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A. THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK (SOSW) MISSION

The mission of the School of Social Work, in accordance with Colorado State University’s land grant heritage and the College of Health and Human Science’s mission and in compliance with the Council on Social Work Education Accreditation Standards (2008), is to:

Enhance human health, well-being, and productivity through the promotion of human rights, social & economic justice, and religious & spiritual tolerance to achieve healthy and productive people with equitable resources in diverse settings. The School aims to advance and strengthen interdisciplinary and collaborative knowledge through teaching, research, service, and using evidence-based practice to prepare undergraduate and graduate students for culturally competent professional and ethical Generalist and Advanced Generalist social work practice and leadership.

DOCTORAL PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. Provide a high quality doctoral education in social work.
   a. Prepare master’s graduates to become productive social work faculty.
   b. Prepare these graduates to become leaders in social work research, education, and administration in higher education.

2. Create a culture of excellence in research and scholarship.
   a. Provide doctoral students with opportunities to work with faculty on research/grant projects.
   b. Provide doctoral students with research mentoring related to specific topics of interest.
   c. Enhance the research and publication capability within the School of Social Work through additional doctoral-level GRA opportunities.

3. Conduct research responsive to the educational and developmental needs of regional human service systems.
   a. Prepare competent social work researchers to develop and evaluate policies and programs in the human services.
   b. Provide regional human service systems access to collaborative research opportunities via research practicum or dissertation research.

4. Contribute to the enrichment of academic life at Colorado State University.
   a. Promote the involvement of students in multidisciplinary approaches to learning by utilizing cognates/concentrations.
   b. Facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration through the strategic involvement of faculty outside social work to support students in the dissertation process.

5. Provide an environment that values and supports diversity in students, staff, and faculty.
   a. Recruit doctoral students, staff, and faculty of diverse backgrounds and beliefs.
   b. Retain students of diverse backgrounds and beliefs by providing support for their differing needs.
   c. Provide an environment that values and is conducive to open discussion of differences in which students, faculty, and staff feel respected, safe, and challenged.

6. Expand the research capacity in the School of Social Work by assuring the material and financial resources necessary.
   a. Continuously strive to add funded GRA positions to provide financial support to PhD students.
   b. Continue to ensure that new faculty positions include requirements related to research expertise and ongoing grant funding.
MSW Program Mission
The mission of the MSW program at CSU is to prepare graduates for professional and ethical Advanced Generalist practice. This is accomplished by preparing social work practitioners to practice in complex, diverse, and dynamic settings and environments and to promote human rights and individual, community, and global well-being. Emphasis is placed on using interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and skills for ethical, culturally competent, socially and economically just interventions.

MSW Program Goals
This is accomplished by preparing Advanced Generalist social workers who:

1. are competent to engage in ethical and autonomous Advanced Generalist social work practice with multiple systems and populations and in diverse environments, based on a bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural perspective across the entire life span.
2. can utilize interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge, skills, and ethical practices to contribute to the enhancement and well-being of multiple systems including individuals, families, groups, and communities.
3. have an understanding of and commitment to the promotion of human rights, social and economic justice, religious and spiritual tolerance, and the elimination of oppressive social conditions for all people.

BSW Program Mission
The Mission of the BSW program at CSU is to prepare graduates for professional and ethical Generalist practice with an emphasis on entry-level social workers who are able to work across all system levels. This is accomplished through preparing social work practitioners who are able to practice in complex, diverse, and dynamic settings and environments and to promote human rights and individual, community, and global well-being. Emphasis is placed on the use of interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and skills for ethical, culturally competent, and socially and economically just interventions.

BSW Program Goals:
This is accomplished by preparing Generalist social workers who:

1. Have a broad knowledge base and skills for practice with multi-level systems that are grounded in systems theory and a person-in-environment framework
2. Practice and behave in a manner that is consistent with the principles, values, and ethics of the NASW Code of Ethics.
3. Demonstrate a commitment to social and economic justice, full inclusion of diverse segments of the U.S. and global society, and a special emphasis on empowering and improving the well-being of marginalized groups.
4. Participate in lifelong learning, professional development and the professional community of social work, and who effectively utilize professional supervision and consultation
5. Utilize critical thinking skills to engage in multiple methods of inquiry, analysis, and evaluation to enhance the quality of human services.

B. SCHOOL COMMITMENTS AND ACTIVITIES
The School mission is fulfilled by six generic activities.

B.1 Faculty Support: Faculty members are provided with space, office supplies, and support sufficient to meet day-to-day needs. Support for faculty is found in the form of travel funds and purchases of goods and services as funding permits. School representatives also serve as liaison to outside units, relaying information to faculty relevant to their needs and professional interests.

B.2 Educational Milieu: The School supports efforts directed at establishing among students, staff, and faculty a broad and genuine appreciation of diverse perspectives and critical analysis. The School is committed to ensuring respect within the School of
differing perspectives. The School is committed to the pursuit of academic excellence in all its research, teaching, service, and outreach activities.

B.3 **Teaching:** The School prepares undergraduate BSW students for entry-level professional positions in social services and also prepares students for entry into graduate programs. At the graduate level, the School prepares MSW students for leadership positions in social services working with individuals, groups, organizations, and communities. In addition, the School prepares doctoral (Ph.D.) students for careers as professors and researchers.

B.4 **Scholarship:** Scholarship contributes to the knowledge base of the profession. Research is comprised of technical reports of empirical analyses, research summaries, and theoretical statements addressing basic and applied issues in the field. Faculty are expected to publish regularly in peer-reviewed outlets with significant impact to the field. Scholarship is also reflected in the receipt of competitive extramural funding, and faculty are expected to fund their research programs. Scholarly writing also addresses professional issues in the academic community.

B.5 **Service:** Faculty serve the University, professional organizations, international, national, and state agencies by providing expertise in best practices and evaluation of services. The School’s responsiveness is associated with its emphasis on the application of science as well as recognition of the importance of community citizenship.

B.6 **Outreach and Engagement:** The School supports the translation of science into programs and policies through outreach and engagement activities.

C. **ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL**

C.1 **Director:** The principal administrator of the School shall be the School Director and is the initial person in the administrative chain to the president.

C.1.1 The Director/Department Head shall be selected as specified in the University Code. (E.4.3.)

C.1.2 The term of office of the Director shall be in compliance with the University Code.

C.1.3 The duties of the Director shall be those specified in the University Code.

C.1.4 Additional Duties: The Director may appoint faculty members to assist with the administration of the School such as, but not limited to, Assistant Director, MSW Graduate Programs Director, BSW Undergraduate Director, Director of CLOE, Social Work Research Center Director, and Field Education Director. Designated titles, responsibilities, and length of service are at the discretion of the Director and may be individually negotiated.

C.2 **Doctoral Program Director:** The Director of the Doctoral Program in the School of Social Work has the responsibility to provide the direction and oversight of all aspects of the PhD program, including admissions, curriculum, advising, and other logistics of the program. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

C.3 **MSW Graduate Programs Director:** The MSW Graduate Programs Director has the responsibility of the oversight of all aspects of the MSW program, including curriculum, advising, and logistics. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

C.4 **BSW Undergraduate Program Director:** The BSW Undergraduate Program Director has
the responsibility to oversee BSW classes, advising, and logistics of the bachelors program in the SOSW. Other duties may include those assigned by the Director of the School of Social Work. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

C.5 Field Education Director: The Director of Field Education is responsible for the oversight and direction of all aspects of the Field Education Program, including curriculum, advising, and logistics. The Field Education Director works with and supervises the BSW and MSW Field Coordinators to ensure quality and consistency across all programs.

C.5.1 BSW Field Program Coordinator: The BSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the BSW Program.

C.5.2 MSW Program Field Coordinator: The MSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the MSW Program.

Please see Appendix A for detailed roles and responsibilities

C.6 Institutes and Centers

C.6.1 Social Work Research Center. The purpose of the Social Work Research Center is to study social work interventions in areas such as child welfare and juvenile delinquency while promoting evidence-based research, practice, and policy. The SWRC provides research and program evaluation services to child welfare agencies, human services providers, governmental entities, and community groups. SWRC also collaborates with social work faculty and other interdisciplinary programs across the university on research and evaluation initiatives. The goals of SWRC are to conduct applied research to bridge the gap between theory and practice in social work and disseminate research on best practices to social service organizations and child welfare agencies through publications, conferences, and training venues.

C.6.2 Center for Life-long Learning and Outreach Education. The Center for Life-long Learning and Outreach Education will develop, administer, and integrate degree and non-degree educational programs that extend outside the on-campus degree programs of the School of Social Work. The Center will exercise oversight to maintain high quality programs that are consistent with the mission and goals of the School of Social Work, the College of Health and Human Sciences, and Colorado State University. The Center will foster increased faculty and student involvement in community improvement as resources for social workers and human service personnel, providing lifelong learning opportunities, and engaging alumni in both providing and participating in the educational opportunities offered by the Center.

