

Revised and Approved, March 13, 2014

**THE CODE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE AND HUMAN
NUTRITION**

COLLEGE OF APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

**Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition
College of Applied Human Sciences
Colorado State University**

I. Administration

- A. The administration of the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition shall be the responsibility of the Department Head.
- B. The Department Head shall be selected as specified in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (AF/AP Staff Manual).
- C. The term of office of the Department Head shall be in compliance with the AF/AP Staff Manual.
- D. The duties of the Department Head shall be those specified in the AF/AP Staff Manual.

II. Eligible Faculty

The academic faculty who may serve and vote in Department governance except when specified otherwise in the code, are those members with a regular or transitional appointment of at least 4.5 months in the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition.

III. Departmental Mission and Goals

A. Mission

The mission of the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition is to illuminate the role of food and nutrition in the health of society through education, research, outreach and service.

B. Vision

The Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition will be nationally recognized for excellence in the following areas:

Undergraduate and graduate education programs

Research in:

- metabolic and molecular nutrition
- community nutrition
- food science/safety

- value-added food processing and development
- food service management

Extension programs in:

- nutrition
- food safety
- health and disease prevention

C. Goals

- 1) Provide undergraduate and graduate students in the fields of nutrition, dietetics, food science/safety, and restaurant and resort management with the knowledge and skills necessary to think critically, apply the scientific method in solving problems, communicate effectively and find meaningful employment.
- 2) Conduct basic and applied research targeted at health promotion that leads to discovery and/or innovation in nutrition, food science and restaurant/resort management.
- 3) Provide current and accurate information and encourage lifelong learning among professionals and consumers through food and nutrition educational outreach programs.

D. Philosophy

The department is committed to promoting alliances linking science with education and outreach in the fields of nutrition, food science and restaurant/resort management to promote a safe, varied and nutritious food supply and a healthy populace. .

E. Department Core Values

- The pursuit of truth, albeit elusive and complicated, is the ultimate goal of the academy.
- In our work we will aspire to have a beneficial impact on our students, colleagues, our profession, and our society that will last beyond our careers in academia.
- We will pursue excellence in research, teaching, and service, with performance standards established that serve as the basis for both accountability and reward.
- We will perform our work with integrity and mutual respect for our students and colleagues.
- Our work will conform to the highest ethical standards.
- Within the faculty there are individual differences in talents and responsibilities, but there will be equal contribution of effort.
- Senior faculty will lead by example.
- Diversity will be embraced and freedom of expression will be promoted.

IV. Committees

No faculty member can be elected to more than two of the following departmental committees at the same time (Advisory Committee, Graduate Committee and Curriculum Committee). In the event an individual is elected to all three committees, the person will inform the Department Head of which committee they will not serve on, and the person with the next highest number of votes will replace them.

A. Advisory Committee

1. To advise the Department Head in administrative responsibilities there shall be a committee consisting of the Graduate Coordinator, Chair of Curriculum Committee, Extension outreach faculty representative, Coordinator of the Restaurant and Resort Management Program, faculty at-large representative, and the Department Head. At least one member of the committee must be an assistant (i.e., untenured) professor. The Department Head shall serve as Chair. The Department Head shall request, in times of his/her absence from the Department, a member of this committee to represent him/her. The Department Head should select one person from among the staff to serve as recorder.

2. Those members of the committee not defined by their roles shall be elected by the faculty from a list of eligible faculty using the Hare system. All faculty members with academic appointments shall be eligible for the at-large position; all faculty members with at least half-time appointment from Extension shall be eligible for the Extension representative position. The term of office for elected members shall be two years with half the membership elected each year. Elections shall be conducted by the Department by May 15th each year. Those elected will begin their responsibilities on August 15th.

3. The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for advising the Department Head on Department organization, the Department role in the college, university and community; staffing, facilities, development and budgetary matters in the areas of teaching, research and outreach. This committee shall also advise on any other matters which the Department Head, Advisory Committee members or eligible faculty members consider necessary or appropriate. The committee shall meet as often as deemed necessary by the Department Head but at least once a semester during the academic year. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members and filed in the Department Office. A vote can be called for by any member to record opinion on any matter under consideration. During the review of matters involving an individual Committee member, the committee member concerned will be excused from the meeting.

4. The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for the development and review of the Department Strategic Plan. The Committee shall consult with the faculty, students and Dean in preparing the strategic plan. The plan shall speak to resident instruction at the undergraduate and graduate level, research and graduate program, extension and public service. Copies of the current plan shall be made available to all members of the Department.

B. Graduate Committee

1. To advise the Department Head and Graduate Coordinator in administering the graduate program there shall be a Graduate Committee consisting of the Graduate Coordinator, four elected, eligible, tenure-track faculty members, one graduate student, the Graduate Admissions Administrative Assistant and the Department Head. The Graduate Admissions Administrative Assistant and graduate student shall serve on the committee in a non-voting capacity; all others shall be voting members. The Graduate Coordinator shall serve as Chair and the Department Head as co-chair. The Graduate Admissions Administrative Assistant will serve as recorder.

2. The Graduate Program Director shall be appointed for a three year term by the Department Head in consultation with the Faculty. Reappointment is determined by the Department Head. The elected members of the committee shall be elected by all members of the eligible graduate faculty using the Hare System. One faculty member will be elected from the eligible nutrition science faculty, one from the eligible community nutrition faculty, and one from the eligible food science/safety faculty. The term of office will be two years with two of the elected members re-elected in even years and two in odd years. Members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. Elections shall be conducted by the Department Head by May 15th with service to start the following August 15th. The department graduate students shall elect their representative each fall for a one-year term. All graduate students past their first year shall be eligible to serve and vote.

3. The Graduate Committee shall be responsible for advising the Department Head and Graduate Program Director on matters concerning the departmental graduate program. The committee will meet as often as deemed necessary by the Graduate Program Director, but at least twice a semester. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members. A vote can be called for by any member to record opinion on any matter under consideration. Specific areas in which the Graduate Committee will advise the Department Head and Graduate Program

Director are:

- Recruitment and selection of graduate students.
- Development of long range goals for the graduate program consistent with the Department Strategic Plan.
- Development of recommendations to Department Head regarding graduate education, e.g., new courses, research facilities, courses in other departments and any other matters related to the graduate program.
- Review, when necessary, academic standing and grievances of graduate students.

C. Curriculum Committee

1. The Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for matters relating to the undergraduate curriculum and new graduate courses. The chair shall be the representative to the College Curriculum Committee. The committee shall consist of six members:
 - the Director of the Didactic Program in Dietetics
 - a faculty representative of Restaurant and Resort Management
 - a faculty representative of Food Science/Safety
 - an faculty member elected at-large
 - an undergraduate student (non-voting)
 - an undergraduate program administrative assistant (non-voting)
2. Those members of the committee not defined by their roles (elected areas of representation) shall be elected by the faculty from a list of eligible faculty using the Hare system. All faculty with academic appointments shall be eligible for the at-large position; all faculty who teach in the Food Safety option shall be eligible for the Food Science position. All members in the Restaurant and Resort Management Program shall be eligible for the Restaurant and Resort Management position. The term of office for elected members shall be two years with two of the elected members re-elected in odd years and two in even years. Members may serve an unlimited number of terms but no more than two terms consecutively. Elections shall be conducted by the Department Head by May 15th each year. Those elected will take office on August 15th.
3. Graduate courses must be submitted to the Graduate Committee for evaluation prior to being submitted to the respective curriculum committees. The Chair will call the first meeting of the year in early September. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members.

