January 17, 2023

To:  Calli Lewis Chiu, Ph.D.
     Chair, Department of Special Education

     Lisa Kirtman, Ph.D.
     Dean of the College of Education

From:  Carolyn Thomas, Ph.D.
        Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject:  Departmental Personnel Standards for the Department of Special Education

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the Department of Special Education have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

CT:mc

cc:  Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support
     Dr. Carol Lundberg, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
     Dr. Sung Hee Lee, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
     Faculty Affairs and Records
According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (6-8-22 version), Section III.: • Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards… …shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. • All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall be reviewed by the department as part of each program performance review. • Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.

I. Preface
Department of Special Education Personnel Standards

The Department of Special Education (hereafter called "the Department") is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region guided by just, equitable, inclusive education (JEIE) principles. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning with an emphasis on establishing an environment wherein the diffusion and creation of knowledge and its organized dissemination are central to the advancements of truth.

The Department also believes that education, that is, teaching in all its forms, is the primary task of higher education today. The Department recognizes that faculty are the key to quality programs and effective learning environments. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning through contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, College of Education, University, profession, and the community.

The Department proposes a personnel document consistent with the Mission and Goals of the University. This document responds to the multiple roles of the faculty at the various stages of their careers and recognizes the unique nature of its many programs as being linked to the community.

The Department shall institute the following procedures designed to assess the Portfolio for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and review bodies shall be aided in their respective roles by having available as clear and objective a statement of the Department's expectations as is reasonably possible. Furthermore, the Department faculty members specifically affirm their position that the interests and needs of students are best served when the faculty represents widely diverse interests and activities, creating a mosaic of talents. With this document, the Department recognizes the full range of talents possessed by the faculty and the great diversity of the functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education.

II. Faculty Responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSU Fullerton, Department faculty shall meet professional responsibilities as they apply to each of the Portfolio evaluation categories.

In the area of teaching, these responsibilities may include:
- developing and implementing comprehensive syllabi,
- communicating clear expectations to students,
- demonstrating a variety of teaching and assessment strategies,
- modeling effective teaching strategies,
- reflecting on teaching practices, and
- committing to just, equitable, and inclusive teaching and learning practices.

In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, faculty are expected to engage in activities that will enhance the overall mission of the professoriate which includes:
- expanding knowledge,
- applying knowledge to consequential problems in education, and
- advancing the reputation of the University.

In the areas of professional, university, and community service, these responsibilities may include:
● contributing to the advancement of the field,
● increasing opportunities for students in the discipline,
● attending University, College, and Department meetings,
● completing committee assignments,
● completing other College and Department duties as assigned by either the College Dean or Department Chair,
● supporting the work of the Department, College and University, and
● contributing to the community in general through service activities.

III. Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Special Education is to develop quality teachers who value lifelong learning. We provide credentials for teachers specializing in:

● Mild/Moderate Education Specialist
● Extensive Supports Education Specialist
● Early Childhood Education Specialist

The program is designed to train educational specialists in an inclusive approach for children with heterogeneous special needs. We believe in collaborations with general education, special education, all service providers, parents, and the community. We train teachers in pedagogy that are multi-paradigmatic and provide a variety of theoretical perspectives related to teaching. The primary focus of the teacher is to meet the individual needs of the child and family. The instructional curriculum provides credential and master's degree candidates with a broad background in the physiological, environmental and social aspects of exceptionality. Candidates will learn effective research-based teaching strategies, characteristics, interdisciplinary/collaboration skills, plus transition and positive behavior support, as each establishes a conceptual base of understanding of persons with disabilities.

IV. Role of the Chair in the Personnel Process

With respect to the personnel process, the following guidelines shall apply:

● The Department Chair shall review the files for faculty unless the Chair is not of a sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file or is being considered for promotion themselves. In that case the Dean shall assume the responsibilities of the Chair (as required by UPS 210.000).

V. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the "Committee") shall evaluate Portfolios and make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to the members of the College as specified in the UPS 210.000 and the CBA.

B. Committee Structure

● All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and not be serving as the Chair of a department.
In promotion considerations, committee members shall have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he or she is the subject of the personnel review process.

An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete their term of office or he or she is ineligible to participate.

C. Election of Committee Members

The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the third week of classes in the fall semester each year.

All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B above will be automatically placed on the slate of nominees for the committee. Individuals wishing to decline shall indicate in writing prior to the second week of the semester. Nominees of individuals not in the Department shall be made in writing to the Department Chair prior to the second week of the fall semester. In addition, nominees shall make a written declaration to the Department Chair prior to Wednesday of the third week of the semester indicating that they wish to be considered. Nominees shall be presented to the Department faculty for election in the following manner: Alphabetized by last name, identified by Department affiliation and rank any nomination(s) from outside of the Department shall be listed on the bottom of the ballot alphabetically in the Department from whence the nomination came.

Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote by secret written ballot for three members from the list of nominees. In the case of a tie, the committee member shall be decided by the flip of a coin by the Department Chair in the presence of Department faculty members.

The alternate member shall be the individual who received the highest number of votes among those nominees not elected to the committee.

D. Committee Chair

The committee shall select its Chair for a one-year term, by nomination.

E. Committee Procedures

1. The Committee shall evaluate the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In its written evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VII of this document. The Committee shall formulate recommendations that shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. (Here and throughout, see UPS 210.000 for additional requirements and information.)

2. The Committee's evaluation for each area shall be based solely on the information submitted in the Portfolio in accordance with UPS 210.000, and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the
faculty member under review as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate**, with respect to each area of performance. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VII.

3. All actions taken by the Committee, including recommendations, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.

4. The Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way the individual members voted.

5. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

VI. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus

With the guidance, support, and advice of an appointed faculty mentor, during the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest and resources required, and the accomplishments they expect to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus should clearly articulate how JEIE principles guide the candidate’s teaching, scholarly, and service activities. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair's office by February 28th. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but shall be reviewed by the Department/Division Chair and the Dean (or equivalent), who shall provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1st. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member's Portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.

The Prospectus will be included in the faculty member's Portfolio that is submitted for review during the probationary period. The Prospectus is in addition to, and separate from, the retrospective self-assessment narratives that have always been a part of the Portfolio.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by Faculty Affairs and Records at the beginning of each fall semester as well as college-wide personnel workshops, and to seek assistance from colleagues.

C. Portfolio Organization and Documentation

The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified by UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be
appropriately documented. The contents of the appendices should represent ongoing reflection and a process of sorting and refining over time.

VII. Criteria and Weighting for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-Time Faculty

The College of Education recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service as vehicles to give meaning to the essence of scholarship. It also values and considers collegiality, ethical and professional behavior, and a commitment to the good and well-being of the Department. Per UPS 210.002 faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their WPAF. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

A. Teaching Performance

The primary mission of the College of Education faculty is the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE). To this end, the faculty’s mission is to teach through an anti-racist lens using culturally and linguistically relevant strategies. In this manner, faculty under review “shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content and review of their materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competences and skills to contribute to society.” (UPS 210.002, p.6). The students’ perceptions of a teacher are an important -though not decisive- means of assessing the quality of teaching. Qualitative evidence of effective teaching is more important than SOQ ratings. Thus, the faculty members’ self-assessment should explain the evidence submitted and address significant discrepancies between data from SOQs AND qualitative indicators. The faculty member is encouraged to submit carefully selected examples of teaching effectiveness and reflective practice. These exemplars may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Establishment of an inclusive learning environment which demonstrates JEIE principles
- Creation of samples course linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes
- Effective use of instructional methods
- Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study
- Building and enhancing currency in the field of Special Education and pedagogical developments as related to teaching
- Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in the faculty handbook and University Policy Statements

Tables 1-6 provide additional information regarding Qualitative Indicators.

Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance:
Criteria for Assessing faculty teaching performance is divided into 2 categories: Mandatory Indicators and Instructional Indicators. Mandatory indicators are listed below:

1. Mandatory Indicators

   a. **Self-Assessment** (maximum 1000-word self-assessment narrative) The faculty member shall include a written discussion of their teaching activities and how these promote teacher candidates to become culturally and linguistically responsive educators. This shall include both a reflective review of teaching performance, including goals for student learning and instructional strategies, as well as future goals and direction of teaching. The self-assessment shall go beyond a simple description of course content and pedagogy. It should include an analysis of the statistical summaries and how trends in student written comments can contribute to an understanding of the data. The faculty member should carefully identify discrepancies in the statistical data and written comments.

   b. **List of Courses Taught** A semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, and the unit value.

   c. **Workload** Faculty workload may include activities in a variety of areas in addition to teaching specific courses, for example, adjustments in workload for the preparation of substantive changes in instructional methods, course development activities, chairing committees, grant preparation, or work to prepare accreditation. The Portfolio shall list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.

   d. **Course Syllabi and Materials** A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials prepared by the instructor to facilitate their teaching effectiveness shall be included in the appendix. Tests, study aids, and other materials such as advanced organizers, video technology, innovative strategies including JEIE activities, instructional television concepts and techniques, evidence of Portfolio and case study assessment, etc. may also be included in the Appendix.

