

CODE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
FOREST AND RANGELAND STEWARDSHIP
WARNER COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Approved March 20, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE	4
SECTION A. STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL VISION AND MISSION	4
A.1 VISION.....	4
A.2 MISSION	4
SECTION C. DEPARTMENT VOTING PROCEDURES AND RIGHTS	5
C.1.FACULTY VOTING PROCEDURES	5
C.2. FACULTY APPOINTMENT TYPES AND VOTING RIGHTS.....	5
C.2.1. <i>Tenure-track, tenured, and NTT faculty members on at least a half-time appointment in the department</i>	5
C.2.2. <i>Faculty and staff appointment types not listed in C.2.1</i>	5
SECTION D. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT	5
D.1 STANDING COMMITTEES	5
D.1.1 <i>Department Curriculum Committee</i>	5
D.1.2 <i>Graduate Program Committee</i>	6
D.1.3 <i>Master of Natural Resources Stewardship (MNRS) Advisory Committee</i>	6
D.2 AD HOC COMMITTEES.....	6
D.3 MAJORS AND MINORS IN THE DEPARTMENT.....	6
SECTION E. PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR NEW OR VACATED FACULTY POSITIONS	7
SECTION F. PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS FOR ACQUIRING TENURE, FOR PROMOTION IN RANK, AND FOR REAPPOINTMENT	8
F.1. COMPOSITION AND INITIAL CONVENING OF TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES	8
F.1.1 <i>The “Tenure and Promotion Committee” for recommending tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor for tenure-track faculty</i>	8
F.1.2 <i>The “Tenured Faculty Promotion Committee” for recommending promotion from Associate to Full Professor for tenured faculty</i>	8
F.1.3 <i>The “Promotion Committee” for recommending promotion in rank for non-tenure-track faculty members</i>	8
F.1.4 <i>The “Mentoring Committee” for all faculty members at the Assistant Professor rank or lower</i>	8
F.2 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT.....	9
F.2.1 <i>Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Department Head</i>	9
F.2.2 <i>Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Mentoring Committee</i>	9
F.2.3 <i>Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Promotion Committee</i>	9
F.2.4 <i>Midpoint comprehensive reviews for tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty seeking promotion</i>	9
F.2.8 <i>Periodic Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty</i>	10
F.3 DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	11
F.3.1 <i>Tenure</i>	11
F.3.2 <i>Promotion</i>	11
F.3.3 <i>Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness</i>	13
SECTION G. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTING ACADEMIC FACULTY TO GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES	14
SECTION H. PROCEDURES RELATING TO SELF EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS	14
SECTION I. PROCEDURES BY WHICH STUDENTS MAY APPEAL ACADEMIC DECISIONS OF THEIR INSTRUCTORS OR GRADUATE COMMITTEES	14

SECTION J. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS 15
SECTION K. PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW AND AMENDING OF THE DEPARTMENTAL CODE
..... 15

PREAMBLE

This code sets forth the principles that guide the internal organization of the Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship (hereinafter the Department). This code is consistent with provisions of the University Code (Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual), with additional department-specific details, and is subordinate to the University Code. In all cases of conflicting policy, the University Code takes precedence. The Department Code aids the Department to efficiently and effectively fulfill its role in meeting the goals of Colorado State University. Each member of the Department assumes responsibility for knowing the precepts of faculty government established by College policies and the University and Department Codes.

SECTION A. STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL VISION AND MISSION

A.1 VISION

We will strive for excellence in forest, rangeland, and natural resource stewardship programs that support and benefit our Colorado, national, and international constituencies. We will advance the sciences and practices of forest and rangeland stewardship through education, research, extension, and outreach. Our students will lead the next generation of land managers and contribute to resolving the challenges confronting a dynamic society and changing natural environment.

A.2 MISSION

Our professional programs in forest, rangeland, and natural resources stewardship, through collaboration with other programs in our College and University, produce graduates who are prepared to meet the challenges facing future land managers. Our research, extension, and outreach programs generate and communicate knowledge to students, managers, policy makers, peers, and the public and establish us as a preeminent authority in forest, rangeland, and natural resources stewardship.

Teaching: We prepare students with the knowledge and understanding to be productive members of a changing society and to lead the next generation of land management professionals. We offer programs of instruction that meet the needs of our departmental baccalaureate and graduate degree offerings and provide for certification and continuing educational needs of Colorado, the nation and, international constituencies.