C.6.3 Human-Animal Bond in Colorado. The love of a companion animal is uncomplicated and unconditional, naturally received and returned by people of all ages. It is in this spirit that Human-Animal Bond in Colorado was founded. Established in 1993 at Colorado State University's College of Health and Human Sciences - School of Social Work, HABIC is a program that effectively uses the powerful human-animal bond in therapeutic settings.

C.6.4 Human Services Assessment Project. Human Services Assessment Project is a Colorado State University sanctioned Center located in the School of Social Work. The Center serves as a research resource program initiated in response to requests from community organizations, agencies, and programs for assistance with evaluation and assessment needs.
D. COMMITTEES OF THE SCHOOL

D.1 Curriculum and Program Evaluation Committee: The Committee membership shall be the Task Leader for each curricular area: HBSE, Policy, Large Systems, Small Systems, Research, Field, and PhD as well as the Chair of the Outcomes Assessment Sub-Committee. The Chair of the CPE Committee shall be the Director of the MSW Programs and the Co-Chair shall be the Director of the BSW Program. Task Groups will consist of those teaching in each curricular area. The Curriculum and Program Evaluation Committee’s function is to:
- manage and evaluate proposed course changes in light of CSWE Accreditation Standards and School outcomes.
- provide leadership in the development and coordination of the School’s efforts in curriculum revision for the BSW, MSW, and PhD programs.
- provide oversight that Master Syllabi are created, disseminated, and followed to assure consistency across sections for meeting CSWE Standards and measurement consistency.
- review and approve all proposals for new courses before submitting them to the School Council for final decision.
- approve required textbooks and monitor delivery of the curriculum to minimize duplication, maintain consistency among sections, and evaluate the match between the level of student learning.
- submit to the School Council for final decision proposals for modification and/or change in the curriculum design or graduation requirements. Such a proposal shall be approved by a majority vote of the Curriculum Committee before submission to the School Council for final decision.
- submit new courses, after School approval, to the College Curriculum Committee.
- The Curriculum Committee shall set forth the form and content required for such proposals and the standards by which the course proposals will be judged. Experimental courses and group studies that substitute for a required course shall be referred to the Curriculum Committee for approval to avoid overlap and enable the setting of program priorities. With committee approval, experimental courses may be offered for two semesters after which they shall be submitted as a proposal for a new course within existing university policy. Certificates may be offered upon approval of Curriculum Committee and with University approval. The School Council shall ratify any changes in the standards for judging new courses. For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting shall be by simple majority of those voting. Any voting member may appeal any decision by the Curriculum Committee in regard to new courses to the School Council if the council, by a simple majority vote, agrees to hear the appeal.

D.1.1 Outcomes Assessment Sub-Committee: The Outcomes Assessment Sub-Committee of the Curriculum and Program Evaluation Committee will be charged with planning and overseeing regularly-scheduled data collection and conducting outcomes assessment. The results of which shall be reported to the faculty at the annual fall retreat. The committee will consist of the Director, the PhD Director, the MSW Programs Director, the BSW Program Director, and the Field Education Director and will be chaired by the Outcomes Coordinator.

D.2 Student Affairs and Admissions Committee: Membership in the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee shall consist of a minimum of three academic faculty members and a member of the support staff. The Student Affairs and Admissions Committee has primary responsibility for developing and recommending to the School Council policies and procedures for the admissions process to the MSW program. The committee is responsible for implementing those policies and procedures in the selection of the applicants to be admitted and reporting the applicant pool and those selected for admission to the School.
Council. The Student Affairs and Admissions Committee is responsible for recommending policy and, when requested, carrying out the procedures relative to matters of students waiving of courses or curriculum requirements (within existing university and school policy), recommendations for readmission in the case of an academic dismissal, and the matriculation status of graduate students. This committee is responsible for reporting to the School Council proposals for changes in the principles, policies, and procedures by which those recommendations are to be made. A student who wishes to appeal a grading decision should be informed of the process described in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual and explained in Informational Appendix B of this Code. Oversight of the School’s guidelines for this process is the responsibility of this committee.

D.3 Administrative Team: The Administrative Team shall advise the Director on all significant matters facing the School. The Administrative team shall include the Director, the PhD Program Director, the MSW Programs Director, the Undergraduate Programs Director, the Director of Field Education, and one elected faculty member. The Director will maintain an archived record of committee business and decisions.

D.4 Scholarship Committee: Membership shall consist of three faculty members appointed by the Director.
Responsibilities:
- To select a committee member who will serve on College Scholarship Committee and chair the School Scholarship Committee.
- To nominate individuals for awards at all levels.
- To encourage students to apply for existing scholarships and awards.
- To develop workshops to encourage/instruct students for application process.

D.5 Tenure, Merit & Promotion Committee: The TMP Committee consists of tenured faculty. The purpose of the committee is to conduct annual reviews and give constructive feedback to faculty for professional development. The TMP Committee also is the first in the line of decision making for tenure and promotion and performance evaluation. The School’s detailed document on TMP is found in Appendix C. Any tenured or tenure-track member of the faculty can propose changes in tenure and/or promotion standards, criteria, or procedures. Proposed changes will be submitted to the TMP Committee Chair who, in turn, will submit them to the TMP Committee for discussion. Any recommended changes shall be reviewed by both non-tenured and tenure-track faculty. If recommended changes are approved by a 2/3 vote of tenure and tenure-track faculty, they shall be added to the School’s Code.

D.6 Non-Tenure Track Committee: The Non-Tenure Track Committee consists of at least three non-tenure track faculty special (instructor, assistant, associate, professor or senior teaching appointments) who are appointed by the Director. This committee shall, in compliance with university code, review the School’s non-tenure track faculty for annual review and promotion. The faculty on the committee must be at equal or higher rank as the person being reviewed.

D.7 Diversity and Human Rights Committee: The School of Social Work Diversity and Human Rights Committee strives to provide leadership and direction to the School of Social Work as the school implements diversity initiatives in accordance with its diversity plan.

D.8 Ad Hoc Committees: Ad hoc committees may be established at the discretion of, and members appointed by, the Director or a standing committee chairperson. Such committees shall be formed to serve for prescribed, limited periods of time, and all deliberations and suggested actions shall be forwarded to the person who appointed the committee for appropriate action. Upon completion of the task, a report shall be
E. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

E.1 Voting and Decision-Making: The faculty who may serve and vote in School governance are tenured and tenure-track academic faculty holding full-time appointments, full-time faculty special, senior teaching, and full-time joint academic and administrative professionals. For the School of Social Work, the designation of joint academic and administrative-professional will be considered for those who are full-time administrative professionals who also carry out academic roles such as teaching and service and who have carried this role for at least 2 years. Criteria for joint appointment include: a) teaching at least 6 credits per year; b) serving at least one time per year on BSW honors committees, MSW committees, or PhD committees; and c) serving actively on at least one School standing committee.

Voting on School issues may be held either in School Council or via email. Voting may be done by proxy. Faculty members on sabbatical are eligible to vote on School matters provided they acknowledge having had sufficient opportunity to review relevant material. All eligible academic faculty may vote on School issues with the exception of tenure and promotion decisions and code decisions.

E.2 Professionalism and Collegiality: Decision-making is focused on issues that impact the overall program and direction of the School, including policies. It is expected that the Director and faculty work with others in a manner that is respectful, honest, collaborative, transparent, and committed to the greater good of the School as a whole. To achieve this expectation, the Director and faculty shall:

1. Base decisions on credible argument, scholarship, and/or evidence.
2. Be guided in decision-making by the School’s Mission and Goals.
3. All faculty and staff shall consistently demonstrate a commitment to being good citizens of the School by upholding high standards of collegiality, by respectfully and directly communicating with others, and by working effectively as team members to advance the greater good of the School, its vision, and its mission.
4. Seek to maximize agreement among faculty on decisions whenever possible.

The Director retains final decision-making authority based on current or anticipated School, college, and university needs and priorities and input from individual faculty members and the school’s committees and Administrative Team as specified in the Manual (C.2.6.2).

E.3 School Council Meetings

E.3.1 Meetings of the faculty shall be called by the School Director at least monthly during each academic term excepting summer. Meetings are listed as part of the School’s Master Schedule. An email announcement will be distributed to faculty members in advance of the meeting. Additional faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the School Director, the Administrative Team, or at the request of at least three faculty members or a Committee Chair. Agenda items for faculty meetings may be submitted by any member of the faculty no later than 3 days before the faculty meeting.

E.3.2 Attendance at School Council is mandatory for all voting members and is strongly encouraged for all non-voting members. Exceptions are granted for illness, attendance at professional meetings that cannot be scheduled at another time, conference travel, and special circumstances (e.g., sabbatical leave, family medical leave). Faculty must notify the Director in advance whenever possible and are responsible for reviewing minutes of the meeting and responding to action items as needed.

E.3.3 A record of action taken at faculty meetings shall be maintained by the School Director an appointed faculty or staff member. A summary of decisions made during a scheduled meeting shall be distributed to all faculty and staff on the School drive.

E.3.4 A faculty member selected by vote at the Fall Retreat serves as Chair for purposes of
conducting faculty meetings. All eligible council members may vote on issues presented for action.

