

## **CSUSB College of Education Professional Expectations and Dismissal Procedures**

The faculty members in the College of Education are committed to holding our students accountable for exemplary ethical and professional dispositions and conduct. Academic dishonesty or an evidenced failure to exhibit dispositions consistent with the profession are grounds for disciplinary action or dismissal from any COE program. In addition to other University policies for adherence to regulations for student conduct, the College of Education specifies further standards of integrity and professional dispositions.

### **1. Academic Standards of Integrity**

Any form of cheating or plagiarism is incompatible with academic integrity and the expectations of those taking courses in the College of Education. Plagiarism is the act of presenting the ideas and writings of another person as one's own. Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means. Plagiarism and cheating include but are not limited to:

- a. Representing the work of another person as one's own either through the attempt to deceive or a failure to sufficiently document the original sources in one's own work.
- b. Copying, in part or in whole, from another's test, software, or other evaluation instrument.
- c. Submitting work previously graded in another course unless this has been approved by the course instructor or by departmental policy.
- d. Submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses, including fieldwork observation hours, unless this has been approved by both course instructors or by the department policies of both departments.
- e. Falsification of information or documents submitted for any university, college, program, or credential purpose.
- f. Using or consulting during an examination sources or materials not authorized by the instructor.
- g. Altering or interfering with grading or grading instructions.
- h. Sitting for an examination by a surrogate, or as a surrogate.
- i. Using unauthorized materials during an examination or assessment.
- j. Falsification of any documents or assignments submitted to any instructor, such as but not limited to, fieldwork observation, fieldwork assignments, supporting documentation for fieldwork hours, fieldwork reports, evaluations and medical notes.
- k. Falsifying or inventing information used in an academic exercise with the intent to suggest that the information or citation is legitimate.
- l. Any other act committed by a student in the course of academic work which defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding or abetting in any of the actions defined above.

## 2. Dispositional Standards and Conduct

All degree and credential candidates are expected to exhibit professionalism and ethical conduct. In this case of teacher credential programs, this is an expression of the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 section 41100 which states that the teacher credential candidate must “demonstrate suitable aptitude for teaching in public schools” (b)(3) and that teacher credential candidates “shall demonstrate personality and character traits that satisfy the standards of the teaching profession. The assessment of the candidate shall be made by the teacher education faculty of the campus, who may also consider information from public school personnel and others’ (California Code of Regulations, Title 5 section 41100 (b)(6)).

The CSUSB College of Education holds all degree, certificate, and credential candidates to the professional and ethical standards outlined below.

- a. Adhere to local, state, federal laws, CA Education codes, and professional codes of ethics applicable to their field of study and practice.
- b. Protect the privacy of those within the professional setting except in cases where the safety of another person is compromised by doing so. This includes protecting the privacy of others when using the internet and social media.
- c. Exhibit a commitment to respect diversity and a willingness to serve, evidenced through behavior, the educational and developmental needs of students and community members irrespective of race, ethnicity, nationality, economic class, language, sex, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, religion, physical/mental ability, or age.
- d. Promote the safety of all K-12 students and work to insure that all students are protected from harassment, discrimination, or bullying.
- e. Promote the safety of professional colleagues, fellow CSUSB students, staff, and faculty and work to insure that they are protected from harassment, discrimination, and bullying.
- f. Exhibit professional behaviors and attitudes such as respectful treatment of others at the university and in field settings, punctuality, exemplary attendance, adherence to deadlines, professional appearance, and working collaboratively with others.
- g. Exhibit a willingness to accept feedback and change one’s behaviors to align with course or program expectations, dispositions, and professional standards.

## 3. Disciplinary Process

Whenever a faculty member, adjunct faculty, field supervisor, principal, resident teacher/supervisor (aka, CSUSB representative) has concerns regarding a student’s academic performance, conduct, or professionalism, the CSUSB representative should first attempt to meet with the student to resolve the concerns. If the concern cannot be resolved or is of a very serious nature, such as physical, sexual, or emotional harassment, the concern is referred to the program coordinator and department chair.

At this time the student may also be referred to entities outside the College of Education (e.g., Student Affairs, Title 9, or campus police) as is appropriate or warranted.

If the above attempts by the CSUSB representative to address misconduct, unprofessionalism, or adherence to the program's expected dispositions are unsuccessful, the program coordinator can request that the department chair form a Student Review Committee (SRC). The request is activated when the *Student Conduct Referral* is submitted to the department chair. Once the department chair receives the *Student Conduct Referral*, the chair has 10 working days to form the SRC. The SRC is composed of the program coordinator (who acts as chair) and at least two other faculty members not parties to the problem. If the program coordinator is involved in the situation beyond the role of coordinator and cannot be impartial, the department chair will appoint another faculty member to replace the coordinator.

Within 10 working days of being formed, the Student Review Committee reviews supporting documentation and meets with the student(s) to hear all perspectives on the situation. During this meeting, the committee will ask the student to attend as well as other parties involved in the situation. The student may bring one representative to the meeting as well. After consideration of the information, the Student Review Committee can recommend that no action be taken, that the student(s) continue in the program with conditions (articulated in the *Student Improvement Plan* outlined below), or be dismissed from the program.

## Decisions

- a. Continuation with Conditions: If the decision is to continue with conditions, the program coordinator works with the student to develop a *Student Improvement Plan*. The plan includes the following:
  - i. detailed description of the concerns or misconduct;
  - ii. description of any actions to be undertaken by the student;
  - iii. deadline by which the student must demonstrate the required level of knowledge, skill, behavior, or ethical conduct;
  - iv. a description of what type of evidence provided by the student would indicate that the concern has been addressed and student improvement has occurred;
  - v. signature sheet signed by the department chair, program coordinator, and the student indicating agreement with the plan and that failure to complete plan may result in dismissal from the program.

The plan will be filed in the student's file and, if appropriate, a hold placed upon the student's registration until the conditions outlined in the plan have been met. The program coordinator shall, on or before the date specified in the plan for completion of the remediation, review student progress based upon evidence provide by the student and/or a faculty member. One or two actions must be taken to resolve the concern.

If the plan is met and the concern is alleviated, the student will be notified and no further action will be taken.

If the concern is not alleviated as determined by the program coordinator or representative, the Student Review Committee meets to consider further action. The Student Review Committee can recommend (a) the creation of a new plan or (b) that the student be dismissed from the program. If the recommendation is for the creation of a new plan, the committee simply repeats the procedure outlined above. If the Student Review Committee recommends dismissal, the case is referred to a meeting of the program faculty.

b. Dismissal: The SRC can recommend dismissal if the student fails to meet the conditions of the *Student Improvement Plan*. Alternatively, if by agreement of the SRC the misconduct was serious enough to warrant immediate dismissal without further intervention, the SRC can recommend dismissal without the development of a *Student Improvement Plan*. In either case, the recommendation for dismissal, along with supporting documentation, is forwarded to a meeting of the program faculty for consideration. The recommendation for dismissal may be for immediate dismissal or dismissal at the completion of the current academic quarter or semester. After examining the documentation presented by the program coordinator, the decision for dismissal is determined by a simple majority of program faculty present in the meeting. The decision is then communicated to the student and the record of the decision placed in the student's file.

**Procedure for forming the Student Review Committee (SRC):** At the beginning of each academic year each department chair recruits for four faculty members to join a college-wide pool of department faculty. These faculty members will potentially serve on ad hoc Student Review Committees. When the need arises, chairs recruit from among the members of the pool, excluding faculty who may be involved in the situation being considered.