The School of Education Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the school, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The School mission affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community. For Performance Reviews, Contributions to Strategic Plans of the School, College and University\(^1\) are also evaluated.

The School of Education has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the anchor and guide for interpreting the rubric. These standards, some of which are based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPT), are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.\(^2\) The candidate submits evidence to align with the elements under each standard (see table of suggested types of evidence). The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Expectations of performance are commensurate with years of service and professorial rank of the candidate. As a result, these varying expectations of development provide a context for utilizing the rubric in performance review and periodic evaluation.

In all areas relating to hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAtoc.shtml), Title 5 regulations and the University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP)\(^3\) (http://www.csuchico.edu/hr/Documents/VPHR-FPPP.doc) govern the School of Education policies. The School Personnel Committee (SPC), the SOE Director, and candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and periodic evaluation must be familiar with these policies and procedures. This document sets the standards by which School of Education faculty are appointed and evaluated.

1.0 SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MISSION

1.1 Mission
The mission of the CSU, Chico School of Education, in collaboration with our community partners, is to develop effective, reflective and engaged educators. We believe in the power

---

\(^1\) FPPP Section 8.5. Note especially the descriptions of evaluation ratings in FPPP Section 8.5.b.1.c.

\(^2\) The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_prorpositio.

\(^3\) The FPPP 2007/2008 is referred to in this document
of education to create a diverse, democratic, socially responsible society in which every student is valued. As a learning community, we are committed to exemplary education programs that use scholarly inquiry and research-based practice as tools for continual professional growth and renewal.

2.0 SCHOOL OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL/SEARCH COMMITTEE

2.1 Function of the Personnel Committee
The function of the School of Education Personnel Committee (SPC) shall be to review and make recommendations concerning appointment, retention, tenure and promotion. It is also the responsibility of the SPC to review and recommend policies and procedures related to these matters. Recommended policy and practice shall be consistent with approved personnel plans and University personnel documents.

The SPC will consult with the School of Education (SOE) Director on the development, implementation and annual review of the personnel/faculty section of the SOE strategic plan. This discussion shall include a discussion of position allocations and proposals that affect faculty positions.

2.2 Structure of the Personnel Committee
The SPC will consist of seven-elected tenured faculty members (including annual FERP faculty), at least three of these whom are at the rank of Professor. The SPC will select a chair, a secretary, and an Affirmative Action Representative (AAR) from among its membership. The AAR shall assure that all committee actions comply with University affirmative action policies and procedures. Service on the SPC shall be for two years. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve on the SPC more than two years within any three-year period. Elections will happen as needed to replace members in a staggered manner to maintain consistency. Faculty members who are on leave for any part of the academic year will not be eligible to serve on the SPC. Faculty members who are eligible for and elected to the SPC are required to serve and may not serve on any other college or university personnel committee.

2.3 Selection of the Personnel Committee
General voting policy, including election of SPC members, will be consistent with the policy specified in the School of Education Governance Committee. All probationary, tenured, and FERP faculty of the School of Education having at least a .50 appointment in the semester of the election will be eligible to vote. Committee elections will take place in May for the following academic year, except as specified in this document. The following procedures will be used to elect the SPC:

The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee. All probationary, tenured and FERP faculty members having at least a .50 appointment will receive a ballot and be eligible to vote. Those nominees receiving the greatest number of votes will be elected. If a tie vote occurs, a run-off election will be held.

2.4 Operation of the Personnel Committee
A quorum will consist of four (4) of the elected Committee members.

The SPC Chair calls and presides at meetings and carries out other appropriate duties. The secretary keeps minutes. These minutes indicate only time, place, date of meeting, members present, and any action taken.

2.4.1 School Search Committee Structure
The School of Education Search Committee (SSC) will normally be constituted in the spring semester preceding the year of the search process. Members of the committee will serve from the time the committee is constituted through the end of the search.

The School Search Committee will consist of: (1) the SOE Director, (2) the coordinator of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, (3) a member of the SPC appointed by the SPC, (4) one tenured or tenure-track faculty elected by the faculty of the department, (5) one faculty member from the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, and (6) optional: one faculty member from another department. For the on-campus interview, the School Search Committee will be supplemented by at least one program student selected by the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve. In years when searches are to be conducted for more than one program, additional members representing programs of primary employment will be added to the Search Committee. The School Search Committee will select a faculty member to chair the committee, who will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the School of Education.

2.5 School of Education Search Processes

2.5.1 The School Search Committee will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned as an early step in writing a proposal for recruitment.

2.5.2 The proposal for recruitment will include selection criteria for the position that specify minimum qualifications and preferred qualifications. These selection criteria will become the basis for position advertisements and the paper screening of applicants.

2.5.3 Candidates for a probationary faculty position must meet School of Education minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned doctorate in education or a related field,\(^4\) and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

2.5.4 The proposal for recruitment shall be approved by the School of Education faculty\(^5\) before submission to the dean of the college and provost of the university. If recommendations for

---

\(^4\) For a candidate not holding an earned doctorate, the candidate must generally verify that he or she will be able to complete the doctoral degree program within six months (see FPPP section 6).

\(^5\) The School of Education faculty, in this case, consists of the SOE tenured faculty.
changes are made after approval by the faculty, the proposal shall be returned to the faculty and a consultation process will be conducted to arrive at an approvable search proposal.

2.5.5 Once approved, advertising for all positions will occur on a timeline that permits the SSC to review the files of applicants, interview final candidates, and make recommendations to the faculty so that an offer of employment can be approved and made prior to the end of the academic year.

2.5.6 The School Search Committee will conduct a paper screening process. This screening process will be used to determine candidates to be interviewed by phone. Following phone interviews, reference checks will be conducted, and candidates will be selected and invited for on-campus interviews.

2.5.7 On-campus interviews will only be conducted at times when the School of Education Search Committee, candidates of the program, the faculty, the program coordinator, the SOE Director, and the dean or associate dean have the availability to interview candidates. SOE faculty and others will be invited to attend an instructional presentation by each faculty candidate related to the position of primary appointment and ask questions of each candidate.