E.3.5 Motions called for a vote may be decided by either a live vote or by email ballot, but the type of vote (in person or email) will be declared prior to the vote. In the case of a live vote, section E.6 below will apply. In the case of an email vote, all eligible faculty members (including those not present at the meeting or on sabbatical) may vote provided they have sufficient opportunity to review relevant material.

E.3.6 For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting in all matters, except where parliamentary rules dictate otherwise, shall be by simple majority of those voting.

E.3.7 Unless an executive session has been formally called, School Council shall be open to contingent and part-time faculty, administrative professionals, and student observers. Those in attendance are invited to speak on issues and, in the spirit of the values of social work, those comments will be duly considered by the faculty.

E.3.8 The parliamentary authority for the School faculty shall be the latest edition of Robert’s Rules of Order.

F. RELATIONS WITH STUDENTS

F.1 Student Interest Groups: The School faculty shall encourage and promote the professional and academic development of the undergraduate majors and graduate students. This shall include support and assistance for student interest groups. At least one faculty member or administrative professional shall serve as an adviser to each student interest group.

F.2 Student Grievances

Philosophy of the Grievance Process

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

G. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS/HIRING

G.1 Appointments to Faculty

G.1.1 Regular (tenure-track) appointments are the result of a national search conducted by a School search committee. The School Director appoints the search committee. In the case of a School Director, the Dean of the College of Health and Human Science initiates the search and the Dean appoints the Search Committee. All faculty being considered for full-time tenure track appointments must be judged by School faculty to possess the requisite skills necessary to attain tenure at the academic rank being sought. This requirement mandates that an essential criterion in hires will be the demonstration of a critical mass of research skills sufficient to prepare and publish scholarly work on a regular basis, and demonstrated evidence or potential (in the case of junior hires) to secure extramural funding. Other important criteria include qualifications to teach courses in the discipline and fit with School needs and long-term priorities.

G.1.2 It is the responsibility of the School Director to appoint a search committee when it is known that there will be an open faculty position. The School Director may appoint one doctoral graduate student and one external member to the search committee. The search committee prepares a position announcement and conducts the search for qualified candidates. Applicant folders of finalists invited for interviews (excepting external letters) will be available to all faculty for review and evaluation within the parameters of current OEO requirements. The search committee develops procedures
and schedules for interviewing candidates, if such interviews are authorized, and makes recommendations of acceptability to the School Director. In each phase of the appointment process, Affirmative Action guidelines of the College and the University shall be followed.

G.2 Other Appointments

G.2.1 Section E.2 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual defines the following types of appointments, specifies terms of service, and describes rights and privileges. These types of appointments are cited here to clarify which entities in the School are involved in making the appointment.

a. Special Appointments: Special appointments are approved by the Director after discussion with the faculty.

b. Temporary Appointments: The Director approves temporary appointments based on a specific, temporary need in the School.

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

d. Joint Academic Appointments: Faculty who request a joint appointment with another School should clear this request through the Director. Requests for joint appointments by faculty members in other Schools are to be reviewed by the faculty.

e. Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments: The Director reviews joint academic and administrative professional appointments for approval. For the School of Social Work the designation of joint academic and administrative-professional will be considered for those who are full-time administrative professionals who also carry out academic roles such as teaching and service and who have carried this role for at least 2 years. Criteria for joint appointment include: a) teaching at least 6 credits per year; b) serving at least one time per year on BSW honors committees, MSW committees, or PhD committees; and c) serving actively on at least one School standing committee.

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

g. Senior Teaching Appointments. The Director will initiate the process for granting Senior Teaching Appointments. The Director shall ask the School's Non-Tenure Track Committee to vote by ballot for or against the appointment of the faculty member being considered. Criteria for eligibility for consideration are specified in Section E.11 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

G.2.2 Emeritus Appointment. As stated in Section E.3 of CSU's Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, academic faculty members who have completed ten years or more of regular full-time or regular part-time service as faculty shall be eligible at the time of their retirement for an emeritus/emerita title equivalent to their highest professorial rank. Academic personnel who have held administrative positions (including directors) for five years or more shall be eligible for the emeritus/emerita title for both positions. The procedures and conditions applying to emeritus/emerita status are:

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

b. Privileges associated with this appointment are issuance of a permanent faculty identification card, listing on the faculty mailing lists, and full library privileges.

G.3 Graduate Faculty: The graduate faculty shall consist of all SOSW and joint appointment to SOSW tenured and tenure-track faculty possessing a doctoral degree. They are eligible to serve as chairs of graduate student committees and/or thesis advisers. To chair dissertation committees, faculty must be tenured Associate Professor or Professor or have experience equal to Associate Professor rank. The Graduate Faculty can come together and make a decision regarding the appropriateness of others to serve in this role consistent with Graduate School policy. Graduate faculty may also be assigned to teach graduate level courses. Procedures for selecting a graduate student adviser for MSW and PhD committees are found in the Graduate Handbook.

H. PERSONNEL

H.1 Academic Faculty: Academic faculty refer to regular tenured and tenure track (at least 50% appointment in School of Social Work) faculty, special appointment faculty, senior teaching appointment, joint academic and administrative-professional faculty, and transitional faculty (see Manual, E.2). These individuals, working individually and together, advance the School’s mission and vision by engaging in some combination of teaching/advising, research, and service to the School, college, and university as well as outreach to Colorado, the nation, and the world. Responsibilities of academic faculty are described in the Manual, D.3 (See D.3.3, as a professional, E.5.2 as a faculty member, and E.5.3 on teaching and advising).

H.1.1 Academic Faculty Workload: Faculty workload includes a combination of teaching, research, and service, the proportion of which varies based on School and faculty needs and interests.

A standard workload for academic faculty in tenured or tenure-track positions includes 50 percent teaching/advising, 35 percent research/scholarly/creative activity, and 15 percent service/outreach. In the School of Social Work, a standard semester load is 15 credits and 9 credits during summer semester. To compute workload related to course instruction, the standard teaching of 12 credits per year may be comprised of lecture, seminar, or recitation courses. A 3-credit course comprises 10% of annual load or 20% of semester load. A 2-credit course is 13% of a semester load. Faculty workload percentages in teaching and advising may also reflect significant effort invested in teaching-focused activities such as development of new courses, significant course revisions, curriculum innovation, academic and research advising, or mentoring of other educators. Teaching assignments are determined annually in the spring before the next academic year. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to teach a minimum of one 3-credit course per academic year unless special arrangements have been negotiated with the Director based on extramural funding and/or workload. Outreach/engagement activities (not service) are not a mandated component of every faculty member’s effort distribution but are to be included when appropriate to the mission of School and college and also goals of the faculty member.

Outreach/engagement activities may be integrated into any of the three workload domains, and are defined as the development and implementation of education, consultation, services, or outreach (e.g. direct service, ongoing consultation, or training) for the benefit of individuals, groups, populations, or organizations locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally. Faculty members negotiate the “placement” of outreach/engagement activities in their effort distribution with the Director
annually. Outreach and engagement activities of tenured and tenure-track faculty must be integrated with their programs of research and/or scholarly teaching. Because the School seeks to build on the strengths of all members, faculty workloads may vary based on the strengths and needs of the individual faculty member in addition to the needs of the School as a whole. Faculty members who maintain a high level of research productivity may have a higher percent effort in research and scholarship and a lower percent effort in teaching and advising. Conversely, faculty members whose main passions and energies are devoted to teaching may have a higher percent effort in teaching and advising and a lower percent effort in research and scholarship. For these reasons, each faculty member is expected to negotiate his or her workload with the Director. Negotiations between the Director and faculty pertaining to workloads shall take into consideration the needs of the School in addition to the faculty member's:

Areas of interests and expertise, including potential for optimal contribution to the School:

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

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

H.1.2 Academic Faculty Responsibilities:

Teaching and Advising (Section E.12.1 of the Manual)

All academic faculty share responsibilities for teaching and advising. With respect to teaching, the faculty endorse a learning paradigm that is focused on improving the quality and depth of students' learning. In a learning paradigm, it is the responsibility of faculty to create learning environments and to utilize pedagogical methods that:

1. Are cooperative, collaborative, and supportive;
2. Expect and hold students accountable to active learning and engagement;
3. Elicit student discovery;
4. Help students grow from an epistemological stance of absolute knowing (i.e. viewing knowledge as received from experts, fixed and existing in absolute form) to contextual knowing (e.g. viewing knowledge as fluid, incomplete, and uncertain but able to be judged as more or less substantiated);
5. Empower students to construct their own knowledge based on a synthesis of expert opinion and research evidence as well as their own and others' experiences and perspectives; and
6. Strive to employ principles of universal design for learning as feasible to address differences in student learning styles.

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

**Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity** (Section E.12.2 of the Manual)

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

All faculty- or student-generated research proposals must be reviewed and approved by at least one of the following Colorado State University boards, according to the type of research conducted:

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

All Principal Investigators (PIs) and Co-PIs involved in human subjects research protocols must have completed [CSU’s Human Subjects Protection Training](https://www.colorado.edu/research/hspts) sponsored by the Institutional Review Board for Colorado State University.

