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Introduction
Schools and colleges are asked to begin their work with careful review of the reports, data sets and guidelines provided by the university. This template is intended to inform the Workload and Operations Phase as explained in the Process Outline.

Schools and colleges are required to respond to the questions below and are free to provide additional comments and analysis where worthwhile. Please note that this template is only one of the deliverables from schools and colleges in Phase 1 and is not intended to present a complete picture on its own.

Responses to the questions in the latter part of this template should be informed by completed department/program templates. Schools/colleges are encouraged to distribute the department/program templates before beginning work on the questions below.

Context for standard teaching load
First complete the Faculty Category Overview by articulating the categories of faculty employed in the school/college as well as the standard teaching load and other responsibilities for each faculty category.

Please provide the additional information needed to understand how the school or college defines or calculates instructional workload. Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices impact faculty teaching load?
- What types of instruction are included in workload calculations? Is any credit-bearing instructional activity not counted?
- Are other instructional activities such as thesis supervision and project oversight included in the standard teaching load?
• Is your standard instructional workload based on the number of courses taught or the number of credit hours? If based on the number of courses, are there any circumstances in which the credit hours have bearing (e.g., 2-credit courses)?

**COE Response:**

*Workload Policies:* Prior to 2013/2014 the College of Education had no formal written policies for determining faculty workload. Since the spring quarter of 2014 we have been piloting a process and set of policies for allowing faculty to opt into a workload that aligns with member’s strengths and interests. In short, this process would allow for faculty members to have differentiated workloads in the areas of teaching and scholarship/research which alter the percent of time spent in each area, affects the number of courses/credits a faculty member would be responsible for teaching and would be subject to differentiated standards and criteria for annual performance review. Appendix A, below, provides an overview of these draft policies. The emerging COE standard workload (the 40% teaching; 40% Scholarship and Research; and, 20% Service workload) requires that tenure track faculty teach a minimum of 18 credit-hours; this can include courses with variable credit hours including 2-credit, 3-credit or 4-credit hour courses. A typical graduate level course in the COE is three credit hours. Full-time NTT faculty are on an 80% teaching; 20% service workload. They are required to teach a minimum of 27 credits across the academic year and their service is directed primarily towards their program.

Workload policies are further informed by expectations for teaching, research, and service. Those expectations are explicated through the COE’s emerging annual performance review standards and criteria. Faculty and administration in the college have been engaged in a process to redefine the standards and criteria for the annual performance review (APR) process. To date, we have focused on standards and criteria for the 40-40-20 standard workload. This process began during AY14/15 and is planned to continue through AY 16/17. Each year we work to refine and strengthen the content and process. The current draft of the standards and criteria are included in Appendix B of this document.

*Workload Credit-bearing Activities:* Various forms of instruction are included in workload, including seminars, lectures, internship and practicum supervision and for our doctoral program, thematic dissertation credits. Faculty do not generally receive workload for independent studies, thesis supervision, graduate projects, and practicum/internships where no faculty supervision is provided. In conducting the review of the COE Faculty Course Sections excel file, we have changed some of the “Include in Teaching Load” responses, and have noted those changes in an added “Notes” column.

Additionally:

1. In summer, 2015, the COE completed an analysis of internships and practica to clarify how these are used in the multiple programs throughout the college. An additional Excel document (“COE table of internships and practica”) is included in the larger COE AAPOR folder and provides details, by program as to how practica and internships are organized and managed.
2. There are some sections of the same course where the capacity of each course differs from term to term. Some of that is accounted for by the practice of lowering the capacity of a course to reserve spaces for students needing the course to graduate. However, there are other instances where the reason for differing capacities from section to section is not clear.

3. There are some courses where the Instructional Method Description changes from term to term. Those are noted in the “Notes” section, and need to be standardized.

4. There are HUMT courses included in this list because they were taught by a COE faculty member. These are not COE courses. As of AY 15-16, COE faculty no longer cover those courses.

5. The EDLR program was undergoing changes in 2014-’15, and there are many unusual assignments where faculty had teaching load assignments that involved helping students complete the former program that was being taught out that year. This was also the last year of an unusual past practice where faculty who supported dissertation credits were given credits for the same students, year-after-year, despite lack of progress by students on completing their dissertations. Two faculty were given workload credit during AY 14-15 to each support a large group of students (about 14-15 students each) to give students a final opportunity to complete their program. In the future, as the EDLR program moves to a thematic dissertation model, a faculty member will receive the equivalent of two courses towards teaching workload for a given academic year. We will no longer allocate workload for individual dissertations.

Context for section sizes

Please review the Course Section Size Report and Summary Data Tables. These reports show, for sections at each level (1000, 2000, 300, 4000, and graduate), the distribution of course sections by size.

Informed by this review, explain your understanding of the drivers behind this distribution of sizes. Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices govern section sizes?
- Are there externally imposed constraints from an accrediting or licensing agency? If so, explain.
- How does the physical inventory of rooms and their characteristics factor into section sizes? Are section sizes constrained by the size of a lab?
- What pedagogical considerations inform preferred course section sizes?

If one or more of the course groupings provided in this report contains courses with different drivers for optimal section sizes such that a different method of grouping would be more informative, please identify the appropriate alternate way of categorizing course sections and provide this information to the Office of Institutional Research (IR). IR will then provide a revised report that will serve as the basis for your explanation to the questions immediately above. The section size categories (original or modified) will at a later stage be used as the basis for the Scenario Planning Model.

COE Response:

Policies Governing Section Sizes. Historically, the COE has not had any formal or consistent policies which governed course management. Thus, there were no codified practices with regards to setting course
caps, making decisions about canceling courses, adding sections, etc. We are in the process of developing those policies and plan to have them in place by the end of AY16/17. Those policies will be informed by curricular, pedagogical, and assessment considerations as well as for a few programs, external accreditation requirements. For example, in courses where students are learning key skills or are engaged in academic service learning experiences we will consider having lower courses sizes than in courses where introductory, background content the focus.

Over the past two years, we began to track formally and make some decisions informally about class size in order to achieve some consistency by course type. Generally, past practice has been to cap course enrollments at about 25 students. However, that number is often confounded by course caps established by external accreditors. Given those external parameters and often fluctuating enrollments across our programs, there is wide variation as to whether courses set at this level ‘filled’. Having course management thresholds set across the university that allow for justified fluctuations by college for unique circumstances would be helpful in achieving equity across schools and colleges as well as providing the university a base by which to analyze and achieve efficient use of our resources.

External Constraints. Three programs in the college, School and Community Counseling and School Psychology have national accreditation/approval standards that impose limits on certain courses within those program plans of studies. The counseling programs are subject to standards and criteria of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The School Psychology program follow guidelines from the National Association for School Psychology (NASP). The following courses are limited based on the standards and criteria of these respective organizations:

Counseling Programs:

- COUN 5100 and COUN 5510 are Pre-Practicum courses. As such, the Counseling program follows the following ratio recommendations for clinical practice:
  - COUN 5100 (Fundamental Counseling Skills) is capped at 24 allowing for four groups of 6.
  - COUN 5510 (Counseling Lab) is capped at 12.

- COUN 5540, 5550, 5560, 5570, 5640, 5650, 5660 and 5670 (Practica and Internship) are all capped at 12 to meet CACREP requirement.

School Psychology Program:

NASP guidelines call for an overall faculty: student ratio of 12:1 across the entire program. From consulting with representatives in the NASP office, these should be implemented most rigidly in clinical courses. Here are the courses with caps currently at 12:

- SPSY 5640 (Individual Educational Assessment)
- SPSY 5660 (Individual Intelligence Assessment)
Physical Space Constraints. At this point in time the COE does not face major constraints with physical space. The one program that is stretched is our Master’s in Teaching program. With cohorts ranging from 42-50, they are often challenged with regards to using our classrooms on the second and third floor. To date, they have managed by accessing smaller breakout rooms and spaces for small group instruction.

Pedagogical Considerations. Pedagogical considerations do and should influence courses sizes. In the COE accreditation requirements are considered. Too, we have basic skill courses in some programs (e.g. counseling, school psychology) where additional instructional aides are hired as facilitators or graders to support faculty instructors. In these courses, the additional instructional assistance allows students to operate in small groups and to be observed directly in order to receive timely formative feedback.

Commentary and recommendations regarding current status
Making use of the information in the completed Faculty and Staff Workload Profiles, please describe your sense of the equity of faculty and staff workload distribution. Responses will vary, but will generally address questions along the lines below:

- Is faculty workload relatively evenly distributed across your departments and programs?
- Is there a difference between the adjusted teaching loads (standard load minus any releases and leaves, as calculated in the Faculty Workload Overview) and the actual teaching loads (as calculated in the Faculty Course Sections Report)? What circumstances led to this?
- Are there departments or programs that face particular challenges and how would you propose to resolve these?
- Is the current distribution of staff resources within the school/college optimal for accomplishing the work of the school/college? If not, how would you revise?

COE Response:

Distribution of Faculty Workload. For the past three years we have worked to reduce historical inequities in faculty workloads across our programs as well as the manner in which the annual performance review process resulted in uneven acknowledgement of variances in faculty accomplishments. Historically, data indicated that the variance among teaching loads was extensive, engagement and accomplishments in scholarship and research were disparate, and contributions to service at the program, college, and university levels uneven. Shifting the long-standing culture and context of faculty workload and annual review is both an opportunity and challenge. This work continues as we strive to develop and implement clear, transparent, and comprehensive workload and annual performance review policies and procedures.

