

The Code of the Department of Construction Management

College of Health and Human Sciences

Colorado State University

Version 10/19/2021 – Approved by Faculty Vote on 10/22/2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| The Code of the Department of Construction Management | 1 |
| Section 1: Mission, Vision, and Values..... | 5 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| A. Mission Statement | 5 |
| B. Vision Statement..... | 5 |
| C. COMMITMENT TO PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| D. Values Statement..... | 6 |
| Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization | 7 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| A. Department Head | 7 |
| B. Unit Leadership – CM Executive Committee | 7 |
| C. Unit Personnel | 8 |
| D. Committees..... | 8 |
| E. Unit Meetings..... | 10 |
| Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures..... | 11 |
| A. Faculty Appointments and Ranks | 11 |
| B. Workload Policy | 11 |
| C. Formation Of Tenure And Promotion Committees | 12 |
| D. Procedures for Tenure | 13 |
| E. Procedures for Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty..... | 13 |
| F. Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty | 14 |
| G. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees | 14 |
| Section 4: Faculty Evaluation, Tenure & Promotion Standards, and Disciplinary Actions | 17 |
| A. Annual Performance Evaluation | 17 |
| B. Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty | 19 |
| C. Comprehensive Performance Reviews | 19 |
| D. Annual Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty | 20 |
| E. Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty | 21 |
| F. Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks..... | 21 |
| G. Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks | 24 |
| H. Disciplinary Action For Faculty..... | 26 |
| I. GRIEVANCE PROCESSES FOR FACULTY..... | 26 |

| | |
|---|----|
| J. Hiring Faculty | 26 |
| K. Mentoring | 26 |
| L. Leave Guidelines | 27 |
| Section 5: Administrative Professionals, State Classified Staff Administrative Policies & Procedures ... | 28 |
| A. Annual Performance Evaluation | 28 |
| B. Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals | 28 |
| C. Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff | 28 |
| D. Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff | 28 |
| E. Grievance Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff | 29 |
| Section 6: Student Policies and Procedures | 30 |
| A. Student Employees | 30 |
| B. Graduate Student Evaluation..... | 30 |
| C. Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants..... | 30 |
| D. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants | 30 |
| E. Student Grade Appeal..... | 30 |
| Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code | 31 |
| A. Review Of The Unit Code | 31 |
| B. Relationships To The Academic Faculty And Administrative Professional Manual..... | 31 |
| Appendix A: Examples of Performance Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty | 32 |
| 1.0 Background | 32 |
| 2.0 Faculty | 32 |
| 2.1 Teaching Effectiveness/Advising/Mentoring | 32 |
| 2.1A Teaching Effectiveness..... | 33 |
| 2.1B. Teaching/Advising/Mentoring | 35 |
| 2.2 Research/Scholarship..... | 37 |
| 2.3 Service/Outreach | 38 |
| 2.4 Administrative Responsibilities | 39 |
| Appendix B: Examples of Performance Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor and Professor Ranks. | 41 |
| 1.0 Background | 41 |
| 2.0 Faculty | 41 |
| Appendix C: The Institute for Learning and Teaching Resources on Teaching Effectiveness | 47 |
| 1.0 Background | 47 |

2.0 Evidence Options for Departments to Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness..... 47

3.0 Departmental Process for Developing and Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Colorado State University 49

4.0 Strengths and Limitations of Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness 49

5.0 Example of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review 49

Appendix D: STUDENT Appeal Process – Departmental Procedures, Requirements..... 52

Section 1: Mission, Vision, and Values

Introduction

The Department is located within the College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS), along with seven other academic units. The mission of the College is to advance discovery, learning, and engagement that enhance the well-being of people, the environment in which they live, and address complex societal issues.

The Department provides an interdisciplinary curriculum that combines courses in construction materials and methods, estimating, scheduling, and computer applications with the basics of civil engineering, business, management, communication skills, and the humanities. The focus is on integrating innovative management systems, computers, and other technologies into the construction process. The Construction Management major addresses issues related to managing multiple construction projects and applying knowledge and skills in resource management, ethics, sustainability, schedule control, cost control, design, safety, and other requirements of the construction process. To further their knowledge of how this broad-based education is applied in the field, undergraduate students are required to complete a six-month internship in a construction-related job or 500 hours of work experience and a three-month internship. The master's program is an advanced curriculum designed to allow students to tailor a portion of the requirements to meet individual interests and goals.

The Department offers coursework, research opportunities, and hands-on learning experiences that lead to a Bachelor of Science or a Master of Science degree. The undergraduate degree program is accredited by the American Council for Construction Education.

Policies and procedures outlined in the Department of Construction Management Department Code were developed and adopted by the Department's eligible faculty. Procedures and policies contained within the Code are consistent with Colorado State University's Academic Faculty and Administrative-Professional Manual (AFAPM). In the event that inconsistencies occur between the Department of Construction Management's policies and procedures and the AFAPM, the AFAPM shall take precedence.

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Construction Management is to advance the knowledge and practice of construction management for the betterment of society through teaching, applied research, and service to local, national, and global communities.

B. Vision Statement

The Department of Construction Management will attain prominence as the country's highest quality construction education program, forging collaborations among disciplines with similar interests and also among industry, alumni, and international partners.

C. Commitment to the Principle of Community

We care about the communities in which we play a part: campus, local, state, national, and global. Our goal is to promote the social, environmental and economic aspects of sustainability with special emphasis on community, healthy living and human equality.

D. Values Statement

We are committed to principles of equity and inclusive excellence in all that we do. These values guide our work in the Department.

Be passionate in providing the nation's highest quality and visionary construction management education.

We share a passion for learning, discovery, and serving. We encourage, recognize, and reward innovation, research, teaching, and service. We have high standards for the quality of learning experience we provide for the students we serve. We foster development personally, professionally, and as a department, and we embrace change as an opportunity to better our program.

Make a positive difference in the lives of students.

We are committed to providing our students with the knowledge and tools that will enable them to succeed in their careers, be leaders in their community, and act responsibly and caringly in their personal lives and as global citizens. We are passionate about lifelong learning and we strive to inspire that passion in our students.

Be a part of something larger than our individual selves

We support the success and well-being of every member of the Construction Management team. We appreciate and celebrate our individual and collective achievements, which strengthen our department, enrich our organizational culture, and make us better educators. We care about our colleagues and our students, and we strive to support them.

Always have integrity.

We value and model integrity, honesty, accountability, and skills that are central to a construction professional. We project a professional image and maintain a professional working environment. We value the autonomy and independent thought and work of each member of the Construction Management family and respect the contributions each person makes. We encourage open communication, teamwork, and cooperation.

Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization

Introduction

The Department of Construction Management operates under a collegial system of faculty and staff participation. Decisions of policy, program, and direction within the Department are the prerogative of the Departmental academic faculty as described in the AFAPM section C.2.4.2. Decisions in departmental affairs are governed by majority vote of the eligible faculty and/or through committees and people that represent the faculty and advise the Department Head.

A. Department Head

The administration of the Department of Construction Management shall be the responsibility of the Department Head. The Department Head shall be selected as specified in the AFAPM. The duties of the Department Head shall be those specified in the AFAPM section C2.6.2. The term of office shall be in compliance with the AFAPM.

Responsibilities of the Department Head include:

1. Directing the work of the department including assigning administrative positions as needed;
2. Preparing and administering the department's budget;
3. Recommending personnel actions;
4. Assigning workloads;
5. Appraising performance of faculty members;
6. Providing department leadership;
7. Coordinate delivery of student support services such as advising, internships, scholarships.

B. Unit Leadership – CM Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of the Department Head, Manager of Operations, and two elected faculty members who each shall serve for a term of three years. These members shall include a representative from each of the tenure-track and continuing contract faculty. The Department Head shall preside over the meetings of the Executive Committee. Nomination and selection of the Executive Committee representative from each group will be by vote of the majority of the members of that group (Tenure Track Faculty and CCF) in an anonymous written or electronic ballot. The Executive Committee member elections will be staggered so that new Executive Committee members are rotated onto the committee is limited to one.

The duties of the Executive Committee shall be to establish Department administrative policy; manage and approve fiscal matters; assist in the creation and approval of a Strategic Plan for the Department at least every 5 years. The Executive Committee shall meet regularly throughout the academic year, keep meeting minutes, archive those minutes, and provide them to the faculty within two weeks. In addition, the Executive Committee will report significant decisions and outcomes to the faculty they represent, and at department meetings. Executive Committee are members of PADB Executive Council. Finally, members of the Executive Committee will assist in the review of the department's ACCE self-study.

C. Unit Personnel

Academic Faculty

Academic faculty are defined and maintain the same rights as defined by AFAPM section E

Administration Professionals

All rights of administrative professionals are defined by the AFAPM

State Classified Staff

All rights of state classified staff are defined by the AFAPM

Voting Eligibility

The academic faculty who may serve and vote in Department governance, except when specified otherwise in the code, are those members with a Tenured, Tenure-Track, Contract, or Continuing teaching appointment of at least half time in the Department of Construction Management.

The faculty advises and makes recommendations to the Department Head and College and University administrators regarding:

- Hiring of new faculty members;
- Faculty member promotion, tenure, and post-tenure issues;
- Research programs;
- Curricula;
- Physical facility needs; and
- Other items as requested by administrators or deemed appropriate by the faculty.

