

## UVA School of Education and Human Development (EHD) PRE-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

### A. Overview

There are three main purposes of the pre-tenure review: (1) to give candidates constructive feedback on how they are progressing in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; (2) to offer candidates recommendations on how to allocate their time and effort to best position themselves for promotion and tenure, and (3) to provide the department chairs and dean information to evaluate the candidates for re-appointment. Tenure-track faculty members are typically reviewed during the latter part of their *third year* of employment in consideration of a second three-year contract. However, this timeframe may vary depending upon a candidate's prior experience, start date, circumstances, and any relevant approved clock stops. If the Dean decides not to renew the candidate's contract, the candidate is entitled to a terminal year. This document describes the timeline, required materials, and procedures for the pre-tenure review.

### B. Timeline

The table below provides a summary of the actions and the typical timeline for the steps in the pre-tenure review process. Details of each step of the process are then described in the sections below.

Action	Date
Chair and Dean's Office initiate the review process	November 1-15
Pre-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) appointed	Mid-January
Candidate submits materials	February 1
PTRC submits report to Department Chair	No later than April 15
Chair writes an assessment/letter and forwards it along with the PTRC to the Dean	May 1
Dean reviews committee report and chair's assessment and decides on reappointment status	May 15
Chair meets with candidate to discuss feedback provided in the Dean's letter and chair's letter	June 1

### C. Procedures

#### *Initiating the review process*

All tenure-track faculty members must undergo a pre-tenure review. In most cases, this will take place no later than the faculty member's third year at EHD. The Department Chair and Dean's Office initiate the review process within the first two weeks in November of that year. The Dean's Office will notify the candidate by email that they are up for pre-tenure review and inform the candidate of the timeline and requirements for pre-tenure review. In some cases, the timeline and requirements may vary because of conditions specified in a candidate's initial appointment letter, clock stop (e.g., family leave), a mid-year start date, or a consensual decision by the Dean, department chair, and faculty member.

A candidate with prior experience as a post-PhD faculty member or researcher may request a pre-tenure review after appointment at EHD for at least one year. Any candidates wishing for an earlier review should discuss this possibility with their mentor, Department Chair, and the Associate Dean. If initial disagreements arise as to whether a candidate should in fact receive an early pre-tenure review, the mentor, Chair, and Associate Dean should meet to discuss this matter, try to arrive at a consensus, and then provide the candidate with their collective recommendation. Alternatively, a candidate with sufficient experience and achievement to warrant consideration for going up for promotion and tenure prior to the end of the three-year contract may request to go up for tenure early, obviating the need for a pre-tenure review. Again, candidates considering going up for tenure early should discuss this possibility with their mentor, Department Chair, and the Associate Dean.

### ***Pre-Tenure Review Committee: Appointment and Responsibilities***

The Pre-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) consists of three tenured faculty members: two from the candidate's department and one from another department. One of these members will be a member of the Promotions Committee. The department chair recommends members of the PTRC to the Dean, who then appoints the PTRC by *mid-January*. The member of the Promotions Committee on the PTRC serves as Chair of the committee. All members of the PTRC will receive training by the Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

The PTRC reviews the candidate's submitted materials and conducts a comprehensive analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition to information supplied by the candidate, the PTRC may also solicit input from members of the candidate's program area and department, and the Department Chair.

The PTRC also conducts an observation of the candidate's teaching and summarizes that information in their report. It is recommended that the observation of teaching conducted by the PTRC follow the [Rubric – Peer Review of Lecture](#) or [Online Instruction](#) tools used by the P&T Committee (available within the [Promotion and Tenure Resources Files](#)) when conducting their observation and review. This observation is independent of the teaching observation referenced in Section D, below.

The PTRC prepares a written report which includes an analysis of the candidate's strengths and targets for improvement in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, along with constructive comments and specific recommendations pertinent to the candidate obtaining a successful tenure review. This report (typically no more than 6 pages in length) is submitted to the Chair of the candidate's department *no later than April 15*. The PTRC report is advisory to the Department Chair and Dean but is not provided to the candidate.

