

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

CODE

Approved December 2011

COLLEGE OF APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES



School of Education CODE

Table of Contents

- I. Administrative Officers
 - A. Chief Administrative and Academic Officer--SOE Director
 - B. Associate Director(s) of SOE
 - C. Associate Director of Continuing Education

- II. Administrative Organization
 - A. Executive Team
 - B. Area of Study Chairs
 - C. Specialization Chairs
 - D. External Advisory Committee for the School of Education (SOE and STEPP)
 - E. Standing Committees
 - 1. Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - 2. Special Appointment Promotion Committee
 - 3. Diversity Committee
 - 4. Administrative Professional and State Classified Staff Committee
 - F. Ad-hoc Committees

- III. SOE Mission, Goals, and Objectives

- IV. The School of Teacher Education and Principal Preparation (STEPP)

- V. Personnel Procedures
 - A. Selection and Appointment of Faculty
 - B. Faculty Assignments
 - C. Faculty Performance Review Policies and Procedures
 - 1. Annual Review Policies
 - 2. Annual Review Procedures
 - 3. Annual evaluation appeals process
 - 4. University Annual Performance Rating Report
 - 5. Comprehensive Mid-Point Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

6. Comprehensive Mid-Point Review of Special Appointments
7. Tenure and Promotion Reviews
 - a. Tenure and Promotion Policies
 - b. Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Faculty and Special Appointments
8. Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Progress toward Promotion (See Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.14.2)
9. Periodic Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty (See Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.14.2)
 - a. Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews
 - b. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews
- D. Evaluation of Administrators and Administrative Professionals
- E. Appeals of Academic and Disciplinary Decisions
 1. Appeals of Grading Decisions (Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section I.7.1)
 2. Appeals on Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy (Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section I.7.2)
- F. Sabbatical Leave
- G. Disciplinary Action for Tenured Faculty
- VI. Operational Procedures
 - A. Faculty Meetings
 - B. Committee Election and Appointment Procedures
- VII. Accreditation and Evaluation Procedures
 - A. SOE and STEPP Self-Study
 - B. Accreditation Reviews
- VIII. Code Review and Revision

CODE-SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

The School of Education (SOE) delivers graduate education programming and is the primary academic unit for the center, the School of Teacher Education and Principal Preparation (STEPP). Both entities are referred to in this document. The Code of the School of Education (SOE) is consistent with the University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual relating to SOE matters, and the University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual shall take precedence in all instances. Further, the SOE Code takes into account the cooperative working relationship with the Colorado Community College System (CCCS) and the implicit relationship with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) as articulated in the standards for educator licensure and professional endorsements.

I. Administrative Officers

A. Chief Administrative and Academic Officer--SOE Director

The SOE Director is the administrative and academic officer and is the initial person in the administrative chain to the Board of Governors. Members of the SOE are responsible to her/him. The SOE Director has responsibility for policies, procedures, and activities which affect the professional status of the SOE and the University. The Director is selected as specified in the University Code. (E4.3). The term of the SOE Director shall be five years, with the potential for reappointment based on satisfactory annual evaluations. Faculty and staff input regarding the Director's administrative performance shall be solicited annually by the Dean.

The duties of the SOE Director are those specified in the University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual Code (C.26.2) and include:

1. Manage all fiscal matters related to SOE to include preparing, administering, monitoring, and adhering to the SOE budget, and reporting budget and fiscal policies to the faculty and staff on a regular basis, at least quarterly.
2. Manage all academic matters related to SOE to include:
 - a. Oversee course scheduling process for all Resident Instruction (RI) and Continuing Education specializations (programs) within the SOE in cooperation with appropriate leadership (ie; Associate Director for Continuing Education, Director for STEPP).
 - b. Coordinate teaching assignments of faculty each semester in cooperation with the Director of STEPP, the specialization chairs, and the Associate Director for Continuing Education.
 - c. Ensure there are appropriate program and outcome assessments throughout the SOE.
 - d. Oversee building facilities and equipment (classrooms, offices, laboratories, technology, etc.).
 - e. Select the SOE Student Appeals Committee, in cases of student appeals of grading decisions as per the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (Section 1.7 .1). See Section V.E.1 in this Code for more information.
3. Manage all personnel matters related to the School of Education (SOE and STEPP) to include:
 - a. Initiate recommendations for appointments, advancement, tenure, and dismissal of faculty and staff members, considering the teaching, advising, research, and service effectiveness of faculty

members being recommended for contract renewal, promotion, tenure, dismissal, and salary increases in coordination with the Director of STEPP, as appropriate.

- b. Evaluate SOE and STEPP faculty, SOE staff, and SOE administrative professionals in accordance with the SOE and the Colorado State University policies and Code.
 - c. Assign equitable faculty and staff work responsibilities in consultation with the Director of STEPP, Associate Director(s), Executive Team and the program chairs.
 - d. Prepare agendas and chair meetings of the faculty, staff, and Executive Team.
 - e. Participate in these meetings as a non-voting member except in the case of a tie vote, where the SOE Director vote is needed to break the tie.
4. Coordinate graduate programs to include
- a. Oversee the graduate program admission processes in conjunction with the Executive Team.
 - b. Monitor graduate program processes (e.g., progress to degree, graduate program standards, and rubrics for prelim comprehensive exams).
 - c. Work with program chairs.
5. Manage all outreach matters related to the SOE to include:
- a. Promote a positive public image for the SOE (e.g., coordinate development and execution of marketing plans, public relations activities, monthly Highlights and the creation of a newsletter.)
 - b. Coordinate alumni and SOE development activities in conjunction with the College Dean's Office.
 - c. Represent the SOE at appropriate meetings and functions.
 - d. Prepare reports requested by higher authorities and outside agencies.
 - e. Organize and facilitate the External Advisory Committee.
 - f. Monitor continuing education offerings.
 - g. Follow University policies, and in consultation with the SOE Executive Team, recruit and recommend an Associate Director of the School of Education Continuing Education to facilitate the SOE continuing education and distance delivery offerings.

B. Associate Director(s) of SOE

In consultation with the Executive Team, the SOE Director may appoint one or more individual from the faculty (tenured, tenure-track, or special appointment*) to the position of Associate Director of SOE to assist with the responsibilities for the administration of SOE. In the event that the SOE Director is absent from the campus for an extended period of time, s/he shall designate an Associate Director to be in charge. The specific responsibilities are assigned by the SOE Director based upon the Director's needs in performing the responsibilities listed above in I.A.

C. Associate Director of Continuing Education

The Associate Director of Continuing Education is appointed by the SOE Director in consultation with the Executive Team. S/he is reviewed annually and shall be reappointed on a three-year basis. The general responsibilities of the Associate Director of Continuing Education are:

1. In conjunction with Program Directors, coordinate off-campus, nontraditional, distance delivery and blended Continuing Education programs and courses.
2. Implement, monitor, and evaluate processes and procedures for the Continuing Education offerings in SOE.
3. Maintain communication with the Division of Continuing Education (DCE) and communicate all policies pertaining to Continuing Education with SOE.
4. Coordinate, and recommend approval when appropriate, Continuing Education course offerings, monitoring the requirements, course content and objectives, instructor qualifications, locations, evaluation instruments, etc. in accordance with SOE and University curriculum and program standards and policies.
5. Coordinate and develop the Continuing Education brochures (fall, spring, summer).
6. In conjunction with the Division of Continuing Education and the Executive Team develop strong public relations for the Continuing Education offerings with schools, business/industry, faculty, staff, and other target audiences.
7. Serve as the contact relative to Continuing Education in the Schools (SOE) by representing the Schools at appropriate meetings and functions related to continuing education efforts and programs.
8. Regularly assess the Schools' Continuing Education program efforts, reporting results to the SOE Director.
9. Coordinate enrollment and fiscal matters with the Division of Continuing Education, SOE Director, and program chairs.

II. Administrative Organization

A. Executive Team

The Executive Team shall be composed of the SOE Director, the STEPP Director, the SOE Associate Director(s), the Associate Director of Continuing Education, and all SOE areas of study chairs and chairs of master's Specializations that do not have a direct link to a doctoral program. Therefore, with the intent to assure that there is equitable representation of programs, both the Higher Education and Instructional Leadership areas of study will appoint two representatives to the Executive Team, one representing a doctoral program and one representing a masters program. The other areas of study will each appoint one representative. Voting members are all of the SOE area of study chairs and the selected masters' specialization chairs. The SOE and STEPP Directors and the Associate Directors participate in these meetings as non-voting members except in the case of a tie vote, where the SOE Director vote is needed to break the tie.