D. Committees

Individuals and committees help facilitate and coordinate the many activities necessary for the Department to function. Establishing committees, assigning their responsibilities, naming committee members, and terminating committees is a responsibility of the Department Head. The purpose of committees is to provide an organizational framework for department personnel to collectively conduct activities vital to department functioning. Committee membership may include any person budgeted in the department and may include students or others from within or outside the department or university. All committees must meet at least once a semester. By September 1 of each year, the Department Head shall publish a list of departmental standing committees, their responsibilities, and a listing of the chair and members of each committee. The Department Head may, at any time, appoint an ad hoc committee to address specific issues that may arise

The Department Head in consultation with faculty and staff will establish department committees and task forces as needed. Committee assignments and duties are determined by the Department Head. Standing committees include:

1. Executive;
2. Appeals;
2. Assessment;

3. Curriculum;
5. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion;
6. Graduate;
7. Recruitment and Retention;
8. Scholarship;
9. CM Cares;
10. IS Lab Building Operation;
11. Tenure and Promotion - Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF); and
12. Review and Promotion – Contract, Continuing and Adjunct Faculty (CCAF)

Assessment and Quality Control

The department recognizes the importance of a strong and continuous assessment of its academic quality and outcomes to realize its vision and mission. To accomplish this goal, the department relies on data managed and interpreted by the CM Assessment Committee. Reports resulting from this assessment are periodically provided to the Department Head, other academic and administrative units within the department and to the entire department's faculty. The CM Assessment Committee reports are publicly available and serve as the basis for assessing the department's quality and outcomes. Refer to the CM Academic Quality and Outcome Assessment Plan for the assessment tools and plan implementation.

Professional Advisory Development Board (PADB)

The Construction Management Professional Advisory Development Board was established on January 1, 2000 to support and promote the Construction Management program at Colorado State University. The PADB is comprised of representatives from construction-related industries through annual membership.

The objectives of the advisory board are to:

- Promote and improve the construction profession through education and the development of a body of construction knowledge;
- Advance and support the highest quality faculty, educational facilities, and undergraduate and graduate programs for students enrolled in the Construction Management major;
- Serve as a liaison between the construction industry and the Department of Construction Management;
- Develop and implement innovative programs that will benefit the Department as well as the construction industry; and
- Provide advice and counsel and contribute to the Department's vision and mission.

The advisory board meets on campus each spring and fall and holds an open dialogue with faculty and staff. Dates for these meetings are determined by the department head and PADB Chair for fall and spring semester as set by the PADB guidelines, and notice is provided to all members at least 30 days before each meeting. Additional sub-committee meetings are held as necessary throughout the year.

PADB Bylaws will be made available to the department and changes will be voted and approved by the eligible faculty and staff in the Department.

Department Representation on College and University Committees

Faculty and staff representatives from the Department also serve on the College's committees. Each member serves a three-year term and may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms on any particular committee. New members begin their terms of service on September 1. For a description of each committee, see the CHHS Code section D.V. For a description of University committees and requirements, see AFAPM Section C and D.

E. Unit Meetings

Meetings of the faculty and staff shall be called by the Department Head monthly during each academic term except for summer. An e-mail announcement will be distributed to faculty and staff members in advance of the meeting including an agenda. A minimum of one department meeting a year shall include a discussion of Departmental budget priorities and allocations within the context of the Strategic Plan. Additional faculty meetings may be called at the discretion of the Department Head, or at the request of at least three faculty members or a Committee Chair. Agenda items for department meetings may be submitted by any member of the faculty or staff, no later than 3 days before the meeting.

Attendance at department meetings is mandatory. Exceptions are granted for illness, scheduled courses, attendance at professional meetings that cannot be scheduled at another time, conference travel, and special circumstances (e.g., sabbatical leave, family medical leave).

The minutes of each department meeting and the department retreat will be recorded and distributed via email within two weeks following the respective meeting.

The Head of the Department serves as Chair for purposes of conducting department meetings. All eligible faculty members may vote on issues presented for action; the Chair may vote only in the event of a tied vote.

Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

A. Faculty Appointments and Ranks

Definitions of faculty appointments shall be in accordance to the AFAPM Section E

B. Workload Policy

In general, tenure-track and tenured Construction Management faculty members distribute their time according to the following ranges: teaching/advising/mentoring, 50% to 60%; research and scholarly activity, 25% to 35%; service and/or outreach, 10% to 15%. The combined effort of teaching and research should generally represent 85% -90% of effort for tenure-track and tenured faculty, although specific allocations of effort are established through agreement between the department head and the faculty member.

In general, CCF Construction Management faculty members distribute their time according to the following ranges: teaching/advising/mentoring, 80% to 95%; service and/or outreach, 5% to 20%; scholarship, 5% to 20% or as negotiated (for Professor Track).

For a complete description of faculty responsibilities, see Section E.5 of the AFAPM. Brief descriptions of major faculty responsibilities are provided below.

Service

Service is a critical component of construction education. Faculty members in Construction Management are expected to provide service to the university, the community, and the construction industry. The Department Head, upon consultation with voting faculty prior to the beginning of each fall semester, shall recommend CSU-related service assignments.

Teaching

Teaching loads shall be negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Head subject to the AFAPM Section C.2.6.2.e. The Department follows whenever possible the college recommendation that the Departmental resident instruction faculty members teach an average teaching load of 55% time.

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.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members and continuing contract faculty with scholarship expectations 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. Faculty wishing to do so must consult with the Department Head who must also take into account ACCE accreditation requirements and faculty teaching assignments.

Attendance and Office Hours

Faculty members are expected to meet their classes at the regularly scheduled times. Given the variety of responsibilities for our faculty, there will be occasions when a faculty member will be forced to miss class meeting times. If an event is known in advance then the faculty member

should make arrangements to have the class taught by another person. Unscheduled class cancellations should be avoided if possible. In lieu of cancelling a class, such dates may be ideal for administering exams or having guest speakers. When a conflict is discovered, the faculty member should notify the Department Head of the dates that the faculty will be missing, along with the planned activities for those dates (i.e. administering exams, guest speakers, student project work days, library research, substitute faculty, etc.). This written notification should be provided to the front office at least one (1) week prior to the date the class will be missed/cancelled.

In the event that it is necessary to cancel a class meeting due to an illness or unplanned event the faculty member should notify the front office as soon as possible on the day of the unplanned absence, by either speaking to a staff member or by leaving a voice mail message. The faculty member is responsible for obtaining a substitute when possible.

Faculty members are expected to make time available for student conferences. Office hours should be convenient to both student and instructor, and opportunities provided for prearranged appointments. Available office hours should be communicated to students and posted on the faculty member's office door.

Research

For departmental faculty whose assigned efforts include research, it is the faculty member's responsibility to contribute to the body of knowledge and/or practice to advance the construction industry and enhance construction education.

As active members in construction academia, faculty should contribute to the profession in ways which are consistent with their interests and resources. It is the responsibility of each faculty member whose assigned effort includes research to pursue an active research agenda, the results of which are periodically communicated through professional outlets.

Engagement

Engagement is a critical aspect of the Department's performance. Furthermore, the Department encourages and values individual faculty and staff engagement in their communities. Any faculty member that engages in any form of university or community engagement shall be recognized for their effort as part of the individual's annual performance review.

Summer Assignments

Unless provided special assignment by the Department (e.g. undergraduate and graduate program coordinators) faculty are not expected to be engaged in either summer teaching or service assignments. Any summer teaching or service assignment will be at the discretion of the individual faculty member. For departmental faculty whose assigned efforts include research, they are expected to be engaged in summer research activities as outlined in awarded grants

C. FORMATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES

The Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (T&P) shall be as follows:

The T&P committee will be comprised of 5 tenured faculty members and the composition will rotate on a 2 year basis with a 2 person and 3 person change on alternating years. The subset

of 5 faculty members on the T&P committee shall be established through nomination and voting by all tenure-track faculty in the department. This process is intended to provide fair and consistent representation on the committee over time. In years where a faculty member will be going up for full professor there shall be a full professor on the T&P committee as needed to provide guidance. When a faculty member is submitting a dossier for promotion to a higher rank with tenure, all tenured faculty at or above the proposed rank shall be given the opportunity to vote for, or against, the granting of tenure to the faculty member under consideration.

The Department's Review and Promotion Committee (RPC) will provide the CCAF with the same process for promotion that is used for tenure and tenure track faculty. The committee will consist of 5 members, each serving two-year terms ending in a staggered fashion to ensure that the committee institutional knowledge is retained. Each group will elect their representative from the respective pool. The committee makeup shall be as follows:

Five (5) members with a minimum of two (2) members from each Tenured and CCF. The CCAF members on the RPC can be of any CCAF rank. When a faculty member is submitting a dossier for promotion to a higher rank, all CCF at or above the proposed rank shall be given the opportunity to vote for, or against, the promotion of the CCF member under consideration along with TTF members of the R&P.

The T&P Committee Chair will serve on both the T&P and RPC in order to ensure consistency among both groups.

The committee and the applicant will work together and provide a written report to the department head stating recommendations and performance rankings to be considered in the promotion process. Recommendation for promotion will be by committee vote of members who hold the rank (or higher) that the candidate seeks.