   e. **Statistical Summaries and Comments of Student Opinion Questionnaires** The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught shall be included. (If data is missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair.) If service credit was given, data on student opinions from all years for which credit was given are to be included.

   f. **Qualitative Indicators of Effective Teaching Performance** The faculty member shall submit carefully selected examples of teaching effectiveness, how their teaching is guided by JEIE principles, and reflective practice as outlined in VII. A. Teaching Performance and further explained below. These materials shall be carefully selected and revised over time to represent the enhancement of one’s teaching performance.
Tables 1-6 are examples and potential sources of evidence as Qualitative Indicators of effective teaching. Each of the items are listed under VII Part A. Teaching Performance indicators.

1. Establishment of an inclusive learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Inclusive Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is responsive to students outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a classroom environment that encourages student interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a classroom environment that contributes to equitable learning for all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Creation of a course linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Course Linking Learning Goals to Assessment and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course objectives and learning goals are clearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
defined and made clear to students at the start of the course.

Assessments and grading practices are clearly related to course goals.

Course objectives and learning goals are reasonable and realistic.

Class time is well organized and effectively used to meet goals

Course content emphasizes students’ acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline.

Syllabi is understandable and comprehensive

3. Effective use of instructional methods.

Table 3: Use of Instructional Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of appropriate teaching/learning strategies in the classroom.</td>
<td>Classroom observation reports (or peer reviews), narrative summary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional methods and approaches are appropriate to course learning goals and student outcomes.</td>
<td>Syllabi, narrative summary, peer reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience</td>
<td>Syllabi, narrative summary, peer review, student opinion questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments help advance course learning goals and contribute to achieving student outcomes.</td>
<td>Project/assignment details, examples of student work/projects/assignments, peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical methods that consider student needs</td>
<td>Syllabi, classroom observations, examples of student work/projects/assignments, FDC workshops, peer review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
### Table 4: Academic Standards and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies appropriate to the course.</td>
<td>Syllabi, narrative summary, assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident.</td>
<td>Syllabi, narrative summary, student writing and projects, student opinion questionnaire comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading system is fair, transparent, and conducive to learning</td>
<td>Assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching

### Table 5: Currency in Discipline and Pedagogical Development Using JEIE Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with pedagogical developments</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in some form of continuous improvement of teaching</td>
<td>Narrative summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively solicits and uses student feedback in course development and revision</td>
<td>Narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment(s).</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary, FDC workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing weaknesses identified in past evaluations via concrete plans</td>
<td>Narrative summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new courses</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of pedagogical workshops</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of student research</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary, letters of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad courses</td>
<td>CV, narrative summary, letters of support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Compliance with University, College and Department Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives final exam or project, if required by the instructor, on the date/time assigned by the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus meets university and college requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

All subcategories of teaching effectiveness are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of this category: student opinion questionnaires (SOQ quantitative data and SOQ comments), qualitative indicators, and (when appropriate) non-instructional assigned time—all are equally valued.

a. Student Opinion Questionnaires. The student opinion questionnaires consist of items rated on a five-point Likert scale. University-provided statistical summaries of all ratings for all classes for each semester will be used. The following scale will be used to evaluate a faculty member's effectiveness based on the statistical summaries. The assessment of ratings is based on the cumulative percentage of ratings averaged over the full period of review. The evaluation will take into consideration recent trends in the ratings (for example if there is a steady rise upward).

Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments. Evaluation of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student opinion questionnaires and contained in written comments on these forms. The evaluations may take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught (size, level, delivery mode, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall consider any efforts to improve teaching performance. Additionally, the faculty member's self-assessment shall address data from SOQ forms, Mandatory Indicators, Qualitative Indicators and other data included in the Portfolio and Appendix.

Note: The students' opinion of an instructor’s teaching performance is informative but shall never be used as the sole or main criteria when evaluating teaching performance.
Student Opinion Questionnaires are designed to solicit student feedback regarding instructors and course content. While they may reveal important trends in student perception, research indicates they are neither valid nor reliable measures of teaching effectiveness. Moreover, both qualitative and quantitative data gathered on SOQs can be impacted by racial, gender, linguistic and other types of biases, suggesting that individual students’ comments – as well as trends within SOQs themselves - must be interpreted cautiously and contextually. Additionally, CSUF and the Department of Special Education recognizes that impactful teaching may create discomfort for students, affecting trends in course evaluations, and that not all students will respond to learning in the same way. Importantly, any single item on the SOQ – or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information – does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