Because of the importance of Committee decisions, no official committee action can take place unless a quorum is present. A quorum is when a majority of the voting members are present. No member may represent more than one constituency.

The Executive Team shall meet at least once a month, more frequently when necessary, and during the summer months as needed. The agendas and a summary of each meeting shall be distributed to all faculty and staff. Others invited to attend in a non-voting capacity as needed to include, but not limited to, the SOE's financial officer, the

SOE's representative to the College curriculum committee, the SOE Diversity Council representative, the SOE Faculty Council representative, and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee.

If a member cannot attend a meeting, a substitute may be designated. S/he will have the same voting privilege as the member being represented. No member may represent more than one constituency represented at the meeting.

The responsibilities of the Executive Team are:

1. Recommend to the SOE Director on matters related to personnel, staffing, decisions regarding new positions, work responsibilities, enrollment management, course scheduling and offerings, program

**Full time special appointments are defined as those who have been hired by the University/ School through a formal search process with a search committee and written job description.*

- coordination, administration, strategic planning, and budgeting, continuing education, public relations, development, and the SOE code, governance, as well as other matters of concern to faculty, staff, and students.
2. Recommend actions on issues raised by the SOE Director, the Associate Director, area of study chairs and specialization chairs, the Associate Director of Continuing Education, the Director of STEPP, SOE faculty, standing or ad-hoc committees, students, or various stakeholders.
3. Serve as the SOE Curriculum Committee reviewing all curriculum proposals submitted by the STEPP or program chairs and forwarding them to the College Curriculum Committee. Curricular actions require a majority vote of those present and should be shared with all SOE faculty at the next regular faculty meeting and posted on the “P” drive.
4. Annually review the SOE Code, presenting suggested revisions at the next SOE faculty meeting following the completion of the review.
5. Serve as the Academic Advisory Committee for the SOE Office of Continuing Education.
6. Serve as the committee to review sabbatical leave requests using established guidelines (see Section V.F). Recommend qualified proposals (in rank order) to the Dean.
7. Recommend nominees for College and University awards.
8. Establish two-way communication between Executive Team and specialization and program faculty represented.

While the Executive Team makes recommendations on behalf of faculty and staff on many issues, some policy issues are more appropriately discussed by the faculty as a whole. The SOE Director, the Executive Team, and the faculty may identify certain issues to be discussed and acted upon at faculty meetings.

B. Area of Study Chairs

The area of study is an administrative structural designation within SOE (see Appendix B). Areas of study represent groupings of specializations that have content commonalities. The specializations may be masters or doctoral programs and may be funded as resident instruction or continuing education offerings. The SOE Director designates, in consultation with specialization faculty, area of study chairs who are in charge of groups of specific graduate specializations and other academic tracks/programs when appropriate. Individuals appointed as chairs of areas of study shall be faculty with regular tenure, tenure-track, or special appointments. Area of study chairs coordinate efforts and resources among the programs they represent. Their responsibilities chairs include:

1. Recruit and admit high-quality applicants to the area of study and to specializations
 - a. Initiate recruitment efforts in coordination with the Executive Team.
 - b. Develop promotional and marketing materials and other communications in conjunction with the Executive Team.
 - c. Respond to inquiries about the specializations within the area of study.

- d. Facilitate, the screening and admission of candidates to the area of study with regard to admittance numbers with the SOE Director and Executive committee.
 - e. Recommend and coordinate the appointment of specialization chairs.
2. Oversee specialization, track and program changes, course revisions, practica and internship requirements and coordinate these efforts through the Executive team.
 3. Initiate and oversee paper work specific to specializations (e.g., Graduate School memos, correspondence, etc.).
 4. In consultation with the specialization chair and faculty, coordinate specialization course offerings, course scheduling, including the hiring and evaluation of adjunct faculty. The execution of these activities must be consistent with University guidelines and receive final approval from the SOE Director and the executive team.
 5. Evaluate and write annual performance letters for faculty.
 6. Assist in accreditation reviews as required.

C. Specialization Chairs

Specializations have a single content focus. Specialization chairs are the leaders and primary contact for the specialization. They work with area of study chairs relative to the specialization area; assisting with the area of study chairs duties as described above. Responsibilities of the chairs include:

1. Recruit and admit high-quality applicants to the specialization.
 - a. Initiate recruitment efforts in coordination with the Executive Team.
 - b. Develop promotional and marketing materials and other communications in conjunction with the area of study chairs.
 - c. Respond to inquiries about the specialization.
 - d. Facilitate, the screening and admission of candidates to the program with regard to admittance numbers with the area of study chairs, SOE Director, and Executive committee.
2. Initiate and oversee paperwork specific to the specialization (e.g., Graduate School memos, correspondence, etc.).
3. Participate in accreditation reviews as required.
4. Make recommendations, with consultation from specialization faculty, for the hiring of high quality adjuncts and evaluate the adjuncts' performance annually.

D. External Advisory Committee for the School of Education (SOE and STEPP)

The External Advisory Committee includes not less than seven or more than ten members from outside the University, representing the functions and/or specialization of SOE and STEPP. Members shall be appointed by the SOE Director based on recommendations from the Executive Team and specialization chairs. The Committee shall meet at least once each academic year. The responsibilities of the External Advisory Committee are to:

1. Advise and assist the SOE and STEPP Directors in reviewing the operations and performance of the unit in accordance with the stated mission, goals, and objectives.
2. Advise and assist the SOE and STEPP Directors and Executive Team in clarifying issues and concerns.

3. Serve as a liaison with the publics served by SOE and STEPP.
4. Provide support for development activities.

E. Standing Committees

Standing Committees are integral to the functioning of the SOE. Because of the importance of Committee decisions, no official committee action can take place unless a quorum is present. A quorum can be declared when a majority of the voting members (as specified for each committee) are present. No member may represent more than one constituency. Committee action will require a majority vote of those present. Chairs of standing committees will report to the Executive Committee on the activities, findings, and actions of the committee on a regular basis at least once during the academic year. Changes related to the roles, composition, and responsibilities of a standing committee must be voted on by the faculty as a whole.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall include all tenured faculty with regular appointments in the SOE. The chair of the committee is appointed by SOE Director with approval by the Executive Team. A special appointment full professor may be selected to serve as the chair of this committee as an exception, to be approved with a vote by the whole faculty. The general responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- a. Complete a written annual review for faculty below the rank of full specifying progress toward tenure and promotion that is submitted by the P&T chair to the Director.
 - b. Meet as a committee of the whole with individual faculty and their mentor(s) to discuss the faculty member's progress towards tenure and/or promotion, upon request of the faculty member. These meetings shall be scheduled by the Director and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and result in a written report.
 - c. Complete the Comprehensive Mid-Point Review of Tenure Track Faculty (see SOE Code V.C.5).
 - d. Complete the Tenure and/or Promotion Review (see SOE Code V.C.7a).
 - e. Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty (see SOE Code V.C.8).
 - f. Approve or revise mentoring programs proposed by the Director for new and junior faculty.
 - g. Recommend to the faculty revisions concerning the SOE Faculty Performance Review policies and procedures.
 - h. Take action on any other matters related to promotion and tenure.
- ##### 3. Special Appointment Promotion Committee

This committee is composed of four members; two tenured faculty members and two special appointments selected by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the SOE Director. The chair of the committee is appointed by SOE Director with approval by the Executive Team. The purpose of the committee is to conduct annual reviews of eligible special appointment faculty interested in advancement. Eligible special appointments are those special appointments who have been hired by the University or School through a formal search process that included a search committee and written job description. The general responsibilities are:

- a. Complete a written annual review for each full time special appointment below the rank of full specifying progress toward promotion that is submitted by the chair to the Director
- b. Meet as a committee of the whole with special appointments eligible for promotion and their mentor(s) to discuss the faculty member's progress towards promotion, if requested to do so by the

special appointment. These meetings shall be scheduled by the Director and the Chair of the Special Appointment Promotion Committee and result in a written report for the faculty member.

- c. Complete the Comprehensive Mid-Point Review (see SOE Code V.C.6).
- d. Complete the 5th year Promotion Review (see SOE Code V.C.7b).
- e. Approve or revise mentoring programs for new and junior appointments.
- f. Recommend to the faculty revisions concerning the SOE Faculty Performance Review policies and procedures.
- g. Take action on any other matters related to promotion.

