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DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL HUMAN DIMENSIONS OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CODE

ARTICLE I. GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

A. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources is to contribute to the conservation, stewardship and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources and the management of those resources in a way that produces both land health and sustainable human benefits. Our focus will be to strengthen the human dimensions of natural resource management and integrate them with the biophysical elements of management. Our efforts will be directed locally, nationally and internationally, across a landscape that includes both public and private lands and resources. To that end, the department will incorporate the following objectives within its program of instruction, research and extension/outreach:

- Foster the type of recreation and tourism that contributes to the health of local, national, and international economies in a socially and environmentally responsible manner,
- To conduct scientific inquiry which helps us better understand and predict human thought and action toward the natural environment,
- Contribute to the planning and management of human activities and resources in parks, protected areas and other natural environments ranging from urban open space to wilderness,
- Contribute to the general public awareness, understanding and appreciation of natural resources,
- Promote and facilitate natural resources policy and decision making that is responsible to public values and which encourages direct and informed public access to the natural resource decision process,
- Contribute to the effectiveness of the techniques and procedures used for environmental communication, facilitation, and dispute resolution in a time of increasing societal demands on a limited resource base.

In fulfilling that mission, the Department will focus its instructional efforts on preparing graduate, continuing education, and undergraduate students to be leaders in the areas of parks and protected area management, tourism and commercial recreation, global tourism, environmental communication, and the human component of natural resource decision-making. The Department will conduct basic science that focuses on understanding human interaction with natural environments and will conduct applied research that demonstrates how this behavioral research can improve management and decision-making. The Department will complement the College’s biophysical perspective by focusing on how human values, perceptions, attitudes and behaviors affect and are affected by natural resources and its management and decision-making.

The faculty of the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources are dedicated to excellence as scientists and teachers. The Department, through the actions of its faculty, staff, students and alumni will strive toward leadership, locally, nationally, and internationally, in the sustainable stewardship of natural resources.
B. DEPARTMENT OBJECTIVES

1. Develop and maintain a program of instruction that recognizes current and future needs for knowledge in the subject areas that are elements of the total Department program and to develop excellence in transmitting this knowledge to graduate and undergraduate students.

2. Develop and maintain a program of basic and applied research directed toward the acquisition of new knowledge and problem solutions applicable to present and future societal needs. Maintain leadership and excellence in the human dimensions of natural resource management.

3. Provide planned informal education programs to disseminate knowledge and research results and respond to opportunities to provide service to natural resource managers and the public within Colorado, nationally and internationally.

4. Develop and maintain appropriate outreach and training opportunities for individuals not in residence at the University.

5. Use faculty knowledge, skills and experience to serve the University community and the private, public and nonprofit sectors within the state, national and international communities.

C. DEPARTMENT PLAN

Specific programs and activities to achieve the goals and objectives of the Department will be articulated in the Department’s Strategic Plan. This document will highlight priorities and will be integrated into the College and University Strategic Plans.

ARTICLE II. ADMINISTRATION

A. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. The Department Head is the administrative officer of the Department. His/her duties, the manner of selection, appointment, term of office and evaluations are specified in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Additional duties are specified in this Department Code.

2. It will be the responsibility of the Department Head, with counsel of faculty, to formulate and implement strategies, policies, and procedures to accomplish Department goals and objectives, and to effectuate efficient operation of the Department.

3. An acting Department Head will be selected on an annual basis by majority vote of the Department faculty to serve as administrative officer during absences of the Department Head and perform other duties as assigned by the Department Head during such absences. If both are absent, a temporary acting Department Head may be appointed by the Department Head.
B. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

1. The Department Head may create standing committees and *ad hoc* committees as deemed necessary for the efficient functioning of the Department. Recommendations of committees must be approved by the Department faculty prior to implementation.

