

THE CODE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE AND HUMAN NUTRITION

COLLEGE OF HEALTH & HUMAN SCIENCES

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

Section 1: Mission, Vision, and (Values)

A. Mission Statement	4
B. Vision Statement.....	4
C. Commitment to Principles of Community	4
D. (Values Statement).....	4
Options: (Educational Philosophy)	

Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization

A. Department Head/School Director	4
B. Unit Leadership	4
C. Unit Personnel	6
• Academic Faculty	
• Administration Professionals	
• State Classified Staff	
• (Student employees)	
• Voting Eligibility.....	7
D. Committees.....	7
E. Unit Meetings (faculty meetings) (attendance & voting).....	9
F. (Unit Organizational Chart and Operations Evaluation Process)	9

Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

A. Faculty Appointments and Ranks	9
(Refer to Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual for details)	
B. Workload Policy	9
• Service	
• Teaching	
• Research	
• Engagement	
• Summer Assignments (service and teaching)	
C. Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees	9
D. Procedures for Tenure	9
E. Procedures for Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty	9
F. Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty	10
G. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees	10

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

A. Annual Performance Evaluation.....	10
B. Comprehensive Midpoint Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty.....	11
C. Comprehensive Performance Reviews	11
1. Promotion Progress Reviews for TTF at the Associate Professor level and all CCF	

2.	5-year Post-Tenure Comprehensive Reviews	
•	Phase I	12
•	Phase II	12
D.	Annual Probationary Period Review of pre-Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty	13
E.	Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty	13
•	Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.....	13
•	Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....	17
F.	Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks	20
•	Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.....	20
•	Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....	23
G.	Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks	25
•	Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor	25
•	Promotion to the Rank of Master Instructor	26
H.	Disciplinary Action for Faculty	28
I.	Grievance Processes for Faculty	28
Section 5: Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff Administrative Policies & Procedures		
A.	Annual Performance Evaluation.....	28
B.	Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals	28
•	Research Professionals.....	29
•	Academic Success Coordinators and Advisors	29
•	Others	29
C.	Procedures for Promotion of State Classified Staff	29
D.	Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff	29
E.	Grievance Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff.....	29
Section 6: Student Policies and Procedures		
A.	Student Employees	29
B.	Graduate Student Evaluation	29
C.	Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants	29
D.	Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants.....	29
E.	Student Grade Appeal	29
Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code		
A.	Signatures Approving of the Unit Code	30
B.	Relationships to the <i>Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual</i>	30
Appendices		
Appendix A: Examples of Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.....		30
Appendix B: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks.....		34
Appendix C: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks.....		34

Appendix D: Annual Performance Standards.....34

Appendix E: Graduate Student Mentoring.....38

Appendix F: Graduate Student Grievance Process.....39

Appendix G: Colorado State Extension Specialists Roles and Responsibilities.....39

Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition

College of Health & Human Sciences

Colorado State University

Section 1: Mission, Vision, and Values

A. Mission Statement

Our mission is to promote health and well-being by providing innovative and impactful research, education and engagement in nutrition, food science and hospitality management.

B. Vision Statement

Our vision is to advance knowledge and promote health by engaging individuals, organizations and communities within sustainable food systems.

C. Commitment to Principles of Community – We are committed to CSU’s Principles of Community:

- *Inclusion* – We create and nurture inclusive environments and welcome, value and affirm all members of our community, including their various identities, skills, ideas, talents and contributions.
- *Integrity* – We are accountable for our actions and will act ethically and honestly in all our interactions.
- *Respect* – We honor the inherent dignity of all people within an environment where we are committed to freedom of expression, critical discourse, and the advancement of knowledge.
- *Service* – We are responsible, individually and collectively, to give our time, talents and resources to promote the well-being of each other and the development of our local, regional, and global communities.
- *Social Justice* – We have the right to be treated and the responsibility to treat others with fairness and equity, the duty to challenge prejudice, and to uphold the laws, policies and procedures that promote justice in all respects.

D. Core Values

Community, Compassion, Fairness, Fun, Integrity, Optimism, Respect, Responsibility

E. Educational Philosophy

The department is dedicated to balance and excellence in life, education, research, and engagement. We strive to provide an inclusive environment and envision learning as not only a lifelong pursuit but also a partnership with our students.

Section 2: Unit Administration, Operations, and Organization

A. Department Head

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

B. Unit Leadership –

- *Budgetary Policy*

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

- *Mentoring Policy*

1. It is the policy of the department to provide mentoring to tenure track assistant professors, tenured associate professors and CCF. Mentoring is a relationship in which a more experienced faculty member(s) acts as a guide, role model and advocate of a less experienced faculty member.
2. Tenure Track Assistant Professors: Upon hire, a new Assistant Professor will initially (first semester) be mentored by the chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee, the Department Head, and an assigned teaching mentor from the department. An orientation meeting will be scheduled within the first month of employment. This meeting will overview the expectations regarding research, teaching and service, using the annual evaluation form as a template. Following this meeting, the new faculty member will develop a 6-month plan that will be reviewed in a follow-up meeting. The new faculty member will be required to identify a mentoring team, made up of at least two faculty with expertise in teaching (this individual will likely be the assigned teaching mentor) and research. The research mentor shall be from within or outside the Department of FSHN and be approved by the chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee and Department Head. The mentoring team and faculty member will be encouraged to meet on a regular basis but at least once per year. The primary role of the mentoring team will be to assist the faculty member to be successful.
3. Associate Professors: During the first annual evaluation following tenure and promotion, the Department Head and Associate Professor will establish a mentoring plan. This plan may involve mentoring by the Department Head or development of a mentor or mentoring team. Ultimately, the approach chosen should meet the needs of each faculty member.
4. CCF: At appointment, the Department Head and chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee shall define the conditions and expectations for each new faculty member. The Department Head in consultation with the faculty member, the chair of the Tenure & Promotion Committee, and the Advisory Committee shall appoint a mentoring committee designed to meet the needs of the faculty member's appointment.
*Mentoring is an important responsibility and as such will be included as a portion of work effort in the annual evaluation of the mentor(s).