**Rating:**

**Results from statistical summaries:**

- **Excellent** 90% or more A and B ratings
- **Good** 80% - 89% A and B ratings
- **Needs Improvement** 70% - 79% A and B ratings
- **Inadequate** Fewer than 70% A and B ratings

**Note:** The reviewers shall note the wide range of scores possible within each University-provided statistical summary. For example, it should be noted that a faculty member with 69% A and B scores would be classified as an inadequate teacher, as would a faculty member with only 50% A and B ratings. Faculty members who feel their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching should carefully explain their scores and explain discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

Reviewers shall also consider student comments as well as the faculty member’s explanation of the ratings in the teaching narrative when assigning a rating for this category.

b. The reviewers shall rate the Qualitative Indicators and render a rating of **excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate according to the guidelines below**

The table below is intended to help faculty and reviewers determine what effective teaching looks like in the department, including both quantitative and qualitative indicators. As is evident in the table, the composite rating of teaching effectiveness is determined through a holistic assessment of both qualitative and quantitative indicators, with the qualitative indicators proving more substantial than the quantitative indicators.

C. “The [teaching] evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.” (II.B.1.a)

D. Serving as chair for a graduate thesis/project/exam committee.
### Department of Special Education Personnel Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. SOQ Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOQ Quantitative Data</td>
<td>90% or more A and B ratings</td>
<td>80%-89% A and B ratings</td>
<td>70%-79% A and B ratings</td>
<td>Below 70% A and B ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOQ Qualitative Data</td>
<td>The pattern of student responses is overwhelmingly positive.</td>
<td>The pattern of student responses is generally positive.</td>
<td>The pattern of responses show one or more areas of concern.</td>
<td>The pattern of responses shows a great deal of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 - 7. Qualitative Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>Evidence of significant accomplishments in the areas listed below.</td>
<td>Evidence of mostly significant accomplishments in the areas listed below.</td>
<td>Evidence of some accomplishments in the areas listed below.</td>
<td>Evidence of few or no accomplishments in the areas listed below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of twelve (12) sources of high-quality evidence must be submitted, with a minimum of two sources per category per full review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Establishment of an environment conducive to learning</th>
<th>Possible sources of evidence: syllabi, course announcements, emails, student feedback, course activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty provides coherent structure for course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings that are easily understood by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty ensures a just, equitable, and inclusive classroom culture by positively affirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students of all genders, races, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, and political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affiliations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty communicates course expectations clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty is open and available for student questions/advising on a regular basis (office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours, emails, phone calls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructional interactions and learning activities allow the instructor to get to know their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Needs Improvement ☐ Inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Creation of a course linking</th>
<th>Possible sources of evidence: syllabi, student feedback, course communication, sample lessons and assessments, student work samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes | • Student learning outcomes (SLO’s) are clearly defined and made available to students  
• Learning activities and assessments are linked to student learning goals  
• Student learning outcomes and assessments encompass the tenants of just, equitable, and inclusive education  
• The link between student learning outcomes and assessments is evident |
| □ Excellent □ Good □ Needs Improvement □ Inadequate |
| 4. Effective use of instructional methods | **Possible sources of evidence:** course activities and assignments, student work samples, student feedback, faculty observation reports, audio, video, and/or digital recordings of lessons. |
| | • Faculty demonstrates substantial knowledge of subject-specific pedagogy  
• Course is designed to support students in the application of new and research-based knowledge and skills  
• Students are empowered to participate actively in class discussions without fear or favor  
• Faculty utilizes educational technology as appropriate to the content and format of the course  
• Instructional methods encompass culturally and linguistically sustaining practices  
• Faculty empower students to demonstrate their funds of knowledge and linguistic assets in innovative, equitable and inclusive ways |
| □ Excellent □ Good □ Needs Improvement □ Inadequate |
| 5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline | **Possible sources of evidence:** assignment directions and scoring guides/rubrics |
| | • Activities, assignments, and assessments are inclusive, and procedures exhibit academic rigor  
• Activities, assignments, and assessments are aligned with current standards of the field  
• Activities, assignments, and assessments are aligned with the goals of the program |
| □ Excellent □ Good □ Needs Improvement □ Inadequate |
| 6. Building and enhancing currency in the | **Possible sources of evidence:** FDC trainings, webinars, peer coaching, professional conferences, self-help trainings, copies of relevant professional development materials, research articles, SOQ progression |
### Department of Special Education Personnel Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relevant discipline and pedagogical developments as related to reaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Current educational research is used to enrich and/or redesign courses to improve access, center marginalized students, and promote success for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty uses student feedback to rethink and redesign courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Course redesign and delivery shows improvement of teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty purposefully incorporates innovative approaches to teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New forms of technology are utilized to enhance instruction and ensure access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Compliance with university, college, and department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in UPS documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible sources of evidence: course syllabi, screenshots of course format in Canvas, attendance records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Course syllabi are developed according to university and department standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Course syllabi are Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty hold course meetings in accordance with the days, times and format indicated in the university course schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching duties as required by the department are met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