2. Department Standing Committees:
   
   a. *Undergraduate Program Committee*

   The Undergraduate Program Committee will consist of the Department Concentration Leaders. Additional faculty may be added by faculty vote. Concentration Leaders are appointed by the Department Head. The Undergraduate Program Committee will have the following duties:

   i. help maintain communications between undergraduate students and faculty,

   ii. review and approve curriculum changes,

   iii. recommend to Department faculty changes to enhance the quality of undergraduate experience,

   iv. approve course substitutions not already approved by Department vote and listed on HDNR Substitutions List,

   v. review and update concentrations, with the Concentration Leader, at least every three years,

   vi. serve as a decision-making body for undergraduate student grievances.

   b. *Graduate Program Committee*

   The Department Head will appoint a Graduate Program Committee chair. The faculty will elect one member to serve on the committee. These individuals will elect a third member. These individuals will serve three-year terms. The Committee will have the following duties:

   i. recommend policies and procedures for the Department graduate program. These will be codified and made available to Department faculty and graduate students in the *Graduate Student Handbook*,

   ii. help to maintain communications between graduate students and faculty,

   iii. review and approve curriculum changes,

   iv. recommend to Department faculty changes to enhance the quality of the graduate experience,

   v. review graduate program every three years,

   vi. serve as a decision-making body for graduate student grievances.
c. Tenure and Promotion Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Committee will consist of all tenured Department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration. The Department Head will be an ex-officio member of this committee.

The Committee will have the following duties:

i. provide counsel to faculty upon request,

ii. respond to policy or process questions of faculty concern,

iii. assure that University and College policies and procedures are followed in tenure and promotion decisions,

iv. provide annual written critique on faculty progress toward tenure and promotion by November 1st of that year,

v. submit a written recommendation to Department Head in support or opposition of an application for tenure or promotion.

3. Ad Hoc Committees

The Department Head may appoint ad hoc committees to address specific problems or issues within a specified time frame. These committees will be discharged by the Department Head after completion of their efforts.

4. Representation on College Standing Committees

Department representatives to College Standing Committees will be elected to three-year terms by the faculty.

C. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

1. A meeting of Department faculty will be scheduled prior to the beginning of the academic year. The agenda for this meeting will consist of current Department business and preparation for annual activities to accommodate Department goals and objectives.

2. Regular or formal meetings of the Department faculty to conduct business will be scheduled as needed during the academic year. An agenda will be prepared for each of these meetings and circulated to faculty at least three working days prior to the meeting.

3. Special faculty meetings may be called by any faculty member for resolution of special issues.

4. Department faculty meetings will be chaired by the Department Head or their designee. These meetings will be conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order.

5. All Department faculty members with the rank of Assistant Professor or above will be eligible to vote on Department issues brought before the faculty. Special appointments and faculty affiliates are encouraged to participate in department meetings and functions. The Department faculty will vote at the beginning of each year regarding the voting privilege for special appointments and affiliate faculty.
6. A quorum will consist of one more than 50% of the eligible voting faculty of the Department not on leave (e.g., sabbatical).

7. All questions or issues before the Department faculty will be decided by a majority vote of faculty present at the meeting, with the exception of changes to the Department Code, which will require a two-thirds vote of all eligible faculty. Proxies or written vote may be accepted for absent faculty.

D. SELF-EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

1. The Department will utilize the Colorado State University PRISM process for ongoing self-evaluations and will conduct an Academic Program Review every six years.

2. This evaluation process will be complimented by periodic surveys of recent graduates, and internal discussions each Fall at the Department retreat or pre-semester meetings.

ARTICLE III. FACULTY

A. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

Department faculty will conform to the duties and responsibilities established in Section D of the University Code.

B. SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF NEW OR REPLACEMENT FACULTY

1. New or replacement faculty appointments will be conducted in accordance with the University Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action policies and procedures.

2. In the case where an external search is convened, the Department Head will appoint a committee of not less than three regular faculty from the Department to conduct a search and review of applications. The committee will consist of at least one voting faculty from the concentration area of the new or replacement position. The Department faculty will meet short-listed candidates through conference and / or seminar and will have opportunity to make recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head will consult with Department faculty and appropriate College and University administrators before making a final selection from the candidate(s) recommended by the committee.

C. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTING FACULTY TO GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. While graduate students are primarily responsible for choosing an advisor, faculty must be willing to accept a student and to guide them in the selection of other committee members. In accordance with the Graduate School, for the masters degree, a committee must have a minimum of three members with one being from outside the Department. For the doctoral degree, committees will have a minimum of four members with at least one outside member.
2. In general, only regular, full-time, tenure-track faculty may serve as chair of a graduate student’s committee. Exceptions to this general rule may occur by unanimous vote of the tenure-track faculty.

3. When circumstances arise that lead to (1) a student choosing to remove a faculty member as his/her chair or (2) a faculty member voluntarily removes himself/herself as a chair, the Department Head will be responsible for selecting replacement or other provisions will be made.

4. These and other graduate program policies, including both faculty and student responsibilities, are outlined in the Department’s masters and doctoral Graduate Student Handbooks. These handbooks will be provided to all graduate students at the beginning of their program.

D. ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

1. The Department Head will meet with each faculty member during the Spring semester for performance evaluation on current year and to establish performance expectations / responsibilities for next year. Productivity will be measured against department standards current at the time of review.

2. The Department Head will keep a written record of items considered in the performance evaluation of each faculty member. Each faculty member will have the right to review their record and to request modification if they believe the record is incorrect or incomplete. A copy of the evaluation will be given to the faculty member.

3. If a faculty member disagrees with their evaluation, they have the right to challenge the evaluation through established University grievance procedures.

E. MID-TENURE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A comprehensive performance review of tenure-track faculty will be conducted at the midpoint of their probationary period at Colorado State University.

1. This review will be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Department Head will not be a member of this committee.

2. Procedures for this review will be consistent with policies and procedures established by the College and by the University Code. Faculty applying for the comprehensive review must utilize current deadlines, guidelines, and documentation procedures for tenure and promotion from the Provost Office.

3. It is the applicant’s responsibility to develop and maintain a portfolio that substantiates excellence in research, teaching and professional service. Excellence will be expected of all faculty regardless of whether an appointment is a part-time or full nine-month position.

4. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will use the information submitted by faculty as the basis for review. Reviews of performance will be based on the faculty member’s productivity in relation to effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility.
(research, teaching and/or professional service). Productivity will be measured against Department standards current at time of review.

5. Committee recommendations will be determined by a vote of all members. Approval requires a roll call majority vote. Minority opinions can be appended to the majority committee recommendations.

6. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the tenured faculty will be provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, the Dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. The report will include one of the following possible outcomes:
   - the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation from the Department;
   - there are deficiencies that, if satisfactorily corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure, or;
   - the faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the tenure committee recommends against further contract renewals.

7. The report will also include any written comments provided by the Department Head, Dean, and Provost/Academic Vice President, as well as the faculty member.

8. The midpoint comprehensive review will be maintained in the faculty member’s personal file.

9. A final comprehensive performance review is required prior to recommendations concerning tenure (see Section E10.4 of the Faculty Manual).

F. PERIODIC COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEWS OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Phase I comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty will occur at intervals five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews during a five year review period.

2. Faculty will be responsible for providing the following materials for Phase I reviews including an updated curriculum vitae, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives. In addition, annual review records will be used in the evaluation.

3. Deadlines for submitting Phase I review materials will be the same as deadlines established for submitting tenure and promotion materials.

4. The Department Head will evaluate Phase I materials to determine an overall assessment of performance. Productivity will be measured against Department standards current at the time of review. The evaluation will identify strengths and deficiencies in the faculty member’s performance. One of three assessments is possible; satisfactory performance, satisfactory but with deficiencies that require attention, and unsatisfactory. An assessment
of satisfactory with deficiencies will require preparation of a professional development plan (per Section E.9 of the Faculty Manual). An assessment of unsatisfactory will result in a Phase II evaluation. The Phase II evaluation would be initiated immediately upon delivery of an unsatisfactory rating.