C. Unit Personnel

- Academic Faculty – Academic faculty are defined and maintain the same rights as defined by AFAPM section C.2.4.2
- Administrative Professionals – Administrative Professionals are defined and maintain the same rights as defined by AFAPM section D.1.2
- State Classified Staff – State Classified Staff are defined and maintain the same rights as defined by AFAPM

section D.10

- Student Employees – Student Employees are defined and maintain the same rights as defined by the Student Employee Handbook
 - Voting Eligibility - The academic faculty who may serve and vote in Department governance, except when specified otherwise in the code, are all tenure track and contract and continuing faculty (CCF) who have an appointment of at least 4.5 months ($\geq 50\%$ effort) in the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition
- D. Committees - No faculty member can be elected to more than two of the following departmental committees at the same time (Advisory Committee, Graduate Committee and Curriculum Committee). In the event an individual is elected to all three committees, the person will inform the Department Head of which committee they will not serve on, and the person with the next highest number of votes will replace them.

Advisory Committee

1. To advise the Department Head in administrative responsibilities there shall be a committee consisting of the Graduate Coordinator, Chair of Curriculum Committee, Extension outreach faculty representative, Coordinator of the Hospitality Management Program, faculty at-large representative, CCF (if not already represented), and the Department Head. The Department Head shall serve as Chair. The Department Head shall request, in times of their absence from the Department, a member of this committee to represent the Department. The Department Head shall select one person from among the committee members to serve as recorder.
2. Those members of the committee not defined by their roles shall be elected by the faculty from a list of eligible faculty using the Hare system. All faculty members with regular or special appointments and at least 50% effort shall be eligible for the at-large position; all faculty members with at least half-time appointment from Extension shall be eligible for the Extension representative position. The term of office for elected members shall be two years. Elections shall be completed by the Department by August 15th each year. Those elected will begin their responsibilities on August 16th.
3. The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for advising the Department Head on Department organization, the Department role in the college, university and community, staffing, facilities, development and budgetary matters in the areas of teaching, research and outreach. This committee shall also advise on any other matters which the Department Head, Advisory Committee members or eligible faculty members consider necessary or appropriate. The committee shall meet as often as deemed necessary by the Department Head but at least once a semester during the academic year. Relevant topic minutes will be added to the faculty meeting agenda. A vote can be called for by any member to record opinion on any matter under consideration. During the review of matters involving an individual Committee member, the committee member concerned will be excused from the meeting.
4. The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for the development and review of the Department Strategic Plan. The Committee shall consult with the faculty, students and Dean in preparing the strategic plan. The plan shall speak to resident instruction at the undergraduate and graduate level, research and graduate program, extension and public service. Copies of the current plan shall be made available to all members of the Department.

Graduate Committee

1. To advise the Department Head and Graduate Program Coordinator in administering the graduate program there shall be a Graduate Committee consisting of the Graduate Coordinator, four elected, eligible, tenure track or CCF faculty members who teach or mentor graduate students, one graduate student, the Graduate Program Administrator and the Department Head. The Graduate Program Administrator and graduate student shall serve on the committee in a non-voting capacity; all others shall be voting members. The Graduate Coordinator shall serve as Chair and the Department Head as co-chair. The Graduate Program

Administrator will serve as recorder.

2. The Graduate Coordinator shall be appointed for a three-year term by the Department Head in consultation with the Faculty. Reappointment is determined by the Department Head. The elected members of the committee shall be elected by all members of the eligible graduate faculty using the Hare System. One faculty member will be elected from the eligible nutrition science faculty, one from the eligible community nutrition faculty, and one from the eligible food science/safety faculty. The term of office will be two years. Members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. Elections shall be completed by the Department by August 15th with service to start August 16th. The department graduate students shall elect their representative each fall for a one-year term. All graduate students past their first year shall be eligible to serve and vote.
3. The Graduate Committee shall be responsible for advising the Department Head and Graduate Coordinator on matters concerning the departmental graduate program. The committee will meet as often as deemed necessary by the Graduate Advisor, but at least twice a semester. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members. A vote can be called for by any member to record opinion on any matter under consideration. Specific areas in which the Graduate Committee will advise the Department Head and Graduate Coordinator are:
 - Recruitment and selection of graduate students
 - Development of long-range goals for the graduate program consistent with the Department Strategic Plan
 - Development of recommendations to Department Head regarding graduate education, e.g., new courses, research facilities, courses in other departments and any other matters related to the graduate program
 - Review, when necessary, academic standing and grievances of graduate students.