Research: We are engaged in comprehensive research programs that advance scientific knowledge and communication for the benefit of Colorado, the nation, and the world. Our research is responsive to constituency needs, provides for student involvement, and is integrated with our teaching programs.

Extension/Outreach: We actively exchange information with individuals and organizations concerned with land stewardship to disseminate knowledge and obtain feedback for evaluation and modification of departmental programs. We serve the lifelong educational and training needs of forest and rangeland stewardship professionals.

Service: We are active participants and leaders in local, university, national, and international scholarly and professional organizations. We are involved in faculty governance, professional, special or ad hoc committees, and other services, activities, or events in our respective disciplines.

SECTION B. DEPARTMENT HEAD DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The principal administrative and academic officer of the Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship will be designated as the Department Head. Members of the departmental faculty and staff are responsible to the Department Head. The Department Head has the general responsibility for all activities that may affect the professional status of the Department and works to represent the best interests of the University. The Department Head is the responsible supervisor of departmental faculty and staff and, in turn, responsible to the Dean of the Warner College of Natural Resources. Selection, duties, and term of office of the Department Head shall be those specified in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Sections C and E. If the Department Head is temporarily absent, the Department Head will appoint an Acting Department Head from the tenured faculty.

SECTION C. DEPARTMENT VOTING PROCEDURES AND RIGHTS

C.1. FACULTY VOTING PROCEDURES

Votes taken by the department faculty will be decided by a majority vote of eligible faculty (C.2) present at a Department meeting, with the exception of changes to the Department code, which will require a two-thirds vote of all eligible faculty members. Proxies or written vote may be accepted for absent faculty members. A quorum will consist of one more than 50% of the eligible voting faculty (see section C) of the Department not on leave (e.g., sabbatical). See Section J for more discussion of *Robert's Rules of Order*, which the Department uses as procedures for voting and which include a provision for vote by ballot. Voting procedures and quorum definitions for tenure and promotion are defined in Section F.

C.2. FACULTY APPOINTMENT TYPES AND VOTING RIGHTS

Six (6) basic types of appointments exist for members of the faculty. They are tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, contract faculty, continuing faculty, adjunct faculty, and faculty on transitional appointments. The Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual defines these and other faculty appointment types at sections E.2.1., E.2.2., and E.2.3. Throughout this code, we refer to non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, which includes faculty on all appointment types in section E.2.1.

C.2.1. Tenure-track, tenured, and NTT faculty members on at least a half-time appointment in the department will be eligible to vote on Department issues brought before the faculty. However, only tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible to vote on personnel, promotion, or tenure matters for tenure-track/tenured faculty (see section F for more details on eligibility and procedures to vote on these matters).

C.2.2. Faculty and staff appointment types not listed in C.2.1 will not have voting rights on Department issues; however, these Department members will be encouraged to participate in and contribute to discussions regarding issues addressed in Department meetings.

SECTION D. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT

D.1 STANDING COMMITTEES

Election / appointment to standing committees will occur prior to the second week of the fall term.

D.1.1 Department Curriculum Committee

The duties of the Department Curriculum Committee shall be to make recommendations to the Department Head pertaining to all undergraduate curriculum matters. The Committee will assist faculty in curricular development, involving both course and program changes, for all degrees. The Committee will advise the Department Head regarding priorities for faculty positions as related to instruction needs. The Chair of the FRS Curriculum Committee shall serve as the Department representative to the WCNR Curriculum Committee. The Department Curriculum Committee will be composed of five individuals, including faculty members or members of the advising staff from within the FRS department. Three of the five members must be tenure-track/tenured/non-tenure track faculty. Two of the five members must be tenure-track/tenured faculty members. Curriculum Committee members will serve three-year terms and can be re-appointed. The Department Head will appoint one faculty member to be the Chair of this committee, and the eligible faculty will vote to approve the remaining four members, in accordance with section C.