D. Procedures for Tenure

The Academic Faculty Tenure Policy is set forth in the AFAPM section E.10 and shall be used as a guide on all tenure matters. Department guidelines for tenure and promotion evaluations are found in Appendix B. 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.

The tenured faculty members within the Department 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 Tenured faculty. A tenure recommendation shall be by a majority vote of all eligible tenured faculty. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. 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 CHHS. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for recommendation by the College of Health and 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.

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

The tenured faculty members within the Department) 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 promotion. The applicant's qualifications will be discussed by the Tenured faculty and shared to all TTF at or above the proposed rank and a formal vote taken including all eligible tenured faculty at or above the proposed rank on granting promotion. A promotion recommendation shall be by a majority vote of all eligible tenured faculty at or above the proposed rank. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. 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 CHHS. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for recommendation by the College of Health and 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.

F. Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty

The faculty members within the Department (the Review and Promotion Committee) will be provided with appropriate materials provided by the applicant, internal, external reviewers, which will serve as the basis for evaluating the individual's qualifications for promotion to a higher rank. The applicant's qualifications will be discussed by the Review and Promotion Committee and shared to all CCAF at or above the proposed rank and a formal vote taken including all CCF at or above the proposed rank and TTF members on the Review and Promotion Committee on granting promotion. A promotion recommendation shall be by a majority vote of all CCF at or above the proposed rank and TTF members on the Review and Promotion Committee. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The results of the vote, the Review and Promotion Committee's written evaluation, the Department Head's recommendation and written evaluation will be sent to the Dean of CHHS. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for recommendation by the College of Health and 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.

G. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees

Committee Composition

The Graduate Committee is made up of the student's advisor, who chairs the committee and must be a member of the CM Department faculty, and two committee members: one from the CM department and one from outside the Department. Students should select committee members based on their knowledge, expertise, and research interests, which should be closely related to those of the student. Emeritus faculty may be committee members but may not serve as the advisor.

An additional faculty member may serve on the committee. Occasionally, a student will request a committee member from outside the University. Non-faculty appointments are subject to certain restrictions and a detailed appointment process. To add a non-faculty member to the committee, see the guidelines for The Advisory System in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

The Graduate Committee and Program of Study are established simultaneously with the GS Form 6. Instructions for completion of the GS Form 6 can be found on the [Graduate School website](#). Students select committee members in consultation with their advisor, and membership must be approved by the Department Head and Dean of the Graduate School.

Function of the Committee

The function of the Graduate Committee is to assist the student in developing and completing the graduate program. Typically, three formal committee meetings are required to address the following items:

- Review and approve the Program of Study (GS Form 6);
- Review and approve the thesis or professional paper research proposal; and
- The student's defense or presentation of his/her thesis or professional paper, before obtaining committee signatures of acceptance.

Graduate Student's Responsibilities

The student is responsible for scheduling meetings with committee members and obtaining signatures on and submitting any necessary forms to the Graduate School and Department.

Roles of Committee Members

All members of the committee are required to:

- Attend the proposal and final thesis defense meetings;
- Review and approve the proposal and final thesis; and
- Assist the student in the process by offering guidance in their respective area(s) of expertise.

Advisor

Each incoming graduate student is assigned a temporary faculty advisor who acts as initial advisor while the student is investigating research interests, potential committee members, and permanent advisor options. After the student's research interests are considered, the student will request a Department faculty member to serve as advisor and chairperson of the graduate committee. The permanent advisor must be chosen by the student by the end of the second semester and approved by the Department Head and Graduate Dean via the GS6 form. The advisor is responsible for mentoring and guiding the student in his/her program of study, thesis committee selection, future career options, and the writing, research, and defense of the thesis. The advisor is also responsible for educating the outside committee member on the Department's final thesis defense process.

While the student is responsible for scheduling meetings with committee members, obtaining signatures and submitting any necessary forms to the Graduate School and Department, and assuring that all requirements for graduation are met, the advisor should monitor the student's progress to help ensure rules and requirements are met.

The advisor shall also inform the graduate advisee of the existence of the Graduate Bulletin and appropriate sections such as the "Evaluation of Graduate Students" and "Student Rights and Responsibilities." Graduate students' familiarity with the Graduate Bulletin can also be encouraged through general graduate student advising.

Department Member

The second department member's responsibility is to provide the student with additional expertise and guidance in the area of research being pursued.

Outside Member

The purpose of the outside member, by virtue of being from a different discipline, is to bring additional and diverse insights into the student's program of study and research. This member also ensures consistency of practice throughout the University and sees that the student receives fair and consistent treatment by the Department.

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

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

Faculty Performance Reviews for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance as outlined below and in the AFAPM section E.14.

Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall be in compliance with the AFAPM, and the Department's Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Performance Evaluations (Appendix A). 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, annual goals for the upcoming year and an updated vita to the Department Head by January 15th in advance of: (1) the annual review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and (2) the annual evaluation conference with the Department Head, both of which occur during the month of February. By December 15th, the Department Head will provide the link where the forms can be found. For the evaluation, each faculty member will allow the Department Head and front office staff access to the course evaluation responses to the questions regarding the achievement of the course objectives to meet ACCE requirements. General information available through coursesurvey.colostate.edu can be considered by the Tenure and Promotion committee and Department head as part of the review process. Additional course evaluation materials, including written comments by students, may be provided at faculty discretion. The faculty member should also provide the Department Head with any other material pertinent to her/his performance such as preprints of published papers, manuscripts in press, and grant proposals under review.

After the annual review, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will make recommendations to the Department Head prior to the faculty member annual conference with the Department Head. 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 a copy of the written summary of the evaluation to the faculty member. The substance of the evaluation shall be based upon criteria provided in Appendix A. The faculty member will sign and return a copy of the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt, and can provide written comments on the second page of the evaluation form if they disagree with the evaluation. Should there be disagreement; the faculty member has the responsibility of providing written explanation for the reasons for the disagreement. The evaluation report may be discussed in a second meeting requested by either party. Reference Section K of the AFAPM.

Faculty Performance Reviews for Contract, Continuing, and Adjunct Faculty (non-tenure track)

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance as outlined below and in the AFAPM section E.14. Each year the CCF will provide the RPC a summary of their accomplishments and goals for review. The process will follow the same process as the T&P committee with the faculty member providing an oral summary of their information followed by a question and answer period. The committee will then draft a written report and send it to the CCF member for review and comment. The CCF member will then return the draft, with comments and concerns, to the RPC for consideration in writing the written report that will be sent to the department head. The department head will include this information in the yearly review process. The RPC will perform a 3-year post-hire (or post-promotion) review at year three regarding the CCF effort needed to achieve the next rank level; similar to the tenure track process. This information will be included in the third-year annual evaluation report as a separate section.

Procedures for evaluation of CCF shall be in compliance with the AFAPM, and the Department's Guidelines for CCF Performance Evaluations (Appendix B). Each CCF 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, annual goals for the upcoming year and an updated vita to the RPC and Department Head by established deadlines in advance of: (1) the annual review by the RPC, and (2) the annual evaluation conference with the Department Head, both of which occur during the spring semester. By December 15th, the Department Head will provide the link where the forms can be found.

General information available through coursesurvey.colostate.edu can be considered by the RPC and Department head as part of the review process. Additional course evaluation materials, including written comments by students, may be provided at faculty discretion. The faculty member should also provide the PRC and Department Head with any other material pertinent to her/his performance as outlined in AFAPM E.12.1 Teaching and Advising (last revised May 6, 2021).

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 Appendix B. 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 they disagree with the 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.

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

At the midpoint of their probationary period in the Department (e.g., in the 3rd year of a 6-year probationary period), the CCF member will be notified to submit to the Department Head and the department 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 March 1st.

The review shall be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion committee by April 1st. Upon completion, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee (see section E.14.2 of the AFAPM for possible outcomes) shall be provided to the faculty member, Department Head, Dean and Provost. 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. Each of the included administrators may add written comments, and copies of these comments will be given to the faculty member, the Tenure and Promotion committee, and each of the administrators. The final report filed with each of the above shall include any comments provided.

C. Comprehensive Performance Reviews

Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews

The Department Head shall conduct Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews as outlined in section E.14.3.1 of the AFAPM. 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's performance is satisfactory, and no further action is necessary;
- b) The faculty member has deficiencies which the academic supervisor believes can be remedied without implementing a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review; or
- c) The faculty member's performance is sufficiently unsatisfactory that 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.14.3.1 of the AFAPM.

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 three possible outcomes as outlined in section E.14.3.2 of the AFAPM.

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 10 days to provide a written response to the summary if the deficiencies are substantial and chronic or recurrent.

In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the Phase II Review Committee, must be remedied, the Department Head 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.15 of the AFAPM are present, the Review Committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation.

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

After each annual performance review cycle, the CCF member will be notified to submit to the Department Head and the department 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 March 1st.

The review shall be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion committee by April 1st. Upon completion, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee (see section E.14.2 of the AFAPM for possible outcomes) shall be provided to the faculty member, Department Head, Dean and Provost. 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. Each of the included administrators may add written comments, and copies of these comments will be given to the faculty member, the

Tenure and Promotion committee, and each of the administrators. The final report filed with each of the above shall include any comments provided.

E. Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Progress towards tenure is separate from the annual review process. The goal of gauging progress towards tenure is a maturation of the candidate's progress in teaching, research and service. As such, the successful tenure candidate will have an overall record of superior or exceeds expectations, increased grant activity, funded or grants applied for, increased collaboration with internal and external persons/groups, publications that support the development of a research agenda or awarded research dissemination, teaching quality supported by Appendix A of the department code and service to the department, college and university.

Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Recommendation for promotion to professor requires demonstration that the faculty member has achieved recognition among both domestic and international leaders in the profession. This achievement is normally demonstrated by maturation in scholarship as well as continued professional development. Promotion to professor also requires a strong record of teaching/advising/mentoring and service. As such, the successful promotion to the rank of professor will have an overall record of superior or exceeds expectations, sustained grant activity, evidence of sustained collaboration with internal and external persons/groups, publications that support a research agenda or awarded research dissemination, teaching quality supported by Appendix A of the department code and service to the department, college, university, and national associations and/or agencies.

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

The table below describe the Department's view on the qualifications of CCF for professor (CCAF) ranks within the department.

INSTRUCTOR

Minimum Requirements

1. Bachelor's degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering, or related field
2. Minimum of five (5) years of experience in any area of construction and/or construction trades
3. Evidence of or verified potential for University-level teaching

Guidelines for Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor (CCAF)

Faculty shall provide evidence of teaching competence, scholarship, and service consistent with their stated effort distribution, and meet the following criteria:

1. PhD or terminal degree
2. Five (5) years or equivalent full-time* University level teaching experience.

- a. If appointment is research oriented, equivalent experience to be determined at time of hire
3. Participation in 20 or more hours of trainings for the improvement of teaching/course content since appointment at current rank
4. Consistent demonstration of exceeding expectations in annual evaluations

Assistant Professor (CCAF)

Minimum Requirements

1. PhD or Terminal Degree in related Construction Management fields **AND** Minimum of five (5) years construction and/or construction related industry experience
2. Minimum of five (5) years of teaching and/or training related activities
3. Evidence of or verified potential for university-level teaching
4. A demonstrated commitment to department service/outreach
5. A demonstrated commitment to scholarship

Guidelines for Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

Faculty shall provide evidence of teaching competence, scholarship, and service consistent with their stated effort distribution, and meet the following criteria:

1. PhD or terminal degree
2. Five (5) years or equivalent full-time* University level teaching experience
 1. If appointment is research oriented, equivalent experience to be determined at time of hire
3. Participation in 20 or more hours of trainings for the improvement of teaching/course content since appointment at current rank
4. Consistent demonstration of exceeding expectations in annual evaluations

Associate Professor (CCAF)

Minimum Requirements

1. PhD or Terminal Degree in related Construction Management fields **AND** Minimum of ten years construction and/or construction related industry experience
2. Minimum of five years of university-level teaching experience
3. Demonstrated superior and sustained performance in teaching that impacts student learning
4. A demonstrated commitment to department service/outreach
5. A demonstrated commitment to scholarship

Guidelines for Promotion from Associate Professor (CCAF) to Professor (CCAF)

1. Five (5) years of experience as Associate Professor (or equivalent)
2. Demonstrated national recognition in area of expertise
3. Development of effective pedagogical methodologies) and comprehensive evaluation of these innovations
4. Increased record of professional development
5. Demonstrated leadership in teaching
6. Continuous Service/Outreach/Engagement to communities and partners beyond the university that draws upon the professor's expertise
7. Appropriate continuous leadership in department service/outreach
8. Demonstrated scholarship and appropriate number of publications in peer reviewed journals
9. Consistent demonstration of exceeding expectations in annual evaluations

Professor (CCAF)

Minimum Requirements

1. Five (5) years of experience as Associate Professor (or equivalent)
2. Demonstrated national recognition in area of expertise
3. Demonstrated sustained excellence in teaching and teaching innovation (e.g. course/curriculum development, integration of service learning,
4. Development of effective pedagogical methodologies) and comprehensive evaluation of these innovations
5. Increased record of professional development
6. Demonstrated leadership in teaching
7. Service/Outreach/Engagement to communities and partners that draws upon the professor's expertise
8. A demonstrated leadership in service/outreach
9. A demonstrated leadership in scholarship

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

The table below describe the Department's view on the qualifications of CCF for instructor ranks within the department. It is noted that CCF that wish to transfer from the instructor track to the professor track may do so after consultation with the CM Department head and submission of a dossier for review and approval by the CM Review and Promotion Committee.

Instructor

Minimum Requirements

1. Bachelor's degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering, or related field
2. Minimum of five (5) years of experience in any area of construction and/or construction trades
3. Evidence of or verified potential for University-level teaching

Guidelines for Promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor

Faculty shall provide evidence of teaching competence, and service consistent with their stated effort distribution, and meet the following criteria:

1. Five (5) years or equivalent full-time* University level teaching experience.
2. Participation in 20 or more hours of trainings for the improvement of teaching/course content since appointment at current rank
3. Consistent demonstration of exceeding expectations in annual evaluations

Senior Instructor

Minimum Requirements

1. Meet at least one:
 1. Advanced degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering or related fields **AND** Minimum of five (5) years construction and/or construction related industry experience
 2. Bachelor's degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering or related fields **AND** Ten (10) or more years of management/senior level experience in the construction industry
2. Minimum of five (5) years of teaching and/or trainer
3. Evidence of or verified potential for University-level teaching

Guidelines for Promotion from Senior Instructor to Master Instructor

Faculty shall provide evidence of teaching competence and service consistent with their stated effort distribution, and meet the following criteria:

1. Five (5) years of experience as Senior Instructor (or equivalent)
2. Participation in 50 or more hours of trainings for the improvement of teaching/course content since appointment at current rank
3. Consistent demonstration of exceeding expectations in annual evaluations

Master Instructor

Minimum Requirements

1. Meet at least one:
 1. Advanced degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering or related fields **AND** Minimum of ten (10) years construction and/or construction related industry experience
 2. Bachelor's degree in Construction Management, Civil Engineering or related fields **AND** Fifteen (15) or more years of management/senior level experience in the construction industry
2. Minimum of five (5) years of University-level teaching experience
3. Demonstrated superior and sustained performance in teaching that positively impacts student learning

H. DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR FACULTY

All disciplinary action for Faculty shall be defined by AFAPM

I. GRIEVANCE PROCESSES FOR FACULTY

The Department believes that the best approach to grievances is prevention through communication. Faculty should deal directly with the Department Head to achieve satisfactory resolution of issues through appropriate communication. In the event that there is communication difficulty between the Department Head and faculty member, the Department may provide an advisory body of faculty for the purpose of attempting to arbitrate the concern through local communication. In the event that these measures do not satisfactorily resolve issues, faculty and departments are referred to AFAPM section K for general grievance procedures established at the University for specifics about the process and time limitation relevant to the grievance process.

J. Hiring Faculty

When a faculty search is authorized, the Department Head shall appoint a search committee. The Search Committee Chair must be a member of the Department and have completed the search chair training offered by the Office of Equal Opportunity.

In order for candidates to be considered for faculty positions, it will be necessary for them to submit, at minimum, a letter of application, complete curriculum vitae and three professional references. A deadline for receipt of applications will be established to be included in any position announcements/advertisements.

All materials submitted by applicants will be open for review by any faculty member, given confidentiality requests.

After a thorough evaluation of all applicants by the search committee, a list of finalists will be identified. 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. Finalists will present a campus seminar and meet with the Search Committee, other members of the Department, the Dean of CHHS, and other appropriate individuals.

A faculty 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.

K. Mentoring

It is the policy of the department to provide all untenured and/or new faculty members with one or more peer mentor(s). The role of the mentor is to provide insight into the working of the university, college, and department, including its history, expectations and general knowledge about the institution. This knowledge can aid the individual in the successful and efficient performance of their research, teaching, and outreach duties, and also enhance their potential

to obtain tenure and/or rank advancement. It is recognized that individuals will wish to identify their mentor(s); however, to initiate the mentoring process, the department head will assign mentors to the new faculty member at the time the person arrives on campus. In many instances, the mentors will have been members of the Search Committee. After a period of 6-12 months, the new faculty member is encouraged to identify individuals who may be better suited to their mentoring needs, if needed, and will be responsible for informing the Department Head of the change(s). All untenured assistant and associate professors will have identified mentors. It is the expectation that the mentor will schedule meetings at least twice per semester to address questions, facilitate awareness of university and department policies and procedures, etc. Mentoring of new faculty members is an important responsibility and as such will be included as a portion of work effort in the annual performance evaluation of the mentor.

L. Leave Guidelines

It is the responsibility of the Department Head to authorize absences of faculty members (T/TT/CCF) for legitimate purposes as specified in section F of AFAPM. One important criterion for evaluating and approving leave requests is the extent to which the proposed leave activities support the department needs and priorities. For this reason, faculty members shall discuss with the Department Head approximately six months prior to filing the application for proposed sabbatical leave activities, Fulbright programs, and other absences for legitimate purposes. Note that there are times a Department Head may find it necessary, when balancing department needs with the faculty member's interests, to decline approval.