2.5.8 The School Search Committee will recommend candidates for employment to the tenured and tenure track faculty. The tenured and tenure track faculty will recommend the individual faculty for hire to the dean of the college. Candidates may be recommended to the dean only after a majority vote of the faculty. The recommendation of the faculty will be recorded in a written document signed by each tenured and tenure track member of the faculty.

2.5.9 For issues not addressed in this document, the SPC will follow the university policies and procedures related to appointments.

2.6. Temporary Faculty Hiring Process (.50 or greater)

2.6.1 Temporary faculty hired for less than a .50 appointment for instruction are hired at the discretion of School Director, in consultation with the appropriate program coordinator and faculty. Temporary faculty hired for any amount of supervision will be reviewed by the School of Education Temporary Faculty Search Committee; the Committee will make recommendations to the School Director. If a temporary faculty’s load is scheduled to increase to .50 or greater (thus becoming a voting member of the SOE per SOE Constitution), s/he must apply through the School of Education temporary faculty hiring process.

2.6.2 Candidates for a temporary faculty position must meet School of Education minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned master’s degree in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

2.6.3 The Temporary Faculty Search Committee will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned. The search committee will
consist of the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director, the program coordinator(s) or designee in which the temporary faculty will be primarily assigned, and one tenured/tenure track faculty representing another program (a minimum of three faculty). Recommendations will be made to the School of Education Director. Temporary Faculty Search Committee is an ad hoc committee appointed by the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director.

2.7 School Personnel Committee Adjunct Committees
In order to conduct university required faculty evaluations according to established timelines, the SPC will determine the need for adjunct committees at the beginning of the fall semester, as follows:

2.7.1 Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee
The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for collecting data for the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty and reporting findings to the SPC (procedures for reviews are addressed in Section 7.0 of this document and Section 8.2 of the FPPP). In years when the number of temporary faculty to be evaluated warrants it, the SPC will call for the election of a Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee of at least three members. All tenured or tenure-track SOE faculty members who are not serving on the SPC or College Personnel Committee shall be eligible to serve on the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee and, if elected, are required to serve. Additionally, any temporary faculty member with a .5 or higher appointment and not currently under review may volunteer to be included on the ballot for this committee. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve more than two years within any three-year period on the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee. The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee.

2.7.2 Post Tenure Review Committee
The Post Tenure Review Committee will conduct periodic evaluations of tenured faculty (see Section 7.0 of this document and Section 8.5 of the FPPP). Tenured faculty members are evaluated at intervals no greater than five years. In the fall semester, the SPC will call a meeting of faculty at the rank of Professor. SOE Professors will produce a slate of review teams to conduct the evaluations scheduled for that year. At least two Professors will be selected to conduct each periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member. The slate of review teams will be brought to the SOE faculty for vote and approval. Faculty members assigned to conduct a periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member are eligible to concurrently serve on the SPC or College Personnel Committee.

3.0 REVISION
At the beginning of each academic year, all members of the SPC shall read the current SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures (SPPP) document and the current University Faculty Personnel Policies Procedures (FPPP) document, revise the SOE document so that it reflects any changes in the University document effective for the current Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle, and notify the faculty of the changes.

---

6 See Appendix G for sample phone interview questions.
7 See Appendix H for a sample interview day agenda. FAAA site.
4 The number of members elected to the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee should be related to the number of evaluations to be conducted. A ratio of four reviews per committee member per semester is suggested.
The SPC shall review the SOE PPP document and SOE faculty evaluation forms and make suggestions for revision to the faculty.

The faculty shall vote to approve an official SOE PPP, supervision forms, and any other appropriate evaluation forms. If approved at all university levels, all changes become effective the following academic year.

4.0 DIVERSITY
There will be a systematic effort to encourage recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates of members of underrepresented groups including women, minorities, individuals with disabilities, and others with the goal of obtaining an employee composition that reflects the representation of these groups in the professional education labor markets from which the University draws.
5.0 APPOINTMENTS

5.1. The normal appointment of a full-time faculty member will be to probationary status. For those seeking a position related to teaching instructional strategies, K-14 teaching experience is required. For other positions, K-14 teaching experience is desirable. Normally, no one with less than an educationally related M.A. degree or equivalent shall be hired to teach or supervise student teachers.

5.2 If any candidate for appointment is to be offered an initial rank higher than Assistant Professor, the SPC’s review of this candidate must use the same rigorous procedure and standards for substantiation specified for on-campus promotions to the proposed rank.

5.3 The SOE will seek a sufficient number of probationary/tenure-track appointments to ensure continuity in program development, sustain the identity of the unit, and maintain a stable core of committed, qualified, and informed faculty. At the beginning of each academic year, the SOE Director and the SPC shall review, and update as necessary, the personnel portion of the SOE strategic hiring plan (SHP), determining needs for new tenure track positions and the needed areas of expertise.

5.4 In an effort to ensure adequate faculty input into School of Education hiring needs and plans, early in each fall semester, the SOE Director and program coordinators will consult with the SPC regarding utilization of current faculty positions and projected program faculty needs. A summary of this consultation will be provided to the School of Education.

5.5 Should the annual consultation on faculty utilization (described in step 5.4, above) indicate a potential need for additional probationary faculty, the SPC will describe to the SOE in a general meeting, the faculty needed and recommend that a request to hire probationary faculty be made. The decision to request hires will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty per School of Education Bylaws. When the request is approved, the decision to constitute a Search Committee(s) will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty per School of Education Bylaws.

5.6 Advertising for all positions, probationary and temporary, will occur on a timeline that permits the SPC to review the files of applicants and interview final candidates prior to the end of the academic year.
6.0 EARLY TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION
Tenured faculty at the top step of their current rank will be reviewed for promotion unless they request to not be considered.

