Section 1. Goals and Definitions for Professional Development School & Partnership School Relationships.

A. Goals: Oswego State University seeks collaborative relationships among school and university-based educators, preservice candidates, and preschool through grade 12 (P-12) students that will:
1. promote authentic learning by all P-12 students to meet the New York State Learning Standards; and
2. prepare preservice candidates to be socially-conscious catalysts for change who create and sustain school environments where excellence is cherished and social justice flourishes, as described by the School of Education’s Conceptual Framework; and
3. provide sustained professional development opportunities for school and university-based educators to enhance their knowledge, practice, and skills in reflection, collaboration, and leadership to promote authentic learning for all students; and
4. use a process of joint inquiry to identify and address the diverse learning needs of all P-12 students, candidates, and school and university-based faculty.

B. A professional development school (PDS):
1. is committed to teaching for social justice and continuous authentic learning for P-12 students, preservice candidates, and school and university-based educators;
2. is committed to implementing research-based best practices in areas that are critical to enhanced P-12 student learning and excellent teacher and pupil personnel preparation (e.g., authentic learning in the content areas, literacy education, special education, student services, teaching for social justice, preservice educator program design and implementation), through a collaborative process of self-reflection and joint inquiry-based decision-making;
3. is committed to enhancing the learning experiences of preservice candidates in the school environment;
4. has committed resources to the partnership between the school and the college, including the identification of:
   a. a team of school-based educators who have agreed to serve as PDS facilitators; and
   b. at least one School of Education faculty member who has agreed to serve as a PDS liaison.
5. has a PDS management team composed of the school-based facilitators, the School of Education liaison(s), and other school and university-based educators; and
6. has met the 2001 NCATE PDS Standards for a “beginning” professional development school (see Sections 2 and 3).

C. A professional development partnership school (PDPS):
1. has some or many of the core characteristics of a professional development school in at least one significant and coherent organizational segment of the school;
2. has established a working relationship among a team of school-based educators and at least one School of Education faculty member;
3. is committed to implementing research-based best practices in areas that are critical to enhanced P-12 student learning and excellent teacher and pupil personnel preparation (e.g., authentic learning in the content areas, literacy education, special education, student services, teaching for social justice, preservice educator program design and implementation); and
4. may be working toward meeting the 2001 NCATE PDS Standards for a “beginning” professional development school (see Section 2).
D. A **university-based PDS liaison**:  
1. is a School of Education faculty member;  
2. receives the equivalent of at least 25% assigned time or extra service compensation;  
3. develops and implements a high quality professional agenda in the PDS related to teaching, scholarship, and/or service that is supported and valued by the School of Education within the university reward structure described by the *Policies of the Board of Trustees*; and  
4. has the following responsibilities:  
   a. serves on the PDS management team;  
   b. engages in joint inquiry with school-based educators at the PDS;  
   c. facilitates communication between the PDS and the School of Education by attending faculty meetings in the School of Education;  
   d. supports the appropriate preservice candidates placed in the PDS; and  
   e. collaborates to meet the professional development needs of school and university-based educators at the PDS.

E. The team of **school-based PDS facilitators**:  
1. includes at least one full-time educator at the school;  
2. receives release time and/or a stipend (see Section 2, Standard V, Part D); and  
3. has the following responsibilities at the PDS:  
   a. serves on the PDS management team;  
   b. engages in joint inquiry with university-based educators at the PDS;  
   c. facilitates communication between school and the School of Education;  
   d. supports the appropriate preservice candidates placed in the PDS; and  
   e. collaborates to meet the professional development needs of school and university-based educators at the PDS.

---

Section 2. **Criteria for Designation as a Professional Development School Affiliated with the SUNY Oswego School of Education** (based on the Beginning Level of the NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools; shaded areas are modifications of the 2001 NCATE PDS Standards).