While sabbatical leaves should not be construed as a mandatory right of any faculty member in the department, such leaves can be considered as a legitimate expectation, providing that the faculty member satisfies the criteria described in this document. Sabbatical leaves are intended to benefit department, the College and the University by increasing the skill level, experience level and/or scholarship of the participating faculty member. Although limitations of resources within the College and University may restrict the actual number of leaves that can be granted in any given year, faculty members are encouraged to consider applying for leave when eligible, and to use such leaves as a means of maintaining and/or enhancing their professional competence. Faculty submitting applications for sabbatical leave must comply with the guidelines and policies outlined in AFAPM Section F.3.4 and CHHS Code Section IX.

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

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

Each administrative professional staff member 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 staff member for the current year. The staff member completes a self-evaluation report for the previous fiscal year to the Department Head or their supervisor by February 15th in advance of the annual review by the Department Head or their supervisor during the months of February and March. By January 1st, the Department Head or supervisor will provide the link where the form can be found. The Department Head or supervisor shall hold a formal annual conference with each individual as part of the evaluation, during which the employee shall be fully advised concerning the methods and criteria used in the evaluation and of the results of the evaluation. The evaluation shall be in writing and shall be signed by the immediate supervisor and the employee, who thereby indicates receipt of the evaluation. A copy shall be provided to the employee.

State classified staff will follow the Performance Management Program as detailed on the CSU Human Resources website. The performance cycle is April 1 to March 31; performance plans are developed in April each year, mid-year review in October, and the final evaluation is conducted in April.

B. Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals

Research Professionals

Procedures for appointment of research professional shall be in accordance to section D.5.3 of AFAPM

Academic Success Coordinators and Advisors

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

Other Administrative Professionals not Delineated Above

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

C. Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff

Procedures for promotion of state classified staff shall be in accordance to University policy Policy ID#: 3-6004-028 and University Code (HR Manual)

D. Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

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

E. Grievance Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

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

Section 6: Student Policies and Procedures

A. Student Employees

All rights and responsibilities of student employees are defined by University Code (Colorado State University HR Manual)

B. Graduate Student Evaluation

Evaluation of Graduate students is defined by the CSU Graduate Bulletin

C. Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants

All rights and responsibilities of undergraduate teaching and research assistants are defined by the University Code (Colorado State University HR Manual)

D. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants

All rights and responsibilities for graduate teaching and research assistants are defined by the Colorado State University HR Manual and CSU Graduate Bulletin

E. Student Grade Appeal

The Construction Management Appeals Committee will consider requests from students who wish to appeal any processes, standards, and/or requirements within the Department of Construction Management. The Appeals Committee will not review appeals for grade changes.

Students may appeal a grade after first discussing the situation with the instructor. In the event that the instructor feels a grade change is warranted, the instructor will initiate a grade change. If the discussion doesn't resolve the situation, the student may submit a written request for a Grade Appeal, explaining why they are appealing the grade, to the Department Head. Instructions and deadlines for that request are available in the General Catalog (under "Grading") and the AFAPM Section I.7. Selection of the members of the grade appeals committee will be made in consultation between the Department Head and Chair of the CM Appeals Committee.

Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code

A. REVIEW OF THE UNIT CODE

Department Code Review shall occur no less than every 5 years. Amendments to the department code in its entirety require approval by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the faculty members of the department eligible to vote. Before a faculty approval vote occurs, a formal vote involving Department staff members shall be sought on any revisions to the Department Code pertaining to sections related to: Mission, Vision, and Values (numbered as Section 1 as of October 2021), Unit Administration, Operations, and Organizations (numbered as Section 2 as of October 2021), Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff Administrative Policies and Procedures (numbered as Section 5 as of October 2021), Procedures for Changing Unit Code (numbered as Section 7 as of October 2021), Student Grade Appeal section (numbered as Section 6e as of October 2021) and the Student Appeal Process – Departmental Procedures, Requirements in the code appendix (labeled as Appendix D as of October 2021). A copy of the amended code shall be provided to the dean of the college and the Provost, and, upon acceptance (as specified in AFAPM section C.2.4.3) of the amendments, the department shall begin to operate in accordance with its amended code.

B. RELATIONSHIPS TO THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL

In the event that inconsistencies occur between the Department of Construction Management's policies and procedures and the AFAPM, the AFAPM shall take precedence.

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

1.0 Background

Like our peer institutions, the Department of Construction Management at Colorado State University strives for excellence from its faculty and staff. The department recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for quality in education, scholarship, and service. This document is meant to aid faculty and staff in the department in terms of understanding expectations as well as stakeholders external to the department in understanding the performance of our faculty and staff.

The intent of the following is not to provide strict criteria, but rather to provide guidelines that can provide objective incentives for the tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as a framework for appropriate and objective performance evaluations.

2.0 Faculty

Faculty members are responsible for teaching and advising; research and scholarly activity; service; and service duties. See the AFAPM for a complete description of the responsibilities of academic faculty members regarding their role as professors and their teaching, classroom, research, and service and outreach activities.

Tenure-track faculty (professor, associate professor, assistant professor) are bound by the departmental, college and University requirements for performance of duties and promotion and tenure.

Faculty performance is primarily evaluated on the quality and quantity of one's productivity in the areas of teaching, research, and outreach or service compared to the effort allocation and goals established during the year of review. The percentage of time devoted (effort allocation) to each of these three activities is determined at the time the faculty member is hired and can be modified by mutual consent in subsequent annual performance evaluations. In general, tenure-track and tenured Construction Management faculty members distribute their time according to the following ranges: teaching/advising/mentoring, 50% to 60%; research and scholarly activity, 25% to 35%; service and/or outreach, 10% to 15%. The combined effort of teaching and research should generally represent 85% -90% of effort for tenure-track and tenured faculty, although specific allocations of effort are established through agreement between the department head and the faculty member.

For a complete description of faculty responsibilities, see Section E.5 of the AFAPM. Brief descriptions of major faculty responsibilities are provided below.

2.1 Teaching Effectiveness/Advising/Mentoring

Teaching effectiveness is an important consideration in the review and promotion process. However, no specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to 1) guide faculty in the evidence gathering or the documentation process needed to support the examples of types of evidence listed below, or 2) guide the T&P Committee in making these categorical evaluations.

The faculty member should focus on the teaching portfolio model (see the TILT website) of building a strong case, over time, using multiple evidence indicators to show they view teaching

effectiveness as continual improvement process. Appendix C gives examples of tools developed by The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT), they include: 2.0 – Evidence Options for Department to Evaluate Teaching effectiveness, 3.0 – Department process for Developing and Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Colorado State University, 4.0 – Strengths and Limitations of Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness, 5.0 – Example of a Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review, and 5.1 – Blank Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review Form. The CSU Faculty Manual states, “Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information.” TILT recommends triangulation of evidence (feedback from STUDENTS, OTHERS and Self-reflection) as no single metric provides a complete picture of teaching effectiveness (Appendix D, 2.0.)

A teaching portfolio is also part of the faculty member’s dossier for promotion and reviewed by internal and external reviewers. Faculty member evaluation considers both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating needed for the performance review outcome they desire. In addition, the faculty member needs to consider yearly performance reviews as a cumulative process that impacts advancement in rank and to plan accordingly. To provide guidance to the faculty member in development of their teaching portfolio, the teaching effectiveness assessment will follow a two-step process, 2.1A teaching effectiveness, and 2.1B teaching/advising/mentoring.

2.1A Teaching Effectiveness

The first step is a peer review of the faculty member provided teaching effectiveness evidence and supporting documentation during the annual committee review process. Table 1A provides many examples of teaching effectiveness evidence (classroom teaching performance and/or curriculum development, accreditation, and instructional innovation). However, if the faculty member has additional evidence not listed, they are encouraged to include it for consideration by the committee and department head. The faculty member is responsible for choosing the appropriate number of criteria they feel is defensible to achieve the assessment rating they desire (teaching effectiveness from the appropriate committee and overall rating by the department head). The faculty member and committee will review the teaching portfolio and discuss its strengths and weaknesses. The appropriate committee (TP/RP) will then provide the faculty member and the department head with a written assessment of each faculty members teaching effectiveness based on the evidence they provide, a review of the teaching portfolio, and a conversation between the appropriate committee (TP/RP) and the faculty member. This ranking will not bind the department head in the annual assessment of the overall employee performance in teaching effectiveness/advising/mentoring2.1B, but will help guide the faculty member in improving their teaching portfolio. The assessment of the teaching portfolio strengths and weaknesses will use the following criteria:

- **Superior** = the faculty chosen criteria adequately support a very high level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of a majority of the chosen criteria.

- **Exceeds Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria adequately support a high level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of a majority of the chosen criteria.
- **Meets Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria supports an adequate level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of the chosen criteria.
- **Below Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria does not support an adequate level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member needs to add/improve the chosen criteria to advance the portfolio to a higher level.
- **Unsatisfactory** = after review of the teaching portfolio provided and discussion with the faculty member the committee believes the faculty chosen criteria does not meet the intent of effective teaching practices.

