College of Education: Demystifying the RTP Process

April 24, 2025

Presenters
Dr. Amber Gonzalez (she/her) and Dr. Albert Lozano (he/him)
COE SEC Co-Chairs (2024 – 2025)

SACRAMENTO STATE

Redefine the Possible™

Strategies for Inclusive Engagement

- Please make sure that your name is correct under participants
- Please mute your microphone and video
- When you have a question/comment, please use the "raise hand" feature under participants and wait to be recognized
- After being recognized please unmute your video and microphone to share
  - Please make sure to state your name first and also speak slowly
- Please use the chat feature *minimally*

- Any additions? Comments?

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Recording

- Recording this presentation
  - Slides and Recording will be placed on the Education website

- Let's save questions until the end
  - Unless they are burning questions that MUST be asked

CBA & UARTP & RTP

Collective Bargaining Agreement → University Appointment, Retention, Tenure, & Promotion → COE ARTP

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Where do I locate the COE ARTP?

- Education Secure Website
- My Sac State
  - At the very top – center
  - Internal Documents and Resources
    - Education → Faculty & Staff Resources Policies & Forms
    - → Policy: Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Teaching Performance Index

1. Faculty member's teaching assignment, indicating workload and courses per semester. Faculty are encouraged to include quantitative results of student evaluations

Please describe the entire workload for each semester under review. The latest semester first.

Semester	Course number and title/Section OR Assigned time description	N	Mean
spring 2020	EDC 254, Section 3: Counseling and Psychotropic Medication	21	4.76
spring 2020	EDC 475, Section 5: Practicum in Counseling	6	4.82
spring 2020	EDC 238, Section 1: Professional Issues in Marriage and Family Counseling	13	4.75
Spring 2020	CCDS Site Supervision: 3 units release time		
spring 2020	MCFC Program Coordinator: 2 units release time		
fall 2019	EDC 219, Section: Group Processing in Counseling		4.54
fall 2019	EDC 216, Section: Counseling Theory		4.89
fall 2019	EDC 280, Section: Practicum in communication		4.58
fall 2019	CCDS Site Supervision: 2 units release time		
fall 2019	MCFC Program Coordinator: 2 units release time		

The RTP Toolkit- your new best friend!

Go to the Toolkit, look around in it, bookmark it.

The index helps you organize your file and assists the reviewers in understanding your evidence

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Overview of Presentation

- Key Terms
- Evaluation Committees
  - PEC, SEC, Branch Chair
  - Election and Responsibilities
- Years of Review
  - Periodic, Retention, Tenure
  - Early Tenure and Early Promotion
- Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action Files
- Index and Evidence
- Evaluative Criteria
  - Teaching Performance
  - Scholarship and/or Creative Achievements
  - Institutional Service
  - Community Service
- Suggestions to Consider

Key Terms

Term	Definition
RTP	Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
Probationary	Tenure-Track (not tenured), may also be referred to as "junior"
WPAF	Working Personnel Action File (or also Volume II), file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. This is the electronic file.
PAF	Personnel Action File (or also Volume I); official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. Usually a folder within the WPAF.
Index	Table of Contents of evidence
Narrative or Reflection	Statement written by faculty member, opportunity to provide context to the evidence they provide in the file

Key Terms

Term	Definition
Periodic Evaluation (or Review)	Materials submitted/received since date of last evaluation
Performance Evaluation (or Review)	Materials submitted/received since date of appointment (or of last promotion)
Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC)	Made up of tenured faculty from your Branch/Department
Secondary Evaluation Committee (SEC)	Made up of tenured faculty from the College

Primary And Secondary Evaluation Committees

- Election
  - Primary Evaluation Committees (PECs)
    - 4 tenured faculty members
      - Branch Chair
      - 3 tenured faculty members from the candidate's academic branch

  - Secondary Evaluation Committee (SEC)
    - 8 faculty members,
      - 2 elected from each of 3 branches
      - 2 members elected at large

- Responsibilities
  - Conduct a substantive review of each faculty candidate relative to retention, tenure and/or promotion.
    - Quality of artifacts are considered
  - Provide *recommendations* on matters of retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on evidence in the candidate's Working Personnel Action File.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Years of Review

Level of Review	Retention Year 1 Periodic Evaluation	Retention Year 2, 3, 5 Periodic Evaluation	Retention Year 4 Periodic Evaluation	Year 6 "Tenure" Performance Evaluation	Promotion to Full Professor Performance Evaluation
First	Primary	Primary	Primary	Primary	Primary
Second		Secondary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
Third	Dean	Dean	Dean	Dean	Dean
Fourth			Provost *conducts a Performance Evaluation*	Provost	Provost

Early Tenure and Early Promotion (UARTP)

- Early tenure is not a right.

- Early tenure is recognition of qualifications and performance substantially beyond that required for the granting of tenure after the normal six (6) year probationary period.

- Early tenure is granted for attaining a professional standard that includes activities which bring widespread recognition to the individual and the university from the academic community and/or the general public.

- A faculty member under consideration for early tenure shall contain evidence of recognized outstanding performance in teaching, which shall be given primary weight, and of appropriate academic preparation.
  - It shall also contain evidence of recognized outstanding performance in at least two (2) of the remaining three (3) university criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion: scholarly or creative achievement, contribution to the institution, and contribution to the community.
  - The candidate must also receive a minimum rating of "meets criteria" for the remaining fourth evaluative area

Early Tenure and Early Promotion (COE ARTP)

- Early promotion and tenure is recognition of qualifications and performance **substantially beyond that required for the granting of tenure** after the typical six (6) year probationary period.