Adjustments to Faculty Teaching Loads. For the past three years adjustments to faculty teaching loads have been made for the following, primary reasons: 1) new hires are provided between 1-2 two course releases across their first two years; 2) department chairs are provided three course releases; and, 3) a faculty
member is provided one course release to serve as the college liaison to Middle College High School. Other course releases are provided through grant-supported funds, special projects funded by the university (e.g., serving on Academic Assembly, supporting a special project through the Center for Community Engagement, etc). A particular challenge in the College of Education is the lack of sufficient resources in our LOA budget line in order to provide the financial supports to offer more course releases. Given the challenges listed below – it may be that the college needs to strive to support an increased number of course releases or increase professional staffing to address existing challenges.

**Challenges Facing Particular Programs.** Three sets of responsibilities place somewhat unique challenges on faculty in the COE that impacts and strains their teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments.

First, as a College of Education, faculty members across all program are expected to be connected deeply to our external environments including K-12 education, community-based education and health providers, and business and industry. Those contexts continue to face rapid changes and thus require faculty to continuously be nimble and flexible in the content and format of their respective programs. The success of our programs relies on extensive and long-term partnerships across these contexts, especially to provide high quality practicum and internship experiences to students as well as respective professional, field-based supervisions. These partnerships require ongoing connection, communication, and collaboration. This places uncommon program-related service expectations on faculty, staff, and administrators in addition to typical program service such as recruitment, admissions, curriculum and pedagogy refinements, assessment, career mentoring/advising, and retention. This adds to an already exhaustive set of service activities at the college, university and professional levels.

Additionally, of the 11 COE professional programs, most are subject to the approval of state and/or national formal reviews and accrediting bodies such as the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) which approves all K-12 related programs, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP), and the National Association of School Psychology (NASP). These approval and accreditation processes require the development and submission of annual and multi-year reports. These reports are in addition to those developed in concert with the university’s regional accreditation requirements. Our Student Development Association is a nationally recognized program and, as such, faculty participate in activities (see SDA program template) beyond those required of programs that draw more locally or regionally. All of these programs as well as our other programs, such as Adult Education, Education Leadership (the EdD program), and our Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages are in increasingly more competitive environments. Again, the activities required to support additional accreditation and approval processes and policies, remain ‘present’ at national and regional professional activities for nurturing prospective student and alumni relations, and to keep a pulse on ever-shifting market demands also places additional service burdens on faculty and administrators.
Finally, the college has five, single-faculty programs. This means that these individuals are responsible for overall coordination of a program. This includes activities associated to recruitment, admissions, curriculum oversight and refinement, continuous improvement and accreditation processes, advising, mentoring, attending to advisory boards, etc. This is particularly challenging when a faculty member is an Assistant Professor. This places an additional burden on the work of these faculty members and again, can limit opportunities for them to engage in service at the college, university and professional levels as well as impact their teaching and scholarship/research.

Combined, these circumstances and associated demands, referred to in several of our program templates, leave faculty members feeling undue pressure in meeting their teaching, scholarship/research, and service obligations. Addressing these challenges will require a combination of using existing resources and well as seeking additional resources. For AY16-17, the college is repurposing a portion of our student employee funding to hire a 20-hour per week student through our Student Development Administration program on a graduate assistantship. This student, will be prepared to support faculty across our five single-faculty programs to relieve them in service related activities connected to recruitment, advising, and admissions. In the future, we hope to secure additional resources to hire about two professional advisors who can serve faculty across all programs.

**Optimal Staff Resources.** The College of Education currently as 11.21 FTE staff members and an additional .85 FTE staff member who is on a one-year contract. These staff support 27 TT/T faculty, 1 full-time NTT faculty and two, part-time NTT faculty in addition to the Dean, an Associate Dean and an Assistant Dean. The faculty to staff ratio is 5.3:1. These staff directly or indirectly support the needs of about 560 students, 30 faculty, about 90 adjuncts annually, and three administrators. We believe that in their respective roles our staff are operating at high levels of performance. We have worked over the past two years to streamline and define clearly their roles and responsibilities. As some university systems become more efficient we believe their work will continue to reach high levels of efficiency.

That said, we believe our students and faculty could be better served with the addition of a limited number of staff positions as well as additional student work-study positions. We expound on those suggestions in the following sections.

Schools and colleges have a number of needs and responsibilities beyond the core academic functions of teaching, research and creative work, and scholarship. Examples include academic and career advising, marketing and student recruitment, technology management, and development/fundraising. The resources for such functions are in located within the school/college, centrally located, or managed through a blend of these.

- What observations and recommendations do you have regarding your ability—and the support you receive—in meeting all such needs and responsibilities?
COE Response

Over the past three years, the college has begun to address severe deficiencies in all areas given as examples above. However, the staff in the college are still stretched as they work at developing systems and processes to systematically identify needs and create focused staffing that allows us to address our needs. In the sections that follow we provide information across several core academic functions to elaborate upon our current status and recommendations we have with regards to our ability to support and meet the needs and responsibilities of each. Overall, we would ask the university to consider if there is equity across the schools and colleges with respect to the allocation of staff and fiscal resources for carrying out core academic functions. We additionally would like to see an analysis of the systems that our staff currently must access for their work to determine whether those systems are allowing staff to work most efficiently and effectively. There are paper-based forms which create unnecessary duplication of effort, multiple data systems that do not coordinate well, and procedures that require staff to create “shadow” systems that create audit trails for information. In short, while our staff has worked hard at developing effective systems internal to the college, they report daily that they are encountering university systems that hamper their effectiveness.

Recruiting and Academic Advising

The College of Education does not have any dedicated staff to support academic advising across our professional programs; all advising is supported by faculty and staff. Over the past few years we have observed and both faculty and staff have provided feedback as to the additional strain this places on their workloads. Further, we believe that students are often confused as to who to turn to for various types of information to support their progress from initial program inquiry through admissions, program planning, to degree completion.

Currently, we have a half-time position that serves as a recruiter and admissions liaison to all 11 programs in the college. As part of her duties, this individual provides general program information to prospective students. Of note, the college is on schedule to add up to two additional programs in the next year. This staff member also supports some marketing functions related to recruiting. This half-time FTE falls short of being able to meet the needs of the myriad of prospective students looking for information and clarification on programs. Students may be directed to one of three program administrative assistants, each of whom support students across four to five programs with between 4 and 11 faculty members each. Meeting the advising needs of prospective as well as newly admitted students puts additional burden on our program administrative assistants as they provide support for data management/reporting, assessment, instruction, admissions, graduation, alumni communications, program related meetings/event planning, website support, etc.
One program, our MIT program has a 1.0 FTE Field Placement Coordinator. About 25% of this person’s time is spent hosting information sessions for prospective students on the first and third Wednesday of every month. This person represents the MIT program at the Graduate Open House – fall winter and spring. Further, this person meets with prospective students to provide information about the program, the application process and state and federal requirements for certification and endorsements. This includes hosting appointments on campus, phone calls, and email as well as responding to potential students who apply to the program but are denied. This person assists in advising new students on endorsements requirements until faculty advisors are assigned and helps to present two orientation sessions each year. No other program has this resource.

Faculty are the next in line to address questions from prospective students that are too specific or involve a high level of career mentoring and advice, of which staff are not qualified to provide. Faculty are involved in providing support for prospective student inquiries in addition to supporting their own admitted-student advisees. Given the professional nature of our degree programs, faculty find the tasks of providing both program advising and career advising/professional mentoring to command an inordinate amount of their time; their feedback indicates this affects the time they can devote to their teaching, research and other service responsibilities. Unfortunately, we receive complaints from students that their faculty advisors do not follow through consistently.

The college would benefit and be able to better provide support to prospective and admitted students if we had two, professional student recruiters and advisors. These individuals could build an all-inclusive system for responding to prospective student inquiries admissions, program (not career or professional mentoring) advising, maintenance of student files, and supporting student registration issues. This role would reduce the demand of each program administrative assistant for other projects and importantly, alleviate the amount of time faculty spend on these functions as well.

**Career Advising and Services**

The college currently has a .85 FTE staff member who supports career services. Historically, this person’s time was almost wholly dedicated to our Master’s in Teaching program. Peripherally, our School Psychology, Special Education, Educational Administration, and School Counseling programs benefited minimally. Other programs received no direct or indirect support/services. In the past three years we were able to alter some of the activities traditionally conducted through this office and are looking at broadening the impact of this role to other programs in the college. That said, it is a large task to support 11 programs for which graduates have a range of contexts in which they seek employment including the K-12 system, community colleges, non-profits, and business and industry.

The college could better support the career and advising services for students if we were to be able to increase our career and advising staffing to a total of 2.0 FTE. This would allow us to support career advising for students across all of our programs as opposed to only a few select programs.
Marketing and Student Recruitment

The College of Education currently employs one full-time Director of Marketing and Communications. The director works closely with the University’s Marketing and Communications Division. The director is responsible for marketing and communications, website development and support, college publications and communications to faculty, staff, students, alumni. She also provides some support for college-wide events. In the past, this position had a half-time, dedicated assistant. Through budget cuts, this support was lost in part as that role was re-purposed for a half-time recruiting/admissions/advising coordinator. This staff position provides minimal support for marketing. The Director of Marketing is supported by the college receptionist, who is not always able to commit scheduled projects and ensure that they are done within a specific time period given other responsibilities. Given the extreme challenges of the university’s migration to a new CRM, new branding requirements, the ever-changing context for digital communications, and the university’s and college goals for increasing enrollment, our Director of Marketing and Communications is stretched to meet the goals of her position with only minimal administrative assistance.