**Service**

Consistent with Section E.12.3–Service of The Manual, academic faculty members engage in service at both university and professional levels that advance the vision and mission of the School as well as the interests of the college and university, the community, and the profession and/or related disciplines.

Service is generally considered to include:

- Participation in all faculty meetings unless excused by the Director;
- Committee work at the School, College, and University levels;
- Professional service in and presentations to organizations locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally; and
- Service on editorial boards as jurors and as grant proposal reviewers.

Committee work at all levels can vary from very low effort (one or two meetings a year with little work outside of meetings) to very high effort (multiple hours per week).

Committee assignments are made by the Director based on School needs and balanced with individual faculty needs and interests. Workload associated with professional service is negotiated with the Director based on the expected effort involved, the match between that effort and the vision, mission, and needs of the School as well as the individual career trajectory, interests, and responsibilities of the faculty member. While it is expected that senior faculty members will undertake greater service roles based on their expertise, junior faculty members shall also participate in service activities to contribute new perspectives, develop expertise, and further the mission of the School, college, and university.

Faculty generating personal income through consulting, fee-for-service, and/or workshop revenues must report these activities in the annual Conflict of Interest form completed by all faculty members. Conflict of interest is fully discussed in Section D.7.7 of the Manual. All faculty are responsible for being fully familiar with this content if involved in consulting relationships with external organizations.
I. EVALUATION

1.1 Annual Performance Reviews/Faculty Activity Reports (FAR): Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member is responsible for submitting a written self-assessment to the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee no later than January 10th, following the end of the calendar year for which he/she is being evaluated. Non-tenure track faculty will submit their self-assessment to the Non-tenure Track Committee. The written self-assessments of faculty who are eligible and choose to be evaluated based on their job description must include: (1) a comprehensive and honest assessment of their performance related to each area of responsibility in their job descriptions, using the criteria of superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory; and (2) Evidence supporting their self-assessment.

Annual Performance Reviews will be conducted in a two-tier process for tenure track and special appointment faculty seeking or considering advancement to a higher rank. First, materials will be submitted to the TMP Committee and a letter will be written. The second part of the process requires the Director to review materials submitted by the faculty and the TMP Committee and write a separate review. Special appointment faculty considering advancement to a higher rank must submit their materials to the Non-Tenure Track Committee for three full years prior to the time when promotion can be considered.

The TMP Committee will write two letters for tenure track and special appointment faculty seeking or considering advancement to a higher rank. The first letter shall be a review of performance over the past one year for annual review. The second letter will evaluate the faculty member’s performance as a whole to evaluate it for progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The TMP writes a letter in response to submitted materials which is shared with the Director and the faculty member, and a copy is kept for the faculty member’s file. The letter utilizes submitted materials by the faculty member, evidence of outcomes of work, and the GRID Appendix C.

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

Each faculty member on regular appointment, whether tenured or not, all special appointments, and all administrative professionals participate in an annual evaluation of performance relative to the particular responsibilities of the position and the particular objectives which have been previously established for the faculty member for the current year.

1.1.1 The annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) follows a specified format established by the School. Generally, the annual FAR describes the faculty member’s professional commitments and specific accomplishments in the areas of research, education, service, and outreach. The report also allows the faculty member to describe her/his goals for the coming year. The faculty member completes an annual activity report and presents it to the TMP Committee or the Non-tenure Track Committee in advance by January 10th.

1.1.2 The TMP Committee or the Non-tenure Track Committee completes a report. The report is forwarded to the Director and the faculty member under review. Upon receipt of the FARs, the Director will draft a summary evaluation using the current form on the Provost’s website. The draft summary will be sent to the faculty member in advance of the annual meeting and discussed during the meeting.

1.1.3 During the annual conference, the Director will (a) present an evaluation to the
faculty member; (b) point out ways to improve as well as maintain competent performance; and (c) reach agreement on the objectives for the faculty member for the following year.

I.1.4 A final version of the written summary will be completed following the conference and shall be provided by the Director to the faculty member no later than 7 days following the annual conference. The faculty member may append a statement to that summary. Copies of these documents will be shared with the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences.

I.1.5 Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall be in compliance with the College and University Codes.

I.1.6 During the annual performance review, each faculty member and the Director shall agree to the distribution of faculty effort across the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service.

I.1.7 Generally, for the first one-third of their pre-tenure years, non-tenured faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor are expected to commit relatively less time to service and proportionately more time to research and teaching. In particular, when fiscally possible, new assistant professor hires will be given “release time” from service and a reduced teaching load to jump-start their research program.

I.1.8d With regard to teaching, the normal load is 2/2. Faculty may buy out of classes at 10% of their 9-month salary. Guidelines for buy-outs stipulate that faculty may first buy out of a course, then buy out of 10% FTE related to their research time, then contribute to summer salary or additional course buy-outs. Faculty with sufficient extramural funds can buy out down to a minimum load of 1 course/annually. In career awards that provide at least 75% of salary coverage, the load will consist of 1 course annually and minimal service requirements.

I.1.9 Criteria for evaluating performance and documenting activities in teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/outreach are described in Appendix C, School Grid.

I.1.10 Each semester, faculty shall evaluate their teaching in order to improve their instruction and courses. The Student Course Survey shall be given in all classes each semester as part of this evaluation process (see AFAPM Section I.8). As noted in Section E.12.1 of the Manual, Student Course Survey results are one source of information that can be used to document teaching effectiveness for annual performance evaluations and for TMP decisions. Faculty are expected to include summaries of course evaluations for their annual evaluations and may also include signed peer evaluations. Evidence of teaching success and innovation will be listed in the annual FAR; supporting documentation will be maintained by the faculty member.

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

J. TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT

J.1 Academic Faculty Evaluation (Refer to Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Salary Increases and Section E.13 Advancement in Rank (Promotion) of the Manual): All academic faculty shall participate in annual comprehensive reviews of performance. Performance reviews are intended to assist faculty in achieving tenure
and/or promotion, to facilitate continued professional development, to refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and/or to assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University. These reviews must be conducted in such a way that they are consistent with the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights.

Each faculty member is responsible for submitting a written self-assessment to the Tenure, Merit, and Promotion Committee or the Non-tenure Track Committee no later than January 10th, following the end of the calendar year for which they are being evaluated. (please see information on external reviewers and timelines in Attachment 1). The written self-assessments of faculty who are eligible and choose to be evaluated based on their job description must include: (1) a comprehensive and honest assessment of their performance related to each area of responsibility in their job descriptions, using the criteria of superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory; and (2) Evidence supporting their self-assessment.

The TMP or the Non-tenure Track Committee writes a letter in response to submitted materials which is shared with the Director, the faculty member, and a copy is kept for the faculty member’s file. The letter utilizes submitted materials by the faculty member, evidence of outcomes of work, and the GRID APPENDIX C.

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

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

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

**J.1.1 Evaluation of Teaching and Advising:** Evidence of teaching effectiveness shall be based upon a faculty member’s portfolio which contain (1) peer evaluations, which should occur biannually or more frequently as deemed appropriate by the Director), (2) examples of curriculum or course improvements and innovations that occurred during the year of the evaluation, (3) quantitative measures from student course evaluations; and (4) other evidence the faculty member considers relevant to an evaluation of his or her teaching and advising, including education-related outreach and engagement activities. Additional evidence may include solicited or unsolicited letters from graduates as well as current students, in addition to evaluations or unsolicited letters from conference/workshop attendees. While anonymous comments may not be used in the faculty member’s summative annual evaluation, all faculty must share all written comments, both anonymous and signed, with the Director on an annual basis for the purpose of formative assessment geared at improving instructional processes. The faculty member may choose to share anonymous student comments with the Director either during his or her annual evaluation meeting or at a separate meeting before or after completion of the annual evaluation.
J.1.2 Evaluation of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: Academic faculty who have research as part of their workload expectations are expected to be active scholars, producing new knowledge within one or more of the four scholarship domains of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and/or application. A critical gauge of successful scholarship is the faculty member’s output of published theoretical works and research findings in respected peer-reviewed academic journals and effectiveness procuring funding from external sources. Additionally, evaluations of research and scholarship effectiveness may consider:

- The individual faculty member’s perspective of the fit within and contribution to the particular body of literature the faculty member attempts to inform;
- The value of the work according to peer evaluations;
- The degree to which published works have been referenced by and requested by others;
- The value of scholarly contributions as judged by publication in professional magazines and letters of response from practitioners or service recipients;
- Research associated with outreach and engagement activities; and
- Awards for significant professional accomplishment.

J.1.3 Evaluation of Service: Consistent with Section E.12.3–Service in The Manual, academic faculty members engage in service at both university and professional levels that advance the vision and mission of the School as well as the interests of the college and university, the community, and the profession. University service is evaluated based on an academic faculty member’s timely and effective participation in important School activities, including regularly scheduled faculty meetings and special events, as well as assigned committees at School, college, and university levels. Professional service is evaluated through the amount and quality of the faculty member’s participation and contributions to the long-term improvement of teaching, scholarship, and the profession.