- Early promotion and tenure is granted for attaining a professional standard that **includes activities that bring widespread recognition to the individual and the university from the academic community and/or the general public.**

- To earn Early promotion and tenure, faculty **candidates must obtain a rating of "outstanding" in Teaching Performance and two (2) of the three (3) other evaluative areas with "meets criteria" for the fourth (4th) evaluative area.**

In the narrative, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain how they have met the standard

Personnel Action File (PAF)

- The PAF is confidential and official
  - Confidential file with exclusive access of the faculty member and designated administrators and administrative staff
  - Official personnel file for employment information
    - Access log
    - Appointment letter and other relevant appointment information
    - Results of standardized student evaluations
    - Written student comments and summaries of oral student comments, if any
    - Submissions by professional colleagues both on and off campus such as letters of evaluation and recommendation regarding teaching performance, acknowledgment of teaching awards or honors, results of class visitations, opinions, and/or evaluation by peers
    - Peer evaluations, if any
    - All evaluations, recommendations, rebuttals, responses and decisions for each level of review for past review cycles

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

- The WPAF is maintained by the faculty member
  - Should be updated for every review period

- The WPAF shall contain:
  - Current CV
  - A clear statement of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester throughout the review period
  - Index to materials submitted
  - Narratives for each of the four categories for evaluation
  - Supporting evidence related to the four categories for evaluation for the period under review
    - Some materials may need to be removed if they are not being considered for this year of review

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

WPAF Folders

- WPAF is organized in the following order, each with an individual folder:
  - Current CV
  - Index
  - Teaching Performance
    - Workload assignment for each semester throughout the review period
  - Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements
  - Contributions to the Institution
  - Contributions to the Community

- Within each folder you should organize your files in the order they appear in your index

Activities and Workload

- Workload assignment of courses and activities for each semester throughout the review period
  - How are you getting your WTU's?
    - You <u>must</u> have 24 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per year (CBA)
  - Include courses taught and reassigned time (or course buy-outs)
    - If you have a buy-out – what was it for?
      - Describe how many units and the work you engaged in

4.3.1.1. Teaching assignment

The most recent semester first. Include N (# of students who completed evaluation) and mean evaluation score for student evaluations.

Semester	Course number and title/Section OR Assigned time description	N	Mean
Fall 2024	CHAD 133: Research Methods in Human Development (01, 4 WTU)	30	4.01
Fall 2024	CHAD 135: Culture and Human Development (03, 3 WTU)	40	4.35
Fall 2024	First year reassigned time: CBA (3 WTU)		
Fall 2024	CHAD 133: Research Methods in Human Development (01, 4 WTU)	40	4.30
Spring 2025	CHAD 133: Research Methods in Human Development (01, 4 WTU)	39	4.5
Spring 2025	CHAD 135: Culture and Human Development (01, 3 WTU)	38	4.44
Spring 2025	First year reassigned time: CBA (3 WTU)		

Workload Table: Teaching Index
RTP Toolkit

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

What is an Index?

- This shows how all the evidence documenting your performance for the past evaluation cycle is organized

- Essentially a directory to the "heart" of your WPAF

- Supporting materials may be listed on the index but not physically present in the file.
  - Considered to be included by reference on the index and are to be considered part of the WPAF for any evaluation actions. – *use sparingly*

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INSTITUTION INDEX

See

Semester(s) and Year	Service activity description and link. Note: Leadership Roles in bold	Category 1 - 4
2019 - present	CHAD MA Program, Active Participation • Active review of applicants for the MA program in Child and Adolescent Development • Active involvement in new graduate student orientations 1a Gonzalez CHAD MA Program_Pieng 10 2022	1
Spring 2019 – Fall 2020	CHAD BA Program Redesign, Active Participation • Child Development Permit Advisor • Active participation in the CHAD: Social and Community Contexts BA degree redesign 1b Gonzalez CHAD Ugrad Redesign_Ferreira van Leer 103122 1ba CHDV Permit for CSUS_2022	1
2020 - present	**CHAD BA Program, EDCE Concentration, Lead UpLift Grant** • Program Lead in the CHAD: Early Development, Care, and Education BA degree redesign 1c BA CHAD EDCE Form B 1d BA CHAD EDCE Assessment Plan 1e CHAD EDCE presentation 9 13 2022	1
2019-2020	**COE WriteOn, Lead Facilitator** • Developed and engaged as the lead facilitator of a program for faculty within the	2

What is Evidence?

- Evidence includes documents, artifacts, or items that support your work
    - For example
        - A syllabus
        - A service letter from a committee chair you served on
        - A letter from an editor thanking you for reviewing for a journal

- Placing evidence into a WPAF is not enough
    - Your reflections/narratives should describe the evidence

- You don't have to include *everything*
    - Who are you? What evidence clearly demonstrates who you are

Organizing Your Evidence?

- Evidence should be presented in the index AND THE NARRATIVE SHOULD FOLLOW THE SAME ORDER
  - Ideally, hyperlink the evidence in the index AND in the narrative

- Keep your audience in mind
  - Not everyone who reviews you will have your disciplinary background
    - Avoid jargon and acronyms
    - Be specific about how your work contributes to your specific discipline – concise and explicit

- Any item presented in WPAF should be discussed in narratives

- Statements such as "available upon request" should be used sparingly

Narratives: What are they?

