

**Official
Approved
Department
Personnel
Standards**

Date: 6/26/2015



California State University
Fullerton

Department of Special Education

Department Personnel Standards

**Approved, June 26, 2015 by Provost Cruz for
implementation with the 2016-2017 Academic Year**

I. Preface

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. 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 the key to quality programs and effective learning environments is the instructional faculty. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning through contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship in all its forms; and service to the Department, the College of Education, the University, the profession, and the community.

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

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 specifically affirms their position that the interests and needs of students are best served when the faculty represents a wide diversity of interests and activities, creating a “mosaic of talent.” With this document, the Department intends to recognize the full range of faculty talent 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 faculties are expected to meet professional responsibilities as they apply to each of the Portfolio evaluation categories.

In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, for example:

- holding classes,
- holding established office hours at regular times and places,
- participating in Department academic advising procedures, and
- attending faculty meetings.

In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, faculties are expected to engage in activities that will enhance the overall mission of the professorate, for example:

- 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 [include, for example:]

- 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 of Special Education,
- supporting the work of the Department, College and University, and
- contributing to the community in general through service activities.

III. Department History and Structure

The Department of Special Education was established in the mid 1970s. Its mission is to provide specialized credentialing and certification of teachers in the area of special education as well as advanced education leading to a master's Degree in education with an emphasis in special education.

IV. Role of the Chair in the Personnel Process

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

- As provided in UPS 210.000, before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair shall consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors. (See UPS 210.000 for further details.)
- 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. 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.
- 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 his or her 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, adequate, 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.** 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 he or she expects 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 shall be due in the Department Chair's office by February 28. 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 developmental narrative will be included in the Portfolio. A Portfolio Vitae shall be included, and citations shall follow APA guidelines. Self-assessment narratives are limited to 1,000 words. The student opinion questionnaire forms shall be added by the Department Chair when the Portfolio is received.

VII. Criteria and Weighing 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.

A. Teaching Performance

The primary mission of College faculty is teaching. The students' perceptions of a teacher are an important--though not decisive--means of assessing the quality of teaching. Evaluations may more readily be assumed to be significant when data from student opinion questionnaires and other evidence presented lead to similar conclusions. The faculty member's self-assessment shall address significant discrepancies between data from student opinion forms and other data included in the Portfolio and Appendix. Mandatory indicators for demonstration of teaching performance are listed below.

1. Mandatory Indicators

- a. Self-Assessment The faculty member shall include a written discussion of his or her teaching activities that includes 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. The number of words shall be limited to 1,000.
- 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 advance organizers, video technology, innovative strategies, instructional television concepts and techniques, evidence of Portfolio and case study assessment, etc. may also be included in the Appendix.
- e. Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught shall be included. (If data are 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. Original Student Opinion Questionnaires The Department Chair will add the forms to the portfolio when it is received. (If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair.)
- g. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions The university-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester shall be provided.

2. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Two categories of data are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness: Student Opinion Questionnaires and Additional Indicators. In order for the faculty member to receive a composite rating of **good** or better on teaching effectiveness she or he shall have received a rating of at least **good** on student opinion forms.

- 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 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). Reviewers will take into account student comments as well as the faculty member's explanation of the ratings in the teaching narrative when assigning a rating for this category.

Rating:	Results from statistical summaries:
Excellent	90% or more A and B ratings, with at least 40% A ratings
Good	75% – 89% A and B ratings
Adequate	65% – 74% A and B ratings
Inadequate	Fewer than 65% A and B ratings

b. Additional Indicators

In addition to the Mandatory indicators, a holistic assessment of teaching performance will consider evidence from the following Additional Indicators. These materials shall be carefully selected and revised over time to represent the enhancement of one's teaching performance.