### Notes:
- In the self-assessment statement in the Portfolio, faculty are encouraged to synthesize both quantitative and qualitative indicators of performance as demonstrating teaching effectiveness.
- Special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (nature and difficulty of courses, etc.) are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation.
- Improvements and/or trends in teaching performance shall be discussed in the Portfolio.
- **Non-Instructional Assigned Time**: Non-instructional assigned time shall be assessed on qualitative indicators documenting performance effectiveness according to the elements of the agreed job description. A minimum of one indicator of high-quality evidence per element, yearly, is required for a rating of Excellent. The proportionality of evidence required for demonstration of effectiveness shall be considered commensurate to the ratio of assigned time to teaching load (i.e., a position that requires 6 units of assigned time and 6 units of teaching shall be evaluated 50% on each; a position that requires 3 units of assigned time and 9 units of teaching shall be evaluated 25% on assigned time and 75% on teaching time). The exception is the release time provided to new faculty—this time is not considered part of teaching performance.
- Classroom observations are to be scheduled and conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080.

### B. Scholarly and Creative Activities
Faculty engaged in scholarly and creative activities generates benefits for the faculty member as well as the University. Such activities may: (a) complement teaching; (b) contribute to the advancement of the field and/or extend the meaning or application of existing knowledge, and human achievement; (c) promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and the spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike; (d) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines; (e) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member; (f) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, the School, the College, and the University (g) enhance the reputation of the University and (h) enhance collaborative scholarship.

Note #1: The term "scholarly" and creative activity” as used here relates primarily to the Carnegie Foundation's report by Ernest Boyer regarding the "scholarship of discovery" and the "scholarship of integration" i.e., to the production of new knowledge and/or to the extension or application of existing knowledge. The Department recognizes and strongly values multiple types of scholarship, including the "scholarship of teaching" and the scholarship of application/professional service (to use Boyer terminology), with all areas addressed in their own respective sections of UPS 210.000 and in the Department of Special Education Personnel Standards.

Note #2: Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many, including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analysis and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

1. Indicators

a. Self-Assessment (mandatory) is a written discussion of the faculty member's performance in scholarly and creative activities. It shall include a discussion of the faculty member's research agenda, which is a focused, well-defined, ongoing body of work; and a reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activities documented by supporting evidence. The number of words shall be limited to 1,000.

b. Publications consist of the dissemination of peer reviewed scholarly work that appears in journals, book chapters, books, and other forms of publication. Documentation shall include one of the following: (1) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish (for unpublished material), (2) reprint of published works, or (3) copy of the publication of a book in the final printed version. Peer review comments and documentation of quality shall be included whenever possible. See “Notes” section for additional information about documentation requirements, particularly for co-authored publications. Documentation of quality of the publication is outlined in sections 2.c and 4.a-d.

c. Pragmatic Scholarship consists of grants awarded, engaged scholarship projects, consultantships, policy analysis, program evaluation, serving as a member of a research project, contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field, public press articles, books, and other non-peer-reviewed materials prepared for
the "lay" or "practitioner" audience, and other comparable scholarly activities and other forms of scholarship with an emphasis on the practical aspects of knowledge.

In documenting pragmatic scholarship, faculty shall include not only their own written record of the project, but also external reviewers comments and the identifiable benefits to the field when available. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products (summary reports, program evaluation, and recordings, are encouraged in this category.

d. Scholarly Presentations are papers and presentations given or accepted to be given at professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. They may consist of featured presentations, keynote addresses, poster sessions, panel discussions, and other forms of work, all of which shall be peer reviewed or invited presentations of a substantive nature and based on a theoretical or conceptual framework.

