated action items and goals.

This plan should be utilized as a tool to develop the teaching of each individual faculty member, to allow advancement, and to achieve teaching excellence over the long term. The annual plan should include a selected domain(s) (not all seven) from the Teaching Effectiveness Framework. The intent is for the faculty member to deeply engage in improvement in a domain(s), not to minimally develop over several domains. For the selected domain(s), the course(s) and/or activity(s) to which the plan pertains and the evidence that will be used to assess goal progression and attainment needs to be outlined. This plan should be included within the narrative statement submitted with the annual evaluation materials. This plan (and associated materials) will be the basis of the annual performance evaluation of teaching. The rating of the faculty member will be based on progress toward goals, not just goal attainment, as excellence in teaching is an ongoing and long-term achievement.

For additional details and resources on the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, see the TILT website:

Teaching Effectiveness Framework, TILT

Developing and Evaluating Teaching, TILT

For additional resources on how to develop and evaluate a teaching plan see the links below and the template example at the end of this section:

Departmental Process for Developing and Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Colorado State University

Goal Setting Form

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; and other activities that organize, communicate, and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer University credit also is considered teaching. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; attendance at workshops on student learning, teaching improvement, and strengthening teaching skills; and planning of curricula and courses of study.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments.

A course survey is completed at the end of each term and is designed to provide feedback to course instructors for course improvement. The course surveys can be used in conjunction with other sources of evidence (see section AFAPM E.12.1 of *The Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*). Thus, these surveys may not be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for a teaching effectiveness and must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools.

"Course surveys will be available for use in faculty reviews, including annual reviews, promotion and tenure, mid-tenure, and post-tenure reviews. The SOE Director will be granted online access to student course evaluations, for all full and part-time/adjunct faculty in the School of Education, in order to assist in these processes. As appropriate, the Co-Directors of the Center for Educator Preparation will be granted online access to student course evaluations, for all full and part-time/adjunct faculty with primary teaching assignments in the Center. Program Coordinators will be granted online access to student course evaluations for all part-time/adjunct faculty in their related program area(s)." (approved 5-12-22)

Faculty should use the table below to help identify potential relevant examples of their work over the past year. Faculty will then write a narrative statement outlining and supporting why this work should earn one of the ratings below. This statement should provide the context and justification for the rating that may not be immediately evident in the Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Report.

Superior

In addition to those descriptors in the 'exceeds expectations' category, a 'superior' rating will include accomplishment of the following:

- Demonstrates high levels of growth (in terms of quality) in one or more teaching domains outlined in the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, in accordance with the teaching plan developed the previous year (as applicable)

- Provides teaching/learning related service (e.g., training Graduate Teaching Assistants, serving as coordinator of a course, and/or contributing to course or program assessment, curriculum revision, or other teaching service)

Exceeds Expectations

 In addition to those descriptors in the 'meets expectations' category, an 'exceeds expectations' rating will include accomplishment of the following:

- Evidence of participation in and integration of professional development related to teaching
- Shares teaching knowledge and expertise in settings outside of the classroom

Meets Expectations

- Inclusion of new or updated teaching plan based on the Teaching Effectiveness Framework
- Demonstrates competence or appropriate levels of growth in one or more teaching domains outlined in the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, in accordance with the teaching plan developed the previous year (as applicable)
- Creates and exhibits an inclusive environment for all learners

Below Expectations

- Inclusion of new teaching plan that contains minimal or superficial content, and/or has superficial updates, and/or is not based upon the Teaching Effectiveness Framework
- Limited evidence of competence or appropriate levels of growth/progress in one or more teaching domains outlined in the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, in accordance with the teaching plan developed the previous year (as applicable)

Unsatisfactory

- No plan submitted or plan not updated
- No evidence of competence or appropriate levels of growth in one or more teaching domains outlined in the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, in accordance with the teaching plan developed the previous year (as applicable)

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: TEACHING

The following table is not provided as a list of activities in which faculty members must engage in order to achieve a specific evaluation rating nor are the types of evidence provided an exhaustive list of all possible examples. Rather, it is meant as a tool to use to think broadly about potential types of activities and evidence of those activities that might be provided to explain and elaborate upon the development of the teaching goals of the faculty member.