4. The committee shall be responsible for advising the Department Head and Advisory Committee on matters concerning the curriculum. The committee will meet as often as deemed necessary by the chair, but at least once a semester. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members. A vote can be called for by any member to record opinion on any matter under consideration. The committee shall review as it deems necessary or when requested by the Department Head: departmental majors, minors and options, course objectives and content, interdepartmental courses or options, all proposals for grants which may affect the curricula, student advising and any other matters related to the curriculum. The faculty committee members shall make nominations for undergraduate scholarships and awards.

D. Social Committee

A committee of one faculty member, one administrative professional, one state classified staff member, and a graduate student shall be elected each year to plan ways to foster a positive social environment and esprit de corps within the department.

V. Procedures

A. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to participate in advising graduate students. Untenured assistant professors will initially participate as committee members and then co-advisors under the direction of their faculty mentor, until their mentor (graduate committee?) determines they are ready to serve as the full advisor.

B. Hiring Procedures

1. When a faculty search is authorized, the Department Head shall appoint a search committee with the advice of the Dean and the Advisory Committee. For Extension specialist positions, CSU Extension personnel from both inside and outside the department shall be included as members of the Search Committee. The Search Committee Chair must be a member of FSHN and have completed the search chair training offered by the Office of Equal Opportunity.

2. In order for candidates to be considered for positions, it will be necessary for them to submit a letter of application, complete curriculum vitae and three professional references.

3. All materials submitted by applicants will be open for review by any faculty member, given confidentiality requests. In addition, the Search Committee shall seek the advice of all eligible faculty members on candidates who are to receive

serious consideration. A deadline for receipt of applications will be established to be included in any position announcements/advertisements.

4. The Search Committee Chair will be responsible for obtaining approval by the CSU Office of Equal Opportunity of the pool of candidates, prior to identification of the finalists.

5. After a thorough evaluation of all applicants by the search committee, a list of finalists will be identified, and based on approval of the finalist list by the CSU Office of Equal Opportunity. Candidates will present a campus seminar and to meet with the Search Committee, other members of the Department, the Dean of CAHS, and other appropriate individuals.

6. A candidate shall be considered for a position in the department only in accordance with the departmental objectives, the staff developmental plans of the department, and the diversity strategic plan of the University. As a result of the search process, the search committee shall solicit feedback from faculty, administrative professionals, staff, and students regarding each candidate interviewed, and submit a written evaluation of each candidate to the department head and to the Dean. The department head in consultation with the search committee and the Dean will make the final decision as to the candidate to whom an offer will be extended.

C. Tenure Granting Procedure

1. The Academic Faculty Tenure Policy is set forth in the AF/AP Staff Manual and shall be used as a guide on all tenure matters. Department guidelines for tenure and promotion are found in Appendix ***. It is the expectation that for tenure-track assistant professors, tenure and promotion to associate professor are linked, such that if a positive recommendation is made in regard to tenure, the recommendation is also made for promotion to associate professor.

2. The tenured faculty members within the department (the tenure and promotion committee) will be provided with appropriate materials provided by the tenure applicant and external reviewers, which will serve as the basis for evaluating the individual's qualifications for tenure. The applicant's qualifications will be discussed by the T&P Committee and a formal written vote taken on granting tenure. The Department Head has the option of approving or not approving this recommendation. The results of the vote, the tenure and promotion committee's written evaluation, the department head's recommendation and written evaluation will be sent to the Dean of CAHS. If the tenure applicant is also an extension specialist, the Director of CSU Extension will also be provided with this information. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for recommendation by the College of Applied Human Sciences Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of the College, the Provost's office, the President's Office, and finally by the CSU Board of Governors.

D. Promotion Procedures

1. The criteria for academic faculty promotion to full professor are set forth in the AF/AP Staff Manual and shall be considered as a guide in matters of promotion. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for action in a similar fashion as stated in item C, with final authority resting in the hands of the CSU Board of Governors.

2. Nominations for advancement in rank may be initiated by the individual faculty member Advisory Committee, the Department Head, or Dean. All recommendations are to be reviewed by appropriate faculty as described below.

4. Candidates for promotion to full professor will be reviewed by all current full professors in the department. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will call a meeting of the appropriate faculty members and a written vote will be taken after consideration of the applicant's qualifications for advancement in rank.

E. Performance Reviews

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance as outlined below and in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (AF/AP Staff Manual).

1. Annual Performance Evaluations

Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall be in compliance with the AF/AP Staff Manual, and the FSHN Department's Performance Evaluation Criteria (Appendix C). Each faculty member on regular appointment, whether tenured or not, undergoes an annual evaluation of performance relative to (1) the particular responsibilities of the position, and (2) the particular objectives which have been previously established with the faculty member for the current year. The faculty member completes a self-evaluation report for the previous calendar year and an updated vita to the Department Head by January 15th in advance of the annual face-to-face evaluation conference, which occurs during the month of February. By December 15th, the Department Head will provide the link where the form can be found. For the evaluation, each faculty member will include all student course evaluation summary sheets for each course taught or co-taught during the year as part of his/her annual performance self-report, as well as copies of all written comments. These materials will remain the property of the faculty member. The faculty member should also provide the Department Head with any other material

pertinent to her/his performance such as reprints of published papers, manuscripts in press, and grant proposals under review.

During the annual conference, the Department Head will (1) present a verbal evaluation to the faculty member, (2) point out ways to improve in areas in which improvement is vital to the successful career development of the faculty member, including progress toward tenure and advancement in rank, (3) be supportive of the faculty member in areas of satisfactory performance, and (4) attempt to reach agreement on the objectives for the faculty member for the following year. Subsequently, the Department Head will prepare, sign and give two copies of a written summary of the evaluation to the faculty member. The substance of the evaluation shall be based upon criteria provided in section C of the appendix. The faculty member will sign and return a copy of the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt, and is free to provide written comments on the second page of the evaluation form if he/she disagrees with evaluation. Should there be disagreement, the faculty member has the responsibility for providing written explanation for the reasons for the disagreement. The evaluation report may be discussed in a second meeting requested by either party.

2. Reappointment and Review of Non-tenured Faculty

a. Yearly Review of Non-tenured Regular Academic Faculty:

The performance of non-tenured regular faculty will be reviewed each year by the Department Head and by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Except for the Midpoint Review, the faculty member's self-evaluation report and current vita due on January 15 will form the basis for this review. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide the Department Head with written comments on each non-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure by February 15 of each year. These comments will be discussed with non-tenured faculty members as part of their annual evaluation conferences and incorporated into written summaries of those evaluations. Evaluation summaries will be signed and distributed as identified in E.1 above.

b. Midpoint of Probationary Period Review:

At the midpoint of their probationary period in the Department (e.g., in the 3rd year of a 6-year probationary period), the non-tenured academic faculty member will be notified to submit to the Department Head and the departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee an updated curriculum vita and an expanded version of their annual performance self-evaluation report to include a statement of their research, teaching and service goals and objectives and a self-analysis of their progress toward tenure. These materials must be provided to the department head by January 15th.

The review shall be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion committee by February 15. Upon completion, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee (see section E.11.1 of the AF/AP Staff Manual for possible outcomes) shall be provided to the faculty member, Department Head, Dean and Provost/Academic Vice President. Each recipient shall have the opportunity to submit written comments in response to the report, which will be directed to the department head and passed on to the Dean and Provost. The final report filed with each of the above shall include any comments provided.

3. Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty
 - a. Promotion Progress Reviews:

No later than the fifth year after acquisition of tenure, associate professors will submit to the Tenure and Promotion Committee a copy of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vita, a statement of research, teaching and service goals and objectives and a self-analysis by the faculty member of progress toward promotion. Faculty members will be notified by the Department Head in early fall that they are coming up for this review and the due dates established for the annual review will be used.