**NCATE PDS Standard I. Learning Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Supports Multiple Learners | • PDS participants plan an environment that simultaneously supports the learning of all P-12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals.  
• Their plans include the creation of field experiences and clinical practice to provide candidates with opportunities for full immersion in the learning community, professional development opportunities for faculty and other professionals, and an inquiry orientation to improve P-12 learning for all students. |
| B. Work and Practice are Inquiry-Based and Focused on Learning. | • The PDS participants articulate a shared goal of improving and assessing the learning of all P-12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals.  
• They express the belief that action research and other forms of inquiry are valuable tools in improving instruction. |
| C. Develops a Common Shared Professional Vision of Teaching and Learning Grounded in Research and Practitioner Knowledge that Fully Supports the SOE Conceptual Framework | • PDS partners have a vision that includes an articulated set of beliefs about teaching and learning for all P-12 students, candidates, and PDS partners.  
• They have a plan to support all P-12 student and professional learning in the context of practice.  
• A majority of site personnel demonstrate a commitment to developing educators who value, practice, and implement the SUNY Oswego School of Education Conceptual Framework themes of authentic learning, social justice, knowledge, practice, reflection, collaboration and leadership. |
| D. Serves as Instrument of Change | • PDS partners envision the PDS as an instrument for school and university improvement.  
• School district and university support the PDS partnership and its potential to provide exemplars of inquiry-based practice and to impel policy changes. |
| E. Extended Learning Community is Fostered | • Although the relationship between the school and university may engage PDS partners in a limited fashion, there are plans for extending the learning community.  
• There are plans created collaboratively for creating a forum to share practices and policies with other PDSs in the partnership and affiliated schools. |
### NCATE PDS Standard II. Accountability and Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Develops Professional Accountability | • PDS partners have a plan in place for the collaborative development and prioritization of important questions about P-12 student, candidate, faculty and other professionals’ learning.  
• They also have a plan in place for using local state, and national standards for assessing all P-12 students, candidates, faculty and other professionals’ learning. |
| B. Assures Public Accountability | • The school faculty reports student achievement data to families and community.  
• PDS partners explore ways to collect and report evidence related to school and university faculty knowledge, skills, and dispositions.  
• PDS partners discuss ways to engage families, policymakers, and the business community in shared responsibility for learning of P-12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. |
| C. Sets Participation Criteria | • PDS partners develop explicit criteria for PDS participants at the institutional and individual levels.  
• Partner institutions are accredited or planning for accreditation. PDS partners identify skills and knowledge for faculty and plan training.  
• Partners discuss criteria for candidates’ admission, program completion, and certification, and the relationship of these criteria to national standards. |
| D. Develops Assessments, Collect Information, and Use Results | • School faculty collect some data about P-12 student achievement and examine the impact of current practices and norms on student learning.  
• The PDS partners’ primary focus is on evaluation of candidates’ skills, knowledge, and disposition in relationship to national standards.  
• Candidate assessment is seen as a primary responsibility of university faculty, with some input from school faculty. |
| E. Engages with the PDS Context | • PDS partners have begun to explore the institutional and community supports and constraints to PDS work. Partners are aware of the need to engage with institutions and policymakers to influence policies.  
• PDS partner institutions have begun to develop inter-institutional relationships and connections with policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work. |

### NCATE PDS Standard III. Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Engages in Joint Work | • PDS partners collaboratively develop a plan for joint work that shapes the learning of candidates as well as all P-12 students.  
• The plan supports collaborative decision-making approaches and strategies to implement the work of PDS  
• The plan also delineates shared institutional goals and leadership and resource commitments. |
| B. Designs Roles and Structures to Enhance Collaboration and Develop Parity of Agency | • The development of new roles and the necessary reallocation of resources are discussed and agreed to by the PDS participants.  
• PDS participants agree to operate the PDS in ways that recognize and encourage parity among the partners. |
| C. Systematically Recognizes and Celebrates Joint Work and Contributions of Each Partner | • Joint work in the PDS is expressed as a value of the PDS participants and institutional leaders. |
## NCATE PDS Standard IV. Diversity and Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Ensures Equitable Opportunities to Learn.** | • PDS partners and candidates examine the gaps in achievement among diverse groups, including those based on ethnic, racial, socio-economic and gender differences.  
• PDS partners and candidates examine the curricula of the university and school programs in light of issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners. PDS partners begin to expand their curricula to include multicultural, gender-fair, inclusive, and global perspectives.  
• PDS partners and candidates begin to engage in learning experiences that allow them to develop the proficiencies to support all P-12 students with exceptionalities. |
| **B. Evaluates Policies and Practices to Support Equitable Learning. Outcomes.** | • School and university PDS partners recognize that their curricula, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies affect outcomes for diverse P-12 students and candidates.  
• PDS partners examine multiple and varied assessment approaches to measure learning in the PDS.  
• PDS partners engage families and community members from diverse populations in support of P-12 learning. |
| **C. Recruits and Supports Diverse Participants.** | • The PDS partner institutions begin to develop practices and policies to recruit and retain diverse candidates, faculty and other professionals to engage in PDS work.  
• PDS partners examine the opportunities they provide for candidates, faculty, and other professionals to develop and demonstrate their capacity to work well with diverse learners and their families. |