Consideration for early tenure or promotion may be requested by any faculty member wishing to be so considered. The request must be made in writing to the SPC Chair, with copies to the Dean and SOE Director by the fall semester census date (the closing date for the current Performance Review cycle). The SPC may also initiate early tenure or promotion consideration. See FPPP 8.4.b.3.a.2.

A faculty member will be recommended for early tenure if he/she has been evaluated as Superior in Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions and also demonstrated accomplishment that makes the person readily distinguishable as a special case as indicated by rare achievement in one of the areas. Meeting the criteria for tenure before the regular cycle does not in itself constitute meeting a special case for early tenure. See FPPP 8.4.b.3.a.3.

A faculty member will be recommended for early promotion only when he/she is evaluated as Superior in Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and, in at least one category, has been recognized as “exceptional.” Recent accomplishments that have brought special state, national, or international professional honor to the individual may be indicators of exceptionality. The evidence to support such recognition must be provided by the applicant. See FPPP 8.4.b.3.c.

7.0 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR ALL REVIEWS
The terminal degree in SOE is the doctorate. A doctorate is required for initial appointment to a tenure track position. An individual with all coursework for the doctorate without having completed the terminal degree will still be considered for hire, if completion occurs within the University’s acceptable guidelines.

The SPC shall be responsible for making a recommendation regarding each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. SPC members will review the data and evaluations. Data and evaluations are to be found in the Personal Professional Data Sheet; faculty member’s dossier; student, colleague and administrative evaluations; and the faculty personnel file. Unless expressly excluded in documents governing the RTP process, all responsibilities that comprise faculty workload are eligible for inclusion and consideration in the review process. This is not subject to change while faculty members are undergoing review.

After reviewing all available data, but before writing its final recommendation, the SPC shall meet individually with each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. The purpose of this meeting will be to answer unresolved questions related to the retention, tenure, or promotion process. The faculty member must be afforded an opportunity to respond to these questions and to receive answers to his/her inquiries about the retention, tenure or promotion process. The interview process will also be an opportunity for the SPC to discuss with the candidate his/her future aspirations as a member of SOE and to suggest ways to meet personal/professional goals. The SOE Director, if not a member of the SPC,
shall be present at this meeting and may participate in the discussion. A written summary of the interview, containing a summary of the substance of the interview, shall become a part of the current review file. The summary will include all questions and a written digest of each response. The report and recommendation relative to each candidate shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement.

In relation to recommendations on tenure and promotion, the committee should follow the guidelines of FPPP section 8.4. All performance reviews shall be written in an evaluative manner using the following rating adjectives: “superior, effective, adequate, or inadequate.” A rating of inadequate in any area does not meet the minimum level of achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. The overall evaluation must average ‘effective’ across all categories for tenure and promotion. Evaluation ratings may be a combination of adequate, effective and superior the mean of which is effective overall. The following combinations of ratings are equivalent to an overall mean of effective:

- Three ratings of effective;
- One superior, one adequate, and one effective (Instruction must be at least effective); or
- Two superiors, one adequate (Instruction must be at least effective).

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member’s capability to be a contributing scholar in education or a related field. SOE values collaborative professional achievement efforts (e.g. writing components of grant proposals or sections of publications), however, each individual contribution must be verified.

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of a consistent line of scholarship over time, including all areas defined in the School of Education personnel document that has resulted in recognition at a state, national, and/or international level. As per FPPP Section 8.4.b.2.e.5, “Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation, and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.”

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion (probationary faculty), reappointment and range elevation (temporary faculty) are reviewed and evaluated in accordance with policies, procedures, and criteria as described in the FPPP (http://www.csuchico.edu/hr/Documents/VPHR-FPPP.pdf). Probationary and tenured faculty should consult both the SOEPPP (especially Section 10) and the FPPP (especially FPPP 3.0, 8.0, and Appendix II) to obtain information on the documents included in their University personnel file, and to help determine the supporting materials they should provide in the dossier they are responsible for submitting.

The College office is the central collection point for all types of probationary faculty evaluation materials. The Dean will establish designated areas for faculty to organize and
view/examine their personnel files. Procedures for collecting data shall insure that only authorized personnel have access to faculty evaluations and files. (Authorized personnel are those identified in the FPPP.)

Temporary faculty will be provided with information about documents included in their University personnel file and the supporting materials they are responsible for submitting in the Temporary Faculty Dossier at the beginning of the semester for which they are scheduled for evaluation. The School of Education office will be the collection point for evaluation materials of temporary faculty.

7.1 Procedures for Classroom Observations (for course instructors, face-to-face or online)
A classroom observation will be conducted for each review cycle. A SPC member, as assigned by the SPC chair, will make a formal observation. The SOE Director may also make an observation. Members of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Post Tenure Review Committee may make an observation as appropriate. Procedures for observations follow:

7.1.1 A time for the observation will be determined through consultation between the observer and the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and observer do not agree to a time, the chair of the SPC will determine the time and date for the observation. There will be a five-day notice, as per CBA 15.14. For online courses an interview between the faculty member and the observer with access to the online course will substitute for the classroom observation.

7.1.2 The faculty member should inform the observer of the objectives of the lesson and provide a course syllabus and other materials that will enable an informed observation. The observer shall prepare a descriptive and evaluative commentary using the Classroom Observation of Faculty Form (see Appendix B). The observer should not solicit comments from students. The observer and faculty member should conduct a post-lesson conference, at which time the observer shares the observation report (Appendix B) and the candidate signs. A report of the observation, aligned with standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as set forth in SOEPPP 10.1, will be placed in the faculty member's University personnel action file. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a written rebuttal to this material per (FPPP 3.0.k).

7.1.3 The reviewing committee member and the SOE Director will typically not observe the faculty member at the same time. Exceptions will be made with approval of the faculty member. Subsequent to the review, additional classroom visitations may be conducted as needed.