The review shall be conducted by all tenured faculty members of higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed (excluding the Department Head) following procedures outlined in the AF/AP Staff Manual, section E.11.2.1. Upon completion a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee (see section E.11.2.1 for possible outcomes) shall be provided to the faculty member, Department Head and Dean. Each recipient shall have the opportunity to provide written comments in response to the report; the final report filed with each of the above shall include any comments provided.

Considerations on progress toward promotion must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution and performance in each area of responsibility. In cases where deficiencies have been identified, the Department Head and faculty member will design a professional development plan appropriate for the individual's professional development and set mutually acceptable time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. As part of this plan, the faculty member's effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility may be adjusted to focus on the faculty member's interests, demonstrated performance, and needs of the Department.

There is no specified time interval required to be in rank as an associate professor prior to promotion to full professor. Promotion to full professor requires an outstanding record of performance in research and education, with achievement of an international reputation as a scholar, based on the number and quality of publications, presentations, funded grants, teaching accomplishments, and outreach accomplishments. For faculty members with extension appointments, it is expected that their outreach efforts will be widely disseminated as evidenced by adoption of curricula, programs, evaluation strategies, etc. outside of Colorado.

b. 5-Year Post-Tenure Comprehensive Reviews:

1) Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews:

The Department Head shall conduct Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews as outlined in section E.11.2.2.1 of the AF/AP Staff Manual. These shall be conducted on all tenured faculty members at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure. The faculty member will be notified by the Department Head in early fall if they are coming up for this review and the due dates established for the annual review will be used.

The faculty member being reviewed will submit to the Department Head an updated curriculum vita and an expanded version of their annual performance self-evaluation report to include a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, a statement of their research, teaching and service goals and objectives and a self-analysis of their progress and accomplishments during the previous 5-year period. The department head will provide the guidelines for completing the self-evaluation.

The review shall include one of the following possible outcomes:

- a) the faculty member is making satisfactory progress;
- b) the faculty member has deficiencies that may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review;
- c) the Phase I review is unsatisfactory and a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

In the case of b) above, the Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, shall prepare a specific professional development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations as outlined in section E.11.2.2.1 of the AF/AP Staff Manual.

2) Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews:

Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews will be initiated when, in the case of c) above, the Department Head determines that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the Phase I review. Initiation of a Phase II review is not grievable by the faculty member.

The Phase II Review Committee shall consist of all the faculty members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee at the same or higher rank as the faculty member being reviewed. If there are not at least three such members, the Department Head will select additional committee members from faculty members of the same or higher rank within the College. These members will be approved by the Tenure and Promotion Committee considering impartiality and lack of bias. The Department Head shall not be a member of this committee.

The Department Head shall submit to the committee all Phase I review material plus a written statement regarding his/her Phase I decision. The committee may request additional material from the faculty member and/or seek comments from external reviewers. The due dates will be established by the Committee.

The Phase II Review Committee shall complete its review, utilizing the requirements for tenure and accounting for workload distributions. As part of the review, a majority of the Committee must agree on one of four possible outcomes as outlined in section E.11.2.2.2. of the AF/AP Staff Manual.

Upon completion of the review, the Committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have 15 days to provide a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the Department Head, and at successive steps, to the dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations identified jointly by of the Department Head and Dean will be sent to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.

In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the Phase II Review Committee, must be remedied, the Department Head and faculty member will design a professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and set time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The plan must be approved by the Dean.

In the event that conditions set forth in Section E.9.7 of the AF/AP Staff Manual are present, the Committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including

tenure revocation.

4. Grievance

The faculty member shall have recourse to the provision in Section K, AF/AP Staff Manual, except where otherwise prohibited, once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendations or decisions made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II Review may be the basis for a complaint under Section K.

F. Selection of Graduate Students

Review of graduate applications and recommendations to the Graduate Program Director shall be made by faculty members of the department. Applications will be evaluated separately by faculty members in the department. .

G. Departmental Operation

1. Procedures relating to self-evaluation of the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition shall be performed as outlined in the University Code. The procedures for this evaluation shall be set forth by the Advisory Committee at the time of evaluation.

2. Departmental Meetings

- a. The Department Head shall call a faculty meeting a minimum of twice per semester with written notice and an agenda given in advance.
- b. Other faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the Department Head.

3. Procedures for Review of the Departmental Code

- a. The Departmental Code shall be reviewed by the Department Head in consultation with the FSHN Advisory Committee no less than every three years.
- b. Amendments to the Code may originate from any eligible faculty member at any time. All amendments shall require a two-thirds majority vote of the eligible faculty members.

H. Teaching Assignments

1. Teaching loads shall be decided by the Department Head in consultation with the Advisory Committee. The department follows the college recommendation that the departmental resident instruction faculty members

teach an average of 6 credits per semester.

2. Individual department members shall be encouraged to develop excellence in specific teaching areas. Within the limitations of available teaching personnel and courses to be taught, teaching assignments will be made by the department head with an attempt to have faculty members teach in their specialty areas.
3. Resident Instruction faculty members may have their 9-month teaching loads reduced based on research responsibilities and buy-out of teaching time via a portion of their 9-month salary provided by a grant or contract. Because the College of Applied Human Sciences counts a 3-credit course as requiring 10% effort, it is expected that a minimum of 10% of a faculty member's 9-month salary will be provided by grant support for each 3-credit course reduction.

I. Budgetary Policy

1. The department head is ultimately responsible for budgetary decisions within FSHN, but should rely on input from the advisory committee, and other faculty members as appropriate. Budgets for research projects in which funding is provided by external funding agencies are the responsibility of the individual investigators working in association with the FSHN Business Officer and the Office of Sponsored Programs. It is expected that investigators will be well versed in the policies of said funding agencies, and follow the appropriate procedures for using these funds to accomplish their apriori specific aims.
2. Indirect costs received into the Department need to be responsive to those costs and functions expected to be covered through indirect cost generation. Unless otherwise negotiated, indirect costs received into the FSHN Department will be split, with the departmental PI of a specific grant having discretionary use over 50% of the funds received and the Department Head having primary discretionary use over the other 50% received.

J. Resolving Grievances

1. The definitions and procedures pertaining to grievances, as published in the AF/AP Staff Manual, apply to all issues which may arise in the department.
2. Processing student appeals of academic and disciplinary decisions, including appeals of grading decisions and violations of the Academic Integrity Policy are found in section I.7 of the AF/AP Staff Manual. If it is necessary to form an Appeals Committee, it will be selected by the Department Head from members of the Graduate and/or Undergraduate Committee (including student members). The outside faculty member, who shall serve as the voting chair of the committee, will be selected by the Department Head from members of the

College.

3. Processing Graduate Student Grievance Procedures are in Appendix A.

K. Mentoring Policy

1. It is the policy of the department to provide mentoring to tenure-track assistant professors and tenured associate professors. Mentoring is a relationship in which a more experienced faculty member(s) acts as a guide, role model and advocate of a less experienced faculty member.

2. Tenure-Track Assistant Professors: Upon hire, a new Assistant Professor will initially (first semester) be mentored by the chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee and the Department Head. An orientation meeting will be scheduled within the first month of employment. This meeting will overview the expectations regarding research, teaching and service, using the annual evaluation form as a template. Following this meeting, the new faculty member will develop a 6 month plan that will be reviewed in a follow up meeting. The new faculty member will be required to identify a mentoring team, made up of at least two faculty with expertise in teaching and research. These faculty may be from within or outside the Department of FSHN, must hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor and be approved by the chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee and Department Head. The mentoring team and faculty member will be encouraged to meet on a regular basis but at least once per year. The primary role of the mentoring team will be to assist the faculty member to be successful.