## NCATE PDS Standard V. Structures, Resources, and Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Establishes Governance and Support Structures.** | • The PDS partner institutions agree to form a professional development school and to develop a joint mission statement.  
• Institutional leaders, both faculty and administration, participate in early discussions and decisions about PDS work. |
| **B. Ensures Progress Toward Goals.** | • PDS partners articulate partnership goals that tie in to local needs and are consistent with the mission of PDSs. The PDS partners agree to place all P-12 students’ needs at the center of PDS work. |
| **C. Creates PDS Roles** | • New roles emerge in the PDS partner institutions for those involved in PDS work.  
• PDS partners plan professional development opportunities for faculty and other professionals to develop leadership, inquiry, and other boundary-spanning skills. |
| **D. Resources** | • Partner institutions identify the kinds of resources needed to support PDS work.  
• Partner institutions have a commitment to incorporating PDS roles into regular job descriptions. |
| **E. Uses Effective Communications** | • PDS participants see communication as a key goal. They recognize the importance of clear communication mechanisms. |
Section 3. Procedure for Becoming a Professional Development School.

A. Letter of Intent:
   1. The building administrator and the faculty members from the school and the university who have agreed to participate in the co-application process shall submit a letter of intent to the Dean of the School of Education ("Dean") and the appropriate School District Superintendent ("Superintendent").
   2. The Letter of Intent shall:
      a. indicate that both parties believe that the school partnership has met the criteria to become a professional development school affiliated with SUNY Oswego;
      b. outline the basis for this assertion; and
      c. propose a timetable for completing the PDS Co-Application Process and Joint Review Process.

B. PDS Co-Application Process:
   1. After positive review and feedback on the Letter of Intent from both the Dean and the Superintendent, the PDS Application shall be completed collaboratively by the building administrator, school-based educator(s), and the university-based educator(s).
   2. The PDS Application shall be submitted to the Dean and to the Superintendent, who will initiate a joint review process.

C. Joint Review Process:
   1. An application to become a PDS affiliated with the SUNY Oswego School of Education will be evaluated by a PDS Review Committee consisting of two members appointed by the Dean, two members appointed by the Superintendent, and one outside expert jointly appointed by the Dean and Superintendent. Personnel from the proposed PDS building, the School of Education faculty liaison(s), and others with potential conflict of interest shall not serve on the Joint Review Committee.

D. Designation as a Professional Development School.
   1. The Dean and Superintendent will review the findings and recommendations of the PDS Review Committee. The Dean has the final authority for designating professional development schools for the School of Education, in consultation with the Provost and President of the State University of New York at Oswego. Likewise, the Superintendent has the final authority for designating professional development schools for the School District, in consultation with the Board of Education.
   2. The School of Education shall not designate any school as a PDS that does not have explicit school district approval. Likewise, the School District shall not designate any school as a PDS that does not have explicit School of Education approval.


A. A collaborative self-study process shall be completed by each PDS on a biannual basis to demonstrate that the PDS continues to meet the beginning level of the 2001 NCATE PDS Standards, and is moving toward the developing level or beyond.

B. A summary of the self-study findings with an action plan for continued improvement shall be submitted to the Dean and Superintendent for review.

C. If the self-study review is unsatisfactory, the Dean and Superintendent shall develop a collaborative plan to support, intervene, or terminate the PDS.
Section 1. Goals of the Professional Development Partnership School (PDPS) Model.