7.2. Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
All teaching faculty (tenure, tenure-track, and temporary) will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 4.0 and 8.1.b. SET results are filed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in the Office of the Dean. The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETS) section notes that all teaching faculty will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 4.0 and 8.1b, which states, “Student evaluations of faculty shall be conducted in a minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee, and in

9 See Appendix I for SOE SET Questions
classes representative of the faculty’s teaching assignment in accordance with Article 15.15 of the CBA.

7.3. Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision

Forms designed for assessing the quality of supervision will be distributed online by the School of Education to credential candidates and to cooperating teachers in fall and spring semesters. Forms completed after the closing date of a personnel cycle will be held out of the file until the next cycle. (See Appendix A) For faculty members whose appointment is primarily supervision of candidates, an interview shall be conducted.

8.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY

8.01 Definition of a temporary faculty as noted in the FPPP (See 6.2.a1). Part time temporary faculty are appointed to 15 units or less per semester. The procedures for recruitment and appointment of full-time temporary faculty shall conform to CBA Article 12.

8.0.2 The SPC is responsible for evaluation of temporary faculty. The primary criterion for the evaluation of temporary faculty is teaching effectiveness as described in SPPP Section 10.1 (See also FPPP Section 8.2.) In addition to the primary criterion of teaching, part-time faculty shall be evaluated as indicated in FPPP 8.2.b.1.

8.1 Evaluation of Part-time Temporary Faculty

8.1.1 Each part-time temporary faculty (including 15 unit part-time faculty) will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. This requirement may be waived for temporary faculty who are in their first semester of employment as described in CBA article 15.25. Members of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will conduct data gathering for evaluations. (See FPPP Section 8.2.d.1) At the discretion of the SPC, Department Chair, or upon the candidate's petition, a review may be scheduled in a year succeeding an annual or biennial review. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member’s work performance since the individual’s initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent. (See FPPP Section 8.2.d.1)

8.1.2 By the end of the first week of each fall and spring semester, the School of Education administrative support coordinator shall provide the SPC with a list of temporary faculty scheduled for review that semester.

8.1.3 The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be a standing committee with two-year (staggered) service commitment and elections held when members term out. Those serving on TFEC will not also serve on SPC concurrently.

8.1.4 The SPC will provide the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee with a list of temporary faculty to be evaluated each semester. The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for data gathering for periodic evaluation of current School of Education temporary faculty.
8.1.5 The SPC will provide each temporary faculty member scheduled for evaluation with information about the evaluation criteria, procedures, and documentation (see Appendix C). Temporary faculty members are responsible for reviewing materials in their personnel action files (in the Dean’s Office) and providing supplementary materials for their evaluations in the Temporary Faculty Dossier. The dossier must be submitted to the School of Education Office by the designated fall or spring census date. (FPPP, Section 8.0.b)

8.1.6 The chair of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will assign a committee member to conduct the classroom observation or supervision interview and draft the initial report of findings. Each member of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee shall read the personnel file and dossier of each faculty member being evaluated.

8.1.7 The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet to finalize reports of findings for each temporary faculty member evaluated. (See Appendix C for procedures and materials for evaluation of temporary faculty.)

8.1.8 The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward reports of findings and classroom observation reports, if applicable, to the chair of the SPC by the first Friday in December for fall evaluations and by the first Friday in May for spring evaluations. These time frames need to change based on new RTP timelines.

8.1.9 Results of the evaluation, including a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation report, if applicable, will be shared with the temporary faculty member by the SPC chair.

8.1.10 Results will be reported to the SOE Director for review. The SOE Director will forward a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation, if applicable, to the Office of the Dean for inclusion in the PAF.

8.2 Evaluation of Full-time Temporary Faculty

8.2.1 Full-time temporary faculty will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. (See FPPP Section 8.2.d.1) The professional growth and achievement criteria and standards for full-time temporary faculty shall be the same as for the Periodic Evaluation procedures for tenure-track faculty (FPPP Section 8.3.a).

8.3 Range Elevation for Temporary Faculty (FPPP Section 8.3– CBA Article 12.18)

9.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

9.1 Faculty members will have opportunities to update personnel files and submit other materials for review as specified in the FPPP and according to the University RTP calendar. (See FPPP
Section 8.1.a.11)

9.2 The SPC shall follow these procedures in conducting reviews:

11 Refer also to FPPP Section 8.5
9.2.1. The chair of the SPC will assign a member of the SPC to draft the initial periodic evaluation or performance review report. Each member of the SPC shall read the personnel file and dossier of the faculty member under review. After reviewing all available data, the SPC shall interview the faculty member.

9.2.2. At the time of the interview the following statement of purpose and procedure will be shared with the faculty member being interviewed. Written permission for audio recording the interview will be obtained prior to reading the following statement. Audio recordings will be kept for three years, and then returned to the faculty member.

“The purpose of the personnel interview is to answer any unresolved questions by committee members about the evidence in the record, or by the candidate about the review process or the committee’s understanding of the evidence. For Periodic reviews, the purpose of the interview is also to provide the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The SOE Director may be present at the interview but may not act as a member of the committee. Minutes of the interview will include questions asked and responses and answers. An audio recording of the interview will be made to facilitate the writing of an accurate interview summary. The interview summary will be added to the personnel action file and become a part of the record. A copy of the interview summary will be provided to you.”

9.2.3. The report and recommendation relative to each faculty member shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement. Endorsement is arrived at by majority vote of the SPC. If a member abstains from voting, that member shall submit a written reason for the abstention. Written abstention reasons shall be attached to the report.

10. EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY
The SOE Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the School of Education, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE mission affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community, and Contributions to Strategic Plans of the School, College and University.12

10.0.1. Faculty who wish to be considered for early tenure or accelerated promotion must make a request in writing to the SPC chair, with copies to the SOE Director and college dean by the candidate closing date for promotion in that cycle. The School of Education defines “exceptional” as superior in all four categories.13 In addition, this individual, through his or her scholarly work, has made a unique contribution to the university.