4. Diversity Committee

Composed of 3-5 interested faculty, 1-2 student representatives, and 1-2 staff members. Annually, invitations are sent to all faculty and staff inviting them to participate on the committee during the academic year. Faculty will recommend student representatives. The purpose of the Diversity Committee is to provide leadership in order to promote and support diversity, democracy, social justice and equity in the policies, practices, and governance structures of SOE and STEPP. General responsibilities are:

- a. To represent SOE on the College Diversity committee
- b. To provide leadership to SOE and STEPP in matters relating to diversity

5. Administrative Professional and State Classified Staff Committee

The State Classified Staff Committee shall include all staff members whose appointment equals .50 or above. The Committee Chair shall be appointed by the SOE Director annually in the fall. The purposes of the State Classified Staff Committee are to facilitate communication and problem-solving. The Committee shall meet every semester or as needed. The responsibilities of the State Classified Staff Committee:

- a. Maintain communication channels among staff and between staff and faculty/administrators.
- b. Problem-solve around workload, personnel, and other staff-related issues.
- c. Facilitate the professional development of support staff.
- d. Recommend policies and procedures to enhance functioning of the SOE.

F. Ad-hoc Committees

Ad-hoc Committees shall be established at the discretion of the SOE Director in consultation with the Executive committee and the faculty in general. While some ad-hoc committees serve for prescribed, limited periods of time, others are on-going, meeting as needed. The appointments to on-going committees shall be made by the director on an annual basis, generally in the fall or when the committee is constituted.

III. SOE Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Yearly, as part of the University planning process, the SOE Director shall facilitate the process by which the SOE develops or revises a strategic plan reflecting its mission, goals, and objectives. These specific objectives shall be published and distributed to SOE, College, and University personnel as appropriate.

IV. The School of Teacher Education and Principal Preparation (STEPP)

STEPP was approved as a Center, Institute or Other Special Unit (CIOUS) on February 10, 2009. STEPP administers all educator licensure programs at Colorado State University. According to the STEPP Task force memo dated August 18, 2008, its mission is to provide the University “a more visible home for teacher and principal preparation and serve as a state, regional, and national leader in the preparation of PK-12 school professionals.” STEPP is an interdisciplinary unit that works with content advisors in other colleges. STEPP maintains its own operating budget. The general responsibilities of the Director of STEPP are to:

1. Manage all fiscal matters related to the STEPP to include preparing, administering, and adhering to STEPP budget, and reporting budget and fiscal policies to the SOE Director.
2. Manage all academic matters related to the STEPP to include:
 - a. Assist in the course scheduling process for all RI and CE programs within STEPP in cooperation with appropriate leadership (i.e.; Associate Director for Continuing Education, SOE Director).
 - b. Coordinate the teaching assignments of STEPP faculty and instructors each semester in cooperation with the SOE Director, the program chairs, and the Associate Director for Continuing Education.
 - c. Ensure that there are appropriate program and outcome assessments.
 - d. Ensure the maintenance of all student and program records.
3. Manage personnel matters related to STEPP to include:
 - a. In conjunction with the SOE Director evaluate annual performance of STEPP faculty and special full time faculty with rank for progress toward promotion and tenure. As outlined in the MOU, “generally the director of STEPP is responsible for evaluating licensure teaching and advising and the Director of SOE is responsible for evaluating performance in graduate teaching and advising, research and service.”
 - b. Evaluate STEPP staff, and administrative professionals in accordance with the School of Education, and the Colorado State University policies and University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
 - c. Write the performance letter for clinical faculty and special full time faculty with rank.
 - d. Negotiate equitable faculty and staff work responsibilities in consultation with the Director of SOE, Associate Director (s), Executive Team and the program chairs.
4. Serve as University Licensure Officer and coordinate licensure programs to include:
 - a. Chair STEPP meetings.
 - b. Determine eligibility for institutional recommendation for all licensure candidates.
 - c. Review and approve all applications for admission to STEPP.
 - d. Approve licensure applications.
 - e. Serve as liaison with the Colorado Department of Education in place of the SOE Director, as assigned.
 - f. Approve all licensure-related requests for substitution or waiver of courses.

- g. Approve contracts for non-degree licensure students.
- h. Facilitate the alternative admissions process where applicable.
- i. Determine acceptability of requests for substitution or waiver of field experience requirements.
- j. Coordinate the advising functions of STEPP including assigning licensure advisers, developing appropriate advising materials, and maintaining communication with advisers within STEPP, SOE, and in other University departments.
- k. Conduct annual follow-up studies of individuals completing the licensure program, including the employment survey and program evaluation.
- l. Disseminate information collected in follow-up studies and the CDE first- and third-year report
- m. Complete educator licensing reports.
- n. Facilitate accreditation of STEPP, monitor program compliance and report results.
- o. Supervise the operation of the STEPP Office.

V. Personnel Procedures

A. Selection and Appointment of Faculty

It is the policy of Colorado State University to seek the best qualified candidates available for all positions within the limitations imposed by the availability of resources, level of the appointment, unique requirements of the position, and the talent pool. In the process of searching for and appointing persons to staff positions, participation by those who will be professional peers and colleagues or who will be subject to direct supervision of the new appointee is strongly encouraged in all cases and is specifically required on some types of appointments. In all cases, appointments are subject to approval by the Board of Governors. Therefore, faculty have a key role in the selection process. The role relative to filling regular, special, and full-time temporary faculty positions follows.

In filling all positions SOE and STEPP shall seek the best-qualified candidates available within the limitations imposed by resources, levels of appointment, unique requirements of the positions, time, and the talent pool. Therefore, significant post-doctoral professional experience outside of SOE and STEPP is an important priority in filling regular faculty positions. It is the philosophy of the SOE and STEPP to maintain diverse perspectives among the faculty. SOE and STEPP are committed to diversity in terms of ethnic or racial backgrounds as well as gender, sexual orientation, and other attributes that provide and nurture a multi-cultural collegium of faculty, students, and staff. The University policy relative to Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action shall be followed in both spirit and intent. Sections E.3 and E.6 in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual specify University selection and appointment policies and procedures.

1. Decisions relative to the nature and responsibilities for regular (new or replacement) positions, special positions, or full-time temporary positions shall rest with the faculty. The needs of SOE and STEPP shall be the primary consideration relative to qualifications.
2. After approvals have been granted at the College and University levels, the SOE Director shall appoint the Search Committee, ensuring appropriate representation from SOE and STEPP as well as outside constituencies. The Search Committee shall follow all University employment policies and Affirmative Action Guidelines in conducting the search.
3. Prior to advertising a SOE position, the SOE faculty must approve the position description (prepared by the Search Committee) either through full faculty participation or through the representative participation of the Executive Team. STEPP position descriptions do not require SOE approval. The final approval of a SOE and STEPP position description lies with the Dean and Provost.

4. Faculty shall be invited to recruit and nominate individuals for the position as well as participate in interviews. The Search Committee shall solicit comments from faculty relative to strengths and weaknesses of interviewees. Whenever possible, faculty shall have opportunities to discuss interviewees' qualifications in open forum.
5. Taking into consideration recommendations of faculty, the Search Committee shall recommend finalist(s) to the SOE Director who shall consider all input.

Part-time, temporary positions may be filled from the Part-Time/Temporary Applicant Pool or a search may be conducted. (See AHS Affirmative Action Guidelines.) When a special or temporary appointment is made to fulfill the needs of a grant or other special circumstances, these appointments shall be made through the appropriate recommendation and approval procedures.

Other types of appointment such as transitional appointments, joint appointments, faculty affiliate appointments, visiting faculty appointments, University distinguished professorships, and emeritus faculty appointments shall be made in accordance with the policies and procedures specified in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (Section E.4 and E.5).

B. Faculty Assignments

The responsibilities of academic faculty are specified in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (Section E.2). The SOE Director, with the advice of the Executive Team, shall be responsible for the assignment of duties to faculty members in the unit. The Director of STEPP will specify responsibilities in STEPP for faculty hired with a primary STEPP appointment.

C. Faculty Performance Review Policies and Procedures

All faculty (tenured, tenure track, full time special appointment, and full time temporary) are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance. These reviews will be conducted in such a way that they are consistent with the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights (see Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, (Section E.11)). The purposes of Faculty Reviews are to (a) assist faculty in achieving tenure or promotion, (b) facilitate continued professional development, (c) refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and (d) assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University.

1. Annual Review Policies

Faculty Performance shall be evaluated annually based on the quality and quantity of performance in fulfilling responsibilities to the unit during the period of evaluation. The evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the University Code as delineated in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section C.2.5.