The faculty member is urged to submit any other evidence that demonstrates teaching Effectiveness, such as, but not limited to, the following:

- class visitations and reviews by colleagues;
- evidence of additional training in teaching or assessment;
- additional assessment of instruction procedures;
- quality of teaching materials;
- evaluation and grading of student performance and how these are linked to the use of course materials and course delivery;
- rationale for textbook selection;
- course development and enhancement;
- video and/or audio tapes of lessons;
- independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member;
- documentation of service as thesis/project advisor or committee member for master's degree students;
- documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork Coordination;
- new course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the curriculum;
- written and signed comments by students;
- innovative teaching such as team or collaborative teaching or distance learning;
- student work samples that illustrate attainment of instructional goals;
- ongoing professional development as a teacher;
- development of new course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the Curriculum; and,
- any other teaching related information and/or materials germane to higher education teaching effectiveness.

The reviewers will rate the Mandatory Indicators and the Additional Teaching Indicators and render a rating of **excellent, good, adequate or inadequate**.

Rating:	
Excellent	Contains four or more items of strong and varied evidence of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies and/or assessment tools; ongoing development of teaching skills.
Good	To achieve a rating of “good,” the faculty member shall provide three or more items of strong and varied evidence of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies and/or assessment tools; on-going development of teaching skills.
Adequate	To achieve a rating of “adequate,” the faculty member shall provide two or more items of strong and varied evidence of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies and/or assessment tools; on-going development of teaching skills.
Inadequate	To receive a rating of “inadequate,” the faculty member Or no evidence of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies, and/or assessment tools; ongoing development of teaching skills.

Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness Reviewers will weigh Student Opinion Questionnaires And Additional Indicators equally for each period under review to determine an overall rating of Teaching effectiveness. Primary consideration will be given to evidence of high quality instructional practices and rigorous standards for student performance as evidenced in the portfolio. In addition, the overall rating of teaching effectiveness will consider the clarity and completeness of the narrative summary of teaching performance, including the faculty member's pedagogical approach and self-assessment of significant accomplishments, as described above.

Based on a composite of the student opinion questionnaires, and Additional Indicators, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching effectiveness as: **excellent, good, adequate, or inadequate**. In order for the faculty member to receive an overall score of good or better on teaching effectiveness, she or he shall have received a rating of at least good on Student Opinion Questionnaires.

4. Notes

- a. In the self-assessment statement in the Portfolio faculty are encouraged to synthesize both Mandatory and Additional Indicators of Performance as demonstrating teaching effectiveness.

- b. 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.
- c. Improvements and/or trends in teaching performance shall be discussed in the Portfolio.

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 external peer-reviewed scholarly work that appears as journal articles, book chapters, and other forms of media. Documentation shall include one of the following: (1) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish (for unpublished material), (2) reprint of published articles (for published works), or (3) copy of the publication of a book in final printed version. Peer review comments shall be included whenever possible. Documentation of quality of the publication is outlined in sections 2.c

and 4.a-d.

c. Pragmatic Scholarship consists of grants awarded, 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 peer-review comments and the identifiable benefits to the field when available. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products, 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 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 some or all of these criteria and the importance of the specific criteria in evaluating each scholarly or creative work.)

a. The Department employs traditional criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, utilizing,

- clarity of conceptualization;
- originality of scholarship;
- external peer reviews;
- publication in respected journals, books, or media;
- professionally recognized scholarly and prestigious invitations and awards and honors; and
- high-quality impact on the field of a scholarly and creative activity.

b. In addition, in light of 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. Other indicators of high-quality scholarship are noted by works that meet the following criteria:

- *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.*
- *Work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or that 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.*
- *Work that is published in respected sources (journals, books, media, etc), with faculty providing documentation of the quality, scope, and/or importance of the journal, book, etc. Respected sources generally are defined as those requiring a rigorous peer-review process for submitted materials.*
- *Other types of activities/indicators, including high-quality pragmatic scholarship that add strength to a faculty's scholarly record include: grants awarded 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 during the probationary period is required to complete the entire review process leading to tenure. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member's overall scholarly and creative activity as: **excellent, good, adequate, or inadequate.**

- A rating of excellent shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly and creative activity, including (a) a comprehensive self-assessment; (b) at least four scholarly, high-quality, peer-reviewed publications ("in press" or published) per five-year review cycle; and (c) an average of two pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations per year.