Curriculum Committee

1. The Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for matters relating to the undergraduate curriculum and new graduate courses. The chair shall be the representative to the College Curriculum Committee. The committee shall consist of seven members:
 - A faculty representative of Nutrition and Food Science
 - A faculty representative of Hospitality Management
 - A faculty representative of Food Science/Safety or Fermentation Science
 - A faculty member elected at-large
 - An undergraduate program administrative assistant (non-voting)
 - An Academic Success Coordinator
2. Those members of the committee not defined by their roles (elected areas of representation) shall be elected by the faculty from a list of eligible faculty using the Hare system. All faculty members with at least 50% effort shall be eligible for the at-large position; all faculty who teach in the Fermentation Science & Technology/Food Safety Program shall be eligible for the Food Science position. All faculty in the Hospitality Management Program shall be eligible for the Hospitality Management position. All faculty of the Nutrition and Food Science Program shall be eligible for the Nutrition and Food Science position. The term of office for elected members shall be two years. Members may serve an unlimited number of terms but no more than two terms consecutively. Elections shall be completed by the Department by August 15th each year. Those elected will take office on August 16th.
3. Graduate courses must be submitted to the Graduate Committee for evaluation prior to being submitted to the Curriculum Management System. The Chair will call the first meeting of the year in early September. Minutes of the meetings will be made available to all faculty members.

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

E. Unit Meetings

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

Section 3: Faculty Administrative Policies and Procedures

A. Faculty appointments and Ranks

Refer to Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual

- All tenure track and CCF faculty positions will require an external search involving a search committee

B. Workload Policy

Workload distributions are determined by the individual job descriptions. Adjustments in workload distribution are made as part of the annual review process.

- **Service** - All FSHN faculty members are expected to provide service to the university, the community, and their respective professions. Most will devote no more than 10-15% of their efforts to service/outreach. However, because Extension appointments in the department carry significant outreach components, some faculty members will have more than 15% of their effort devoted to this category.
- **Teaching** - The Food Science & Human Nutrition Department values excellence in teaching and mentoring. All faculty members are expected to be good teachers who are well organized, creative, regularly update their course materials, and who demonstrate a genuine desire to facilitate student learning. While the percent effort devoted to teaching/advising will vary among the faculty, all assistant, associate, and full professors whose salaries are provided all or in part by resident instruction funding, are expected to provide RI instruction and provide mentoring for students based on their assigned workload distribution as determined by the individual faculty member and the department head. Extension faculty members will likely have little if any responsibility for undergraduate or graduate courses, but because quality teaching is an important part of their job descriptions, they also must provide evidence of their teaching effectiveness.
- **Research** – All tenure-track faculty and research CCF faculty are expected to participate in research. Percent effort devoted to research will vary among the faculty and be determined as part of initial contract discussions and/or during the annual review process.
- **Engagement** – All FSHN faculty members are expected to participate in engagement. Workload distribution will be determined as part of their service activities.
- **Summer Assignments (service and teaching)** – Summer assignments will be determined during the spring semester based on department needs.

- C. Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees – Candidates for promotion to full professor will be reviewed by all current professors in the department. Candidates for promotion to associate professor and tenure will be reviewed by all tenured associate and full professors. All CCF faculty promotions will be reviewed by all faculty with a rank above the applicant. The formation of the promotion and tenure committee is the responsibility of the department head.

D. Procedures for Tenure

The Academic Faculty Tenure Policy is set forth in the AF/AP Staff Manual and shall be used as a guide on all tenure matters. Department guidelines for tenure and promotion are found in the Appendices. 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 (the tenure and promotion committee) will be provided with appropriate materials provided by the tenure applicant and external reviewers, which will serve as the basis for evaluating the individual's qualifications for tenure. The applicant's qualifications will be discussed by the T&P Committee and a formal written vote taken on granting tenure. The Department Head has the option of approving or not approving this recommendation. The results of the vote, the tenure and promotion committee's written evaluation, the department head's recommendation and written evaluation will be sent to the Dean of CHHS. If the tenure applicant is also an extension specialist, the Director of CSU Extension will also be provided with this information. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for recommendation by the College of Health & 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

1. The criteria for academic faculty promotion to full professor are set forth in the AF/AP Staff Manual. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels for action in a similar fashion as stated in section D, with final authority resting in the hands of the CSU Board of Governors.
2. Nominations for advancement in rank may be initiated by the individual faculty member, Advisory Committee, the Department Head or Dean. All recommendations are to be reviewed by appropriate faculty as described below.
3. Candidates for promotion to full professor will be reviewed by all current full professors (TTF and CCF) in the department. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will call a meeting of the appropriate faculty members and a written vote will be taken after consideration of the applicant's qualifications for advancement in rank.

F. Procedures for Promotion of Contract and Continuing Faculty

1. The criteria for promotion are set forth in the AF/AP Staff Manual and Appendix D of this document. All recommendations will be transmitted through the appropriate administrative channels.
2. Nominations for advancement in rank may be initiated by the individual faculty member, Advisory Committee, Department Head or Dean. All recommendations are to be reviewed by appropriate faculty as described below.
3. Promotion review for faculty in the instructor rank will include a minimum of 3 letters, exterior to the department but either internal or external to CSU. Promotion review for faculty in the professorial rank will include a minimum of 3 letters exterior to CSU.
4. Candidates for promotion will be reviewed by all current faculty (TTF and CCF) with a higher rank. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will call a meeting of the appropriate faculty members and a written vote will be taken after consideration of the applicant's qualifications for advancement in rank.

G. Faculty Appointments to Graduate Student Committees – see section 2D

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

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

All faculty are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance as outlined below and in

the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual (AF/AP Staff Manual).