- a. The purposes of Annual Reviews are to (1) recommend merit salary increases, (2) identify perceived strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies in performance, and (3) provide suggestions and assistance to faculty members in improving performances.
- b. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate performance in all four areas: (a) Teaching (40% of workload), Advising (10% of workload), Research and Scholarly Activities (35% of workload), and Service and Outreach (15% of workload). Non-standard workload efforts, reflecting administrative responsibilities, external funding arrangements, increased advising responsibilities, or other circumstances--may be approved by the SOE Director. However, all faculty should demonstrate continuing effort in each area. Special appointments are expected to demonstrate performance primarily in the teaching area with a standard load being four classes each semester. Non-standard workload efforts, reflecting administrative responsibilities, external funding arrangements, increased advising responsibilities, or other circumstances--may be approved by the SOE Director.
- c. The evaluation of faculty and special appointment's performance shall be based on the calendar year (January through December). During the Annual Review Conference each spring, faculty shall file or

re-commit to a Three-Year Plan including projected activities in the areas of Teaching, Advising, Research and Scholarship, and Service and Outreach, as well as the unit's goals as reflected in the strategic plan. These Plans can be adjusted yearly but must be re-submitted every three years. Goals should relate to the Benchmarks established for each area (see Appendix A).

3. Annual Review Procedures

- a. By February 1, each faculty member and special appointments shall submit a portfolio to the SOE Director documenting annual performance in teaching, advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. The portfolio should include (1) the Colorado State University Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Activities Report, (2) an updated vita, (3) the Faculty Council approved course evaluation instrument (summary sheets and evaluations) for each course taught plus summary sheet, (4) other materials such as student products, unsolicited letters, advising evaluations, award or other recognition letters, copies of published works of the same year, and (5) a summary statement. The summary statement should explain the faculty member or special appointment's performance given the evidence presented. This portfolio should address the Benchmarks rubric in Appendix A for the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. These Benchmarks are not to be considered all-inclusive. Instead, they represent the kinds of behaviors anticipated to achieve a specific rating. Other types of evidence may be included in portfolios to document performance.

The portfolio materials submitted by the faculty and special appointments shall be reviewed and evaluated by the SOE Director. Performance in each of the areas of teaching, advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach shall be assessed. The SOE Director uses the benchmarks rubric in Appendix A to guide his or her professional judgment in assigning ratings. The Director has the discretion to request further information from faculty, if needed. Evaluations ratings will reflect individual workload considerations, specifically addressing the differing responsibilities and effort distributions of the faculty member.

- b. By March 10, each faculty member and full time special appointment shall meet with the SOE Director to discuss the annual performance ratings. Also at this meeting Faculty members and special appointments should discuss their Plans and determine their workload percentages for the year. Both the SOE Director and faculty member shall sign off on the Three-Year Plan and yearly workload percentages, indicating that the projected activities and percentages are appropriate for the faculty member and also help move SOE and STEPP forward. The Director of STEPP will attend the meetings of those faculty who have appointments in both STEPP and SOE. Progress towards tenure and/or promotion will also be discussed.
- c. After the meeting the SOE Director shall complete the final assessment, communicating it by letter. In addition to the numerical ratings, the SOE Director shall include a short statement substantiating the assessment in each area. For all regular faculty members and special appointments, below the rank of Full, this letter shall include a written assessment from either the P & T committee or the Special Appointment Promotion committee specifying progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
- d. The SOE Director will complete for each faculty member and special appointment a salary letter outlining any merit or cost of living raise for the next academic year at the earliest possible date. The salary letter merit information is based upon the annual evaluation ratings being entered into the Summative Salary Exercise Rating (SSER) formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SSER} = & (\text{Teaching Score X Percentage of Workload}^*) + \\ & (\text{Advising Score X Percentage of Workload}^*) + \\ & (\text{Scholarship Score X Percentage of Workload}^*) + \\ & (\text{Service Score X Percentage of Workload}^*) \end{aligned}$$

* The typical percentage of Workload shall be considered as teaching (40%), advising (10%), research and scholarly activities (35%), and service and outreach (15%). Individual faculty members may negotiate variations from these baselines with the Director.

The SSER rating shall be determined using the following scale:

Superior	8.0 - 10.0
Exceeds Expectations	6.0 - 7.99
Meets Expectations	4.0 - 5.99
Below Expectations	2.0 - 3.99
Unsatisfactory	0.0 - 1.99

A faculty member or special appointment may not be rated as Superior or Exceeds Expectations if a rating in any of the four areas falls below Meets Expectations. The highest SSER rating which could be achieved would be Meets Expectations.

- e. Merit pay increases shall be based on the SSER and shall be determined as follows:
- (1) All faculty and special appointments whose overall rating is in the Meets Expectations category shall receive a percentage of their salary as a merit increase. This percentage, determined by the SOE Director, shall be the same for all individuals in the Meets Expectations category.
 - (2) Those faculty and special appointments whose overall rating is above Meets Expectations shall receive a flat dollar amount for each point or fraction thereof above the Meets Expectations level (5.0). The exact dollar amount for each rating point shall be determined by the SOE Director.
 - (3) Faculty and special appointments whose overall rating falls below Meets Expectations shall receive a smaller percentage of salary as a merit increase. The SOE Director shall have the discretion to determine what percentage, if any, is earned.
 - (4) The SOE Director shall have the option to utilize up to 25% of the entire salary exercise allotment for equity and other administrative or discretionary salary adjustments.

8. Annual evaluation appeals process

Any faculty member disputing their annual evaluation should first request a meeting with the SOE Director to which the faculty member's mentor is also invited. If agreement about performance is not reached, faculty and special appointments may request that the respective committee (P&T committee or The Special Appointment Promotion committee) review and provide the Director and the faculty member with an evaluative rating of the annual evaluation materials. For disagreements about ratings not resolved within unit see the grievance process outlined in Section K of the CSU Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.

9. University Annual Performance Rating Report

The University requires the reporting of each faculty member's annual performance rating on a university-generated standard form. The SOE Director shall have the responsibility for relating the rating scale to the University form and reporting the performance rating for each faculty member to the Provost/Academic Vice President.

10. Comprehensive Mid-Point Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

A comprehensive mid-point performance review of tenure-track faculty shall be conducted at the midpoint of the probationary period) at Colorado State University. This review shall be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure track faculty following the procedures listed below.

- a. On February 1st, the midpoint of the probationary period, in addition to the annual portfolio, tenure-track faculty members will submit to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application*.
- b. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall complete their review, using the Benchmarks in Appendix A to guide their professional judgments in rating each faculty member. This review will be completed by March 1st, and a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee will be provided to the faculty member, the SOE Director, the Dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. The report shall include one of the following possible outcomes: (1) The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation for tenure from the SOE; (2) There are deficiencies that if satisfactorily corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure; or (3) The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends against further contract renewals.

The report shall include any written comments provided by the SOE Director, Dean, and Provost/Academic Vice President as well as the faculty member.

11. Comprehensive Mid-Point Review of Special Appointments

A comprehensive mid-point performance review special appointments shall be conducted year three of their employment at Colorado State University. This review shall be conducted by the Special Appointment Promotion Committee following the procedures listed below.

- a. On February 1st, of the third year of employment at CSU, in addition to the annual portfolio, special appointment faculty will submit the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application* to the Special Appointment Promotion Committee.
- b. The Special Appointment Promotion Committee shall complete their review, using the Benchmarks in Appendix A to guide their professional judgments in rating each faculty member. This review will be completed by March 1st, and a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee will be provided to the faculty member, the SOE Director, and the Dean. The report shall include one of the following possible outcomes: (1) The faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation for promotion from the SOE; (2) There are deficiencies that if satisfactorily corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation promotion; or (3) The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the Special Appointment Promotion Committee recommends against further contract renewals.

The report shall include any written comments provided by the SOE Director, and Dean, as well as the faculty member.

12. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

The specific policies and procedures on conferring tenure and/or promotion are found in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Sections E.9, E.10, and E.11. The SOE will adhere explicitly to these policies and procedures. Additional guidelines unique to SOE are specified below.