Marketing support provided by MarCom in the area of technical website support (helping with issues as they arise) and digital artwork is a great help. However, the University’s ability to help with print design projects and photography is often severely limited by time constraints. They are also less aware of the specifics of our programs. Even photography and video is hard to schedule because the needs of the university come first. Programs in other colleges do a lot of their own grassroots marketing (creating flyers, brochures, creating videos) which is not possible here due to limited staff and workloads that are at a maximum.

Our Director of Marketing and Communication would benefit from having either a dedicated staff assistant or a full-time graduate assistant. This would allow her to shift more routine tasks from her load and to focus on developing new marketing and communication strategies, products, and approaches as well as conduct research of competitors and connect with and document (e.g. through creating a video library) experiences of our current students and alumni to enhance our marketing initiatives.

Professional Learning and Education

Our Professional Learning unit is staffed by a full-time coordinator. This individual is responsible for managing all operations including processing student registrations, marketing, purchasing, website development, management of instructor contracts, maintenance of records, processing of payments and invoices, scheduling of courses and programs, management of special events, and coordination of the office’s budget. This individual would benefit greatly from dedicated work-study support in order to manage the tedious nature of processing paper-based registrations (as the university does not have a system which allows for an online or technology based system separate from the on-campus programs), providing technology support for online and hybrid course offerings, coordination of on-site events, and providing technical assistance to synchronous learning events.
Technology Management

Unlike other schools and colleges on campus, the COE does not have any permanent staff devoted to technology management. As indicated above our Director of Marketing and Communications is responsible for developing, updating, and maintaining our website in addition to her myriad responsibilities. Given changing certification and accreditation/program approval standards, the needs to develop updated and current information and recruiting campaigns, and curriculum refinement across all of our programs, our website requires constant, vigilant attention. In addition, for the past two years the college has received permission to use salary savings from faculty lines to hire a temporary instructional designer to assist our faculty in moving courses and programs to hybrid and online platforms. Indeed, the college offered the first fully online programs for the university. We depended heavily on this in-house instructional designer to support those accomplishments. While almost half of the COE faculty participated in the CDLI training, we found that they need ongoing support over time to build out quality hybrid and online courses/programs. Since the college has launched the university’s first two fully online degrees and since our Professional Learning office has developed many other programs and online initiatives, we required more support than CDLI could offer. For the past two years, and for the coming year, we have re-purposed an empty salary line to hire an instructional designer who has been invaluable in launching our efforts. Our ability to support an instructional designer will end during AY16/17. Our two department chairs, with the support of our Assistant Dean have had to support the technology needs of our numerous adjunct faculty – this adds a heavy load to their already-full job descriptions. Finally, administrative staff report providing website update support and that they spend time troubleshooting faculty technology issues both on-site and when faculty are working from home.

The College of Education would benefit in terms of its website management, instructional technology advances, and support for adjunct faculty’s coordinated and consistent use of technology in their instruction from having a full-time staff member who is responsible for technology management across the college.

Practicum/Internship Placements and Supervision Coordination

Another area where the college has inequitable resources is in the areas of practicum/internship placements and supervision coordination. In our MIT program, there is a 1.0 FTE staff member. As mentioned above about 25% of this person’s time is spent in recruiting and advising, the other 75% of time is devoted to coordinating field placements in the MIT program including coordination of accountability for students, school personnel, and field supervisors. This person develops and maintains linkages, communication and interactions with school administrators, teachers and staff in the school districts and independent schools in the area. This staff member hires and coordinates procedures with the adjunct faculty who serve as field supervisors. He maintains accurate student files and data records pertaining to field placements and provides
data for the certification process. He creates forms and information to clarify participants’ responsibilities in field placements, counsels’ students and field supervisors in difficult situations, troubleshoots issues in field placements, and submits grades for TEED 5013 and TEED 5028/5029.

In our SDA program, there is a .50 FTE non-tenure track faculty member who is responsible for coordinating, placing, conducting seminars for, evaluating, and advising students as they complete a minimum of 300 contract hours across multiple internship sites, locally, regionally, and nationally. This individual also provides general program advising to students and supports service to the program.

No other programs in the college are afforded similar resources, despite the fact that students in almost all programs are required to participate in either a practicum and/or an internship. In three programs, community mental health and school counseling, as well as in school psychology, a faculty member (one who serves both school and community mental health, and then one faculty member from school psychology) receive annual stipends of $6,000 to coordinate and set up placements for all students in those respective programs. While the stipend does provide some compensation for this work, the amount of support and follow-through cannot compare to that provided by the MIT or SDA program resources. Faculty in remaining programs basically carry the burden of supporting students for placement or depend on students to locate their own placement and then approve those sites/mentors.

Having resources to increase staff support for practicum/internship placements and supervision coordination would reduce the service expectations on faculty and create more sustainable, equitable, and comprehensive supports for students as they prepare for, engage in, and are evaluated through their field experiences.

**Development and Fundraising**

Through University Advancement the COE share a Director of Development with Mateo Ricci. This Director works closely with the Dean to support development activities as well as a Dean’s Advisory Council, of which development is one of the functions served by this group. The Director of Development also supports some alumni activities particularly those that are connected directly to prospective development growth. The Director receives administrative support from the Dean’s Executive Coordinator. To date we are satisfied with this function.

Please provide an overview of the role of student workers in the school/college, responding to the questions below:

- What types of work do your student workers do? E.g., graders, administrative support, research support, etc. (This supplements the student worker information in the Staff Workload Profile.)

**COE Response**
The college uses student employees in a variety of roles including work-study, graduate research assistants, graduate assistantships through the Division of Student Development, and graders.

**Work Study.** Work-study students support college staff in clerical, administrative tasks. For example, they process and track payments for the offices of professional learning and career services. They transcribe minutes or other documents, scan large files, assist in producing materials for faculty (various projects and documents), assist with event coordination, process donor letters for our development officer, assist staff with data entry, make phone calls, staff the front desk, deliver and pick up materials across campus offices, record data, and a number of other various tasks.

**Graduate Research Assistants.** The college supports faculty research by offering opportunities during the academic year as well as up to two summer fellowships, whereby faculty can apply for support that can include hiring a graduate research assistant. These positions are dedicated to supporting faculty and research scholarship. The number of student workers assigned to these opportunities varies by year. We do not anticipate a decrease but instead an increase in our need to provide faculty this type of support as the expectation for their active participation in research and scholarship is fully realized.

**Graduate Assistantships.** During FY16 the college worked with the Division of Student Development to hire its first student through the graduate assistantship (GAship) opportunity connected to the Student Development Administration (SDA) program. This GAship was allocated to the SDA program as the program faculty were undergoing significant transitions. The program had a recent retirement that was replaced with a brand new TT/T faculty member. In addition, a .50 FTE NTT faculty member assumed an additional .50 FTE position in the university and was released from any service responsibilities to the college for one year. The student hired into this position was responsible for supporting program activities having to do with recruitment, admissions, assessment, and event services. As indicated earlier, in FY17 the college committed to continuing this position for a broader number of programs, specifically those that are operated by a single faculty member or fewer than three faculty assigned to a program. Again, we hope that through this GAship, program faculty and administrative assistants will benefit from support for recruitment, admissions, limited advising, event activities, and limited assessment reporting functions.

**Graders.** A limited number of student employees are hired to support faculty in the School Psychology program to aid faculty who teach courses that involve intense numbers of hours grading student work. Specifically, these courses address the skills and competencies needed to administer standardized assessment protocols to students in the K-12 system. Our SPSY students have minimum requirements for the number and breadth of protocols through which they administer tests to K-12 students; the graders assist the faculty instructor with the arduous task of reviewing and correcting each protocol.
• What logic or strategy determines which departments/programs receive student support? Is this periodically adjusted? (The Budgeted Resource Overview contains student wages by department.)

COE Response

The logic or strategies used to determine who receives student worker support varies by type. In the following sections we review our strategies for allocating this important resource. We seek feedback from faculty and staff annually to review and revise as needed how we allocate and use this resource.

**Work Study.** Our receptionist has created a system by which our use of work study students is coordinated with staff across the college as well as the number of hours assigned on a weekly basis. Based on requests from staff, she assigns one or more work study students to assist staff for a specified number of hours per week. If an individual requires additional time, the staff negotiate based on changes in need by week or time of quarter/year.

As work study students cultivate greater expertise with specific types of projects than others, they may be paired with a certain office more consistently than another student. Some staff have a greater demand for student employee time than others, and so they receive a great proportion of time.

**Graduate Research Assistants.** Currently our use and allocation of graduate research assistants is granted through a competitive application process that is made available to faculty at least twice a year. We also have limits on the number of years/summers that a faculty member is qualified to receive this support for a particular research or scholarly project. Faculty are required to submit scholarly products created through this support. Failure to do so will take that faculty member out of the running for this support until that requirement is met.