J.1.4 Quality Indicators for Promotion to Associate Professor: For promotion to associate professor with tenure, it is expected that the candidate:

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

J.1.5 Quality Indicators for Promotion to Full Professor: The Provost’s Guidelines on promotion and tenure at Colorado State indicate that a full professor should be a university leader who has contributed in a major way to the mission of his or her School and college as well as the entire university. Successfully maintaining a level of productivity considered sufficient for promotion to associate professor is insufficient for promotion to full professor. Rather, a successful candidate for full professor is expected to demonstrate qualitative differences in the scope and level of his or her contribution well beyond those that supported promotion to associate professor. These guidelines provide an important context for the following quality indicators:

- Has maintained a focused track of scholarship that is recognized as an important line of inquiry by reputable and knowledgeable scholars at national and/or international level;
- Has demonstrated consistent and sustained excellence in teaching;
• Has met assigned service obligations, including leadership roles at the School, College or University level;
• Has demonstrated professionalism and collegiality by participation in respectful and constructive dialogue and decision-making in context of faculty meetings and other School Work committees, and commitment to teamwork consistent with the School’s mission and vision with a high level of professionalism.

J.1.6 Mediation and Grievance Procedures: As stated in Section K the Manual, academic faculty are “Covered Members” of the university. As such, academic faculty:
• Shall attempt to mediate grievable conflicts prior to filing a grievance complaint.
• Have the right to initiate a Grievance in accord with requirements set for in Section K.8 of the Manual, The Right to Grieve.

K. ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS
As described in Section D.1.2 of The Manual, administrative professional positions are positions that are exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes but are not academic faculty positions. The classification of a particular position as an administrative professional position must be coordinated with Human Resource Services. Administrative professionals work to advance the School’s mission and vision through their contributions in the domains of service, outreach and practice; research, scholarship and creative activity; and teaching. The various contributions of administrative professionals across these domains may also be undertaken campus-wide, throughout the state of Colorado, as well as nationally and internationally.

K.1 Selection/Hiring: Selection of administrative professionals is made according to university policy and guidelines established by the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) at Colorado State University. The Director gains approval to search from the Provost, develops the job description with the supervisor, appoints the search committee, and coordinates the search according to guidelines established by OEO. The committee, working through the college OEO coordinator, carries out the search according to established processes and procedures. The selected candidate for the position is subject to approval by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Colorado State University Central Administration. In addition, a background check is required on the selected candidate before an offer can be made.

K.2 Workload of Administrative Professionals: The workload of administrative professionals may include activities in the domains of service, outreach, and practice; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and teaching. The proportion of activities in each of these domains shall reflect and be consistent with administrative professionals’ particular job descriptions. Administrative professionals shall clarify their workloads with their respective supervisors and negotiate any possible changes on an annual basis at minimum and more frequently as needed. Administrative professionals may have their workloads adjusted if they obtain external funding that supports work directly related to their designated responsibilities and job descriptions. Administrative professionals who submit a proposal for external funding shall discuss and negotiate, prior to submitting the proposal, any desired future adjustments to their workload with their respective supervisors.

K.3 Responsibilities
Service/Outreach/Practice
Primary responsibilities of administrative professionals in the School typically fall in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Service, outreach, and practice activities may include:
• Providing direct and indirect services to individuals, groups, and systems;
• Acting as consultants and educators;
• Providing leadership to and managing programs including but not limited to developing and evaluating programs, managing budgets, overseeing personnel, overseeing public
relations, etc.;
• Providing service to the School, College, and/or University; and
• Providing service to professional groups and organizations.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
Administrative professionals recognize and value research, scholarship, and creative activities. The activities of administrative professionals in this domain are typically closely tied to and integrated with their primary responsibilities in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Research, scholarship, and creative activities may include:
• Publishing in refereed and non-refereed forums;
• Disseminating new knowledge from outcome-oriented services;
• Presenting their work in refereed and non-refereed public forums;
• Providing continuing education;
• Procuring and implementing external funding; and
• Participating in professional specialty area activities.

Teaching
Administrative professionals recognize the value of teaching. The activities of administrative professionals in this workload domain are typically closely tied to and integrated with their primary responsibilities in the domain of service, outreach, and practice. Teaching can be formal and informal in nature and may include activities such as:
• Teaching courses in the social work curriculum;
• Providing guest lectures in the School, campus-wide, or externally;
• Monitoring curricular content related to specialty areas;
• Serving as fieldwork educators;
• Supervising and training graduate student employees and graduate teaching assistants; and
• Developing training and educational materials, including training tutorials and modules.

K.4 Annual Evaluation: Administrative professionals shall participate in annual comprehensive evaluations of their performance. Annual evaluations are intended to assist administrative professionals in achieving professional excellence, facilitate their continued professional development, and align their professional interests with their particular job descriptions. Administrative professionals with joint academic appointments shall also use the Administrative Professional Evaluation. The School Director conducts the annual evaluation for Administrative Professionals and joint academic and administrative professionals where there is not an immediate supervisor other than the Director, and those with joint faculty appointments. Annual evaluations are conducted by the immediate supervisors of Administrative Professionals who do not have joint appointments.

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

K.5 Dismissal Procedures: As described in Section D.5.6 of The Manual, all administrative professionals are “employees at will” and their employment is subject to termination by either party at any time. The authority to terminate most administrative professionals has been delegated to the President by the Board. The vice president in charge of an academic School or administrative unit must review and approve any recommendations concerning the termination of administrative professionals on any grounds, except for terminations at the end of the stated employment period, before the action is presented for final approval.

K.6 Mediation and Grievance Procedures: As stated in Section K the Manual, administrative professionals are “Covered Members” of the university. As such, administrative professionals:
• Shall attempt to mediate grievable conflicts prior to filing a grievance complaint.
• Have the right to initiate a Grievance in accord with requirements set for in Section K.8 of the Manual, The Right to Grieve.

L. SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION

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

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

M. CODE REVISION

M.1 Review of School Code: The School Code shall be reviewed by the voting faculty (tenured, tenure track, and special appointment faculty) in the year prior to the end of each term of the Director (normally 5 years). This code may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote when a quorum is present. For purposes of transacting business, a simple majority of members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. The amendment shall be presented for a first reading and distributed at least one week before such meeting. A second reading will be followed by a vote.

M.2. Code Amendments: Amendments to the Code may originate with the Director or any eligible voting faculty member at any time. Each amendment will be reviewed by the Director prior to presentation to the full academic faculty for review. In exceptional circumstances, any part of this code may be suspended for one year. All amendments or suspensions to the Code shall require a two-thirds majority vote of the eligible School faculty (tenured, tenure track, and special appointment faculty). Appendices to this code may be created or amended by a simple majority vote.

No statement in this document shall be interpreted in a fashion inconsistent with the CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
APPENDIX A: ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL

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

2. **Doctoral Program Director**: The Director of the Doctoral Program in the School of Social Work has the responsibility to provide the direction and oversight of all aspects of the PhD program including admissions, curriculum, advising, and other logistics of the program. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.
   2.1. Work with the SOSW PhD Graduate Administrative Assistant in the implementation of the application process.
   2.2. Represent the School at all college meetings for the School graduate coordinators.
   2.3. Provide any information regarding the SOSW PhD program as requested by the Graduate School and the College.
   2.4. In collaboration with the Director, select members of the PhD committee, call meetings of the committee and record action steps. This committee reviews all applications, and makes recommendations for admissions, as well as provides curricular and policy recommendations as needed.
   2.5. Oversee recruitment of PhD students.
   2.6. Interview all Doctoral Program applicants.
   2.7. Communicate admission decisions to all PhD applicants.
   2.8. Provide an orientation meeting for all new PhD students as cohorts are admitted.
   2.9. With the assistance of the PhD Graduate Administrative Assistant, respond to students as requested on graduate program policies and required graduate school forms as they progress through the program.
   2.10. Provide guidance and assistance to faculty as needed related to PhD committee processes, prelim exams, proposals and dissertations.
   2.11. Update the PhD Program Manual as needed.
   2.12. Serve as a member of the SOSW Administrative Team.
   2.13. Serve as key advisor to all PhD students until their graduate committee is formed.
   2.14. Recommend to the Director the schedule for PhD classes and potential teaching faculty.
   2.15. Assist with University Assessment of the SOSW Doctoral Program.
   2.16. Represent the SOSW at the annual Group for Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE) Conference.
3. **MSW Graduate Programs Director:** The MSW Graduate Programs Director’s responsibilities are to oversee MSW classes, advising, and logistics of the MSW programs in the SOSW. The responsibilities of the 50% time MSW Program Director are listed below. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Director.

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

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

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

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

3.5. Communicate admission decision to all graduate applicants.

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

3.7. Oversee recruitment of graduate students.

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

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

3.10. Update the student MSW Manual as needed.

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


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


3.15. Leadership in MSW accreditation reports.

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

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

Other duties as assigned by the Director of the School of Social Work.