3. Associate Professors: During the first annual evaluation following tenure and promotion, the Department Head and Associate Professor will establish a mentoring plan. This plan may involve mentoring by the Department Head or development of a mentor or mentoring team. Ultimately the approach chosen should meet the needs of each faculty member.

4. Mentoring is an important responsibility and as such will be included as a portion of work effort in the annual evaluation of the mentor(s).

APPENDIX A

**GRADUATE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition**

1. The student should discuss the problem with his/her professor, adviser and/or work supervisor, as appropriate. If the student believes some form of discrimination may be involved, the Office of Equal Opportunity should be consulted.
2. If a satisfactory resolution of the problem is not achieved, the student may take the problem next to the Department Head, who will, after hearing the student's account of the problem, consult with the student's adviser and any faculty and/or students involved. Having consulted all parties and gathered all possible relevant information, the Department Head will formulate a resolution to the problem.

3. If a satisfactory resolution of the problem is not achieved, the Department Head may instruct the Food Science and Human Nutrition Graduate Committee to hear the student's appeal within four weeks and submit a report to the Department Head and grievant. If this fails to resolve the issue, the student proceeds to step 4.
4. If the proposed resolution is not satisfactory to the individuals involved, the problem may be presented to the Dean of the Graduate School (or the Dean's representative, i.e., Associate Dean, Assistant Dean). The Dean will consult the Department Head, the adviser, and any other relevant source of information and will coordinate with the Dean of the student's college in seeking a resolution to the problem. The Dean will then propose a resolution to the parties concerned.
5. If the resolution proposed by the Dean of the Graduate School is not satisfactory to the parties concerned, a review committee will be formed composed of one faculty member appointed by the Graduate Dean, one faculty member appointed by the College Dean, one faculty member selected by the grieving student, and one student selected by the Graduate Student Council. This committee will review the problem and make a recommendation to the Graduate Dean or Dean of the College for action. The Dean to whom the recommendation is made will inform the concerned parties of his/her decision on the recommendation.
6. If the parties concerned will do not find the resolution of the problem acceptable, a final appeal may be made to the Academic Vice-President, who will review the findings of the committee and the action of the Dean and make a final decision, which will be communicated to all parties concerned.

Appendix B

The responsibilities of the Graduate 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 department head.

1. Work with the FSHN Graduate Administrative Assistant in the implementation of the graduate application process.
2. Provide any information regarding the FSHN graduate program as requested from the Graduate School, and college pertaining to the Graduate program.
3. Represent the department at all college meetings for the department graduate coordinators.
4. Oversee communication with potential graduate students
5. Meet with potential students.
6. Organize the review of applications.
7. Determine acceptance based on input from the graduate faculty after thorough review of all application materials. The director will only convey acceptance into the department's graduate program after confirmation with the assigned advisor.
8. Communicate admission decision to all graduate applicants.
9. Provide an orientation meeting for all new graduate students in the department at the start of each semester.
10. Oversee recruitment of graduate students.
11. Organize an open forum with graduate students at least once per year.
12. Respond to graduate students as requested on such items as graduate program policies, completion of required forms, etc.
13. Update the student Graduate Manual as needed.
14. Chair the department Graduate Committee.
15. Serve as a member of the FSHN Advisory Committee

APPENDIX C: FSHN- GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

In evaluating work performance, the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition does not use numerical scales rigidly assigned to various types of activity in order to categorize performance. Given the variance within the faculty in regard to effort distribution devoted to scholarship, teaching, and service; types of scholarship (laboratory-based, clinical, behavioral, and educational research), and the lack of availability of federal funding for some research activities, a rigid metric does not serve the department well. Nevertheless, it is important for faculty members and the department head to have an understanding regarding work expectations and the performance characteristics and descriptions within each of the 5 evaluative categories for performance evaluations: superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, and unsatisfactory. **The intent of the following is not to provide ‘hard and fast’ descriptors, but rather guidelines that can provide incentives for the faculty, as well as a framework for appropriate and objective annual performance evaluations.**

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

The following descriptors of specific performance categories are based on 40% effort distribution for research/scholarship. **If a faculty member has an effort distribution greater than or less than 40% effort devoted to scholarship, the expectations will be adjusted accordingly based on an understanding reached by the department head and the faculty member.** It is also recognized that there exists a fairly normal “ebb and flow” of research publications, such that a single year may be not adequately represent one’s research activity during a given evaluation period. For example, an individual may change the focus of scholarship requiring some retooling and pilot work, resulting in less tangible evidence of scholarly productivity. Moving into a new area of inquiry is to be encouraged without penalty, and such change in direction must be considered in the performance evaluation.

Superior Category- All of the expectations noted in Exceeds Expectations category below, and the acquisition/maintenance of at least one multi-year extramural research grant. Will include accomplishment of most of the following during the calendar year:

- multiple (> 3) scholarly publications to include original research publications in top-tier refereed journals and/or invited monographs or book chapters;
- 2-3 manuscripts submitted for publication
- ongoing research funded by a multi-year extramural grant
- submission of extramural grant proposals
- multiple national or international scientific presentations

Exceeds Expectations-

- 2-3 refereed publications and submission of 1-2 manuscripts for publication, with at least one manuscript published in a top tier journal in that particular field of research
- maintenance of funded-research program

- 1-2 abstract presentations at national meetings and 1-2 invited talks.

Meets Expectations-

- 1-2 refereed publications and submission of at least 1 manuscript for publication
- submission of 1-2 extramural grant proposals as PI
- 1-2 presentations at national scientific meetings.

Below Expectations-

- No manuscripts submitted for publication, or submission of manuscripts fails to result in publications
- lack of evidence of an independent, funded research program
- level of productivity falls short of percent effort assigned to research/scholarship
- little evidence of self-initiated research; no attempts to secure external funding.

Unsatisfactory-

- Despite percent effort allocated to research, not actively engaged in research/scholarship activity as determined by lack of peer-reviewed publications, lack of submission of manuscripts for publication, lack of grant applications, and no presentations of original research at professional meetings.

Teaching/Advising/Mentoring

The FSHN Department values excellence in teaching and mentoring. All faculty members are expected to be good teachers who are well organized, creative, regularly update their course materials, and who demonstrate a genuine desire to facilitate student learning. Valid measurement of teaching effectiveness is not easy, and it is understood that student evaluations of their professors cannot be considered the “gold standard” for measuring teaching quality. Nevertheless, student teaching and advising evaluations, using approved university instruments, form one important component for evaluation of teaching/advising performance, and all department instructors are expected to obtain such student evaluations every semester. Peer evaluation of teaching is another component and is expected of untenured faculty members, those nominated for teaching awards, and those whose teaching evaluations fall below expectations. While the percent effort devoted to teaching/advising will vary among the faculty, all assistant, associate, and full professors whose salaries are provided all or in part by resident instruction funding are expected to provide RI instruction and provide mentoring for students based on their assigned workload distribution as determined by the individual faculty member and the department head. Extension faculty members will likely have little if any responsibility for undergraduate or graduate courses, but because quality teaching is an important part of their job descriptions, they also must provide evidence of their teaching effectiveness. It is expected that they will solicit feedback from members of their “audiences” as well as peer evaluations. The intent of the following is not to provide strict criteria, but rather to provide **guidelines** that can provide objective incentives for the faculty, as well as a framework for appropriate and objective performance evaluations.

