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SOLES Curriculum Committee

Department of Leadership Studies

• New course (Experimental, Info Only) LEAD 379- Leadership and the Global Pursuit of Social Innovation

• Drop Course LEAD 508- Marketing Nonprofit Organizations

• Revision LEAD 558- Leadership and the Dynamics of School Organization

• Revision MILS 102- Introduction to Leadership

• Revision MILS 302- Applied Team Leadership
SOLES Curriculum Committee

Department of Learning and Teaching

- Revision EDSP 375P/575P - Evidence Based Inclusive Practices Mild/Moderate 5-22
- Revision EDUC 375P/575P - Inclusive Curricula for Learners 5-22
Clinical Mental Health Counseling (Program Change)

• New Course COUN 502- Professional Orientation and Ethics
• New Course COUN 526- Group Counseling
• New Course COUN 540 Clinical Interviewing
• Revised Course COUN 542 Additions Counseling
• Expansion to 3 Units COUN 550- Advance Human Sexuality
• New Course COUN 555 Evidence Based Counseling Theory and Techniques
• New Course COUN 560 Evidence Based Counseling With Underserved Populations
Initiative #1 Addressing Societal Challenges

As a prominent education and human services school we must confront important human challenges. Through our Centers and Departments, we marshal academic expertise from across the disciplinary spectrum to produce research and programming of contemporary social relevance. Using evidence-based practices SOLES is uniquely positioned to contribute to the dialogue surrounding the challenges of: educating our citizenry for the workplace of the 21st century, meeting the leadership and management needs of the nonprofit and public sectors, addressing the social-emotional needs of our community through clinical work, and addressing teaching and learning issues locally, nationally and globally.

1. **Strengthen the Capacity of SOLES’ Centers and Institutes:** the Institute for Nonprofit Education and Research’s (INER) Caster Center for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Research, the Center for Education Policy and Law (CEPAL), the Global Center, the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA), the Leadership Institute (LI), and the Mobile Technology Learning Center (MTLC)

   - Create collaborative solutions to societal challenges.
   - Drive debate and bring media attention to policy issues in our respective sectors.
   - Serve as a community resource for information and research services connecting the community to SOLES.
   - Elevate collaboration between faculty and students across SOLES’ disciplines and across USD.
   - Train doctoral students in research and evaluation methods to address important community needs.

**Global Center: Connections and Impact**
- Expand connections with existing partnerships, Ashoka campuses, and NGOs (e.g., Edify, Save the Children).
- In collaboration with USD, establish at least one SOLES initiative in a strategic location abroad.
- Expand research opportunities abroad for students and faculty.

2. **Serve as a Catalyst and Hub for the Greater San Diego Community**
- Strengthen our high profile annual conferences, speaker series and symposia in order to enhance the vibrancy of our environment and to stimulate debate in the community.
- Provide services to the community through symposia, workshops, projects, events, and continuing education.
- Provide additional opportunities for influential scholars to visit SOLES for extended stays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiative #2 Teaching Excellence

Innovation is in the DNA of SOLES. For example, we created the first Leadership Studies doctoral program in the nation; we were the first education school in the nation to require that all students have an international experience; and, we have students from all three departments conducting Action Research projects annually. SOLES and USD are nimble and thus we are able to be highly responsive to our community and stakeholders in offering new programs, courses and certificates.

Our ability to assume a more influential leadership role in the sectors we serve, is directly related to the quality of our teaching efforts, which have a direct impact on all of our programs and certificates – undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and continuing professional education.

1. Commitment to Experiential Learning and Reflective Practice: In particular, we offer experiential learning opportunities to students through our practicum and fieldwork courses, internships, the Leadership Institute, the Leadership Conversation Project, action research projects and our work with pedagogies such as PBL and lesson study. The substantial international research and study opportunities available to our students are also evidence of our leadership in experiential education. Going forward, we:
   o Deepen commitment to extending and creating additional opportunities; further integrating them in all our academic programs.
   o Promote us, both internally and externally, as a laboratory for innovative pedagogies that highlight the connection between theory and practice and emphasize experiential learning.