10.1. Evaluation Categories and Standards
The School of Education has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and
12 FPPP Section 8.4.2.2
13 FPPP Sections 8.5.b.2.c.3 and 8.5.b.3.c
elements under each category provide the foundation and context for interpreting the rubric. These standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation. The elements under each standard are examples of how each standard can be demonstrated in teaching practice. The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Within each of the three categories of Instruction, Professional Growth, and Other Contributions to the University, the candidate submits a narrative illustrating how the evidence aligns with each standard, but not necessarily each element (see table of suggested types of evidence). Included in this narrative is an instructional growth plan (a description of your plan for growth in each area, including goals, action steps and a timeline that responds to evidence from multiple sources).

The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/five-core-propositions.

INSTRUCTION
Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty. The area of Instruction seeks evidence of the faculty member’s professionalism and skill as an educator with respect to methodology, materials, learning activities and School standards. Models of effective teaching are complex and diversified. While the following areas related to instruction may not be exhaustive, it suggests the complexity of teaching roles. All activities that are a part of a candidate’s instructional assignment must be considered in the evaluation process.

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Treat students equitably.
   b. Recognize individual differences.
   c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
   d. Develop students’ cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
   e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content he or she teaches and how to teach the content to adult learners.
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
   b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
   c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
   d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.

f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.

g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.

h. Create multiple paths for learning.

i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

**Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to

a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.

b. Make effective use of time.

c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.

d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.

e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.

f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.


**Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about his or her practice and learns from experience.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to

a. Model the professional dispositions he/she seeks to inspire in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).

b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).

c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.

d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The faculty member’s narrative for Instruction should explain how the submitted evidence meets each standard. All required evidence elements must be included. Elements listed as Additional Evidence are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations of teaching by Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection upon Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET’s)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on evaluations of supervision when part of your teaching load.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development, including creating new courses, substantial course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement or program cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement and inclusion of diverse experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g. team teaching or guest presentations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on peer observations (conducted by either university colleagues or K-12 personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of using data to inform instructional practices (e.g., student outcome data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student growth in response to faculty feedback on an assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from students (unsolicited) and/or public school personnel (for supervisors of student teachers) that address strengths not otherwise addressed in the evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short audio or video footage of instruction, with reflective commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student evaluations of faculty data shall be used, but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate’s knowledge of his/her field. The candidate should provide a summary of student evaluation of faculty data (from SET) that includes calculation of averages.*

---

15 FPPP Section 8.2.b.3.a.
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Rubric for Category I. Instruction

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or minimal evidence that the faculty member has met all four standards. Some or all of the required evidence is missing.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all four standards at a satisfactory level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards. All four of the required types of evidence are included.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at a satisfactory level and one or more approaching an exemplary level. Representation across standards is substantiated by all four of the required types of evidence and some additional types of evidence.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at an exemplary level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by all four of the required types of evidence and some additional types of evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

The area of Professional Growth and Achievement seeks evidence of the faculty member’s professional development through scholarly activity, including independent scholarship and scholarship undertaken in collaboration with professional colleagues and students, related to professional contributions to students, the discipline of education and the professional community, in accordance with the School of Education mission. Research agendas that benefit from collaborative and interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and recognized accordingly in the evaluation process.

**Standard 1. The faculty member contributes to scholarship related to his or her area of expertise.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:

a. Engage in professional research and writing.
b. Exhibit or present scholarly or discipline-based products.
c. Demonstrate currency in his or her field.
d. Contribute to changing theory, practice or policy.

**Standard 2. The faculty member contributes professionally to the discipline and the professional community.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:

a. Participate in professional organizations.
b. Enhance scholarship and resources through grants and contracts.
c. Provide scholarly leadership in the education community.
d. Engage in interdisciplinary and collaborative activities.
For the duration of the appointment, professional growth and achievement will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The column on the left lists specific examples of achievement in each category (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), not necessarily in order of importance. Some of the examples represent a range of significance to the field. In those cases, the example on the right is considered to have a greater weight than the example on the left. Items on the right and those without a separating line may be viewed as examples of the “exemplary” types of criteria included in the rubric below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Specific Examples of Achievement</th>
<th>Greater weight is given to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td>Articles published in professional journals</td>
<td>Articles in refereed journals or in professional journals that are widely read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Chapter in book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in local media or newsletters that help to educate others about the school’s mission/work, such as articles that relate to diversity and civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
<td>Presentations at professional conferences</td>
<td>Keynote, invited, refereed, or peer reviewed and accepted presentations at national and international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>Juried exhibits at national or international conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Presentations</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed poster presentations at national or international conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and contracts</strong></td>
<td>Scholarship related to grant or contract work</td>
<td>Principal Investigator/Director/Author of the grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Scholarly Activity</strong></td>
<td>Author of reviews of other’s work</td>
<td>Reviews published in refereed journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations</td>
<td>Editorial collaborations with students, such as joint research and publications.</td>
<td>Scholarship and collaboration that results in publication in refereed journals; presentation at national or international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>Author of accreditation documents</td>
<td>Participation at state, national or international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and consulting in the education community including the CSU, Chico service area</td>
<td>Professional awards for scholarly activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional memberships</td>
<td>Professional memberships</td>
<td>Elected office or service as an officer or board member in national, state, regional and local professional organizations, and/or conference planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce research and publications related to service learning, such as measuring the effectiveness of service-learning and discussing the results in the context of a broader subject</td>
<td>Matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement

For the duration of the appointment, professional growth and achievement will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or <strong>minimal</strong> evidence that the faculty member has met both standards.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level and one or more <strong>approaching an exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is substantiated by the evidence.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at an <strong>exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by the evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY**

The area of Other Contributions to the University and Community evaluates the faculty member’s service to the department, college, university and community, especially in regard to active participation as a team member in the department (which may include mentoring of incoming faculty), and service in governance on department, college and university committees. The School of Education encourages civic engagement and values mutually beneficial partnerships that align the teaching and research agenda of the university and the self-identified interests of the communities of its region.