D.1.2 Graduate Program Committee

This committee will maintain/edit the Graduate Student Handbook that includes Department policies and procedures for graduate students. The Committee will develop pertinent policies related to the Department's graduate programs and advertisements of these programs. The Graduate Program Committee will also be responsible for making recommendations to the Department Head pertaining to all graduate curricula matters. The Committee will assist faculty in graduate curricular development and changes in program areas for all graduate degrees in the Department. The FRS Graduate Program Committee will be composed of three faculty members and advising staff from within the FRS department; these faculty members must teach or advise graduate students. The Chair of this committee must be a tenure-track/tenured faculty member; if there is a Graduate Program Director, this faculty member will chair this committee. At least two of the committee members must be faculty members who have voting rights per section C.2.1. Graduate Program Committee members will serve three-year terms and can be reappointed. The Department Head will appoint one faculty member to be the Chair of this committee, and the faculty will vote to approve the remaining two members, in accordance with section C.

D.1.3 Master of Natural Resources Stewardship (MNRS) Advisory Committee

The role of this committee shall be to provide oversight of the MNRS program, support evaluation of applicants, and serve as the advisory committee for students in the MNRS program. This committee shall be composed of at least three individuals and must include the lead advisor for the MNRS program, if this position is filled. At least two of the committee members must be faculty members who have voting rights per section C.2.1. MNRS Graduate Advisory Committee members will serve three-year terms and can be reappointed. The Department Head will appoint a Chair of the committee, and the faculty will vote to approve the other two members in accordance with section C, above.

D.2 AD HOC COMMITTEES

In addition to the above standing committees, ad hoc committees may be formed either by appointments by the Department Head or by election by department faculty.

D.3 MAJORS AND MINORS IN THE DEPARTMENT

The Department hosts the following majors, minors, and graduate degrees:

Majors:

- Natural Resources Management
- Restoration Ecology

- Forest and Rangeland Stewardship (concentrations include: Forest Management, Forest Fire Science, Forest Biology, Rangeland Conservation and Management, Rangeland and Forest Management)

Minors:

- Forestry
- Range Ecology
- Ecological Restoration
- Interdisciplinary Conservation Biology

Graduate programs:

- Forest Science (M.S. and Ph.D.)
- Rangeland Ecosystem Science (M.S. and Ph.D.)
- Master of Natural Resources Stewardship (MNRS) (specializations include: Ecological Restoration, Forest Science, Rangeland Ecology and Management)

SECTION E. PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR NEW OR VACATED FACULTY POSITIONS

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

The Department Head will notify the faculty of the search before the search begins at a Department Meeting or via email. When an external search for a tenure-track faculty or NTT faculty member is convened, the Department Head will appoint a member of the faculty to serve as the head of the search committee for the position and also appoint a minimum of two additional faculty members to the committee. At a minimum, these three appointed search committee members must be faculty with voting rights in the Department as defined in section C.2.1. above. When the search is for a tenure-track position, at least three members of this committee must be tenure-track / tenured faculty members. The search committee will select and recommend to the Department Head a short-listed group of candidates from the applicant pool to be brought on campus for personal interviews with Department, College, University, and other appropriate individuals through the use of conferences and/or seminars. The search committee and Department Head will encourage participation in the interview process by Department faculty and staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students. Following the interview process, the search committee will convene the faculty to obtain their input. The search committee will submit their recommendation, the recommendation of the faculty, and summary of student and stakeholder input to the Department Head. The Department Head will consult with appropriate Department, College and University personnel before making a final selection from the candidate(s) recommended by the committee and faculty.

SECTION F. PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS FOR ACQUIRING TENURE, FOR PROMOTION IN RANK, AND FOR REAPPOINTMENT

The promotion, tenure, and reappointment processes are initiated by the Department Head at the time of the annual review during the calendar year in which the faculty member will submit their application for promotion or tenure. These processes will be carried out with the assistance of a Tenure and Promotion Committee or Promotion Committee, as identified in subsequent sections. The responsibility of the Department is to provide a recommendation to the University regarding tenure, promotion, and reappointment; however, the final authority for all personnel matters is the State Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System.

F.1. COMPOSITION AND INITIAL CONVENING OF TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES

A quorum of any tenure or promotion committee exists when 2/3rds of the eligible committee members are present or have submitted their input or vote by proxy through another committee member.

F.1.1 The “Tenure and Promotion Committee” for recommending tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor for tenure-track faculty

The Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of all FRS tenured faculty members that hold academic rank at or above the rank sought by the tenure-track Candidate (i.e. individual seeking tenure and promotion). The Tenure and Promotion Committee will convene in the Spring term to review the record of each untenured faculty member (Candidate) who was in a tenure-track position during the previous academic year. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for a given Candidate will be the same individual who chairs the Candidate’s Mentoring Committee (see F.1.4).