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Teaching Effectiveness Framework Domains ● Instructional Strategies ● Inclusive Pedagogy ● Feedback and Assessment ● Classroom Climate ● Student Motivation ● Pedagogical Content Knowledge ● Curriculum/Curricular Alignment	*Choose type(s) of evidence that best align with the domain(s) from the teaching plan.* *Triangulation is suggested (provide at least three types of evidence for each goal, e.g., a **self**-inventory, **student** course survey questions that align with goal, and **other**, such as a peer observation).* ● Self-reflection ● *Examples of course improvements and techniques implemented (active learning, student goal setting, student-centered activities, alignment of objectives/activities/assessments, formative assessments, techniques for building classroom community, etc.) and their measured impact (data) on students. Data may include level of participation, quiz scores, test question scores, student feedback, etc. (lead and lag measure) ● Curricular materials (assessments, use of materials from minoritized groups, resources to make connections beyond the course, etc.) ● *CDHE toolkit inventories ● Course survey and TEF appropriate domain questions from survey (each question is aligned with one of the TEF domains) ● Student feedback (letters, emails, informal surveys, other written comments) ● Discipline concept inventories ● Assessment data ● Peer observation (*TILT peer observation forms, *TILT Teaching Squares, *COPUS) ● *Teaching Practices Inventory (TPI) ● Discipline licensing exam ● Student engagement captured in checks for understanding, response rates, etc. ● Peer review of course materials ● Improvements based on student feedback and/or outcomes of improvements ● Teaching award

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment	- Participation in training(s) - Evidence of personal awareness of assumptions and biases - Examples of inclusive practices in the classroom and curriculum (clear expectations, opportunities for a wide range of voices, high student involvement and interaction, use variety of teaching methods, content and examples reflect a diversity of contributors and perspectives, support needs of minoritized students (race, disability, international status, veterans, gender identity, etc.), allow opportunities for risk and failure, create class norms for interaction, etc.)
Disseminating Teaching Knowledge	Workshops, presentations, invited lectures, publications, etc. focused on sharing teaching expertise and practices
Professional Development Related to Teaching	- Participation in professional development activities (workshops, conferences, study groups, etc.) - Teaching techniques, materials, concepts, and/or - improvements created and/or used for based on professional development activities
Teaching/Learning Service	- Training Graduate Teaching Assistants - Serving as coordinator of a course - Contributing to course or program assessment/curriculum revision

Resources

[TILT Peer Observation Forms and Teaching Squares](#)

[CDHE Toolkit: Colorado Department of Higher Education Equity Toolkit](#)

[COPUS: Classroom Observation Protocol for Undergraduate STEM](#)

[TPI: Teaching Practices Inventory](#)

Additional Evidence for TEF Domains:
[Framework for Developing Teaching Effectiveness](#)

EXAMPLE: Cover Sheet of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

This document should be used to summarize your triangulated evidence to demonstrate growth in teaching effectiveness. Attach supporting documents as necessary.

Name: Professor X

Review Period: January – December 20XX

Today's Date: 12/XX/XX

Title of Course(s) Taught this Year: Course X 100, Course X 203, …

Teaching Goal: My goal was to integrate at least three active learning techniques into Course X 100 with a particular focus on the _____ unit in which students typically struggle.

Teaching Effectiveness Domain: Instructional Strategies

Evidence #1: Summary (attach data or other supporting documents)

TPI (Teaching Practices Inventory) – When I took this inventory a year ago, I scored an 18, mostly because I spent the majority of my class period lecturing. I've been introduced to the evidence on active learning and appreciate knowing that I am incorporating instructional strategies that are known to improve student outcomes. After integrating several active learning strategies, I still lecture, but I break up lecture with short discussion activities, and I save the end of class for another discussion activity or a short, written reflection. This time when I took the TPI, I scored a 31. (See attached) I'm not quite where I want to be with making my class interactive on a regular basis, but I definitely engage students more often and will continue to incorporate more active learning into my course. I may want to continue working on this Teaching Effectiveness Domain and set my goals for next year related to more on Instructional Strategies.