The School of Education (SOE) at SUNY Oswego seeks to establish and sustain collaborative relationships among school and university-based educators and preservice candidates to benefit preschool through grade 12 (P-12) students. Such relationships may be organized as professional development partnership schools as described herein, or formally structured as professional development schools (PDS) as described in the School of Education’s Professional Development School Policies. The goals of both kinds of partnerships are to:

A. Promote authentic learning by all P-12 students to meet the New York State Learning Standards;
B. Allow for enhanced reflection and professional growth as a result of cooperative efforts among college faculty, school administrators and personnel, classroom teachers, and preservice candidates;
C. Have a significant positive impact on the educational experiences of undergraduate and graduate candidates in teacher education and pupil personnel preparation; and
D. Provide sustained professional development opportunities for school and university-based educators via a process of joint inquiry and the implementation of research-based best practices.

Section 2. A Professional Development Partnership School (PDPS):

A. Consistently hosts 8-10 student teachers per semester (4-5 per quarter).
B. Has some or many of the core characteristics of a professional development school in at least one significant and coherent organizational segment of the school.
C. Is committed to implementing research-based best practices in areas that are critical to enhanced P-12 student learning and excellent teacher and pupil personnel preparation (e.g., authentic learning in the content areas, literacy education, special education, student services, teaching for social justice, preservice educator program design and implementation).
D. May be working toward meeting the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Professional Development School Standards at the “beginning” level.
E. Is staffed by a Professional Development Coordinator (PDC), a part-time or fulltime School of Education faculty member who is permanently assigned to the partnership school. The PDC is likely to be an experienced retired teacher or school administrator, who develops a close relationship to the full-time faculty in the School of Education. The responsibilities of the PDC are to:

1. Consistently supervise the student teachers placed at the partnership school each quarter. The PDC is paid by SUNY Oswego for this service at the negotiated rate.
2. Spend the equivalent of an additional half-day per week (during two college semesters per year) in the partnership school working with teachers, the Principal, candidates, and P-12 students to implement a mutually-agreed upon professional development partnership plan. The PDC receives a stipend of $1,250/semester from the school district for this service.
3. Submit an annual report and a professional development partnership plan by May 1 of each year to the Superintendent and Dean of the School of Education. The annual report must follow the format provided by the SOE’s PDS Specialist in consultation with the School of Education’s Professional Development Committee. The sustained, inquiry-based professional development partnership plan must focus on P-12 student achievement and the professional growth of preservice and inservice educators; it must be collaboratively developed with the teachers and Principal at the partnership school and approved by all stakeholders.

4. Is supported by a PDS Specialist, a School of Education faculty member assigned by the Dean as part of his/her regular workload to:
   a. Meet on a regular basis with the PDC, and the teachers and Principal in the partnership school(s) as needed, to promote effective collaboration;
   b. Facilitate the implementation of the professional development partnership plan;
   c. Support the production of the annual report for each partnership school site.

Section 3. The Role of the School District in Supporting a Professional Development Partnership School.

A. The Superintendent, Principal and the teachers in a designated professional development partnership school (PDPS) collaboratively commit to hosting 8-10 student teachers per semester on a consistent basis. The PDPS must be identified by the Superintendent at least one semester prior to the anticipated placement of student teachers.

B. The Principal and teachers in the PDPS work with the Professional Development Coordinator (PDC) to identify and implement a mutually agreed upon, sustained, inquiry-based professional development partnership plan focused on P-12 student achievement and the professional growth of preservice and inservice teachers.

C. The school district commits $5,000 per year to the PDPS effort: $2,500 per year to pay the PDC and $2,500 per year to be used by PDPS participants to achieve the goals of the professional development partnership plan.

Section 4. The Role of the School of Education in Supporting a Professional Development Partnership School.

A. Upon the designation of a specific professional development partnership school by the Superintendent, the Dean of the School of Education (or designee) will hire and assign a part-time or full-time faculty member to supervise student teachers on a consistent basis, and serve as the Professional Development Coordinator (PDC).