Procedures for evaluation of faculty shall comply with the AF/AP Staff Manual, and the FSHN Department's Performance Evaluation Criteria (Appendix C). Each faculty 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 faculty member for the current year. The faculty member completes a self-evaluation report for the previous calendar year and submits this along with an updated vita to the Department Head by January 15th in advance of the annual face-to-face evaluation conference, which occurs between February and April. By December 15th, the Department Head will provide the link where the form can be found. For the evaluation, each faculty member will include all student course evaluation summary sheets for each course taught or co-taught during the year as part of their annual performance self-report, as well as copies of all written comments (copies of written comments should be sent electronically). These materials will remain the property of the faculty member. The faculty member should also provide the Department Head with any other material pertinent to their performance such as reprints of published papers, manuscripts in press, and grant proposals under review.

During the annual conference, the Department Head will (1) present a verbal evaluation to the faculty member, (2) point out ways to improve in areas in which improvement is vital to the successful career development of the faculty member, including progress toward tenure and advancement in rank, (3) be supportive of the faculty member in areas of satisfactory performance, and (4) attempt to reach agreement on the objectives for the faculty member for the following year. Subsequently, the Department Head will prepare, sign and give two copies of a written summary of the evaluation to the faculty member. The substance of the evaluation shall be based upon criteria provided in section C of the Appendix. The faculty member will sign and return a copy of the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt, and is free to provide written comments on the second page of the evaluation form if 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 departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee an updated curriculum vita and an expanded version of their annual performance self-evaluation report to include a statement of their research, teaching and service goals and objectives and a self-analysis of their progress toward tenure. These materials must be provided to the department head by January 15th.

The review shall be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion committee (tenured faculty only) by March 1. Upon completion, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee (see section E.11.1 of the AF/AP Staff Manual for possible outcomes) shall be provided to the faculty member, Department Head, Dean and Provost/Academic Vice President. Each recipient shall have the opportunity to submit written comments in response to the report, which will be directed to the department head and passed on to the Dean and Provost. The final report filed with each of the above shall include any comments provided.

C. Comprehensive Performance Reviews

1. Promotion Progress Reviews for tenure track faculty at the associate professor level and all CCF:

No later than the fourth year at any given rank faculty will submit to the Department Head and the Tenure and Promotion Committee a copy of all annual reviews from the time of appointment to the faculty members current rank, an updated curriculum vita, a statement of research, teaching and/or service goals and objectives and a self-analysis by the faculty member of progress toward promotion. Faculty members will be notified by the Department Head and Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee regarding the

deadlines for this review.

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

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

There is not a specified time interval required to be in rank as an associate professor prior to promotion to full professor for tenure track faculty, although the typical minimum period of time is 5 years. For CCF the minimum period of time in a given rank prior to consideration for promotion is 5 years. Appendix D outlines the guidelines and criteria for promotion.

2. 5-Year Post-Tenure Comprehensive Reviews

- Phase I

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

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

The review shall include one of the following possible outcomes:

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

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

- Phase II

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 materials plus a written statement regarding their Phase I decision. The committee may request additional material from the faculty member and/or seek comments from external reviewers. The due dates will be established by the Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation of probationary, pre-tenure faculty members occurs annually and will be performed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Head. This review should have three purposes: 1) to provide constructive advice for improvement to the faculty member; 2) to provide affirmation of the faculty member's progress when appropriate; and 3) to inform the probationary faculty member of shortcomings in meeting expectations of the Department. Most probationary evaluations provide advice on how to improve performance and effectiveness in teaching, research and service.

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

that complete records of evaluations and resulting activities (e.g., advice or warnings from the Chair) be made available to succeeding Tenure and Promotion Committees.

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

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

E. Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- **Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor**

General philosophy:

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

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

Research:

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

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

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

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

Many research programs depend on funding; thus, it is expected that the candidate shall seek and obtain external funding for scholarly work. Specific dollar amounts are not determinants in tenure decisions; however, if the researcher needs a large research budget to successfully develop the research program, large grants are necessary components for that candidate. Success and reputation of a program likely depends on such grants. Evaluators examine not only the apparent effort and success of the candidate in obtaining research funds, but also the record of applications submitted. Successful proposals reflect quality of the candidate's ideas and work, and provide evidence of their reputation in the research area. Annual reports made to sponsors of the research may provide evidence of research effort prior to publication. Ultimately, the greatest significance is attached to the results obtained by use of any funds acquired; i.e., whether funding leads to and continues to produce high quality published work.

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

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

The metrics for evaluation of engagement activities as scholarly work shall include: clear goals for the activities; documentation of adequate preparation for the activities; appropriate methods for the conduct of the activities; documentation of significant impacts and outcomes resulting from the activities; effective presentation of the results of the activities with peer review; and reflective critique on the results of the activities. Additional criteria may include a beneficial impact or outcome attributable at least in part to the

application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service.

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

Teaching:

An important mission of Colorado State University is to educate undergraduate and graduate students, thus excellence in teaching is also an important component of the review process for tenure and promotion. Student teaching evaluations form one component for evaluation of teaching performance. It is critical that student evaluations be conducted in all courses. It is the responsibility of the pre-tenure candidate to analyze the results of student teaching evaluations and to take steps to ameliorate weaknesses noted in these evaluations. In addition, it is the responsibility of the tenure and promotion committee to identify weaknesses and for the chair of that committee to discuss these weaknesses with the probationary faculty member. Finally, the department head will discuss positive and negative evaluations with each faculty member during annual evaluations.

Peer evaluation of teaching is another component in the evaluation of teaching, and it is expected that the pre-tenure faculty member will implement, in consultation with their mentoring committee, a process of obtaining annual evaluations and constructive feedback from other faculty who excel in teaching. Pre-tenure faculty are expected to participate in professional development activities (seminars, workshops) related to teaching and instruction. The committee looks favorably on explicit efforts to improve teaching, particularly when accompanied by improvement in student and peer teaching evaluations.