Relative to tenure, “faculty members on a regular academic appointment with the rank of assistant, professor or higher shall be considered for tenure based upon evidence of capability for significant professional contributions” Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.10.4). Relative to promotion, the Criteria for Advancement in Rank and Merit Salary Increases are found in

Section E.11 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Additional discussions of evaluation considerations are found in the Document for Tenure and Promotion Application available through the office of the Provost/Academic Vice President.

a. Tenure and Promotion Policies

- 1) Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor must hold a doctoral degree.
- 2) The minimum performance expectations for faculty are delineated in the School of Education Benchmarks in Appendix A. In accordance with the College of Applied Human Sciences promotion and tenure guidelines “Promotion to Associate Professor requires the demonstration of at least exceeds expectations in instruction/advising/mentoring and research/ scholarship/creative activity along with at least meets expectations in service/outreach. Advancement to Professor requires demonstrated sustained, quality contributions to the body of knowledge through research/ scholarship/creative activity and the candidate is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis. Evidence of extensive continuing scholarly activity is present. The record should include a substantial number of refereed publications or juried works aligned with the faculty members’ effort distribution and the faculty member's workload.”
- 3) The rank of a newly-appointed faculty member may be specified in the position description, and the search committee must recommend individuals whose performance has been consistent with the expectations for that rank. In cases where faculty rank has not been specified for the hire, after consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the SOE Director will assign rank in alignment with the expectations for that rank.
- 4) A newly-appointed faculty member who has been awarded tenure at another academic institution and has the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may be recommended for tenure immediately with the approval of at least two-thirds of the tenured faculty.

b. Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Faculty and Special Appointments

Following are the procedures to be followed in the consideration of colleagues applying for tenure and/or promotion. Deadline dates for submission and renewal of materials are established each year.

- 1) During the Annual Evaluation meeting with the SOE Director, faculty members and special appointments not fully promoted will discuss the faculty member’s development and fitness for the position and prospects for eventually acquiring tenure and/or promotion. By March 10, for tenure-track and tenured faculty, a written summary of the T &P evaluation will be prepared by the P &T chair after a review of the faculty member’s vita and will be provided to the faculty member, informing him/her of progress toward tenure and/or promotion and any perceived problems with performance that might jeopardize prospects for tenure and/or promotion. A copy of this written evaluation will also be provided to the Dean of the College of Applied Human Sciences. For special appointments, the letter is written by the Special Appointment Promotion committee following a review the faculty member’s vita and provides information about progress towards promotion.
- 2) The SOE Director shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure not later than the sixth year of service of a regular member of the faculty. The SOE Director shall also initiate the process leading to the recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion.
- 3) The faculty member will complete the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application* available from the Office of the Provost, submitting the application and support materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the date established each year. Special appointments will complete the *Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Application* available from the Office of the

Provost, not before their fifth year of employment at CSU, submitting the application and support materials to the Special Appointment Promotion Committee on the established date.

- 4) The Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct the faculty review and voting processes for promotion and/or tenure actions. Signed ballots with a rationale for the vote shall be required from eligible faculty members, and a promotion and/or tenure decision shall be by a majority vote. Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion shall be provided an opportunity to appear in person before the Committee if they so choose. The Special Appointment Promotion Committee will use this same process when making a recommendation about a special appointment's application for promotion.
 - 5) On the date established each year, the P & T shall forward to the SOE Director the faculty vote and comments and the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote and comments, along with minority opinions. At the same time, the Committee shall also notify the candidate(s) in writing of the faculty decision(s). This process is replicated by the Special Appointment Promotion Committee.
 - 6) The SOE Director shall review the materials received from the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Special Appointment Promotion Committee. The SOE Director will make a recommendation and justification for the granting or denial of tenure and /or promotion. The SOE Director will notify special appointment faculty of the promotion recommendation in writing. The SOE Director will send faculty materials and the recommendations to the Dean on the date established each year.
 - 7) The Dean shall review the materials received from the SOE Director, and in some cases discussion with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and make a recommendation and justification for the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion, forwarding the appropriate materials and recommendations to the Provost/Academic Vice President on the date established each year.
 - 8) Following a review and discussion with the Council of Deans, the Provost/Academic Vice President's recommendation is forwarded to the President.
10. Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty - Progress toward Promotion (See Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.14.2)
- a. No later than the fifth year after the acquisition of tenure, Assistant and Associate Professors will submit to the Promotion and Tenure Committee a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vita, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives. Special Appointments who have achieved the rank of associate and are interested in moving to the rank of full may submit their materials to the Special Appointment Promotion Committee. If there are no full professors on this committee, the tenured full professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee will fulfill the duty.
 - b. The Promotion and Tenure Committee members of higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed shall complete its review by the date established each year, and a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee will be provided to the faculty member and special appointment, the SOE Director and the Dean. The recommendation for tenured faculty is also sent to the Provost/Academic Vice President. Considerations on progress toward promotion must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution and performance in each area of responsibility. The report shall include one of the following possible outcomes.
 - 1) The faculty member should be considered for promotion.
 - 2) The faculty member is making progress toward promotion.

- 3) The faculty member is not making progress toward promotion but no deficiencies are identified that necessitate a development plan for improvement.
- 4) The faculty member is not making progress toward promotion and deficiencies are identified that necessitate a development plan for improvement.

The report shall include any written comments provided by the SOE Director, Dean, and Provost/Academic Vice President, as well as the faculty member.

In cases where deficiencies have been identified, the SOE Director and faculty member will design a plan appropriate for the individual's professional development and set mutually-acceptable time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. As part of this plan, the faculty member's effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility may be adjusted to focus on the faculty member's interests, demonstrated performance, and needs of the unit.

If, within an additional three years, the faculty member has not achieved promotion, another comprehensive review must be conducted.

11. Periodic Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty (See Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section E.14.2)

a. Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews

The SOE Director shall conduct a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review of all tenured faculty at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five year review period.

This review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vita, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives.

The SOE Director shall provide an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance. The evaluation should identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. If a faculty member has deficiencies that, in the opinion of the SOE Director, may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review, the SOE Director in consultation with the faculty member should prepare a specific professional-development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations. This plan may include resources, assistance, and opportunities to be made available to the faculty member and a time-frame by which the SOE Director will monitor progress toward achieving the planned goals.

If the evaluation from a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review is unsatisfactory, a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

b. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews

Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the SOE Director determined that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the Phase I Review. A Phase II Peer Review Committee of at least three peers at the same or higher rank shall be appointed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The initiation of a Phase II review is not grievable by the faculty member.

This review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vita, a self-analysis by the faculty member, a statement of goals and objectives, and peer evaluations and student opinions of teaching. It shall occur 45 days after the appointment of the Phase II Review Committee.

The Peer Review Committee shall complete its review, using the requirements for tenure to guide their professional judgments in rating each faculty member, taking into consideration the differing responsibilities and effort distributions of the faculty member.

A majority of the Committee must decide on one of two possible outcomes:

- 1) No further actions are necessary if the faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance as identified by the SOE, or if the deficiencies are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.
- 2) Further action is required if there are substantial chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied or the Committee concludes that the conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual appear to be present.

In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the Peer Review Committee, must be remedied, the SOE Director and faculty member will design a professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and set time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The plan must be approved by the Dean.

In the event that conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual are present, the Committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation. For each outcome, the Committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the SOE Director and in successive steps to the Dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations of the SOE Director and Dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.

The faculty member shall have recourse to the provisions of Section K, Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual except where otherwise prohibited (e.g., Section E.10.7) once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendation or decisions made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II may be the basis for a complaint under Section K.

D. Evaluation of Administrators and Administrative Professionals

The Director of SOE shall have the responsibility for setting criteria and undertaking annual evaluations of all SOE administrators (e.g. Director of STEPP, Associate Director for Continuing Education, Associate Director(s)). The appropriate Director/Administrator is responsible for the evaluation of the administrative professional aligned with the office. As part of the yearly evaluation process, feedback shall be solicited from all faculty and staff regarding the performance of all administrators and administrative professionals.

E. Appeals of Academic and Disciplinary Decisions

1. Appeals of Grading Decisions (Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section I.7.1)

Faculty members are responsible for stating clearly the instructional objectives of the course at the beginning of each term and for evaluating student achievement in a manner consistent with these objectives. Students are responsible for meeting standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled. Faculty members and instructors are responsible for determining and assigning final course grades. Graded examinations, papers and others materials used as a basis for evaluating a student's achievement will be available to the student for inspection and discussion. Students may appeal faculty grading decisions. The burden of proof, however, rests with the student to demonstrate that the grading decision was made on the basis of any of the following conditions:

- a. A grading decision was made on some basis other than performance and other than as a penalty for academic dishonesty.
- b. A grading decision was based upon standards unreasonable, different from those which were applied to other students.

- c. A grading decision was based on a substantial, unreasonable, or unannounced departure from previously articulated standards.

Before making an appeal, the student should discuss the situation with the faculty member(s) involved in the decision.

To appeal a grading decision, the student shall submit a written request to the SOE Director. The request must set forth the basis for the appeal, identifying one of the three categories set forth above. The request must be submitted or postmarked, if mailed, no later than 30 calendar days after the first day of classes of the next regular semester following the date the grade was recorded. If no appeal is filed within this time period, the grade shall be considered final.