Note: When discussing teaching evaluations, the FSHN Department believes the most pertinent items from the standardized university course evaluation instrument are the following six items:

7. Overall, I would rate this course as good.
10. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject.
11. The teacher was enthusiastic about the course.
12. The teacher organized the course effectively.
13. The teacher was prepared for class sessions.
18. Overall, I would rate this teacher as good.

Superior - Will include accomplishments of most of the following criteria.

- Nomination or reception of teaching or advising awards.
- Excellent student evaluations ($\geq 95\%$ in 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' (SA/A) categories).
- Indication of highly effective advising (e.g., evaluations that exceed the FSHN average).
- Success in advising/mentoring graduate students as shown by numbers graduating, student research awards, student co-authored manuscripts, and positive comments about the student's mentor made to the Dept. Head during exit interviews.
- Creative approaches to teaching and mentoring (e.g. service learning projects).
- Recognition by peers as an outstanding teacher who serves as a teaching mentor for other faculty members.
- Evidence of effective advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students in programs of study, practicums, and projects (eg., extension) or effectively managing dietetics internship programs.

Exceeds Expectations –

- Substantial evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond the Meets Expectations category (teaching evaluations with 85% in SA/A);
- Advising evaluations above department norm.
- Clear evidence of steps taken to enhance teaching or advising.
- Development of significant new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching.

Meets Expectations -

- Relative to percent effort, teaches an appropriate number of classes (those that are new preps and/or require major revisions carry extra weight);
- Advises an appropriate number of undergraduate and graduate students.
- Receives teaching evaluations with at least 80% of responses in the 'agree' or 'strongly agree' category and less than 5% in the 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' (S/SD) category.
- Advising evaluations at or above the department average.

- Provides evidence of steps taken to improve courses and/or teaching and advising.
- Evidence that efforts are made to keep course content and materials current.
- **Needs Improvement** – Level of involvement in teaching and advising falls short of percent effort requirements.
- Teaching evaluations have less than 80% in A/SA categories and/or greater than 15% in D/SD categories.
- Advising evaluations are below department average.
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course material to be current based on latest research findings
- Little effort to keep current with curricular requirements and excessive reliance on support staff or other faculty members to provide appropriate advising information.

Unsatisfactory –

- Poor class evaluations (more than 25% in D/SD).
- Evidence of problems in teaching or advising (justified and verified complaints).
- Lack of interest or evidence in updating courses, materials or improving teaching techniques or taking steps to attend teaching workshops.

Service/Outreach

All FSHN faculty members are expected to provide service to the university, the community, and their respective professions. Most will devote no more than 10-15% of their efforts to service/outreach. However, because Extension appointments in the department carry significant outreach components, some faculty members will have more than 15% of their effort devoted to this category. There is no attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, rather the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines.

Superior – In addition to those descriptors in the ‘meets expectations’ category, a superior rating will include accomplishment of many of the following depending on the percent effort devoted to service/outreach:

- Member of a journal editorial board
- Holds an office in a national professional organization
- Involved in the planning of a national conference or a symposium or program for such a conference
- Provides leadership on department, college, or university committees
- Serves on grant review panels
- Serves on state, regional, and/or national program committees
- Mentors colleagues inside and/or outside the department

Exceeds Expectations – In addition to those descriptors under ‘meets expectations’, will include several from the superior category.

Meets Expectations –

- Serves as an ad hoc reviewer for research journals (reviews 2-3 papers per year)
- Serves on department, college, and university committees when elected or asked
- Participates in the normal operations of the department by attending faculty meetings, provides constructive input on department issues, and attends department functions such as student poster presentations and seminars
- Provides outreach to lay audiences on topics within area of expertise
- Is a member of at least one professional organization and attends at least one professional meeting per year

Below Expectations –

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

Unsatisfactory –

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

Administrative Responsibilities of Some Faculty Members

Some faculty members within FSHN will have administrative responsibilities that require a significant identifiable percent effort beyond teaching, research, and service. The Coordinator for the RRM Program, the Graduate Program Director, and the Dietetic Program Director devote approximately 10% effort to handling the many responsibilities associated with these positions. These responsibilities must be considered in assigning the respective effort distributions for the individuals assuming these positions, and also in the evaluations of their performance. Individuals holding these positions will have a 10% reduction in their assigned teaching and/or research loads, based on their negotiations with the department head. At the time of assignment, specific performance goals will be established jointly by the each individual and the department head.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty members with CSU Extension appointments necessarily have different work responsibilities than non-Extension faculty. It is clearly the expectation of the department, college, and university that Extension faculty members contribute scholarly work in line with the department’s mission, but these expectations must be in accord with their effort distribution.

APPENDIX D

COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION IN REVIEWS OF CANDIDATES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION¹

I. Promotion and Tenure: Advancement from Assistant to Associate Professor

A. General philosophy:

Because Colorado State University is a research intensive university, ultimately, a positive decision and recommendation for tenure is based on the conclusion that the candidate is, and will continue to be, an excellent scholar. The Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition attaches a very high value to research productivity and scholarship for tenure decisions. This is reasonable in that the research endeavor typically informs and influences teaching, advising and mentoring, and professional service. Recommendation for tenure represents a commitment of permanency – a recognition that excellence will continue.

Although it is recognized that professional activities and scholarship differ among disciplines, without evidence of creative, productive and successful scholarship, a pre-tenure candidate with impeccable credentials as a teacher and with exemplary service ordinarily will be unsuccessful in achieving tenure in this department. The criteria as set forth in this document refer to the usual 5 years period from initial appointment as an assistant professor to the application for tenure and promotion beginning during the sixth year. For a person to apply for early tenure and promotion, the requirements are even more rigorous than those established and stated below.

B. Research:

Promotion and tenure require a demonstrated commitment to scholarly research.

The department expects that the pre-tenure candidate (also referred to in this document as the probationary candidate) will establish an independent research program based on work performed while at CSU. In this context, the department defines independent research program as one that the candidate has developed while at CSU and can include collaborative projects both within and outside the university. The committee realizes that faculty may not have changed research direction from that followed in a Ph.D. or postdoctoral program, and may maintain collaborative contacts with mentors/advisors in their previous programs. However, in tenure decisions, evaluators must be convinced that a candidate is not significantly dependent on previous mentors or post-doctoral supervisors. Particularly where the bulk of the publication record is first authored by other individuals, the contributions of the candidate must be made clear and the record must show that the contributions reflect a leadership role in the candidate's research program.

One measure of research productivity is peer-reviewed publications. Although the overall publication record is examined, work published before appointment is generally viewed as evidence for hiring and not counted significantly as productivity substantiating a recommendation for tenure or promotion.

One of the most important criteria for tenurable research productivity is scientific merit, translated into quality of published work. Most, if not all publications should appear in leading, peer-reviewed journals of the candidate's research area. Second- or third-level journals will carry less weight and those not peer-reviewed carry little weight in considering quality. Invited book chapters or review articles, especially if peer-reviewed, can demonstrate quality. A large number of such chapters or reviews with limited numbers of peer-reviewed, primary research articles during the probationary period (first five years in rank as a tenure track assistant professor) might raise a question of whether the invited publications were truly based upon the candidate's reputation as an independent scholar. Quality, significance, and creativity of publications are evaluated thoroughly by the Department, taking advantage of expertise within our faculty, and by careful selection of external reviewers. Sometimes views of external reviewers may be decisive in determining quality in a candidate's specialized area. Often the frequency and nature of citation of the candidate's publications by other scientists may be a significant measure of how well the work is accepted by others in the discipline.