2. Increased Support for Teaching Excellence: All of our programs are well regarded, and our intent is to increase their stature. In recognition of the pivotal role that faculty will play in achieving that goal, we will:
   o Increase support and incentives for developing excellent courses and teaching materials.
   o Provide incentives and opportunities for faculty to innovate and incubate new ideas in their respective disciplines and professions.

3. Strategies and Resources for Attracting Top Faculty and Students: The quality of our pedagogic efforts depends on our ability to bring together innovative teachers and highly qualified students, both of whom have a wide range of experiences and cultural perspectives. Therefore, achieving teaching excellence at SOLES requires that we:
   o Attract and retain a diverse faculty.
   o Attract and retain a diverse student body.
   o Prepare students to work in diverse communities.
   o Increase our endowment in order to support recurring scholarships and additional assistantships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiative #3 Intellectual Influence

A vibrant intellectual environment is essential for any prominent school within a university. One of our key roles is to expand our influence in the local, regional national and international community. The core intellectual capital of SOLES is nurtured within our academic departments. Our ability to assume a leadership role in education, the nonprofit sector and mental health community is directly related to the quality and influence of our scholarship. This scholarship, in turn, directly affects by the school’s intellectual environment.

The current intellectual environment at SOLES is strong. Our research output is increasing and becoming nationally and internationally recognized. Some faculty support and incentives for research accomplishments are institutionalized. Building upon this foundation, more can now be done to strengthen the intellectual environment in SOLES.

1. Increase Support for Faculty and Student Scholarship
   - Increase the number of professorships, chairs, fellowships, and additional research support.
   - Increase support to students to attend professional conferences, and be involved in research projects, and professional associations.
   - Support cross-departmental research seminars in, for example, action research or quantitative analysis that will deepen the impact and generality of our research.

2. Increase Faculty Applications for Grants, particularly to Private Foundations
   - Develop strong and purposeful connections to private foundations that fund in SOLES’ program areas.
   - Provide grant-writing support to faculty.
   - Offer focused, timely professional development on grant writing particularly targeting foundation grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal #4--Sustainability
The final document will contain:
1. SOLES 4 School-Wide Goals
2. Each of the four departments (L & T; LS; SFMHS; NROTC)
3. Each Center (CEPAL; CASTER; GLOBAL; ELDA) will have at least one goal

Timeline:
A. Ask departments to consider monthly meeting feedback about their goals
B. Discuss draft 11 at May 8 DAC meeting; revise
C. Discuss draft 12 at May 9 monthly meeting include possible metrics
D. Finalize metrics over summer
E. Goals and metrics to be discussed at September EDAC and monthly meeting
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
Committee Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLES-Wide Committee Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. ARRT:</strong> Cordeiro (Dean), Donmoyer (At-Large, 2nd of 2), Getz (1st of 2), Inoue (1st of 2) Johnson (2nd of 2, Second At-Large), Williams (Chair) (2nd of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. ARRT Policy Advisory</strong> Martin (1 of 2), McDonald (2 of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured, Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Faculty Status:</strong> Donmoyer (2nd of 2), Hubbard (1st of 2), Inoue (1st of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured and tenure track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Curriculum:</strong> Reed (Chair), I. Martin (1st of 2), McDonald (1st of 2), Spencer (2nd of 2), Estrada (1st of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured and tenure track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. University Professorship:</strong> Donmoyer, Hubbard, Quezada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former University Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. SOLES Global Center:</strong> (Alexandrowicz), Dews, (Inoue), (Lattimer), Martinez, Nash (Chair), Dunigan, Quandt, McDonald, Tessema, Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Dean’s Advisory Cabinet:</strong> Ault, Dews, Gelb, Getz, Krist, Lattimer, Neiger, Reed, R. Stein, Mumford, Rabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Action Research Committee:</strong> Getz, Inoue, Lattimer, McDonald, Rowell (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Sustainability Committee:</strong> Garofalo (Co-chair), Gonzalez (Co-chair), Alexandrowicz, Krist, Gelb, Martin, Reed, Hetherington, Raimond, Coughlan, Degheri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOLES ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEES

- **Alumni Relations/Remarkable Leaders** Dews, Lattimer, Mandell, Mantle, Neiger, Quezada, Smith, Manley, J. McDonald, Martin, Mantle, Preisnberg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senate</td>
<td>Reed (2nd of 2), Quezada (1st of 2),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Alternates based on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ARRT Appeals</td>
<td>Galloway (2 of 2), Reed (1 of 2),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzalez (alt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professorship Oversight</td>
<td>Williams (3rd of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the three previous University Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Integrity</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic Calendar Committee</td>
<td>Alexandrowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Library Committee</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Experiential Learning Committee</td>
<td>Alexandrowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University Budget</td>
<td>Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. International Center Advisory</td>
<td>Dews, Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Academic Program Review</td>
<td>Patterson (2nd of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>Barnes (1st of 3), Buczynski (1st of 3),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzalez (1st of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Center for Educational Excellence</td>
<td>Lattimer (1st of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. WASC – Steering Committee</td>
<td>Krist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Graduate Assembly</td>
<td>Dews, Reed, Getz, Mumford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Commencement Committee</td>
<td>Dews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SON ARRT Committee</td>
<td>Ammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parking and Transportation</td>
<td>R. Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Faculty Grievance</td>
<td>Gelb, Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SOLES ARRT Committee Draft Statement on Teaching (4/26/12)**

a. Does the teaching demonstrate command of the subject?
b. Is the teaching innovative?
c. Is technology used as a tool for teaching innovation?
d. Are teaching materials organized and presented to students clearly or easy to understand manner?
e. Does the teaching motivate students to learn the subject?
f. Are strategies in place to measure student performance?
g. Does teaching involve strategies for constructive feedback?
h. Are students challenged to address needed academic and/or personal barriers to their learning?
i. Does teaching promote experiential and/or transformational learning opportunities?
j. Does teaching demonstrate a desire to construct beneficial learning environments?
k. Does the instructor provide information that is useful or valuable to know?

d. Methods of Assessment: The above criteria are difficult to measure. Efforts to assess teaching can parallel the challenges that researchers face trying to define and operationalize constructs. No method or approach is a perfect measure of the construct. These indicators, particularly in isolation, are not infallible. The candidates under review could use the items listed below as resources for developing a case that they have met expectations in the area of teaching:

a. Self-Assessment – It is important for candidates to reflectively assess their own teaching. For example, a self-assessment document may include, but not be limited to, teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence. The document may be supported by a collection teaching examples/documentation that demonstrates implementations or successes of their teaching philosophy, improved teaching skills, consideration of alternative teaching objectives and methods, or other aspects of their teaching that warrants discussion.

b. Peer-Assessment - A peer assessment offers a candidate feedback that pinpoints their strengths and areas for improvement exposed in other forms of assessment. Peer assessments should be conducted at the request of the faculty member wishing to be reviewed, and may be a required evaluative tool at the department/program level. The ARRT committee encourages candidates to include more than one peer assessment. When selecting a peer reviewer the candidate should consider the potential for the peer reviewer to be objective and/or constructive in their assessment. Peer assessment can take many forms, but should involve: (1) considers whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire desired professional knowledge and/or skills; (2) considers whether the grading system and evaluation/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development; (3) examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness; (4) recognizes the risks and successes inherent in creative teaching methods; (5) Peer reviewers may also elicit feedback from the students directly by talking to them during a portion of the class. Potentially, the peer reviewer should facilitate feedback before, during, and after teaching sessions. Feedback should be based on: (1) examination of materials for the course (e.g., syllabus, handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and (2) classroom observation(s) in the classroom or clinical instructional settings and/or (3) data gathered from ongoing teaching mentoring. After the peer assessment, the peer reviewer should produce a report that is discussed with the candidate being reviewed and presents the strengths and areas for improvement for the teaching of the faculty member.

c. Student Assessment- Student review of teaching is required in SOLES via an on-line evaluation system. Sixteen items are scored on a seven-point scale and three open-ended student questions reflect more qualitative or attitudinal factors. While student reviews occur each semester, they should not be used as the sole criterion for evaluating teaching. Candidates under review should respond to student ratings and explain important contextual information that may aid ARRT committee members in analyzing student assessment data. Candidates may include other forms of
SOLES ARRT Committee Draft Statement on Teaching (4/26/12)