F.1.2 The “Tenured Faculty Promotion Committee” for recommending promotion from Associate to Full Professor for tenured faculty

The Tenured Faculty Promotion Committee consists of all FRS tenured faculty members who hold academic rank at or above the rank sought by the Candidate. The Committee will elect a chair from amongst their ranks. The Committee shall be convened during the Spring term of the academic year prior to the academic year in which the faculty member (Candidate) intends to apply for promotion.

F.1.3 The “Promotion Committee” for recommending promotion in rank for non-tenure-track faculty members

The Promotion Committee will include all tenure-track and tenured faculty members at or above the rank sought by the Candidate (i.e. individual seeking promotion). The Promotion Committee will also include all non-tenure track faculty members with voting rights (see C.2.1) in the same promotion track (either Instructor or Professor track) at or above the same rank as the Candidate. The Promotion Committee will convene in the Spring semester to review the record of each NTT faculty member (Candidate) who was in their position during the previous calendar year and who intends to seek promotion. The chair of the Promotion Committee will be the same individual who chairs the Candidate’s Mentoring Committee (see F.1.4).

F.1.4 The “Mentoring Committee” for all faculty members at the Assistant Professor rank or lower

A Mentoring Committee shall be constituted for each tenure-track faculty member and for all faculty members at the Instructor, Senior Instructor, or Assistant Professor ranks who intend to seek promotion. A subset of three members of the faculty at a rank higher than the faculty member for whom the mentoring committee is convened shall be appointed by the Department Head; for tenure-track faculty members, the Mentoring Committee must be composed of tenured faculty members. One member will be designated by the Department Head to serve as Chair of the Mentoring Committee and will serve as the primary mentor for the Candidate. The Mentoring Committee will convene during the first semester of the Candidate’s appointment and then in subsequent years.

F.2 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT

F.2.1 Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Department Head

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

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 and kept in the Candidate's personnel file.

F.2.2 Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Mentoring Committee

It is the responsibility of the Mentoring Committee to clearly articulate expectations regarding tenure and promotion to each Candidate. Each Mentoring Committee (Section F.1.4) will meet with the Candidate annually, conduct an annual evaluation of the faculty member, and make a recommendation annually concerning reappointment and progress towards tenure and/or promotion to the Department Head and the Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Promotion Committee. This recommendation will be provided to the Tenure and Promotion or Promotion Committee by February 15 of each year.

F.2.3 Annual faculty performance evaluations by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Promotion Committee

It is the responsibility of the Tenure and Promotion Committee or Promotion Committee to review annually the performance of all tenure-track faculty members eligible for promotion and all NTT faculty members who intend to seek promotion by March 15. This review will build upon the Mentoring Committee's evaluation conducted during the same academic year. The Committee shall be responsible for assessing annually the faculty member's performance with regards to department, college, and university standards for tenure and promotion. They will inform the Department Head regarding progress and will write an annual, written review of the Candidate's progress that will be shared with the Candidate and will become part of the Candidate's file; this review will be provided each year to the Department Head by March 15.

F.2.4 Midpoint comprehensive reviews for tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty seeking promotion

A comprehensive performance review of tenure-track faculty and all other faculty members at the Instructor or Assistant Professor ranks who intend to seek promotion will be conducted during their third year in position and rank at Colorado State University. Procedures for this review will be consistent with policies and procedures established in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Faculty applying for the comprehensive review must utilize current deadlines, guidelines, and documentation procedures for tenure and promotion from the Provost's Office. It is the applicant's responsibility to develop and maintain a portfolio that substantiates excellence in research, teaching, and professional service per their appointed workload allocation. The Tenure and Promotion Committee or Promotion Committee will use the information submitted by the Candidate and other materials gathered by the Committee as the basis for review. Committee recommendations regarding satisfactory progress towards tenure and/or promotion will be determined by a vote of all members. In the case of a split vote, a majority and minority report will be included with the recommendation. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the Committee will be provided to the Candidate, the Tenure and Promotion Committee or Promotion Committee, and the Department Head and forwarded subsequently to the Dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. The midpoint comprehensive review will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file.