5. Phase II evaluations will be conducted by the Department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Committee numbers fewer than three faculty, the Department Head with the available Tenure and Promotion Committee members, will select a sufficient number of other Tenured Faculty Members at Colorado State University to raise the number of committee members to three.

6. Phase II procedures for evaluating faculty will be the same as procedures used in reviews of tenure and promotion. Faculty will have one month following an unsatisfactory assessment to submit the appropriate evaluation materials. The committee will follow existing procedures for soliciting external reviews.

7. Criteria used for evaluating faculty will be the same as those used in tenure and evaluation. Faculty will be evaluated only on their performance during the interval since the last comprehensive or tenure review.

8. Possible conclusions of the Committee Evaluation are described in E.9 of the Faculty Manual.

G. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure and promotion for each academic rank will be consistent with policies and procedures established by the College and by the University Code. Faculty applying for tenure or promotion must utilize current guidelines and documentation procedures from the Provost Office. The required forms are on the Provost’s website:

www.provost.colostate.edu/print/p&tapp.doc

1. General Evaluation Process

- Only tenured faculty can vote on tenure decisions; full professors can vote on promotion decisions to the rank of associate and full professor; associate professors can vote on promotion decisions to the rank of associate professor but not to full professor.

- If a committee of at least three tenured faculty of higher rank cannot be constituted, the Promotion Committee will include all tenured faculty of higher rank (i.e., full professors) and other qualifying faculty selected from the College of Natural of Natural Resources and / or Colorado State University. The outside committee member(s) will serve as a full member of the Committee with voting privileges. Selection of this (these) outside individual(s) will be based on their ability to help in assessing the excellence of the applicant’s performance in teaching, research, and/or service. Selection of the outside committee member(s) will be determined by all full professors in the Department.
• When a member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee believes there may be a conflict of interest situation in a forthcoming tenure or promotion vote, the Committee may by a majority vote, excuse a member from deliberation and voting in this situation.

• Separate recommendations from the Department Committee and Department Head will be forwarded to the College Executive Committee who will advise the Dean. The College Dean will subsequently make recommendation to the Provost. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will assess productivity using Department standards available at the time of review.

• The Department Head will administer a “blind” review in October of the year a faculty member is applying for tenure or promotion. The applicant must prepare their portfolio for external review and declare their intentions to pursue a tenure or promotion decision by September 1st of that year.

• Final authority for the granting of tenure and promotion lies with the State Board of Agriculture, which has been delegated to the President of the University. Nothing is final until the President acts.

• If the Dean and/or Department Head disagree with the committee, there should be compelling reasons and those should be documented in writing. All responses must be copied to the faculty member.

• Annual evaluations and mid-probationary reviews should show consistency with the tenure/promotion evaluation. For example, a candidate should not receive positive annual evaluations with progress toward tenure on track, then not be recommended for tenure. The annual evaluations and mid-probationary reviews should be included in the dossier.

2. Time in Service, Prior Service and “Early” Cases

• The time in rank may be reduced by an amount of prior service – provided this is spelled out in the offer letter. If prior service is spelled out in the offer letter, then utilization of this prior service means that the case is not classified as “early.” However, utilization of prior service requires mutual approval of the candidate, the Department Head, and the Dean, indicated by signature, at the time of application for tenure and/or promotion and prior service must be explicitly stated on the cover page of the dossier. The candidate always has the option to utilize the full six-year probationary period, even with prior service documented in the offer letter.

• The normal period of service before consideration for tenure is five completed years. Tenure is granted at the end of the sixth academic year.

• The normal period in rank as Assistant Professor before consideration for promotion to Associate Professor is five years. Similarly, the normal period in rank as Associate Professor before consideration for promotion to Full Professor is five years. In these cases, advancement in rank is granted at the end of the sixth academic year.
• Cases may be considered early, although this will not be a routine occurrence. Early cases are held to a significantly higher standard than regular cases. Simply meeting the usual standard is not enough. For any early case there should not be the slightest concern or doubt about performance in any areas of responsibility, in particular this means that no part of the case can rest upon unpublished work.