**Graduate Assistantships.** The recent addition of a grad assistantship in the college and planned future use of that grad assistantship is to provide support to single-faculty or small faculty operated programs. This serves to provide some relief to faculty who end up supporting all functions of a program as they do not have colleagues who can share in supporting recruiting, admissions, assessment, curriculum, instruction, and advising functions.

**Graders.** Our use of graders does not vary significantly. The numbers of and hours worked by graders is influenced by numbers of students in the assessment courses.

• To what extent do students replace staff support?
COE Response

There are only two categories of student workers in the College of Education that could potentially be considered as replacing staff support work - work study students and graduate assistantships. Work study students do not replace staff support. They generally perform time-consuming tasks that have a low level of expertise and varying levels of priority. They save staff time, but do not replace their primary job functions.

Our administrative staff who support programs are at the Senior Administrative Assistant level because of the high level of work that they perform. Only one administrative assistant, the receptionist, is not at that level, and she oversees and assigns the work study students. Student workers support this work.

Given the functions performed by our recent use of graduate assistantships and the lack of any staff in the college of education to support academic advising, we do believe that in the future, should the university provide support to the college to hire professional staff academic advisors, our need for GAship would change.

- Are your student wages/FTE more than you need, appropriate to your needs, or insufficient?

COE Response

Based on our answers to question two above, the college would benefit from additional student wages/FTE to support. We will continue to ensure that our current use of work study students is optimized.

Non-salary funding:
- The majority of the Portfolio and Operations Review is about people: faculty, staff, and students. What, if anything, is important to add regarding non-salary funding?

COE Response

Non-salary costs comprise just 6% of the college’s overall budget – a percentage that has been the case in the college’s history. That suggests that non-salary budgets are very low and also suggests a need to gain additional funding in non-salary budget categories.

Opportunities for change

What else would you like to share regarding opportunities for change?
- If you had additional resources, what would you adjust operationally to improve? What would be the impact?

At this time, we are not interested in academic program changes (refer to Phase 2 in the Process Outline for more about the academic program portfolio review), so focus your response on the other aspects of school/college operations.
COE Response

In addition to information provided above with regards for additional resources in our staff FTE and student work FTE, we considered opportunities for change that would increase the efficiency of our operations both in concert with the university level as well as at the college level. We have several ideas for improving our operations and efficiencies, including strategies that both involved and did not involve additional resources. Below we categorize and provide suggestions by function/domain. These recommendations come from ongoing discussions with staff and the administration of the college:

a. Improved, college-university-wide procedures and policies that are clear and consistent:

- Storage of files in general – we should move towards digital storage of files. This would improve accuracy and accessibility, and streamline tasks that require coordination among multiple campus offices.
- Waitlists – there does not appear to be an official policy regarding waitlists. This process should be automated through SU Online/ Datatel to improve accuracy of decisions and equal access to waitlists. Instead, the process is entirely manual and requires the coordination of three staff from within our college, and is dependent on the registrar’s responsiveness (i.e. to manually reduce course caps to prevent waitlist circumvention).
- Update the ERP data more frequently - it is tedious and requires an intense amount of time to operate within older and less efficient versions.
- Consolidate HR functions into one campus unit – having faculty services operate in tandem to the HR office is confusing and inefficient.
- Integration of university information systems.
- Create policies that clarify where official ‘personnel’ files (faculty and staff) are housed, what information should be collected and stored in those files annually and over time.
- Create policies that clarify what ‘personnel’ information can and cannot be stored separately at each college and school level.
- Create policies that clarify what information should be stored (and how) in student files, including information that may link to student actions such as violations of student conduct, grading grievances, etc.
- For those colleges in which continuing and professional education services are provided, support independent digital platforms that are not constrained by university practices that are built to serve traditional as opposed to non-traditional students (e.g. the School of New and Continuing Studies, the College of Education’s unit on Professional and Continuing Education). This includes admissions, registration, payments, marketing, website support, etc.
- The university started but has not finished creating a comprehensive policy for data storage and purging. This leads to volumes of files (both stored in paper form and digitally) and information that is stored or destroyed in a manner that may not be secure, does not conform to external organization regulations and requirements, and takes up un-necessary space.
- Conversations began this quarter about coordinating outreach to alumni through follow-up surveys across Alumni Relations and the schools/colleges. We are eager to pursue such collaborations as they create more efficient processes and support deeper understanding and coordination of needs across
the university. We have needs around greater involvement of our alumni, which ties to both Development and Marketing, to expand mentoring programs, event planning, and sharing current news. Coordinating these initiatives with the central Alumni Relations unit makes sense.

b. Improved professional development, cross-training both at the university and college levels:

- Reconsider and update the types of technology we support on campus and provide increased campus professional development opportunities for using that technology. For example, database management or digital marketing courses.

c. Improved college level procedures and policies that are clear and consistent:

- When the new Dean arrived three years ago, as well as with personnel transitions in the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean positions, it became increasingly clear that the college had very few written policies and procedures. This includes academic and operational policies and procedures for functions such as enrollment and course management, determining faculty workload, continuous improvement and accreditation, bylaws, scholarship allocations and processing, charges for standing committees, budget allocations, etc. We have a plan in place for AY16-17 to address these issues.
- Student Scholarship process – the college needs policies around when and to whom these are offered, as well as who is responsible for selecting awardees. This is a critical component of improving student body diversity. A helpful suggestion was offered to consider having a staff member on the scholarship and awards committee.
- Budgeting – college finances are tracked in an Excel spreadsheet. This information should be in a database so that it is accessible and uniform. The forms associated with college finances, such as honoraria copies, stipend forms, etc., should be stored in a database rather than on a shared drive. This would make using and manipulating the data more useful in that it is less time-consuming to retrieve and understand and capable of being compared across departments or across years. With resources we could migrate to a system such as ACCESS – this would require professional development of all staff and administrators.
- Career Services – Support the Educator Career Services office to work in collaboration with other COE staff and faculty to gather, maintain and update our graduate’s hiring information in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner. It would better enable us to stay connected with our alums and serve to engage and utilize them as valuable resources in multiple ways (networking/job placement, marketing to potential students, promoting COE programs within the educational work place, mentoring, assisting in COE courses, programs, events, etc.). The SDA program could serve as a useful model for achieving this.
- Cross-training of Staff - Continue to analyze the current distribution of staff resources to consider if cross-training of job functions would better support faculty and students. For example, K-12 programs have a higher workload with reporting and accreditation. During particularly demanding times of the year, having other staff learned about how to support those functions could be helpful.
• If you had fewer resources, what would you adjust operationally and what would be the impact? Again, in this phase, we are not interested in academic program changes.

**COE Response**

Administration and staff in the College of Education cannot fathom having fewer operational resources. Currently, when all personnel resources are factored into our budget, the fiscal resources allocated to college operations has historically constituted about 5-6% of our overall budget. We have the impression (admittedly we hope this process will shed light on this) that we have one of the leanest faculty/staff resources across the Division of Academic Affairs. We continue to strive for efficiencies within our college; with continued attention to needed updated systems and infrastructure supports at the university level we are committed to continuing to be efficient.

As example, if we were to reduce our staff support to programs, faculty would have to take on even more service than they do now, and this would most likely lead to decreases in expectations for scholarship and/or teaching. If we were to reduce the minimal support we now direct to recruiting, admissions, and marketing, in addition to shifting more responsibilities to faculty it would most likely translate into longer wait times for changes to the website or program flyers, and it would mean programs might need to send their own materials to alumni or networking events. Individual programs would also need to go back to setting up their own information sessions. Fewer resources in terms of funding from the college would mean no support for the Banner or SPARK, our two primary marketing publications. Fewer funding resources from graduate admissions means fewer dollars going into marketing.

• Are there ways that with your current level of resources, you could improve quality, effectiveness, or equity within your school/college?

**COE Response**

Staff and administrative feedback to this question revealed several areas to which we can continue to attend to with regards to our efforts to improve the efficiencies and equity of use of current resources. Below we summarize our ideas:

• *Updated revenue sharing for professional education:* For the past three years, the college has attempted to create a better revenue/expenditure model for operating its off-campus extended education offerings. The past model has been inadequate to meet the demands of this work, and the current model that has evolved in the past year is even worse. We have hopes that the university will support the development of a better model in the near future.

• *Cross-analysis and training* with staff across the university with similar job functions: for example, working with other program assistants across the university. Currently we have little to no knowledge of how other grad program assistants across SU handle their workload or manage projects. While their
day-to-day support may look different, checking in with them to streamline processes could save time and make us more productive.

- **Reduce unnecessary duplication in data entry and eliminate paper-based processes**: for example, our work study students currently enter the same information into both FileMaker Pro and Taskstream. We have them filing paper-based PEP forms, and helping to cross-check transcripts and fill out tracking forms for admissions. If we were able to eliminate paper files and had integrated data systems that support accreditation/program approval requirements, we could make more efficient use of our work study resources.

- **Creation of a decision making matrix.** This decision making matrix would outline which group(s) of people make which decisions. This would be in part to clarify what we mean by shared governance. When we collectively know who makes which types of decisions (ex. all college, all faculty, all staff, program admins w/ deans, department chairs, deans, or dean only), then it saves time and effort trying to figure out who decisions need to go to, in turn making us more productive.