- **NARRATIVE SHOULD BE WRITTEN FOLLOWIING THE ORDER OF THE INDEX**
- For each evaluative area you will be *required* to write a narrative.
- Details the work that you <u>*have completed*</u> during the period under review
- Be concise and detailed
  - Teaching narrative is *usually* your longest

- The narrative provides
  - Details on the evidence submitted
  - Reflection on what has been done - what has gone well and where are opportunities for growth
  - Where have you grown within that evaluative area
  - Aspirations for future activities (e.g., professional development, new course preps, service activities)

- Should you write a general narrative?
  - Not necessary but…
  - If you do write a general narrative – make it short and highlight how your work fits together in all evaluative areas
  - IF there is something that occurred over the year that impacted your work. For example – COVID 19, a passing of a loved one, a life event – You should write a general narrative

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

COE Weights for Evaluative Criteria

- Teaching Performance – 55%
- Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements – 15%
- Contributions to the Institution – 15%
- Contributions to the Community – 15%

Teaching Performance

Redefine the Possible™

Teaching Performance

- Effectiveness in teaching performance creates sustained positive influence on all students' knowledge, skills, and dispositions and contributes to accomplishing the course and program objectives.

- Effective teaching creates a positive learning environment by providing a dynamic, equity-minded, and student-centered approach in multiple areas of the faculty member's expertise and involves engagement with the program's students, courses, and curriculum.

- Effective educators display leadership through engaging in consistent self-reflective practices and ongoing efforts to remain current in pedagogical practices in higher education including culturally responsive and inclusive pedagogy, and evidences expertise in subject matter, pedagogical strategies, and communication.

Teaching Performance

A holistic evaluation of faculty member's teaching performance will seek to identify the quality of each source of evidence by examining each for indicators of effectiveness in teaching as defined above and contextualized in the faculty member's narrative statement

Candidates must submit evidence as required below.
1. Faculty member's teaching assignment
   - Indicating workload of courses taught per semester (as well as re-assigned time)
2. Sample course syllabi and other course materials such as course outlines, reading lists, grading procedures, lecture outlines, assignments, assessments
3. Narrative Statement
   1. Educational/pedagogical philosophy
   2. Self-reflection contextualizing SQEs
   3. Relationships between teaching effectiveness and evidence
   4. Plans for maintaining and/or improvement

General Suggestions

- Teaching Narrative
  - Remember the mission of the CSU system is teaching
  - Review previous evaluations and respond to them
  - Self-analysis of teaching effectiveness
    - Demonstrate action and reflection
    - How did COVID-19 impact your teaching?
    - How have racial injustices impacted your teaching?
  - Include information about how you apply your philosophy of teaching to your instruction
    - Classroom assessments, innovative pedagogy, problem-based inquiry, student centered teaching – recognizing students' cultures and histories within your curriculum
    - How did COVID-19 impact this?
  - Include professional development activities
    - How did you implement new knowledge, reflection
  - Development of any new courses – curriculum
    - How was your expertise utilized for this activity?
  - Syllabi
    - DO NOT include ALL syllabi for every course for every year
      - Include the most recent syllabus and explain *concisely* how the course has improved

General Suggestions

- Classroom observation
    - DO THEM
    - Years 2 + 3 + 4 or 5
    - Who should I ask to do a classroom observation?
        - Program
        - Branch
        - PEC/SEC member
        - CoE colleague
        - CTL mentor
    - Invite them to use the observation form AND a brief reflection

CoE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Include in WPAF, OR include a letter based on this form

Faculty name:	Observer name:
Course name:	Date:

OBSERVER PLEASE OMIT/DELETE ITEMS BELOW THAT YOU HAVE NOT OBSERVED

Item	Comments/evidence
1. Course materials provide an equity/global perspective on course topics.	
2. Assessments are varied; evaluative criteria are explicit.	
3. Authors of course materials represent diverse backgrounds.	
4. Pedagogy allows space for academic discourse inclusive of various perspectives.	

Teaching Performance & SQEs

- SQE's are required per CBA, all of your evaluations will be part of your PAF

- Per COE ARTP
  - SQEs shall **<u>never</u>** be used as the **<u>only</u>** standard for assessing teaching performance.
  - SQEs shall not be given undue weight in faculty evaluations, since these numerical scores may reflect implicit bias and attitudes that extend beyond the successful accomplishment of the faculty member's teaching performance.

General Suggestions

- Student Evaluations
  - Remember that you are the expert of your classroom – bring your analytic skills in reviewing the data
    - Try to not create summaries of the data but rather put the data in context
      - How did COVID-19 impact this data?
        » Response rates? Student expectations? Your own expectations?
    - Address the feedback received in the context of your teaching philosophy, pedagogical approaches, and strategies used for assessing student learning
    - Address *all* feedback – quantitative and qualitative
      - Do not shy away from addressing an aspect of the course design or classroom practice that did not achieve the desired result
      - If evaluative data raised an issue with course design or classroom practice you should dissect the issue and outline plans to address it in the future
        » This demonstrates dedication to improving your teaching
    - If you believe there are biases, address them – call these out
      - Do not rely on your reviewers to know or understand that SQEs are culturally biased

Teaching Performance Index

1. Faculty member's teaching assignment, indicating workload and courses per semester. Faculty are encouraged to include quantitative results of student evaluations

Please describe the entire workload for each semester under review. The latest semester first.