☐ A case that is considered one year early must provide clear and convincing documentation that the individual is truly exceptional in all areas of performance. For a case to be considered two years early, the national/international reputation must be clearly that of a star, and the case should be supported by at least eight superb letters from full professors at major national universities or research labs. At least six of these letters should be from professors at universities.

☐ If any case is being brought forward more than one year early, the Dean and Department Head must present to the Provost convincing prima facie evidence of its merit before beginning the process.

3. Effort Distribution

• The percentage assignment of effort distribution reported on the dossier must be in conformity with workload expectations. Although exceptions may occur, a normal workload distribution for a faculty member in the Department is:

  a. 40% teaching – Two, three-credit type “A” courses per semester,
  b. 10% advising undergraduate / graduate students, independent study courses, and undergraduate Honor’s Theses,
  c. 40% research,
  d. 10% service, which may include participation on University, College, and Departmental committees, professional outreach, and community service.

Substantial deviations from these workload expectations must be explained in writing.

• Assignment of effort distribution must be approved by the candidate, Department Head, Dean, and Provost before beginning the tenure/promotion process.

• Research productivity must be aligned with faculty member’s effort distribution. The higher the percentage of research allocated, the greater the expectation for publications and grants.

4. External Letters

• Every case requires the support of outside evaluators. External letters must be collected from similar kinds of institutions, and the people writing those letters cannot be too closely connected to the candidate. A plan for selecting external reviewers will be prepared in advance and should not select only the names recommended by candidates.
• Any number of letters may be provided as part of the dossier, but they must include five letters with the following properties:

- The letter writer should not be a thesis advisor, member of graduate committee, teacher, or mentor of the candidate.
- The letter writer should be employed at a peer or aspirant university, or at a research institute or laboratory.
- The letter writer should have experience at or above the rank aspired to by the candidate.
- At least half of the letter writers should be chosen by the Department Head or Department Tenure and Promotion committee rather than the candidate.

• External reference letters are considered CONFIDENTIAL to the candidate and are not part of the personnel file. These letters must be kept in a separate confidential file.

• Reviewers will be asked to provide a written critique on the quality of performance and contribution of scholarship in the areas of excellence.

5. Department Expectations and Standards / Guidelines

Sustained Productivity

• Evidence of sustained productivity in research, teaching and service over the entire probationary period will be used in the evaluation process.

- Evidence of sustained research productivity will be based on the number and quality of research publications (specific expectations are noted in the sections to follow) generated by the candidate each year across the entire probationary period. No or limited research articles in the earlier years of the probationary period, followed by multiple articles in the last year of the probationary period will be viewed as last minute efforts to attain tenure and promotion and does not constitute sustained engagement in the profession.

- Similarly, evidence on sustained teaching and service will be based on the candidate’s productivity in these areas each year across the entire probationary period.

• Research Expectations and Standards / Guidelines

- Publication in refereed journals is the common standard used to judge research performance. “Refereed publications” are defined as:
  - Contributions to periodicals, serials and monographs with national or international circulation where manuscripts have been submitted to review and evaluated by peers to determine acceptability. These contributions should be original contributions to the discipline.
• Reviews, short notes, invited papers, and discussion papers, although not “refereed publications” may be used for additional evidence of scholarly work. While presentation of papers at professional meetings, preparation of research reports and consultation are indicators of achievement, they often lack the necessary peer approval and widespread dissemination that are usually deemed necessary.

☐ Evidence of scholarly / research activity will be evaluated, not merely enumerated, to assess the continuity and effectiveness of the faculty member’s effort and the quality and significance of the results.

☐ The following criteria will be used as evidence for “minimum” research activity:

• Depending on effort distribution and nature / contribution of the articles, senior authorship on 10 to 12 refereed publications during the five consecutive years preceding application for either tenure or promotion to Associate Professor. For example, an Assistant Professor with a 40% research workload distribution is expected to be senior author on approximately 10 to 12 refereed journal publications during the tenure probationary period.

• Second or third authorship is evaluated at 1/2 or 1/3 the weight respectively.

• If a faculty member is second author following his/her graduate student, full credit for the publication is given.