**Standard 1. The faculty member engages collaboratively, creatively and productively in the work of the department, college, and university.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Provide service to the institution through committee work.
   b. Provide service to the institution through advising.
   c. Provide service to the institution through department, college or university leadership.
   d. Provide service to the institution through active participation in institutional, state and national accreditation and program reviews.

**Standard 2. The faculty member contributes to the learning community through outreach and services. Reviewers will assess quality, quantity and relevance of these activities.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Participate in K-12 schools.
   b. Participate in the community at large.

For the duration of the appointment, other contributions to the university and community will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence (not listed in order of importance or weight). Elements are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of participation in the teamwork of School of Education programs and projects, (especially as they relate to the SOE mission, university strategic priorities, and campus diversity action plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments of program coordinators and others on participation in department programs and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising of credential candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal advising of students, particularly those from under-represented populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing MA thesis or project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on MA advisory committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected or appointed membership on department, college and university committees, committee leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of teaching, collaboration and service, in and outside the School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in activities with K-12 schools and the community at large, including work that promotes democratic education principles and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of accreditation materials for national and state reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric for Category III. Other Contributions to the University and Community

For the duration of the appointment, performance in Other Contributions will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or <strong>minimal</strong> evidence that the faculty member has met both standards.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level and one or more <strong>approaching an exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is substantiated by the evidence.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at an <strong>exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by the evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY** (Addressed for Performance Reviews Only)

**Standard 1. The faculty member demonstrates responsibility for assisting the department in sustaining and advancing its mission and goals and conforming to university strategic plans.**

The candidate is expected to address how data in Categories I - III provide evidence of involvement in accomplishing the mission of the SOE as well as university strategic plans. As part of a Performance Review, the SPC is charged with determining whether the faculty member has met this responsibility.

---

16 The University Strategic Plan is available at [http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/](http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/).
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to
a. Contribute to achieving the SOE’s missions.
b. Contribute to achieving university strategic plans.

Suggested Types of Evidence
Evidence of contributions to goals and plans should include a brief narrative that guides the SPC to accomplishments and activities related to specific department and university goals and plans related to diversity, civic engagement, and sustainability. This narrative will normally include items that have been referenced in evaluation Categories I through III. Refer to Section 1 for the School of Education mission statement. See Appendix D for the University Strategic Plan for the Future.

11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

11.1 As per FPPP Section 8.4.a.16.a. “Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty.” In the area of Instruction, “an evaluation of ‘effective’ is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.”

11.2 As per FPPP Section 8.4.b.2.e.5, “Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation, and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.”

11.3 In all areas of evaluation, ratings must be adequate, effective, or superior for tenure and promotion to Associate or full Professor. A rating of inadequate in any area does not meet the minimum level of achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. The overall evaluation must average ‘effective’ across all categories for tenure and promotion. Evaluation ratings may be a combination of adequate, effective and superior, the mean of which is effective overall. The following combinations of ratings are equivalent to an overall mean of effective:

- Three ratings of effective;
- One superior, one adequate, and one effective (Instruction must be at least effective); or
- Two superiors, one adequate (Instruction must be at least effective).

12.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

Tenured faculty members undergoing periodic evaluation are reviewed in accordance with policies, procedures and criteria as described in the FPPP, Section 8.5. Faculty members should also consult the SOEPPP (especially Sections 7 and 10) for departmental standards. Reviews are conducted on a timeline that insures completion and filing of the evaluation report in the spring semester by the date established by the university.

12.1. The Post Tenure Review Committee contacts each faculty member to be evaluated in writing during the fall semester with procedures for the evaluation, a list of materials requested by the committee, and the assignment of a committee member to make a classroom observation.

12.2. Faculty members submit, to the chair of their review committee, a brief summary of
academic activities aligned with evaluation areas in Section 10 of this document, a current professional vita, syllabi of current courses, and descriptions of student assignments and assessments.

12.3. A member of the Post Tenure Review Committee makes a classroom observation of the faculty member following procedures in Section 7 of this document.

12.4. The Post Tenure Review Committee examines materials submitted by the faculty member and the Working Personnel Action File, meets with the faculty member, and writes a report as described in FPPP Section 8.5. The committee report is forwarded to the college dean.

12.5 For policies and procedures regarding a faculty member’s right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response to any level of review, see FPPP 8.5.b.4.d.

13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED
For policies and procedures not addressed in this document the School of Education will apply policies and procedures in the FPPP.
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Appendix A
Review of Supervisors

School of Education
California State University, Chico
Chico, CA  95929-0222
530-898-6421

DATE:

TO:        Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers
FROM:      Personnel Committee
           School of Education

SUBJECT:   Evaluation of University Supervisor

The CSU, Chico supervisor(s) assigned to your school this semester is evaluated periodically as part
of our personnel process, which includes decisions relative to tenure, retention, promotions, and
awards. A personnel file is maintained for each School of Education faculty member to accumulate
material until that individual is scheduled for a performance review.

Your participation in the evaluation process is important in assessing the supervisor's effectiveness
in the supervisory role. An evaluation form is on the reverse for your response, or you may respond
by letter or memo if you prefer.

Please mail your response in the enclosed envelope. Your prompt response will be greatly
appreciated.

Comments (from reverse side):
Appendix B
University Supervisor Evaluation

Survey Respondent: _____Cooperating Teacher/Mentor  _____Candidate

Placement Type:
Name of University Supervisor __________________________  Date ____________

Part I. Please use the following scale when rating the university supervisor on each of the items.