- **Update program website pages to provide clarity to prospective students, thus reducing the need for student to contact staff/faculty for information.**

- **Work with the Registrar’s office to clarify our program plans of study to reduce students’ issues with registration.**

- **Standardize expectations of how admins support programs/ have written policies regarding these expectations.**

- **Building off of best practices literature as oppose to tradition, standardize (with clear policies) how programs within the College operate (admissions policy, general processes and operations, expectations of support staff) rather than having them be personality driven.** Faculty in the SDA program could serve and a major resource for this initiative.

- **Finance – decentralize the teaching pool and assigned faculty salary cost by program areas.** This would allow the college to track more accurately program costs in addition to data in SUDDS. We suspect this may not be a good time to make the change as the university is going to change from 13-digit budget numbers into 17-digits budget numbers in the new accounting system in July 2017.

- **Continue to create a shared college-calendar that identifies key projects, reports, initiatives across the academic year to help communicate and support time-management and collaboration among faculty, staff and administrators.**

- **Build on our strategic planning initiatives to include not only academic goals and objectives but operational goals and objectives, with clear articulation across the two.** Ensure that voices of all stakeholders are included.

- **Continued cross-training of staff.**

- **Re-purposing of current space to create more efficient use of existing spaces.** This would allow us to create collaborative work spaces that encourage teamwork, collaboration, and supportive group dynamics.

**Other**

Please share any other information, concerns, or opportunities valuable to this process.

Response:
Attachments to the school/college report

Attach any school/college policies relevant to this process, e.g., definitions of research activity, service expectations, or course release policy. Please list the documents below.

COE Response

Two Appendices follow which provide further detail to sections of this report. In addition, there is an excel file in the COE’s AAPOR folder, referenced above, which provides further information about internship and practicum policies and procedures.
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Introduction
This document conveys a structure and accompanying set of policies and procedures for the College of Education at Seattle University to approach decisions about a faculty member’s annual teaching, scholarship/research, and service workload. It explicates how workload is assigned and is then connected to a respective developing set of standards and criteria for annual performance evaluation linked to that assignment. Faculty and administration in the college have been engaged in a process to develop clear, transparent, and flexible workload policies and procedures beginning in AY14/15 with the intention of adopting final guidelines by the end of AY16/17. We are developing this model to address:

- Pervasive and historical workload inequality in CoE;
- Provide a stable framework for annual assignments;
- Establish flexibility with respect to the percentage of time a faculty member can devote to the domains of teaching and scholarship/research;
- Allow a faculty member the choice in how they allocate and use their time to teaching and scholarship/research, provided that associated criteria for annual performance review are met;
- Establish clear and comprehensive definitions of the activities that constitute teaching, scholarship/research, and service,
- Create associated criteria through the annual performance review process that acknowledge the range of faculty productivity.

Importantly, this document provides for a differentiated workload to acknowledge and honor the strengths and differences among faculty.

Through this process the College of Education proposed to adopt a 40(T)-40(R)-20(S) workload as the customary faculty workload. At the same time, the COE is committed to allowing faculty to pursue workloads that best take advantage of their individual strengths and professional goals and aspirations. We propose to adopt a set of policies and procedures to allow faculty to opt into differentiated workloads for teaching and scholarship/research. Under special circumstances, and with approval by the Dean, faculty may request a differentiated service assignment.

I. Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty Differentiated Workloads

A. Parameters for Differentiated Workloads in the CoE

College of Education faculty distributes their work across the areas of teaching, scholarship and research, and service. In their work across these three areas, faculty engage typically in a workload of 40% teaching, 40% scholarship/research and 20% service. Faculty efforts and accomplishments under this workload are assessed during the annual performance review. This policy proposes instituting a differentiated workload option in which variance from the typical workload is possible. This policy does not create unilateral rights for a faculty member to insist on a particular workload assignment. The proportions of teaching, scholarship/research, and service may vary from the typical allocation depending on individual circumstances such as annual performance review, and the particular needs of a faculty member’s program or the college. However, given their pre-tenure status, Assistant Professors will not be able to decrease their scholarship responsibilities below the standard 40%.
B. Examples of Differentiated Workloads in the CoE

The examples following illustrate the manner in which faculty can shift the percent of time allocated to teaching, scholarship and research. Generally, shifts in scholarship/research are made based on ‘course buy-outs’ – this occurs when either through a special project or grant award, funds are directed to the college to support a reduction in a faculty member’s course load and to provide the funds necessary to hire an adjunct instructor. Special projects could be based on initiatives strategic to the college or in cases where there is minimal to no funding sources for an individual faculty member’s research agenda. As a general policy, faculty cannot fully buy-out of their teaching responsibilities. Each faculty member is expected to teach a minimum of one course during the academic year. Exceptions to this policy require prior approval from the Dean.

1. Assistant Professor, tenure-track, workload models
   a. Standard workload model: 40%-40%-20% teaching (equivalent of 6, 3 credit hour courses) - scholarship/research -service
   b. Research Buy-out models
      i. Sub-model 1: one course buy-out per AY with 30-50-20 teaching- scholarship/research-service distribution.
      ii. Sub-model 2: two course buy-out per AY with 20-60-20 teaching-scholarship/research-service distribution.

3. Associate Professor, tenure-track or tenured, workload models
   a. Standard workload model: 40%-40%-20% teaching, scholarship/research ,service distribution.
   b. Scholarship/Research Emphasis Models: same as the buy-out models for the assistant professor with the option of adding a 3rd sub-model of three course buy-out per AY with a 10-70-20 teaching-research-service distribution.
   c. Teaching-Emphasis Models
      i. Sub-model 1: 50-30-20 distribution for teaching scholarship-research scholarship-service, with one additional, minimum 3-credit hour course.
      ii. Sub-model 2: 60-20-20 distribution for teaching-research-service, with two additional 3-credit hour courses, or one additional, minimum 6-credit hours of coursework added to the teaching load.

4. Full Professor, tenured, workload models
   a. Standard workload model: 40%-40%-20% teaching scholarship-research scholarship-service distribution.
   b. Scholarship/Research-Emphasis Models: same as the buy-out models for associate professor.
   c. Teaching-Emphasis Models: same as the buy-out models for associate professor.

C. Procedures for Requesting a Differentiated Annual Workload

The request for a differentiated workload for an academic year must be made in writing at the end of an academic year. The request is documented in concert with the faculty member’s submission of his annual performance review self-assessment. Workload requests are submitted during the spring quarter and encompass planning details for the subsequent summer and academic year. Proposed plans will be reviewed during a spring-quarter annual review cycle and must be approved in writing by the Associate Deans and Dean.
The review process will examine individual faculty goals and needs including career development and promotion, academic unit program needs, and the goals and objectives of the CoE, as well as results from his/her most recent annual performance review assessment. If approved, the differentiated workload will be effective for one year. Results of the annual performance review must be considered as a faculty member proposes continuing a differentiated workload or changing workload through future and subsequent professional plans.

When budget resources allow, faculty who wish to increase their workload in the area of teaching, may include the option to propose a strategic, partnership development activity in lieu of teaching an additional course. The faculty member must propose an activity with clear objectives, activities, outcomes, products, timelines, and connections to a CoE strategic initiative/goal. With approval of the Dean, a faculty member can submit a request in his/her workload plan to teach a course in the summer for no pay and apply that course towards his/her AY teaching workload.

There are many circumstances under which faculty receive support in the form of a ‘course buy-out’ in exchange for a range of responsibilities. In some cases, those responsibilities are best described perhaps, as ‘research’ in others, ‘service’ and still others, ‘administrative’. Under these circumstances, the faculty member’s workload distribution will be altered to reflect accurately the nature of the responsibilities associated with the course buy-out. For example, if a faculty member receives two course buy-outs for administrative responsibilities, his/her workload could be illustrated as 20(T)-40(R)-20(S)-20(Admin). Faculty with formally designated administrative responsibilities will be evaluated based on the associated goals, outcomes, and quality of the respective administrative assignment.
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Introduction

Teaching, research and service have traditionally constituted the primary roles and responsibilities of faculty in Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Indeed a focus on teaching, research and service is aligned with the charge of Jesuit universities. In Decree 4 of the GC 32, Father Kolvenbach, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, shared that to be a university requires dedication “to research, teaching and the various forms of service that correspond to its cultural mission” (Kolvenbach, 2011).

Mission and Frameworks

As its mission, the College of Education (COE) community endeavors to be a scholarly learning community of students, staff and faculty characterized by collegiality and collaboration. We strive to lead collaboratively by serving others grounded in the ethics and values of the Jesuit tradition. COE faculty members work to provide a curriculum relevant to the needs of the profession, the greater society and supported by the best practice and research. Our administration, faculty and staff commit to welcoming and representing the diversity of our society through our teaching, programs, student body, and personnel. The College of Education strives to produce graduates who are compassionate and effective professionals in their respective areas of preparation.

This document outlines the process, standards, and criteria by which faculty in the College of Education engage in self-assessment and their performance reviewed and rated on an annual basis. The COE annual performance review (APR) standards and criteria reflect our commitment to the advancement of effective knowledge transmission and generation (Aronowitz, 2000). This framework points to the importance of teaching, scholarship/research, and service as well as the synergistic relationship among these three functions. Our work is informed further by our mission for social justice, a focus on educating the whole person, an emphasis on leadership for a just and humane society, and our goal to positively impact our community stakeholders.