As indicated in Appendix E of this document, another aspect of teaching is graduate student mentoring. The committee recognizes that the period of probation might be too brief to expect a large number of completed graduate students. However, active and successful participation in the mentoring of graduate students is an important component of both scholarship and teaching, for those programs that have graduate students. Publications should be associated with some MS research projects and all PhD projects. Attention is also given to a candidate's response to past advice on improving mentoring skills. Pre-tenure faculty are expected to participate in professional development activities related to mentoring students.

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

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

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

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

Service:

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

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

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

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

Other criteria:

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

Extension Specialists:

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

- **Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

General philosophy:

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

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

Research:

As in evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, research contributions are reviewed as a major reflection of scholarly reputation of the candidate. A high level of productivity, as evidenced by publications, obtaining research funding, and other criteria detailed above for the earlier promotion must be documented for the period beyond that promotion. Evidence of increased professional scholarship includes not only expanded productivity in the form of published research articles in primary journals of the discipline, but also synthetic and theoretical contributions in the form of review articles or other scholarly discourses. Creative innovations and "break-through" discoveries that are highly cited in the candidate's area (in literature of the discipline as well as by external reviewers for the candidate) constitute solid evidence of excellence in reputation for the candidate. Continuous publication of important contributions which are well received and which build significant foundations in the candidate's area also constitute an important component of the research criterion.

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

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

candidate has transcended the threshold of recognition to be included among the respected, leading scholars in the candidate's area.

Teaching:

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

As indicated in the Research Section, the candidate is also expected to demonstrate a high degree of success in mentoring graduate students. Exit interviews with graduate students by the department head or assistant department head will be used to evaluate the faculty member's mentoring effectiveness. Other criteria used to judge the faculty member's mentoring abilities include but are not limited to the successful completion of graduate studies by the majority of the candidate's students; publication of research findings in top tier, peer-reviewed journals; and successful procurement of post-doctoral fellowships or career positions by the graduate student. The candidate is expected to demonstrate effective and productive professional relationships with their students.

Service:

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

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

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

Scholarly reputation:

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

Extension Specialists:

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

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

- **Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor**

General philosophy:

Contract and continuing assistant professors will either have a primary responsibility (effort, likely $\geq 70\%$) in teaching with secondary responsibilities in research and service or a primary responsibility (effort, likely $\geq 30\%$) in research with secondary responsibilities (effort) in teaching and/or service. Criteria and expectations for promotion will be similar to that for tenure track assistant professors but will be weighted in a manner appropriate to the individual's effort distribution. The criteria as set forth below refers to the minimum 5-year period from initial appointment as an assistant professor to the application for promotion to associate professor.

Research:

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

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

One of the most important criteria for research productivity is scientific merit, translated into quality of published work. Most, if not all, publications should appear in leading peer-reviewed journals of the candidate's research area. Second or third level journals will carry less weight and those not peer-reviewed carry little weight in considering quality. Invited book chapters or review articles, especially if peer-reviewed, can demonstrate quality. A large number of such chapters or reviews with limited numbers of peer-reviewed, primary research articles during the probationary period might raise a question of whether the invited publications were truly based upon the candidate's reputation as an independent scholar. Quality,

significance, and creativity of publications are evaluated thoroughly by the Department, taking advantage of expertise within our faculty, and by careful selection of external reviewers. Sometimes views of external reviewers may be decisive in determining quality in a candidate's specialized area. Often the frequency and nature of citation of the candidate's publications by other scientists may be a significant measure of how well the work is accepted by others in the discipline.

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

Many research programs depend on funding; thus, it is expected that the candidate shall seek and obtain external funding for scholarly work. Specific dollar amounts are not determinants in promotion decisions; however, if the researcher needs a large research budget to successfully develop a research program, large grants are necessary components for that candidate. Success and reputation of a program likely depends on such grants. Evaluators examine not only the apparent effort and success of the candidate in obtaining research funds, but also the record of applications submitted. Successful proposals reflect quality of the candidate's ideas and work, and provide evidence of their reputation in the research area. Annual reports made to sponsors of the research may provide evidence of research effort prior to publication. Ultimately, the greatest significance is attached to the results obtained by use of any funds acquired; i.e., whether funding leads to and continues to produce high quality published work.

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

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

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

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

Teaching:

An important mission of Colorado State University is to educate undergraduate and graduate students, thus excellence in teaching is also an important component of the review process for tenure and promotion. Student teaching evaluations form one component for evaluation of teaching performance. It is critical that student evaluations be conducted in all courses. It is the responsibility of the assistant professor to analyze the results of student teaching evaluations and to take steps to ameliorate weaknesses noted in these evaluations. In addition, it is the responsibility of the tenure and promotion committee to identify weaknesses and for the chair of that committee to discuss these weaknesses with the probationary faculty member. Finally, the department head will discuss positive and negative evaluations with each faculty member during annual evaluations.

Peer evaluation of teaching is another component in the evaluation of teaching, and it is expected that the assistant professor will implement, in consultation with their mentoring committee, a process of obtaining annual evaluations and constructive feedback from other faculty who excel in teaching. Assistant Professors are expected to participate in professional development activities (seminars, workshops) related to teaching and instruction. The committee looks favorably on explicit efforts to improve teaching, particularly when accompanied by improvement in student and peer teaching evaluations.