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities

These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty members under review to show how their work addresses these criteria and the importance of the specific criteria in evaluating each scholarly or creative work.

a. The Department employs the following criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, including:
   ● clarity of conceptualization;
   ● originality of scholarship;
   ● external peer reviews;
   ● publication in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, books, or media;
   ● professionally recognized scholarly presentations and/or invitations at the state, national or international levels.
   ● high-quality impact on the field of a scholarly and creative activity.

b. In addition, considering our philosophy, we also evaluate scholarly and creative activities based on whether the activity meets one or more of the following criteria:
   ● complements teaching;
   ● contributes to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement;
   ● contributes to the overall quality of the Department, the College, and the University;
   ● enhances the professional growth of the faculty member; and
   ● advances the reputation of the University.

c. High-quality scholarly work includes all of the following:
   ● Work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work showing what has been done in the past and a rationale as to why additional work is needed.
   ● work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge. Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject
designs, descriptive research and meta-analysis, and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

- work that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for publications that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments.
- other types of activities/indicators that add strength to a faculty member’s scholarly record (but that do not replace the requirement for scholarly publications) include: grants awarded (except as specified in section VII.B.3 below); peer-reviewed or invited scholarly presentations/posters; contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field; public press articles, books, and other non-peer-reviewed materials prepared for the “lay” or “practitioner” audience; and other comparable scholarly activities.

3. Guidelines for Ratings for Scholarly and Creative Activity

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an ongoing, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the entire review process leading to tenure and promotion. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member's overall scholarly and creative activity as: excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate.

a. A rating of excellent shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly and creative activity, including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication ("in press" or published) per year, at least four high-quality peer-reviewed publications ("in press" or published) per five-year review cycle; AND (b) at least one pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentation per year.

A large, high-quality, externally funded grant, and/or a meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities.

- A large, high-quality, externally funded grant includes all of the following criteria:

  1. **Multi-year funding**, operating on a 2-year or greater grant cycle with total award of approximately $50,000 or more.

  2. **Work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis; i.e. (is conducted within the context of existing knowledge).** Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area; and

  3. **Work that is externally reviewed by peers**, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. The peer-review process shall reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best ways of providing
such documentation, especially for grants that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments provided with the text of the grant.

4. **Evidence that the impact of the grant will be substantial** (e.g., number of candidates impacted, number of partner districts impacted, evidence of university and/or birth-22-year collaboration, letters of support).

**Note about pursuing externally funded grants:**
- External grant writing is something generally not undertaken by junior faculty members. Instead, external funding opportunities should generally be sought by tenured faculty who have already established themselves as strong researchers. Faculty are advised that they shall still need to establish themselves as researchers primarily through peer-reviewed publications. While a substantial grant adds strength to a faculty member’s scholarly record, it does not replace the requirement for scholarly publications for all faculty.

- **Engaged Scholarship:** A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the criteria established by the College of Education, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication per year for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. Engaged scholarship cannot be used to achieve a rating of good or lower.

- **Criteria:** A meaningful, high-quality, engaged scholarship project includes all of the following five criteria (faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence):

  1. A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by evidence-based practices).

  2. Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis; (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area.

  3. Multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrate both the quantitative and qualitative impact of the project. A clear impact on a district/community partner is required. These could include a letter from partners, data collected, etc.

  4. A description of the evaluation process and outcomes that includes research questions informed by and situated within the literature; an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline; implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better; and directions for future work. Evaluation results and implemented changes based on this evaluation must be completed and disseminated before the faculty member can submit this work for the RTP process.
5. Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders must be included. Dissemination may be accomplished in various ways, including formal presentations to partnership groups and reports for partners.

b. A rating of **good** shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly and creative activity including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) every two years, three (3) publications during a five-year review cycle: AND (b) one refereed presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly.

c. A rating of **needs improvement** shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly activity including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) every 2.5 years, two (2) publications during a five-year review cycle; AND (b) one refereed presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly.

d. A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for needs improvement.

The progress chart below (Table 1) is intended to serve a useful guide for faculty. However, it is not meant to serve as a strict illustration of the progression required to earn tenure and promotion. The department recognizes that once a faculty member submits a manuscript for external/peer review that the review process and associated timelines are not controlled by the faculty member. As such, a faculty member may have a period of seemingly low productivity because several manuscripts have been submitted and are under review. And it is possible for a faculty member to later have a surge in productivity once manuscripts under review have been peer reviewed and are moved to the status of accepted for publication. The reviewers are aware of this point and will take this into consideration when reviewing a faculty member’s overall productivity as a researcher.