### ***Department Chair's and Dean's Responsibilities***

After reviewing the PTRC written report and the candidate's materials, the Department Chair prepares a formal written assessment of the candidate. The assessment reflects the Chair's independent judgment concerning the candidate's likelihood of earning tenure based on his or her current and projected work and should contain specific references to the quality and amount of scholarship, teaching, and service. This written assessment should also reflect the analysis and recommendations of the PTRC in their report.

The Department Chair submits this assessment report and the PTRC report to the Dean by May 1. The Dean reviews the committee report and the chair's written assessment and provides a letter to the candidate regarding his/her decision on reappointment by May 15. When the Dean's assessment letter has been completed, the Department Chair will schedule a meeting to discuss its contents with the candidate. This discussion highlights recommendations and strategies to best position the candidate for promotion and tenure and will offer guidance regarding any areas of concern. This feedback meeting should take place before *June 1* of the candidate's third year, and could include the Dean, Associate Dean, or other faculty mentors. The candidate will receive a copy of both the Dean's letter and the Chair's letter, but neither the PTRC report nor any external letters (see details below on the external letters).

The Chair's assessment, the Dean's letter, the PTRC report, and any other external letters or other materials collected as a part of the process will become part of the tenure review dossier and serve as one basis for judging the candidate's progress. Any suggestions or recommendations contained in the Chair's assessment letter or Dean's letter will be carefully considered at the time of the tenure review.

#### ***D. Materials for Submission***

The candidate submits review materials to the Dean's office no later than the first day of February following notification of the pre-tenure review process. The goals of the pre-tenure review dossier are to contextualize the candidate's work and to provide evidence of the candidate's progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. The dossier contains a narrative, a curriculum vitae, and supporting documentation for scholarship, teaching, and service. Letters also make an important contribution to pre-tenure review deliberations. Therefore, each candidate's packet includes the following: 1) Name of 1 SEHD faculty member (tenured and at the rank of associate or higher) who can write an *internal* letter regarding teaching. 2) Names of 3-4 external scholars (tenured and at the rank of associate or higher) in their area so that the Dean can obtain at least one *external* letter evaluating their scholarship. Both the internal teaching letter and the external scholarship letter(s) will be requested and collected by the Dean's office, not the candidate. See additional details on all of these materials below.

#### ***Narrative***

The narrative is an explanation of the candidate's professional goals and accomplishments that delineate the nature of their work in scholarship, teaching, and service. The narrative is not merely another listing of achievements already included in the curriculum vitae; rather, it explains the candidate's scholarship, teaching and service goals and the extent to which their work indicates progress towards those objectives and/or achievement of those goals. Further, the statement explains the candidate's approach to their work as well as the extent to which their approach makes or is likely to make a unique contribution to the field. This narrative provides the candidate with an opportunity to acquaint reviewers with the culture of their discipline and role within it. Possible topics could include, for example, the interrelationships between research, teaching, and service, or a discussion of program development efforts, or contributions that the candidate's students are making to the school or field. The candidate should use discretion in deciding how the narrative can best describe their unique contributions. This narrative should be no more than 10 pages total, with a 1-2 page introductory overview and 2-3 pages, on average, for each of the 3 subsections (scholarship, teaching, service). The narrative should be single-spaced, 12 point font, with one inch margins.

Goals and accomplishments specific to research, teaching or service should be delineated in the specific sub-sections of the narrative and link to the supporting documentation. The following topics delineate the expected content of the narrative subsections.

### Scholarship Subsection

The scholarship sub-section of the narrative should provide a comprehensive perspective of the candidate's scholarship. It should include a statement of one's research interests, goals, accomplishments, and projected future trajectory. This statement should reflect an analysis of the candidate's contribution or potential contribution to the field as documented in the supporting materials. Because there are different forms of scholarship within EHD, it is important for candidates to describe the typical expectations regarding scholarly expressions in their discipline. This section can identify the importance of the different types of scholarly works (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.), the presence or absence of quality markers such as impact factors for journals in the discipline, granting agencies available, and intricacies of data collection processes. The section should be clearly assembled so readers outside the candidate's field understand what the scholarly expectations are within the candidate's discipline. See the appendix for sample ways to present quality indicators for publications.