Semester	Course number and title/Section OR Assigned time description	N	Mean
spring 2020	EDC 254, Section 3: Counseling and Psychotropic Medication	21	4.76
spring 2020	EDC 475, Section 5: Practicum in Counseling	6	4.82
spring 2020	EDC 238, Section 1: Professional Issues in Marriage and Family Counseling	13	4.75
fall 2019	EDC 219, Section: Group Processing in Counseling		4.54
fall 2019	EDC 216, Section: Counseling Theory		4.89
fall 2019	EDC 280, Section: Practicum in communication		4.58
fall 2019	CCDS Site Supervision: 2 units release time		

Student evaluation data

3. Sample of course syllabi and other representative course materials

Artifact description (e.g. CHDV 111 Syllabus)	Your contribution to its development	Tab #
Syllabus #1	Described in the narrative - add a couple of words	2
Syllabus #2		3

Syllabi & course materials

Categories 4-9:

4. A classroom observation describing a faculty member's teaching effectiveness by a qualified faculty member familiar with the candidate's discipline. The observer shall provide documentation, such as a letter from observer, or teaching observation form describing the faculty member's teaching effectiveness during the observation. The classroom observer must either be fluent in the language in which the course is taught or

You can see here, again, the value of using this chart to organize the required evidence.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Teaching Performance

Evidence in categories 4.3.2 shall be included as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and year of review.

4. A classroom observation
5. Curriculum development or assessment
6. Application of professional development
7. Culminating experience support
8. Community engaged instruction (beyond required components of assigned workload)
9. Student support, not otherwise noted
    4. Supervising independent study

LATINX MOTHERS PERCEPTIONS OF LATINX REPRESENTATION IN
CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

A Thesis

by

Sandra Angulo Cruz

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
Dr. Amber Gonzalez [Type Name Beneath Signature]

_____, Second Reader
Dr. Alicia Herrera [Type Name Beneath Signature]

_____
Date

Evidence for culminating Experience, include the title page with your name as the chair or second reader

Other evidence could be a support letter from the area program coordinator

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Teaching Performance Rating Criteria

Review Level	Probationary Year 2	Probationary Year 3	Probationary Year 4-5	Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full	Post Tenure	*Outstanding Performance
Meets Criteria	Evidence of teaching effectiveness in all required materials from 4.3.1 AND evidence of teaching effectiveness in at least one (1) of the ~~other~~ "Additional sources of evidence..." (4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.6) AND SQEs that indicate development of teaching effectiveness.	Evidence of teaching effectiveness in all required materials from 4.3.1 AND evidence of teaching effectiveness in at least two (2) of the " Additional sources of evidence ...(4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.6) AND SQEs that indicate development of teaching effectiveness.	Evidence of teaching effectiveness in all required materials from 4.3.1 AND evidence of teaching effectiveness in at least three (3) of the "Additional sources of evidence..." (4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.6) AND SQEs that indicate teaching effectiveness.	SQEs that indicate teaching effectiveness.	(A)Evidence of teaching effectiveness in all required materials from 4.3.1 AND (B)evidence of sustained investment in teaching effectiveness in at least four (4) of the "Additional sources of evidence..." (4.3.		

UARTP 5.5E. states "…the evidence to support a recommendation to grant tenure shall be considerably more substantial than that to support a recommendation to retain a probationary employee." Therefore, COE ARTP has a developmental retention process, each year the expectations are greater than the years prior.

ITY
O

Scholarly and Creative Achievements

Redefine the Possible™

Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements

- Scholarly and/or creative achievements are discipline-based, instructionally-related, applied, action, community engaged, or evaluation research that contributes to the discipline, the community, or society at large.

- Quality scholarship and/or creative achievements are grounded in theoretical and/or practical orientations, apply appropriate investigative methods, and are disseminated to appropriate academic, practitioner and/or community audiences.

Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements

- Faculty members <u>must submit a narrative statement</u> that includes a holistic and detailed summary contextualizing each scholarly or creative contribution as it relates to advancing, synthesizing, and applying knowledge within their larger program of work.
  - Discuss your research agenda, address your tenure research agenda
    - How did COVID-19 impact this research agenda?
      » Add the short term and long term impact
      - Discuss works completed, under review, in progress
      - Highlight collaboration with students
  - Discuss the quality of your work
    - YOU define quality indicators
      - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
      - Social Justice focused work
      - Rankings of journals
      - Rejection rates
      - Contributions to the discipline
    - Define your role in collaborative projects

Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements

Evidence in category 1-4 shall be included as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and year of review.

- Category 1: Lead Author (1st/2nd) of a peer-reviewed/edited publication, in press or published

- Category 2: Co-Author (non-lead) peer-reviewed/edited publication, in press or published

- Category 3: Evidence of an Active Scholarly Program

- Category 4: Evidence of Scholarship-Related Activities

4.4.5. Scholarly or creative Achievements Rating Criteria

Review Level	Probationary Year 2	Probationary Year 3	Probationary Years 4–5	Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full	*Outstanding Performance
Meets Criteria	Two (2) pieces of evidence including: progress towards an activity in categories 1-2 AND one (1) additional activity in any of the categories	Three (3) pieces of evidence including: progress towards an activity in categories 1-2 AND two (2) additional activities in any of the categories	Four (4) pieces of evidence including: adequate progress towards two (2) activities in categories 1-2 AND one (1) additional activity in categories 1-3 AND one (1) additional activity in any of the categories	Five (5) pieces of evidence including: One (1) activity in category 1 AND one (1) additional activity in categories 1-2 AND two (2) additional activities in categories 1-3 AND one (1) additional activity in any of the categories	Seven (7) pieces of evidence including: (A) two (2) scholarly or creative activities in category 1 AND (B) two (2) additional scholarly or creative activities in categories 1-2 AND (C) two (2) additional scholarly or creative activities in categories 1-3 AND (D) one (1) additional scholarly or creative activity in any of the categories.