F.2.5 Procedure for recommendations on advancement in rank and granting of tenure

For tenure-track/tenured faculty, in accordance with section E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, the Department Head shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion, beginning at the time of the annual review during the academic year prior to the academic year in which the Candidate intends to submit their application. The Department Head shall consult with the Tenure and Promotion or Promotion Committee following the annual review before initiating this process to confirm whether to proceed with the application to advance in rank and/or granting of tenure.

For non-tenure track faculty seeking advancement in rank, which they are eligible to do in their sixth year in position and rank in accordance with section E.13 of the Faculty Manual, the Department Head shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion, beginning at the time of the annual review during the academic year prior to the academic year in which the Candidate intends to submit their application for promotion. The Department Head shall consult with the Promotion Committee following the annual review before initiating this process to confirm whether to proceed with the application to advance in rank.

Procedures for this review will be consistent with policies and procedures established in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion must utilize current deadlines, guidelines, and documentation procedures for tenure and promotion from the Provost's Office. It is the applicant's responsibility to develop and maintain a portfolio that substantiates excellence in research, teaching, and professional service per their appointed workload allocation.

Because this recommendation is primarily a faculty responsibility, the Department Head shall ask the Tenure and Promotion or Promotion Committee to vote by ballot for or against tenure and/or promotion of the faculty member being considered. Promotion to Associate Professor does not automatically grant tenure. Tenure will usually accompany a promotion, but the decision on tenure is made independently of the decision on promotion. Any tenure and/or promotion recommendation shall be made by a majority vote of the Committee. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. A written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the Committee will be provided to the Candidate, the Tenure and Promotion or Promotion Committee members, and the Department Head. This letter will accompany the Candidate's application materials, which will be forwarded subsequently to the Dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President for review and either endorsement or opposition. A copy of this recommendation will be maintained in the faculty member's personal file.

F.2.8 Periodic Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty

Phase I reviews will be conducted by the Department Head in accordance with section E.14.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

When necessary, Phase II comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty members will be conducted by a Departmental Review Committee in accordance with section E.14.3.1 and section E.14.3.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. The members of the Departmental Review Committee, in order to eliminate the potential for bias, will include all tenured faculty members (excluding the faculty member undergoing Phase II review) in Forest and Rangeland Stewardship who hold the same or higher rank as the faculty member under review. Only if the Department cannot supply three members of suitable rank, then will the Department supply as many members of suitable rank as possible to the Departmental Review Committee; the existing members of the Departmental Review Committee will select any necessary additional members from among the faculty of the Warner College of Natural Resources. Criteria for review of the tenured faculty member will be jointly agreed to by the Committee to ensure an equitable evaluation in terms of teaching, research, service, and outreach, based on the nature of the faculty member's appointment. The tenured faculty member under review will provide the Committee with comprehensive documentation in support of the criteria by

which they will be evaluated. The faculty member under review may submit letters of support from peers within or outside the Department and University; they may also submit letters from professional organizations. The tenured faculty member may submit any additional information relevant to his/her performance criteria. Within two months of being convened, the committee will conclude its review and provide a written report in accordance with section E.14.3.2 of Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. This report will be provided to the Department Head and the Candidate and kept in the Candidate's personnel file.

F.3 DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship is a multidisciplinary department, which encompasses social, biological and physical sciences, and contains a breadth of professional traditions and faculty members with diverse appointments. Accordingly, there will be a diverse set of expectations for the granting of tenure and promotion within the different disciplines and appointment types. It is the responsibility of the Mentoring Committee to clearly articulate these expectations to Candidates at the assistant professor rank, or its equivalent, or lower. The recommendation for granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion in the Department shall be based on the following criteria:

F.3.1 Tenure

The tenure decision is based primarily on the candidate's performance of teaching, advising, service, and other assignments and achievements in scholarship. Tenure also reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. Faculty members are not merely employed by the University but are integral to the educational, extension, and research programs of the University; tenured faculty members are the community of educators who create institutional stability and an ongoing commitment to excellence. Tenure, therefore, will be granted to faculty members whose achievements in serving the University's missions and potential for effective long-term performance warrant the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment.