### Teaching Subsection

The teaching subsection of the narrative and documentation of all the activities of the candidate that are considered forms of instruction include, but are not limited to, course instruction, mentorship and advising, and other individualized student consultation and support. The teaching section should provide a comprehensive perspective of the candidate's teaching and should document clearly that teaching is of high quality. The teaching subsection should emphasize classroom teaching and course instruction, but can also provide information on advising and mentoring as the candidate has been engaged in those activities. This subsection on teaching should include the following:

- Teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- Analysis of teaching materials
- Evidence of effective teaching

*Teaching Philosophy and Pedagogy.* A narrative of the candidate's conceptualization of their teaching should articulate: the major ideas that inform their teaching; intent and approach to conveying those ideas through various forms of teaching; approaches to the improvement of teaching, professional development, and innovation; ways that their teaching engages and challenges students; and the use of student evaluation to inform their teaching. The candidate should highlight specific expertise in content areas in which they teach. In addition, candidates should provide evidence of continuous efforts at professional development, such as use of available resources to improve teaching, personal reading or conference/workshop attendance, and descriptions of outcomes of critical reflection.

*Analysis of Teaching Materials.* The candidate should submit a critical, evidence-based analysis of two courses taught on at least two occasions at UVA. This section should demonstrate how the candidate's teaching philosophy extends into course materials and how courses have been and will be improved. Supporting documentation can be provided, such as efforts to solicit and incorporate feedback on their

syllabus, course readings, assignments, and course materials from senior colleagues, mentors, content experts, the Center for Teaching Excellence.

*Evidence of Effective Teaching.* The importance of effective teaching in a school of education is a priority in tenure and promotions decisions. EHD defines high quality teaching through the following 5 Principles: 1) Active, Engaged, and Participatory; 2) Inclusive, Equitable, and Representative; 3) Respectful and Professional; 4) Challenging, Informed, Responsive, and; 5) Coherent and Organized. At a minimum, candidates should include their teaching evaluations; however, other evidence of effective teaching is strongly encouraged, such as documented participation in programs and professional development aimed at improving teaching, reports of having colleagues observe and provide feedback on teaching, and effective and noteworthy innovations in their teaching and course planning. Collaborative teaching, teaching that addresses University constituencies outside of the EHD, clinical teaching/supervision, and mentorship of student research should also be described.

As described above (Section D on page 3), the candidate will also provide the name of a senior tenured colleague who will be asked by the Dean's office to submit a letter regarding the candidate's teaching. This colleague can conduct additional observations during the review period; however, it is strongly recommended that the candidate select a letter writer who has conducted observations prior to the review, so the candidate can incorporate their response to that formative feedback into their narrative.

#### Service Subsection

The narrative should also include a description of the candidate's service to the School (e.g., program area, department, center), UVA, field, and major professional service activities, with emphasis on more recent professional contributions and those sustained over time. The candidate should include information on the agency/organization, role, date/duration, activity, and significance or impact for each activity. When possible, the candidate should comment on the impact of their service; they may cite and/or summarize previously received written comments or feedback by collaborators or members of the organizations served. In the case of EHD service, they may cite and/or summarize comments from the Department Chair, program coordinator, staff, students, or other faculty as evidence of impact.

#### ***Curriculum Vitae***

The curriculum vitae provides an historical overview as well as the current professional responsibilities of the candidate. The following information should be included:

#### *Personal Data*

- Name
- Department
- Current rank and title(s) and year of appointment
- List of majors and minors from undergraduate to highest degree. Cite institution's name and dates that degrees were awarded.
- Years of service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher education (names and dates)
- Ranks held at UVA and years (inclusive dates) in each
- Professional positions held (provided in reverse chronological order).