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS INDEX

See categories and criteria

Year	Evidence description and link	Categories 1 - 4
2020	**Gonzalez, A. M.** (2020). Teaching using a flipped classroom approach: Impacts for students of color. *Hispanic Education Technology Services Online Journal*. https://hets.org/ejournal/2020/11/15/article-8-teaching-using-a-flipped-classroom-approach-impacts-for-students-of-color/ 1 Gonzalez 2020 Teaching using a flipped classroom approach	1A
2022	Arellano, L., Cuellar, M. G., **Gonzalez, A. M.** (2022). Accountable to whom: Reimagining Hispanic Serving Institutions financial models. *New Directions for Higher Education*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/he.20441 2 Arellano Cuellar Gonzalez 2022 Accountable to whom	2A
2021	**Gonzalez, A.** (Principal Investigator) & Ferreira van Leer (Co-Principal Investigator). (2021-2023). *Using our voice to transform Hispanic Serving Institutions: Latinx student perceptions of "servingness"* (Project No. 21-06842) [Grant]. College Futures Foundation. $150,000 3 Gonzalez Ferreira van Leer 2021 Using our Voice and College Futures Foundation	2B
2021	**Gonzalez, A. M.**, Ferreira van Leer, K., Alexander, K., Toledo Bustamente, N., Berta-	3E

SACRAMENTO

Manuscripts and Other Editor-Reviewed Works of Writing

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
Just the text of your manuscript in a word document	Accurately label "in progress", "under review", and "in press" Provide context to publications – remember people outside your discipline will be reviewing these and do not know your major journals or conferences Data on journal or edited volume impact factor, sales rankings, or any other evidence of selectivity (optional, but nice to include) Text or abstract in its published version (the publisher's version) Letters of acceptance, peer review comments or related communication from the editorial team regarding the status of your submission If multiple authors, a statement of effort percentage, signed by all authors. For in-progress publications—receipt of submission to journal or publisher (e.g., email, electronic notice)

Provide Journal's Published Version of Your Abstracts

Beyond the Baccalaureate: Factors Shaping Latina/o Graduate Degree Aspirations

Marcela G. Cuellar[1] [iD] and Amber M. Gonzalez[2]

Abstract

This study examined how Latina/o undergraduate students' graduate and professional degree aspirations change during college. Using longitudinal data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, a multinomial logistic regression analysis was conducted to examine factors associated with aspiring to earn a degree beyond a baccalaureate. Findings show that many students change their initial aspirations and several college experiences, such as higher college GPA and faculty interactions, are associated with Latinas/os' graduate and professional degree aspirations.

Resumen

Este estudio examinó como estudiantes latinos de pre-grado cambian sus aspiraciones sobre título profesional y postgrado durante su carrera universitaria. Usando información longitudinal del Programa de Investigación de la Cooperativa Institucional, se condujeron análisis de regresión logística multinominal para examinar factores asociados con la aspiración de obtener un postgrado. Los hallazgos demostraron que muchos estudiantes cambian sus aspiraciones iniciales y que varias experiencias universitarias, como un alto promedio universitario e interacciones con profesores, se asocian con aspiraciones de grados profesionales y de postgrado en latinos.

Keywords

Latina/o undergraduate students, degree aspirations, postbaccalaureate, graduate school, graduate degrees

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Include Emails from Editors to Show Current Status of Your Submissions

Congratulations! Your article has been tentatively approved for publication on the HETS Online Journal (needs minor revision)

Yelixa M. Castro Cruz <Yelixa_Castro@inter.edu>
To ● Gonzalez, Amber M
Cc ○ Yubelkys Montalvo

ⓘ You forwarded this message on 10/27/2020 2:10 PM.
This message was sent with High importance.

Reply | Reply All | → Forward | ⋯
Tue 10/27/2020 1:21 PM

📄 Flipped classroom and Students of Color academic success 9 21 2020_ByCo-ED.docx ∨
44 KB

📄 Flipped classroom and Students of Color academic success_By ChiefEd.docx ∨
45 KB

📄 Review-Teaching Using a Flipped Classroom Approach.docx ∨
23 KB

📄 PUBLISHING AGREEMENT - HETS ONLINE JOURNAL-REV_June2016.pdf ∨
241 KB

Dear Dr. González:

Greetings! Hope you are doing fine. Congratulations! We are pleased to inform that your article *Teaching using Flipped Classroom Approach: Impacts for Students of Color* has been **TENTATIVELY approved (subject to revisions)** for publication on the Volume XI, Fall Issue of the HETS Online Journal (publication is scheduled by the end of this month, but this is subject to changes). Please refer to the comments both Chief Editor, and Co Editor has included on the attached documents for your consideration and use. Rubric of your review has been included as well for your record. If you agree to move forward with the process, please in return **send us** your **revised article on or before** this Friday, **October 30th**. Also, we need you to send us at your earliest convenience your information for the authors page. The requested information is the following:

For each one of the authors:
1. Title at your institution or organization
2. Contact information (any you may want us to include, email, phone, blog, e.g.)
3. Brief bio in English with your experience on any related field. Up to two paragraphs long. **(we highly recommend this to be included)**
4. Portrait photo (web resolution on a .jpeg format) **(we highly recommend this to be included)**
5. Signed the attached publishing agreement for each author (Also attached)

We appreciate your kind support on this HETS initiative.