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

4.2. Conduct Progression to the major for students.

4.3. Administer key advising for the BSW program.

4.4. Attend college/university key advising meetings.

4.5. Distribute information on advising/student resources/systems’ changes to faculty.

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

4.7. Participate in the administrative leadership team.


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

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

4.11. Monitor, adjusting as needed, class enrollment.

4.12. Schedule the BSW classes.

4.13. Recognize BSW student achievement.


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

4.16. Administer and support advising for undergraduate students.
4.17. Maintain contact with two-year colleges in the state to facilitate the transfer process.
4.18. Meet with potential students to acquaint them with requirements of the BSW program.

5. **Field Education Director:** The Director of Field Education with the following responsibilities:

5.1. Planning and implementation of field policies, ensuring consistency between campus and distance programs, problem solving, and ongoing development of the Field Education Program.
5.2. Interview, train, supervise, and oversee all Adjunct Faculty Field Consultants.
5.3. Assign Faculty Field Consultants each semester.
5.4. Revise and manage BSW & MSW Field Manuals.
5.5. Create and revise Field Forms to conform to current EPAS (accreditation) guidelines.
5.6. Supervise Field Education components of the Distance MSW Program.
5.7. Plan and manage field agency recruitment, maintenance, and development.
5.8. Devise and coordinate Field Education Schedules each semester.
5.9. Plan and conduct Field Instructor orientations each semester.
5.10. Plan and conduct Faculty Field Consultant orientations each semester.
5.11. Plan and facilitate ongoing Faculty Field Consultant supervision & development meetings.
5.12. Conduct MSW student orientation meetings.
5.13. Conduct/supervise BSW orientation meetings.
5.15. Conduct meetings with students who are terminated from placements to determine disposition of field placement, next steps, grades, hours, and other logistics.
5.16. Consult with Faculty Field Consultants regarding any concerns with a student or agency placement.
5.17. Collect and record Field course grades.
5.18. Field Education research and evaluation, addressing Field specifically and evaluation needs of the School of Social Work, the University, and the CSWE accreditation body.
5.19. Participate in or lead assigned Committees: Field Advisory, Outcomes and Evaluation, Distance MSW Program Advisory, Curriculum and Program Evaluation Committee, Student Advisory Team, Scholarship, Field Coordinator’s College, Faculty Field Consultant Advisory meetings (3 per semester).

6. **BSW Field Program Coordinator:** The BSW Program Field Coordinator will lead development and implementation efforts for a successful field education for the BSW Program. Duties include:

6.1. Develop field agency placements that offer generalist and advanced generalist field experience for students.
6.2. Conduct training for BSW field instructors, on-site supervisors, and field liaisons to ensure the educational process of students.
6.3. Conduct orientations for students applying to and entering field placements.
6.4. Work with students through the application and interview processes for field placement to ensure an appropriate field education experience.
6.5. Maintain BSW student files in accordance with CSU School of Social Work standards and procedures.
6.6. Assist with orientation and supervision of field liaisons.
6.7. Participate in SOSW Field Team to develop and implement field policies and procedures.
6.8. Assist with monitoring and evaluation of field placements.
6.9. Coordinate and participate in student advisory committee.
6.10. Assist in maintaining and enhancing ongoing and timely communication with students regarding program information, receiving feedback and addressing resource needs.
6.11. Attend and participate in School of Social Work Council meetings and assigned committee meetings.
6.12. Other duties as assigned.

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

**CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

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

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

8.1. Raise research support funding from federal, state, and county agencies.
8.2. Design rigorous research studies and program evaluations.
8.3. Analyze and interpret quantitative and qualitative data collected from a variety of sources.
8.4. Write high-quality research and evaluation reports.
8.5. Publish articles in refereed journals.
8.6. Disseminate findings through trainings, workshops, and conference presentations.
8.7. Effectively complete administrative tasks, including budget oversight and personnel management.

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

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

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

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

9.4. Communicate all necessary information to new students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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


9.15. Develop each cohort as a learning community through regular communication via RamCT cohort site.

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

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

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

9.19. Oversee and manage Distance MSW Program Budget.

9.20. Be “on-call” on weekends classes meet face-to-face to address emergencies.

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

9.22. Coordinate with SAT and students regarding the planning of their cohort’s graduation hooding ceremony.
9.23. Ensure excellent course development & teaching through collaboration with TILT and instructors, special cohort events twice a year, when students are meeting face-to-face (done in collaboration with SAT and other creative options as they develop.)
Appendix B
Student Grievance

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

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

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

Definition of a Concern

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

Identification of the Concern and the Informal Resolution Process

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

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

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

The student(s) making the appeal shall deliver the complaint to the chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee and the date of its receipt must be recorded on the document and initialed by both the student and committee chair. That date becomes the starting point for the formal grievance process.

The chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee will notify the faculty member of the formal grievance within no more than five working days of its receipt. The faculty member will have no more than five working days to prepare a written response to the grievance and submit that statement to the committee chair.

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

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

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

Should either party disagree with the hearing committee’s decision, s/he may appeal to the School Director within no more than five working days of date of the committee’s report. The School Director will then

1 From this point until the conclusion of the process the committee chair shall be responsible for monitoring the process, maintaining copies of all documentation provided, and preparing a record of the actions taken.
2 By agreement of both parties, or in the event of pressing emergencies, subject to the written approval of the School Director, the time limits can be extended for reasonable time periods, but should not exceed thirty working days. In the event that parties to the grievance are absent from campus, the chair of the Student Affairs and Admissions Committee may grant up to an additional thirty days at any phase of the process. If the appeal is filed during a summer session, no action will be taken until the beginning of the fall semester.
3 If either party pursues outside legal action, the school grievance process shall immediately cease.
review the case within no more than ten working days and provide a written decision regarding the merits of the complaint. The School Director may agree with or overturn the hearing committee’s decision.

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

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

For MSW or PhD Students, for more details regarding the formal rights and responsibility, please see the Graduate Catalog, Section L. http://www.graduateschool.colostate.edu/current-students/bulletin.aspx
Annual Merit Review

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance. All full-time faculty members, tenured or non-tenured, must be evaluated each year by the Tenure, Merit and Promotion Committee and the School Director. If a faculty member is employed for a semester or two-semesters and does not plan to be rehired, s/he should still be evaluated, though this evaluation rests with the Director.

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

The annual merit review of faculty is initiated by the Tenure, Merit and Promotion Committee (TMP), working in concert with the school director. Faculty members are informed early in the academic year of the date for submission of annual merit review materials to the committee. The procedures for evaluation of the faculty in the School of Social Work are designed to provide each person with the opportunity to describe her/his accomplishments, successes, and challenges in the areas of teaching, research and creative activities, and service and outreach to the TMP Committee and the Director of the School. Faculty members are asked to discuss the direction(s) they plan to take in the upcoming year as part of the annual review process. Thus, faculty, in concert with the School, can reflect on the calendar year period, stepping back from their day-to-day activities.

Workload percentages of time devoted to each category of expected faculty activity (and the “other” category) are to be provided by the School Director.
The guidelines and measurement criteria (Tables I, II & III) described in this document, should be viewed as a general expression of the expected standards for faculty productivity, and should not be seen as inflexible.

**Faculty Performance Assessment Format for Merit Review**

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

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

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

Appendix TMP A provides a recommended format to faculty for compiling their report of yearly activities. This format may be updated from time to time by the TMP Committee and submitted to faculty for approval.

Appendix TMP B contain a document written by the Provost Rick Miranda that provides University guidelines related to the process and evidence required for promotion to associate professor, tenure and promotion to full professor.
Table I: Teaching: Each area must be addressed in rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding teaching in classroom</td>
<td>Strong teaching in classroom</td>
<td>Adequate teaching in classroom</td>
<td>Weak teaching in classroom</td>
<td>Poor teaching in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 to 5.0 in average of all courses and 90% or more tally of Strongly Agree/Agree on student evals</td>
<td>3.8 to 4.4 average of all courses and 85% or higher tally of Strongly Agree/Agree on student evals</td>
<td>3.0 to 3.7 average of all courses and 80% or higher tally of Strongly Agree/Agree on student evals</td>
<td>2.1 to 2.9 average of all courses and 70% or higher tally of Strongly Agree/Agree on student evals</td>
<td>Under 2.0 average of all courses and 69% or less tally of Strongly Agree/Agree on student evals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And

**B. Research Advising** [demonstrated by Research committee chairing. Research advising is expected of all eligible faculty and will be evaluated each year.]

MSW:_________ PhD:_________

*Note: Committee chairing will be tied to workload and utilized in a cumulative format over several years. For example: 5 MSW or honors completed, 2 PhD completed = 1 workload credit the next semester.