## *Scholarship*

List all scholarly endeavors in reverse chronological order for each of the following categories:

- A full listing of all publications (clearly indicate whether published, in press, or in review; use the format of the most current American Psychological Association Style Manual; please indicate all student co-authors on all publications with an asterisk or italics).
  - Journal articles and monographs
    - Refereed
    - Non-refereed
  - Scholarly books
  - Practitioner-oriented books
  - Textbooks
  - Edited volumes
  - Book chapters
  - Published abstracts
- Grants and Contracts (note role as investigator, e.g., PI, co-PI, consultant, title of grant, sponsor/agency, amount, award dates)
  - Grants funded and total award amount
  - Grants in review
  - Grant-related technical reports
- Scholarly Presentations (please indicate all student co-authors on all presentations with an asterisk or some other notation by the student's name)
  - International and national peer-reviewed presentations and workshops
  - Regional, state or local peer-reviewed presentations and workshops
  - Invited scholarly presentations and workshops
  - Other scholarly presentations
  - Conference proceedings
- Other Scholarly Activities
  - Book reviews
  - Development of tests / assessments
  - Media (software, videos, etc.)
  - Technical reports
  - Creative endeavors related to the candidate's expertise
  - Archived data sets
  - Public Dissemination of Scholarship (e.g., blog posts, podcasts)
  - Research briefs
- Scholarly Activities in Progress (e.g., papers currently under review for publication, grant applications currently in preparation for submission or under review)

See the appendix for sample ways of including quality indicators in relation to scholarly products on the CV.

## *Teaching*

List each course taught with the semester and year taught. Include courses taught in regular semesters, summer sessions, on-line, and at other institutions for the time period under review. Include courses taught in regular semesters, summer sessions, online, and at other institutions for the time period under review. Also list all graduate students and postdoctoral scholars mentored, dissertation committee membership (noting those committees chaired by the candidate), and other significant student mentorship responsibilities.

## *Service*

List all service activities in reverse chronological order for each of the following categories:

- Membership in international, national, regional, state, and local organizations. Cite leadership positions held and dates of service.
- Service-oriented presentations. List presentations given, panels chaired, and dates and locations of presentations at regional, state and local meetings.
- Faculty service, administrative assignments, and professional development at the program, department, SEHD, and University-wide levels. Cite reports written for committee, School, or University use. Briefly describe nature and involvement of all administrative assignments throughout the academic session and summer. Also, list any other service activity.
- Service to organizations and agencies, such as review panels for federal agencies. Briefly describe role.
- Consultations for organizations and agencies ranging from individual schools to professional agencies. Briefly describe role.

## *Honors*

List nominations, honors and awards received, citing the source of the award and date.

## ***COVID Impact Statement: Required Element***

It is recognized that the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted faculty productivity in a variety of ways, many of which will continue to be felt after the immediate public health crisis has passed. This includes, for example, delays in ability to collect data, delayed publication pipelines, limited access to community sites, pivot to online learning, additional support to students, and management of family/personal obligations impacted by COVID. Candidates are required to provide a COVID-19 Impact Statement, which includes Scholarship, Teaching, and/or Service as relevant for position (up to three pages single spaced total). In this document, the candidate will summarize and provide relevant examples of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the candidate's work, performance, and productivity. Please note, we are not requesting detailed personal or health information; rather, we suggest candidates focus this statement about the impact of COVID-19 on various aspects of their work and productivity. In developing this statement, candidates are advised to consult with their Department Chairs, Center Directors, mentors, and/or Associate Deans. This document will not be shared with external reviewers, but will be made available to the Dean, Department Chair, and PTRC.

This report from AERA and the Spencer Foundation might be useful to candidates as they prepare the COVID-19 impact statement, and to the Pre-Tenure Review Committee as they review and discuss this information. Levine, F. J., Nasir, N. S., Rios-Aguilar, C., Gildersleeve, R. E., Rosich, K. J., Bang, M., Bell, N. E., & Holsapple, M. A. (2021). *Voices from the field: The impact of COVID-19 on early career scholars and doctoral students* [Focus group study report]. American Educational Research Association; Spencer Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.3102/aera20211>

## ***E. Supporting Documentation***

### ***Scholarship and Grant Activity***

Two to four publications that are representative of the candidate's scholarly efforts should be included in an Appendix. In addition to what is provided in the CV regarding grant submissions and awards, candidates should include written feedback and scores received for projects not funded.