Have a wonderful day,

Yelixa

Yelixa M. Castro, MBA
HETS Consortium
P: (787) 250-1912 ext. 2373
M: (787) 616-3201
W: www.hets.org

Stay connected!

Participating as an Editor or Peer Reviewer

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
• Say in your narrative that you reviewed for a journal without referencing any public information about the journal	• Create tables and figures to guide the reader • Include letters from editors or associate editors; if not available and you don't want to bother, include the email that you receive as confirmation that you submitted a review

Writing Grant Proposals for Scholarship

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
• Give just the title of your grant proposal	•Provide a copy of the grant proposal abstract in its submitted form •Provide email evidence (or a screenshot) that your grant was submitted successfully. •Provide a copy of the notice of award from granting institution •Provide a letter from the grant PI describing your contribution to the grant proposal. •If you have not yet submitted the proposal, but have an idea that has been sent through the IRB, then include the submission of IRB as evidence.

RE: You signed: "#10032892 - Small Grant submission(2481958)_202102262126"

Greene, Rebecca D
To: ○ Ferreira van Leer, Kevin A; ○ Allison, June M; ✓ Gonzalez, Amber M

From: Allison, June M <june.allison@csus.edu>
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Ferreira van Leer, Kevin A <k.ferreiravanleer@csus.edu>; Gonzalez, Amber M <amber.gonzalez@csus.edu>
Cc: Greene, Rebecca D <rebecca.greene@csus.edu>
Subject: FW: You signed: "#10032892 - Small Grant submission(2481958)_202102262126"

Hi Kevin and Amber,

You may have already received notification from Spencer, but wanted to forward this email that confirms your application has been signed and is now in review! Attached is a copy of the signed agreement.

Congratulations and good luck--it was nice working with you both again!

Take care,
June

From: Rexin, Shannon <srexin@csus.edu>
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Allison, June M <june.allison@csus.edu>
Subject: FW: You signed: "#10032892 - Small Grant submission(2481958)_202102262126"

Good morning June,

Kevin and Amber's proposal has been successfully submitted! 😊

Shannon

From: The Spencer Foundation <echosign@echosign.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Rexin, Shannon <srexin@csus.edu>; Spencer Foundation <Adobe@spencer.org>
Subject: You signed: "#10032892 - Small Grant submission(2481958)_202102262126"

Adobe Sign

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Making Presentations of your Scholarship

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
• Give just the title of your presentation	• Page from the program showing your name and presentation title and abstract • Email or letter indicating your presentation's selection • If presenting for an organization that is not universally known, include publicly-available information about the organization (for example a screenshot of the About page of the organization's website)

	Probationary Year 3	Probationary Years 4-5	Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full	
Two (2) pieces of evidence including: progress towards an activity in categories 1-2 AND one (1) additional activity in any of the categories	Three (3) pieces of evidence including: progress towards an activity in categories 1-2 AND two (2) additional activities in any of the categories	Four (4) pieces of evidence including: adequate progress towards two (2) activities in categories 1-2 AND one (1) additional activity in categories 1-3 AND one (1) additional activity in any of the categories	Five (5) pieces of evidence including: One (1) activity in category 1 AND one (1) additional activity in categories 1-2 AND two (2) additional activities in categories 1-3 AND	Seven (7) pieces of evidence including: (A) two (2) scholarly or creative activities in category 1 AND (B) two (2) additional scholarly or creative activities in categories 1-2 AND (C) two (2) additional scholarly or creative activities

Remember that this is developmental, you are always progressing your research agenda so make it very clear that you have PROGRESS TOWARDS AN ACTIVITY IN CATEGORIES – provide evidence of this in your index and speak about it in your narrative. BE SPECIFIC!

Additional Suggestions

- Community Engaged Research
  - Highlight that this is community engaged research however,
  - Be clear on separating the research from the community engagement
    - Publication is DIFFERENT than meeting with the community

Contribution to the Institution

Contributions to the Institution

- Contributions to the institution includes active participation in shared governance as well as the application of one's professional expertise to address academic program and institutional needs to support the success and engagement of the diverse student and faculty body.

- Quality contributions to the institution are those activities that are <u>sustained and provide evidence growth in the faculty member</u>.

  - Active participation is defined as sustained involvement in regularly scheduled meetings and engaging in work that is beyond attending meetings themselves.

  - Leadership or substantial responsibility includes demonstration of initiative in a substantial project, holding an elected and/or appointed office, directorship, chairship and/or leading a substantial project. A substantial project involves significant effort and is impactful.

Contributions to the Institution

- Faculty members must submit a narrative statement including a reflection on the faculty member's sustained institutional service and growth of service during the period under review.

- Within this narrative, faculty members should explain the nature of each of these activities and contextualize these activities within their larger program of service to the institution.

  – Explain the significance of your service contributions

  – How did COVID-19 impact your contributions to the institution?