And

**C. Peer Evaluations of Teaching** – A standard format will be used. It is recommended that faculty seeking advancement have at least 1 peer evaluation per year, and consider 1 per semester

**D. Development of a new class** or development of an innovative teaching methodology.

**Guidelines for Evaluation:** In general, it is expected that each faculty member’s classroom instruction will reflect adherence to the school’s curriculum and that each course will be appropriately planned, use current materials and creative methods to achieve course objectives, and that the faculty member’s communication skills will be judged adequate to accomplish course learning goals. In regard to student advising, faculty members should be viewed as available to students outside of class during regularly scheduled office hours. An important aspect of advising is serving on or chairing MSW or PhD research committees. Presentations that are essentially a teaching activity (e.g., seminars, workshops) should reflect accurate and effective transmission of knowledge and skills to professional audiences. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to present materials describing any unique teaching/advising contributions (such as development of a new class) the person has made and to suggest how that unique contribution might appropriately be evaluated.
Table II: Research and Creative Activities: Each area must be addressed in rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Research Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more PR Published Articles &amp; 2 under review</td>
<td>3 Published PR Articles or 2 Published &amp; 2 under review</td>
<td>1-2 Published PR Articles or 1 article under review</td>
<td>1 or more articles in process</td>
<td>No publication activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Contract and Grant Development (internal or external)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI of 1 or more federally or nationally funded external grants or contracts</td>
<td>Co-PI of 1 or more federally or nationally externally funded contract or grant or 1 External grant as PI under review</td>
<td>PI on 1 or more local, state or internally funded grants or 2 grants submitted</td>
<td>Key personnel or consultant for an externally funded grant</td>
<td>No involvement in internally or externally funded grant activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Professional Presentations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PR National Presentations and 1 or more PR International Presentations</td>
<td>2 PR National Presentations or 1 PR National and 1 PR international presentation</td>
<td>1 PR National Presentations</td>
<td>State or local presentations only</td>
<td>No presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines for Evaluation:** A mix of articles, grants/contracts, and books (other than text books) provides the primary evidence used in this system. Two issues need to be addressed:

1. Productivity level – Interpretation of productivity issues is relative to such factors such as complexity of topic and research methods and if working alone in an area of inquiry or with a group, such as on a grant.
2. Quality and impact – of research publications related to area, journal ranking, citation scores, impact factors and H-Index

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

- Significance, scope, complexity, dollar amount of the contract or grant funding source such as NIH/CDC/NSF compared to CSU grant or small funding source
- Quality of grant critiques
- Sustained grant activities
- Research award
- Journal Editor

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

*Professional presentation are important particularly related to gaining a national reputation or recognition, but are not weighted equally with sections A & B.
### TABLE III: Service and Outreach Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach any of the rating levels, the service activity for service/leadership roles, committee participation, and community must be equivalent to the criteria identified in any two categories*.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Professional service/leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected or appointed to a leadership position in a national, international, regional, state professional organization related to social work or social work education</td>
<td>Committee service in professional organizations related to the social work or social work education</td>
<td>Participation in professional activity that promotes the knowledge, skills or values of the profession</td>
<td>Infrequent service in the social work profession</td>
<td>No service activity in the social work profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. University, College, School service, outreach, and leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership position in the University’s or College’s organizational structure that promotes the School’s goals/interests</td>
<td>Participation on two or more College, or Univ committees or Chair of a student committee in the School’s organizational structure.</td>
<td>Participation on one College or University committees and Regular participation and membership in one School committee</td>
<td>Minimal participation on one School committee</td>
<td>No involvement in committee activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Community service, outreach, and leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more community presentations, workshops and Leadership role in 2 or more community organizations</td>
<td>Two community presentations or workshops to community groups and Leadership role in 1 community organization</td>
<td>One community presentation or workshop to a community group and Service role in 1 or more community organizations</td>
<td>No community presentations or No involvement in community organizations</td>
<td>No community presentations and No involvement in community organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE ABOVE EVALUATION RATING MAY BE RAISED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:
- Outreach activity in behalf of the School
- Administrative duties assigned by the School’s Director
- Nominee or recipient of award for service activities
- Exceptional activity in time, scope, or importance

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

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

GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING MATERIALS FOR EACH SECTION OF ANNUAL REVIEW MATERIAL

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

1. The CSU Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Activities Report form.
2. A cover letter/memo (narrative statement) summarizing reflections and rating his or her own performance in each of the three areas: teaching, research and creative activities, and service and outreach.
3. Relevant background materials including those as indicated below.
4. An updated Curriculum Vita using the recommended format on the Provost’s Website.

Teaching and Advising.

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

Information Sources: In addition to the faculty member’s statement of teaching philosophy that might be included in cover letter/narrative statement, the faculty member should provide documentation that includes but is not limited to:
1. Student evaluation face sheet summary for each class using the CSU (standardized teaching evaluation instrument) (Note: The faculty member should have computed the $\bar{X}$ score and % of “strongly agree” and “agree” ratings for each item.) The faculty member must submit evaluations from all courses taught during the year.
2. Peer teaching evaluation summaries. (Suggested instrument available)
3. Notification of nominations for or receipt of award or recognition for teaching
4. Miscellaneous materials that reflect quality of teaching, attention to teaching experience, teaching portfolio, innovative teaching techniques and/or approaches, etc..
5. Unsolicited signed letters/notes from students, etc.

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

Evaluative criteria for assessment: See Table I.
Research/Scholarship/Contract and Grant Activity.

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

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

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

Primary: A mix of articles, grants/contracts, and books (other than text books) provides the primary evidence used in this system. The grids provided in tables sections A, B and C of table II provide suggested ranges related to publications, grants/contracts and presentations.
Two questions need to be addressed:
1. Productivity level – Interpretation of productivity issues is relative to such factors such as complexity of topic and research methods and if working alone in an area of inquiry or with a group, such as on a grant.
2. Quality and impact – of research publications related to area, journal ranking, citation scores, impact factors and H-Index

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

The candidate is required to make a case for his/her research trajectory and is in the best position to discuss the quantity and quality of their work relative to a specific area of inquiry.

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

Evaluative criteria for assessment: See Table II.
University/Professional/Community Service.

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

**Information Sources:** Faculty members should describe and critique their service activities in the cover letter/narrative statement.
Documentation should include but not be limited to:
1. Evidence of presentations (to community or general public) presented at local, state, and regional conferences
2. Copies of materials relevant to service activity, or outreach
3. Copies of letters received related to service/outreach activity

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

**Evaluative criteria for assessment:** See Table III.

Other Assigned Responsibilities.

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

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

**Guidelines for Evaluation:** The performance of these responsibilities is expected to represent high quality work that enhances achievement of the school’s mission.

**Evaluative Criteria for assessment:** Evaluative criteria for “other” activities are to be established with the Director of the School.
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Introduction: Why this document may be useful
Each year, questions arise among faculty members, promotion and tenure committee members, and department chairs, concerning our promotion and tenure processes for regular faculty. These processes are admittedly a bit complex, and there are elements of discretion in the system that makes bright lines and formulaic answers difficult to achieve. However, in the main, we have a fair and balanced approach that is consistent with institutional expectations regarding tenure and promotion around the country for research institutions like our own.

The main elements of our process are in place for sound philosophical reasons, and include (at least) two primary goals. The first is to build outstanding academic programs that will serve our students and our state and continue to increase in quality and reputation. The second is to support and guide, in a constructive way, the career development and success of our faculty, who we know are the main drivers in attaining the first!

In our efforts to achieve these goals, we work from a strong set of values as well. Of paramount importance to the institution is to enunciate and expect high standards of quality, and then to use these standards as a guide for decision-making. Adherence to department codes helps to ensure this; also, external evaluators are essential in calibrating our standards to national norms. In addition, we insist on operating in a fair and transparent way, with appropriate communication throughout. For example, we insist that all internal letters of recommendation (from the P&T Committee, Chair, and Dean) are available to the candidate, with options for comment. We strive to maintain a level of honest objectivity in our approach to the evaluation; throughout the process, we look to the written record and documented activity as the gold standard for evidence of quality. We honor the principle that the faculty have primacy in the P&T decisions, and we go to some lengths to place the greatest weight of evaluation with the expressions of the faculty will - through the formal votes, and the written recommendation from the P&T Committee of the Department.

This document is intended to give an informal exposition of the process (especially with respect to the central administration’s role); this includes an overall explanation of CSU’s process, and specific discussions about the P&T clock, early promotions, annual and midpoint evaluations, and external letters. I trust you will see that we have striven to design things so that our institution’s goals and values are taken into account at every step. Following that, some calibration for the types of decisions that are being made across campus and centrally each year is presented, with sections on promotion to associate professor, tenure, and promotion to full professor.

Process at CSU
Upon hiring, the offer letter should indicate the rank of the position, and indicate the academic year that a consideration for promotion to the next rank (and tenure if applicable) will be made. (This is the ‘years of prior service credit’ detail.) In the year of consideration, the faculty member will assemble their dossier (typically in the summer) and consult with the Chair and/or the department’s P&T committee to develop a list of external reviewers, from whom reference letters are sought. There is a template for the dossier provided on the Provost’s web site that should be used.
In the late fall, when the dossier and external letters are in hand, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Department, in conjunction with the faculty eligible to vote, will make a recommendation to the Chair. This follows procedures outlined in the departmental code, and different Departments have different processes for this step. The best practice seems to be that a small ad hoc P&T Committee assists the candidate and the Chair in developing the materials, and that Committee makes a presentation to the full faculty, who provide a recommendation via a written vote. The Chair of the P&T Committee then summarizes the case in a written memo to the Chair, and reports the vote of the faculty.