B. The Dean of the School of Education will designate a PDS Specialist to provide training and support for the PDC, and the Principal and teachers as needed, to implement the mutually agreed upon, sustained, inquiry-based professional development partnership plan focused on P-12 student achievement and the professional growth of preservice and inservice teachers.
Preamble. The designation of Graduate Faculty member in the School of Education is a reaffirmation of the School’s commitment to the principles of human diversity and to excellence in teaching and scholarly activity. The criteria for the School of Education Graduate Faculty outline standards that promote the selection and continuing growth of graduate faculty within the School of Education and which are consistent with those of major national accrediting bodies.

Section 1. Criteria for SUNY Oswego School of Education Graduate Faculty.

A. Graduate faculty possess a terminal degree from an accredited institution of higher education that is directly relevant to the instructional assignments of the faculty member.

B. Graduate faculty have a minimum of one year of full-time experience in teaching at the graduate or undergraduate level, and provide evidence of effectiveness/success in their past teaching assignments.

C. Part-time graduate faculty meet the requirements for full-time graduate faculty.

D. Graduate faculty with the responsibility for supervision of school-based field experiences have had training in supervision, as well as professional experiences in the school setting in which that supervision takes place.

E. Graduate faculty remain informed about scholarly work in the areas in which they teach.

F. Graduate faculty are actively involved in professional associations, and provide education-related services at the local, state, national and/or international levels in their areas of expertise and assignment.

G. Graduate faculty regularly obtain and, where appropriate, use feedback from students, peers, and duly authorized review committees to improve the quality of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service within the School of Education.

H. Graduate faculty demonstrate both theoretical and applied competence in their area(s) of expertise through significant, successful professional experience in the area(s) in which they instruct.

I. Graduate faculty demonstrate ongoing commitment to facilitating/promoting the growth, development, and progress of graduate students by teaching at least one graduate level course within a two year period and maintaining within the department a proportional share of the graduate student advisement load.

J. Graduate faculty are committed to graduate programs as demonstrated by ongoing, active involvement in activities such as supervision of graduate student projects/theses, summer instruction, and participation on appropriate School of Education and College committees (particularly those impacting on graduate education).
K. An active program of scholarly and professional activity is maintained by graduate faculty. Scholarly and professional activity includes such endeavors as:
1. Publications in scholarly journals
2. Original research
3. Grant-writing
4. Holding office in professional organizations
5. Professional practice within the area of instructional expertise
6. Presentations at professional conferences
7. Consultation and public speaking in the area of professional expertise
8. Program and curricular development

Section 2. Exceptions to Requirements. In special circumstances, exceptions to the requirements in Section 1, A-C may be made for individuals who demonstrate exceptional qualities and/or professional achievement that clearly enhance the quality of the graduate program to which they are appointed and for whom fully-qualified, alternative appointees are unavailable. In such cases, the department must forward its recommendation to the School of Education Faculty Council with a description of the efforts made to find a qualified applicant and a description of the unique qualifications which warrant that the appointment outside of established guidelines for graduate faculty be approved. Persons appointed pursuant to this section shall be designated Associate Graduate Faculty.

Section 3. Criteria for Cooperating Teachers and Other Field-Based Supervisors in Graduate Programs (School District Employees).

A. Cooperating teachers and other on-site, field-based supervisors of graduate candidates in applied settings have a minimum of three years of experience in the area in which they are supervising, are certified for the areas in which they are teaching or working, and are recommended by the appropriate school administrator.

B. Exceptions may be made for otherwise qualified cooperating teachers and field-based supervisors in school settings where teacher shortages exist.

Section 4. Compliance Procedures.

A. Within each department that offers graduate programming within the School of Education, a graduate faculty member will be selected by the department to act as coordinator of graduate studies for that department. The coordinator, in conjunction with the department chair (graduate coordinator and chair may be the same person), annually reviews the records of current or prospective appointees to the graduate faculty with respect to adherence to the criteria for appointment to the graduate faculty.

B. Appointment to the graduate faculty is made by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the Dean of the School of Education. Credentials of prospective nominees are reviewed by the appropriate chair and graduate coordinator. From the chair and coordinator, the appointment form is forwarded to the Dean of Education for his/her approval. The Dean of Education may refer the application to the Faculty Council for its opinion on the qualifications of the candidate for graduate status. The Dean of Education then sends his/her recommendation forward to the Dean of Graduate Studies for his/her action.
Preamble. The following workload policies apply to all full-time and part-time faculty, except where specifically noted.