Another research criterion used in tenure and promotion decisions, is the quality of graduate student mentoring. Because Colorado State University is a research intensive university dedicated to training future scientists, it is the expectation of the FSHN Department that the faculty member establish productive working relationships with her/his graduate students characterized by relevant and rigorous educational guidance, well-communicated goals and research objectives, appropriate timelines, etc. within an atmosphere of mutual respect and collegiality. One sign of effective mentoring is for the faculty member's graduate students to finish degrees in a timely manner and to obtain post-graduate positions and fellowships. Exit interviews from graduate students will also be considered in the evaluation of mentoring.

Many research programs depend on funding; thus, it is expected that the candidate shall seek and obtain external funding for scholarly work. Specific dollar amounts are not determinants in tenure decisions; however, if the researcher needs a large research budget to successfully develop the research program, large grants are necessary components for that candidate. Success and reputation of a program likely depends on such grants. Evaluators examine not only the apparent effort and success of the candidate in obtaining research funds, but also the record of applications submitted. Successful proposals reflect quality of the candidate's ideas and work, and also provide evidence of his/her reputation in the research area. Annual reports made to sponsors of the research may provide evidence of

research effort prior to publication. Ultimately, the greatest significance is attached to the results obtained by use of any funds acquired; i.e., whether funding leads to and continues to produce high quality published work.

Some faculty members in the department have CSU Extension appointments and outreach and engage have become important aspects of translational research. The scholarship-based model of outreach/engagement stimulates interaction with the community, which produces discipline specific, evidence-based practices. Outreach/engagement activities may be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution. For the activity to be scholarly, it must draw upon the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member while contributing to the public good, addressing or responding to real-world problems.

The scholarship of engagement is evaluated through the amount, quality, and effectiveness of those activities to the external community. Evaluating engagement activities as integrated into conventional teaching and research can be difficult, and requires multiple criteria to assess the scholarship of the activity.

The metrics for evaluation of engagement activities as scholarly work shall include: clear goals for the activities; documentation of adequate preparation for the activities; appropriate methods for the conduct of the activities; documentation of significant impacts and outcomes resulting from the activities; effective presentation of the results of the activities with peer review; and reflective critique on the results of the activities. Additional criteria may include a beneficial impact or outcome attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service.

If the candidate has a higher percent effort devoted to research, this will place more emphasis on the research component, thus research expectations will be higher. Although it is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to critically evaluate his/her research progress on an ongoing basis, progress in this area will also be evaluated by the tenure and promotion committee and the department head on an annual basis.

C. Teaching:

An important mission of Colorado State University is to educate undergraduate and graduate students, thus excellence in teaching is also an important component of the review process for tenure and promotion. Student teaching evaluations form one important component for evaluation of teaching performance. The University has mandated that student evaluation of teaching be performed using a single form for all faculty within the university. It is critical that student evaluations be conducted as often as possible during the probationary period, and in a variety of courses: lower and upper division, low and high enrollment, general and specialized courses. It is the responsibility of the pre-tenure

candidate to analyze the results of student teaching evaluations and to take steps to ameliorate weaknesses noted in these evaluations. In addition, it is the responsibility of the tenure and promotion committee to identify weaknesses and for the chair of that committee to discuss these weaknesses with the probationary faculty member. Finally, the department head will discuss positive and negative evaluations with each faculty member during annual evaluations.

Peer evaluation of teaching is another component in the evaluation of teaching, and it is expected that the pre-tenure faculty member will implement a process of obtaining evaluations and constructive feedback from other faculty who excel in teaching. Pre-tenure faculty should take advantage of seminars and workshops to improve teaching, such as are conducted by The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT). The committee looks favorably on explicit efforts to improve teaching, particularly when accompanied by improvement in teaching evaluations.

As indicated in section IB of this document, another aspect of teaching is graduate student mentoring. The committee recognizes that the period of probation might be too brief to expect a large number of completed graduate students. However, active and successful participation in the mentoring of graduate students is an important component of both scholarship and teaching. For those programs that have graduate students, Thus at the time of tenure review successful completion of at least three master's student and/or doctoral students is expected. Publications should be associated with some MS research projects and all PhD projects. Attention is also given to a candidate's response to past advice on improving mentoring skills.

Success in supervising undergraduates in independent studies or honors program projects is recognized as a time-intensive and often very productive activity of collateral teaching. The committee views such activities as significant evidence of commitment to teaching.

Recognition of superior teaching in the form of special awards is not a normal expectation during the pre-tenure period, but if the candidate has received such an award, it is certainly utilized as evidence of quality teaching performance.

For some candidates, teaching may be de-emphasized due to receipt of a large research-related grant. It is unusual for a recipient of such an award to step away from teaching entirely. The committee must fully understand the requirements of the award and give the candidate full credit for whatever teaching is done. That teaching is evaluated in the same way as for other pre-tenure faculty, as described above, but guided by the understanding that the candidate may be required by the sponsor to put more emphasis on areas other than teaching. However, such an award also does not preclude the requirement that any candidate for tenure and promotion must establish a record of good teaching.

Overall, the committee must be convinced that the candidate has mastered the basics of teaching in his/her assigned courses, has responded positively to constructive feedback, and that teaching activities will continue to improve and develop in quality.

D. Service

Service is evaluated at several levels including professional service, service to the community, and Department, College or University service. Involvement on committees of the Department, College or University is a responsibility of faculty members and represents a contribution to faculty governance. Pre-tenure faculty members are not expected to be heavily involved in such service activities during their first two or three years, while establishing their research programs. Thereafter they are expected to participate in Departmental service at a level equivalent to that of tenured faculty. However, the department does not expect pre-tenure faculty members to become heavily engaged in service activities at a higher level in the academic setting, unless such service can be done without infringing on their research program and teaching responsibilities.

Professional service is a more important component of the service record. This may include active participation in professional organizations, peer-reviewing for journals and granting agencies, or participating in organizing symposia or other professional meetings. Typically, a candidate for tenure will not have reached the level of election as an officer of a professional society, or appointment to an editorial board or granting agency review panel; however, such activities would demonstrate unusual contribution in professional service.

Community service related to a candidate's professional expertise may also be an important component of the service record. Such activities as speaking to classes in secondary or primary schools, addressing or advising community organizations relating to professional expertise, etc. Generally, community involvement not relevant to one's area of expertise is not credited toward the service record; however, if the activity directly brings positive attention to the University, College, or Department, it may be considered a contribution to the service component.

In general, overall service is seen as a measure of a candidate's commitment to the institution and to the profession. A less tangible component in evaluation of service and general departmental "citizenship" is the relative effectiveness with which the candidate interacts professionally with colleagues and students. A positive professional posture toward colleagues and students not only is supportive of departmental goals, but also may be reflected in the degree to which the candidate is successful in service, teaching, and research.

E. Other criteria:

Other professional criteria are more difficult to quantify; however, they may often contribute to evaluation of a tenure candidate. Often such additional criteria are quite specific to an individual candidate, thus it is not possible to produce a complete list of such special criteria. In general, candidates involved in unusual, valuable professional activities will receive evaluative credit for such activity.

F. Probationary evaluations

Evaluation of probationary, pre-tenure faculty members should carry three purposes: 1) to provide constructive advice for improvement to the faculty member; 2) to provide affirmation of the faculty member's progress when appropriate; and 3) to inform the probationary faculty member of shortcomings in meeting expectations of the Department. Most probationary evaluations provide advice on how to improve performance and effectiveness in teaching, research and service.