**Table 7. Progression Chart for High-Quality Scholarly Publications (in-Press or published would be acceptable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Chart</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8. Progression Chart for Pragmatic Scholarship (conference presentation, funded grants, or pragmatic publication published or in press).**
### Progress Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>1 total</td>
<td>1 total</td>
<td>1 total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2 total</td>
<td>2 total</td>
<td>2 total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3 total</td>
<td>3 total</td>
<td>3 total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4 total</td>
<td>4 total</td>
<td>4 total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Notes

a. Quality, quantity, and the impact of the faculty members' contributions all need to be considered in light of prevailing professional standards.

b. All scholarly and creative activities shall be properly documented with a complete APA citation. Additionally, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, letters of invitation, galley pages, copies of final printed versions of publications and letters of review, and evaluation of performances are expected, depending on whether the activity is unpublished or published. A detailed statement shall be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author, signed by each co-author. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Records has an appropriate form, and when used, this form shall be signed by each co-author.

c. Documentation also shall provide for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care shall be taken to distinguish work in progress from that already completed.

d. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is measured by its overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in the Portfolio.

e. Once tenure and promotion are earned, a faculty member may concentrate their scholarly energies in areas other than the publication of peer-reviewed articles. For example, rather than publishing peer reviewed articles, a tenured faculty member may instead choose to publish a scholarly book or a book chapter that contributes substantially to the field. The faculty member shall demonstrate that their work has undergone a rigorous review process. Whichever scholarly path is chosen, the faculty member shall demonstrate a sustained and focused scholarly agenda, regardless of whether that focus results in peer-reviewed articles, scholarly books/book chapters/edited books, or some combination thereof.

f. The [scholarly and creative accomplishments] evaluations, at all levels, should take into account evidence of cultural taxation. (UPS 210.002, Section II.B.2.a)

g. The [scholarly and creative accomplishment] evaluation should consider evidence of mentoring activity (UPS 210.002, Section II. B).

### C. Professional, University, and Community Service

Faculty in applied fields such as those in the Department of Special Education, are to be encouraged not only to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, but also to communicate and apply knowledge by means of presentations and consultations. Conference presentations that result from external peer-review processes and are related to the faculty member's research agenda may be presented as part of the section on scholarship. Such items shall be presented in only one section of the Portfolio. Understood in the wider sense of communication and application of the knowledge base of the disciplines in the College, the area of professional activities has much in common with
that of scholarly and creative activities. The benefits are much the same—that is, such activities may:

- complement teaching by allowing the instructor to draw from applied experience,
- promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied,
- bring recognition as a leader to the faculty member from their peers, and,
- enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.

As with the area of scholarship, the quality, quantity, duration, and significance of one's contributions all need to be considered in the context of the potential benefits and in light of prevailing professional standards.

As a College of Education, we are dedicated to the enhancement of the education of teachers. Our mission is to provide an exemplary level of education of teachers consistent with the mandates of the State of California, the University, and the recommendations of appropriate professional bodies governing the education of all students. Our emphasis is founded on service to the educational community at large with a special emphasis on dynamic interaction with the schools and districts within our service area and region with the focus on just, equitable, inclusive education being at the forefront of all we do. All College faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of our students and the educational communities within our region.

1. **Indicators**

Evidence of service shall be recognized and evaluated by such indicators as listed below. These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how work addresses some or all of these indicators. Faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence.

a. Self-assessment (mandatory) that discusses the impact of the contributions on the profession, the field, and the individual. There is a 1000-word limit for the self-assessment narrative.

b. Professional Service: Including but not limited to the following:

- assuming professional leadership roles
- acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates
- editing professional journals
- reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals or conferences
- attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops that may not be peer-reviewed or theoretical in nature
- reviewing grant proposals
- receiving professional training or providing professional training to others
- formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes
- participating as an invited member on state or national policy committees and forums
- receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition

engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community

c. Department, College, and University Service: Including but not limited to the following:

- external field support for students in the teaching environment
- serving as chair for a graduate thesis/project/exam committee
● assuming leadership roles in the College or University
● active participation in system-wide, University, College, and/or Department committees and activities
● advisor for student organization on campus or liaison with student groups
● sponsoring student organization
● faculty advising
● lecture/staff development given to University audiences and other university classes
● active membership on advisory boards within the University formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes
● developing/facilitating internships, service learning opportunities, or community-engaged learning opportunities

d. Community Service: Including service valuable to school districts and the wider community and region. Including but not limited to the following:
● providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field
● invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums
● engaging in professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community
● active membership on advisory boards within the community
● supporting school-wide or agency system
● special services to the community (for example, lectures);
● participation in community groups such as involvement with public school programs
● service valuable to school districts and the wider community and region

2. Rating Criteria for Service Activities

The following ratings will be used: excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate.

● A rating of excellent shall be rendered for activities that reflect a high degree of involvement in terms of both quality and quantity. The faculty member shall have high quality sustained participation in service activities as evidenced by an average of at least five or more activities per year in the areas of Professional, Department, College, University, and Community service, totaling 25 service activities over a five-year period.