Further, this approach to workload reaffirms the College of Education’s commitment to understanding our work broadly as conceptualized by Boyer. As he indicated:

We believe that the time has come to move beyond the “teaching versus research” debate and give the familiar and honorable term “scholarship” a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work. Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s own knowledge effectively to others. Specifically, we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching” (Boyer, 1990, p.16).

Notably, Boyer recognizes that all three components are central to the work of the teacher/scholar. He conceptualized different phases of the scholarship of research and positioned the act of teaching as holding equal prominence as research and scholarship. To recognize equally the value of teaching and scholarship/research the COE is piloting a differentiated approach to workload that recognizes the various forms and functions of scholarship and teaching, allowing individual faculty to opt into a workload in which in addition to a common expectation for service, time devoted to teaching and scholarship is the same or a workload in which there is either more of a focus on scholarship activities or teaching. It is critical to note, however, that Boyer emphasizes that this focus cannot be solely a focus on one of the three components of
the academic life and must engage all three. A differentiated workload allows for a rebalancing of those components. It does not eliminate any of them.

Lee Shulman built on Boyer’s model, providing a fuller description of the scholarship of teaching:

Scholarly teaching is teaching that is well grounded in the sources and resources appropriate to the field. It reflects a thoughtful selection and integration of ideas and examples, and well-designed strategies of course-design, development, transmission, interaction, and assessment. Scholarly teaching should also model the methods and values of a field, avoiding dogma and the mystification of evidence, argument and warrant. We develop a scholarship of teaching when our work as teachers becomes public, peer-reviewed and critiqued, and exchanged with other members of our professional communities so they, in turn, can build on our work. These are the qualities of all scholarship. Both scholarly teaching and a scholarship of teaching are deeply valued in the professional community..... That clinical work, however valued, does not become scholarship until it is subjected to systematic reflective analysis. Such reflection leads to its display or communication in ways that render it community property in the fullest sense—public, reviewed and exchanged (2000, p 50).

Through our teaching we strive to develop and maintain responsive programs, pedagogies, and advising to effectively prepare and continue to support the development of teachers; college, adult, and community educators; student affairs professionals; and clinicians, leaders, and new scholars. Through disciplined inquiry and scholarly activities, faculty and students contribute to understandings of and solutions for important problems of educational and community practice and policy. The College encourages diversity in choices of problems to be addressed and methods of inquiry used. The College also encourages collaborative and cross-disciplinary research as faculty members address significant problems of practice. The impact on community can be framed as instructional (e.g., the development of professional development initiatives), scholarship and research (e.g., research collaborations within schools, districts or community organizations) or as service (e.g., participation in education reform, community renewal, and improvement of learning and teaching at all levels – from preschool through adult learning or serving on community organizational boards). Our stakeholders can be at any level—local, state, national or international. Some faculty choose to work across these levels, and others choose to focus more intensely on one level or another.

**Standards and Criteria**

Faculty and administration in the college have been engaged in a process to redefine the standards and criteria for the annual performance review (APR) process. This process began during AY14/15 and is planned to continue through AY 16/17. Each year we work to refine and strengthen the content and process. The current draft of the standards and criteria are included in Appendix A of this document. Currently, the criteria represent expectations for faculty who have chosen a 40 (T)-40 (R)-20(S) annual workload. Further work is required to modify the criteria for differentiated workloads (see differentiated workload policy). The proposed standards and criteria are organized by the domains of teaching, scholarship and research, and service. However, faculty in a College of Education, like ours, work often at the intersections of these areas. Through the annual performance review process, faculty members have the opportunity to discuss and make transparent their accomplishments and describe the intersections of two or more domains. For example, when the findings of an empirical study of a teaching approach are published or an innovative program is described and shown to have impact on others is published – these situations might contribute to both teaching and research performance. However, teaching materials like curriculum, supplements, videos, and online course materials would be documented solely under teaching as they are products developed as resources for others to use through specific university courses, classes, seminars or practicum/internships.
Annual Performance Review Policies and Procedures

According to the SU Faculty Handbook adopted in Fall, 2015, “With limited exceptions, all faculty undergo an annual performance evaluation. The evaluation includes input from the faculty member in question, the chairperson or dean, and students.” (p. 19).

A. COE Annual Performance Review Process

In the past, the CoE relied on a model of self-assessment, Department Chair assessment and then final assessment by the Dean. With proposed shifts in the roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs, that model is no longer applicable.

During AY 14/15 and AY15/16 the following procedures were followed:

1. Faculty opted into a workload through a professional planning process.
2. Faculty developed annual goals by standards across the domains of teaching, scholarship and research, and service.
3. Faculty engaged in a self-assessment process whereby they judged the degree to which they met their goals, and documented additional accomplishments. This self-assessment was then sent to the Dean.
4. The Dean met individually with each faculty member and engaged in a conversation about her self-assessment, the purpose of this conversation was to seek clarification, pose questions, and to provide initial formative feedback.
5. The faculty member was provided the opportunity to edit her self-assessment based on the conversation with the Dean. Edited self-assessments were then sent to the Dean.
6. The Dean reviewed each self-assessment, rated each domain and provided additional comments about each domain. The Dean also provided comments when her ratings differed from a faculty member’s self-ratings.

During the three year transition period related to this work, faculty continue to deliberate on the proposed APR content and process.

As example, one approach relies on teams of faculty to consider and endorse the self-assessment of individual faculty members and then for the team to forward its assessment to the Dean, along with the self-assessment. Faculty would submit self-assessment materials aligned to their approved workload option. Overall, it is the responsibility of each faculty to provide the context for his or her work in a clear narrative and presentation of data. This documentation is critical to the process so that each reviewer at every level (e.g. self, committee or Dean’s level) will understand the candidate’s work and provide a thorough and fair assessment/evaluation. Evaluation results will inform future workload decisions. Teams of peers would then engage in a normative process, linked to the standards and criteria, to qualitatively and quantitatively consider a holistic assessment of each individual’s work. As teams consider the collective work of individuals, they would identify general patterns of bodies of work within and across the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of discovery, integration, and application, and service that meet expectations as well as those that begin to exemplify not meeting, exceeding, or illustrative of outstanding work. This approach has the potential benefit of engaging faculty with one another’s work and providing a broader understanding of the collective assets of the college.
Feedback from individual faculty as well as from faculty participating in the performance review process would be used annually to continue to refine the annual performance review draft policies and procedures.

**B. Reporting Results of the Annual Review Process**

As the content and process of the Annual Performance Review process develops over the pilot process (AY14-15 – AY 16-17) the Dean is developing methods for reporting to faculty results of the APR within the bounds of maintaining confidentiality. During AY15/16 the Dean presented numerically-based aggregate results that illustrated faculty performance across the domains of teaching, research/scholarship, and service by ratings (developing, met, surpassed, excelled). In addition, the Dean provided information regarding the level of agreement between faculty self-ratings and the Dean’s final ratings. Results of faculty feedback sought in conjunction with the self-assessment process as well as the Dean’s general feedback on the content and process was presented. As administration and faculty members continue to advance a new system, the manner in which results will be reported annually will be refined and defined further.

**References**


Seattle University

Faculty Self-Assessment/Evaluation Form

Summer 2015 - Spring 2016

Faculty Name:  
Signature:  
Department:  
Program:  
Faculty Rank/Position Title:  
Date Tenure Awarded:  

AY Elected Workload Weightings:  
   Teaching: ____
   Research and Scholarship ____
   Service ____
   Administrative Responsibilities (if applicable – note that this is for approved course-released duties only) ____ - describe responsibilities:

Annual Performance Review: Did workload weightings change across the academic year (any changes must have been approved by the Dean in writing)? If so, please indicate above.
Teaching

A. Course Information

*For the self-assessment process,* in the table below please list all courses in chronological order beginning with courses you taught in the summer, then fall, winter, and finally the subsequent spring (insert additional rows as needed). This template documents that you have fulfilled teaching the minimum course workload. **All** courses, including details regarding credit hours, etc., associated with your workload, including courses buy-outs from grants, contracts, administrative work, etc., should be indicated on the template and align with your specified teaching workload distribution. With approval from the Associate Dean for RO/PL and the Dean, a faculty member can teach a course through professional and continuing education towards load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter (R, F, W, S) and Year</th>
<th>Course Credit Hours</th>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled/ # of evaluations submitted</th>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Indicate if this was course was previously taught with typical annual updates/edits, a brand new prep, revised from face-to-face to fully online or hybrid.</th>
<th>Ratings for Items 3 &amp; 4 and Median of Items 1-4 on Course Evaluation</th>
<th>List type of other evidence you have about your teaching (e.g., self-reflections, observations, formative assessments). Summarize themes from these sources under Standard 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisory responsibilities (Independent Studies, Graduate Projects) as applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Supervision</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Add additional rows as needed

Dissertations (as applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Add additional rows as needed

**B. Teaching Goals/Accomplishments by Standard**

*During the self-assessment process*, list and describe your accomplishments by standard/criteria for the respective academic year (please indicate N/A when pertinent):

**Standard 1: Faculty member participates in curriculum development, program planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement activities. REQUIRED**

*Faculty member provides evidence of…*

Participating and collaborating (as possible) in the:
1. Development, review, analysis, reflection, and evaluation (e.g., comprehensive exams, outcome assessments, accreditation, and improvement of an integrated set of opportunities involving a program of study (e.g., courses, sequences, instructional experiences, pedagogical experiences, and assessment experiences) designed to achieve specific learning goals, (2) program evaluation of students, and, (3) development of program level activities (e.g., certificates, tracks, and/or minors).