Within 30 days of receipt of the request for an appeal, the student's appeal shall be provided to the faculty member or instructor who assigned the grade and an Appeals Committee shall be appointed by the Executive Team. This committee shall be composed of two SOE faculty members and two SOE students and one outside faculty member who shall serve as the voting chair.

The Appeals Committee will review the written appeal and response of the faculty member(s) or instructor(s). They may elect to separately interview both the student and the faculty member(s) or instructor(s) before rendering a decision. The decision of the Appeals Committee will be based upon whether one of the conditions for an appeal set forth above has been met. At the conclusion of the deliberations, the Committee shall render one of the following decisions: 1) the original grading decision is upheld, or 2) the SOE Director or his/her designee(s) will reevaluate the student's achievement of the instructional objectives of the course and assign a grade accordingly.

Written notice of the committee's decision and the reasons for the decision normally will be sent to the student and the faculty member(s) or instructor(s) within 30 calendar days of appointment of the committee. The Appeals Committee's decision is the final decision of the University. Written summaries of the hearing and decision, together with a rationale for that decision, shall be provided to the student and the faculty member who assigned the grade and shall be retained in the SOE office for a period of one year.

2. Appeals on Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy (Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section I.7.2)

Faculty members or instructors are expected to use reasonably practical means of preventing and detecting academic dishonesty (see Catalog for the Academic Integrity Policy). If a faculty member or instructor has evidence that a student has engaged in an act of academic dishonesty, the faculty member or instructor will notify the student of the concern and make an appointment to discuss the allegations with the student. The student will be given the opportunity to give his/her position on the matter. If the student admits to engaging in academic dishonesty or if the faculty member or instructor judges that the preponderance of evidence supports the allegation of academic dishonesty, the faculty member or instructor may then assign an academic penalty. Examples of academic penalties include assigning a reduced grade for the work, a failing grade in the course, or other lesser penalty as the faculty member or instructor deems appropriate. If, after making reasonable efforts, the faculty member or instructor is unable to contact the student or collect all relevant evidence before final course grades are assigned, he/she shall assign an interim grade of Incomplete and notify the student of the reason such grade was given.

If the student disputes the allegation of academic dishonesty he/she should request a hearing with the Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services. A hearing will be conducted to determine whether a preponderance of evidence exists in support of the allegations of academic dishonesty. If the University Hearing Officer finds insufficient evidence or clears the student of the charges, the faculty member or instructor will determine a grade based on academic performance and without reflection of the academic dishonesty charge and change any previously-assigned grade accordingly. If the University Hearing Officer finds the student culpable, the Hearing Officer may impose additional University disciplinary sanctions.

Faculty members or instructors should report to the Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services all cases of academic dishonesty in which a penalty is imposed. Incidents which the faculty member or

instructor consider major infractions should be accompanied by a recommendation that a hearing be conducted to determine whether additional university disciplinary action should be taken.

Information about incidents of academic dishonesty is kept on file in the Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services. No further action is initiated unless the incident constitutes a major infraction, the student has a prior record of University infractions, or there are subsequent reports of misconduct.

F. Sabbatical Leave

Guidelines and policies related to sabbatical leave can be found in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section F.3.4 and the College of Applied Human Sciences Code, Section VIII.

The SOE and College due dates for sabbatical leave requests shall be published each fall. The Executive Committee will assess sabbatical leave proposals based on the following criteria which mirror those established in the College Code.

1. The value of the sabbatical leave plan for the professional development of the individual;
2. The value of the sabbatical leave plan for SOE and STEPP, College, and University;
3. The quality and significance of the proposed sabbatical leave activities;
4. The feasibility of the proposed projects/activities (e.g., realistic time frame, necessary resources, etc.);
5. The extent to which completion of the proposed activities/projects can be measured/documented;
6. SOE and STEPP's ability to arrange feasible staffing alternatives.

Additionally, the SOE Director will give priority to faculty members based on length of employment at the University on a regular, continuous appointment and number of previous sabbaticals. If the committee determines that more than one sabbatical proposal shall be forwarded to the Dean, the proposal will be rank-ordered based on the aforementioned criteria.

G. Disciplinary Action for Tenured Faculty

The policies and procedures related to disciplinary action for tenured faculty are found in Section E.10.7 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. This section describes Basis (E.10.7.1), Initiating Procedures (E.10.7.2), Preliminary Investigation (E.10.7.3), Hearing (E.10.7.4), Procedures Following Completion of the Hearing (E.10.7.5), Term of Continuation of Faculty Salary and Benefits Following Revocation of Tenure (E.10.7.6), Time Limit for Action by the Provost/Academic Vice President (E.10.7.7), and Appeal of Decision (E.10.7.8).

Section E.10.7.2.2.a establishes a Preliminary Committee composed of tenured faculty, or a committee thereof (at least six members), as determined by the SOE Code.

In SOE, the Preliminary Committee, with the exception of the SOE Director and the faculty member, shall be appointed by the SOE Director in consultation with the Executive Team. Additionally, one tenured faculty member from outside the unit, having no administrative duties (appointed by the Dean or in the case of conflict of interest by the Provost/Academic Vice President) shall serve as a non-voting chair of the committee.

Section E.10.7.3.3.b establishes a Hearing Committee of at least six members and comprised of SOE tenured faculty, or a committee thereof, as determined by the SOE Code.

In SOE, the Hearing Committee, with the exception of the SOE Director and the Faculty Member, shall be appointed by the SOE Director in consultation with the Executive Team. This committee shall be chaired by the individual who chaired the Preliminary Committee (the tenured faculty member from outside the SOE).

VI. Operational Procedures

A. Faculty Meetings

The SOE Director shall call faculty meetings to include all regular, special, and temporary faculty, during the academic year (fall and spring semesters). The dates for meetings shall be established early in the academic year, and an agenda shall be distributed by the SOE Director 24 hours in advance of each meeting.

Additional meetings may be called by the SOE Director upon request of the faculty or a standing committee. Written notice and an agenda shall be distributed in advance.

Minutes of SOE meetings shall be taken by a staff member appointed by the SOE Director. Minutes are to be distributed to all faculty members and the Dean and are available to the public.

When decision-making occurs at faculty meetings, the following procedures shall be in place:

1. No matters shall be acted upon unless they are included on the agenda.
2. Whenever possible, a consensus approach shall be used to allow for maximum discussion of items under consideration. A simple majority shall be necessary when voting on matters, except for revisions of the SOE Code.
3. For the purpose of transacting business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the SOE voting faculty. Except for voting on revisions of the SOE Code and tenure and promotion decisions, the voting faculty shall include all tenure and tenure-track faculty, and all full-time temporary and special appointment faculty. A list of all voting faculty shall be presented by the SOE Director at the first regular faculty meeting in the fall term.

B. Committee Election and Appointment Procedures

Unless otherwise specified, SOE representatives to College or University committees (excluding Faculty Council) shall be nominated by the Executive Team and elected by the faculty. Additional names may be proposed from the floor at the designated faculty meeting.

Each fall semester, the SOE Director shall initiate the election/appointment of standing committee members following procedures outlined in the SOE Code.

Individuals wishing to serve on ad-hoc committees should make their wishes known to the SOE Director who shall appoint these committees on an annual basis.

VII. Accreditation and Evaluation Procedures

Programs in a unit as diverse as the SOE frequently undergo reviews for accreditation and evaluation purposes, such as the following.

A. SOE and STEPP Self-Study

A Self-Study of the operations of the SOE shall be conducted every six years, following the guidelines and procedures established by the Provost/Academic Vice President. Departmental operations to be evaluated shall include undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, and outreach programs and other programs represented in the SOE and STEPP objectives.

A committee of qualified faculty members shall be appointed by the SOE Director to coordinate the preparation of the Self-Study report. This Self-Study Committee may call upon specific program faculty to prepare or contribute to sections of the report. The Self-Study Report shall be presented to the SOE faculty for review prior to submission to the Dean and Provost/Academic Vice President.

If members of the SOE faculty or the SOE Director are acutely dissatisfied with the operations of the SOE, they may initiate a request for an interim self-study. If the request comes from the SOE faculty, at least one-half of those eligible must sign the request for an interim self-study before it can be conducted. This request is to be

submitted to the Dean who shall follow the procedure outlined for the regular self-study after notifying the SOE Director and the eligible faculty members of the request for an interim self-study.

B. Accreditation Reviews

When the SOE and STEPP programs are subject to review by associations such as the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) or the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), and the Department of Higher Education (DHE) the SOE Director in conjunction with the STEPP Director shall coordinate the accreditation process, appointing committee(s) of qualified faculty members to prepare needed reports and materials. The committees may call upon specific program faculty to prepare or contribute to sections of the report.