• Since interdisciplinary research is desirable, and these studies often produce papers with multiple authors, multiple authorship is given full credit if explained on a case-by-case basis.

☐ The evaluation will take into account the type and quality of the publication / research. Some measures of quality are:

• the prestige of the journals in which publications appear,
• reviews of publications in the critical literature,
• awards for significant accomplishment,
• grants obtained in open competition.

☐ A distinction is made between peer reviewed (a.k.a. peer-edited) and refereed publications. For example, although documents such as USDA Forest Service Technical Reports are peer reviewed, may be original contributions, and are widely disseminated, they are not refereed because all such reports are ultimately published. One criteria then for distinguishing peer reviewed from refereed publications is the probability a manuscript submission will be accepted or rejected. If the probability of rejection equals 0, the publication is not refereed.

☐ The accept / reject ratio can be applied to other types of publications. For example, books, book chapters, and conference proceedings would typically be considered peer reviewed, not refereed publications, because once the author has written the manuscript, the document will be published. The accept / reject ratio
also provides a criterion for ranking the prestige of a journal publication. Journals with higher rejection rates apply more rigorous standards. Candidates seeking tenure and promotion should consult with members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee if they have questions about the acceptability of any given journal.

- **Teaching / Advising Expectations and Standards / Guidelines**

  Academic advising/mentoring (undergraduate and graduate) should be evaluated as part of the promotion and tenure process. As noted in the Faculty Manual (E.12.1):

  The faculty in each academic unit will develop specific criteria and standards for evaluation and methods for evaluating teaching and advising effectiveness and will evaluate teaching and advising as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. These criteria, standards, and methods will be incorporated into departmental codes. (E.12.1)

  - Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:
    - Teacher portfolios,
    - Professor conducted mid-semester evaluations,
    - Evaluations by undergraduate and graduate students of both teaching and advising skills,
    - Evaluations of other faculty members, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures given by the faculty member being evaluated, or on observations of students’ preparedness for courses sequential to the one taught by the faculty member being evaluated,
    - Letters from students,
    - Opinions of graduates,
    - Development of new and effective techniques of instruction,
    - Number of undergraduate advisees assigned to the faculty member,
    - Number of graduate advisees. Depending on effort distribution, faculty members in the Department are expected to advise an average of 2 to 3 Ph.D. students, 5 to 6 master’s students, or combinations thereof. Advising 1 Ph.D. student is considered equivalent to advising 2 master’s students.

  - Promotion and tenure documentation should include the faculty member’s advising load and a summary of advising effectiveness.

- **Professional Service Expectations and Standards / Guidelines**

  University service may include: committee work (Departmental, College and University), interdisciplinary collaboration on academic programs or governance, development of special forums, symposia and other events, participation on search committees, and advising student organizations.
Public service is often reflected in work on boards, commissions, task forces or working groups at the community, state, or national level – especially where the faculty member’s expertise is sought. Awards for such service may prove a measure of quality. Evidence of technical assistance, training, development of extension materials and activities (handbooks, technical reports, videos, radio or television shows, surveys, field days, etc.), participation on evaluation or mediation teams - especially where they are directed at the natural resource agencies or other clients that we serve in our discipline – are all concrete demonstrations of service.

Participation in and contribution to professional societies may be judged by length of membership, offices held, conferences or symposia the person has helped to organize, editorial boards served on and certainly any time served as editor of a professional journal or publication. Invited presentations at professional meetings – especially plenary or keynote addresses are evidence that the person’s work is often evidence of leadership and progressive work in the field. Letters of appreciation or recognition by outreach clients can serve as tangible evidence of contribution for both public and professional service.

Service Indicators and Standards / Guidelines

Depending on effort distribution, acceptable performance should be obtained from two of the following categories for achieving a minimum acceptable performance for service and outreach.

- University Committee Service:
  In the average year, acceptable performance requires service on two Departmental, and one College committee and participation in at least one other institutional strengthening activity (search committee, development of symposium, participation on work group, student organization advising).
  Excellence requires adding two activities in any of these categories or chairing a notable Departmental, College or University committee. Excellence could also be achieved by taking primary responsibility for a successful symposium, task force, or public relations campaign or other related activity.