● A rating of good shall be rendered if there are considerable quality activities in variety (four activities) per year in the areas of Professional, College and University, and Community service.

● A rating of needs improvement shall be rendered if there are quality service activities in variety (three activities) per year in the areas of Professional, College and University, and Community service.

● A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for needs improvement.

Faculty at the associate rank are expected to provide service at the College, University, and/or professional level as well as to the Department.
Note: The evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

VIII. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty
Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual’s progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. “When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement.” If probationary faculty receive a rating of needs improvement or lower in one or more areas, a full performance review will be recommended, instead of an abbreviated review.

If service credit was granted, candidates “shall include documentation of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted.” And, “accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion… (and) …shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.”

In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member shall be rated needs improvement (one cycle of review prior to Probationary Year 3), good or excellent in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service. In order to be retained, the probationary 5th year faculty member shall be rated good or excellent in all categories: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure in the sixth probationary year regardless of the rank at which they were appointed (this includes probationary Associate Professors).

1. In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member shall be rated excellent in teaching or scholarly and creative activities and at least good in the other areas.

2. In order to receive tenure a faculty member shall have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university. If the dissertation is listed in the Portfolio as a published document, it shall be included in the Appendix section. If the dissertation is listed as an unpublished document, it need not be included in the Portfolio Appendix.

3. Early Promotion and Early Tenure: In order to be awarded early tenure and promotion to associate, the faculty member shall exceed the standards in VIII.B.1 by receiving a rating of excellent in all three areas, Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

   a. “Early tenure may be granted in cases when a faculty member demonstrates a record of distinction in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.” (UPS
C. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Regardless of the rank at which they were appointed, promotion from one rank to another requires that the faculty member request promotion via the University-approved form and according to University timelines. For faculty requesting consideration for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, four years in rank is the standard time frame, unless the faculty member is requesting an early consideration for promotion to Full Professor.

Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. The WPAF shall be submitted by October 1 of the sixth probationary year for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Therefore, the review period for promotion to Professor begins October 2 of the sixth probationary year. Any materials added to the WPAF during the review process (after October 2) for promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

There is no time limit for promotion to full professor. For example, a faculty member may decide to wait until 8-10 years before submitting a file for promotion to full professor.

Note: Scholarly and creative activities for promotion to full professor shall include an ongoing body of work that substantially adds to scholarly accomplishments achieved for the individual's promotion to associate professor. These may include, but are not limited to, the publication of a book, peer-reviewed articles, and book chapters.

1. Promotion to Full Professor

In order to be granted promotion to full professor, the faculty member shall be rated, at minimum, excellent in two areas (one of which must be Teaching) and at least good in the third area.

2. Early Promotion and Early Tenure

Refer to UPS 210.000 for eligibility requirements.

In all cases, the faculty member shall satisfy to a greater extent the requirements for promotion and/or tenure delineated in earlier sections. Additionally special requirements are described below.

a. Early Tenure requires that the faculty member shall be rated excellent in teaching, scholarship, and service.

b. Early Promotion to Associate Professor requires that the faculty member shall be rated excellent in teaching, scholarship, and service.

c. Early Promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member shall be rated as having a sustained record of excellence in all three areas since last promotion.
### Summary of Minimum Tenure and Promotion Requirements
#### Department of Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure and Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Early Tenure</th>
<th>Early Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor</th>
<th>Early Promotion to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall be EXCELLENT, GOOD, or NEEDS IMPROVEMENT in one review cycle prior to Probationary Year 3, in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.</td>
<td>EXCELLENT in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities and at least GOOD in two other areas.</td>
<td>Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.</td>
<td>Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.</td>
<td>Sustained level of high performance is required for promotion to professor. EXCELLENT in two areas (one of which must be teaching) and at least GOOD in the third area.</td>
<td>Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 The instructor helped me to understand how systems and structures perpetuate educational inequities and consider solutions to address equitable outcomes.

1.2 The instructor encouraged me to examine my own privileges and biases.

1.3 After taking this course, my understanding of the subject matter has increased.

1.4 The instructor created a learning environment that encouraged students to be actively engaged in their own learning.

1.5 The instructor used a range of methods to promote student learning.

1.6 The instructor allowed for diverse points of view.

1.7 The instructor fulfilled the course objectives.

1.8 The instructor was available to students at the times stated in the course documents.

1.9 The instructor communicated course expectations effectively.

1.10 The instructor promoted the professional and ethical use of technology.

1.11 The instructor related the content of this course to a broader educational/societal context.

1.12 Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

Please continue to Page 2.
2. Comments

2.1 What feedback would you like to provide the instructor?