VIII. Code Review and Revision

The Executive Team shall review the SOE Code each spring semester. Any revisions shall be presented to the faculty for review and action at the following fall retreat. Revisions of the Code shall be handled following these procedures.

- A. In addition to the revisions suggested by the Executive Team, any SOE faculty member may present an amendment or revisions to the SOE Code to the SOE Director in writing at least two weeks before the regularly-scheduled faculty meeting at which the amendment is to be discussed. The SOE Director shall distribute copies of the amendment along with the agenda for the faculty meeting, and the vote may be taken at the subsequent faculty meeting.
- B. Amendments or revisions to the SOE Code must be passed by a two-thirds majority of the regular (RI) tenure or tenure-track SOE faculty members and full-time special appointment faculty members who are not on approved leave.
- C. Amendments or revisions to the SOE Code shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College and the Provost/Academic Vice President for final approval.

APPENDIX A

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW STANDARDS AND BENCHMARKS

In evaluating annual faculty work performance, the School of Education does not use rigid numerical scales associated with each of the various types of performance activity within each of the areas of research, teaching, advising, and service. Given the variability across our specialization areas with respect to availability of federal funding for some research activities, availability of different kinds of teaching formats, and “time-in-field” access to doctoral advising and external service opportunities, a rigid metric does not serve the SOE well. Nevertheless, it is important for faculty members to have an understanding regarding work expectations and the general performance characteristics associated with each of the five evaluative categories for performance evaluations: superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, and unsatisfactory. The intent of the following rubrics is not to provide “hard and fast” descriptors, but rather guidelines that can provide incentives for the faculty, as well as a framework for appropriate and objective annual performance evaluations.

The Director of the SOE reserves the authority to assign higher scoring within benchmark categories or even increasing a rating to a higher benchmark level based on exceptional or extraordinary performance by a faculty member. Publishing in the highest rated journals, receipt of a national or international research award, acquiring external funding near or above seven figures, being appointed to the National Academies of Education or Sciences, receiving support from the most highly-esteemed national or international foundations, being appointed to a national research or review panel, receiving an invitation to deliver a scholarly keynote presentation – these are examples of research/scholarly achievements at the highest levels for which the Director of the SOE may make appropriate adjustments. Similarly, exemplary work in teaching, service, or advising can also result in higher scoring judgments by the Director of the SOE in those areas as well. *It will be the duty of each faculty member to point out and make a convincing case in her or his reflective statement for consideration of such extraordinary achievements.*

The Director of the SOE also reserves the authority to assign higher or lower scoring within and across benchmark categories for faculty holding the rank of assistant professor. In general, as faculty move up in rank, one would expect less and less difficulty achieving performance standards for the various benchmarks. This is because greater time in academe provides faculty greater opportunities to collaborate with other colleagues in writing, hone their own writing skills, have more manuscripts in the pipeline, be responding to reviewer’s comments on prior grant applications; make connections with sources in granting agencies, develop innovative teaching techniques, acquire better advising skills and more advisees, and acquire higher levels of service opportunities, etc.

Finally, a bit about our benchmarks. In order for a faculty member to receive a “Superior” rating within any category, or across all categories, he or she must have done something exceptional. Similarly, faculty who “Meet Expectations” should be doing just that – achieving exactly what would be normatively expected during that calendar year. It is reasonable to expect, then that most faculty ratings would fall in the “Meets Expectations” and “Exceeds Expectations”, both within and across ratings categories. Similarly, there should be far fewer ratings at either extreme of the benchmark scale.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP BENCHMARKS and PERFORMANCE/PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

The performance standards for each of the five benchmarks on the following page are indexed to the standard effort distribution for resident instruction faculty in the School of Education which is 35% time, or approximately 3 months of a nine-month academic year salary. It will be the responsibility of the Director of the School of Education to make adjustments up or down in expected productivity for achieving each benchmark for faculty whose research and scholarship effort distributions are greater or lesser than this 35% time standard.

There are three primary forms of research/scholarship that should anchor each faculty member's annual productivity: (1) refereed publications, book chapters, books, or monographs; (2) refereed presentations before national or international professional societies; and (3) competitively-acquired external grant funding. The primary *quality* test for all of these three forms of research and scholarship is the peer review process. Thus, the *expectation* for achieving the performance standards for all benchmarks except Unsatisfactory will be that the body of work was subjected to a peer review process. Additional qualitative judgments can be made on this body of work by the Director of the School of Education based on additional quality features such as (but not limited to):

Extraordinarily high numbers of entries across one or more of the productivity domains;

Refereed publications that are in upper tier journals, have high impact factors, have been invited as a part of a special issue, are solely- or first-authored, etc;

Books and book chapters that are published by top-level publishers, have achieved exceptionally wide distribution, are in their third or higher edition; have been translated in one or more foreign language(s), are solely- or first-authored, etc.

External grant funding in which the faculty member is P. I. or Co-P. I., funding that spans multiple years and approaches or exceeds six figures per year, funding which generates indirect costs, funding in which other faculty in the SOE are also receiving support through buyouts, funding that provides for tuition and assistantship dollars for graduate students, etc..

Additional research and scholarly activity such a book review in a refereed journal, a book published with a custom/local/vanity publisher, an article for a state or national newsletter, a test review or encyclopedia entry, an article or chapter in a non-refereed journal or book, a monograph, or a book review in a non-refereed book or proceedings can be used by the Director of the SOE to enhance scoring for a faculty member. Thus, within a category, superior demonstration of one aspect may weight a category rating more than others, such that one does not *necessarily* have to have a superior in all aspects of that domain to get a superior. For example, receipt of a large grant, and no conference presentation could earn an "exceeds" or "superior" rating, depending on the factors involved in that individual case. Alternatively, in the case of a junior faculty, a number of papers, a submitted grant, but no funding might earn a "superior" rating depending on factors in that case, whereas it probably would not earn such a rating for a senior faculty. The table on the following page provides minimum performance/productivity standards for research and scholarship for each of the five benchmark ratings.

Table of *Minimum* Performance/Productivity Standards in RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP for Benchmark Ratings

Performance/Productivity Standards	Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unaccep- table
<p>Book (either edited or authored) with top tier publisher (evidence of top tier status such as exhibiting wide distribution; wide variety of disciplines; in 2nd edition or greater; 2nd printing or greater; high sales distribution, etc.)</p> <p>Journal article in top tier journal in field as evidenced by low acceptance rates; high distribution rates; or high impact factor rating/qscore/esteem rating or other evidence of top tier status</p> <p>One or more external grant(s) as P. I. or Co- P. I.</p> <p>One or more internal (CSU) grant(s) as P. I. or Co-P. I.</p> <p>Research staff or evaluator on another individual's external</p>	<p>At least one</p> <p>OR</p> <p>At least One</p> <p>Funded</p>	<p>At least one</p> <p>OR</p> <p>At least One</p> <p>Submitted</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Funded</p> <p>OR</p>	<p>Submitted</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Submitted</p> <p>OR</p>		<p>Little or no Productivity</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p>

<p>grant of any amount</p> <p>Receives continuation funding as P.I., Co-P.I., or research staff on another individual's external grant of any amount</p> <p>Lesser tier journal article; book chapter; monograph; proceedings; continuation funding as P. I., Co-P. I., or research staff of prior externally funded grant; or other scholarly writing</p> <p>National or international level invited or refereed scholarly presentation</p>	<p>At least One</p> <p>At least One</p>	<p>Funded</p> <p>At least One</p> <p>OR</p> <p>At least One</p>	<p>Submitted</p> <p>OR</p> <p>At least One</p> <p>At least One</p>	<p>At least One</p> <p>At least One</p>	
--	---	---	--	---	--

TEACHING BENCHMARKS and PERFORMANCE/PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

The seven performance standards for each of the five benchmarks on the next page are indexed to the standard effort distribution for resident instruction faculty in the School of Education which is 40% time, or approximately 10% time for each course during a nine-month academic year. It will be the responsibility of the Director of the School of Education to make adjustments up or down in expected productivity for achieving each benchmark for faculty whose teaching effort distribution is greater or lesser than this 40% time standard.

There are five primary forms of evidence that should anchor each faculty member's annual productivity in teaching: (1) student evaluations of teaching; (2) course syllabi; (3) development and use of varied instructional techniques or curriculum enhancements; (4) formal efforts to improve teaching skills such as peer evaluations of teaching or active engagement in TILT activities or other professional development activities; and (5) receipt of an external award associated with either teaching or curricular/pedagogical innovation(s). In addition, other forms of evidence of teaching quality certainly can and should be added to a faculty member's teaching portfolio (i.e. evidence of training in pedagogical techniques, independent testimonials of teaching excellence by former and current students, etc.) to the extent those forms of evidence exist.