Table 1A. Examples of Teaching Evidence by Criteria

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Classroom Teaching Performance | <p>Assures syllabi comply with university and department requirements.</p> <p>Communicates course requirements and grading system clearly</p> <p>Demonstrates consistency among objectives, units of study, and assignments.</p> <p>Structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning.</p> <p>Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students.</p> <p>Uses a variety of teaching methods/media to respond to varied learning styles.</p> <p>Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest; paces material well.</p> <p>Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level.</p> <p>Evaluates students fairly and appropriately.</p> <p>Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness</p> <p>Receives positive student evaluations.</p> <p>Receives positive evaluations from direct peer observation.</p> <p>Has received teaching awards, nominations, or other recognition of teaching excellence.</p> <p>Interacts with students (including those with accommodations) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn.</p> <p>Involves students in critical thinking about their own learning.</p> <p>Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback.</p> <p>Is sensitive to students' needs and responds to such needs appropriately.</p> <p>Synthesizes knowledge and skills of course content effectively.</p> <p>Integrates theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom.</p> <p>Consistently demonstrates a commitment to and models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness.</p> <p>Is regularly on time and well prepared for class.</p> <p>Makes themselves available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails.</p> |
| | Examples related to Program Accreditation |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Accreditation | Continually works on ACCE SLO achievement for accreditation evidenced by: Providing the required SLO assessment information to the department and continuously update how the SLO target number will be achieved by providing a quality improvement plan meeting ACCE requirements. Able to demonstrate knowledge gained by students during the course. Able to demonstrate assignments adequately cover the intended content based on the course description, syllabus, and applicable Student Learning Outcomes, Etc. |
| | Examples related to Curriculum and Innovation |
| Curriculum Development and Instructional Innovation | Develops content and assignments of sufficient depth and breadth. Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area. Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction. Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, theories, methods, and techniques in related areas. Organizes course materials effectively (e.g., assignment guidelines, rubrics, exams, online platform, etc.). Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art tools. Uses flipped classrooms, high impact learning, service learning or other cutting-edge pedagogies. Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development. Demonstrates evidence of innovation that is influenced by both internal and external sources of evidence-based teaching practices. Participates in TILT Course Redesign. Receives instructional design grant. |

The second step in the process is the evaluation of the overall teaching effectiveness/advising/mentoring by the department head outlined in section 2.1B.

2.1B. Teaching/Advising/Mentoring

The Department Head will determine the overall performance and expectations of each faculty member based on the supporting evidence they choose to provide. At least one annual peer teaching review is required for all faculty and the Department Head will consider the evidence from the peer teaching review. The five following categories provide a broad range of examples of criteria needed to achieve the desired evaluation level by the faculty member. Not all the listed criteria are required to attain the desired evaluation category. The department head will consider all the evidence presented, including the peer teaching review and the committee teaching effectiveness review, when assigning an annual assessment rating. The faculty member is responsible for reviewing the criteria in each assessment category and choosing what they feel is an appropriate amount support for their desired assessment rating. To this end, faculty should communicate with the department head as needed to understand their expectations.

Superior:

- Significant teaching awards or other recognition (national, college, university)
- Success in advising/mentoring graduate students as shown by significant numbers graduating, student research awards, student co-authored manuscripts, and positive comments about the student's mentor made to the Graduate Program Coordinator.
- Creative approaches to teaching and mentoring (development of significant new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching)
- Recognition by peers as an outstanding teacher who serves as a teaching mentor for other faculty members
- Clear evidence of significant steps taken to enhance teaching or advising
- Serve as a coach of a competition team at the regional or national level and/or positive comments about the team's coach made to the Competition Coordinator
- Significant advising of student clubs/chapters/organizations
- Outstanding teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

Exceeds Expectations:

- Exemplary teaching awards (department), nominations (national, college, university), or other recognition
- Success in advising/mentoring graduate students as shown by exemplary numbers graduating, student research awards, student co-authored manuscripts, and positive comments about the student's mentor made to the Graduate Program Coordinator
- Creative approaches to teaching and mentoring (development of exemplary new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching)
- Clear evidence of exemplary steps taken to enhance teaching or advising
- Active participation as a coach of a competition team
- Exemplary advising of student organizations
- Strong teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Nominated for teaching award
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

Meets Expectations:

- Advises an appropriate number of graduate students
- Serve as a coach of a competition team
- Good teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in most classes taught
- Evidence of attention to addressing constructive feedback from various sources
- Provides evidence of steps taken to improve courses and/or teaching
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

- Evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course materials to be current with industry standards and ACCE guidelines

Below Expectations:

- Lack of graduate students advising; tempered by the numbers of graduate students in the program and the number of faculty needing to advise them
- Very little effort in continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course materials to be current with industry standards and ACCE guidelines
- Unreasonable cancellation of classes
- Weak teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of weak teaching performance (e.g., some missed classes, documented student complaints, etc.)
- Poor performance evaluations with no or minimal attempt to address feedback

Unsatisfactory:

- Lack of interest or evidence in updating courses, materials, or improving teaching techniques
- Excessive cancellation of classes
- Consistently fails to acquire teaching evaluations or feedback
- Poor teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of poor teaching performance (e.g., frequently missed classes or documented student complaints, unprofessional conduct in classes, etc.)

2.2 Research/Scholarship

Faculty members in Construction Management are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge to advance the construction industry and enhance construction education.

The following descriptions of specific performance categories are based on 35% effort distribution for research/scholarship. If a faculty member has an effort distribution greater than or less than 35% effort devoted to scholarship, the expectations will be adjusted accordingly 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 not adequately represent faculty research activity during a given evaluation period.

There is no attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, rather the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines. The descriptors offer insight to the criteria used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair in performance evaluations. Note that a significant number of, but not all, items in a particular category must be achieved to meet that category.

Superior Expectations

- More than 3 refereed publications with at least two manuscripts published in top quality peer-reviewed construction-related journals and submission of 1-2 additional manuscripts for publication.
- Acquisition of one multi-year, extramural research grant
- Submission of at least one additional external grant proposal as a PI or Co-PI
- Superior maintenance of a funded research program as noted by interim reports, final reports, sponsor presentations, significant dissemination of results

Exceeds Expectations

- 2-3 refereed publications with 1-2 manuscripts published in top quality peer reviewed construction-related journals and submission of 1-2 additional manuscripts for publication.
- Submission of at least one external grant proposal as a PI or Co-PI
- Exemplary maintenance of a funded research program as noted by interim reports, final reports, sponsor presentations, exemplary dissemination of results

Meets Expectations

- 1-2 refereed publications in top quality peer reviewed and submission of at least one additional manuscript for publication
- Submission of at least one external grant proposal as a PI or Co-PI
- Evidence of self-initiated research

Below Expectations

- No manuscripts submitted for publication or submission of manuscripts fails to result in publications
- No attempts to secure external funding
- Little evidence of self-initiated research

Unsatisfactory

- Despite the percent effort allocated to research and scholarly work, the faculty member exhibits no effort to create a plan to engage in research and scholarly work

2.3 Service/Outreach

Service is a critical component of construction education. Faculty members in Construction Management are expected to provide service to the university, the community, and the construction industry. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service as an advisor to student organizations and mentoring will be recognized as evidence of service to the Department.

All faculty are expected to work for the common good of the Department, the College, and the University. Teamwork is critical for success on the job, and faculty must be able to maintain relationships with students, co-workers, and other constituents that are based on professionalism and mutual respect.

The following descriptions of specific performance categories are based on 10-15% effort distribution for service/outreach. If a faculty member has an effort distribution greater than or less than 10-15% effort devoted to service, the expectations will be adjusted accordingly based on an understanding reached by the department head and the faculty member. There is no attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, rather the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines. The descriptors offer insight to the criteria used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair in performance evaluations. Note that a significant number of, but not all, items in a particular category must be achieved to meet that category.

Superior Expectations

- Member of a journal editorial board
- Holds an office in a national professional organization
- Significant service as a reviewer or editor for research journals and/or proceedings
- Provides significant leadership on department, college, or university committees
- Serves on significant grant review panels
- Significant mentoring of colleagues inside and/or outside the department
- Significant engagement of members of the construction industry

Exceeds Expectations

- Provides exemplary leadership on department, college, or university committees
- Exemplary service as a reviewer for research journals and/or proceedings
- Serves on exemplary grant review panels
- Exemplary mentoring of colleagues inside and/or outside the department
- Exemplary engagement of members of the construction industry

Meets Expectations

- Serve as a reviewer for research journals and/or proceedings
- Serves on department, college, and university committees
- Active participation in department meetings and events
- Provides outreach to lay audiences on topics within area of expertise
- Attends at least one professional organization meeting per year

Below Expectations

- Fails to meet at least 2 of the criteria identified in “meets expectations”

Unsatisfactory

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

2.4 Administrative Responsibilities

Some faculty members within Construction Management will have administrative responsibilities that require a significant identifiable percent effort beyond teaching, research, and service. 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 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 each individual and the department head.

Appendix B: Examples of Performance Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor and Professor Ranks.

1.0 Background

Like our peer institutions, the Department of Construction Management at Colorado State University strives for excellence from its faculty and staff. The department recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for quality in education, scholarship, and service. This document is meant to aid faculty and staff in the department in terms of understanding expectations as well as stakeholders external to the department in understanding the performance of our faculty and staff.

The intent of the following is not to provide strict criteria, but rather to provide guidelines that can provide objective incentives for the contract and continuing faculty (CCF) as well as a framework for appropriate and objective performance evaluations.