As the College of Education recognizes that securing large, high-quality, externally-funded grants is a competitive process requiring many of the same components found in high

quality scholarly publication, in lieu of one of the required articles in (b), a faculty member may count a large, high-quality, externally funded grant, as defined per the guidelines that follow, toward 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 pre K-12 collaboration, letters of support).
- A rating of good shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly and creative activity including (a) a comprehensive self-assessment; (b) at least three scholarly, high quality, peer reviewed publications (“in press” or published) per five-year review cycle; and (c) an average of one pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentation per year.
 - A rating of adequate shall be rendered for a minimal degree of scholarly and creative activity which is judged to be of modest quality and/or productivity on a scholarly agenda, including (a) a comprehensive self-assessment and (b) at least two scholarly, peer-reviewed publications (“in press” or published) at the four-year review cycle; and (c) an average of one pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations per year.
 - A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for an unacceptable self-assessment and/or insufficient quality and/or quantity of scholarly and creative activity.

4. 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 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 the following five criteria (faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence):

- 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).
- 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.
- multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrates 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.
- 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; 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.
- 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.

5. 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, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, journal acceptance rates, letters of invitation, dates, places, final printed versions of galley pages, locations, copies of final printed versions of publication, letters of review, and evaluation of performances. A detailed statement signed by all co-authors shall be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author. Faculty Affairs and Records have an appropriate form.
- c. Documentation also shall be provided for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care shall be taken to distinguish work in progress from work that is already completed.

- d. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is not measured by the image of a specific journal or publisher, but by the activity's overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty members under review to clearly delineate such evidence in his or her Portfolios.

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 School, the area of professional activities has much in common with that of scholarly and creative activities. The audience for professional activities is broader than is the scholarly audience. 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 her or his peers, and,
- enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.

As with the area of scholarship, the quality, quantity, and impact 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 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. All College faculties 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 in the three categories of service. (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.) Self-assessment that discusses the impact of the contributions on the profession, the field and the individual (mandatory):

a. Professional

- 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 (which may not be

- peer reviewed or theoretical in nature);
 - reviewing grant proposals;
 - receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others;
 - formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes;
 - Receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition.
- b. College and University
- External field support for students in the teaching environment;
 - serving as chair for a graduate thesis/project 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;
 - faculty advising;
 - lecture/staff development given to University audiences and other university classes;
 - Active membership on advisory boards within the University.
- c. Community
- 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, adequate 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 four or more activities per year-in the areas of Professional, College and University, and Community service.
- A rating of good shall be rendered if there are considerable quality activities in variety (three or more) activities per year in the areas of Professional, College and University, and Community service.
- A rating of adequate shall be rendered if there are activities in several (two or more) activities per year in the areas of Professional, College and University, and Community service.
- A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for a lack of sufficient activity.
Faculty at the associate rank are expected to provide service at the College, University, and/or professional level as well as to the Department.

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. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member shall be rated, at minimum:

- good in the area of teaching and one other area; and
- adequate in the remaining area but shall be making obvious progress toward a rating of good. If the remaining area is scholarly and creative activities, by year four the faculty shall have published at least two scholarly works and have at least two additional scholarly works submitted for publication.

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.

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.

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.

C. Criteria for Promotion

Promotion from one rank to another requires that the faculty member request promotion via the University-approved form and according to University timelines.

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 teaching, scholarship, and
- good or excellent in service.

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.

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

	Retention	Tenure and Promotion to Associate	Early Tenure	Early Promotion to Associate	Promotion to Full	Early Promotion to Full
Teaching	excellent or good	excellent or good*	excellent	excellent	excellent	excellent
Scholarly and Creative Activities	excellent, good or adequate*	excellent or good*	excellent	excellent	excellent*	excellent
Professional, University and Community Service	excellent, good or adequate*	excellent or good	excellent	excellent	excellent or good*	excellent
	*If adequate, shall be making obvious progress toward good. Shall be good or excellent in teaching and one other area.	*Shall be excellent in teaching or scholarly and creative activities.			*Shall be excellent in teaching and scholarly and creative activities	