Evidence #2: Summary (attach data or other supporting documents)

I asked a colleague to observe my class using the COPUS observation tool from the Wieman Institute. The observation from January 2019 demonstrates a traditional lecture approach indicated by the tick marks in both of the left hand columns: "instructor – lecturing; students – listening/taking notes." The November 2019 COPUS looks significantly different, including, "instructor – lecturing, asking questions, guiding small groups, answering questions; students – listening/taking notes, asking questions, working in groups, writing independently, answering questions." The November observation forms shows a much more engaged classroom. (see attached) This evidence aligns with the TPI evidence and it shows that I am providing a more active learning opportunity regularly in my large enrollment course.

Evidence #3: Summary (attach data or other supporting documents)

To set my teaching goal, I used the Teaching Effectiveness Framework to assess my competency in Instructional Strategies. In January 2019, I put myself at the *Emerging* level because I rarely, if ever, varied my instruction and I had no idea about research-based best practices in teaching. Now, in December 2019, I have increased my use of research-based best practices and have witnessed a marked improvement in student engagement. I have also seen a slight shift in student success in the _____ unit in Course X 100 (see attached student scores and my reflection on the Teaching Effectiveness Framework).

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS: STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING

Student advising and mentoring in the SOE occurs through serving in a number of possible roles: undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, graduate co-advisor, graduate committee member, and supervisor of students who are graduate research or teaching assistants. The role(s) in which faculty members serve will depend on their workload and program.

Advising is geared toward degree advising, career advising, and mentorship for all students, regardless of level. Advising is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. All faculty are expected to mentor students consistent with the student's goals, and can include faculty's work, as well as participating as chair or member of committees to advise the student's work. For additional information on workload percentages for advising please see Appendix D.

Note that this section refers to **student** (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoc) mentoring; faculty mentoring is addressed in service/outreach.

Faculty should use the table below to help identify potential relevant examples of their work over the past year. Faculty will then write a narrative statement outlining and supporting why this work should earn one of the ratings below. This statement should provide the context and justification for the rating that may not be immediately evident in the Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Report.

Superior - In addition to those descriptors in the 'meets expectations' category, a superior rating will include accomplishment of <u>many</u> of the following depending on the percent effort devoted to advising, the activities commiserate with the workload/position/rank of the faculty member, and the impact/influence of each:

- Collaborates with student in writing and presentations leading to publications in refereed journals or presentations at local, state, regional, national, or international conferences
- As a result of mentorship, student advisee wins award/grant
- Evidence of outstanding advising (e.g., innovative methods, leading student group activities and service projects)
- Student receives award or recognition for mentored project
- Student presents mentored work at a research/creativity event.

Exceeds Expectations- In addition to the relevant accomplishments in the 'meets expectations' category, an exceeds expectations rating will include accomplishment of <u>many</u> of the following depending on the program, percent effort devoted to advising, the activities commiserate with the workload/position/rank of the faculty member, and the impact/influence of each:

- Mentors students in students' teaching
- Collaborates with student in writing and presentations leading to publications in non-refereed publications or presentations at local meetings or conferences
- As a result of mentorship, student advisee applies for award/grant
- Students present mentored work at research conference
- Provides supervised research or teaching experiences
- Serves as Key Advisor/Next Step Advisor for degree/major

Meets Expectations- The faculty member will include accomplishment of the following depending on the program, percent effort devoted to advising, activities commensurate with the workload/position/rank of the faculty member, and the impact/influence of each:

- Mentors students in their writing endeavors, encouraging submission for publication or presentation
- Serves as chair or co-chair on committees (graduate level) and advises, co-advises, or service on committees for honors theses (undergraduate level)
- Member of graduate or undergraduate student committees
- Advises undergraduate students (see table below)
- Participates in undergraduate mentorship activities
- Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities
- Supports students in the registration process unique to each unit within the School
- Recruiting and advising prospective applicants; member of admissions committee; conduct applicant interviews as necessary;
- Advise and orient students to program requirements, professional education courses, licensure requirements, and university processes.

