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College of Education

1.0 PURPOSE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

1.1 Mission Statement/Preamble

As we strive to meet the educational challenges of our community, we continue to work with our practitioner, colleagues and students to develop responsive systems of educational leadership and challenging learning environments. We seek to maximize the opportunities for all to achieve their full potential. We embrace the diversity of the community we serve; building on its strengths, while addressing its needs. We draw upon interdisciplinary traditions to seek new solutions in an environment of constant educational renewal.

Our students learn in a community-based environment developed through partnerships with the public schools and other agencies. They apply their skills and knowledge using a variety of academic disciplines and community resources. They are prepared to provide for the needs of the people in a diverse society. Our faculty and students collaborate to develop a genuine community of scholars dedicated to ensuring access to the full range of opportunity afforded by this society. Programs use a multidisciplinary approach to reflect more completely the broad diversity within our society. Program faculty teach each student cohort the appropriate counseling, administrative, developmental and instructional skills necessary to respond to the professional challenges now and in the future.

Our College is dedicated to providing the intellectual leadership and energy necessary to analyze and adapt, where appropriate, schools and community services in a time of increasingly rapid societal changes. Our collaborative efforts aim at a process for this restructuring that is responsive to the dynamic society in which our students move. Diversity, community, and collaboration are the values that mark the vision behind all of our educator preparation programs.
1.2 Purposes
Pursuant to this, the specific purpose and responsibilities of the College—its functions—are to provide the following:

1.2.1 Courses of instruction that deal with the educative process for many perspectives, that engage the many aspects of the process—whether psychological or philosophical, whether curriculum or method of instruction, whether for the young or the adult, and that include some value for the general education program for any student.
1.2.2 Programs of courses and field experience that lead to basic California teaching credentials and to specialist credentials for specific educational services at all public school levels.
1.2.3 Programs that lead to credentials for educational administrators and counselors; to the practice of career, vocational rehabilitation, and other counseling positions.
1.2.4 In all professional instruction an emphasis on depth and thoroughness of study, on the contexts of performances much as the skills, on development of student resources and independence of learning, and on the values that profession serves.
1.2.5 In conjunction with professional preparation programs or separately, graduate programs that lead to the Master of Arts in Education with many specializations and to the Master of Science in Counseling.
1.2.6 In-service instruction for educational professionals as well as pre-service either as this is inherent in M.A. and specialist programs or as it requires separate provision.
1.2.7 Topical courses, programs, and other experiences in response to public need and for which the College is an appropriate agency.
1.2.8 A place and a faculty for the assignment of public and private grants for research and innovation germane to the purpose of the College.
1.2.9 Cooperation with other Colleges and departments in interdisciplinary instruction and curriculum development.
1.2.10 Instruction that serves the need of other professions for educational theory and process, as the ministry, nursing, law enforcement, research, and the military.
1.2.11 Liaison and cooperation with adjacent agencies of schooling, government, and social welfare and serve the public interest.
1.2.12 In all of these functions, a climate of reason, humaneness, and scholarship; a concern for feelings as well as information and actions, a dedication to innovation, experimentation, and social action and reform as these are indicated and appropriate to the nature of the College.
Policies and Procedures on Appointments, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

The Undergraduate, Credentials, and Graduate Branches, in the College of Education present this document to the University Appointment, Retention, and Promotion Committee in efforts to advance the culture required of the disciplines in the CoE. The following policies and procedures on Appointments, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (ARTP) are consistent with those of the University and serve to supplement rather than supplant these documents.

Performance Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Promotion and Tenure are regarded as the recognition of the accomplishments of a faculty member and an indicator of trust in the potential contributions that will be made during their academic life. The doctoral degree is required for promotion and award of tenure.

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Primary Committee

Composition: Branch Primary Committees shall be composed of three (3) tenured faculty from the candidate’s academic discipline with a rank higher than those under consideration for promotion. FERP faculty can participate as long as the review is conducted in a semester in which the FERP faculty is on campus. One member of the committee shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member. In cases where fewer than three (3) faculty members within the Branch are eligible to participate, additional members from related disciplines in the College of Education will be elected. An alternate shall serve as a regular working member in all policies and procedural matters and be eligible to vote when replacing a regular member who is unable to attend or who recuses themselves for possible conflict. If there are no tenured discipline based faculty, or if the majority of the Committee is faculty external to the Branch, then the Branch Chair shall serve as an ex officio member for the purpose of discipline specific, peer, and Branch specific discussions, but will not have a vote on the Committee.