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

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

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

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

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

Occasionally we bring cases to the Council of Deans even though we do not have significant concerns, but the case has some illustrative aspect that we could all benefit from exploring. Following the Council of Deans discussion, the Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The Provost and President meet to discuss the cases, and the President presents the final recommendations to the Board, generally at their May meeting.
The Clock
Our general policy here is that, after five years in rank, a promotion is considered not to be an early action. For the case of hiring an assistant professor, say in the summer of 2010, the promotion to associate professor would be considered in the fall of 2015. If successful, the promotion would be effective on July 1, 2016, and the rank of Associate Professor would begin then. In the summer of 2021, the faculty member will have had five years at this rank, and could be considered for promotion to Full Professor in the fall of 2021, and this action would not be ‘early’.

In the case above, the tenure decision would also be made as part of the same process in the 2015-16 year.

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

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

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

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

The rationale is that, as an institution, one of the aspects of the tenure and promotion decision is that we are interested in the ability of the faculty member to sustain productivity over a long time - a career. The shorter the period that productivity is demonstrated, the weaker that ‘sustainability’ argument may be.

An early case should be discussed at both the Dean and the Provost level before being encouraged to be brought forth.

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

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

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

**External Letters**

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

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

**Promotion to associate professor**

In this and the next sections I would like to delineate some of the criteria and issues that we look for in evaluating promotion and tenure proposals. I do not mean to co-opt the rightful pre-eminence of the faculty in doing this. However, I believe that it is informative to see how a common philosophy can express itself in a variety of ways across our inhomogeneous institution, and how we can arrive at decisions that are both fair and department-specific, in the main. In evaluating a successful and well-rounded faculty member, we have expectations in teaching effectiveness, in research and scholarly accomplishments, and in service contributions (any of which may include engagement activity). Let us consider each of these in turn.
Evidence of teaching effectiveness:
We strive to determine whether the candidate has demonstrated a commitment to, and a capacity for delivering, quality and quantity in their instructional efforts. Our mission as a student-centered university demands that we not undercut our institutional goals by compromising on this important dimension.

The types of evidence that demonstrate competence in the instructional role, that are most convincing, include: thoughtful peer and student evaluations, especially when these are driven by a department-level program of assessment; estimates of student learning, both in the classes taught by the professor and in subsequent classes if possible; enrollments in courses taught by the professor; well-organized syllabi that indicate course expectations with clarity; indications of course development (even if minor). We also look for a certain amount of breadth in the instructional assignments: success at a variety of courses, and at a variety of levels (lower division, upper division, and graduate) gives more confidence than evidence of effectiveness in only one course for several years.

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

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

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

It will come as no surprise that basic metrics for success include: refereed publications in respected national or international outlets, or published monographs as appropriate to the discipline; presentations at regional, national, and international conferences; invitations to visit and present at peer (or higher) institutions; external funding activity (writing of proposals, obtaining awards, and obtaining renewals); measured consideration of citations by other authors; meaningful collaborations whose value can be documented; activity in applied research (invention disclosures, patents, etc.); development of a concrete portfolio of creative artistry or performance in (inter)national venues. Scholarly achievements are quite differently expressed, and differently weighted, in various disciplines and departments. Nevertheless, the overriding expectation across the institution is one of external validation of quality, impact, and national recognition, as measured by evidence in the dossier.
We are especially interested in knowing that the assistant professor has moved well past the research of their terminal degree, and is successful at establishing new and productive lines of inquiry and achievement.

Here at CSU we have a well-deserved reputation for interdisciplinary activity. We value that, and at promotion and tenure time we are in a position to reward it. Such work can cause a CV to look a bit different, and we know that. We would never devalue a strong grounding in one’s discipline, and the building of a disciplinary reputation with quality and impact. However we do try to take interdisciplinary work into account, in a positive way.

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

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

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

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

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

One way that we have seen this philosophy expressed is when we ask, about someone who has demonstrated success at another institution or in another career path: can this faculty member be successful here at CSU? For this reason, for example, we may well look more closely at the establishment of a CSU-based research and scholarship program for the tenure decision.
Additional questions that I have heard posed for a tenure case are: Would we be honored to have this person represent our department, our college, and our University? Will we be delighted to invest significant resources in the professional development of this candidate, for the benefit of our students, our programs, and our institution? Will this action be improving the department, college, and university? Are we ‘raising the average’ in the unit by the tenure decision? If we get convinced that we are, then we start asking about how much. If we are not convinced, then we have problems; and at the Provost level, we will look very critically at cases that come without a strong positive consensus.

**Promotion to full professor**

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

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

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

**Closing**

This document was intended to clarify the basic elements of the process of promotion and tenure here at Colorado State, with special attention paid to the central administration’s role. In addition to procedural matters, we tried to expose some of the general criteria that have been used in the recent past to make decisions. Further specific information can be found in our Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, especially sections E.10-13.
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Section VII. Advancement and Tenure (pp. 12-14): College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines/Criteria for and Documentation of Recommendations

College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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

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

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

Criteria For and Documentation of Recommendations

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

Detailed information and supporting materials are needed by the College administration for the purpose of review. The responsibility for the preparation of such information and documentation lies primarily
with the candidate. Faculty should always check with the Office of the Provost Webpage to assure they are following the most recent guidelines for submitting materials for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The candidate's School/school will prepare a recommendation that discusses the extent to which the candidate meets the relevant criteria and standards specified by the School/school code. The recommendation should report the School/school vote, including specification of the numbers of those voting for and against and those abstaining. Any minority opinions concerning the recommendation must be discussed. Any agreements to award previous institutional experience(s) must be detailed in writing and approved by the Dean and Director/Director. Guidelines on the desired documentation in each of the areas of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service can be found in School/school codes.
Attachment 1
Procedures for Solicitation of Letters from External Reviewers and Timeline

1. Names of potential external reviewers are to be solicited both from the faculty applicant and from members of the T&P Committee. The final list of potential external reviewers shall be compiled from names of individuals provided both by the faculty applicant and the T&P Committee. The list of potential reviewers submitted by the faculty applicant should consist of 6-8 names, as should the list produced by the T&P Committee. The T&P list will generally be prepared by the Chair of T&P and one or more T&P member(s) appointed by the Chair. Whenever possible, those T&P members compiling this list should have expertise in the candidates’ discipline area. The candidate may also provide a list of persons they feel would not be able to give an unbiased review to the T&P committee.

2. In identifying external reviewers (whether it be by the applicant or by the T&P Committee), the goal is to remove bias and enhance integrity of the process. Potential reviewers should not be individuals, such as the dissertation chair or a collaborator in research, who might find it difficult to objectively evaluate the applicant’s work.

3. The lists provided by the faculty applicant and by the T&P Committee should contain the following: (a) name, title/position, address, and phone number; (b) e-mail address; (c) rationale for identifying the individual as an external reviewer including his/her contributions to the field; and (d) professional or personal relationship to the faculty applicant (if any).

4. The T&P Committee Chair will compile a final list, from both the applicant and the T&P Committee, of no fewer than 8 names and will submit this list to the Director. This list shall identify the names of reviewers and identify from which list they were drawn. Less than half of these names may be derived from the applicant’s list.

5. The Director will contact reviewers to be sure they are able to complete the evaluation by the deadline, believe they are qualified, and are willing to provide letters. The Director will draw a majority of names from the list supplied by T&P.

6. Only in rare cases will the faculty applicant’s entire dossier be sent to reviewers. Generally, external reviewers will be mailed a smaller packet of materials that includes the following:

   (a) A cover letter prepared by the Director and the T&P Chair wherein the following are specified (a) a list of questions to be addressed by the reviewer (see lists below); (b) a description of the materials included in the packet; (c) a description of the nature of the University and the School including research publication requirements; (d) a description of the teaching and administrative assignments of the candidate; (e) a statement stressing the confidentiality of the evaluation process; and (f) the deadline by which materials must be received.

   (b) At least 3-6 examples of the faculty applicant’s published/in press scholarly work (no fewer than 3 examples for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, and no fewer than 6 examples for promotion to Professor). Note: in-press manuscripts may be included, but the majority of the scholarly work must have been published. The majority of publications sent to reviewers must represent work wherein the faculty applicant is either the sole author and/or the primary contributor. In instances where coauthored work is submitted, the faculty applicant must describe her/his role in producing the work.

   (c) A statement prepared by the faculty applicant concerning the scholarly work to be reviewed, as well as a description of her/his research program; and

   (d) A current vita.

This packet of materials should be mailed far enough in advance that the T&P Committee will receive the external reviews before recommendations must be submitted to the School. This will generally require a 1-2 month lead time.
7. As mentioned above, external reviewers are to be asked a limited set of questions and/or requests. These items will vary slightly depending on whether the faculty applicant is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, or for promotion to Professor. A suggested format for these items is as follows, following the template on the Tenure & Promotion Application:

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

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

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

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

**Timeline for Tenure and Promotion**

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