As indicated in section IB of this document, another aspect of teaching is graduate student mentoring. The committee recognizes that the period of probation might be too brief to expect a large number of completed graduate students. However, active and successful participation in the mentoring of graduate students is an important component of both scholarship and teaching, for those programs that have graduate students. Publications should be associated with some MS research projects and all PhD projects. Attention is also given to a candidate's response to past advice on improving mentoring skills. Assistant Professors are expected to participate in professional development activities related to mentoring students.

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

Recognition of superior teaching in the form of special awards is not a normal expectation at the Assistant Professor level, but if the candidate has received such an award, it is certainly utilized as evidence of quality teaching performance.

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

Service:

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

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

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

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

- **Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

General philosophy:

Contract and continuing associate professors will either have a primary responsibility (effort, likely $\geq 70\%$) in teaching with secondary responsibilities in research and service or a primary responsibility (effort, likely $\geq 30\%$) in research with secondary responsibilities (effort) in teaching and/or service. Criteria and expectations for promotion will be similar to that for tenure track associate professors but will be weighted in a manner appropriate to the individual's effort distribution.

Scholarship, regardless of primary and secondary responsibilities, will be required for advancement to professor. Scholarship will involve activities that draw upon the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member while contributing to the teaching mission of the department, public good, or addressing/responding to real-world problems. Scholarship could involve publications, presentations, development of novel teaching methods that are used beyond the individual's specific courses, and new course development that involves constituencies outside of CSU students.

The criteria as set forth below refers to the minimum 5-year period from initial appointment as an associate professor to the application for promotion to professor. It is assumed that criteria described for promotion to Associate Professor have been met by a candidate for promotion to Professor. The candidate's record since attaining the Associate Professor rank is the main subject of evaluation. It is expected that some faculty members may reach a sustained professional plateau at the Associate Professor rank. It is the responsibility of the departmental leadership to encourage and provide opportunity for such faculty to resume professional progression and thereby strive toward meeting criteria for promotion to Professor.

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

Research:

As in evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, research contributions are reviewed as a major reflection of scholarly reputation of the candidate. A high level of productivity, as evidenced by publications, obtaining research funding, and other criteria detailed above for the earlier promotion must be documented for the period beyond that promotion. Evidence of increased professional scholarship includes not only expanded productivity in the form of published research articles in primary journals of the discipline, but also synthetic and theoretical contributions in the form of review articles or other scholarly discourses. Creative innovations and “break-through” discoveries that are highly cited in the candidate’s area (in literature of the discipline as well as by external reviewers for the candidate) constitute solid evidence of excellence in reputation for the candidate. Continuous publication of important contributions which are well received and which build significant foundations in the candidate’s area also constitute an important component of the research criterion.

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

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

Teaching:

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

As indicated in the Research Section, the candidate is also expected to demonstrate a high degree of success in mentoring graduate students. Exit interviews with graduate students by the department head or assistant department head will be used to evaluate the faculty member’s mentoring effectiveness. Other criteria used to judge the faculty member’s mentoring abilities include but are not limited to the successful completion of graduate studies by the majority of the candidate’s students; publication of research findings in top tier, peer-reviewed journals; and successful procurement of post-doctoral fellowships or career positions by the graduate student. The candidate is expected to demonstrate effective and productive professional relationships with their students.

Service:

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

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

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

Scholarly reputation:

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

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

• **Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor**

General Philosophy:

The criteria as set forth below refers to the minimum 5-year period from initial appointment as an instructor to the application for promotion to senior instructor.

Teaching:

An important mission of Colorado State University is to educate undergraduate and graduate students, thus excellence in teaching is also an important component of the review process for tenure and promotion. Student teaching evaluations form one component for evaluation of teaching performance. It is critical that student evaluations be conducted in all courses. It is the responsibility of the course instructor to analyze the results of student teaching evaluations and take steps to ameliorate weaknesses noted in these evaluations. In addition, it is the responsibility of the tenure and promotion committee to identify weaknesses and for the chair of that committee to discuss these weaknesses with the course instructor. Finally, the department head will discuss positive and negative evaluations with each faculty member during annual evaluations.

Peer evaluation of teaching is another component in the evaluation of teaching, and it is expected that Instructors will implement, in consultation with their mentoring committee, a process of obtaining annual evaluations and constructive feedback from other faculty who excel in teaching. Instructors are expected to participate in professional development activities (seminars, workshops) related to teaching and instruction. The committee looks favorably on explicit efforts to improve teaching, particularly when accompanied by improvement in student and peer teaching evaluations.

Undergraduate student advising, supervision of undergraduate independent studies and honors program projects, and supervision of graduate student independent studies and thesis projects may also be considered as evidence of effective teaching and mentoring. However, participation in these activities should be discussed with and approved by the Department Head.

Recognition of superior teaching in the form of special awards is utilized as evidence of quality teaching performance.

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

Service (if a component of effort distribution):

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

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

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

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

- **Promotion to the Rank of Master Instructor**

General Philosophy:

The criteria as set forth below refers to the minimum 5-year period from initial appointment as a senior instructor to the application for promotion to master instructor. In addition, promotion will require that the individual have a MA or MS degree.

Teaching:

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

Undergraduate student advising, supervision of undergraduate independent studies and honors program projects, and supervision of graduate student independent studies and thesis projects may also be considered as evidence of effective teaching and mentoring. However, participation in these activities should be discussed with and approved by the Department Head.

Recognition of superior teaching in the form of special awards is utilized as evidence of quality teaching performance.