The Committee shall be elected by full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the Branch and serve for one academic year. The membership of the Committee shall elect a Chairperson. The Branch Chair will, when appropriate, conduct a review and submit an independent recommendation, except where prohibited by College of Education policy or contract language.

Comment [SG1]: Under this criteria branches would have multiple committees, right??

Comment [SG2]: How does this conform to UARTP policy as to role of the chair in RTP? Each primary unit may choose one of the following alternatives to govern the role of the chair in connection with periodic evaluation of full-time temporary faculty and probationary faculty not subject to performance review:

1. The primary unit chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate evaluation.

OR

2. The primary unit chair shall not serve on nor meet with the primary committee but shall conduct an independent review and submit a separate evaluation.
Committee Procedures: The Committee will review, discuss and act upon requests and documentation materials for faculty retention, tenure, and promotion. Confidentiality will be maintained throughout this process.

In cooperation with the Branch Chair, the Primary Committee will ensure that evaluation procedures and criteria are made available to the faculty members to be reviewed prior to commencement of performance review.

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is that portion of the Personnel Action File (PAF) used for periodic or performance review. Each candidate, in conjunction with the Branch Chair, has the responsibility of preparing a WPAF according to the format designated by the College of Education Dean.

SOMEWHERE IN THIS DOCUMENT WE SHOULD ADDRESS FORMAT INCLUDING WHAT IS IN PAF – APPOINTMENT LETTER, ETC. AND WHAT IS IN WPAF AND THE ISSUE OF EACH SECTION INCLUDING A NARRATIVE PREPARED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER THAT ORIENTS THE READERS.

Written comments received from the primary Committee’s recommendation letter shall be placed in the WPAF and copies of the material and rationale for the recommendations given to the candidate at least five (5) days prior to such placement. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a rebuttal in writing, and/or request a meeting with the Primary Committee no later than ten (10) days following receipt of the Primary Committee recommendation. A copy of the candidate’s written rebuttal shall accompany the WPAF and be forwarded to the Secondary RTP Committee for consideration.

In order to be able to cast a vote, committee members must be present during all committee meetings and discussions and must have reviewed the candidate’s WPAF file. Elected alternates should, whenever possible, also be present in order to cast a vote. Abstentions will not be counted as a negative vote.

A simple majority vote of Committee members will be required for any action. All votes will be conducted by secret ballot.

Data Reviewed: All materials serving as a basis for evaluation and used by the Primary Committee for substantive deliberations will appear in the WPAF prepared by the candidate. The Dean of the College of Education, as custodian of the PAF, will submit materials to the WPAF which include documented material.
from the department faculty and colleagues, results of standard student evaluations and written comments, and other signed written comments.

Criteria for Evaluation: The following criteria have been adopted by the Branches of the College of Education consistent with University policies and procedures for retention, tenure, and promotion. It should be noted that Teaching Effectiveness is recognized as the primary and essential criterion as referenced by the requirement of “meets criteria” at all levels of review during the retention and tenure process.

COMPETENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

- Branch averages of student summative evaluative scores must be included in the WPAF.
- Those summative scores must be drawn from the numerical scores on official standardized student evaluations administered in either electronic or paper and pencil format.
- The file must include a statement describing the nature of the faculty member’s teaching assignment, including such factors as the number of course preparations, frequency of teaching the same preparation, whether courses are undergraduate or graduate, lower or upper division, whether a course is required or elective, class size, and any other relevant features of the assignment.
- In cases where a portion of the faculty’s assignment is covered by assigned time or release time, a description of the duties involved should be provided.

Evidence of teaching competence should include both judgmental and descriptive evidence to be demonstrated by any or all of the following criteria:

1. Development of course syllabi and other course materials to include course outline, objectives, reading list and references, teaching strategies, evaluation, grading procedures, lecture outlines, handouts, electronic mediums (e.g., power point presentations, videos, etc.) and examples of tests and quizzes.