2.0 Faculty

Faculty members are responsible for teaching and advising; service; and administrative duties. See the AFAPM for a complete description of the responsibilities of academic faculty members regarding their role as professors and their teaching, classroom, and service and outreach activities.

CCF (are bound by the Departmental, College and University requirements for performance of duties.

Faculty performance is primarily evaluated on the quality and quantity of one's productivity in the areas of teaching, and outreach or service. The percentage of time devoted to each of these activities is determined at the time the faculty member is hired and can be modified by mutual consent in subsequent annual performance evaluations. In general, CCF Construction Management faculty members distribute their time according to the following ranges: teaching/advising/mentoring, 80% to 95%; service and/or outreach, 5% to 20%; scholarship, 10% to 20% or as negotiated (for Professor Track).

For a complete description of faculty responsibilities, see Section E.5 of the AFAPM. Brief descriptions of major faculty responsibilities are provided below.

2.1 Teaching Effectiveness/Advising/Mentoring

Teaching effectiveness is an important consideration in the review and promotion process. However, no specific quantitative criteria or formulae exist to 1) guide faculty members in the evidence gathering or the documentation process needed to support the examples of types of evidence listed below, or 2) guide the RP Committee in making these categorical evaluations.

The faculty member should focus on the teaching portfolio model (see the TILT website) of building a strong case, over time, using multiple evidence indicators to show they view teaching effectiveness as continual improvement process. Appendix D gives examples of tools developed by The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT), they include: 2.0 – Evidence Options for Department to Evaluate Teaching effectiveness, 3.0 – Department process for Developing and Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Colorado State University, 4.0 – Strengths and Limitations of Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness, 5.0 – Example of Teaching

Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review, and 5.1 – Blank Form of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review. The CSU Faculty Manual states, “Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information.” TILT recommends triangulation of evidence (feedback from STUDENTS, OTHERS and Self-reflection) as no single metric provides a complete picture of teaching effectiveness (Appendix D, 2.0).

A teaching portfolio is also part of the faculty member’s dossier for promotion and reviewed by internal and external reviewers. Faculty member evaluation considers both workload distribution and the quality of the evidence they provide. Faculty members do not need to provide all evidence listed here, but need to provide sufficient evidence to obtain the rating needed for the performance review outcome they desire. In addition, the faculty member needs to consider yearly performance reviews as a cumulative process that impacts advancement in rank and to plan accordingly. To provide guidance to the faculty member in development of their teaching portfolio, the teaching effectiveness assessment will follow a two-step process, 2.1A teaching effectiveness, and 2.1B teaching/advising/mentoring.

2.1A Teaching Effectiveness

The first step is a peer review of the faculty member provided teaching effectiveness evidence and supporting documentation during the annual committee review process. Table 1A provides many examples of teaching effectiveness evidence (classroom teaching performance and/or curriculum development, accreditation, and instructional innovation). However, if the faculty member has additional evidence not listed, they are encouraged to include it for consideration by the committee and department head. The faculty member is responsible for choosing the appropriate amount of criteria they feel is defensible to achieve the assessment rating they desire (teaching effectiveness from the appropriate committee and overall rating by the department head). The faculty member and committee will review the teaching portfolio and discuss its strengths and weaknesses. The appropriate committee (TP/RP) will then provide the faculty member and the department head with a written assessment of each faculty members teaching effectiveness based on the evidence they provide, a review of the teaching portfolio, and a conversation between the appropriate committee (TP/RP) and the faculty member. This ranking will not bind the department head in the annual assessment of the overall employee performance in teaching effectiveness/advising/mentoring 2.1B, but will help guide the faculty member in improving their teaching portfolio. The assessment of the teaching portfolio strengths and weaknesses will use the following criteria:

- **Superior** = the faculty chosen criteria adequately support a very high level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of a majority of the chosen criteria.
- **Exceeds Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria adequately support a high level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of a majority of the chosen criteria.

- **Meets Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria supports an adequate level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member meets the intent of the chosen criteria.
- **Below Expectations** = the faculty chosen criteria does not support an adequate level of teaching effectiveness. After a review and discussion of the teaching portfolio, the committee believes the faculty member needs to add/improve the chosen criteria to advance the portfolio to a higher level.
- **Unsatisfactory** = after review of the teaching portfolio provided and discussion with the faculty member the committee believes the faculty chosen criteria does not meet the intent of effective teaching practices.

Table 1B. Examples of Teaching Evidence by Criteria

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Classroom Teaching Performance | <p>Assures syllabi comply with university and department requirements.</p> <p>Communicates course requirements and grading system clearly</p> <p>Demonstrates consistency among objectives, units of study, and assignments.</p> <p>Structures course sessions in ways that are conducive to learning.</p> <p>Presents concepts with clarity, and in a manner readily understood by students.</p> <p>Uses a variety of teaching methods/media to respond to varied learning styles.</p> <p>Uses an engaging instructional style that stimulates interest; paces material well.</p> <p>Maintains rigor, teaching at the appropriate level.</p> <p>Evaluates students fairly and appropriately.</p> <p>Regularly seeks feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness</p> <p>Receives positive student evaluations.</p> <p>Receives positive evaluations from direct peer observation.</p> <p>Has received teaching awards, nominations, or other recognition of teaching excellence.</p> <p>Interacts with students (including those with accommodations) in a manner that is educationally appropriate and motivates students to learn.</p> <p>Involves students in critical thinking about their own learning.</p> <p>Provides students with prompt, detailed, and constructive feedback.</p> <p>Is sensitive to students' needs and responds to such needs appropriately.</p> <p>Synthesizes knowledge and skills of course content effectively.</p> <p>Integrates theory with practice and draws on this capacity in the classroom.</p> <p>Consistently demonstrates a commitment to and models a high level of respect and appreciation for diversity and inclusiveness.</p> <p>Is regularly on time and well prepared for class.</p> <p>Makes themselves available to students outside class as evidenced by keeping posted office hours and providing timely responses to e-mails.</p> |

| Criteria | Examples of Types of Evidence |
|---|---|
| Accreditation | Continually works on ACCE SLO achievement for accreditation evidenced by: Providing the required SLO assessment information to the department and continuously update how the SLO target number will be achieved by providing a quality improvement plan meeting ACCE requirements. Able to demonstrate knowledge gained by students during the course. Able to demonstrate assignments adequately cover the intended content based on the course description, syllabus, and applicable Student Learning Outcomes, Etc. |
| Curriculum Development and Instructional Innovation | Develops content and assignments of sufficient depth and breadth. Maintains up-to-date knowledge in content area. Reflects evidence-based practices in syllabi and course instruction. Continuously updates course content, readings, and media to reflect new issues, theories, methods, and techniques in related areas. Organizes course materials effectively (e.g., assignment guidelines, rubrics, exams, online platform, etc.). Develops and utilizes technology in teaching, including course management software, websites, and other state-of-the art tools. Uses flipped classrooms, high impact learning, service learning or other cutting-edge pedagogies. Provides evidence of significant contributions to major curriculum development. Demonstrates evidence of innovation that is influenced by both internal and external sources of evidence-based teaching practices. Participates in TILT Course Redesign. Receives instructional design grant. |

The second step in the process is the evaluation of the overall teaching effectiveness/advising/mentoring by the department head outlined in section 2.1B.

2.1B. Teaching/Advising/Mentoring

The Department Head will determine the overall performance and expectations of each faculty based on the supporting evidence they choose to provide. At least one annual peer teaching review is required for all faculty and the Department Head will consider the evidence from the peer teaching review. The five following categories provide a broad range of examples of criteria needed to achieve the desired evaluation level by the faculty member. Not all the listed criteria are required to attain the desired evaluation category. The department head will consider all the evidence presented, including the peer teaching review and the committee teaching effectiveness review, when assigning an annual assessment rating. The faculty member is responsible for reviewing the criteria in each assessment category and choosing what they feel is an appropriate amount support for their desired assessment rating. To this end, faculty should communicate with the department head as needed to understand their expectations.

Superior:

- Significant teaching awards or other recognition (national, college, university)
- If a continuing contract faculty is on the professor track, success in advising/mentoring graduate students as shown by significant numbers

graduating, student research awards, student co-authored manuscripts, and positive comments about the student's mentor made to the Graduate Program Coordinator.