Section 1. Class Size

A. Enrollments for courses in the School of Education typically are limited to 50 students in lower division undergraduate courses, 30 in upper division courses, and 20 in graduate courses. Instructionally based rationales exist for lower enrollments in some courses. For example, laboratory sections may establish lower enrollment to meet safety guidelines; writing intensive courses and field-based courses requiring student supervision may also have lower enrollment limits.

B. Double workload credit for teaching a single large section of a required course will be awarded if the total number of students is greater than 85 for lower division undergraduate courses, 50 for upper division undergraduate courses, and 35 for graduate courses.

Section 2. Number of Course Preparations. The number of course preparations is not to exceed 3 per semester.

Section 3. Number of Advisees

A. The wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs with the School of Education place varying advisement demands on faculty. However, advisement responsibility within a department must be equitably distributed among the faculty. The department chair and faculty in each department determine the equivalent advisement loads across programs, and reasonable advisement expectations for all faculty.

B. As a rule, part-time instructors are not assigned advisees. Whether full-time temporary faculty are assigned advisees is the prerogative of the respective department.

C. Faculty with time assigned for advisement coordination usually have proportionally larger numbers of advisees than other faculty.

Section 4. Teaching Load and Workload.

A. State and Institutional Requirements

1. Section 52.21(b)(2)(i)(h) of the New York State Education Department Commissioner’s Regulations requires that “faculty teaching assignments in teacher education programs shall not exceed 12 semester hours per semester for undergraduate courses, or 9 semester hours per semester for graduate courses, or 21 semester hours per academic year for faculty who teach a combination of graduate and undergraduate courses.”

2. The SUNY Oswego Faculty & Professional Staff Handbook states “the instructional portion of faculty workload assignments for full-time faculty at the College is generally equivalent to 12 semester hours per semester during the academic year” (Section 6, page 1). No distinctions are made for the level of courses taught.
3. The criteria for all personnel decisions in the School of Education are based on criteria of the Policies of the Board of Trustees – mastery of subject matter, teaching, research, service, and continuing growth. No distinctions are made for the level of courses taught. Specifically, expectations for research, service, and quality of instruction for faculty teaching graduate and undergraduate courses are identical in the School of Education. (See the School of Education Scholarship Policy.)

B. Workload in the School of Education

1. Overall workload equity should prevail for all faculty members across the School of Education. That is, the instructional load plus research and service effort – i.e., overall workload – should generally be equitable for all faculty who teach graduate or undergraduate courses or some combination.

2. The figure graphically represents these workload equity expectations. Instructional load for all faculty in the School of Education is the equivalent of 12 semester hours per semester, represented by the circle divided into four sections. Undergraduate and graduate faculty members have the same overall workloads – instructional load or its equivalent, plus research and service – represented by the overall square area in the figure.

3. School of Education faculty are expected to spend significant time in one-to-one teaching interactions with candidates involved in projects and theses. They are also expected to spend significant time in the schools, creating relationships that support candidate learning. In recognition of this fact, all School of Education faculty should have a 9 sh teaching load. Thus, project and thesis advisement and/or school involvement is built into the typical faculty instructional assignment as the equivalent of one 3-sh course.

4. Faculty with teaching loads of less than 9 sh per semester generally have additional non-course-related assigned time responsibilities, as defined in Sections 10-12; teach large enrollment courses as described in Section 1; or are eligible for a course reduction due to a high rate of project/theses completion as defined in Section 5.

Section 5. Theses & Project Advisement. Faculty whose rate of project/theses completion over time is significantly higher than the average, and who do not otherwise have assigned time for graduate advisement, are eligible for a one course reduction in their subsequent teaching load as follows:

A. Faculty who complete 16 or more projects/theses in a 3-year period are eligible for a one course reduction in teaching load in the next academic year.

B. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the completion of projects/theses through departmental or Graduate Studies records, and to request such a course reduction in writing prior to the date when course schedules for the next semester are finalized. The chair of the department may postpone a project/thesis course reduction for one semester, pending resource availability.

Section 6. Summer Teaching. Faculty cannot be compelled to teach in the summer. However, in programs where the faculty has determined that summer course offerings are important to meet the needs of candidates, faculty are encouraged to teach in the summer.