2. Quantitative results of student summative evaluations and written appraisal from student evaluations. Every faculty member is evaluated by summative student evaluation in all classes.
3. Active participation in individual course and curriculum development and evaluation.

4. Direction and administration of students’ culminating experience (e.g. student teaching, master’s theses/projects, etc.) as part of their teaching assignment.

5. Development of learning models, learning resource materials, and/or new teaching methods for students or clinical faculty.

6. Program curriculum development and summative evaluation.

7. Participation in continuing education instruction, workshops, or trainings.

8. Documentation of teaching effectiveness based on classroom observation by a tenured faculty from the candidates field of discipline during the first, second, and fifth probationary years. Additional reports consistent with the Primary Committee’s request for an individual to work on improving an area of teaching effectiveness in subsequent evaluations the following year may be required by the Primary Committee. The individual faculty employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es). The written report of these observations will be included in the faculty member’s WPAF.

9. Formal recognition of teaching competence through reception of awards or citation from academic or professional units.

10. Submission by professional colleagues, both on and off campus, such as letters of evaluation and recommendations regarding teaching performance.

11. Evidence illustrative of student advising activities, including assisting advisees to clarify career goals, develop educational plans, select appropriate courses. Other activities may also include collaborating with students on research and pedagogy projects, supervising independent study and other related projects and experiences. Submissions by professional colleagues,
both on and off campus, such as letters of evaluation and recommendations regarding teaching performance.

**Competent Teaching Performance Ranking Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria</td>
<td>* X of Y criteria met&lt;br&gt; <strong>AND</strong>&lt;br&gt; Scores above 3.0 on overall student summative evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria, minimally</td>
<td>* X of Y criteria met&lt;br&gt; <strong>AND</strong>&lt;br&gt; Scores at or above 3.0 on overall student summative evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds criteria</td>
<td>* X of Y criteria met&lt;br&gt; <strong>AND</strong>&lt;br&gt; Scores in top quartile of branch faculty scores on overall student summative evaluations&lt;br&gt; <strong>AND</strong>&lt;br&gt; Documentation by discipline specific peers of outstanding teaching performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet criteria</td>
<td>* X of Y criteria met&lt;br&gt; <strong>OR</strong>&lt;br&gt; Scores below 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOLARY AND/OR CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

Scholarly achievements shall be defined as research and/or creative activities, including instructionally-related, discipline-based, applied, action and/or evaluation research. Evidence of an ongoing and sustained record of scholarly and/or creative activities should be demonstrated by the following:

1. Dissemination of scholarly works in peer-reviewed/edited publications, professional books/texts, book chapters, or equivalent.

2. Participation in the writing and submission of funded grants research reports, and other associated documents (e.g., Human Subjects submissions, evaluation reports), or equivalent.

3. Authorship of other creative works or equivalent.

4. Peer-reviewed or invited presentations at international, national, regional, state, and local meetings and conferences.

5. Evidence of an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress.

6. Evidence of scholarship or creative activity in the development or application of technology, or both.

7. Presentation of professional lectures pertaining to the faculty employee’s scholarship and creative activities.

8. Creative activity culminating in innovative programs, service learning projects, or policy proposals, programs or materials pertaining to issues of public concern.

9. The products of consulting, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise.

---

Comment [c9]: DG: What level/average meets standard for “meets criteria?” Is this fair to Deaf Studies faculty, who are teaching in a second language or through interpreters, which can impact student perceptions of instructional competence? (I see at end, seems to say 3.0 meets criteria – this seems ok to me, depending on how many other criteria are also required for “meeting criteria.”

Comment [c10]: SG: Do we need the word “equivalent” and what do we mean by that?

Comment [c11]: DG: No avenues for non-peer-reviewed work to be included? Under old system, non-peered work was allowable; is all our work in this area now not to be included? Can we at least be “grandfathered in” in order to not have all the work we did in this area be in vain? Why can we not produce scholarly-based, but non-peer-reviewed work for dissemination among the general public, such as parents and our communities? It would probably be fair to have non-peer-reviewed work to count as “half” (or a “third”) of peer-reviewed work but still receive credit as publication.