Scholarship:

Scholarship will involve activities that draw upon the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member while contributing to the teaching mission of the department, public good, or addressing/responding to real-world problems. Scholarship could involve publications, presentations, development of novel teaching methods that are used beyond the individuals' specific courses, and new course development that involves constituencies outside of CSU students.

Service (if a component of effort distribution):

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

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

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

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

H. Disciplinary Action for Faculty

The Department follows procedures as outlined in Section E.15 of the AF/AP Staff Manual.

I. Grievance Processes for Faculty

The definitions and procedures pertaining to grievances, as published in the AF/AP Staff Manual, apply to all issues, which may arise in the department.

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

A. Annual Performance Evaluation:

Procedures for evaluation of Administrative Professionals (Section D 5.5) and State Classified Staff (Section D.10) comply with the AF/AP Staff Manual. Each Administrative Professional 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 Administrative Professional completes a self-evaluation report for the previous calendar year and submits this along with a plan for the upcoming year to the Department Head and supervisor by January 15th in advance of the annual face-to-face evaluation conference, which occurs between February and April. By December 15th, the Department Head will provide the link where the form can be found.

During the annual conference, the Department Head or supervisor 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 individual, (3) be supportive in areas of satisfactory performance, and (4) attempt to reach agreement on the objectives for the following year. Subsequently, the Department Head or supervisor will prepare, sign and give two copies of a written summary of the evaluation to the individual. The Administrative Professional 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 Administrative Professional 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.

Evaluation of State Classified Staff will occur three times per year as outlined in the AF/AP Staff Manual following procedures similar to those described above.

B. Procedures for Promotion of Administrative Professionals

Administrative Professionals are evaluated every 3 years of service by the Department Head and Supervisor as

outlined in the AF/AP Staff Manual.

- Research Professionals

Research Professionals are evaluated annually as described above for Administrative Professionals and for promotion every 3 years of service by the Department Head and Supervisor as outlined in the AF/AP Staff Manual.

- Academic Success Coordinators and Advisors

Academic Success Coordinators are evaluated annually as described above for Administrative Professionals and for promotion following procedures outlined by the Collaborative for Student Success.

C. Procedures for Promotion of Classified Staff

Evaluation procedures follow guidelines outlined in the AF/AP Staff Manual including section D.10.

D. Disciplinary Action for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

Procedures for disciplinary action follow guidelines in the AF/AP Staff Manual.

E. Grievance Processes for Administrative Professionals and State Classified Staff

The Department follows procedures as outlined in Section E.15 of the AF/AP Staff Manual. The definitions and procedures pertaining to grievances, as published in the AF/AP Staff Manual, apply to all issues, which may arise in the department.

Section 6: Student Policies and Procedures

A. Student Employees

Student employees are hired following Human Resources and the Office of Equal Opportunity guidelines. A supervisor is assigned to each student employee. Supervisors are responsible for oversight and evaluation of student employees.

B. Graduate Student Evaluation

Graduate students are evaluated by an advisor and the graduate student's committee (usually one to two faculty members from within the department and one faculty member from outside of the department).

C. Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistants

All teaching and research assistants are assigned a supervisor or mentor. The supervisor or mentor is responsible for annual review of the assistant as well as professional development and mentorship.

D. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants

All GTAs and GRAs are assigned a supervisor or mentor. GTAs and GRAs are evaluated by the supervisor or mentor and GTAs are also evaluated by undergraduate students participating in courses associated with the GTAs responsibility as well as the graduate committee. Supervisors or mentors are responsible for professional development and mentorship of GTAs and GRAs.

E. Student Grade Appeal

Student grade appeals follow guidelines set forth in the student conduct manual.

Section 7: Procedures for Changing Unit Code

A. Signatures Approving of the Unit Code

This version of the Code was approved by the faculty of Food Science and Human Nutrition on **DATE**.

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

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

B. Relationships to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - The FSHN code is designed to be entirely consistent with the AFAPM however, if there is a conflict between the two documents, the AFAPM takes priority.

Appendices

Appendix A: Examples of Annual Performance Standards

- Refer to Section 4.E Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty
- Refer to Section 4.F Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor Ranks
- Refer to Section 4.G Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Instructor Ranks

Appendix B/C: Examples of Promotion Standards for Contract and Continuing Faculty on Professor and Instructor Ranks

MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR CCF RANKS

<p style="text-align: center;">Instructor</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">BA, BS and 5 years relevant experience MA, MS relevant area and 3 years relevant experience</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Responsibilities:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Teaching Teaching + Service</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Senior Instructor</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">BA, BS and 5 years at instructor or equivalent higher education experience</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Assistant Professor</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PhD</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Responsibilities:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Teaching + [Research and/or Service] Research + [Teaching and/or Service]</p>

<p>Master Instructor</p> <p><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p>MA, MS and 5 years at senior instructor or equivalent higher education experience *Scholarship – defined in Appendix D</p>	<p>Associate Professor</p> <p><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p>5 years @ Assistant Professor or equivalent higher education experience</p>
	<p>Professor</p> <p><u>Minimum Requirements:</u></p> <p>5 years @ Associate Professor or equivalent higher education experience</p>

Appendix D: Annual Performance Standards

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

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

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

Superior Category- All of the expectations noted in Exceeds Expectations category below and the following:

- 5 or more publications in professional journals, or written scholarly/creative documents published outside of CSU
- 1-2 presentations at regional/national or international conference
- Receipt of a multi-year, external grant
- Submission of >2 internal and/or external proposals
- 1 invited talk at a conference or university

Exceeds Expectations-

- 3-4 publications in professional journals, or written scholarly/creative documents published outside of CSU