  – How have racial injustices impacted your contributions to the institution?

  – Link your service contributions to your identity as a scholar

Contributions to the Institution

In addition to the narrative statement, evidence in categories 1-4 shall be included as appropriate to the faculty members assignment and year of review.

- Category 1: Academic Branch & Program Service
- Category 2: College Service
- Category 3: University Service
- Category 4: Student-Centered Institutional Service

4.5.5. Contributions to the Institution Rating Criteria

Review Level	Probationary Year 2	Probationary Year 3	Probationary Year 4-5	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Full	*Outstanding Performance
Meets Criteria	Evidence of active participation in any category.	Evidence of active participation in two (2) different categories.	Evidence of active participation in category 1 AND evidence of active participation in two (2) different categories 2-4	Evidence of active participation in category 1 AND evidence of active participation in category 2 AND evidence of active participation in categories 3 OR 4 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership	Evidence of active participation in two (2) different categories AND in both of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership	Evidence of sustained active participation in three of the four categories AND evidence of sustained, ongoing leadership and/or substantive responsibility in 2 of the 4 categories presented

Illustrating your Institutional Service

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
• List in dense narrative form all the details of your institutional contributions • List things in institutional service that you already listed in scholarship, teaching, or community service without articulating clearly for the reader why it should not be considered "double dipping"	•Provide a table highlighting service contributions – time commitment, outcomes or service activities •Provide a letter or email from the chair or another member noting specific role/tasks you have served/completed on behalf of the committee/group • Include materials developed highlighting any reference to your role in developing them

Service Acknowledgement Letter

- RTP Toolkit
  - Service Acknowledgement Letter

California State University, Sacramento
Division of Inclusive Excellence
6000 J Street, MS 6078• Sacramento Hall 220 • Sacramento, CA 95819
T (916) 278-4796 • F (916) 278-4664 • www.csus.edu/diversity

May 17, 2021

[Via email: amber.gonzalez@csus.edu]

Dr. Amber Gonzalez, Associate Professor
COE-Undergraduate Studies in Education
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

RE: Service to Sacramento State, Antiracism and Inclusive Campus Plan

Dear Amber Gonzalez:

On behalf of Sacramento State and the Division of Inclusive Excellence, I would like to thank you for serving on the campus-wide Antiracism and Inclusive Campus Plan process. Your commitment to Sacramento State is evident in your engagement in this important work.

Sacramento State embarked on this planning process understanding we needed to engage a collective group from our campus, even though time was short and the demands for action were high. Your service on the Institutional Commitment Action Planning Group helped create a plan to support the transformational change Sacramento State has committed itself to. Moreover, your responsibility in serving as a co-chair required an additional time commitment. From November 2020 to May 2021, you dedicated over 35 hours of meeting and planning time that was instrumental in the creation of the final plan. More importantly, the contribution of your voice, perspective, lived experiences as well as your willingness to learn from and engage with others in this important, emotional work is of tremendous value. I am grateful for having been able to work with you and have been inspired by the community that has been built during this collective process. I am deeply appreciative of your willingness to share your vision of how Sacramento State can advance our commitment to antiracism, inclusion, and belonging.

Emails can also be used as sources of evidence – ideally this would be the email THANKING you for your service or with the final outcome of the service – however, if used sparingly, these emails thanking you for agreeing to serve can be used as evidence.

From: Slabinski, Rusty
Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 2:18 PM
To: Gonzalez, Amber M
Cc: Diaz, Viridiana
Subject: Search Committee Orientation Link

Hi Amber –

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a faculty representative on the Director, Equity and Affinity Centers search. In order to receive access to the applications for review, you need to complete a search committee orientation, which will remain current for the next two years.

Here is the link to the online Search Committee Orientation, "**Searches and Recruitments in the CSU**." Please complete the online orientation as soon as possible. Select the "Register" button in the top right corner, disable the pop-up blocker, and have your Global VPN active if you are not on campus in order to launch the trainings.

If you are unable to access the orientation from the link above please navigate to "CSU Learn" from your MySacState and search for the training using the search term "Searches and Recruitment in the CSU."

To complete the Sac State HR Confidentiality/Nepotism Agreement, please be sure to read the document and select "Yes" when the system prompts you to indicate you have "completed the activity." This step is what signals to HR you have completed the training.

Tables are Helpful

Institutional Service Contributions

Program/Department Service			
Semester	**Activity**	**Time Commitment**	**Relevant Outcomes**
Fall 2023 – Spring 2024	Curriculum Review Committee	3 hours per month – meetings and 3- 5 hours preparation	Reviewed 15 course proposals
Fall 2023 – Spring 2024	Program meetings	90 minutes meetings twice a month	Actively participated in discussions related to department strategic planning and curriculum revisions
College Service			
Fall 2023 - Spring 2024	College meetings and retreats	90 minutes per month and 6 hours per semester	Actively participated in discussions related to College strategic planning

Contributions to the Community

Redefine the Possible™

Contributions to the Community

- Professional contributions to the community related to the faculty member's area of expertise include establishing and maintaining an active presence in the civic, cultural, educational, political, and/or social activities that address the professional and/or publicly identified needs at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.

- Contributions to the community shall be consistent with the University's value of equity and the College's mission to serve diverse communities towards engendering positive social change.

- Quality contributions to the community are those <u>activities that are sustained and evidence growth.</u>

- Active participation is defined as sustained involvement in regularly scheduled meetings and engaging in work that is beyond attending meetings themselves.