Section 7. Student Teaching Ratios. Individual faculty members shall not supervise more than 18 student teachers per semester, or 4.5 student teachers per 0.25 teaching load per semester.

Section 8. Practicum Ratios.

A. The definition of practicum varies across disciplines, but in undergraduate programs that require practica, the average should be no more than 30 students to 1 faculty member per course, or fewer if required by applicable professional standards.
B. Graduate programs are expected to meet applicable professional standards. For those graduate programs not governed by professional standards, the department in consultation with the Dean shall determine the appropriate student/faculty ratio based upon warranted practice in the field.

Section 9. Internship Ratios.

A. The definition of internship varies across disciplines, but in undergraduate programs that require an internship, the ratio of students to teacher should be no more than 15:1 for a semester, or fewer if required by applicable professional standards.

B. In the graduate programs, the ratio of students to faculty varies according to differing instructional activities associated with the internship. The graduate programs are expected to meet applicable professional standards. For those graduate programs not governed by professional standards, the department in consultation with the Dean shall determine the appropriate ratio based upon warranted practice in the field.

Section 10. Independent Study. Faculty in the School of Education assume responsibility for supervising students for Independent Studies (on courses that bear credit for the student, but not for the faculty member) in a manner consistent with institutional policy.

Section 11. School or Site Involvement. Faculty shall strive to embed all professional education courses in the school setting, as is appropriate for the particular discipline. Therefore, faculty involvement in a school setting is generally viewed as part of the regular instructional load (see Section 4B). In the case of Professional Development School (PDS) initiatives, departments or the Dean may provide assigned time for participating faculty.

Section 12. Assigned Time. In general, assigned time for faculty depends on the size of the program, and specific programmatic needs. Assigned time may be granted for department chair, program coordinator, admissions coordinator, student teaching coordinator, advisement coordinator, coach and trainer. Responsibility for a grant or special project may also fall under this category.
Section 1. Definition of Scholarship.

The School of Education embraces a comprehensive definition of scholarship that is inclusive of the diverse creative and scholarly activities consistent with our mission of collaborating in partnerships with citizens of the world to develop, implement, and assess innovative, socially conscious educational programs for all learners. Though there is diversity within the school in terms of the types of scholarship recognized, there are salient commonalities across departments:

A. Consistent with the mission, scholarship should reflect the School’s commitment to exceptional teaching, and to collaborating with the public.

B. Scholars are current in their field as evidenced by reading widely, participating in professional and community associations and conferences, publishing in peer reviewed journals, and/or authoring book chapters or books.

C. Scholars also engage in grant writing to further our understanding of topics relating to education, research in their subject matter field, research that integrates theory and practice, curriculum development that is reported in the literature, and/or pedagogical innovations.

D. Third party validation, for example through peer review, or receiving a competitive grant or award, is necessary in assessing the contribution of one’s scholarship.

E. Internal evaluation of all scholarly activities conforms to the published Policies of the Board of Trustees.

Section 2. Promoting Scholarship for All

A. The School of Education faculty pursue scholarly endeavors that are both self-renewing and in alignment with the School’s overall mission. The administration of the School of Education is committed to acquiring and allocating adequate resources that foster the growth and development of exemplary teachers as scholars. Cogent examples of the various levels of administrative support provided include, but are not limited to exchanges and sabbaticals, joint appointments, graduate assistants, reduced teaching loads, travel funds, assigned time to develop long range departmental research agendas, laboratory equipment, and the development of personal growth contracts toward the attainment of tenure and promotion.

B. The School of Education promotes an esprit de corps among its faculty members, each of whom has an individual dedication to exceptional teaching as it contributes to advancing academic scholarship in their disciplines.
Section 1. Documentation. Faculty preparing material or consideration for Discretionary Salary Increases (DSI) should create two folders:

A. Case Presentation Folder

1. Annual summary covering the period under review, organized by the “Criteria for Personnel Decisions” in the Policies of the Board of Trustees and including brief characterizations of the significance of the activities. Faculty should use this outline for the presentation of their request to be considered for a Discretionary Salary Increase award.
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. A letter of intent accompanied by a brief summary documentation where appropriate to provide evidence in support of the faculty member’s performance as outlined above (e.g., teaching evaluation summaries, summary of assessment of innovative pedagogy, summary of scholarship and service, etc).