### ***Teaching***

- *Class Materials:* Candidates should submit the following materials when appropriate for two courses (if possible taught on at least two occasions at UVA):
- *Syllabi:* A syllabus for each course that details the following: readings, required texts, assignment descriptions, evaluation criteria, and their rubrics; or additional materials that may be relevant.
- *Student Evaluations:* Student evaluations from all courses for the most recent two years must be submitted. The candidate's evaluations should include both quantitative and qualitative data as well as department and school norms. A table should be provided that summarizes for each course the candidate's performance on the key evaluation items noted (and comparative School averages and ranges), as well as lists by course the number of students enrolled and the number responding to the evaluation taught in this period (see sample Table 2 in Appendix). Key evaluation items include:

#2) Through this course I gained a deeper understanding of the subject matter.

#8) Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

#9) The instructor created an environment that respected difference and welcomed diverse perspectives.

*Please note that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the submission of Spring 2020 course evaluations is optional*

- *Evaluation of Teaching by a Senior Faculty Member:* As described above, candidates provide the name of a tenured EHD faculty member who submits a letter that reviews the candidate's teaching and related course materials (e.g., syllabus and readings). This person should also have observed at least one period of classroom teaching and provide information regarding this observation in the letter. This letter becomes part of the candidate's packet and serves as a source of information regarding the quality of teaching. The letter is requested by the Dean's office, not the candidate. This observation is conducted in addition to the observation conducted by the PTRC.



- *Individual Instruction and Advising:* Candidates document advising activities in the teaching section of the dossier and should provide evidence of effective individual instruction relevant to these activities. Indicators of the quality of the advising or the advising relationship may include awards received by advisees, advisees' presenting at conferences or publishing papers, and/or successful job placement of advisees. Some but not all faculty will have supervised student research and directed theses and dissertations, depending on their degree of experience when they began at SEHD. When applicable, the candidate should provide information on dissertation and thesis advising, including the student's name, thesis/EdD capstone project/dissertation title, the date the degree was awarded (when applicable), and status of the dissertation or thesis (i.e., dissertation or thesis proposed or defended; papers submitted, presented, or published; awards received). It is not necessary to provide copies of such documents; bibliographic information is sufficient. This information can be included on the CV or in a separate document.

### *Letters*

- Candidates must include the name of **one internal tenured EHD faculty member** who can write a letter evaluating their teaching. Given the focus of this letter is largely on teaching, it is strongly recommended that candidates identify a senior colleague who has previously observed their teaching and provided feedback prior to the review period; additional teaching observations can be conducted by this letter writer during the review period. This letter writer should be at the rank of associate or full and tenured; however, it may be coauthored by a teaching Academic General Faculty.
- The candidate also provides the names of **3-4 external scholars in their research area** so that the Dean can obtain at least one external letter evaluating their scholarship. All letter writers should be at the rank of associate or full and tenured; however, it is preferable that most of these scholars be at the rank of full or advanced associate.

Please note that both types of letters will be requested and collected by the Dean's office, not the candidate.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1. Sample ways to present impact and quality indicators for scholarly publications**  
**3 examples are provided: journal article, book chapter, book**

Note: When reporting Journal Impact Factor (JIF) we recommend using the [Clarivate/Journal Citation Reports](#) JIF when available. The Clarivate site also reports the rank of the journal as well as citation reports for individual articles.

You can access individual author impact metrics via [Web of Science](#). This includes the overall author h-index as well as citation reports for individual articles. WoS also provides an [author beamplot](#), which provides an average citation percentile of authors' publications (overall as well as by year).

Table Format:

Citation	Journal Impact Factor	Times Cited Google Scholar	Times Cited Web of Science	Other notes (e.g., journal rank, acceptance rate, awards, article media attention)
Williams, J.L. & Deutsch, N.L. (2016). Beyond Between-Group Differences: Considering Race, Ethnicity, and Culture in Research on Positive Youth Development Programs. <i>Applied Developmental Science</i> , 20(3), 203-213. Doi: 10.1080/10888691.2015.1113880	3.479 (2020)  4.364 (5-yr)	101	34	19% acceptance rate  Ranked 22/77 for JIF Psychology, Developmental
Tolan, P. H., & Deutsch, N. L. (2015). Mixed methods in developmental science. In W.F. Overton, & P.C. Molenaar (Eds.), <i>Handbook of child psychology and developmental science</i> , Vol. 1: <i>Theory and method</i> . (7th ed.). (pp. 713-757). Editor-in-chief: R. M. Lerner. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.	N/A	33	N/A	First chapter on mixed methods in the <i>Handbook of Child Psychology &amp; Developmental Science</i> From Amazon book page: "The <i>Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science</i> , a four-volume reference, is the field-defining work to which all others are compared. First published in 1946, and now in its Seventh Edition, the <i>Handbook</i> has long been considered the definitive guide to the field of developmental science."
Deutsch, N.L. (2008). <i>Pride in the Projects: Teens building identities in urban contexts</i> . New York: New York University Press.	N/A	95	N/A	Published as part of <i>Qualitative Studies in Psychology</i> series; Reviewed in Journal of Youth & Adolescence: Whitehead, S.N. (2009). <i>Pride in the Projects: Teens Building Identities in Urban Contexts</i> . <i>J Youth Adolescence</i> 38, 744–745 (2009). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9380-x">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9380-x</a>

CV Format:

Williams, J.L. & Deutsch, N.L. (2016). Beyond Between-Group Differences: Considering Race, Ethnicity, and Culture in Research on Positive Youth Development Programs. *Applied Developmental Science*, 20(3), 203-213. Doi: 10.1080/10888691.2015.1113880

**JIF: 3.479 (2020); 5-YR JIF: 4.364; 19% acceptance rate; 101 GS cites; 34 WoS cites**

Tolan, P. H., & Deutsch, N. L. (2015). Mixed methods in developmental science. In W.F. Overton, & P.C. Molenaar (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science*, Vol. 1: *Theory and method*. (7th ed.). (pp. 713-757). Editor-in-chief: R. M. Lerner. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

**[From Amazon book page:** “The *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science*, a four-volume reference, is the field-defining work to which all others are compared. First published in 1946, and now in its Seventh Edition, the *Handbook* has long been considered the definitive guide to the field of developmental science.”]

Deutsch, N.L. (2008). *Pride in the Projects: Teens building identities in urban contexts*. New York: New York University Press. **[Published as part of *Qualitative Studies in Psychology* series;** Reviewed in *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*: Whitehead, S.N. (2009). Pride in the Projects: Teens Building Identities in Urban Contexts. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 38, 744–745 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9380-x>]

Table 2. Example of Average Student Evaluations for Two Focal Courses

						#2. "Gained a deeper understanding of the subject matter"		#8. "Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher"		#9. The instructor created an environment that respected difference and welcomed diverse perspectives."	
Course	Semester	Enrollment	Respondents	Response %	Percentage Taught	Candidate	EHD	Candidate	EHD	Candidate	EHD
EDHS 2250, Stress & Anxiety Management	Fall, 2020	29	14	48.28%	100%	4.62	4.48	4.5	4.45	4.5	4.47
EDHS 2250, Stress & Anxiety Management	Spring, 2021	27	9	33.33%	100%	4.56	4.5	4.33	4.37	4.67	4.46
EDHS 2250, Stress & Anxiety Management	Fall, 2021	30	8	26.67%	100%	4.13	4.47	4.63	4.45	4.63	4.45
EDHS 2250, Stress & Anxiety Management	Spring, 2022	59	58	98.31%	100%	4.47	4.42	4.48	4.44	4.63	4.43
<b>Average</b>		<b>36.25</b>	<b>22.25</b>	<b>51.65%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>4.45</b>
EDHS 8390, Internship in School Counseling	Fall, 2020	6	4	66.67%	100%	4.25	4.48	5.0	4.45	5.0	4.47
EDHS 8390, Internship in School Counseling	Spring, 2021	5	5	100%	100%	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.37	4.83	4.46
EDHS 8390, Internship in School Counseling	Fall, 2021	5	5	100%	100%	4.2	4.47	4.40	4.45	4.40	4.45
EDHS 8390, Internship in School Counseling	Spring, 2022	6	4	66.67%	100%	4.75	4.42	5.0	4.44	5.0	4.43
<b>Average</b>		<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>83.34%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4.55</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>4.81</b>	<b>4.45</b>