Student evaluations of teaching will typically represent the primary evidence in a faculty member's teaching portfolio. At a minimum, summaries of these evaluations for every course the faculty member taught during the calendar year **must** be included in the portfolio in order for a faculty member to receive at least a "Meets Expectations" rating in teaching. Additionally, in order for faculty to receive a rating of "Superior" or "Exceeds Expectations", faculty **must** submit **all original student evaluation forms** that they received for every course she or he taught during the calendar year. Faculty must also provide a copy of each syllabus for every course he or she taught in the calendar year in order to receive a minimum rating of "Below Expectations."

With respect to development and use of varied instructional techniques or curriculum enhancements can include use of both distance and traditional instructional delivery formats; use of pedagogically innovative classroom techniques; development of new and research-based curriculum; and/or adoption of curriculum or pedagogical techniques by external users. As with all forms of teaching activity, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide evidence of the innovativeness of any of these forms of pedagogical or curricular enhancements, typically through the narrative in the "Reflective Statement".

Finally, faculty cannot achieve a rating of "Superior" **unless** she or he has either received an honor, award, or grant associated with their teaching, or had an independent (non-SOE) professional peer evaluation of her or his teaching, or engaged in two or more TILT-sponsored PD/teaching activities during the calendar year. The table on the following page provides minimum performance/productivity standards for teaching for each of the five benchmark ratings.

Table of *Minimum* Performance/Productivity Standards in TEACHING for Benchmark Ratings

Performance/Productivity Standards	Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
Teaching award or external funding award for teaching innovation or curriculum/course redesign.	Receipt	Nomination			Little or no Evidence
	OR	OR			
Formative evaluation of teaching	At least One	At least One			
		OR			
Engagement in activities designed to improve teaching (e.g. TILT activities, PDI, sponsored workshops, etc.)	At least One	At least One			
Syllabi for courses	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	

	ALL	MOST	MANY	SOME	
High quality ratings from student course evaluation					
Use of some mix of distance and traditional instructional delivery formats in teaching.	At least One	At least One	At least One		
	OR	OR	OR		
Use of pedagogically innovative classroom techniques, development of new and research-based curriculum; and/or adoption of curriculum or pedagogical techniques by external users.	At least One	At least One	At least One		

ADVISING BENCHMARKS and PERFORMANCE/PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

Advising in the School of Education occurs through serving in a number of roles: undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, graduate co-advisor, graduate methodologist, graduate committee member, and supervisor of students who are graduate research or teaching assistants. The performance standards for each of the five benchmarks on the next page are indexed to the standard effort distribution for resident instruction faculty in the School of Education which is 10% time, or approximately equal to the time and effort it would take to deliver completely one semester course during a nine-month academic year. It will be the responsibility of the Director of the School of Education to make adjustments up or down in expected productivity for achieving each benchmark for faculty who's advising effort distribution is greater or lesser than this 10% time standard, or who's number of years as a faculty member in the School of Education is insufficient to expect full advising loads.

There are two primary forms of evidence that should anchor each faculty member's annual productivity in advising: (1) ratings on student's achievement of benchmarks and advising survey; and (2) other forms of evidence. Similar to the standards for teaching and research/scholarship, there are many different combinations of ratings and other form of evidence that can be achieved to acquire the final overall rating on advising; the expected activity across the productivity standards in the table on the following page are basic guidelines.

As can be seen in the table on the following page, faculty can meet expectations by having their three year rolling average of advising and committee work (as reflected in the scoring associated with student benchmark achievements) at or above the average of the three year unit average (100 pts) and if their ratings on the annual advising survey at or above the mean rating of 3 of a highest possible rating of 6. In order to exceed expectations or receive a superior rating in advising, faculty must present evidence of advising work on one or more additional types of advising activity.




Table of Performance/Productivity Standards in GRADUATE ADVISING for Benchmark Ratings

Performance/Productivity Standards	Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unaccep- table
<p>Ratings on Student Benchmarks and Advising Survey</p> <p>Average ratings on annual survey of student advising</p> <p>Three year rolling average on points in advising/ committee work on student benchmarks</p>	<p>Average ≥5.0</p> <p>>130</p>	<p>Average ≥4.0; ≤4.9</p> <p>101-129</p>	<p>Average ≥3.0; ≤3.9</p> <p>71-100</p>	<p>Average ≥2.0; ≤2.9</p> <p>40-70</p>	<p>Average <2.0</p> <p><40</p>
<p>Other Forms of Evidence</p> <p>Receives advising award/recognition at any level</p> <p>Co-authors with advisee or GRA/GTA a grant proposal that includes graduate student support</p>	<p>The numerical averages and ranges on the two performance standards above are guidelines to follow in the event that no additional evidence is provided such as, but not exclusive to, the examples provided here. As other forms of evidence are provided, the criterion levels on the two performance standards above may be diminished and still allow for higher ratings.</p>				

<p>Co-authors with advisee or GRA/GTA a manuscript that gets published</p> <p>Co-authors with advisee or GRA/GTA any grant proposal</p> <p>Supervises advisee or GRA/GTA on assistantship funded through any source</p>	
---	--

Table of Performance/Productivity Standards in UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING for Benchmark Ratings

Performance/Productivity Standards	Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
<p>Outstanding Advising as evidenced through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising evaluations • Awards or recognition • Unsolicited comments from advisees • Serves as Key Advisor/Next Step Advisor for degree/major • Other mechanisms deemed appropriate <p>Attendance/participation with advisees at professional conferences/workshops</p> <p>Develop, implement and provide evidence of undergraduate recruitment activities.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>↕or</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes on one or more additional criteria</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No other evidence</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No other evidence</p>

<p>Serves on Honor student thesis committee(s) as advisor or co-advisor.</p>	<p>Yes  or Yes</p>	<p> or Yes  or Yes</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

SERVICE PERFORMANCE/PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

The performance of service work by faculty in the School of Education is essential to keep the operations of the School, the University, and the profession as a whole functioning efficiently and with quality. The forms that service work can take is as numerous and varied as the number of faculty who engage in them; hence, it is nearly impossible to categorize them discretely or hierarchically in importance. Indeed, it may be easiest to understand just what service work is, by defining it in the negative – all of the collective professional activity in which faculty engage that is not teaching, research or advising. Additionally, because of this variability, it is equally difficult to develop ways to assess the quality with which faculty produce these differing forms of service. Nonetheless, faculty are given typically 10-15% of their nine-month academic time in which to engage in service work – a testimony to the necessity of doing this kind of faculty work.

Service work can be viewed as largely administrative (i.e. membership on a search committee) or largely scholarly (i.e. serving on a grant review panel); it can be paid or unpaid; it can be brief (i.e. delivering a seminar at the PDI) or long-term (i.e. serving as editor of a journal). Despite this width and breadth of activities, it is useful to categorize service work by ever-increasing spheres of influence – service to the School of Education, service the College and University, service to the state; service nationally, and service internationally. The utility of this categorization is not to imply ranking of importance but to focus different kinds of faculty into different sectors of these spheres to aid them in their own career advancement. While exceptions may occur, junior faculty should minimize or forego service to the School, College, and University in favor of service to the state, nationally, or even internationally. Conversely, it should fall on the shoulders of full professors to do the service work of the School, College, and University, while still maintaining some presence nationally and internationally.

Because of the variability in activities and the inverse nature of what should be the focus of those activities depending on seniority, it is not feasible to develop a useful table aligning activities to benchmark ratings. As such, the Director of the School of Education will take into account the duration, intensity, variability, and focus of service activities individually by faculty member in assigning benchmark performance ratings.

CODE Appendix B

SOE Structure

Degrees

Ph.D.

Education and Human Resource Studies

M.Ed.

Education and Human Resource Studies

M.S.

Student Affairs in Higher Education

Five Areas of Study and Related Specializations

I. School Leadership

Specializations:

School Leadership, Ph.D.

Principal Licensure, M.Ed.

II. Organization Performance and Change

Specializations:

Organization Performance and Change, Ph.D.

Organization Performance and Change, M.Ed.

III. Research Methodology

Specialization:

Research Methodology, Ph.D.

IV. Higher Education Leadership and Counseling

Specializations:

Higher Education Leadership

Tracks: College and University Leadership, Ph.D.

Community College Leadership, Ph.D.

Counseling and Career Development, M.Ed.

SAHE, M.S.

V. Instructional Leadership

Specializations:

Learning, Teaching, and Culture, Ph.D.

Interdisciplinary – STEM, Ph.D.

Adult Education and Training, M.Ed.