Below Expectations-

- Fails to meet at least 3 of the criteria identified in "meets expectations"

Unsatisfactory-

- Provides little to no recognizable student advising or mentoring to the department, college, university, or profession

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING

The following table is not provided as a list of activities in which faculty members must engage in order to achieve a specific evaluation rating nor are the types of evidence provided an exhaustive list of all possible examples. Rather, it is meant as a tool to use to think broadly about potential types of activities and evidence of those activities that might be provided to explain and elaborate upon advising and mentoring completed by the faculty member.

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Undergraduate Advising	● Provides evaluations and/or testimonials from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. ● Participates in recruitment activities and college fairs (e.g., RAM Welcome, Choose CSU, Discover CSU, Future Teacher Expo (state-wide event) etc.) ● Assists in recruiting and advising prospective applicants, serving on the admissions committee, and advising newly admitted students to professional education courses and/or licensure requirements ● Meets with students to explain graduation requirements ● Provides academic advice ● Regularly meets with students around professional development ● Supervises teaching, research, or independent study ● Supports student research presentations or publications ● Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities ● Participates in undergraduate mentorship activities (e.g., Alpha Delta Kappa Collegiate Club, Student Outreach Undergraduate Leadership (SOUL), Celebrate Undergraduate Research & Creativity (CURC), Multicultural Undergraduate Research Art and Leadership Symposium (MURALS), Showcase judge, etc. ● Advises, co-advises, or service on committees for honors theses ● Structures and advises students' honors option within courses ● Supports students in the registration process unique to a PDS model ● Graduates students in a timely manner ● Attends graduation events ● Advising award

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Graduate Advising	- Provides results of SOE Graduate Advising Survey - Provides evaluations and/or testimonials from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers - Participates in recruitment activities and college fairs - Assists in recruiting and advising prospective applicants, serving on the admissions committee, and advising newly admitted students to professional education courses and/or licensure requirements Meets with students to explain graduation requirements - Provides academic advice - Regularly meets with students around professional development - Provides letters of support for student applications for scholarships, graduate or professional school, jobs, or other opportunities - Supervises independent study - Supervises graduate research or teaching assistants - Collaborates with and/or mentors students on presentations, publications, and/or grant applications - Serves as chair, co-chair, and member of graduate committees - Graduates students in a timely manner - Obtains grants that provide graduate research funding - Attends graduation events - Advising award

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS:

SERVICE, OUTREACH, ENGAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

The performance of service work by faculty in the SOE is essential to keep the operations of the SOE, College, University, and the profession as a whole functioning efficiently and with quality. The forms that service work can take are as numerous and varied as the number of faculty who engage in them; hence, it is nearly impossible to categorize them discreetly or hierarchically in importance. It may be easiest to understand what service work is, by defining it in the negative – that is, all of the collective professional activity in which faculty engage that is not teaching, research or advising.

Service work can be viewed as administrative (i.e., membership on a search committee) or scholarly (i.e., serving on a grant review panel); it can be paid or unpaid; it can be brief (i.e., delivering a seminar) or long-term (i.e., serving as editor of a journal). Despite this width and breadth of activities, it is useful to categorize service work by ever-increasing spheres of influence – service to the SOE, service to the College and University, service to the state; service nationally; and service internationally.

Faculty are typically allocated 10-15% of their nine-month academic time in which to engage in service work, with larger percentages for those with additional service expectations. It is expected that pre-tenure individuals will have smaller service assignments than post-tenure individuals, and expectations for service will be commensurate with rank (e.g., early career faculty will not necessarily be expected to serve as chairs of committees to earn superior). Non-tenure track faculty may also have service expectations as negotiated with the Director of the School of Education. Faculty will be evaluated based on workload distribution and current rank.

Some faculty members within SOE will have service responsibilities that require a significant identifiable percent of effort beyond typical service (e.g., center director, specialization coordinator). These responsibilities must be considered in assigning the respective effort distributions for the individuals assuming these positions, and in the evaluations of their performance. Individuals holding these positions may have a reduction in their assigned teaching, advising and/or research loads, based on their negotiations with the Director.