F.3.2 Promotion

The following table (Table 1) outlines the criteria for promotion within both the Instructor and Professor tracks. Details on these tracks can be found in the Faculty Manual at E.13. There are six available ranks for faculty grouped into four levels of ranks:

1. Instructors
2. Senior Instructors and Assistant Professors
3. Master Instructors and Associate Professors
4. Professors

Note: Evaluation of promotion according to these criteria will be made commensurate with the Candidate's appointment and allocation of effort.

Instructor Track	Professor Track
<p><u>Instructor</u> Instructors must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Master's degree in appropriate field (or equivalent); b) Primary appointment responsibilities of teaching; and c) Relevant experience and expertise in their field. 	<p>[No equivalent]</p>
<p><u>Senior Instructor</u> Promotion to Senior Instructor will be based on evidence of the Candidate's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Record of documented efforts and progress towards increased proficiency in teaching effectiveness (see section F.3.3); b) Evidence of professional development. 	<p><u>Assistant Professor</u> Assistant Professors must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ph.D. in appropriate field; b) Appointment that includes research and/or outreach/service responsibilities; and c) Relevant experience and expertise in their field.
<p><u>Master Instructor</u> Promotion to Master Instructor will be based on evidence of the Candidate's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Record of documented efforts and ongoing progress towards increased proficiency in teaching effectiveness (see section F.3.3); b) Record of positive contributions to the Department's instructional program or curriculum development; and c) Evidence of ongoing professional development. 	<p><u>Associate Professor</u> Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon evidence of the Candidate's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Record of documented efforts and progress towards increased proficiency in teaching effectiveness (see section F.3.3); b) Achievement in scholarship that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to their respective field or profession, with potential for distinction; c) Appropriate balance of institutional and professional service; d) Evidence of professional development
<p>[No equivalent]</p>	<p><u>Professor</u> Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon evidence of the applicant's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Record of documented efforts and ongoing progress towards increased proficiency in teaching effectiveness (see section F.3.3); b) Distinction in scholarship or teaching (commensurate with appointment) as evidenced in the candidate's recognition, leadership, or significant contributions to their field or profession; and c) Exemplary institutional and professional service, and an appropriate balance between the two.

F.3.3 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

As outlined in the Faculty Manual (Section E.12.1), excellent teachers are characterized by a variety of factors, including: their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; formation of interrelationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought; engagement of students in the learning process; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Teaching encompasses a faculty member's activities in multiple areas, including (but not limited to): 1) undergraduate and graduate teaching; 2) advising, mentoring, and student supervision; and 3) educational outreach activities (e.g. with peers, at conferences, on webinars, and by other forms of instruction beyond regular teaching duties).

Teaching effectiveness in FRS is defined as: "Using a variety of evidence-based tools and approaches to facilitate positive student learning outcomes." Teaching effectiveness is comprised of multiple domains (e.g. inclusive pedagogy, curricular alignment, classroom climate, pedagogical content knowledge, etc.). The Department encourages faculty members to identify a teaching goal and pursue a meaningful and manageable plan to improve teaching effectiveness, in line with our departmental and institutional commitments to education. The Faculty Manual dictates that evaluation of teaching effectiveness at CSU will not be based on anonymous comments, nor based on student course evaluations alone; rather, it must be based on multiple sources of information. We expect individual faculty members to pursue proficiency in teaching effectiveness using an evidence-based strategy, such as the CSU TILT (The Institute for Learning and Teaching) Teaching Effectiveness Framework.

Efforts to improve teaching effectiveness should occur at multiple points throughout the year. Each year in annual evaluations by the Department Head (see F.2), faculty members must provide a brief narrative that describes their goal and how they have been pursuing teaching effectiveness, the efforts they have made over the course of the previous year, and how they intend to measure progress for mid-point and promotion reviews. Faculty members will be expected to document both **efforts and progress** towards improved proficiency at the midpoint review (see F.2.4) and at times when they are seeking promotion (see F.2.5). This should include a succinct narrative summary describing how they have been pursuing teaching effectiveness since their appointment or last promotion, efforts made, and evidence of progress. Evidence of efforts and progress may be presented as an attachment, appendix, or in a teaching portfolio. For both annual and promotion reviews, we encourage faculty members to bring other types of evidence of success (e.g. awards, student letters, undergraduate and graduate student success, etc.) whenever appropriate.