Can publication in other venues, such as edited books or websites also count as being reviewed by peers? If no, why not? What about works that have been included in other works without solicitation? Shouldn't we receive credit for having our work be recognized as worthwhile by our peers? What about submissions that have been rejected? Do we no longer get credit for having at least taken time to research and write?

What counts as “creative” work? No examples of these are given in this section.

"Average, one scholarly work per year" (meets criteria). This puts a lot of burden on us to research, write, and publish, especially when we also carry full teaching loads. Also, many journals and publications often take a great deal of time to put work into publication; this can potentially impact how often we SEEM to be published.
**Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Ranking Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria</td>
<td>• One (1) scholarly product every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria, minimally</td>
<td>• One (1) scholarly product every two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Exceeds criteria                  | • On average, two (2) scholarly products per year for the most recent two years  
                                    |   **AND**  
                                    | • One (1) of these four products must be published, accepted, or in-press in a peer-reviewed/edited publication, or equivalent.  
                                    |   **AND**  
                                    | • Candidate must be a lead author on at least one (1) of the products published in a peer-reviewed/edited publication, or equivalent |
| Does not meet criteria            | • No scholarly products in two (2) years                                 |
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTION

Evidence of University, College, and Branch/Program service should be demonstrated by the following criteria:

1. Active participation in CSU, University, College, or Branch/Program governance, committees, or task forces.

2. Contributions to the University, College, or Branch/Program such as membership on committees, orientation, or recruitment.

3. Service in University, College, or Branch/Program leadership roles.

4. Development of accreditation and assessment (WASC, etc.) documents or University, College, or Branch/Program review documents.

5. Advising of student organizations in the University, College or Branch/Program.

6. Service as an official representative of the University, College, or Branch/Program in the community.

7. Student advising when this activity extends beyond that of the normal program advising expected of all faculty, explain the nature of this activity.

8. Evidence of collaboration and supervision of students on research and pedagogy projects as well as supervising independent study.

Comment [c12]: SG. What is the difference between 1 & 2?

Comment [c13]: SG: Is this on committees or, say, in administrative roles like program coordinator or chair? Should these be two different items?

Comment [c14]: DG: I do not have major issues with this; however, “meets criteria” includes assuming a leadership position on committees, which suggests that continued service on those committees over more than one year is necessary. However, voting structures within the COE have often prevented some people from staying on within a committee in order to gain the necessary experience to be ready for leadership within those committees.

I also note that the expectation is that one will serve on more than one committee. However, with the number of faculty we have and the reduced number of committees under the reorganization, it is quite likely that a number of faculty will find themselves shut out of service on committees due to membership constraints.
## Contributions to the Institution Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria</td>
<td>Service on more than one (1) Branch/Program committee with evidence of increasing responsibility (e.g., leadership position or lead on a committee sponsored special project) AND Service on one (1) College or one (1) University committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria, minimally</td>
<td>Service on one (1) Branch/Program committee AND Service on one (1) University or College committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds criteria</td>
<td>Service on one (1) Branch/Program committee AND Service on one (1) College committee AND Service on one (1) University committee AND Evidence of increasing levels of responsibility on College, Branch/Program or University committee(s) (e.g., leadership position or lead on a committee sponsored special project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet criteria</td>
<td>No evidence of service at any institutional level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY

Evidence of contributions to the community should be demonstrated by the following criteria:

1. Membership in national, regional, state, or local professional organizations or societies (e.g., American Educational Research Association, CA AERA).

2. Offices or leadership roles held in professional organizations at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.

3. Participation on committees of professional organizations at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.

4. Participation or leadership roles on committees of societies, agencies, commissions, organizations, panels, or boards, at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.