Probationary evaluations should identify both strengths and weaknesses. In particular, they are critical in identifying problem areas for a faculty member as early as possible after appointment and to communicate clearly to the faculty member the perceived problem, along with advice for remedial action by the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Tenure and Promotion Chair to provide appropriate positive or negative feedback when the Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendations are received; however, the Head or members of the committee are free to directly advise the candidate as well. Once a faculty member has been informed of areas requiring improvement, subsequent probationary evaluations must discuss those previously identified areas and assess the degree to which the faculty member has addressed them. Thus, it is imperative that complete records of evaluations and resulting activities (e.g., advice or warnings from the Chair) be made available to succeeding Tenure and Promotion Committees.

If a probationary evaluation concludes there is inadequate progress toward tenure, the faculty member must be informed of the magnitude of the inadequacy at the earliest possible time in order to provide opportunity for improvement. In the most serious cases of inadequate progress, particularly when earlier warnings or advice have not been addressed adequately by the faculty member, a recommendation will be made for a conditional or terminal contract.

For a given faculty member, the sequence of probationary evaluations should provide a consistent and logical progression of early advice, response to advice, and additional advice and response between the Department Head, the T&P Chair and the faculty member. Thus, probationary evaluations should be viewed as mechanisms for assisting the faculty member in achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, as well as for identification of inadequate progress.

G. Extension Specialists

Some tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition have appointments as Extension Specialists. While their work responsibilities differ from RI-funded faculty members as delineated in the appendix on Roles and Responsibilities of Extension Specialists, these faculty members are still expected to exceed expectations in the areas of teaching, engagement, research, and service, with the criteria presented above adjusted to their specific percent efforts devoted to each of these responsibilities.

II. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A. General philosophy:

It is assumed that criteria described for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor have been met by a candidate for promotion to Professor. The candidate's record since attaining tenure and Associate rank is the main subject of evaluation. It is expected that some faculty members may reach a sustained professional plateau at the Associate Professor rank. It is the responsibility of the departmental leadership to encourage and provide opportunity for such faculty to resume professional progression and thereby to strive toward meeting criteria for promotion to Professor.

For promotion to Professor, a candidate must demonstrate sustained professional development since obtaining tenure and Associate Professor rank. The record should clearly indicate that he/she is a recognized scholar and authority in the particular area of expertise, at the national and international level. That record must include evidence of excellence in teaching, research, and service. The guiding philosophy is founded on the departmental goal of establishing a continuously improving pool of Professors who are viewed nationally and internationally as leading scholars in the various disciplines of the Department.

B. Research:

As in evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, research contributions are reviewed as a major reflection of scholarly reputation of the candidate. A high level of productivity, as evidenced by publications, obtaining research funding, and other criteria detailed above for the earlier promotion must be documented for the period beyond that promotion. Evidence of increased professional scholarship includes not only expanded productivity in the form of published research articles in primary journals of the discipline, but also synthetic and theoretical contributions in the form of review articles or other scholarly discourses. Creative innovations and "break-through" discoveries that are highly

cited in the candidate's area (in literature of the discipline as well as by external reviewers for the candidate) constitute solid evidence of excellence in reputation for the candidate. Continuous publication of important contributions which are well received and which build significant foundations in the candidate's area also constitute an important component of the research criterion.

Candidates who maintain a constant direction in scholarly work in a given research area should demonstrate marked success and increasingly high visibility and respect. However, some candidates may shift gears during the years since initial appointment and pursue new directions of scholarship. In such cases, the candidate's progress is evaluated based on the rationale for change and on documented success with the effort. If change in direction required training, that must be formally documented, along with demonstrating a successful outcome and increased scholarly reputation. A pattern of continual or periodic "jumping around" from one area to another may be viewed as lack of direction. Regardless of the degree to which a candidate remains in a given area or progresses through various areas of research, he/she must demonstrate clear evidence of having developed a reputation for excellence as a scholar.

Evidence of a strong scholarly reputation may include invited presentations at meetings and/or institutions, invited review articles and book chapters or other scholarly documents, and evidence of outstanding mentoring of graduate students and/or post-doctoral fellows as appropriate for the faculty member's appointment and workload distribution. Development of collegial relationships with leading scholars around the world also can be demonstrated through visits from such colleagues to our department for collaborative research efforts with the candidate. Also invitations extended to the candidate for sabbatical work at other institutions such as those stemming from Fulbright awards provide evidence of a strong internationally recognized scholarly reputation. . Ultimately, the evaluation must clearly indicate that the candidate has transcended the threshold of recognition to be included among the respected, leading scholars in the candidate's area.

C. Teaching:

Student and peer teaching evaluations are examined, as described above for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. A candidate must demonstrate, not only high levels of teaching effectiveness and response to constructive advice, but also increased effectiveness in teaching contributions to the Department and the institution. New and innovative methods which demonstrate commitment to teaching excellence are encouraged by the Department and are viewed positively in the evaluation.

As indicated in the Research Section, the candidate is also expected to demonstrate a high degree of success in mentoring graduate students. Exit interviews with graduate students by the department head or assistant department head will be used to evaluate the faculty member's mentoring effectiveness.

Other criteria used to judge the faculty member's mentoring abilities include but are not limited to the successful completion of graduate studies by the majority of the candidate's students; publication of research findings in top tier, peer-reviewed journals; and successful procurement of post-doctoral fellowships or career positions by the graduate student. The candidate is expected to demonstrate effective and productive professional relationships with his/her students.

D. Service:

A candidate for Professor should demonstrate a continuing and expanded role in service contributions to the Department, and be actively involved in committees or other service activities at the College and University level. Leadership, in the form of chairing committees and of productive service to major Departmental, College, and University committees represents positive contribution and commitment. Substantial activity directed toward programmatic development of the candidate's discipline within the Department and the University also constitutes positive service and commitment.

Again, professional service is judged a more important component of the service record. As evidence of a national and international reputation, the candidate should document professional service at those levels. Various types of evidence are appropriate and might include (but are not limited to) the following: 1) substantial service to professional societies as an officer or as organizer of symposia or other national or international meetings; 2) service to professional journals or other publications as editor or member of an editorial board; 3) substantial service to major granting agencies as a member of peer review panels; 4) service in organizing or contributing to multi-disciplinary or multi-institutional research programs; and 5) other sorts of professional service at national and international levels.

Again, community service related to a candidate's professional expertise may be an important component of the service record. The same kinds of activities are judged significant here as in tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

E. Scholarly reputation:

External letters of evaluation are especially important in evaluating national and international reputation. These are solicited from leaders in the broad as well as narrower area of scholarship and should demonstrate unequivocally that the candidate is highly regarded and professionally respected as a leading scholar in the candidate's discipline. Evidence from the overall record and from external letters should clearly demonstrate anticipation of continued high level scholarly work in the distant future.

F. Extension Specialists

Associate professors with extension appointments will have the same opportunities as RI-faculty to progress toward full professor rank. It is recognized that the work responsibilities of extension faculty members differ from RI-funded faculty members as delineated in the appendix on Roles and Responsibilities of Extension Specialists. However, criteria for successful advancement in rank to professor still requires the candidate to have a well-established national reputation for outstanding work, including excellent contributions to their profession in scholarship, education, engagement, and service. Such evidence will include a solid research portfolio characterized by excellence in grantsmanship and publications indicating positive outcomes resulting from extension outreach and engagement activities. Other examples of nationally recognized contributions include the adoption by other states or land-grant universities of the faculty member's created extension programs, models, and or curricula, and reception of national awards for innovation in extension program development and engagement. Extension faculty members promoted to professorship are also expected to provide evidence of outstanding mentorship of graduate students and collaboration with CSU extension agents.

¹Special thanks to the Nutrition Department at Arizona State University for allowing the FSHN Department to use information from their T&P document in developing Appendix D.