- 1-2 presentations at regional/national or international conference
- Submission of 1 internal grant proposal and 1 external grant proposal

Meets Expectations-

- 1-2 publications in professional journals, or written scholarly/creative documents published outside of CSU
- 1-2 presentations at regional/national or international conference
- Submission of 1 internal or external grant proposal

Below Expectations-

- 0-1 manuscripts submitted for publication, or submission of manuscripts fails to result in publications
- 0-1 presentations at regional/national or international conferences
- Lack of evidence of attempts to establish or maintain funded research program
- No internal or external grant proposal submissions

Unsatisfactory-

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

Teaching/Advising/Mentoring

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

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

- Teaching, advising or mentoring award
- Documented evidence of participation in 1 additional professional development activity related to instruction, advising or mentoring
- Development of new and innovative approaches to teaching/instruction/mentoring
- Teaching material shared beyond CSU through presentations or publications
- Received funding for course or program redesign

Exceeds Expectations-

- Documented evidence that course content has been adapted based on student evaluations and content requirements
- Documented evidence of participation in 1 professional development activity related to instruction, advising or mentoring
- Relative to percent effort, teaches an appropriate number of classes
- Documented evidence of exceptional advising or mentoring (e.g. student awards, graduation, co-authored manuscripts)
- Recognized as excellent by internal or external peer review or develops course material and content for the first time

Meets Expectations-

- Documented evidence that course content has been adapted based on student evaluations and content requirements
- Documented evidence of participation in 1 professional development activity related to instruction, advising or mentoring
- Relative to percent effort, teaches an appropriate number of classes
- Documented evidence of advising or mentoring

Below Expectations-

- Level of involvement in teaching and advising falls short of percent effort requirements
- Ineffective in achieving course objectives
- Course evaluations and comments below average for the unit
- Low quantity and quality of advising/mentoring
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course material to be current based on latest research findings
- Little effort to keep current with curricular requirements and excessive reliance on support staff or other faculty members to provide appropriate advising information

Unsatisfactory-

- Ineffective in achieving course objectives
- Course evaluations and comments well below average for the unit
- Evidence of problems in teaching or advising (justified and verified complaints)
- Level of involvement in teaching and advising falls short of percent effort requirements
- Low quantity and quality of advising/mentoring
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course material to be current based on latest research findings
- Little effort to keep current with curricular requirements and excessive reliance on support staff or other faculty members to provide appropriate advising information

Service/Outreach

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

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

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

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

Meets Expectations-

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

Below Expectations-

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

Unsatisfactory-

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

Administrative Responsibilities of Some Faculty Members

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

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

APPENDIX E: GRADUATE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

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

relevant information, the Department Head will formulate a resolution to the problem.

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

APPENDIX F: RESPONSIBILITIES OF GRADUATE ADVISOR

The responsibilities of the Graduate Advisor are listed below. Given the magnitude of these responsibilities, additional monetary remuneration or reduced percent effort in other areas can be negotiated with the Department Head.

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

APPENDIX G: COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SPECIALIST ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

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

The responsibilities of Colorado State University Extension (CSUE) specialists are many and varied. Specialist appointments in Extension vary typically in length from 3 to 12 months and in type from regular faculty to administrative professional. CSUE's specialist appointments may also be differentiated by responsibility and targeted audience. All specialists serve as important links between field and campus at Colorado State University. All specialists are responsible for supporting CSUE's mission: to provide information and education, and encourage the application of research-based knowledge in response to local, state, and national issues affecting individuals, youth, families, agricultural enterprises, and communities of Colorado. Each specialist's work should have a clear focus with priorities on topics appropriate to Colorado and the mission of CSUE. Efforts should be related to one or more CSUE Work Team plans of work.

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

TEACHING AND ADVISING

Dissemination of Information. Specialists, being responsive to clientele requests, will provide regular updates, summaries of research findings, and the identification of resources that are appropriate for use in local programs and with other clientele groups. This may be in the form of newsletters, peer-reviewed technical reports, blogs, electronic-mail messages, teleconferences and/or webinars, website updates, mailings, development of peer-reviewed fact sheets, etc.

Specialists will support, mentor, and keep agents informed about relevant county, state, and federal databases that affect priorities for county Extension work.

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

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

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

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY

It is expected that all Extension specialists be engaged in research and scholarship that emphasizes the synthesis and translation of research into educational programs. Examples and evidence of research activities include publishing in refereed journals, technical reports, digital and other electronic media publications, developing research-based curricula and curriculum-products for use by others, conducting and reporting program evaluations, giving regional, national and international presentations, as well as developing research-based program materials that are adapted for use by other states. This is not an exhaustive list. Extension specialists’ scholarship is typically and historically characterized by peer review of manuscripts in all three areas—teaching, research, and service. Any scholarship that is different from traditional research journal-based scholarship must add to the body of knowledge, be peer reviewed, and be communicated in a way that an audience has access to it.

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

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

ENGAGEMENT

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

SERVICE

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

Carefully selected service is expected of specialists. Evidence of service activities might include serving on department, college and/or university committees or serving on state, regional and/or national committees or boards that are professional, academic, agency, and/or industry-based. Specialists are encouraged to establish relationships with local, state, and federal agencies, participate in policy development and serve as trusted testifiers for legislative committees. Specialists are also encouraged to link with major state industries, service, and regulatory agencies in areas of major program responsibilities. Service rendered in one’s professional capacity as a citizen of the community is commendable and may be evaluated as an appropriate faculty activity.

METRICS

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

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

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

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