5. Participation in the peer review process of grants, manuscripts, books and/or other publications.

6. Volunteer, pro bono, or paid presentations, consultant trainings/activities.

7. Community service activities specific to the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise.

8. Awards or other forms of community service recognition.

9. Clinical services provided to the University/College, or Branch/Program.

10. Participation in mass media (press, radio, internet, blogs, etc.) activities.

Comment [RJ17]: I have a question about this; under scholarly activities there is the criteria “Presentation of professional lectures pertaining to the faculty employee’s scholarship and creative activities.” I commonly do workshops for schools, organizations, etc. on bullying – which is my area of scholarship – however these presentations are using my expertise to help the community and not directly related to research findings I have done, would that be covered under this bullet? Maybe we can add “trainings” after consultant?

Comment [c18]: SG: Shouldn’t this go under institutional service?
### Contributions to the Community Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets criteria</strong></td>
<td>• X of Y criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets criteria, minimally</strong></td>
<td>• X of Y criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds criteria</strong></td>
<td>• X of Y criteria met with a leadership position in a professional organization at the international, national, regional, or state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not meet criteria</strong></td>
<td>• Less than X criteria met AND • Not a member of a professional organization at the international, national, regional, or state level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [WPL19]:** My only concern about this metric is that it does not allow for someone who really invests deeply in a community service activity. This seems to privilege doing many potentially unconnected activities over doing one or two activities that may have a large impact. Can we account for that somehow?

**Comment [WPL20]:** I would like to assume they are all professionally related… this gets us away from community service actually being service to my family, …

**Comment [RJ21]:** I agree with the comments above that quantifying it by number of criteria is too simple, might do a lot in one area and that may speak to their strengths but not do any or as much in the other criteria. I think there should be a way to take that into consideration.

**Comment [SG22]:** Again, to require this specificity related to leadership positions in professional organizations seems too much to me.

**Comment [c23]:** DG: Does membership in national organizations HAVE to be professional in nature? What about orgs like NAD, Deafhood Foundation, etc. Why is participation in peer review under “Community” rather than under “Scholarly”?

**Comment [c24]:** DG: GENERAL IMPRESSIONS: Under each subject area, options are given for meeting the criteria in each area. Are certain options to be given more credit or weight than other options (by Primary/Secondary committees) in meeting criteria? Or is each option given EQUAL weight? That is, under Community, 10 options are allowed. Is option #9 given just as much weight as option #1?

What if one has done work in an area that does not fit neatly within the options provided or has not been defined within the document? Is this work then going to be disallowed for consideration toward tenure/promotion?
RETENTION & PROMOTION

Retention Criteria: Tenure-Line Faculty

- For first and second probationary year faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve “meets criteria” in Teaching Effectiveness and one of the three remaining evaluative areas (Scholarly and/or Creative Activities, Service to the University and Service to the Community).

- For third and fourth probationary year faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in the area of Teaching Effectiveness and two of the remaining three evaluative areas.

- For fifth year probationary faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are the same. To be tenured and promoted to Associate Professor, the faculty member must maintain a ranking of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas.

Promotion Criteria: Full Professor

To be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in Competent Teaching Performance and “exceeds criteria” in the area of Scholarly and Creative Achievements and one other evaluative area. The peer-reviewed publication on which the candidate is lead author cannot be the same article used to satisfy the Scholarly and/or Creative Activities for tenure. The two remaining evaluative areas must be ranked at the “meets criteria” level.

Early Tenure and Early Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor

The criteria for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor are the same. To receive early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “exceeds criteria” for the areas of Competent Teaching Performance, as well as a ranking of “exceeds criteria” for one of the other three areas (Scholarly and Creative Achievements, Contributions to the

Comment [c25]: SG: I can’t remember exactly what the discussion about the criteria was here and how it compares with what we have for Associate.
University, or Contributions to the Community). The areas in which the faculty member does not achieve the “exceeds criteria” ranking must be ranked at the “meets criteria” level for early tenure and promotion to be granted.

Early Promotion Criteria: Full Professor

To achieve early promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “exceeds criteria” for the area of “Competent Teaching Performance,” as well as a ranking of “exceeds criteria” for two of the other three areas (Scholary and Creative Achievements, Contributions to the University, or Contributions to the Community). The areas in which the faculty member does not achieve the “exceeds criteria” ranking must be ranked at the “meets criteria” level for early promotion to be granted.

Post Full Professor Review Criteria:

TBD