1 – Strongly Disagree  2- Agree  3 – Neutral  4-Agree  5-Strongly Agree  N--Not Observed

The university supervisor:

1. Establishes clear expectations of candidate’s assignments and requirements.

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

2. Evaluates candidate’s classroom work using Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

3. Provides specific feedback that leads to growth in teaching skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

4. Conducts conferences according to program guidelines.

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

5. Communicates effectively and clearly.

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

6. Provides knowledge of current practices in teaching.

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:

7. Assists candidate in meeting pupil needs (e.g., developmentally and culturally appropriate strategies and materials).

1 2 3 4 5 N

Please provide a reason for your rating:
8. Supports candidate’s development of the five School of Education professional dispositions.
   1  2  3  4  5  N
   Please provide a reason for your rating:

9. Supports cooperating teacher in mentoring the candidate (e.g., setting goals, developing improvement plans, etc.).
   1  2  3  4  5  N
   Please provide a reason for your rating:

10. Demonstrates professionalism through organization, dependability, and promptness.
    1  2  3  4  5  N
    Please provide a reason for your rating:

Part II.

How do you rate the overall quality of supervision?
Unacceptable   Minimally Acceptable   Adequate   Very Good   Superior

Please provide a reason for your rating:

Part III. For candidates only:

1. How many observations did the university supervisor conduct?
   a. Formal (with lesson plan, completed program observation form)____
   b. Informal (drop-in) ____

2. How many times did you meet with your university supervisor to discuss teaching practices or program requirements? ______

3. On average, across all TPEs and dispositions, how would you rate your teaching performance?
   Unacceptable, Acceptable Beginning Practice, Acceptable Professional Practice, Exceptional Practice
   Please provide a reason for your rating:

4. On average, across all TPEs and dispositions, how do you think your university supervisor would rate your teaching performance?
   Unacceptable, Acceptable Beginning Practice, Acceptable Professional Practice, Exceptional Practice
   Please provide a reason for your rating:

5. Overall, I feel that my performance in this placement has been successful.
   1 – Strongly Disagree   2- Agree   3 – Neutral   4-Agree   5-Strongly Agree
   Please provide a reason for your rating:

PART IV. For Cooperating Teachers Only

1. How many observations did the university supervisor conduct?
   a. Formal (with lesson plan, completed program observation form)____
   b. Informal (drop-in) ____

2. How many times did the supervisor meet with you to discuss the candidate’s teaching performance or to discuss program requirements? ______
3. On average, across all TPEs and dispositions, how would you rate the candidate’s teaching performance?
   Unacceptable, Acceptable Beginning Practice, Acceptable Professional Practice, Exceptional Practice

4. Overall, I feel that the candidate’s performance in this placement has been successful.
   1 – Strongly Disagree  
   2 – Agree  
   3 – Neutral  
   4 – Agree  
   5 – Strongly Agree  

   Please provide a reason for your rating:
Appendix C
Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty

Faculty Name: ______________________  Observer Name: ______________________

Required Observation ____  OR  Elective Observation ___

Course: _________________  Room: _______  Time: _______  Date: _______

Overview of lesson:

Describe examples of any of the elements of each standard that were demonstrated in this teaching episode. (See end of Appendix B for a complete list of School of Education standards and elements in the area of Instruction.)

Standard 1. The candidate is committed to students and their learning.

Standard 2. The candidate knows the content he or she teaches and how to teach the content to adult learners.

Standard 3. The candidate is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.
Standard 4: The candidate thinks systematically about his or her practice and learns from experience. (Observer: Include any examples of elements from this standard that were demonstrated during the post-observation conference with the faculty member.)

Summary of the Observation:

Observer’s signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________

I have debriefed the observation with the observer, and I have received a copy of this report.

Observed faculty member’s (or instructor’s) signature: ________________ Date: ____________
Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty (Continued)

These are the standards and elements as they are listed in the SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures.  

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.
   a. Treat students equitably.
   b. Recognize individual differences.
   c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
   d. Develop students’ cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
   e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content he or she teaches and how to teach the content to adult learners.
   a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
   b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
   c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
   d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
   e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
   f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
   g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
   h. Create multiple paths for learning.
   i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.
   a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.
   b. Make effective use of time.
   c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
   d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
   e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
   f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.

Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about his or her practice and learns from experience.
   a. Model the professional dispositions he/she seeks to inspire in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
   b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).
   c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.
   d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

---

16 The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_proposito].
Appendix D
Procedures for Review of Temporary Faculty

DATE: 

TO: Temporary Faculty Review Committee:

FROM: School of Education Personnel Committee:

SUBJECT: Review of Temporary Faculty

The Temporary Faculty Review Committee will use the procedures that follow for the review of temporary faculty in this annual cycle.

1. Use the evaluation criteria in Section 10 of the SPPP.
2. Review the faculty member’s Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in the Dean’s Office. All members of the committee must review the PAF and sign it.
3. Review the dossier provided by the faculty member. (FPPP Section 6.1-6.4) The preparation of the dossier is the first step of the periodic evaluation process. (FPPP Section 11.8)
4. The reviewees may be an instructor and/or supervisor.
   a. If an instructor, conduct a classroom observation by one member of the committee. We recommend a one-hour period for the observation and a follow-up debriefing.
   b. If a supervisor, review materials that provide evidence of effectiveness.
5. Draft an individual report (not to exceed two pages) for each faculty member under review based on the observation and other documents. The report should contain a statement commenting on the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness and other areas of evaluation if appropriate. As a guide for the observation and report use the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, underlined sections.
6. Meet as a committee to finalize reports.
7. Submit reports to the School Personnel Committee and the Director in accordance with the current RTP schedule established by the Provost and Office of Faculty Affairs.
8. The department chair will transmit the report to the faculty member and to the dean for placement in the PAF.