Efforts to improve teaching effectiveness involve training, implementation of new strategies, and peer-evaluations by peers or other education professionals. Evidence therefore can include:

- Engagement in training to develop teaching skills;
- Documentation of efforts to improve instructional and student engagement techniques across teaching effectiveness domains (e.g. classroom climate, inclusive pedagogy, feedback and assessment, etc.);
- Evaluations conducted by education professionals or 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;

Progress may be documented in the form of longitudinal presentation of changes to both lead measures (e.g. improved practices and improved peer and student evaluations) and lag measures (e.g. improved student learning outcomes) over time. Evidence can include:

- Documentation of changes over time in instructional and student engagement techniques across teaching effectiveness domains;

- Changes in evaluation ratings by undergraduate and graduate students;
- Documentation of improved student learning outcomes (e.g. performance, knowledge retention);

SECTION G. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTING ACADEMIC FACULTY TO GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES

While graduate students are primarily responsible for choosing an advisor, a faculty member 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 Master's of Science 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. In the case of students enrolled in the Master's of Natural Resources Stewardship, a common departmental faculty committee (D.1.3) serves in the advisory function.

In general, only full-time, tenure-track faculty members may serve as chair of a graduate student's committee. Exceptions to this general rule may occur by majority vote of the tenure-track/tenured faculty on a case-by-case basis for faculty members with different appointment types. In such cases, the Graduate Program Committee shall draft a written agreement between the Department and the advisor specifying the conditions for such an agreement. The draft agreement will be submitted by the Graduate Program Committee to the eligible faculty for a vote of approval.

When circumstances arise that lead to (1) a student choosing to remove a faculty member as his/her chair or (2) when a faculty member wishes to voluntarily remove themselves as a chair, it is the responsibility of the faculty member and student to work with the Department Head to find a suitable replacement.

SECTION H. PROCEDURES RELATING TO SELF EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

The Department will conduct an Academic Program Review every six years consistent with Section C.2.3.2.2.d of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

This evaluation process will be complimented by periodic surveys of recent graduates and internal discussions at faculty meetings during the academic year.

SECTION I. PROCEDURES BY WHICH STUDENTS MAY APPEAL ACADEMIC DECISIONS OF THEIR INSTRUCTORS OR GRADUATE COMMITTEES

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

The Department faculty 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.

Prior to filing a formal appeal, the student must try to resolve the problem personally with the faculty member or instructor involved. Faculty members and instructors 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.

If a problem related to grading decisions is not satisfactorily resolved between the student and the faculty member or instructor, the student will be advised that he/she may file a formal appeal in accordance with I.7.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

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, two students from the Department, and a faculty member from another department to serve as the voting chair of the appeals committee. The appeals committee will proceed according to Section I.7.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

If the problem involves academic integrity, the student may request a hearing with the Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services in accordance with Section I.7.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

If the Department Head is a party to an appealed grading decision, 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 or instructor, in accordance with Section I.7.1. of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

SECTION J. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

A meeting of all department faculty and staff will be scheduled near 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.

Regular or formal meetings of the department faculty and staff to conduct business will be scheduled by the Department Head as needed during the academic year. An agenda will be prepared for each of these meetings and circulated to faculty at least one working day prior to the meeting.

A faculty meeting may be requested by a petition of the majority of the faculty for resolution of special issues.

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*.

An administrative assistant shall take notes at all faculty meetings. These notes will be circulated to all department faculty members for review within one week of the meeting. At the next faculty meeting, these notes will be approved by majority vote. The approved notes will then be placed on the department web site for one year for access by the department faculty. The Department Head will be responsible for maintaining an archive of these notes.

SECTION K. PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW AND AMENDING OF THE DEPARTMENTAL CODE

The code may be revised the year prior to the end of the Department Head's term and shall be reviewed in connection with the evaluations of academic programs and departmental operations. Revisions to this code may be suggested at any time by faculty in the department by written petition to the

Department Head. In such situations the Department Head will request that a code revision committee consisting of three faculty members be nominated and approved by the faculty. This committee will carefully consider all requests for changes in the code and, after soliciting faculty input on draft changes, present them together with its recommendations to the Department for adoption or rejection. A two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty will be required for adoption of each proposed change.

Any revision, amendment, or modification of the code that is adopted by the faculty will become effective on the first day of the month following its adoption, or as provided in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.