- Leadership or substantial responsibility includes demonstration of initiative in a substantial project, holding an elected and/or appointed office, directorship, chairship and/or leading a substantial project.

Contributions to the Community

- Candidates must submit a narrative statement including a reflection on the strength and growth of the faculty member's professional contributions to the community during the review period.

  - Explain the significance of your service contributions
  - How did COVID-19 impact your contributions to the institution?
  - How have racial injustices impacted your contributions to the institution?
  - Link to your identity as a scholar

In addition to the narrative statement, evidence in categories shall be included as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and year of review.

- Category 1: Service to Organizations

- Category 2: Other Service to the Community Specific to Expertise

4.6.3. Contributions to the Community Rating Criteria

Review Level	Probationary Year 2	Probationary Year 3	Probationary Year 4-5	Tenure and Promotion	*Outstanding Performance
Meets Criteria	Evidence of developing active participation in categories 1 or 2.	Evidence of active participation in categories 1 or 2.	Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in categories 1 or 2, OR multiple service areas in categories 1 or 2.	Evidence of service in category 1 OR evidence of service in category 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership	Evidence of sustained, ongoing leadership and/or substantive responsibility in both categories

How Should I Present Evidence of Community Service?

Redefine the Possible™

Illustrating your Service in the Community

DON'T DO THIS	DO THIS
• List in dense narrative form all the details of your community contributions • List things in community service that you already listed in scholarship, teaching, or university service without articulating clearly for the reader why it should not be considered "double dipping"	•Provide tables and figures with details for reader •Provide a letter or email from organization noting specific role/tasks you have served/completed on behalf of the organization • Include materials developed for mass/social media, highlighting any reference to your role in developing them

Additional Suggestions

Redefine the Possible™

Additional Suggestions

- Slowly work on the development of WPAF
  - It takes time to organize and organization is going to be the best thing you can do to present your best self to your evaluation committees
- Maintain an updated and comprehensive CV (always)
  - Add to electronic WPAF
- Include dates on evidence (e.g., powerpoints, papers, syllabus)
- Sort by academic year (and semester for teaching performance) with most recent year first
- Provide tables and figures to help guide the reader as needed

Additional Suggestions

- Cite policy in your narrative
  - We have a new folks on evaluation committees, new leadership across campus – they may not know COE ARTP well
  - New language in UARTP

SACRAMENTO STATE

Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Narrative

Narrative statement

According to the RTP policy, in order to *meet criteria* in the area of scholarly and/or creative achievements for promotion to full professor, a faculty member must present at least five (5) pieces of evidence including the following:

- One activity in category 1 and
- One additional activity in categories 1-2 and
- Two additional activities in categories 1-3 and
- One additional activity in any of the categories.

I am presenting to the evaluation committees various pieces of evidence and seek to be ranked at *meets criteria* for Scholarly and/or Creative Achievement.

My scholarship focuses on the role of social support networks and institutional structures on Latina/o/x students' aspirations and motivations while pursuing an education, focusing on the transitions through the educational pipeline. Working at the intersection of human development, educational psychology, and critical race theories in education, I actively explore the strategies in educational settings Latina/o/x students use in educational settings to ensure success, manage failure, and persevere throughout their educational career. Since beginning my position at

- New language within UARTP highlighting credit for faculty who's work (UARTP 5.5)
  - enhances Sac State's commitment to antiracism, belonging, diversity, equity, and/or inclusion
  - Contributes to Sac State's role as a community engaged university
- If this applies to you – highlight it in your narrative.

5.5. Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. A unit shall exercise the discretion conferred by this section in a manner consistent with the mission of the University as a regional comprehensive university that places primary emphasis on teaching performance in the evaluation of faculty unit employees for retention, tenure or promotion.

B. Faculty work that enhances Sacramento State's commitment to antiracism, belonging, diversity, equity and/or inclusion shall be given appropriate credit in any of the four evaluation criteria areas and at every level of the review process.

C. Faculty work that contributes to Sacramento State's role as a community engaged university shall be given appropriate credit in any of the four evaluation criteria areas and at every level of the review process.

SACRAMENTO STATE

Additional Suggestions

- Ask a colleague to view their index and narrative (ideally tenured)
  - Someone 2-3 years ahead of you
- If you are going to double dip, be explicit about what counts in what area
- Keep your audience in mind
  - Not everyone who reviews you will have your disciplinary background
  - Be specific about how your work contributes to your specific discipline – <u>concise and explicitly</u> – do not write pages and pages
- Review and consider *all* feedback from the most recent review and all earlier reviews
  - Track your progress in addressing the feedback
  - In the narrative statement, address both your reflection and the feedback you received **and** all actions you chose to take in response to the feedback
- Before submitting
  - Review your entire WPAF for accuracy
  - Make sure that all of your **<u>hyperlinks</u>** work

SACRAMENTO STATE

Your Support Network

- SEC Mentors
  - Each person reviewed by SEC *that is not a Full Professor* should have been reached out to by someone on SEC – use this person as part of your support network – they have chosen to work with you on your file

- College Support
  - Associate Dean
  - Branch Chair
  - Colleagues, Peers, Mentors
    - 2024/2025 PEC/SEC Chairs

- University Support
  - Dr. Rebecca Cameron, Interim AVP Office of Faculty Advancement
  - Jackie Kernen, Manager of Academic Personnel
  - Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)

Questions and Comments