Faculty should use the table below to help identify potential relevant examples of their work over the past year. Faculty will then write a narrative statement outlining and supporting why this work should earn one of the ratings below. This statement should provide the context and justification for the rating that may not be immediately evident in the Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Report.

Superior/Exceeds Expectations- In addition to those descriptors in the 'meets expectations' category, a superior or exceeds expectations rating will include accomplishment of many of the following depending on the percent effort devoted to service, the activities commiserate with the workload/position/rank of the faculty member, and the impact/influence of each:

- Journal editor or member of a journal editorial board
- Holds an office or plays a leadership role in a national and/or major state or regional professional organization
- Involved in the planning of a national or major state or regional conference, symposium or

program for such a conference. This may include reviewing presentation proposals or proceedings manuscripts

- Provides leadership on school, college, or university committees
- Serves on grant review panels
- Serves on state, regional, and/or national program committees
- Contributes to or participates in activities that showcase the school, college and/or university to external audiences
- Mentors colleagues inside and/or outside the school
- Serves in an administrative role that results in a successful and progressive program, degree and/or specialization
- Advises student groups/organizations
- Participates in student recruitment activities

Meets Expectations- The faculty member must achieve all of the following, as they are appropriate/expected for their workload/position/rank:

- Serves as an ad hoc reviewer for research journals (reviews 2-3 papers per year)
- Serves on school, college, and/or university committees
- Participates in the normal operations of the school and program by attending faculty meetings, provides constructive input on issues, and attends functions such as student poster presentations and seminars
- Provides outreach to lay audiences on topics within area of expertise
- Is a member of at least one professional organization
- Attends at least one professional meeting per year, as permitted by SOE funding
- Serves in an administrative role that results in a functioning program, degree and/or specialization

Below Expectations-

- Fails to meet at least 3 of the criteria identified in "meets expectations"
-

Unsatisfactory-

- Provides little to no recognizable service to the department, college, university, or profession

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: SERVICE, OUTREACH, ENGAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

The following table is not provided as a list of activities in which faculty members must engage in order to achieve a specific evaluation rating nor are the types of evidence provided an exhaustive list of all possible examples. Rather, it is meant as a tool to use to think broadly about potential types of activities and evidence of those activities that might be provided to explain and elaborate upon service work completed by the faculty member.

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Department, College, University, and State Service	● Participates as an engaged member or leader in committees at the school, college, university, or state level ● Contributes to the creation of policies and procedures ● Contributes to the creation of collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships between the school and college/university ● Participates in events that showcase the school, college, or university
Faculty and Professional Mentorship	● Works collaboratively with other faculty members to provide materials, expertise, and assistance when needed ● Mentors less experienced faculty in teaching or research philosophies, strategies, and techniques ● Provides peer evaluations, observations, etc. for other faculty ● Reviews article or grant proposal for a colleague through multiple drafts
Professional/Community Service	● Maintains memberships in professional societies ● Attends professional meetings relevant to position and program needs ● Seeks office in professional societies ● Assists in planning professional conferences, including reviewing presentation proposals or proceedings ● Serves state/community related to professional expertise ● Consults to community groups related to professional expertise ● Participates in accreditation reviews at other institutions ● Conducts community workshops, seminars, and/or presentations
Editorial/Grant/Professional Review	● Joins review/editorial boards ● Participates in grant review panels ● Reviews manuscripts for journals and/or books for publishers ● Serves as an external reviewer on T&P requests

Criteria	Examples of Types of Evidence
Leadership in Service	● Chairs a major School /College/University/State standing or ad hoc committee with accomplishment of set goals/charge ● Receives College/University/Local/State service award ● Assumes leadership role in national, state, or regional professional organization ● Serves as Editor or Associate Editor of national or international refereed journal ● Reviews grant proposals for a national funder ● Serves as guest editor of journal/special edition/issue of journal
Administration	● Provides leadership for a program, degree, or specialization ● Leads and/or supports innovative and progressive program initiatives ● Plans for the future of a program particularly within the context of the school, college, university, and