APPENDIX E

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SPECIALIST ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES¹

INTRODUCTION

Specialists are crucial to the success of the Colorado State University Extension system through the development and delivery of research. Specialists provide leadership for field and campus faculty, departmental, and Extension personnel in the development, implementation, and evaluation of Extension education programs relevant to their specific subject matter expertise.

The responsibilities of Colorado State University Extension (CSUE) specialists are many and varied. Specialist appointments in Extension vary typically in length from three to 12 months and in type from regular faculty to administrative professional. CSUE's specialist appointments may also be differentiated by responsibility and targeted audience. All specialists serve as important links between field and campus at Colorado State University. All specialists are responsible for supporting CSUE's mission: to provide information and education, and encourage the application of research-based knowledge in response to local, state, and national issues affecting individuals, youth, families, agricultural enterprises, and communities of Colorado. Each specialist's work should have a clear focus with priorities on topics appropriate to Colorado and the mission of CSUE. Efforts should be related to one or more CSUE Work Team plans of work.

This document provides direction regarding specialists' roles and responsibilities with guidelines categorized into teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, engagement, and service. These guidelines are not considered mandates, but rather a compilation of potential roles and responsibilities. Expectations should be commensurate with of a specialist's appointment and job description. Further, there needs to be flexibility and mutual agreement between specialist, supervisor, other administrators, and department tenure and promotion committees (where appropriate) as to specific roles and responsibilities associated with any given specialist assignment. The specialist's effort distribution is determined at the time of hire. Changes to the effort distribution shall be agreed upon with the department head subject to the provisions of Section C.2.6.2.e and E.9.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (hereinafter referred as the Manual) and stated clearly in writing as part of the annual performance evaluation. The effort distribution shall be used as a framework for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews as well as tenure and promotion decisions.

¹ 09/2010, Approved 27 September 2010 by CSUE Specialists Association. Original version was written by the CSUE Extension Specialist Role and Performance Review Committee, 2005 (Robert Fetsch, Tom Holtzer, Jerry Johnson, Pat Kendall, Sandra McDonald, and Steven E. Newman). SpecRole, Rev.

TEACHING AND ADVISING

Dissemination of Information. Specialists, being responsive to clientele requests, will provide regular updates, summaries of research findings, and the identification of resources that are appropriate for use in local programs and with other clientele groups. This may be in the form of newsletters, peer-reviewed Technical Reports, blogs, electronic-mail messages, teleconferences and/or webinars, website updates, mailings, development of peer-reviewed fact sheets, etc. Specialists will support, mentor, and keep agents informed about relevant county, state, and federal databases that affect priorities for county Extension work.

In-Service and Professional Development. Specialists are expected to deliver in-service trainings and workshops. These teaching presentations are important ways of providing research-based information and effective educational programs to agents, extension paraprofessionals, and others. Effective teaching incorporates a strong research base, clear concepts of how to use resources, and coordinated updates or consulting after the training, which encourages adoption and program evaluation. In-service trainings build subject matter knowledge among agents and paraprofessionals as well as provide specialized program responses to current state and regional program issues. Effective program planning includes input from agents, paraprofessionals, and others. Successful program dissemination includes agents, paraprofessionals, and others using the materials and working with specialists to collect and aggregate program impacts.

Collaboration with Professionals. Developing professional relationships with major state and county government departments and key service or regulatory agencies with responsibility in one's subject-matter is a specialist responsibility. This includes providing information and updates or research summaries to professionals in these organizations. Team building and collaborative activity involving CSUE campus and field staff and agency partners who are associated with the design/implementation /evaluation of CSUE Work Teams plans of work also are important specialist responsibilities.

Student Mentoring/Teaching. Mentoring, co-advising, and advising undergraduate and graduate students on research projects, internships and practica that relate to Extension's mission are specialist responsibilities. When applying for funding of projects related to Extension specialists should include financial support for student, graduate assistant, or intern expenses.

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY

It is expected that all Extension specialists are engaged in research and scholarship that emphasizes the synthesis and translation of research into educational programs. Examples and evidence of research activities include publishing in refereed journals, technical reports, digital and other electronic media publications, developing research-based curricula and curriculum-products for use by others, conducting and reporting program evaluations, giving regional, national and international presentations, as well as

developing research-based program materials that are adapted for use by other states. This is not an exhaustive list. Extension specialists' scholarship is typically and historically characterized by peer review of manuscripts in any and all three areas—teaching, research, and service. Any scholarship that is different from traditional research journal-based scholarship must add to the body of knowledge, be peer reviewed, and be communicated in a way that an audience has access to it.

Scholarly creative activities include the integration of knowledge or technology leading to new interpretations or applications. The assemblage of research-based information for a targeted audience via a literature review is an element of scholarship and research. Other examples of scholarship include developing peer reviewed fact sheets, submitting grant proposals, developing policy recommendations for use by public decisions makers, and others as described in Section E.12.2 in the Manual.

Extension specialists are expected to collaborate with other faculty at CSU and other institutions from within and outside their disciplines, and with professionals from other organizations. The criteria for evaluating the original or creative nature of research and other creative activities should be the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. Standards for determining quality will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit. CSUE specialist research and scholarship activity, responsibility, and accountability should be consistent with the specific nature and time allocation of individual appointments.

ENGAGEMENT

The scholarship-based model of outreach/engagement stimulates interaction with the community, which produces discipline specific, evidence-based practices. Outreach/engagement activities may be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution. For the activity to be scholarly, it must draw upon the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member while contributing to the public good, addressing or responding to real-world problems.

SERVICE

Historically, many Extension specialists considered the majority of their work to fall in this category. However, for the purposes of this document, "Service" carries a restricted definition described under Section E.12.3 of the Manual.

Carefully selected service is expected of specialists. Evidence of service activities might include serving on department, college and/or university committees or serving on state, regional and/or national committees or boards that are professional, academic, agency, and/or industry-based. Specialists are encouraged to establish relationships with local, state, and federal agencies participate in policy development and serve as trusted testifiers for legislative committees. Specialists are also encouraged to link with major state industries, service, and regulatory agencies in areas of major program responsibilities.

Service rendered in one's professional capacity as a citizen of the community is commendable and may be evaluated as an appropriate faculty activity.

METRICS

The Manual defines engagement as education and information transfer activities for constituencies that do not include degree seeking students. These activities require a background of significant scholarship, diagnostic skills, use or development of creative and focused methodologies, information organization and media skills, and written and oral skills in interpreting as well as presenting information.

The scholarship of engagement is evaluated through the amount, quality, and effectiveness of those activities to the external community. Evaluating engagement activities as integrated into conventional teaching and research can be difficult, and requires multiple criteria to assess the scholarship of the activity.

The metrics for evaluation of engagement activities as scholarly work shall include: clear goals for the activities; documentation of adequate preparation for the activities; appropriate methods for the conduct of the activities; documentation of significant impacts and outcomes resulting from the activities; effective presentation of the results of the activities with peer review; and reflective critique on the results of the activities. Additional criteria may include a beneficial impact or outcome attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service.

For faculty/specialists receiving funding from CSUE, the measurable indicators of success should include, but are not limited to: active partnership with agents and/or paraprofessionals; grants submitted and funded with agents as co-PIs; service as CCA leader and/or Work Team co-leader; Extension fact sheets and other peer reviewed publications, some of which are co-written with agents; applied research projects based on identified needs of clientele; in-service training conducted using various methods; workshops developed in partnership with agents, public agencies and others; timely completion of CPRS as a measure of time spent; and guest presentations on and off campus (face-to-face or webinar). These indicators are to be addressed during the annual performance evaluation.