A. Statement on Teaching for the School of Education and Leadership Sciences-

The following policies were created by the SOLES ARRT Committee to aid candidates in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process. Candidates could use these teaching statements, definitions, assessments and resources to address the criteria established within the SOLES file preparation recommendations:

a. Values Statement Regarding Teaching: Candidates for promotion and tenure should be able to clearly articulate the philosophy and goals of their teaching as they relate to their specific field. Teaching is a dynamic endeavor that involves creativity, experimentation, leadership, personal reflection and collaboration. Candidates should specifically address teaching challenges and strategies for improvement. Further, we recognize that teaching does not occur in a vacuum, and candidates should provide evidence of how their teaching works synergistically with the other criteria for promotion and tenure at USD and SOLES (scholarship, service, support for the mission and values).

b. Definition: Teaching can take on many forms. Quality teaching respectfully challenges students, models continuous learning, facilitates critical thinking, facilitates specific learning outcomes, and engages students in the learning process. To some extent, quality teaching starts and continually returns to the question: What do my students need to learn? The ARRT committee recognizes that quality teaching can be difficult to define and have created a working definition in an attempt to encourage candidates to reflect on and report on high quality teaching wherever it may occur professionally.

a. Classroom Instruction- Developing new teaching strategies, incorporating new technologies, designing new assessment strategies, locating new course materials and designing appropriate assignments help to enhance classroom instruction and maintain high expectations of quality classroom teaching.

b. Clinical Instruction and Supervision- Many professional training programs involve some form of clinical or supervisory instruction. The goals and learning objectives of these educational experiences can be very different from classroom teaching. Advancing supervision strategies, improving assessment practices and/or designing innovative clinical experiences are important teaching endeavors.

c. Curriculum Development- Programs and faculty consistently work to respond to new developments and/or changes in requirements (e.g., state licensing boards, credentialing requirements, accrediting bodies). Designing and redesigning courses, course sequences and program requirements are important teaching elements that can play a major role in student training and their ability to access professional opportunities.

d. Academic Advising/Mentoring- Advising and mentoring students beyond course selection and matriculation requirements is a valuable area of teaching. Improvements to advising can have a huge impact upon student learning and development (e.g., consulting on research projects/proposals, career planning).

e. Experiential Learning- Many programs and faculty incorporate experiential learning into their work. This form of teaching can take on many different shapes, but usually involves students learning by doing. Designing and implementing effective experiential learning activities typically represents a great deal of effort and coordination on the part of the instructor, but also may yield meaningful learning opportunities that contrast or complement what might be possible in the classroom.

f. International Learning Experiences- Teaching internationally or from a global perspective broadens the scope of instruction and offers new instructional challenges and opportunities.

c. Criteria for Assessment: It is helpful to distinguish between the criteria for evaluating teaching from the actual methods that we use to evaluate teaching. No single criterion is adequate to measure teaching, and some criterion may not apply in all cases. These criterion, to some extent, may overlap and include:
student assessment data if available, although candidates are encouraged to include the conditions and purposes for which the data was collected (e.g., conducting research on teaching, peer facilitated mid-semester evaluation, etc.).

d. Evidence of Teaching Development- Candidates under review could demonstrate efforts to improve their teaching by taking advantage of any external (campus or off-campus) resource designed to address issues related to teaching. These resources may be used for a range of instructional needs that could include syllabus consultation, videotape feedback or direct observation in order to provide faculty with confidential, independent feedback about teaching through a variety of formats. Candidates may want to include evidence of professional development activities that specifically speak to challenging areas noted within the other forms of teaching assessment (self-assessment, peer-assessment, student-assessment).

e. Evidence of teaching excellence through publications- For example, individuals may publish articles on how they teach a course or the development of a new course in their field. Likewise, developing a widely used text for a training program could be additional evidence for teaching excellence.

f. Feedback on courses by alumni- Former students who are now in the work force may be able to give a different perspective on the quality of the materials or concepts taught in a particular course. Were there important deficits? Or, do they feel the course prepared them for the real world in that particular area?

g. Employers/Supervisors – Do employers or supervisors of current students (schools, agencies) believe they have the necessary skills to be successful? Likewise, do employers or supervisors of our students after graduation feel our graduates have the necessary skills, or do they perceive deficits in a particular area? Candidates could collect from assessments that measure these areas and include them their file.

h. Performance on program, state, or national exams – The ability to pass sections of a comprehensive exam might point to the strength or deficiencies in a particular class.