- Public Service:
  In the average year, acceptable performance requires participation in at least one community, state, national or international outreach effort requiring more than the equivalent of 10 person days and development of at least one of the deliverable products mentioned above.
  Excellence requires an equivalent of at least 15 person days of effort, two or more deliverable products and/or written recognitions or awards for service. Such service should be with/for institutions or clients who are logical recipients of services provided by a land grant university and by our discipline in particular.
Professional Service:

Acceptable performance could be achieved by active membership in at least one professional organization recognized by our profession and require at least 6 person days of involvement that could be fulfilled from attendance at conferences, meetings, symposia and which should include at least one work product such as an invited presentation, reviewed article or participation in work group activities.

Excellence would be achieved by active membership in two or more professional associations or organizations, where one would give the equivalent of 10 or more person days of involvement, produce two or more work products, or recognition by ones peers for leadership or achievement on behalf of the profession. Being an editor or actively serving on the editorial board of a professional journal should automatically be an indicator of excellence. Being elected or appointed to serve on a recognized board or commission of importance to the profession should also constitute excellence in this category.

H. INTERNAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

1. Any full- or part-time faculty members, including instructors, have the right to question any decision, which may affect their Departmental responsibilities, professional status, or salary.

2. Any faculty member who feels that they may have a complaint against the Department Head, or any other Department faculty member, should discuss the problem with the individual(s) involved to try to resolve the problem as quickly as possible at that level.

3. If a situation is not resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant, he/she should discuss the matter informally with the Department Head (or if the Department Head is the subject of the issue, with the Dean of the College) prior to invoking the CSU grievance procedures (see Faculty Manual, Section K).

I. FACULTY AFFILIATES

Individuals may be formally designated as faculty affiliates who may be instrumental in assisting the Department to achieve its goals and objectives. The Department Head, with counsel of faculty, will invite appropriate individuals to participate. Appointments will be made in conformance with Section E.5.3. of the University Code.

ARTICLE IV. STUDENTS

A. STUDENT APPEALS

1. An appeal stems from an alleged academic injustice to a student. It may have resulted from academic requirements or actions of a faculty member or the Department or from written decisions of faculty members or the Department Head.

2. The faculty of the Department recognizes the importance of resolving student grievances in a timely and equitable manner. The faculty further recognizes the right of students to
appeal decisions to a higher administrative level. It is, therefore, the policy of the Department to provide a specific procedure for dealing with grievances in a fair and impartial manner.

3. Prior to filing a formal appeal, the student must try to resolve the problem personally with the faculty member involved. Faculty members are expected to meet with appellate students in good faith and to discuss the situation in a professional and responsible manner. Emphasis should be on resolving the situation quickly and acceptably, with due consideration for academic and professional standards, as well as the student’s position.

4. If the problem is not satisfactorily resolved between the student and the faculty member, the student will be advised that he/she may file a formal appeal in accordance with I.7.1 of the Faculty Manual.

5. If the problem involves academic integrity, the student may request a hearing with the Office of Judicial Affairs in accordance with Section I.7.2 of the Manual.

6. If the problem does not involve academic integrity, the student may initiate a formal appeal with the Department Head. The Department Head will appoint an appeals committee consisting of two faculty members and two students from the Department, and a faculty member from another department to chair the appeals committee. The appeals committee will proceed according to Section I.7.1 of the Manual.

7. If the Department Head is a party to the incident being appealed, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee will appoint the appeals committee, receive their decision, and provide a written notice of the decision to the student and the faculty member, in accordance with Section I.7.1.

**ARTICLE V. CONSISTENCY AND REVISION OF THE CODE**

All policies and procedures adopted in this Department Code will be consistent with policies and procedures of the College of Natural Resources and the University Code.

A review of the department code should be undertaken in the year prior to the end of each term of the Department Head.

Approved:

Mike Manfredo, Head
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