**Standard 1 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:**

1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

**Standard 2: Faculty member participates in course revision, development, and design. REQUIRED**

*Faculty member provides evidence of…*

Participating and collaborating (as possible) with colleagues to create, revise, update, and incorporate feedback based on type of course and faculty function in the college. Courses align content to program outcomes, with annually updated content and materials to reflect knowledge advancements in the field, and integrating technology into the implementation of courses consistent with expectations at the program level and commensurate with Seattle University’s Ignation pedagogy.

**Standard 2 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:**

1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

**Standard 3: Faculty member’s instruction demonstrates high quality and effective teaching across multiple, ‘best practice’ criteria. REQUIRED**

*Faculty member provides evidence of…*

Providing quality learning opportunities, maintaining currency in course content, communicating clear expectations and criteria for judging work, adjusting teaching to meet students’ needs, engaging students in their own learning and that teaching is of high quality.

**Standard 3 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:**

1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)
### Standard 4: Faculty member provides quality advising and professional mentoring. **REQUIRED**

Faculty member provides evidence of...
Guiding, supporting and informing students about programs, courses, and career development, as well as activities that create personalized learning opportunities for students and/or other faculty, to encourage higher levels of expertise and/or guide professional development. Please delineate average number of advises by academic year – if this varies significantly by quarter – please note.

### Standard 5: Faculty member has impact on practice in community, state-wide and/or nationally. **OPTIONAL**

Faculty member provides evidence of...
Engaging in activities that make teaching relevant external to the COE which have an impact on teaching practice and teaching partnerships in the community (local, state, national, and/or international levels) and is recognized for quality of teaching and influence through special teaching appointments and invitations.

### Standard 6: Faculty member may engage in teaching scholarship. **OPTIONAL**

Note: Refereed (blind reviewed) published inquiry on teaching should be listed in the research/scholarship.

*(If so) Faculty member provides evidence of...*

The development and dissemination of instructional or assessment materials that are accessible and publically available to support the instruction of other individuals. Dissemination should include outlets related to practice, instruction, assessment, and personnel preparation.

### C. Faculty Member’s Self-assessment

Overall, my teaching (check one):

- [ ] Does Not Meet Expectations – Provides unconvincing and/or no evidence of meeting the criteria in teaching Standards 1-4.
_____ Partially Meets Expectations – Provides marginal evidence of meeting the criteria in teaching Standards 1-4.

_____ Meets Expectations – Provides sufficient evidence of meeting the criteria of the teaching Standards 1-4 and may have evidence of small contributions in Standards 5 and/or 6.

_____ Meaningfully Surpasses Expectations – Provides evidence of annual accomplishments that exceed the criteria in teaching Standards 1-4 and/or evidence of substantial achievement in Standards 5 and/or 6.

_____ Extraordinary – Provides evidence of truly exceptional performance in the criteria in teaching Standards 1-4 and in Standards 5 and/or 6.

Additional Information/Rationale for Self-Assessment Summary Rating:

Scholarship and Research

A. Scholarship and Research Accomplishments by Standard

*During the self-assessment process, list and describe your accomplishments by standard/criteria (please indicate N/A when pertinent):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Over time, the faculty member has a constructed focused, sustained, agenda of empirical and non-empirical scholarship. REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member provides evidence of...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, clear, sustained, focused scholarly agenda that demonstrates a commitment to the COE and/or SU mission and vision and reflects ongoing activities across the research continuum (design, implementation, data analysis, publications in progress, press, etc.) for advancing one’s agenda over the upcoming academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Faculty member demonstrates a record of high quality, publication productivity. REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member provides evidence of...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A continuous record of scholarly publications that build over time, with an average of two publications per year (1-3 year window & including articles, books, chapters, technical reports) with a majority that are peer (blind) reviewed, and a larger number/percent that are empirical and linked to a faculty member’s focused scholarship agenda. For journal articles, this may or may not include top-tier outlets. Record of scholarly products demonstrates leadership and/or independence in publications. Products are published with students, faculty, and/or community partners (principals, teachers, practitioners, directors, etc.).

Standard 2 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:
1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

Standard 3: Faculty member’s record of dissemination of scholarship / research is presented in diverse venues and media that have impact on practice and others. REQUIRED

Faculty member provides evidence of...
Refereed and invited conference and formal presentations. May also show evidence of other forms of research dissemination (e.g. websites, webinars, editorials, podcasts, etc.) that are not published or in more traditional written formats (e.g. technical reports, white papers, etc.).

Standard 3 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:
1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

Standard 4: Faculty member has impact on practice in community, state-wide and/or nationally. OPTIONAL

Faculty member provides evidence of...
Engaging in activities that make a one’s scholarship/research relevant external to the COE that have an impact on scholarship/research practice and scholarship/research partnerships in the community (local, state, national, and/or international levels, and is recognized for quality of scholarship/research work and influence through special scholarship/research appointments and invitations.

Standard 4 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:
1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

Standard 5: Faculty member seeks internal and external funding/resources to support teaching and/or research /scholarship. OPTIONAL

Faculty member provides evidence of...
Evidence of efforts to secure internal and external funding/resources directed to supporting (when opportunities are available) teaching or scholarship activities and/or research and scholarly activities, with a growing emphasis on external funding.

Standard 5 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:
1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)

B. Faculty Member’s Self-assessment
Overall, my scholarship and research (check one):

______ Does Not Meet Expectations – Provides unconvincing and/or no evidence of meeting the criteria of scholarship and research Standards 1-3.

______ Partially Meets Expectations – Provides marginal evidence of meeting the criteria in scholarship/research Standards 1-3.

______ Meets Expectations – Provides sufficient evidence of meeting the criteria in scholarship/research Standards 1-3 and may have evidence of small contributions in the criteria for Standards 4 and/or 5.

______ Meaningfully Surpasses Expectations – Provides evidence of annual accomplishments that exceed the criteria in scholarship/research Standards 1-3 and/or evidence of substantial achievement in Standards 4 and/or 5.

______ Extraordinary – Provides evidence of truly exceptional performance in meeting the criteria in scholarship/research Standards 1-3 and Standards 4 and/or 5.

Additional Information/Rationale for Self-Assessment Summary Rating:

Service

NOTE: If a faculty member is compensated through salary and/or time for service activities, those activities should be clearly documented as such and taken into consideration when evaluating service activities. Over time, a candidate is expected to have a record of achievement across all four aspects of service.

A. Summer 2016 Service

Do not complete if you did not teach in the summer.

At Seattle University, summer teaching carries an expectation for service to your program and/or the college. Please provide information about the activities, projects or tasks for which you were responsible during the summer quarter.
B. Service Goals/Accomplishments by Standard

*During the self-assessment process,* list and describe your accomplishments by standard/criteria and professional goals for the respective academic year (please indicate N/A when pertinent). In the reflection section please include information regarding the time demands, scope of work, and outcomes of your service accomplishments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Faculty member provides Service to the program/college. REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member provides evidence of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating collaboratively in service to the mission and strategic goals of the program and college, promoting the mission and vision of the COE, contributing to increasing the college’s reputation, improving the college’s culture and program quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Faculty member provides Service to the university. OPTIONAL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member provides evidence of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in service to the university that promotes the mission and vision of the university and contributes to increasing the quality of university culture, a positive image of the CoE within the university citizenry, the effectiveness of self-governance, the quality of university programs and the reputation of the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3: Faculty member provides Service to the profession. OPTIONAL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member provides evidence of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in service to enhance the profession and bring recognition and distinction to Seattle University and COE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Faculty member provides Service to the community/partners. OPTIONAL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member provides evidence of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates volunteer service that is not primarily connected to teaching and/or scholarship/research to community or governmental organizations, partners, and/or individuals that aligns with the mission of the COE or Seattle University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3 Accomplishments/Details/Reflections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Please insert or delete rows as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Faculty Member’s Self-assessment
* Opportunities and expectations for providing service beyond the program/college level is influenced by several factors that include years of service, rank, and opportunities. Therefore, service can vary from one year to another, be focused in one or multiple areas, and fluctuate terms of intensity across time – all of which may or may not be within the faculty member’s influence. In recognition of workload allocations, it is expected that a faculty member will generally devote about 20% of one’s time overall to service-related activities.

Overall, my service (check one):

______ Does Not Meet Expectations – Provides unconvincing and/or no evidence of meeting the criteria in service Standard 1 or Standards 2-4.

______ Partially Meets Expectations – Provides marginal evidence of meeting the criteria in service Standard 1 or Standards 2-4.

______ Meets Expectations – Provides sufficient evidence of meeting the criteria of the service Standard 1 and has evidence of small contributions in Standards 2, 3, and/or 4.

______ Meaningfully Surpasses Expectations – Provides evidence of annual accomplishments that exceed the criteria in service Standard 1 and/or evidence of substantial achievement in Standards 2, 3, and/or 4. Accomplishments also reveal significant amount of time spent in service.

______ Extraordinary – Provides evidence of truly exceptional performance in meeting the criteria of service Standard 1 and Standards 2, 3, and/or 4. Accomplishments also reveal extraordinary amounts of time spent in service.