Temporary faculty under review are responsible for checking their personnel action file (in the Dean’s Office) for accuracy and providing the following to the School of Education office:
• Copies of syllabi for course taught (instructors only),

• Current assessment system(s) including associated rubrics or scoring criteria,

• Additional materials that provide evidence of teaching and/or supervision effectiveness and student assessment, and

• Evidence documenting, *Developing as a Professional Educator.* (Standard 6)
Appendix E

The Temporary Faculty Dossier for Periodic Evaluation

Temporary faculty have a responsibility to review materials in their personnel action files (in the Dean’s Office) and provide supplementary materials for their evaluations in the Temporary Faculty Dossier. The dossier must be submitted to the School of Education Office by the designated fall or spring census date. (FPPP, Section 8.0.b)

The Temporary Faculty Dossier should contain:

- A faculty curriculum vita/resume
- A statement of the faculty member’s philosophy of teaching,
- Summaries of SET and/or University Supervisor Evaluation results,
- Copies of current syllabi for courses taught (instructors only) and descriptions of student assignments and assessments,
- Additional materials that provide evidence of teaching and/or supervision effectiveness, and
- (Optional) a brief summary of other activities that show support for the mission and goals of the department. (These may include activities related to evaluation categories in SPPP Section 10.)

Procedures for conducting classroom observations can be found in SPPP Section 7.1. Information about Student Evaluation of Teaching is in SPPP Section 7.2; information about the Evaluation of Supervision is in SPPP Section 7.3.

University Supervisor Interview Sample Questions

1. Tell me about your observation process. Do you have a specific process for preparing candidates for observation?

2. What observation strategies do you use during the lesson?

3. How do you structure the post observation conference?

4. Please share an example of site problem solving situation in which you felt success and one in which you felt challenged.

5. How do you learn about the strengths and needs of your supervisees? How do you use this information to assist your students outside the formal observation process?

6. How do you develop a working professional relationship with cooperating teachers?

7. Can we organize the supervision experience differently?
Appendix F

Range Elevation

Criteria for RANGE elevation for temporary faculty (excluding coaches) shall be appropriate to lecturer work assignments [CBA 12.19]. For elevation to the RANGE of Lecturer B or above, the individual must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last RANGE elevation, whichever is more recent. (FPPP 8.4.b.2 and 8.4.b.3)

Professional growth and development for lecturer RANGE elevation eligibility is defined as teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field, unless the faculty member’s work assignment includes duties in addition to teaching.

Teaching excellence is indicated in the standards under Instruction in SOEPPPP 10.1.

Suggested evidence for maintaining currency in the field may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, nor prescribed by, the following list:

- Increased mastery of the discipline evidenced by additional relevant education or an additional degree
- Effectively using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field
- Contributing to and planning professional development activities on campus
- Presenting original work at professional meetings and conferences
- Collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the community
- Publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- Research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- Editing professional publications
- External fundraising and resource development related to the mission of the University
- Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University
Appendix G

Sample Phone Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process

The following descriptive interview sample questions are designed to allow candidates to provide pertinent information about their qualifications for the position, based on their actual experiences. The SOE Director should introduce the members of the search committee and briefly describe the position under consideration before asking the first question. The candidate should always be asked if he or she has other job-related information they would like to add that the committee did not cover.

1. Why did you apply to CSU, Chico for this position? What attracted you to this position and place?

2. One of the requirements for this position is that you have at least three years of K-12 teaching-related experience. Briefly describe one of your K-12/SPED experiences that you believe uniquely qualifies you for this position and explain why.

3. What knowledge or experiences have you had that will contribute to our need to prepare educators for successful work with learners from diverse populations including English learners?

4. Please briefly describe the range of your supervision experiences and the ways you go about supervising teacher candidates.

5. Provide an example of a grant development, research project and/or teaching experience in which you have worked collaboratively with others to accomplish a professional goal.

6. Please describe your scholarship agenda and your plans for scholarly work in the future.

7. Given the following scenario, describe the methods and approach you might use to provide effective instruction for this content [Committee provides position specific examples of content addressed in a course.]

8. Other position-specific question(s) added by the search committee.

9. Do you have questions for us?
Appendix H
Sample Interview Day Agenda

California State University, Chico

School of Education
On-Campus Interview, Date

Applicant for Position
Candidate Name
University
Degree

Date

8:30 – 9:00 Breakfast with Search Committee Host
9:00 – 9:30 Visit – Diversity Office, Kendall Hall 110
9:30 – 10:30 Teaching Demonstration, Tehama 105
10:30 – 11:00 Meet with Search and Hiring Committee, Tehama 105
11:15 – 11:45 Meet with School of Education Director
11:45 – 1:00 Lunch with faculty
1:00 – 2:00 Research Presentation, Tehama 105
2:15 – 2:45 Meet with Dean, Tehama 203
3:30 – 4:00 Visit – Research and Sponsored Programs, 25 Main, Room 103
4:00 – 4:30 Faculty / Staff Reception, Tehama 105
4:30 Leave for hotel or opportunity to explore the university/community
Appendix I

Student Evaluation of Teaching: School of Education

General Information

1. You are a:  (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate)
2. Is this course: (Required, Elective)
3. Expected Grade: (A, A or B, B, B or C, C, C or D, D or F, F)

This evaluation form will be used by the instructor of this class to help improve teaching effectiveness and by the University in retention and promotion decisions. You are asked to evaluate the instructor of this class on teaching ability, not on the course content. There will be a section for you to add comments at the end of the survey.

Part A

1. How well are you keeping up with the assignments and readings for this course? Give a percentage estimate. (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%).

Part B

Response Code:

(SD) Strongly Disagree, (D) Disagree, (N) Neither Disagree or Agree, (A) Agree, (SD) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor presents the material in an understandable way.
2. The instructor communicates high expectations.
3. The instructor has command of the course content.
4. The instructor is prepared for each class session.
5. The instructor provides appropriate feedback.
6. The instructor is helpful and responsive to students.
7. The instructor is willing to listen to student questions and opinions.
8. The instructor actively encourages equitable participation of students.
9. The overall instruction in this course contributes to learning.
10. The syllabus explains the course requirements.
11. The assignments contribute to learning.
12. The instructor prepares students to work with diverse populations.
13. What did your instructor do to make this class a good learning experience for you? (Text Box)
14. What could your instructor do in the future to make this a better class? (Text Box)
15. How do you rate the overall quality of teaching in this class? (Superior, Very Good, Minimally Acceptable, Unacceptable)
16. Important: Please give at least one reason to justify your rating. (Text Box)