B. Supporting Source Material Folder

1. Journal articles, manuscripts, poster presentations
2. Course syllabi, exams, raw assessment data, raw teaching evaluations
3. Committee assignments and evaluation of committee work from committee chairs
4. Et cetera

Section 2. Procedures.

A. The Case Presentation Folder will be the only folder forwarded to the School of Education Personnel Committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. The Supporting Source Material Folder should be kept secure in the department chair’s office for review if required.

B. Source materials should be read in detail by the department chair and department review committee in making evaluative judgments of the strength of the case presented by each candidate. The department chair and department review committees are best able to evaluate a candidate’s scholarly record. Their obligation is to examine and authenticate the source materials and include evaluative comments in the letters of support that are sent forward along with the Case Presentation Folder.

C. Letters of support for each candidate from both the department chair and the department review committee should begin with a summary evaluation. Using the “Criteria for Personnel Decisions” in the Policies of the Board of Trustees, writers should also provide evaluative statements within criteria in a bulleted fashion indicating what was particularly illustrative of meritorious activity.
Section 1. Rationale.

A. The School of Education's Conceptual Framework emphasizes the importance of seven principles including authentic learning, social justice, knowledge, practice, reflection, collaboration & leadership. All faculty members in the unit should continually assess and reflect upon their professional practice as educators (reflection), and continually seek opportunities to work together and learn from one another (collaboration).

B. The Policies of the Board of Trustees (1998, Article XII, Title A) state that the purpose of evaluation shall be the appraisal of the extent to which each academic employee has met his or her professional obligations to the University. Continuing growth is one of the five criteria listed for consideration during evaluation of academic employees, and it is commonly demonstrated by keeping abreast of current developments in one's field and being able to successfully accept increased responsibility.

C. The Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education (NCATE, 2006 Edition) include one standard specific to faculty qualifications, performance and development (Standard 5). SUNY Oswego’s NCATE-accredited School of Education must utilize a systematic and comprehensive evaluation system that includes regular and comprehensive reviews of the professional education faculty's teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession.

Section 2. Evaluation Procedure. Pursuant to these tenets, the School of Education embraces a collegial view of performance evaluation that provides an avenue for all faculty to reflect, grow and improve as vital members of the academy, and as active contributors to SUNY Oswego's learner-centered community. With this goal firmly in mind:

A. Department Chairs in the School of Education will, at their first departmental faculty meeting in the fall semester, identify those faculty members on continuing appointment (tenured) who have not submitted materials supporting consideration for promotion or discretionary salary increase (DSI) within the previous two years. This first faculty meeting should occur not later than October 1st and not earlier than the date for departmental submission of DSI folders to the School of Education's peer review committee. (In years when DSI funds are not available, the first faculty meeting should not occur earlier than September 1st).

B. The Department Chair shall inform in writing those individuals identified that the following materials should be prepared for submission to her/his office not later than May 1st of the subsequent spring semester. If the department chair is the faculty member being reviewed, she/he will submit the above materials to the Dean of the School of Education by May 1st:

1. An updated and complete curriculum vita;

2. Student evaluations from not less than two classes (six preferred) taught by the faculty member during the previous two years (summer sessions included);

3. A written peer evaluation of at least one class session held during the current academic year [faculty are encouraged to invite peer review(s) from outside their own department, and even from outside the School of Education]; and
4. A brief reflective statement written by the faculty member that describes how the peer review process has informed his/her teaching effectiveness, and the extent to which it may have influenced or informed future scholarship or service.

C. The Department Chair will review the materials submitted by faculty members on continuing appointment and schedule a meeting with each of them prior to the end of May. This session will allow time for further reflection, formative assessment, and collegial discussion that is pertinent to the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service.

D. If any area(s) of concern arise as a result of the evaluation process, the faculty member and department chair will draft a mutually agreed upon plan for performance and development that spans two following two years.

E. All materials assembled and collected during this process shall be placed in the faculty members' personnel folders maintained in the department chair's office.

Section 5. Effective Date of Policy is September 1, 2003.