Additional Information/Rationale for Self-Assessment Summary Rating:

**Administrative and/or Stipend Work**

In the space below, please describe the purpose/outcomes/accomplishments of administrative work related to course buy-outs, grant releases, stipends, etc., in which you engaged over the academic year. For each type of course buy-out indicate the number of
releases (and associated credit hours) you received during the academic year. If you received a stipend, please describe the purpose of the stipend prior to delineating your outcomes/accomplishments.

**Workload Assignment for Subsequent Academic Year**

**A. Workload Weightings Proposed by the Faculty Member:**

Teaching: ____%  Research and Scholarship ______%  Service _____%

Administrative Responsibilities (if applicable – note that this is for approved course-released duties only) ______% - describe responsibilities and source of support:

**B. Approved Workload Weightings by Dean:**

Teaching: ____%  Research and Scholarship ______%  Service _____%

Administrative Responsibilities (if applicable – note that this is for approved course-released duties or stipends only) ______%
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APPENDIX A: TEACHING STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE EXAMPLES

**Standard 1: Faculty member participates in curriculum development, program planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement activities.**

- Reviews and improves/enhances program curriculum.
- Designs new program curriculum.
- Develops/significant revises (based on data analysis) outcome assessments;
- Formally evaluates program curriculum based on data analysis (i.e., comps, outcome assessments);
- Conducts program level evaluation of students;
- Develops program level curriculum tracks (e.g. certificates, tracks, and/or minors).

**Standard 2: Faculty member participates in course development and design.**

- Documents updated, annual course content that maintains currency with the literature, program outcomes and competencies, and responds to student or peer feedback.
- Participates in interdisciplinary collaboration regarding course content.
- Integrates technology into the implementation of courses consistent with expectations of the program/college.
- Documents initiatives to bring innovation and creative approaches to teaching.
- Participates in creating new courses aligned with program outcomes.
- Mentors junior faculty in course development

**Standard 3: Faculty member’s instruction demonstrates high quality and effective teaching across multiple, ‘best practice’ criteria. REQUIRED**

- Provides evidence of innovation and creativity in teaching.
- Provides evidence of syllabi aligned to standards, current, relevant, and sequenced for effective instructional experiences.
- Conducts analysis of course outcomes (e.g., course exams) with a purpose of continuous teaching improvement.
- Course and instructor ratings based on student evaluation data; course and instructor data reflects ratings at or above the college/university averages, improved ratings over time, and/or uses evaluation data to improve instruction.
- Evidence of positive peer evaluation of teaching for the purpose of teaching improvement.
- Uses technology and diverse media (videos, software, etc.) where appropriate.
- Receives teaching awards.
- Utilizes the University’s professional development resources (i.e., Center for Faculty Development, CDLI trainings, etc.).
- Collaborates with colleagues for professional development and/or improvement (i.e., sharing information, expertise, and resources with colleagues).
- Uses of teaching videos as evidence of reflective practice.

**Standard 4: Faculty member provides quality advising and professional mentoring.**

- Provides data on availability and accessibility of student advising.
- Provides evidence of giving students timely and accurate information.
- Demonstrates currency of knowledge on program changes and status.
- Demonstrates knowledge of and sharing relevant resources.
- Contributes to effective advisement SYSTEMS and RESOURCES (handbooks, websites, collaborative online forums, listservs, online forms, checklists, etc.).
- Shows a record of success with students’ perceptions of advising.
- Works with doctoral students by serving on their committees when possible.
- Directs independent studies.
- Mentors students for post-degree jobs/doctoral programs/etc.
- Assists alumni in their professional development.
- Creates and/or support student groups.
- Seeks funding to support student involvement in research and service.

**Standard 5: Faculty member has impact on practice in community, state-wide and/or nationally.**

- Presents at practitioner conferences.
- Provides workshops and/or training.
- Serves as an external program reviewer.
- Is invited to conduct a workshop or training.
- Participates in practitioner action-research.
- Earns professional teaching honors and awards.
- Receives awards from local, state or national organizations for teaching contributions to the field.

**Standard 6: Faculty member may engage in teaching scholarship.**

*Note: Refereed (blind reviewed) published inquiry on teaching should be listed in the research/scholarship.*

- Generates publicly available, published, instructional products - e.g., curriculum, assessments, lesson plans, chapter supplements, online materials, handbooks, modules, etc.).
- Evidence of scholarship of teaching publications that have not undergone peer-review.
- Evidence of national reputation through activities such as invitations for:
  - Consulting
  - Invitations for upper level (Symposia, colloquia, keynote) presentations on teaching
APPENDIX B: SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE EXAMPLES

Standard 1: Faculty member has constructed focused, sustained, agenda of empirical and non-empirical scholarship.

Description of scholarship statement should define clearly the:

- problems/issues being addressed;
- significance of addressing such problem(s) for the discipline, field, and/or practice;
- conceptual and/or theoretical frameworks that serve as a foundation to the work; and,
- a clear trajectory over time of a concise research agenda.

Documents activities across the research continuum
Evidences rigorous, systematic methodologies through activities
Documents data analyses which supports and links to findings and interpretations

Standard 2: Faculty member demonstrates a record of high quality, publication productivity.

- Vita illustrates a record of publications over time, with an average of two publications per year (1-3 year window & includes articles, books, chapters, technical reports).
- Record of publications should:
  - provide solid evidence of the focused research agenda;
  - be generally uninterrupted.
- A growing proportion of work is published in national outlets
- Work includes peer-reviewed outlets.
- A significant proportion of products document the impact of the program of research.
- Published research products with students, new faculty and/or community partners (principals, teachers, practitioners, directors, etc.) that illustrate leadership and mentorship.
- Independently published research products.
- Publications indicate a balance over time of practice-based and research-based products (if the candidate chooses to publish about practice).
- A significant proportion of publications are in research-based outlets.
- There is a clear trajectory of advancement or inclusion of mid-to upper-tier outlets.

Standard 3: Faculty member’s record of dissemination of scholarship / research is presented in diverse venues and media that have impact on practice and others.

- Evidence of refereed conference or other formal presentations
- Ongoing, updated, research-related websites accessed by the profession and community,
- Long-term contributions of research to blogs and other social media outlets,
- Creates executive reports
- Artistic and creative endeavors
### Standard 4: Faculty member has impact on practice in community, state-wide and/or nationally.

- Building a national reputation for scholarship and research through activities such as invitations for:
  - Consulting
  - Leading national conferences
  - Invitations for upper level (symposia, colloquia, keynote) research presentations.
- Invitations from peers, as well as more senior scholars, to participate in conference symposia.
- Invitations to participate in material development.
- Invitations to present at research-focused conferences, meetings and other organizational activities.
- Professional honors and awards for scholarship and research.
- Awards from local, state or national organizations for intellectual contributions to the field.
- Research/Scholarship Awards
- Community peer reviews of effectiveness of scholarly methods and high impact on community issues.
- Community or Business scholarship awards
- Research publications chosen for recognition

### Standard 5: Faculty member seeks internal and external funding/resources to support teaching and/or research/scholarship.

- Submitted proposals to state, federal or private foundations for externally funded projects
- A record of securing funding external to the university.
- A record of securing funding internal to the college or university
APPENDIX C: SERVICE STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE EXAMPLES

Note: If a faculty member is compensated through salary and/or time for service activities, those activities should be clearly documented as such and taken into consideration when evaluating the quantity of service activities. Paid work external to the university is not considered ‘service’. If a faculty member is compensated for work external to the university through salary and/or time, paid activities should not be considered as service (e.g. paid consulting services). Paid external professional activities/self-employment should not be conflated with service and should not be conducted in a manner that impacts the expectations of one’s full-time position at Seattle University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Faculty member provides Service to the program/college.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‣ Exhibits participation or leadership across organizational activities at the program or school levels (chairs committees, committee membership, serves as special point person for program function, leads ad hoc or task force work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Takes lead or participates in the process and outcomes associated with program evaluation for continuous improvement and accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Takes lead or participates in the life of the program (e.g., sponsors/ advises student, faculty, and other university groups, revises student handbooks, participates in student meetings [e.g., group advisory meetings, orientations and student admissions meetings]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Takes lead or participates in inter-professional activities that advance the program/college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Faculty member provides Service to the university.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‣ Participates in university committees or is involved in university work and initiatives (e.g., reviewing internal grants, participating in accreditation activities, serves on ad hoc task forces, assumes active role in graduation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Volunteers for student, faculty and other stakeholder activities (e.g. recruitment, serves on program reviews, research symposia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Takes lead or participates in inter-professional activities that advance the college/university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Supports Dean’s development activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3: Faculty member provides Service to the profession.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‣ Provides service to state, national or international professional research or teaching communities (e.g. serves as program reviewer, member of an award committee, contributes to a national newsletter, assumes executive role in board of directors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Serves as discussant or chair for research/teaching conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Reviews manuscripts for journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Serves as a guest editor or co-editor of a journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Evaluates state or federal grant proposals, conferences, or book proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Takes lead in the organization of conferences or symposia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Serves as a chair of professional organization boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Holds service awards or recognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Faculty member provides Service to the community/ partners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Leads workshops
• Consults with community organizations/partners.
• Participates in advocacy efforts.
• Provides pro bono professional services related to academic discipline.
• Participates on a community organization/school board.