- Creative approaches to teaching and mentoring (development of significant new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching)
- Recognition by peers as an outstanding teacher who serves as a teaching mentor for other faculty members
- Clear evidence of significant steps taken to enhance teaching or advising
- Serve as a coach of a competition team at the regional or national level and/or positive
- comments about the team's coach made to the Competition Coordinator
- Significant advising of student clubs/chapters/organizations
- Outstanding teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

Exceeds Expectations:

- Exemplary teaching awards (department), nominations (national, college, university), or other recognition
- If a continuing contract faculty is on the professor track, success in advising/mentoring graduate students as shown by exemplary numbers graduating, student research awards, student co-authored manuscripts, and positive comments about the student's mentor made to the Graduate Program Coordinator
- Creative approaches to teaching and mentoring (development of exemplary new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching)
- Clear evidence of exemplary steps taken to enhance teaching or advising
- Active participation as a coach of a competition team
- Exemplary advising of student organizations
- Strong teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Nominated for teaching award
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

Meets Expectations:

- If a continuing contract faculty is on the professor track, advise an appropriate number of graduate students reflective of their scholarship expectations.
- Serve as a coach of a competition team
- Good teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in most classes taught
- Evidence of attention to addressing constructive feedback from various sources
- Provides evidence of steps taken to improve courses and/or teaching
- Evidence of continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO

- Evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course materials to be current with industry standards and ACCE guidelines¹

Below Expectations:

- If a continuing contract faculty is on the professor track, lack of graduate students advising reflective of their expected scholarship activity ; tempered by the numbers of graduate students in the program and the number of faculty needing to advise them
- Very little effort in continually providing ACCE accreditation materials to the department for each course taught with an attached SLO
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course materials to be current with industry standards and ACCE guidelines
- Unreasonable cancellation of classes
- Weak teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of weak teaching performance (e.g., some missed classes, documented student complaints, etc.)
- Poor performance evaluations with no or minimal attempt to address feedback

Unsatisfactory:

- Lack of interest or evidence in updating courses, materials, or improving teaching techniques
- Excessive cancellation of classes
- Consistently fails to acquire teaching evaluations or feedback
- Poor teaching evaluations provided by peers, TILT, or other expert body in all classes taught
- Evidence of poor teaching performance (e.g., frequently missed classes or documented student complaints, unprofessional conduct in classes, etc.)

2.2 Service/Outreach

Some faculty members within Construction Management will have service and outreach responsibilities that require a significant identifiable percent effort beyond teaching. These responsibilities must be considered in assigning the respective teaching effort distributions for the CCF, and also in the evaluations of their performance. CCF may receive a reduction in teaching effort based on service and outreach responsibilities negotiated with the Department Head. At the time of assignment, specific performance goals will be established jointly by each individual and the Department Head.

2.3 Awards and Recognition

A faculty member may submit any evidence of additional awards and recognition in line with mission of the department, college, or university.

2.4 Scholarship

A faculty member may submit evidence of scholarship in line with their assigned requirements. It can be related to the scholarship of teaching, in which data are collected and outcomes

presented in conference or publications as noted in promotion criteria. This would not be expected within the Instructor Tracks.

Appendix C: The Institute for Learning and Teaching Resources on Teaching Effectiveness

The information in this appendix may change from time to time as The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT) refines or develops new processes. As such, this section of the department code may change to include the most current resources for teaching effectiveness without a vote as the contents are derived from a source external to the department. Any TILT changes to Teaching Effectiveness that impact the department annual review/assessment process will require both a discussion and vote of the eligible department members.

1.0 Background

Colorado State University, like its peer institutions, strives for excellence from its faculty and staff in all areas. To this end there is a university wide effort to concentrate on teaching effectiveness. The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT) has developed, and will continue to develop, materials and processes focusing on Teaching Effectiveness. This appendix provides several examples of tools that faculty can use to build their teaching portfolio and teaching effectiveness documentation for use in the annual evaluation and promotion processes.

The information consists of TILT resources that can be used by faculty as resources/guidelines that can provide objective frameworks for teaching effectiveness documentation used in the annual performance evaluations.

Faculty should work with the CM Department Head and the Chairperson of their evaluation committee in planning and preparing their teaching effectiveness plan for the calendar year. In addition, they should periodically review the [TILT website](#) to ensure that they have the most recent material relating to teaching effectiveness to use in their efforts to reach and maintain a high level of teaching effectiveness.

2.0 Evidence Options for Departments to Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness.

The CSU Faculty Manual states, "Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information." TILT recommends triangulation of evidence (feedback from STUDENTS, OTHERS and Self-reflection) as no single metric provides a complete picture of teaching effectiveness. Consider the following options to meet individual department needs. More information about these tools can be found on links provided below and on the Strengths-Limitations of Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness document on the [TILT website](#).

Triangulation of Evidence

| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>SELF: Teaching Practices Inventory (TPI)¹</p> <p>STUDENT: CSU Course Survey questions that align with teaching goal³</p> <p>OTHER: COPUS²</p> | <p>SELF: Teaching Practices Inventory (TPI)¹</p> <p>OTHER: TILT peer observation form that aligns with teaching goal⁴</p> <p>STUDENT: Course improvements based on CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework/ student data⁵</p> | <p>STUDENT: Course improvements based on CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework/ student data⁵</p> <p>OTHER: TILT peer observation form that aligns with teaching goal⁴</p> <p>STUDENT: CSU Course Survey questions that align with teaching goal³</p> <p>OR Course improvements/student data⁵</p> | <p>STUDENT: Course improvements based on CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework/ student data⁵</p> <p>SELF: CDHE Inclusive Practices inventory⁶</p> <p>STUDENT: CSU Course Survey questions that align with teaching goal³</p> | <p>Choose any combination of three forms of evidence that fit department needs</p> |

¹[Teaching Practices Inventory \(TPI\) \(TPI for Natural and Social Sciences\)](#) - a self-reported inventory that characterizes teaching practices utilized in a lecture class, it's focus on evidenced-based practices. Can be scored (0 - 60) and aligned with the [CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework](#) to aid in developing teaching skills and setting teaching goals. (lead measure)

²[COPUS](#) - a peer observation form aligned with the TPI (above). Used to record and characterize how teachers and students spend time in the classroom. Although originally designed for STEM courses, it has the capacity to be used in natural and social sciences as well. (lead measure)

³[CSU Course Survey](#) questions that align with teaching goal - the current CSU Course Survey aligns each question with a domain from the [CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework](#). Additional sets of questions to be developed. (lead measure)

⁴[TILT peer observation forms](#) - a set of observation forms that align with the [CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework](#) so that instructors and observers focus on one goal and teaching domain at a time. (lead measure)

⁵Course improvements/student data - a record of improvements made based on teaching goal. Improvements include (but are not limited to) evidence-based teaching practices specific to a [CSU Teaching Effectiveness Framework](#) domain and their observed and measured impact (data) on students. Data can include level of participation, quiz scores, test question scores, student feedback, etc. (lead and lag measure)

⁶[CDHE Inclusive Practices inventory](#) - a self-reflection inventory of inclusive teaching practices from the Colorado Department of Higher Education. (lead measure)

Source: The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT), Version 2.0. © 2020 Colorado State University 2020 BY-NC-ND 4.0

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

4.0 Strengths and Limitations of Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness

5.0 Example of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

The following is a TILT document with examples of evidence filled in as an example of what your narrative could be. Please review the appropriate department evaluation criteria in appendix B or C as applicable to your teaching classification.

Cover Sheet of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

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

Cover Sheet of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

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

Name: Professor X

Review Period: January – December 2019

Today's Date: 12/12/19

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

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

Teaching Effectiveness Domain: Instructional Strategies

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source: The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT), Version 2.0. © 2020 Colorado State University 2020 BY-NC-ND 4.0

5.1 Blank Form of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

Cover Sheet of Teaching Effectiveness Evidence for Annual Review

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

Name:

Review Period:

Today's Date:

Title of Course(s) Taught this Year:

[Teaching Goal](#)

[Teaching Effectiveness Framework Domain:](#)

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

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

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

Appendix D: STUDENT Appeal Process – Departmental Procedures, Requirements

The Construction Management Appeals Committee will consider requests from students who wish to appeal any processes, standards, and/or requirements within the Department of Construction Management. The Appeals Committee will not review appeals for grade changes. Grade Appeals are addressed in the department code, section 6.E

Students wishing to appeal departmental processes, standards and/or requirements must complete a formal application process. To apply, students must:

- Meet with their CM advisor to discuss the appeal process and obtain an application form.
- Turn in the completed application to the CM advisor. An application packet will be considered complete when it contains the following items:
 - Completed application form; students must specify whether or not they would like to be present at the Appeals Committee meeting. By signing this form they indicate their understanding that the Appeals Committee decision is final.
 - A one-page (or less) letter of appeal that states the student's request and explains the extenuating circumstances regarding the request. Students may submit this letter for review and revision suggestions to the advising staff prior to formal submission.
 - An updated CM check sheet and curriculum plan, which is available from the CM advising staff.
 - An updated unofficial transcript, available on RamWeb.
 - Any additional supporting documentation.
- The completed application packet must be submitted to the CM advising staff one week prior to the Appeals Committee meeting at which the request will be addressed.

Advising staff pre-appeal responsibilities:

- Review application packet for completeness.
- Attach any additional supporting documents including, but not limited to, curriculum plans, advising notes, and/or email correspondence.
- The advising staff representative member of the Appeals Committee will:
 - Provide the application packet to the committee prior to the meeting.
 - Attend the beginning of the meeting to answer any questions, provide additional documents, and make recommendations.

Construction Management Appeals Committee responsibilities:

- Review each appeal and make a decision regarding whether or not the appeal will be accepted or denied based on each student's individual extenuating circumstance(s).
- The Appeals Committee chair will make notes in the appropriate section of the application form detailing the reason(s) for acceptance or denial of the appeal.
- The committee chair will complete the "office" portion of the appeal form and obtain all necessary signatures from Appeals Committee members.

- The committee chair will turn appeal packets, complete with appropriate notes and signatures, back in to the CM advising office.
- Contact students via email regarding the outcome of their appeal and copy advising staff.

CM advising staff post-appeal responsibilities:

-
- File a copy of the appeals application materials in the student's file.
- Provide assistance to students who may need to adjust their academic plans based on the outcome of their appeal.